



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, April 16, 2018
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 16, 2018, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, and PITZER were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of April 2, 2018 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Ruffin.

Mr. Thomas asked that B69-18 be moved from the consent agenda to old business. Ms. Peters asked that B71-18 be moved from the consent agenda to old business. The agenda, including the consent agenda with B69-18 and B71-18 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Trapp.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI5-18 Oath of Office of Newly Elected Second Ward Council Member Mike Trapp.

Discussion shown with SI6-18.

SI6-18 Oath of Office of Newly Elected Sixth Ward Council Member Betsy Peters.

The City Clerk administered the Oath of Office to Council Member Mike Trapp and Council Member Betsy Peters, and Mayor Treece presented each with a framed Commission of Office.

Ms. Peters stated she was honored to be re-elected as the Sixth Ward Council Member and hoped to represent the Sixth Ward well.

Mr. Trapp thanked everyone that had been supportive and all of the voters as there had been a great turnout in the Second Ward. He felt it had been a great victory for civility, and he thanked everyone again.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC4-18 Board and Commission Applicants.

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

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Norgard, Peter, 1602 Hinkson Avenue, Ward 3, Term to expire May 1, 2023

CONVENTION AND VISITORS ADVISORY BOARD

Drury Tom, 4603 Slocumb Court, Ward 2, Term to expire September 30, 2019

DOWNTOWN COLUMBIA LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

Neagle, Cindy, 1836 Cliff Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire May 1, 2021

Peckham, Nick, 2009 N. Country Club Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire May 1, 2021

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

Rushing, Joy, P.O. Box 61, Ward 1, Term to expire May 31, 2022

Stanton, Anthony, 315 LaSalle Place, Ward 1, Term to expire May 31, 2022

Mr. Thomas suggested they delay making appointments to the Fair Housing Task Force for another cycle a number of people that had attended the Fair Housing Symposium had expressed interest on being on the Task Force, but the application period had either already closed or had closed soon after. Ms. Amin noted it had closed the Friday of the event. Mr. Thomas commented that he had checked with Mr. Cole, who would be staffing the Task Force, and Mr. Cole had indicated he was supportive of the idea of delaying appointments to expand the field.

Mayor Treece stated he believed a larger pool would give them more choices.

Mr. Skala commented that he felt those were compelling reasons.

Mayor Treece asked if there was any objection to readvertising. No one objected.

Mayor Treece pointed out they were still accepting applications to the Integrated Electric Resource and Master Plan Task Force as well, and noted they had received five applications to date. He encouraged those with expertise in that matter to apply.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH11-18 Proposed replacement of storm drainage and sanitary sewer infrastructure along a portion of Garth Avenue north of Lynn Street.

PH11-18 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp stated he was pleased they were moving forward on this as he had seen a lot of flooding at that intersection. He pointed out the road had nearly collapsed there so he was glad it would get the attention it needed. He thanked the voters for approving the stormwater increase, and noted it was one of the ballot projects he had been most excited about as it would complement the work they would do with the nearby stormwater basin. He thought it was great to see this area revitalized. The work done by the City and others, to include the Housing Authority, had really stabilized the area, and it had the look of a suburban neighborhood. He commented that he could not imagine how the area might look had they not intervened.

Ms. Peters asked how long Garth Avenue might be closed. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not know yet. They would have a better idea as they moved forward with the design of the project and authorization to bid it.

Mayor Treece understood pavement had collapsed there, and asked if that had been attributable to this issue. Mr. Sorrell replied it had been attributable to the section of storm drainage they were requesting permission to replace.

Mr. Skala understood this fit into the improvement category of inflow and infiltration. Mr.

Sorrell stated the sanitary sewer replacement would help reduce infiltration into the sewer system, and the storm drainage was what had caused the pavement failure recently.

Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to proceed with the replacement of storm drainage and sanitary sewer infrastructure along a portion of Garth Avenue, north of Lynn Street. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters and approved unanimously by voice vote.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B68-18

Voluntary annexation of property located at the southwest corner of Highway KK and Scott Boulevard; establishing permanent M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood) zoning (Case No. 18-42).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood the sewer plant was located in the lowest area of the Perche Creek watershed. Mr. Teddy stated he suspected it was located in a low point. Mr. Thomas understood it was close to where the Perche Creek flowed into the Missouri River, and asked if the need for the force main meant water and gravity flows from this location did not go into the Perche Creek watershed and instead went into the Missouri River at some other point. Mr. Teddy replied this parcel was in the Mill Creek watershed although a small portion might be in the Perche Creek watershed. It was close to a drainage divide and the natural drainage was toward Mill Creek, which was a tributary of the Perche Creek. Mr. Thomas understood it was then really in the Perche Creek watershed. Mr. Teddy agreed ultimately it was all within the Perche Creek watershed. He explained their breakdown of watersheds included subwatersheds. In addition, the nearest large capacity line would be within the Mill Creek watershed. Mr. Thomas understood that would require a pump. Mr. Teddy agreed and noted that would lead to the Perche Creek trunk sewer, which was a wide diameter sewer.

Mr. Pitzer understood the offsite improvements would be paid entirely by the developer. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked if that would service only this property or if it would be available for other tie-ins. Mr. Sorrell replied it would be designed only to serve this property. Mr. Pitzer asked if that was the most logical way to proceed. Mr. Sorrell replied most likely. He explained this property drained into the Mill Creek watershed, but almost everything else south of the highway drained into the Bonne Femme watershed or into another tributary to the Perche Creek that was downstream of the wastewater plant. If they continued to hook into the Mill Creek system, it would soon no longer have capacity for properties within the Mill Creek watershed. The long range master plan included a regional pump station in this area that would tie directly into the wastewater plant, but it was not funded and was out several years. Mr. Pitzer understood there was plenty of capacity on the Mill Creek line to accommodate this development. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. He explained if they continued to develop further into the south and pumped into that system, it would run out of capacity.

Mr. Pitzer noted he had asked Mr. Sorrell from some projections of revenues versus maintenance costs for the extension if it were to be built and given to the City, and appreciated receiving that information. Several scenarios had been provided, but they had all showed the revenue generated would be significantly above and beyond any operational costs. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct.

Ms. Peters understood Mr. Teddy had indicated the City's jurisdiction extended to this area and asked for clarification. Mr. Teddy replied directly north was the city limits so City neighborhoods were established directly north of this site. In addition, there were City neighborhoods directly to the south even though they were not contiguous. He explained the city limits were pushed out along a couple of corridors, Route K and a combination of Scott Boulevard and Route KK.

Mr. Thomas understood the gray scale areas on the diagram were within Boone County

jurisdiction and the colored areas were within the City of Columbia. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Ms. Peters asked if this site was within the urban service area. Mr. Teddy replied the urban service area ended right at Route KK, and this was just across from it. He explained the urban service area line had been drawn to follow existing sewer basins. There had not been a parcel by parcel, neighborhood by neighborhood, or sector by sector analysis of that boundary. It was a generalized boundary that followed existing areas that had sewer or where there was a planned and funded major sewer.

Ms. Peters asked about fire and police protection for the area. Using a diagram, Mr. Teddy pointed out the nearest fire station if there was joint response, and noted there was another station on Chapel Hill Road that was within the City. Ms. Peters asked how far the Chapel Hill Road station was from this site. Mr. Matthes replied the Boone County Fire Protection District (BCFPD) station was located near there, but that did not mean there was a staff person within it, so that was something to consider when discussing response times. The City's nearest station was Station No. 6. Ms. Peters understood Mr. Teddy had pointed out a BCFPD station. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Fire Chief White noted the City's closest station would be Station No. 6 on Chapel Hill Road. Ms. Peters understood they no longer had a joint response agreement with the BCFPD. Chief White stated that was correct. The response area agreement that covered the automatic aid ended on April 3rd. Ms. Peters asked how long it would take the Fire Department to get to this area from Chapel Hill Road. Chief White replied he would need study it to provide an estimated time.

Mr. Matthes pointed out it was in the long range plan to build a station in the southwest, and understood Chief White had discussed that with this landowner. Chief White explained they had reached out due to its location and the need for a station in that general area. He commented that the most important thing for a fire station was road connectivity in terms of how far and how quickly one could reach other areas. The intersection of Route KK and Scott Boulevard provided north, south, east, and west connections almost immediately so a station near this location would allow them to complete the gap and provide coverage to the east. Mr. Matthes pointed out there was a funding mechanism to purchase the land as part of the capital improvement sales tax ballot. He thought a little under \$3 million had been earmarked for a southern municipal service center of which a fire station would be a piece of it.

Mayor Treece asked if the property owner had offered to donate the land. Chief White replied he had only preliminarily reached out to see if the land was available.

Mr. Skala understood the discussion had been extremely preliminary, but it interacted with their decision to rezone and annex the property if there was price for the property. Mr. Matthes explained the perfect location was on that corridor between Route K and Route KK on Scott Boulevard.

Mr. Skala stated he was glad there was clarification of this property being a County island. It was just beyond the urban service area, but was a County island, and there were several instances of that around the community. He asked if there had been any discussion with other nearby areas as to whether they wanted to come into the City or if they were unlikely to annex into the City. Mr. Teddy replied he had not heard that property owners in the area wanted to petition for annexation.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the neighborhoods in the area were generally within the four minute response window. Chief White replied they looked at four minute travel from the nearest station, and these would not be within four minutes. It was an area of concern for them.

Mr. Pitzer asked Chief White if other potential sites had been identified in the area. Chief White replied there had been a couple of other sites they had considered without reaching out to the property owners, and those had since been developed. They were looking up and down the corridor for a suitable location.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a roundabout at the corner of Route KK and Scott Boulevard. Mr. Teddy replied there was a roundabout at that intersection. Mr. Thomas

asked if the roundabout had splitter islands and pedestrian crossings on each of the four legs. Mr. Teddy displayed a diagram and noted it appeared to have splitter islands. Mr. Nichols stated the roundabout consisted of splitter islands and crosswalks, and they had extended a sidewalk. He commented that it would connect to the school since a sidewalk had been built along there. Mr. Thomas was happy that would be a walkable intersection.

Tim Crockett, 1000 W. Nifong Boulevard, explained they were asking for M-N and did not have any plan to go along with it. It was about 10 acres, but about half of an acre of property had been given as right-of-way for the roadway and roundabout improvements for the new elementary school. He commented that there was existing residential to support the proposed zoning as there were roughly 1,400 residential homes in this vicinity. This site was at the intersection of a minor arterial and a major collector roadway, and the M-N designation would be compatible with the adjacent zoning and land uses. It was also a nodal location. He displayed information provided by the City with regard to nodal locations and a diagram showing existing commercially zoned land and the subject site. The existing commercially zoned properties were at the nodes, i.e., the intersections of arterial and collector roadways, and the Unified Development Code (UDC) indicated the purpose of the M-N district was to provide commercial shopping and service facilities in or near a residential neighborhood. He noted they had that at this site. He commented that the principle land use was small shopping area with sales services oriented to the needs of the local population, and thought they could fulfill that at this location. He pointed out the UDC had indicated citizens had expressed a strong desire for mixed-use development as they wanted a livable or walkable area. He understood commercial nodes or urban villages should ideally be spaced approximately one-half mile apart. This situation involved a little over one-half of a mile. He believed this location was justified and that they could have other nodal locations. He commented that neighborhood scale commercial was a walkable center located near a residential neighborhood that included small marketplaces, daycare, and professional offices. He noted a daycare was across the street from this site so they would look at small professional offices and marketplaces. He pointed out this site was within the Boone Electric Cooperative service territory, and they had ample capacity to serve the site. It was also within the Consolidated Public Water Supply District (CPWSD) No. 1 service territory, and the water tower located near the Thornbrook neighborhood was actually a CPWSD No. 1 facility, so the subject site would be served by that water tower. In terms of sanitary sewer, they were proposing to be a City of Columbia customer, and there was capacity along Route KK to the north. Regardless of the sewer option, it would be net positive to the City. He commented that they would be fully compliant with the storm sewer regulations. He understood there had been issues with other developments and the school property, and pointed out this site would not drain into that watershed so they would not compound or contribute to that issue. He noted this site was adjacent to the city limits and the urban service area, and utilities were available to the site. He explained the site was also located within the sewer service status area as identified in Columbia Imagined and in an area in need of a fire station. He stated Chief White had contacted him last week indicating they were interested in a fire station at this location. In terms of the urban service area, it went around the elementary school so that school was not within the urban service area. He pointed out the urban service area was a guide and not a steadfast absolute. He displayed a sewer service area map and noted the subject site was in the beige area, which was designated as an area that would have sewer service in the future. He displayed a fire service territory map, and pointed out there was ample room for a fire station on the site. He reiterated they were asking for M-N zoning and would be compliant with the UDC and Columbia Imagined. Utilities were available to the site, and it had the full support of staff and an 8-0 approval from the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC).

Mr. Skala asked how a potential fire station at this site would affect the salability or

development of the property. Mr. Crockett replied he and Chief White had only briefly talked. He understood they would not be on the hard corner as they wanted to be able to get on to Scott Boulevard to head south, north, east, or west with relative ease. He did not know the size of property needed, how it would fit, etc. He pointed out there was an existing pond on the site, which could be a great stormwater feature, and there were a lot of things they would need to review and take into consideration. Mr. Skala commented that he understood it was very preliminary, but it would affect the bottom line for the City in terms of a fire station and the developer in terms of development. Mr. Crockett agreed.

Mr. Pitzer understood they did not have any development plans for this site. Mr. Crockett stated they had some thoughts, but it would be neighborhood driven. He commented that they envisioned something like the area near Walgreens as there were commercial uses and office uses along with livable units upstairs or on the perimeter of the commercial uses.

Mr. Pitzer asked how close the next service area was besides the daycare that had been mentioned. Mr. Crockett replied a Breaktime was located two miles to the north at Scott Boulevard and Vawter School Road. He understood a nursery was to the south, but it was not really service oriented. In terms of services, one would have to go to the old little general near the New Town area. Outside of Scott Boulevard and Vawter School Road, one would have to go to the Walgreens area or the Hy-Vee area to the north so it was a substantial distance.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he believed Route KK was a clear southern boundary, and understood this site was outside of the urban service area. He commented that this was speculative zoning at this time because they did not really have any plans, and this meant a speculative expansion of the City beyond the urban service area. He did not feel that was good policy. He could not think of one good reason to expand the City physically based on the presentation tonight. In addition, he felt this would lead to a further expansion of the City to the south. He did not understand why they would want to take on additional responsibility and understood they could build the fire station at this site regardless. He reiterated he did not know why they would want to grow physically when they were stretched in so many ways. The notion that people would pay fees to the City for various services and that it would pay for growth was idiocy as had been demonstrated by the recent past. He challenged the Council to not break this line without a full blown west/southwest area plan followed by a robust west/southwest area transportation plan. He reiterated this request was purely speculative and there was not any benefit to the City.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he believed there were a lot of positives with this annexation. In terms of infrastructure, the only item that would need to be constructed was the sewer, and the sewer would not only pay for itself, but it would also send funding back to the sewer fund to pay for other projects. He stated this was the type of mixed-use development that was really needed in this corner of town as the closest service facility was a gas station that was two miles away. He understood a daycare would be constructed across the roundabout. Due to all of the nearby homes, he felt having some services nearby would be of great benefit to all of the residents and would keep people from driving much longer distances to services. In response to Mr. Clark, he noted there were already developments further south from the site along Scott Boulevard. He pointed out this was adjacent to the urban service area, and all the infrastructure was there. It would serve a need in terms of providing some mixed-use development and would be beneficial to the community there. He stated there was a big need for a fire station in the southwest, and pointed out that was more pressing due to the end of the mutual response agreement between the City and the BCFPD. If one was able to be built here that would be great. Otherwise, they needed to continue to look elsewhere. He commented that he supported this annexation and zoning request, and did not see any negatives. The one thing that could be said was the fact it was adjacent to the urban service area, but it would not really add any burden in terms of infrastructure, besides the

sewer that would be paid for, so he planned to support it.

Mr. Skala stated he was evolving into a fiscal conservative when it came to annexations and urban service areas. He agreed the urban service area line was not inviolable, and depending upon the circumstances they could and should adjust it if they agreed with an annexation. He commented that he agreed with Mr. Clark in this instance in that this was a bit premature as there was not anything driving this decision and that there might be some things mitigating the driving of this decision, such as the discussion with regard to the fire station. He agreed fees would come back to the City to help pay for some of the development in terms of the sewer, but did not feel that was case with electricity and water. He also agreed the infrastructure was in place, but did not see any particular reason to annex this property tonight. He commented that there were good reasons for annexations, but did not feel this property should be annexed, and noted he would vote accordingly.

Ms. Peters asked why this had not been on the consent agenda since it had an 8-0 PZC vote in favor of it. Ms. Amin replied it had been scheduled for the consent agenda, but at the last meeting, Mr. Crockett had indicated he had a presentation next time, and Mr. Thomas and Mr. Skala had made comments. She explained when she had pointed out it was scheduled for consent and asked if they wanted it to be moved to old business instead, they had indicated they did.

Mr. Trapp commented that for an area to be walkable, three things were needed, i.e., rooftops, sidewalk infrastructure, and places to go. If they reviewed the walkability scores of the Thornbrook neighborhood, it would be very low, similar to the Second Ward, because there was not anywhere to go. There was not any commercial development to which someone could walk. The fact they were served by Boone Electric Cooperative and CPWSD No. 1 worked out well for the City because those entities provided the electric and water services, and the City would collect the gross receipts tax on those utilities. In addition, commercial development was a sales tax generator. He believed this annexation would benefit the City and that it made sense at this busy corner with a school nearby. He liked the node concept and planned to support it.

Mr. Thomas stated he planned to support this as well. He commented that he often opposed annexations when it would lead to another enormous area of land to be annexed. In this situation, the City was all around it. This was almost an island of Boone County within the City. He noted the urban service area had not functioned as he thought it would when they were developing the comprehensive plan. He hoped that when they updated the comprehensive plan, they were a lot more thoughtful about planning for the future in terms of where they saw development happening and wanted development to happen. He stated he would argue the Perche Creek should be a hard boundary to the west, and that they should find where the City limits extended to the south to determine logical areas within which to encourage development and outside of which to make a decision they would not bring it into the City. He commented that this was a needed land use form and that it would be mixed-use according to the zoning district. He thought there was a potential for this to be an urban village in a suburban area to south of Columbia. He hoped the specific site design was more urban in nature with buildings and pathways connecting the commercial site to the adjacent neighborhoods. He noted it appeared the roundabout had good pedestrian connectivity for the school kids and across to the daycare and the subdivision in the northeast corner. He hoped the development would not involve a series of boxes surrounded by parking lots. He also hoped the parking requirement in the mixed-use neighborhood district was lower than what it had been for the commercial zoning district. He commented that he would argue that it should be lowered further to make it truly walkable. On the whole, he believed this would be a benefit to the area, and noted he planned to support the annexation and associated zoning.

B68-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES:

PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B72-18 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with the Hallie Holland Living Trust for the acquisition of property located at 912 East Walnut Street to be used by the Solid Waste Division for a collection site for refuse, cardboard and container recycling in the Downtown CID; appropriating funds.

Discussion shown with R60-18.

R60-18 Adopting the Downtown CID Compactor Location Master Plan.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas commented that he had some concerns about this proposal and believed this was tied to the compactor plan that would be discussed later. He wondered if they should consider both at the same time.

Mr. Thomas understood the \$690,000 would be paid from solid waste enterprise funds and asked if that money came from residential, commercial, etc. Mr. Sorrell replied the enterprise fund included all portions of the solid waste utility, and the cost of this purchase would be allocated toward the Downtown CID, and all costs for solid waste services within the boundary of the Downtown CID were charged only to the customers within the CID. When they did the cost of service study and took the purchase price into account, the rates within the CID would have to be adjusted to cover those costs. He noted they could pick a time frame, likely 30 years, to amortize the purchase price. Mr. Thomas understood they separately billed CID customers and this \$690,000 would only be applied to the bills of the customers within the CID. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. The intent was that the cost of providing refuse collection and recycling services within the CID would be covered by the residents and business within the CID. Mr. Thomas asked if it would involve all of the different customer units within the CID or if the CID as an entity pay a single bill for all of this. Mr. Sorrell replied it would be all of the units within the CID. Mr. Thomas understood the area matched the CID taxable area.

Mr. Thomas asked how the Council felt about discussing the compactor plan now or holding this item until they got to that item on the agenda. Mayor Treece asked if there was any objection to bringing R60-18 from new business to this portion of the agenda. No one objected.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Peters asked how they had decided upon the \$690,000 for this piece of property. Mr. Sorrell replied an appraisal had been completed, which he believed had come in at \$700,000, and the property owner had offered to sell it for less than the appraised value. There was also some money that needed to be spent to make the site usable for collection and recycling.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked why the City would be purchasing property for private businesses to put their trash on for the City to collect. Mr. Sorrell replied the downtown area was unique in that it was fully developed for the most part, and when it was developed, everyone was allowed to construct from property line to property line or right-of-way line to right-of-way line. There had not been any requirement in the past to provide for solid waste services inside the structure. They had since changed the ordinances, and if there was enough use in a building, solid waste facilities were required to be located inside the footprint of a new building. In areas where that was not an option, something had to be done to collect materials, and only the right-of-way was available. The purchase of this property would allow for a permanent solution. He pointed out they sometimes leased private properties to place compactors on, and it was a comparable expense.

Mayor Treece asked how this compared to Peachtree, Broadway Bluffs, or other commercial developments. Mr. Sorrell replied those had been developed more recently

and were more modern, so they had planned solid waste collection services as part of the development. This had not occurred in the downtown when it was developed decades and decades ago.

Mayor Treece asked how many of the sites on the compactor location master plan were on municipal owned or leased property versus private footprints. Mr. Thomas asked how many of those were current collection sites and how many were proposed sites. Mr. Hunt responded grid by grid, and noted the yellow squares were compactors.

Mr. Hunt noted Grid 1 had two compactors. The northernmost was an existing compactor and was located in a public right-of-way. The southernmost was located inside the new apartment building at that location. Mr. Thomas understood that one was on private property, but it was required by ordinance. He asked if it was available to users outside of the building. Mr. Hunt replied no. Mr. Thomas understood it was just for the residents of the apartment building. Ms. Peters asked for clarification with regard to the apartment building. Mr. Thomas replied it was located on Elm Street, between Fifth Street and Sixth Street. Ms. Peters understood it was the Brookside 1-2 bedroom apartments.

Mr. Hunt continued to Grid 2 and noted the northernmost site was on City owned property behind the Gentry Building. The one on Sixth Street, next to the My House Bar, would be a new one that did not exist today. It was proposed to place that one at the westernmost end of the alley. The one to the east of that on Seventh Street was in an apartment building. The one further east of it on Eighth Street would be a proposed new compactor in the alley. Mr. Thomas understood that was the Opus building. Mr. Hunt stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas asked if the one on the west of the building had been required. Mr. Hunt replied he did not know if the ordinance had been in place when that apartment building was constructed, but it would be required today.

Mr. Skala asked if it was safe to assume the ones incorporated due to the ordinance in newer buildings were specifically there for the residents of the building and not for anyone else to use. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought that was a safe assumption. Mr. Thomas stated it might be helpful to delineate that because it was not clear when they were all yellow boxes.

Mr. Hunt moved on to Grid 3, and noted the one at the top left corner was in the alley behind Broadway Brewery. He explained there had been a lease of a piece of property, but the compactor had been removed from that location because the buildings on both the north and south sides of the alley had been damaged when getting the compactor in and out of that location. As a result, they were proposing to put the compactor back in the alley. Mr. Thomas asked if that would block the alley to traffic. Mr. Hunt replied yes. Mr. Thomas asked if it would be blocked to pedestrians as well. Mr. Hunt replied no. He explained directly to the east on the other end of Alley A was another existing compactor behind US Bank. Staying on the east side and going south was another compactor on a City owned parking lot, and next to the compactor were two recycling roll-off containers. The south end of the grid had a compactor in the south end of the alley, and they were working with a property owner to move it to the north end of the alley as it would then be out of the public alley and would involve a private property lease. This move would allow the alley to be open. Mr. Thomas asked what was typically paid per year to lease a piece of land the size of a compactor. Mr. Hunt replied he did not believe there was a typical amount. The lease recently approved for the Wabash Arms compactor was \$6,500 per year with a three percent escalation. He expected this one to be more due to it being closer to campus where property was more valuable.

Mr. Hunt stated both compactors on Grid 4 were existing compactors, and they had actually already discussed them.

Mayor Treece asked for the footprint of trash compactors. Mr. Hunt replied they were approximately 12 feet by 20 feet.

Mr. Pitzer noted Mr. Hunt had indicated there were recycling containers on one of the sites, and understood the others did not have a recycle container. Mr. Hunt stated that

was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked how recycling was handled inside the apartment buildings. He wondered if the recycling was picked up by individual unit inside the apartment buildings. Mr. Hunt replied recycling service within the CID was by and large provided by two yard dumpsters that were located in the alleys. Most of the trash dumpsters were gray or brown, and the green and blue dumpsters were for recycling. The recycling dumpsters were located on City owned property, like the one mentioned. There was also one at the Wabash Station and one north of the Armory. Those were open for anyone's use. Mayor Treece asked if they had considered placing one in the parking garages. Mr. Hunt replied the garages did not have the head room due to the height required to load and unload the containers. Mayor Treece asked if there was not any square footage around the existing parking garages that would be accessible. Mr. Hunt replied he thought the parking garages were built like other downtown buildings in that they were built from property line to property line. He noted they could look at all of the garages, and pointed out they had a compactor in the alley behind the Fifth and Walnut garage.

Mr. Ruffin commented that he had received quite a few concerns regarding dumpsters in the alley between Eighth Street and Ninth Street, as well as dumpsters adjacent to the Hathman building, 15-17 N. Tenth Street, with regard to trash, grease, etc. He understood this plan would eliminate all of the dumpsters and force the businesses to use the compactor and asked if that was correct. Mr. Hunt replied in general, yes. The concept was to reduce the number of trash dumpsters and to have more trash compactors. The compactors, while not perfect, provided a lot more storage than a dumpster as one compactor could replace about 30 two-yard trash dumpsters. Rather than servicing the dumpsters six days a week, they could service the trash compactor once or twice a week. It was less trips, less noise, and less traffic. He noted he was not sure there was a good solution for the grease. Mr. Ruffin explained he was particularly concerned about the removal of the dumpsters in the alley between Eighth Street and Ninth Street because of the width of the alley. He understood buildings had been damaged by the trucks and there had been issues as a result. Mr. Hunt stated an option would be to remove all trash service from that alley, and those with businesses and tenants there would have to take their trash to a different location further away. It was not something they were proposing because it was not the most convenient for the most number of people. Mr. Ruffin commented that he thought they were concerned about the lack of sanitation the dumpsters created as it made the alleys unwelcoming to those that wanted to walk through it. He stated he would like to see that become a part of this plan. He wanted to assure the businesses and others who were in the area that they would either remove the dumpsters or find a more effective way of ensuring the businesses used the dumpsters properly.

Mayor Treece asked how much the grease abuse was an enforcement issue versus an access issue. He wondered if one could dump grease in a City dumpster. Mr. Hunt replied City ordinance specified trash should be as free as possible of liquid so liquid grease would be a violation of the ordinance. Mayor Treece commented that there appeared to be an equity issue as well because a lot of restaurants had spent a lot of money to have a grease containment system for the grease to be evacuated, recycled, or sold. The dumping of grease in the alley seemed to be an expensive solution for the City. Mr. Hunt explained they were currently working with the Public Works Department to come up with a solution for the grease, i.e., the used cooking oil from deep fryers. He pointed out there was not an easy solution as most of the buildings in the CID were built from property line to property line, and unless the restaurant could find adequate space within the building to store used cooking oil, they would not have any place to put it. The downtown trash and recycling was a common use system whereby any resident or business in the CID could use any dumpster they chose to use so there was not any accountability for any mess.

Mr. Skala stated he had seen a private company removing some grease one morning behind the KOPN radio station and they had missed the lip of the truck, which effectively

dumped most of a 55 gallon drum of grease in the alley. He thought they might want to consider a better approach to enforcement and monitoring.

Mr. Thomas understood that in addition to these 30 or so locations that had compactors or would soon have a compactor, there were also a number of dumpsters sited in the area and asked how many. Mr. Hunt replied close to 100. Mr. Thomas understood those were serviced daily because they were fairly small in capacity, and asked if most or all of them would be eliminated through this plan. Mr. Hunt replied the ones that would be eliminated would be the ones where they would add a compactor. Mr. Thomas stated it would have been helpful to have all of that information in the plan to really understand what was being proposed. Mr. Hunt explained they had intended to include everything, but as they went through the process, the group had decided to only address the compactors because the dumpsters were mobile. The concern was that if they had the trash dumpster on the master plan, they would not be able to move it without coming back to the Council. Mr. Thomas thought they could have included it as a background for the plan to show the current situation and the definite plan for the future along with other options. Mayor Treece asked if those dumpsters were on private or public property. Mr. Hunt replied they were in public rights-of-way.

Melissa Frier, 17 N. Tenth Street, explained she was speaking for Aardvarks and displayed some photos of the mess in the alley between Ninth Street and Tenth Street. She pointed out the sludge that ran out from under the dumpsters ran down Tenth Street toward Broadway and into the storm drain system. In her almost 15 years of working at Aardvarks, she had never seen a mess like this. She understood a compactor had been removed several months ago for reasons unknown to her, but since then, the mess was like never before. It included rotten food and leaks from unsealed trash bags. From a business standpoint, she did not want her customers to have to see this as they approached her business. She commented that she understood 51 percent of purchases were now made online, which directly affected the sales tax brought into the City, and believed that if they would provide a more pleasant atmosphere, it might be a way to convince people to shop locally. She felt the rotten food and the increase in insect and rodent activity was a result of this and needed to be resolved. She pointed out it going into the storm sewer was a health hazard and environmental concern as well. She commented that she believed purchasing the property at 912 E. Walnut would be a real benefit to the entire downtown area. She understood it would not address all of the issues, but the mess was vastly more contained when there had been a compactor. She understood there was some opposition due to the cost and the desire of the City to not become a landlord. She thought it was feasible for the City to purchase the property, delineate the small amount needed for the compactor, and sell the remainder of the property. She noted she could name at least five landlords that would jump at the opportunity to purchase such a desirable location, even with the compactor located nearby. She stated she hoped the Council would approve the purchase of this property.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Frier if she rented or owned her building. Ms. Frier replied they rented the building. Mayor Treece asked her if she was comfortable paying higher trash fees to offset the cost of the property. Ms. Frier replied she was not the owner, and only the manager, so she could not say for sure, but she thought the owner would be happy to do that in order to have a better atmosphere. She pointed out their property had also been damaged as a result of a semi-truck running into and destroying both of their air conditioning units between Ninth Street and Tenth Street.

Dan Viets, 15 N. Tenth Street, stated he agreed with the comments of Ms. Frier and noted they lived with this every day. It stunk very badly when walking in that alley, and the food spillover was not healthy as it was attracting rats, vermin, and insects. He commented that summer would come, and it would get worse with the heat. It was a very bad situation. He noted he was sympathetic of others that had lived with similar situations for quite some time and was glad the City was taking a comprehensive approach in trying to solve this problem. He hoped the City would purchase the property.

He commented that it was not a perfect solution, but it was the only solution he was aware of that could be pursued in the short term for this urgent situation. The slime, grease, and ooze that came out of those of dumpsters made it dangerous to walk in the alley as it was slippery. He could not imagine much worse than falling in it. It was an ugly situation that was crying out for some kind of immediate relief. The dumpster had narrowed the alley tremendously. It had never been wide enough for real vehicle traffic, but it was now impossible to get a lot of vehicles down the alley. He pointed out it was also impossible to close the dumpsters with the way they were aligned against the wall of the building they occupied, and every time it rained, the items in the dumpster got soaked and did not dry out quickly causing it to rot. It was a horrible situation. He pointed out there were more people and businesses in the downtown, and a consequence of that was more trash.

Mayor Treece asked if the dumpsters mentioned would be removed with the purchase of the property and the compactor there. Mr. Sorrell replied yes, and explained everything, i.e., recycling and refuse collection dumpsters, within those two blocks would be relocated to this one common location.

Mr. Thomas understood the concern mentioned about grease leaking out would not be addressed by this change because those placing grease illegally in the dumpsters would likely put the grease illegally in the compactor as well. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct and noted that was a separate issue, which they were working on with the CID and the Public Works Department in hopes of bringing proposed solutions to Council in the future.

Katie Essing, 11 S. Tenth Street, commented that she was with the Downtown CID and noted a quality of life issue that came with a vibrant and full downtown was lots of trash. She thanked the Solid Waste Division for helping them work on this issue over many months, and pointed out the CID Board supported the Master Plan, of which the purchase of this property was a part. She explained the CID Board would like the City to save the historic building so it would maintain the streetscape along Walnut since only the parking lot in the back was needed. She stated she believed that would lower the rate impact to the users in the CID.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Essing if the Downtown CID property owners were comfortable paying higher utility rates to offset the cost of this. Ms. Essing replied it had not been an easy decision, but due to the complaints and volume of trash in the area, it seemed to be critical as mentioned by previous speakers.

Mr. Ruffin asked if the building on Walnut Street was currently occupied. Ms. Essing replied she did not believe it was currently occupied. Ms. Peters commented that part of it was as she had been there yesterday. She explained she thought it had been a 15-foot wide building, but it appeared to be 40 feet wide. The building had two apartments upstairs and a place for business on the first floor. Ms. Peters wondered what they would do with regard to parking for that building if they used the parking lot for trash and recycling. Ms. Essing replied a consideration was parking, but it had been privately held. She understood the owner would give up that parking.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, commented that the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) had met the night after this item had appeared on the meeting agenda as an introduction and first reading item. As a result, they had been unaware of it when they had formulated their agenda for their April meeting, and had not been able to discuss it. She expressed her unease as a member of the public with regard to the perils of this purchase. There were two distinct buildings with two distinct addresses. The first floor area, which currently had an organizing office in it, could be used for residential or commercial purposes. Further upstairs were two apartments that could be affordable housing for young people and people of modest means that might work downtown. It was not the luxury housing that tended to be the only option available to students. She commented that in looking at the picture displayed she saw a lot of cars behind the buildings and a lot of space for putting a dumpster on private property when those same

private property owners were earning revenue from leasing their buildings to restaurants and other businesses that generated trash. She stated she recalled a discussion that required a property owner to contribute \$50,000 to a sewer bypass downtown because the existing sewer line, which also served the North Central neighborhood by Hubbell Drive and St. Joseph Street, had continually been blocked with grease. She noted they kept spending money or asking others seemingly unrelated to the problem to solve a problem that was the result of a lack of enforcement. Until they solved the grease problem, they were just providing a bigger and more expensive container in which to dump. She asked the Council to think carefully about taking what seemed to be the more difficult, but perhaps, much less expensive route of enforcement first. The two buildings were old and in need of cosmetic help, but they were also representative of a time when business storefronts looked a certain way. She pointed out Ninth Street, around the corner, was a historic district and all of the structures there were contributing structures to the look and feel of downtown as it existed in the 1920s and 1930s. It represented a cultural heritage of Columbia. When turning the corner from Ninth Street, they continued to see that roofline and those materials indicative of that time. She again asked the Council to think carefully before spending money on something that might be improved by enforcement.

Tootie Burns explained she was representing Orr Street Studios Board and the North Village Arts District Board, and was glad to see the Master Plan, which had been in the works for some time. She viewed it as a plan that would allow everyone to know where dumpsters were placed and where appropriate disposal would occur. She commented that the North Village Arts District and the Orr Street Studios very much supported the Master Plan as a way to organize how trash could be disposed and where dumpsters could be placed. She stated she believed it would also encourage recycling. She explained the dumpster they were concerned about in the alley near Orr Street was a vehicle for illegal dumping and dumping that occurred every day with debris outside of the dumpster, which created a problem for them. She applauded staff for coming up with a Master Plan that would allow people to know where dumpsters were located and with placement that was appropriate for businesses and residents downtown. She believed it would decrease the opportunity for indiscriminate dumping, and asked the Council to support the Master Plan. It made sense, was supported by many businesses, and would help with the trash situation downtown.

Mr. Thomas asked Ms. Burns how this would help to encourage recycling. Ms. Burns replied she understood the dumpster that was currently in the alley near Orr Street would be moved to the Wabash Station where there were currently recycling dumpsters. This would provide the ability to recycle when placing trash in the dumpster. She explained they already recycled as they would walk the recycling across the street. She thought other businesses would do the same.

Mr. Thomas understood the proposed compactors were not split in half with both recycling and trash capacity. Mr. Hunt stated that was correct. He explained at Orr Street, they were proposing to remove the trash dumpster in the alley and relocate a trash compactor currently on the Wabash property from the southwest corner to the northeast corner along with a recycling bin in a nice enclosure. Mr. Thomas agreed it would be helpful for well-labeled recycling receptacles and the regular trash compactor to be next to each other.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Burns who owned the alley south of Orr Street where the problematic dumpster was located. Ms. Burns replied she thought the City owned it. Mayor Treece asked if that was the City's dumpster as well. Ms. Burns replied yes. Mayor Treece asked for the status of that dumpster. Ms. Burns replied it was the reason she was speaking. Mayor Treece noted he had called twice to have it dumped.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, agreed the situation with the dumpster mentioned by Mr. Viets and Ms. Frier was as bad as they had indicated, but it had been that way for a long time. He understood they had a compactor plan now, but they still did not have a

combined compactor, collection, grease, facility, and enforcement plan. If they did not put all of those things together, he did not believe they would ever make any progress because it was difficult to get people to accept enforcement. He suggested the Council hold off on moving forward until they learned about enforcement options. He commented that he also wanted to know in detail what the CID would pay when only half of the property purchased would be used as he believed the CID had been created to solve and fund issues such as this. He noted he wanted more detail about how this would be funded. Like Ms. Fowler, he also wondered about the rest of the property, i.e., the building, and its role in the downtown. He did not feel the situation would get any better or worse in the next few weeks, and thought the CID should purchase the building allowing the City to lease the necessary space from them. He also thought more specifics were needed in terms of enforcement along with financing.

Mr. Pitzer asked if this property had been listed publically for sale before staff had discussed this option. Mr. Sorrell replied it had been listed for some time, but it was then taken off of the market. The property owner had contacted the City to see if they might be interested in purchasing the south half. Mr. Pitzer asked for its listing price. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not recall.

Mr. Pitzer understood rate increases would not be requested for the next two years in terms of solid waste collection. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct, and explained a lot of rate adjustments had been done based on the most recent cost of service study. This fiscal year had been the last for the rate adjustments across all categories, and they needed a couple of years of data prior to conducting another rate study to determine the costs of providing service. He wanted to include the purchase price of this into it at that time so the costs could be recovered over a 30-year period. Based on current rates over 30 years, he thought the maximum increase that could be attributed to the purchase was five percent. Mr. Pitzer understood there was \$1.5 million in excess reserves in the solid waste fund. Mr. Sorrell stated they had received a larger amount of revenue than had been anticipated at the landfill due to the combustion residuals project resulting in the excess reserves increasing dramatically this fiscal year. Mr. Pitzer commented that it sounded as though they might have been increasing rates too much. Mr. Sorrell explained it was a one-time project. Mayor Treece pointed out it was another City division paying them to dump those residuals. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct.

Ms. Peters asked if they had trash compactors for these locations or if they would have to purchase them. Mr. Sorrell replied they had them. He explained they replaced them on a routine schedule and always had additional available in case a business needed one.

Mr. Ruffin asked if this site was large enough to add recycling bins and for the timeline if this was approved tonight. Mr. Hunt replied the site was large enough for a trash compactor, a compactor for cardboard, and dumpsters for containers and metal. They had plenty of room if they used the parking area of the property. In terms of a timeline, if this was approved, they would have to set up a closing date, and about 30 days after the City had possession of the property, they could place the trash compactor set. He explained they would need to have a meter set for electricity, which was the only thing that required lead time. He pointed out he did not know the current status of the contract the owner had with the people that parked in that lot, so that was something unforeseen that had not been explored with the owner.

Mr. Ruffin asked Ms. Essing if she anticipated any resistance from business owners for removing the dumpsters in the alleys. Ms. Essing replied she thought they would receive complaints if they did not have any trash in that alley at all. It was a dense area with restaurants and businesses and they would have to walk behind this building or across the way, which was a further walk. Mr. Ruffin commented that if they did not remove the dumpsters, the problem would continue to persist. Ms. Essing stated that was correct if they were unable to do the compactor. Mr. Ruffin explained he meant even with the compactor if they did not remove the dumpsters. Ms. Essing stated she thought the

dumpsters would be removed with the compactors. Mr. Ruffin asked Ms. Essing if she thought the local businesses would complain if they had to walk there. Ms. Essing replied no as it was right there within the same alley.

Mr. Skala commented that he understood compactors were at least a partial solution to the trash problem, but was concerned about the integrity of the building they would purchase. He noted he was also particularly troubled by the issue of grease and its enforcement. He wondered if they might want surveille the compactors to determine where the violations were occurring. He thought they needed to view this as a holistic problem. The purchase of this property might help with the trash situation, but it did not do anything to address the grease issue or enforcement.

Mayor Treece asked if staff had looked at the north facing property in terms of its condition. He wondered what kind of liability they might inherit and if the building would even be in compliance with the UDC if they utilized the parking for trash and recycling containers. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought they could replat it so the south side met all of the requirements of the UDC and they could sell the property on the north.

Mayor Treece understood the owner had contacted the City with regard to purchasing only south portion of the property and asked for clarification. Mr. Sorrell replied it had been discussed, and the appraised value was about \$350,000, but the owner had wanted a considerably higher amount. As a result, staff asked for the purchase price for the entire site.

Ms. Peters suggested tabling B72-18, which was the sale of the property, to allow time for the HPC to look this property and for staff to address the other issues, such as whether this would meet the UDC.

Mayor Treece stated he would be in favor of tabling this. He understood one potential solution was to acquire the lot with the intent of subdividing it and taking only the square footage needed. This would allow time to determine if they needed to leave access to that rear parking lot through a passageway and how all of that would look. In addition, they could place restrictive covenants on the title if merited. He also felt they would want to put it back on the market the day it closed as it should not be a part of the City's portfolio. He commented that he still was not sure it was the responsibility of government to provide a site for trash receptacles, but noted he could be persuaded.

Mr. Pitzer asked if there was a deadline on the offer for the property. Mr. Sorrell replied he was not aware of a deadline on the offer, but he did not know what the property owner would do if this was tabled as he had the option of going elsewhere.

Ms. Peters made a motion to table B72-18 to the May 21, 2018 Council Meeting to allow time for the Historic Preservation Commission to look at this property and to allow staff time to address the outstanding issues mentioned tonight. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Thomas stated he had concerns about purchasing a property that was 40 feet by 140 feet to place a compactor that was only 6 feet by 10 feet on it. They did not know what the property had been listed for when it was on the market, and did not know what arrangements the landlord had with the people that parked cars there. It felt like a poorly thought out plan. He commented that it might be the right thing to do, but he questioned whether all of the due diligence had been done. He understood there was an urgent problem to solve for the residents and business owners in the area, but had some concerns about spending taxpayer or ratepayer money in this way. He also had concerns about the plan, but would comment on that later.

Mayor Treece commented that unless staff had asked all of these questions and had received answers, he was inclined to allow them time to flush it out some more.

Mr. Skala stated he wanted to seek more clarification before proceeding as well.

Mr. Thomas agreed, and noted he wanted to know the condition of the building, what they were buying, etc.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had walked through the building. Mr. Sorrell replied he had not.

Mr. Thomas asked if they had explored other possibilities in terms of leasing an appropriate amount of land. Mr. Hunt replied the compactor had been located on the south side of the alley on private property. The City had a private property lease for that compactor and the owner had terminated the lease and requested it be removed, so it had been removed. They had preliminary discussions with the owner of the parcel they were asking to purchase without any luck. The bank on the west end did not want it either. Mr. Thomas asked about placing it in an on-street parking space at a curb. Mr. Hunt replied it would likely take two parking spaces. Mr. Thomas understood it was 10 feet by 6 feet. Mr. Hunt stated the unit itself was 8 feet wide and 12-13 feet long and space was needed for an enclosure around it and for the truck. He explained they typically asked for a 12-foot wide and 20-foot long space.

Ms. Peters asked if the size was the reason they could not just put it in the alley. Mr. Hunt replied it would fit in the alley, but a vehicle could then not be driven past it. Ms. Peters wondered if they needed to drive vehicles past it in that alley.

The motion made by Ms. Peters and seconded by Mr. Thomas to table B72-18 to the May 21, 2018 Council Meeting to allow time for the Historic Preservation Commission to look at this property and to allow staff time to address the outstanding issues mentioned tonight was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece asked if there was any further discussion on the Master Plan. Mr. Thomas replied he would like to see the problems, such as grease, the ability for people to recycle, enforcement, the desire to get rid of dumpsters, the efficiency created by the compactors, etc. along with a map of all of the current facilities, to include recycling, in comparison with the proposal. He did not feel this was a plan. He felt it was just a map. It did not provide any justification for this particular choice, the methodology, how many downtown property owners were involved, etc. He wanted to see a more robust plan for solid waste collection in the CID.

Mayor Treece asked staff if they contemplated the Master Plan as a plan or just as a map. Mr. Sorrell replied it was contemplated mostly as a map showing the locations of the compactors. Mr. Pitzer pointed out it was called the Locator Master Plan.

Ms. Peters commented that the Solid Waste Division staff knew what they were doing, and they had heard from the CID and those that went through the trouble of walking through these alleys and areas. She stated she was not opposed to them moving ahead with this part of the plan, and for them to then provide a report or more comprehensive plan with the information requested by Mr. Thomas and what they could do about everything else. She thought they needed to start somewhere, and this would allow that to happen. It also appeared as though the compactors worked much better than the overflowing dumpsters. Mayor Treece agreed and noted it appeared that most were in the public right-of-way instead of leased space.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed with Ms. Peters. He noted explanations with regard to the issues of trash, grease, and enforcement could come to Council when B72-18 was back before the Council. This plan at least showed where the compactors would be located. He commented that he would like to see additional coding on the map as had been suggested by Mr. Thomas, and thought that could also be provided when B72-18 came back before them.

Mayor Treece asked if staff would look at the ordinances for existing enforcement methods in terms of the Office of Neighborhood Services since there were residents in the downtown and the Public Health and Human Services Department with regard to grease, animals, etc. to ameliorate the problem.

Mr. Thomas asked if they approved the plan showing the compactor on 912 E. Walnut Street if it would compel them to purchase the property. Mr. Hunt replied the map actually showed it in the alley in the right-of-way. Mr. Thomas stated he was comfortable voting on the plan then.

The vote on R60-18 was recorded as follows: **VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:**

B82-18

Amending the FY 2018 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Utility Customer Services Fund, Community Relations Department and Information Technology Department; amending the FY 2018 Classification and Pay Plan by adding, closing and consolidating classifications and changing a classification title; transferring funds; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked how these changes would improve the customer service experience. Mr. Sapp replied they had looked at three different things that had happened with utility billing, i.e., the marriage between process and ordinance, the technology behind it, and the human factor. He explained one of the things they had discussed doing was examining their process from the very basics of what they did every day to create a utility bill from the time a customer came in for service all of the way through receiving a bill and being able to make payment. He commented that they had put a number of teams together to ensure they were addressing all of the issues they had so clearly heard about from customers and the Council. They felt by moving these team members into these appropriate areas, they would be better equipped to look at these processes and make changes to ordinances when needed and be better able to ensure the technology was working as it should or change their processes to marry into the technology. He pointed out they also felt the experience of the Contact Center and the Community Relations Department brought to a customer experience the ability to articulate well with customers through written and verbal communication. He explained they held regular team meetings with a variety of different departments throughout the City to ensure they were addressing all of the issues. Once they were able to determine what the process was today, which they were working to map, they would be able to look at it as a holistic approach and tweak any processes to better serve customers. Mayor Treece stated he was grateful to hear about their approach and general attitude along with the team that had been put together to address this. He pointed out utility billing might be the only or first interaction residents of Columbia had with City government, and if they did not have a good experience, they would likely not trust them to do other things. He loved the fact they would start by looking at how the bill looked and how they received the bill. He appreciated the attitude and the whole customer service experience.

Mr. Pitzer understood Mr. Glascock had indicated sixteen positions would be transferred. Mr. Glascock stated sixteen full time employees and three temporary employees would be transferred.

Mr. Pitzer understood classification closed meant the position would be eliminated after the people were transferred. Mr. Sapp stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked for clarification with regard to classification consolidation. Mr. Sapp replied they would change the Utility Customer Service Supervisor to just a Customer Service Supervisor. At this time, they had two different types of supervisors that were doing the same thing, the Contact Center supervisor and the Utility Customer Service supervisor. Instead of having two classifications, they would only have one. Mr. Glascock explained they had been in two different divisions, but were now being consolidated. Mr. Pitzer asked for clarification regarding a classification that was reassigned. Mr. Sapp replied the Customer Service Representative II would be converted to a Senior Administrative Support Assistant to handle payroll, be a human resources liaison, etc. since the department would grow with this change. Mr. Pitzer understood it was a job role that would change for that individual. Mr. Sapp stated that was correct. He explained the Customer Service Representative II position was actually on they had in the Contact Center now that was vacant, and since it was the same pay grade, they would just change it to the Senior

Administrative Support Assistant position. He noted it would not affect the budget.

Mr. Pitzer stated Section 4 of the ordinance had a transfer of \$38,026 from Utility Customer Service to Information Technology, but that was not referenced in the memo unlike the other numbers in the ordinance. Mr. Chapdelaine explained that was a current position that was moving into the Information Technology Department, and those funds were moving with them. Since it was an existing position it did not have to be highlighted separately.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Sapp about his assessment of the current staffing in the new accounts, bill payments, drive-through lane, etc. areas. Mr. Sapp replied those were things they would continue to review. He explained the drive-through lane and the cashiers office was operated by Treasury, which was a division of the Finance Department. Utility Customer Service was what they would move to the Community Relations Department. He noted he and Stephanie Brown were looking at the staffing levels in Utility Customer Service, and they were comfortable with where those were at now. He pointed out they experienced a fair amount of turnover so they would focus on having good policies, training programs, etc. in place to ensure any new person would develop the culture they wanted.

Mayor Treece asked who answered the phone when someone called the number on the bill due to a problem with the bill. Mr. Sapp replied it was answered by a Utility Customer Service representative. Mayor Treece asked if they were housed within the Community Relations Department. Mr. Sapp replied yes, pending approval from Council tonight. Mayor Treece understood they would then receive the same new approach Mr. Sapp had mentioned tonight. Mr. Sapp stated that was correct. He explained they wanted to bring them on board this cultural change to ensure they were serving and enhancing the customer experience. When someone called, they wanted that person to receive a good explanation for any billing question. He noted the goal was for that Utility Customer Service representative to be able to address issues at ease. He pointed out the Council would have to bear with them for a little while because it would require training.

Mayor Treece asked if customers that physically walked into the building would work with Treasury employees or Utility Customer Service employees. Mr. Sapp replied the Utility Customer Service had people available to address walk up customers along with people who called. He noted they were located on the west side of the historic Daniel Boone lobby. Mayor Treece asked if they would be directed to that room. Mr. Sapp replied yes, and explained they had a full-time Contact Center employee at a temporary desk in the historic Daniel Boone lobby most of the time to direct people to the appropriate office.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a reason for those to be two separate functions of two separate departments. He understood someone paying a bill would go to Treasury, but if there was a problem with the bill, that person would have to go to Utility Customer Service. He wondered why it could not be a one stop shop. Mr. Sapp stated that was a fair question and something they would need to work through with the Finance Department. At the very least, they would need to ensure they were crystal clear on communications back and forth.

Mr. Skala explained he had been a participant of budget billing for several years and an almost \$600 bill had come due recently. He noted adequate notice had been provided that this was forthcoming, and when he had called to ask questions, they could not explain the exact reasons, but had extended options in paying that larger bill. His interaction had been positive and felt improvements were being made.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, thanked Mr. Pitzer for his questions earlier with regard to this. He understood a budget had been adopted with a number of positions, and asked if the closing of a classification was equivalent to an actual reduction in the budget. Mr. Sapp replied they had a Contact Center Manager currently and that classification would be closed and changed to an Assistant Director for the classification added. They would essentially close the Contact Center Manager and add it as a classification of Assistant Director of Community Relations. Mr. Clark understood it was management

reorganization. Mr. Sapp stated that was correct. Mr. Clark understood it was not a budget reduction. He commented that he liked the idea of Mayor Treece with regard to charging each division or department their share of the audit. Currently, the financial audit was funded on a global basis. He stated an adequately staffed and well-organized accounting department was essential to city government running well, and asked Council to charge each of the divisions and departments an appropriate fee to adequately fund and resource that portion of the Finance Department. He suggested they take that up at the work session on May 7.

B82-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B69-18

Rezoning thirty-eight (38) parcels in the West Ash and North Central Neighborhoods within an area bounded by Sexton Road on the north, West Boulevard on the west, West Broadway on the south, and Tenth Street on the east with thirty-three (33) of such parcels rezoned from R-2 (Two-Family Dwelling District) to R-1 (One-Family Dwelling District), four (4) parcels rezoned from R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to R-1 (One-Family Dwelling District), one (1) parcel rezoned from R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to R-2 (Two-Family Dwelling District) (Case No. 18-51).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece explained an amendment sheet had been distributed to Council due to an error in the section number and in two property descriptions. He noted the Council had also received a letter today asking that there be a moratorium or administrative delay on future downzonings.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece understood all of the applicants were the real property owners of each of the parcels. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the difference between the West Central and West Ash neighborhoods. He understood the plan involving West Central had a map of properties west of West Boulevard, and this appeared to involve the area east of West Boulevard. Mr. Teddy replied a West Central Area Plan had been completed, but it was different than the title of this zoning case. It had been a broader area and really looked at the area west of Providence. It had not been only about neighborhood conservation as it had also included proposed development concepts involving nodes, recreational space, and utilities. It had been a comprehensive area plan. This rezoning request included a combination of the West Ash and North Central areas, and those were the names chosen for the zoning case. Mr. Pitzer understood the map included was not inclusive of the entire area that had been covered under the Plan. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer asked if there were any restrictions in the resolution that allowed for group downzonings in terms of requiring the downzoning requests to be similar in nature with regard to the scope of the downzoning or the ultimate level of the downzoning, and if there were any geographic restrictions. Mr. Teddy replied they allowed multiple properties on a single application. It would get unwieldy if they were to go citywide as they would have to do a lot more analysis by area. He commented that he felt this rezoning request was fairly straightforward because the majority of these lots were single-family lots with R-2 zoning that wanted to go down to R-1 zoning to reflect the existing use. In addition, some were small lots that would barely support a duplex unit as two-family dwellings required a 7,500 square foot lot. There were common characteristics to the set. He understood Mr. Pitzer wondered how far would they go in allowing the same application to contain this many parcels, and noted the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) had

asked the same question.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the restrictions imposed on properties adjacent to R-1 zoned properties. Mr. Teddy replied additional neighborhood restrictions would apply if property were upzoned to R-MF or if they were discussing the North Central neighborhood where there was already R-MF zoning. In that case, upon redevelopment of the R-MF zoned property, there would be a requirement for the building to be stepped down to a 24-foot height within 25 feet of a single-family or two-family dwelling district. If it was a larger lot, a building could still reach its full height of 35 feet, but might have to have a wing or something of the lesser height. Another option to achieve 35 feet would be to add ten feet to the normal setback. It involved the idea of a more gradual transition.

Mr. Thomas understood there had been a fairly lengthy discussion involving accessory dwelling units at the PZC meeting, and asked if any action had been taken and for a summary of the points of that discussion. Mr. Teddy replied it had been a question and answer situation as some of the applicants had support for the concept of an accessory dwelling unit. Mr. Thomas asked if that was allowed in R-1 or not. Mr. Teddy replied it was a conditional use in R-1, and there was some expression of disappointment that it would not be permitted with the downzoning to R-1. Mr. Thomas understood there would be a process to request an accessory dwelling unit, but there would not be an associated cost. Mr. Teddy stated an application would be required, which would involve an application fee and the issue would go before the PZC. Mr. Thomas understood there had been discussion about changing the rezoning request such that accessory dwelling units would be by right. Mr. Teddy explained the reason it was allowed only by conditional use was so it would be reviewed on a case by case basis. If they were to consider allowing it in bulk, a detail analysis of each and every lot would be required. He pointed out in some instances the accessory dwelling unit could be remote from fire hydrants or in an area with a lot of parking already on the street. Mr. Thomas understood nothing had changed, and if anyone wanted to add an accessory dwelling unit if this rezoning request was to be approved, they would have to obtain a conditional use permit. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas noted the map from the West Central Area Plan had showed nodes at about six corners of arterial and collector streets for a denser, mixed-use development with lower parking requirements, and asked if any actual legal action had taken place to make that allowable or possible. Mr. Teddy replied the Plan only provided guidance if someone had a redevelopment plan. He pointed out most of the corners were already developed and occupied with housing. In some cases, there might be a church or institution. He reiterated most of the corners were developed. Mr. Thomas understood there had been demolition at the corner of Clinkscales Road and Broadway, and asked Mr. Teddy if he had any idea what the owner was planning. Mr. Teddy replied they had been engaged in the planning process, and thought it was only their desire to move the buildings that were there because they did not want to be landlords. Mr. Thomas understood they did not have plan for redevelopment at the moment.

Mr. Skala stated he recalled several areas of the community that wanted accessory dwelling units by right, like the North Central neighborhood, while there were others that did not, like the Benton-Stephens neighborhood, and that was the reason for the requirement of a conditional use permit. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Amanda Staley Harrison explained she was speaking on behalf of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) and in support of the downzoning of these 38 properties. According to the Boone County Assessor's website, these properties ranged in age from about 1900 for the property at 719 West Broadway through 1954 for the property at 322 Anderson Avenue. In addition, 21 of the structures had been built as the country had entered into World War II. The homes were representative of the swath of housing in core neighborhoods surrounding downtown, collectively representing the largest inventory of workforce housing from the 1920s, 1930s, and 1940s, and many had exterior and interior design elements found in bungalow and craftsman style homes. Housing affordability

was just as important then as it was now, and much of the affordability had to do with size. Small footprint homes with small yards were predominate in the core neighborhoods downtown and provided a clear link economically, culturally, and equitably between the past and the present. She stated the HPC supported this joint application for downzoning by these property owners and asked the Council to undertake a process that would begin with the neighborhoods examining and bringing forward proposals that would protect the inventory of original housing stock for the cultural contribution to the community and for the affordability for individuals and families with modest means. She commented that downtown neighborhoods were not less important due to their smaller overall property footprint or the more modest incomes of their residents. She noted that it had been acknowledged that there was unfinished work to be done after the adoption of the Unified Development Code (UDC) that would protect this housing stock from displacement and these neighborhoods from out of scale redevelopment that would result in the accelerated demolition and resident displacement. It had also been acknowledged that for future downzoning proposals, more resources need to be accessible to facilitate the process, and that all property owners, including those that owned property and rented them to individuals, be included in conversations so a strong strategic plan could be implemented in the core neighborhoods. She believed it should be a carefully designed process that should begin with the recognized neighborhood associations, and the neighborhood associations could carry the proposals through a joint body of neighborhood associations with guidance and input from commissions, including the HPC, the Environment and Energy Commission, the Community Development Commission, the Commission on Cultural Affairs, and the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council. She urged the Council to ensure a neighborhood driven process that included all property owners and ensured for the planning by the residents with their ideas and allowing them to form the consensus of opinions with city entities providing facilitation resources as needed rather than a top down approach whereby staff and the PZC examined a series of ideas, while popular in other parts of the country, the neighborhoods here would not support. She reiterated the decision needed to be made with input from the people that lived in the neighborhoods. She commented that an administrative delay on these 38 properties would be unfair because the residents had been working diligently and had been respectful of the processes that were already in place. She stated she believed the City's social equity agenda as part of its Strategic Plan was best served by the bottom up approach that recognized and valued the opinions of people that lived alongside each other, and reiterated an administrative delay for these 38 homes would be unfair and would unequivocally send the wrong message that the concerns of residents were not worth consideration.

Jim Meyer, 104 Sea Eagle Drive, stated he did not have any objection to this particular downzoning request and was supportive of it, but asked the City to carefully consider this kind of request in the future. He explained the policy to encourage downzoning had been put in place prior to the adoption of the UDC as the downzoning would only affect the property that would be downzoned. Now, with neighborhood protections in place in the UDC, the downzoning would affect the surrounding property owners in terms of setbacks and height restrictions. He thought the City should carefully balance that by taking as much time in reviewing and considering these proposals as it would a proposal from a property owner that wished to upzone their property. He commented that he also thought a downzoning like this could affect a property, not only when it was redeveloped, but if there was a loss due to a fire, as there were neighborhood protections that would come into play depending upon the amount damage to the existing structure. He reiterated he felt the City should consider these carefully and not provide a blanket approval, similar to how they would handle an upzoning.

Tori Kassabaum, 115 Anderson Avenue, explained she lived in one of the houses requesting downzoning and stated they had chosen that for many reasons to include the diversity of the neighborhood. It was a wonderful, rich cultural place to live. The small

square footage home was affordable and they loved that it was in a family-oriented neighborhood. She noted they wanted to protect the character, diversity, architecture, and history of the neighborhood as a home was one of the biggest investments for most of them. She commented that she was not against affordable housing in her neighborhood, even with larger structures, but she believed it should be intentional and planned. Currently, they were seeing big apartments with high rent for college students, who were not necessarily invested in the neighborhood.

Zandra De Araujo, 304 West Boulevard North, stated she was the West Ash Neighborhood Association President and noted she had helped coordinate this effort. She understood there had been a request for an administrative delay and explained she was in opposition to that request. She commented that they had started this process in January 2015 when the West Central Neighborhood Action Plan had been proposed to them, and they had participated in a lot of neighborhood meetings to that effect along with opposition to increased development in the neighborhood. She stated the West Ash neighborhood essentially included R-1 properties. Following the completion of the West Central Neighborhood Action Plan, they had moved forward with the first priority, which was to downzone properties individually. She noted that process had essentially begun around the time the Benton-Stephens neighborhood had received approval in 2016. She explained the neighborhood had been meeting since then and she had helped to facilitate the computer and electronic side of things. She pointed out they were trying to protect against situations whereby smaller bungalows were eclipsed by larger developments next door as the neighborhood protections in the UDC would not do much in that regard. She noted they were also concerned about infrastructure problems in the neighborhood. Four bedroom and four bathroom duplexes on small lots would be more taxing on the sewage systems and other infrastructure. She commented that this process had been long, and they had learned a lot. She understood other neighbors wanted to downzone as well, and felt it would be helpful to communicate to those neighbors if there would be opposition or trouble getting these passed in the future since this had been a three-year process for them. It took a lot of effort and time to navigate a very complicated system in trying to protect the neighborhood.

Christine Gardner, 112 Anderson Avenue, explained the reason most of the people requesting the downzoning were in one particular area was because they had a neighborhood association. It had been a very long and complicated process, but had been done because they felt they were at a disadvantage when trying to save the character of their homes and neighborhoods. It had taken hundreds and hundreds of hours by staff and the residents. As per the UDC, their only, albeit weak, protection to their homes and the character of their neighborhoods was to downzone. If they did not do this, they would be assessed as R-2 whether they were in a single-family home or not, and it had been recommended in the Neighborhood Action Plan. She commented that historically huge sections of central downtown had been massively upzoned, and the East Campus and Benton-Stephens neighborhoods had been affected first since they were close to the University. She noted the Action Plan had been voted on about 2.5 years ago, and it felt as though that had put a target on them as there seemed to be a new development every week overshadowing their homes. They had not been given the chance to put together an overlay as homes had been lost. In addition, there was a continued growing imbalance of owner-occupied and rental properties. There were increased student rental developments with four bedrooms and four bathrooms and increased infrastructure failures, which included stormwater, flooding, and traffic problems. She was concerned about the future if something was not done now. She feared losing the unique character of her home and neighborhood. As intended, when built in the 1930s to 1950s, these were mostly single-family homes. It was a low-to-moderate income neighborhood with a mix of eclectic, tolerance of eccentricity, multi-cultural, immigrants, minorities, etc. She stated they were not opposed to change, but they wanted positive change. She commented that policy decisions had caused

neighborhoods to fade and die, but did not feel it was inevitable as it was in the human dimension. She mentioned too many short-term rentals, too many run down properties being allowed to be purchased by one individual, etc. as issues. She asked those in present in support of the downzoning to stand, and approximately 20 people stood. She pointed out the next group was organizing so clarity from the Council would be needed.

Christiane Quinn, 719 W. Broadway, commented that the PZC had voted unanimously in favor of the rezoning and it had the support and recommendation of staff. As the owner of one of the 38 properties, she wanted to ensure there was not a disconnect between the Columbia Imagined Plan and the current City Council. In looking at the map, some might feel there was something behind the request since it was spread throughout town, but the process had been recommended by the Council to save time and effort. It allowed them to combine properties to avoid each one of them from having to come before the Council individually asking for the same thing. She noted the Neighborhood Action Plan had recommended downzoning so they would not lose the character of their neighborhood. In the past, the entire north side of Broadway had been rezoned to R-2. She could not imagine that happening now. If they did the same for the south side of Broadway, it would destroy the neighborhood feeling and all of the single-family homes. She commented that the properties on the north side of West Broadway had been impacted by the upzoning and did not like the changes that had resulted. She stated she was on a one acre lot on West Broadway and the corner of Anderson Avenue, and had joined her neighbors in this petition for downzoning. She thanked Christine Gardner who had worked hard on this effort over the past two years. She wanted to see houses next to her instead of apartments, and grass instead of cars and parking lots. She asked the Council for its support on this downzoning request, and noted there were plenty of other locations for developers. She did not feel they should purchase and demolish single-family historic homes solely because they were on the north side of Broadway. She did not feel Broadway should be a divider of this town and asked the Council to support the property owners that wanted to maintain the single-family home character of their neighborhood.

Peter Norgard, 1602 Hinkson Avenue, commented that he thought the Council should support this downzoning request. He noted this was an opportunity for members of a neighborhood to come together as a community, which was rare. When this had been done in the Benton-Stephens neighborhood, it had provided a nice opportunity for them to meet a lot of people they had not had the chance to meet previously. He thought they were there to build communities, and this assisted in that process as people had come together for a common cause. He pointed out the development community had fought tooth and nail during the UDC hearings to water down the neighborhood protection standards to the greatest extent possible, and he believed they had been fairly successful. As a result, he would argue any claim that this infringed on their ability to develop was somewhat specious. They would still make money, and life would continue. They might not make the same amount they would otherwise, but they would still be able to make money. This would not impact them to the point this downzoning should be denied. With regard to a potential administrative delay, he would argue the administrative delay that existed previously was to prevent developers from frontloading their applications before the UDC was in effect, and therefore, served an actual purpose. The proposed administrative delay would not serve any purpose other than to fluster those residents that had chosen to downzone.

Robert Hemmelgarn, 805 Alton Avenue, commented that he was an officer of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association Board and was speaking on their behalf. Over the past year, their Board had facilitated extensive dialogue with regard to downzoning in the community. While at present, the Board had chosen to not take an official position of support or opposition to the practice of downzoning in the neighborhood, they were working to facilitate more dialogue on the matter and supported this handful of property owners within the neighborhood that had requested their support

in pursuit of these property protections. They also saw a real value in the protection and preservation of the integrity of the neighborhood.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, thanked staff for correcting the transcription error in the ordinance and provided a handout of an advertisement she had found in the Wall Street Journal indicating a zip code should not determine a person's future in relation to the fiftieth anniversary of the Fair Housing Act. When reading the list of things differentiating a child's likelihood of success, an item missing was homeownership for their parents. She commented that the North Central Columbia neighborhood had been mixed-use for likely as long as her house had been there and her house had appeared on the 1910 census. It had been owned outright by Hungarian immigrants for a family of four, which was shocking considering the small square footage of the house. The dad was a tailor downtown and the fifteen year old son washed bottles, perhaps at Central Dairy. Her house and the houses surrounding her represented a place for people to grow economically into homeownership. They had a civic value beyond the pride of ownership. If they wanted to see redevelopment in terms of more owner-occupied and/or rental affordable housing, she suggested they stand on the berm at Jefferson Middle School and look in all directions as they would view people investing in their properties. They were constantly increasing and improving the ability of more people to live alongside them, and they were welcoming in that effort. She asked that they not forget that having owner-occupied homes was a good way to stabilize a neighborhood and to provide for children, seniors, and the future.

Dee Dokken, 804 Again Street, stated she was a proponent of smart growth and central density, and was asking to downzone her property. She commented that there were two old style duplexes on her block, and she was glad they were there. A friend from work could afford to live there, and it was good to have her. She noted the property next to her currently had a homeowner, who was moving, so it would soon be rental again, and she had appreciated those that had lived in the house now and previously when it was a rental. She pointed out the entire area would not be downzoned. It would be a mosaic of R-1 and R-2 because the process of downzoning was very labor intensive. In addition, many people did not want to downzone. They wanted the ability to rent out the basement. She reiterated there would always be a mix, and in her view, this downzoning would help to stabilize the neighborhood. She commented that everyone that lived on her block was happy to be there. This included renters, younger residents, older residents, etc. They loved the neighborhood the way it was now, and it would likely still have that character and neighborhood feel with a little more density. She thought the conditional use permit process for accessory dwelling units would be good for the neighborhood as a way to increase density. The neighborhood was liked because people could bike to many places. They could even walk, although there were not many sidewalks. She could see why people wanted to live there.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, explained he was downzoning from R-MF to R-2, and this process and what these people were doing to protect the quality of life and character of their neighborhoods was about how they could make the community great. He commented that he did not like the City's motto of being the greatest city as it was an ego-driven notion and did not get them anywhere. He felt to be a great city, they had to have processes. He questioned the cult of the highest and best use as it was based upon investment value and not the use value of a residence. He also questioned the dream about accumulating wealth as it was negative. He stated the upzoning that had been done 40-60 years ago without anyone's knowledge had created a massive pressure of speculative value and rental value as opposed to use value, and it had destroyed the North Central Neighborhood as a 70 percent owner-occupied neighborhood. He pointed out they were trying to reverse this, and those west of Providence Road were trying to prevent it from happening to them at all. He hoped the Council would eventually strengthen the neighborhood protections in the UDC, but understood that was a discussion for another day. He commented that this downzoning was about protecting

property rights, to include use property rights of people in single-family houses, whether owned or rented, and the neighborhood protections currently in the UDC were only a partial correction on the enormous imbalance between the property rights of those that wanted to make money from the property and those that wanted to use the property to live. He hoped the Council would resist that and a moratorium on the one mechanism by which they could protect the use value and their investment in their equity in their properties and neighborhoods.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that Mayor Treece had made a good speech with regard to coming from the bottom and climbing to the top at the Fair Housing Conference this year. He noted he was in his thirtieth year of promoting Habitat for Humanity, and their third house had been built in this general area. The improvement in the area had been remarkable since then. He stated ownership resulted in pride and the maintenance of homes.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B69-18 per the amendment sheet handed out that evening. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Ruffin stated he was grateful for the hard work of Ms. Gardner and all of the residents over the past two years to bring them to this point. He noted this was an important decision they would make tonight. He commented that these neighborhoods were amazing. One could not appreciate them when just driving by, but when walking through them, one was able to see the houses up close and meet the residents that had so much care for their properties. There was a sense of architectural, racial, and cultural diversity there. He stated he was firmly convinced these areas were unique in the City of Columbia, and that they had an obligation to preserve them for future generations. He noted he would support this rezoning request wholeheartedly, and asked the Council to do the same.

Mr. Skala commented that he hoped to extend some of the successes that had occurred in the Benton-Stephens neighborhood to the West Ash area. He understood a comment had been made with regard to balance, and noted he saw this as an issue of balance. The UDC would begin to provide some neighborhood protections. He stated many years ago, a lot of these areas were blanket upzoned to attract more residents and encourage vitality, but now there was a predation in some of the neighborhoods in terms of making it sufficiently uncomfortable so some would move and then cobbling the properties together to build larger and larger structures for a better return on investment. He explained he viewed this voluntary downzoning as a step forward. It was not an easy process, and those that were participating were doing so for the integrity of their neighborhoods and not for any punitive reason toward other property owners. He did not view this as an onerous problem for those that had chosen not to downzone. He noted Mr. Norgard had commented on the administrative delay with regard to how it would not serve a purpose in this instance, but had served a purpose in the former instance when they were preparing to implement the UD, and agreed. He did not see any reason to entertain the idea of any kind of administrative delay, and noted he would enthusiastically support this downzoning request.

Mr. Pitzer stated he did not feel group downzoning was good public policy for the City. He explained he was sympathetic to the motivations and desires for it, but pointed out this Council had also advocated for increased density, reduced urban sprawl, more affordable housing, increased availability of mass transit, more mixed-use of land, and additional investment and reinvestment in aging infrastructure. He felt the policy advocating for these large scale downzonings was in contradiction to all of those goals. He believed a better way would be for a more encompassing approach that incorporated some elements of the downzoning with some elements of Columbia Imagined that advocated for the idea of upzoning in certain places and the use of neighborhood nodes

for mixed-use development. This action would make the development of those types of neighborhood nodes even more difficult. He thought 13 of the 38 properties were either on a corner or next to a corner, which would immensely complicate any decision to advocate for neighborhood nodes. The townhomes Ms. Fowler had mentioned on Rogers Street as an example of an exciting and enthusiastically endorsed redevelopment would be significantly complicated as well by having pockets of downzoning sprinkled throughout the community. He felt they needed to be careful in terms of how many group downzonings they would approve, and noted this would be the second in a little over one year. He understood a third application was in process. If more and more of these actions were taken, it would be extraordinarily difficult to achieve some of the goals the Council had indicated they wanted to achieve. If they hinted to a limit of downzoning that would be allowed or to restrictions in the future, he thought that would only set off a rush to beat that deadline and lead to outcomes that were not fair to anyone. He explained he wanted to bring these points up to ensure they were included in the discussion going forward as they thought about the overall City they wanted. If they wanted to reduce sprawl, encourage more people to live in concentrated areas so mass transit could be provided, allow for walkable communities, etc., they had to be careful to not take steps that made all of that even more difficult than it was already.

Mr. Thomas stated he agreed with a lot of the comments of Mr. Pitzer, but noted he supported the desire and the right of residents to control their own neighborhood. He thought the bigger principle was for people to have the ability to create through a policy process the neighborhood in which they wanted to live. He commented that he had also increased his respect for the idea that small and older homes were a valid form of affordable housing, and that density was not the only way to achieve affordable housing. He noted these neighborhoods were fairly dense compared to some of the ones further out in the Fourth Ward and Fifth Ward neighborhoods. He stated he would support this downzoning request. He pointed out he had followed the advice of some of the presenters by looking at the apartment buildings just south of the Ash Street and Garth Street intersection, and agreed they were unattractive buildings. They were bulky and went close to the lot lines. There were a lot of blank walls. Almost the entire ground floor involved parking and cars had about the same amount of space as the people living on the upper floor. He felt that was problematic, and believed they should look to create a zoning code that disallowed those kinds of buildings. He thought they could create delightful density at the corners and that they should encourage multi-story mixed-use denser developments at those corners that were marked on the West Central Area Plan. He suggested they apply form-based zoning to it to ensure the building had the features, setbacks, etc. they wanted instead of worrying about use as he felt what would develop would be walkable coffee shops and small stores and offices. He felt that was what they wanted to reduce overall automobile dependence as they could make the nodes transit connection points too.

Mr. Trapp commented that land use decisions were made by the landowners. With neighborhood protections, there would be some impacts to other property owners. He was sorry to see more properties taken out of accessory dwelling unit consideration with the extra expense of a conditional use permit, but thought that should be weighed against people's desire to make a change on their own property. There were still a lot of other areas that were capable of taking in density. He stated he was supportive of this request, and noted he had supported the policy resolution that had made it easier to do mass downzonings, which had preceded the neighborhood protection standards. He commented that he had some ambivalence because Mr. Pitzer had made some compelling points, but when they weighed everything, their values often conflicted. He thought they should support this tonight. He understood there might be another group working on a group downzoning, but he did not feel they would see much more. As a result, he did not believe a moratorium was necessary.

Mr. Skala stated he was glad Mr. Pitzer had raised the issues of smart growth, and

within the ten principles of smart growth, there was increased density and the reduction of urban sprawl, but there was also the sense of place. He thought in this case sense of place trumped some of the density arguments.

**B69-18, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO:
PITZER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

B71-18

Authorizing a right of use license permit with Columbia Restaurant Investor's #1 for construction, installation, maintenance and operation of a private railing and terminal posts with string lighting within a portion of the Locust Street right-of-way.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Peters asked what would be involved with this and how that would affect foot traffic. Mr. Teddy replied it would be a fenced outdoor sidewalk café. Ms. Peters understood it would take some of the sidewalk at the corner. Mr. Teddy explained it currently did, and the City had informed them that the method by which they had fixed their outdoor café fence required a right of use permit and that they were too close to the corner light post. The plan was to pull back from the light post and provide five feet of clearance around the café area as required by ordinance. He understood they wanted to retain the feature of posts fixed into the sidewalk. He noted Chapter 4 of the City Code indicated an outdoor café serving alcohol could not have permanently affixed posts without a right of use permit. City staff had determined a right of use permit was required for this system, which was why this was before the Council.

Ms. Peters understood the café was already there, and asked if it was okay to leave it there. She commented that a lot of traffic traveled on Ninth Street and wondered how the café might affect traffic. Mr. Teddy pointed out it was on the Locust Street side, and noted he did not believe it received as much foot traffic since it was not a continuous commercial street like Ninth Street.

Ms. Peters understood it was strictly on the Locust Street side. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct, and noted they were looking to seat people outdoors during nice weather. Mr. Teddy pointed out they had an ordinance that encouraged this. Most of it was in Chapter 24 of the Code of Ordinances, but Chapter 4 of the Code of Ordinances included some design features. Ms. Peters asked if the sidewalk was wide enough. Mr. Teddy replied yes, and explained they had the five feet of clearance as was required. He noted the Council retained the ability to order removal of the improvements with reasonable notice. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

Ms. Thompson pointed out some concern had been expressed by the Disabilities Commission with regard to the lack of clearance and encroachment upon the ability to maneuver at the Room 38 right of use permit that had been granted, so they were aware of this request and had expressed the same concern with regard to providing for 60 inches of clearance, particularly when bikes were parked in the bike rack. They had received assurance that there would be 60 inches, but it was something the Public Works Department and Community Development Department would need to be cognizant of during construction.

Mayor Treece commented that he had received several complaints regarding Room 38, and asked if the City had the authority to require removal of those improvements upon proper notice. Ms. Thompson replied yes. Mayor Treece asked if that project had been constructed as represented to the City. Mr. Nichols replied yes, other than the enclosure. They had not been aware of the flaps and the windbreaker. Mayor Treece explained the most recent problem had occurred when a truck with an extended bumper had parked too close to curb so the bumper had hung over the ADA accessibility corridor. Mr. Nichols stated they had reviewed that situation. There was room to shift all of the

parking two feet to the east while maintaining the proper length so they would do that and add more curb there. He noted staff would put together a proposal for that as he thought it would eliminate the issue of the overhang. Ms. Peters asked if that was five feet wide at Room 38. Mr. Nichols replied it was when measuring to the curb. They would add two feet of curb space to address the overhang issue.

B71-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: PETERS. ABSENT: RUFFIN (Mr. Ruffin stepped out during the vote on this item). Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B70-18 Approving the Final Plat of La Grange Place, Plat 4, a Replat of Lots 3 and 4 of the Plat of La Grange Place, located on the south side of Rollins Street and east of Providence Road (506 Rollins Street); granting a design adjustment relating to street right-of-way width (Case No. 18-41).
- B73-18 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B74-18 Accepting conveyances and a temporary construction easement for sewer, drainage, and utility purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B75-18 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code to change the existing thermal storage rider to an energy storage rider.
- B76-18 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services to facilitate the transfer of naloxone to trained local first responder agencies.
- B77-18 Authorizing an agreement with Beacon of Hope Foundation and Columbia Community Land Trust, Inc. to provide residents of Lynn Street Cottages with fruit and vegetable vouchers to promote healthy eating; appropriating funds.
- B78-18 Accepting a donation from United HealthCare for wellness promotion and programs for City employees; appropriating funds.
- B79-18 Appropriating funds from the sale of a 2003 Sutphen SA75 fire truck for major fire station repairs.

- B80-18 Amending the FY 2018 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Public Works Department - Custodial & Maintenance Services Division.
- B81-18 Amending the FY 2018 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the City Utilities Department; amending the FY 2018 Classification and Pay Plan by reassigning classifications.
- R49-18 Setting a public hearing: proposed installation of a suspended ceiling system in office areas at the Columbia/Boone County Public Health and Human Services facility.
- R50-18 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of a replacement Central Missouri Aviation (CMA) Hangar 350 structure to be located directly south of Taxiway C and west of Hangar 40 and construction of a connecting apron and taxiway at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- R51-18 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located generally southeast of the intersection of I-70 Drive SW and Strawn Road (840 N. Strawn Road) (Case No. 18-47).
- R52-18 Declaring the results of the April 3, 2018 municipal election.
- R53-18 Adopting the Title VI Program Plan for Columbia Transit.
- R54-18 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri and the Missouri State High School Activities Association.
- R55-18 Authorizing a professional engineering services agreement with Walker Consultants to prepare construction documents and provide construction phase services for repairs and maintenance of the 10th & Cherry parking structure.
- R56-18 Transferring FY 2014 General Fund savings for a community workshop on climate action and outreach efforts for the climate action and adaptation plan.
- R57-18 Providing contingent authorization of a state aviation trust fund project

consultant agreement with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. to complete a Documented Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) checklist relating to the proposed new terminal site at the Columbia Regional Airport subject to receipt of funding authorization and approval of the consultant agreement from the Missouri Department of Transportation.

R58-18 Providing contingent authorization of a state aviation trust fund project consultant agreement with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. to complete a Supplemental Terminal Area Master Plan (STAMP) relating to the proposed new terminal site at the Columbia Regional Airport subject to receipt of funding authorization and approval of the consultant agreement from the Missouri Department of Transportation.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

R59-18 Finding the structure located at 509 Clinkscales Road is a dangerous structure; authorizing a special taxbill against the property.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if the property would still be owned by the current property owner with this action. Mr. Teddy replied yes, and explained this would only authorize the use of city funds for demolition costs.

Mr. Thomas asked for the circumstances that typically led to the City acquiring a property. Mr. Teddy replied there could be a tax sale in the future, and the City would on occasion purchase a property if beneficial, but it was not something for which they had planned.

Mr. Thomas asked if the owner was current with property taxes. Mr. Teddy replied he did not know. Mr. Thomas asked if that would be a cause for the City to acquire the property. Mr. Teddy replied there could be a foreclosure situation. Ms. Thompson stated they watched foreclosures closely, and Mr. Cole and a member of the Law Department would review the annual list. She understood the City might bid on some properties as they became available. She explained a property being delinquent did not necessarily mean it would go up for sale. There was a process and time frame that had to lapse.

Mr. Pitzer asked what kind of response staff had received as Mr. Teddy had indicated a positive response had not been received. Mr. Teddy replied they had not received any response from the owner.

Mr. Pitzer understood Mr. Teddy had already ruled that the structure needed to be demolished, and asked if this had come to Council because money was being spent or because a tax bill would be issued. Mr. Teddy replied it was due to both reasons. Staff was requesting authorization to proceed as there was money in the budget for this purpose. Mr. Pitzer commented that it was a relatively minimal amount, and staff had the authority to spend certain amounts without Council approval. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct, but noted this also involved a tax bill, which involved placing an encumbrance on the property.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Teddy if he had physically inspected the property. Mr. Teddy replied he had on a previous occasion, but since he was the hearing officer, he had not been involved in the round of inspections that had led to this finding. He had seen

photographs of the inside and outside of the property and the inspector had given testimony. In addition, the City Prosecutor had represented the City and had gone through all of evidence for his consideration.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he did not believe Mr. Teddy had the authority or power to make a finding that the house was uninhabitable, and that it was the Council that had that authority under City Code and State Law. He thought staff was coming to the Council as a fact finding body to make the finding, and asked if that was correct. Ms. Thompson stated Mr. Teddy had made the findings of fact. In this particular instance, it was the tax bill that required Council approval.

Mayor Treece noted the resolution indicated the Council found and determined the structure was a dangerous structure and demolition thereof would not interfere with the goal of preserving historic properties and was in the best interest of the public. Ms. Thompson explained that language had been added when the administrative delay had been in effect, and that finding was no longer required, but they had continued to use that language so the Council could consider the historic nature of the property.

The vote on R59-18 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R61-18

Approving the City of Columbia Landfill Site Master Plan.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer commented that at the work session he had expressed concerns with regard to the rate structure, particularly on the commercial side, as they were significantly cheaper than some other landfills, which might cause additional trash to come to the City's landfill and result in the need to expand it sooner. He asked if there had been or would be a further look at that rate structure. Mr. Hunt replied they were proposing to raise the fee at the landfill as part of the upcoming budget cycle from \$52 per ton to \$55 per ton. Mr. Pitzer asked if that was for commercial users or all users. Mr. Hunt replied it would be for everyone, but most of the people were the private haulers. It would not affect the residential collection rates or the commercial trash customers. Mr. Pitzer asked how that compared to Jefferson City or some of the other area landfills. Mr. Hunt replied Jefferson City was at \$64 per ton and Macon was at \$72 or \$75 per ton. Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Hunt if he did not see a need to increase it further. Mr. Hunt replied there was a Hancock Amendment issue as their rates were supposed to be based upon the cost to operate the landfill. Mr. Pitzer asked if the cost to operate the landfill included the cost to expand the landfill. Mr. Hunt replied it did, and noted future rate increases would be needed to fund the future landfill cells. The intent of the landfill was to have the cash available to build the landfill cells versus what they had done the last time, which was to sell bonds.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he would recommend approval of the Master Plan as long as it could be amended as he believed there was an opportunity for larger generators at the landfill. He understood they might not generate enough methane to run them, but felt other gases or sources of energy could operate them. He hoped the Master Plan was flexible enough if the Integrated Electric Resource and Master Plan Task Force felt that would be a good idea. He understood the plan was for \$1.5 million per year for five years for the new landfill project based essentially on enterprise funds, which meant charging customers, and likely charging residential customers more since it was the only portion of solid waste operating in the black. He suggested they keep an eye on the fund balance and the five year plan and projections, and the spending of the fund balance. He understood there had been a possible offer to buy half of the property at 912 E. Walnut Street at \$350,000, which was about half of its value, and that would be less of a hit on that fund balance. He commented that cost of service studies were dependent upon customer classes, capital costs, etc., and hoped the Council would ask

the consultants to look at the structure of the cost of service study next time it was done so they would really get all of cost in that could appropriately be recovered under the Hancock Amendment through rates.

Mr. Thomas stated he thought the work session had resulted in a really good presentation, justification, and report.

The vote on R61-18 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B83-18 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code to clarify land features that are considered sensitive and restricted from development.
- B84-18 Changing the uses allowed within The Colonies Lot 101 & 102 O-P Plan located on the east side of Colony Drive and approximately 400 feet north of the Forum Boulevard and Katy Lane intersection; approving the statement of intent (Case No. 18-68).
- B85-18 Approving the Final Plat of CPS Waugh - Locust Subdivision located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Waugh Street and Locust Street; granting design adjustments relating to street rights-of-way; granting a design adjustment relating to corner truncation (Case No. 18-59).
- B86-18 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with Paul A. Hinshaw and Michelle Hinshaw for the acquisition of property located at 1101 N. Eighth Street and 1103 N. Eighth Street.
- B87-18 Approving a redevelopment agreement in connection with the Broadway Hotel Phase Two TIF Redevelopment Plan and Project.
- B88-18 Authorizing a relinquishment of outer roadway agreement with Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for conveyance of a portion of Jacobs Place.
- B89-18 Authorizing a right of use permit with Missouri Network Alliance, LLC dba Bluebird Network for installation and maintenance of fiber optic cable within the City rights-of-way.
- B90-18 Authorizing an internship program agreement with the Society of Municipal Arborists to sponsor an urban/community forestry intern in the Parks and

Recreation Department; appropriating funds.

B91-18 Appropriating funds for a new temporary employee.

B92-18 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code relating to the duties of the Columbia Vision Commission.

X. REPORTS

REP30-18 Administrative Public Improvement Project: Cosmo Skate Park Improvements.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece understood there was not an objection to moving forward with this process.

REP31-18 Inclusionary Housing Report.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked if this was on the Planning and Zoning Commission agenda to review.

Mr. Teddy replied they had been looking at the somewhat overlapping topic of bonus densities or bonus zoning, which was referred to in the inclusionary housing literature as one tool that could be used as an offset in terms of building a certain percentage of the housing stock as genuinely affordable units, but that was not the only application of it. He noted it could apply to conservation developments, downtown developments that might set aside public amenities, etc. A bonus density was more of a tool and technique while inclusionary zoning was more of a program.

Mr. Skala stated he was inclined to have the Planning and Zoning Commission look into inclusionary housing as well as bonus densities.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Teddy if it was his impression that when a developer built an apartment complex under a mandatory inclusionary zoning ordinance if the required units were smaller in size or different in some way than the market rate units. Mr. Teddy replied there was some allowance for that in the ordinances. Some communities would allow the affordable units to be more modest in terms of amenities or finishes, but they would actually measure it so the less expensive construction would be used to a point, and that point would be a part of the legislation. Mr. Thomas understood that point was a point at which it was not obvious from the outside which units were the affordable ones. Mr. Teddy stated the general impression would be it was affordable housing that did not look like affordable housing. It appeared to be very much a part of the development it was within. He thought participating builders would want it that way. He noted there were ordinance that got into the details in terms of the feature reductions that would be possible.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a regulatory body that oversaw the rental rates and the sale prices, and wondered how that worked. Mr. Teddy replied it required oversight, and might be done in-house via a housing department or division that assigned people the task of reviewing households moving into those units or there could be an agency that played a role.

Mr. Thomas thought this was a strategy they should look into as it appeared to create significant affordable housing in markets that were growing. He liked Mr. Skala's idea of asking the Planning and Zoning Commission to review it, along with the Fair Housing Task Force as they conducted an in-depth study of fair and affordable housing.

Mayor Treece stated he was reluctant to tinker with the Unified Development Code (UDC) when it came to density or parking requirements regardless of the nobleness of the

affordable housing component. He explained he did not want to penetrate it with voluntary or involuntary incentives.

Mr. Thomas stated he did not see a problem with it, but felt it could be discussed. He noted it created mixed-income neighborhoods, which was really powerful for poverty and enabling younger generations to perform well.

REP32-18 Missouri State Auditor response to R35-18.

Mayor Treece explained they had some discussion on this topic at the work session. He understood Mr. Pitzer had suggested they take the next step with the survey component, and noted his suggestion had been to ask the City Manager to come back with funding mechanisms, one of which could be prorating the costs of the audit across all funds as a percentage of total funds. He pointed out there had also been some sticker shock and reluctance on the part of some.

Mr. Skala explained he had suggested that they might want to consider doing this on a more limited basis, potentially targeting some of the historical problem areas, such as the Water and Light and Finance Departments, as the cost would be significantly lower and involve a lot less time. He commented that besides the cost, he was worried about the time frame of 2-3 years as it could put a lot of pressure on the City to not move forward with bonding, etc. necessary for the normal operations of the City.

Mr. Pitzer noted his suggestion with regard to moving forward with the survey was dependent on it not costing too much. He understood it would have to come back to them for an appropriation of funds.

Mayor Treece commented that at some point there should be a mechanism to allow them to hear from the public again as to their perception of the cost and time versus public confidence. Ms. Peters asked if he was referring to a public hearing. Mayor Treece replied he was thinking about some mechanism, and it could be the appropriation to do the survey. Mr. Ruffin stated he thought that was important because they would ultimately have to justify why they were doing this. Mayor Treece agreed. He noted there were other things he would prefer to spend \$500,000 on, but he did not want to do it at the jeopardy of public confidence.

Ms. Peters commented that thus far she had only heard negative comments. Mr. Trapp stated he had heard a mix of comments, but more were supportive than not. Mr. Skala agreed.

REP33-18 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Sidewalk Transition Plan.

Mr. Nichols and Ms. Anderson provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if the interns would be paid or unpaid. Ms. Anderson replied they were paid, and were engineering students from Mizzou.

Ms. Anderson continued the staff report.

Mr. Thomas commented that it sounded like a great plan as it would be systematic and data driven with a prioritization approach. It did not really create any more funding, but it would ensure the funding they had would be used as well as possible. He asked if there were any particular comments or responses from the Disabilities Commission, the Public Transit Advisory Commission, or the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission. Ms. Anderson replied the comments were generally tied to funding. Mr. Thomas understood they liked the plan that was described. Ms. Anderson stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece asked if the ADA component considered audible push buttons for crossings. Ms. Anderson replied yes. Mayor Treece understood they had prioritized about ten crossings, and asked where they were on that list. Mr. Nichols thought several were at Providence Road and would be addressed by the ADA improvements being completed by MoDOT.

Mayor Treece asked about the bus shelter plan. Ms. Anderson replied they had done most where they were able to install them, but there were some instances whereby the property owner did not want to work with the City, so they were looking for other locations. Mr. Nichols explained they were trying to find someone willing to work with

them where they were having difficulty. Mr. Skala understood the Whitegate area had been mitigated by the purchase of the property for the park. Ms. Anderson stated that was correct. Mr. Nichols explained it had been a challenge to obtain the authorization to install the bus shelters.

Mr. Thomas noted there was a lot of value to improving sidewalks for accessibility close to bus stops, especially those close to regular paratransit customers. If the City could create the connectivity for people with mobility impairments to get to the bus stop, they would be able to use the regular service, which would save money in terms of the paratransit service.

Mr. Thomas asked if there would be a report back at the end of the audit phase in terms of what they found and the priority projects. Ms. Anderson replied they could provide a report if Council wanted. Mr. Nichols agreed. Mr. Thomas assumed this would become an annual program. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct, and noted plan adoption would allow them to work toward ultimate compliance.

Mayor Treece asked if there were any efficiency by having the plan identify priority pathways and whether they already had a term and supply contract for sidewalk repair. Mr. Nichols replied they did, and they had used Council savings one year and would have some annual funds in 2020. In the meantime, they were using savings from other projects. He noted they were obligated to fix the ramp when doing the mill and overlay work. Mayor Treece asked if the City anticipated providing a list of sidewalk projects to a prime contractor for them to complete by determining what might be most efficient in terms of pricing. Mr. Nichols replied the City had a term and supply contract now with two subcontractors, and about 70 ramps had been installed over this past year.

Mr. Pitzer stated he had heard a couple concerns with regard to roundabouts as they were not always as accessible to visually impaired pedestrians as traditional intersections, and asked what they could do to mitigate that concern when building roundabouts. Ms. Anderson replied she was still looking it, and pointed out a visually impaired person had approached her at an interested parties meeting about the issue. It was still under study to determine how to make it more accessible to visually impaired individuals. She understood the issue was that the stop and go traffic could not be heard at roundabouts. Mr. Pitzer thought the Federal Highway Administration had issued a report that the intersection would not be considered accessible if certain criteria were not met. Ms. Anderson stated she was not familiar with that report with regard to roundabouts, and noted she would look into it.

REP34-18 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

Mayor Treece understood this report had been provided for informational purposes.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Lynn Maloney, 204 Maplewood Drive, commented that Race Matters, Friends was glad Sergeant Fox had come to their meeting last week along with three members of the community outreach unit. She referred to a statement made by Tara Warne-Griggs, a member of Race Matters, Friends, which indicated that his lack of experience with community oriented policing and his demonstrated unfamiliarity with the ongoing conversation the City had been having over the past five years starting with the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence had created the distinct impression that the City Manager, the Police Chief, and the CPOA were trying to play the City, and in particular, those already most at risk for harm by the police and policing practices. The conversation concerned them greatly in that they did not believe their leaders were acting in good faith where community policing was concerned. She explained Sergeant Fox had talked about a buffet style of different programs the Council would be able to select from after receiving the report. She stated they were concerned as they wanted to see a report about making the transformation. She noted Sergeant Fox had also indicated the Council could pick projects they might consider affordable to put together for a ballot

initiative. She commented that they would not consider that a department-wide transformation to community oriented policing. They did not want the report to be based on generating a ballot initiative and would hold the report to a high standard. It needed to be a well thought out comprehensive plan about what community oriented policing really meant philosophically in terms of expectations for officer behavior, leadership, and supervisory culture and organization structure. They could then talk about what it would take with regard to resources. She stated they were surprised he was not talking about transformation, and noted he had indicated that was beyond his pay grade. He had only planned to offer the Council some things to discuss more money for more officers. She explained that although they were not on the same page, they were glad he had been willing to talk to them. She hoped the Council would interject itself in the creation of this report before it was actually finished and submitted this summer.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, understood there were two wheelchair bound citizens in the Paris Road area near Splashers that had indicated an issue with the bus stop. He thought there was a request for the bus to pull into the lot. As sidewalks were being built, he believed something needed to be in place to make the bus stops accessible.

Mr. Elkin noted 152 houses had been built by Habitat for Humanity over the past 30 years, which had assisted with the affordable housing stock. He thought more people needed to be involved in the building affordable homes.

Mr. Elkin commented that the wife of the gentleman that ran the Turning Point had passed away recently. He noted the job had been advertised as a \$60,000 job, and asked if that was a \$60,000 package or \$60,000 annually. He understood the gentleman did not get that kind of cash and wondered how it had been advertised. He also did not know if the gentleman would continue with the job moving forward, and asked someone to follow up and determine what a new person might be paid.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he had listened to the discussion regarding the audit report and had been confused. He thought they were looking for a performance audit, but what the State Auditor had sent back was information on full blown financial audits, and those were very different things. Instead of moving forward with the survey, he suggested they ask the State Auditor for copies of full blown financial audits that had been done in the past so they could see how they looked. In addition, they should find out what the State Auditor did with regard to performance or value auditing. He thought they should then have the discussion again.

Mr. Clark suggested the City talk to the Federal Highway Administration with regard to the roundabout issue as he was certain they would have a manual that would tell them about the levels of service of roundabouts.

Mr. Clark stated he had listened to Sergeant Fox's presentation and it had been a mess in many ways. He commented that he was not sure Sergeant Fox had the appropriate credentials, and had only been hired for this task because he had given a presentation at an interview that had really impressed Mr. Matthes and Chief Burton. He suggested Sergeant Fox give that presentation. He commented that he believed it was in the purview of the resolution for him to conclude and recommend a process led by outside facilitation, such as people from the CRS office in Kansas City.

Mr. Clark understood Mr. Pitzer had mentioned the policies which were not supportive of certain things, and noted he had also heard Mr. Thomas state something similar. He did not believe Columbia had more than 2-3 intersections in the entire central city of 6.5-7.5 square miles where it would be appropriate to think about nodes. He suggested they conduct a central city area plan instead of conducting quarter- or half-mile area neighborhood planning processes. He encouraged the Council to understand the planning processes and the hierarchy as a way to robustly and responsibly sort out where policies could be incorporated. He also hoped the west area plan, which had been

discussed, would be done soon.

Mayor Treece congratulated Mr. Trapp and Ms. Peters on their re-elections. He thanked Mr. Ruffin for serving as Mayor Pro Tem this last year, and noted he would like to appoint Mr. Skala to be Mayor Pro Tem for the next 12 months with the consent of the Council. No one objected.

Mayor Treece stated he currently served on the New Century Fund Board and was fine continuing in that role unless anyone else wanted to serve. Since no one expressed interest, Mayor Treece indicated he would continue to serve.

Mr. Trapp commented that he had received correspondence from the Missouri Developmental Disabilities Council as they had received a grant and had a lot of free training through Niagara University to implement first responder disability awareness training. It was POST-certified for the police portion. There was also training available for fire, which they could share with their County partners and the hospitals with regard to ambulance service. He noted he had forwarded that correspondence to Mr. Clubine to share with staff, and thought it might be something they should consider. Columbia had a large community of individuals with disabilities, and they were overly victimized in crime. In addition, there were some specific issues with regard to evacuation with fire.

Mr. Thomas commented that in response to Mr. Clark, he believed having destinations at about a half-mile grid was perfectly consistent with walkable communities. He thought a range of different options and destinations, which would include retail, restaurants, and office along with denser housing, would assist in the reduction of the automobile. It would create walkability and usable bus hubs. He stated he thought it was a good vision and would be happy to discuss it further as he had seen it done in other cities in the United States and Great Britain.

Mr. Thomas encouraged Mr. Matthes to engage Lieutenant Jones, Sergeant Hestir, and other members of the community outreach unit with Sergeant Fox so that the on the ground experience with community oriented policing could be included in the development of the plan.

Mr. Skala understood they had delayed the appointment of a fiber broadband task force until the spring so they would know its status with the State Legislature, and wanted an update and to resume that effort. He asked staff to bring back information.

Mr. Skala commented that he had been approached by people representing the Agriculture Park as part of the Farmers Market proposal regarding interaction with the City Manager with regard to options as a result of a deadline they were facing. He assumed these options would be presented along with legislation prior to the deadline of April 26. Mr. Matthes stated he had met with representatives, but had been unaware of any deadline. Mr. Skala understood they had indicated the Council would receive some documentation at the May 7 meeting to consider options that might help them achieve their goal. He wanted some assurance that it could proceed without too much difficulty if the Council was willing to go along with one of the suggestions represented by the City Manager. Mr. Matthes commented that they had discussed various ways to fund a gap.

Mr. Skala understood Hanover Boulevard had been resurfaced and appreciated those responsible even though he had not been aware that would be done.

Mr. Pitzer commented that during the recent campaign season, there had been a couple instances of some very politically charged personal attacks during the open comment

period. He was hesitant to restrict public comments, but felt those types of comments were beneath them as a body and did not have a place within a city council meeting. He believed they belonged outside of the Council Chamber. He asked the Council if they would be willing to look into the issue. He noted he was not sure how they would change rules or policy to prevent it, but if the Council was supportive, he would like to look into it.

Mayor Treece stated he had tried to keep those comments focused on the agenda item, and asked to be told if he could do a better job of redirecting people. He commented that he did not want to make it difficult for the Council to be attacked for their positions, and did not want to discourage public dissent. He agreed there was a time and place, and if it was targeted toward an agenda item, he could focus it on the item. He was not sure it would be an ongoing problem.

Mr. Pitzer stated he agreed they should be open to criticism with regard to policy positions, but in this case, he did not feel it was about policy. There was also no response mechanism in the way they were structured.

Mr. Skala noted there was if one wanted to give a retort at the end of the meeting. With the way they were organized, it was the prerogative of the mayor to manage it, but if enough of them did not like what was going on, they could impose more structure. At this point, he was comfortable. If warranted, he did not have any inhibition responding.

Mr. Trapp stated he would be interested in seeing how other cities dealt with this situation. He noted the newspaper stories were out when being attacked at 7:00 p.m., and not being able to respond until 2:00 a.m. did not strike him as right. He would be curious to see how other communities dealt with the situation.

Mr. Matthes stated staff would prepare a report.

Mayor Treece commented that there had been other attacks on the Council during the public comment section.

Mr. Skala noted he took umbrage with some of the attacks on staff as they did not have the prerogative to respond, and some of it was a bit unfair. Campaigns were different and some had gone to the dark side. That was the kind of thing that was difficult, and there were a few times it had rankled him to have to sit there without saying anything. He reiterated he thought that was the prerogative of the mayor with input from the rest of them.

Mr. Pitzer stated he would like to be provided options. Mr. Matthes noted staff would provide a report.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 11:44 p.m.