



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Tuesday, January 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 Tuesday, January 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 TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, and PETERS were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

Mayor Treece explained the minutes from the December 18, 2017 and the January 2, 2018 Council Meetings were not yet complete.

Mayor Treece requested a special item be added to the agenda and for B16-18 to be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B16-18 being moved to old business and the addition of a special item, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Ruffin.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI1-18

Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Association Award Presentation.

Mayor Treece explained he had attended the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Association event at the St. Paul AME Church last night whereby several recognitions had been made, and had asked James Gray to attend tonight's meeting to make similar comments.

James Gray stated he was present on behalf of the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Association, and noted he wanted to recognize the men and women of the Columbia Police Department (CPD) for all they did. He provided an example of an officer that had assisted a lady that had been late for work because her car would not work by purchasing a battery, installing it for her, and contacting her employer to explain she would be late. He noted school resource officers built personal relationships with kids and helped to keep them out of trouble. He mentioned the outreach unit, which included Lieutenant Jones and Officer Anthony, as they had participated in a basketball camp and were involved with the schools and the community. He stated he had seen officers holding the hand of young injured African-American kids, and thanked the men and women of the Police Department for all of their hard work. He presented Lieutenant Jones and Officer Anthony with the Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Association 46th Annual Celebration Award for the outstanding service provided by the CPD Community Outreach Unit (COU), and thanked them for the work they were doing and would continue to do.

Mr. Gray commented that the City Manager and City Council had been working hard for Columbia, and the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Association also wanted to recognize

the City of Columbia for what they had been doing to try to make things better for many in the community in terms of jobs, etc. He asked the City Manager and Council to join him at the podium and presented them with a Lifetime Achievement Award for making a difference in the community. He understood more work needed to be done, but felt they had come a long way.

Mayor Treece thanked Mr. Gray and the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial Association, and noted they had hosted a great event the night before. He stated yesterday had been a day to not only commemorate his birthday, but to also recognize his assassination, which had occurred about 50 years ago in April of 1968.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC1-18 Board and Commission Applicants.

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

Mayor Treece understood they had one applicant for the Columbia Community Development Commission, and that the applicant had applied for multiple commissions. He suggested they readvertise that vacancy. Mr. Skala stated he thought that was a good idea, and no one objected.

COLUMBIA VISION COMMISSION

EarthSoul, Kevin, 110 E. El Cortez Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire December 15, 2020

FIREFIGHTERS' RETIREMENT BOARD

Kenny, Nicholas, 812 Leawood Terrace, Ward 4, Term to expire December 31, 2019

HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION

Getzoff, Kimberly, 501 S. Glenwood Avenue, Ward 4, Term to expire December 31, 2019

MAYOR'S COUNCIL ON PHYSICAL FITNESS AND HEALTH

Gooch, Teresa, 3908 Snow Leopard Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire November 30, 2020

Nilon, Avila, 1303 Parkridge Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire November 30, 2018

PARKNG ADVISORY COMMISSION

Cecil, Gregory, 1700 Oak Cliff Place, Ward 4, Term to expire February 1, 2021

DeBrunce, Val, 6302 Upper Bridle Bend Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire February 1, 2020

Knoth, Nicholas, 3510 Calumet Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire February 1, 2020

Kvam, Kenneth, 2604 Luan Court, Ward 4, Term to expire February 1, 2019

Lamb, Ronald, 515 Cherry Street, Apt. 204, Ward 1, Term to expire February 1, 2019

Simonson, Lawrence, 2706 Hillshire Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire February 1, 2021

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH2-18 Proposed construction of the Nifong Boulevard corridor improvement project between Providence Road and Forum Boulevard/Willowcreek Lane and proposed construction of the Forum Boulevard improvement project between Green Meadows Road and Nifong Boulevard.

PH2-18 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols and Ben Ross, a consultant with Engineering Surveys and Services, provided

a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked how much of the \$12.3 million cost for the Forum Boulevard improvements from Nifong Boulevard to Green Meadows Road. Mr. Nichols replied \$1.1 million. Mr. Thomas asked if there was traffic data or delay data for Forum Boulevard as he wanted to understand the justification for widening Forum Boulevard to four lanes. Mr. Ross replied data had been collected and noted it was a gap area as it was four lanes at Green Meadows. Mr. Thomas stated he felt the area from Green Meadows Road to Country Club Drive could be considered a splurge since it went down to two lanes afterward. Mr. Ross commented that they had considered the economies of scale in building it in conjunction with the larger project. Mr. Thomas asked if there was traffic data justifying the four lanes. Mr. Stone replied it was important to have dual lefts from a timing perspective with a two lane section, and the east bound to north bound movement was a heavier movement. Mr. Thomas understood that was east bound from Nifong Boulevard to north bound on Forum Boulevard. Mr. Stone stated that was correct, and explained it would be one of the pieces moving forward that would make the timing work. If they had two lanes going north, they needed two receiving lanes as it would otherwise result in weaving problems. Mr. Thomas understood they currently had one lane for left turns and asked for the delay or stacking in that one lane.

Mark Huebbe with EFK Moen, Inc., another consultant, stated it was currently at a level of service D in the morning and at a level of service E in the evening. He noted they were predicting it would be a level of service F in the design era. Mr. Thomas asked what that correlated to in terms of actual delays. Mr. Huebbe replied anything over a 60 second delay was a level of service F. Mr. Thomas asked if D was about 45 seconds. Mr. Huebbe replied yes.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he was looking forward to this project and believed it was very much needed. He thought many people had experienced the situations shown in the video and there were likely many other more serious situations, especially in terms of pedestrians. He asked how they proposed handling the construction and disruptions that would occur, and how long the construction would take. Mr. Ross replied he thought construction would take about a year, and explained they planned to keep one lane of traffic open in each direction at all times. He noted they were also planning to keep the existing mainline pavement intact and do a mill and overlay. He thought they would still be able to maintain access to all of the driveways by either closing half of the driveway or only closing one driveway in situations where there might be multiple driveways. Mr. Pitzer asked if construction would occur along the entire stretch or if they would move from east to west or west to east. Mr. Ross replied they would leave that to the contractor to decide. He believed they would likely be doing work along the entire corridor with paving occurring from one direction to the other. It might also be from one side to the other, especially if they were shifting traffic from the existing pavement to the new pavement. He explained they would work out a traffic phasing plan and a temporary traffic control plan as part of the final design.

Mr. Pitzer commented that some of the earlier drawings he had seen had shown a possible connection to Rock Bridge High School to the south of Arora Drive, and asked for the status and plans for it. Mr. Ross replied he understood the plans for Arora Drive had been submitted to the City, and pointed out Engineering Surveys and Services was the design engineer for that developer, JES Development, and they were also working for the Columbia Public Schools (CPS) in terms of the driveway. He was unsure of the schedule of the Arora Drive project. Mr. Pitzer understood it would include the northern connection to Rock Bridge High School. Mr. Ross stated he knew CPS wanted it and thought Jeffrey Smith was agreeable since there was an easement. He believed once Arora Drive was built, they would allow the driveway connection to Rock Bridge High School.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding the roundabout Mr. Ross had discussed and dismissed at Forum Boulevard and Nifong Boulevard. She wondered why the signalized

light would work better in this situation. Mr. Huebbe explained it would operate at a level of service E in the evening peak with an average delay of 98 seconds while a signal would operate at a level of service D with 40 seconds of delay. It would just operate better as a signal. Ms. Peters asked if that was due to the volume of traffic. Mr. Huebbe replied yes. He noted there was so much volume along Nifong Boulevard that there were no gaps for the vehicles that were on Forum Boulevard to actually enter the roundabout since they would have to yield to the traffic already within the roundabout. He explained it was the reverse situation in the mornings whereby that those on Bethel Street would not be able to enter the roundabout there. Ms. Peters understood they had to stop the traffic on Nifong Boulevard to allow others to get out. Mr. Huebbe stated that was correct and was the reason the signal worked better. Mr. Stone pointed out that was unusual, and noted the issue had been discussed at length.

Mr. Thomas asked if roundabouts with part time traffic signals to create gaps were a part of the lexicon of devices that could be used. Mr. Stone replied not in the United States. He explained they were used in Britain some, but understood they were in the process of moving away from them as it took away from what they were trying to do with a roundabout. Mr. Thomas understood they only operated at the peak times when there were not any gaps.

Mr. Skala commented that the discussion reminded him of some of the signals on expressways in larger cities. Mr. Stone stated that was a metering situation. Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Kevin EarthSoul, 110 E. El Cortez Drive, stated he was a resident of the Rock Bridge neighborhood, which was behind Gerbes. He believed a lot of people traveling east on Nifong Boulevard in the mornings were taking Forum Boulevard to get to Green Meadows Road in order to access Providence Road, and wondered if the improvements on Nifong Boulevard would alleviate that problem. He noted there was commercial to the west of Forum Boulevard and mostly residential to the east of Forum Boulevard, and felt improvements to Forum Boulevard would only improve access to those businesses and homes in those two areas. He understood there was already a light at Bethel Street and a light would be installed at Monterey Drive as part of the Nifong Boulevard improvements so they would improve access to the area between Forum Boulevard and Providence Road, and wondered if it was necessary to spend over \$1 million to add a couple of lanes on Forum Boulevard, north of Nifong Boulevard. He explained he had been driving Uber and Lyft over the past few months so he was very familiar with a lot of the problems with traffic around the community, and felt there were other locations that needed attention more than that short stretch of road on Forum Boulevard.

Carl Barchet stated he lived on Scottson Way and understood the project would include an 8-foot sidewalk, which meant their fences would be removed and replaced. He wondered if a rock wall could be installed instead to prevent erosion and help mitigate sound. Mayor Treece asked if this was something that was negotiated when the right-of-way was acquired. Mr. Nichols replied they generally worked with individuals as impacts to properties occurred. Mayor Treece stated his experience was that they typically left it better than they found it.

David Zerrer asked if they were going to close the exit from Panera on to the side road that ran north to south. He wondered about his route if he was at one of those businesses and wanted to go west on Nifong Boulevard to the Thornbrook neighborhood. Mr. Ross described the route using a diagram. Mr. Zerrer asked if Monterey Drive was now a public street or if it was still a private drive. Mr. Ross replied it was still private. Mr. Zerrer asked if there had been any consideration by the City to take that roadway over in order to control the intersection. Mr. Ross replied he understood the City had been asked to take it over for many years, but had not yet done so. Mayor Treece asked for clarification as to Monterey Drive being a private street. Mr. Ross replied it was private south of Nifong Boulevard. He explained it was basically the parking lot of the shopping area. Mr. Zerrer stated he felt it was really a street. Mr. Ross noted it was a driveway.

Mr. Zerrer stated it was a very busy driveway if it was not a street. He noted he was involved with the urgent care business nearby and was not sure how people would travel west unless they went to Providence Road and turned near Sophia's and back around where 44 Stone was located, which he would not characterize as convenient or reasonable. He wondered why the City would not take over Monterey Drive so they could move traffic, control speeds, control stop sign locations, etc.

Mayor Treece stated he had received a similar comment from a constituent with regard to Granada Boulevard and how it connected back to Nifong Boulevard, and wondered if consideration had been given to improving its intersection with Monterey Drive as well. Mr. Nichols replied they had those discussions. He explained they had to make the improvement to Monterey Drive at Nifong Boulevard in order to align the driveways. They typically did not take over private roads because they were not built to city standards. It would have to be brought to the standard before the City would bring it to Council to consider. He commented that they could look at that driveway for improvements as part of the negotiations.

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

Mr. Thomas stated he planned to make a motion for an amendment as he did not believe a case had been made for widening Forum Boulevard to four lanes. There had not been an increase in traffic over the last 20 years according to the data from MoDOT. He noted there was another project on the CIP at about \$13.7 million, which had since been reduced to about \$12.7 million and would widen Forum Boulevard from Chapel Hill Road to Country Club Drive, and he strongly opposed that project. He did not feel there was a necessity to widen the section of Forum Boulevard from Nifong Boulevard to Green Meadows Road to four lanes, and understood it had been added to the Nifong Boulevard project with a motion by Ms. Nausser, the former Fifth Ward Council Member. He did not feel left turns from Nifong Boulevard to Forum Boulevard created a sufficient need for two lanes, and when Nifong Boulevard was improved much of that left turn traffic might continue east on Nifong Boulevard. He did not believe they needed to spend that \$1.1 million here, and continue with ever-expanding roadways and the failure to properly fund other modes of transportation that were more economical, sustainable, healthy, and equitable.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to remove the widening of Forum Boulevard, which included the double left turns, from this project. He wanted to leave it at a single left turn from Nifong Boulevard on to Forum Boulevard and not widen the roadway to Green Meadows Road. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Skala commented that in many ways he was persuaded. He noted 51 percent of the CIP funding had been reserved for the Fifth Ward, which was a significant amount of money. He understood there were needs in the Fifth Ward, and was not as persuaded as Mr. Thomas with regard to this providing an opportunity for other modes of transportation. He stated he was thinking more about equity citywide. He suggested they consider phasing to determine whether the improvements on Nifong Boulevard would create an exacerbated problem on Forum Boulevard.

Mr. Pitzer stated he disagreed with Mr. Thomas. He noted they had approved the roundabout at Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road, which would be a dual lane roundabout with two lanes in each direction going north to the creek. When going south, one would come out of the roundabout with the road narrowing suddenly for a short distance until one got to Nifong Boulevard where it would widen back out again. He felt it would be a somewhat awkward traffic movement to try to squeeze it down and bump it back out for such a short stretch. He also disagreed that there was a benefit to not widening Forum Boulevard. He believed it made sense to continue the four lane stretch. He commented that he took issue with the comment that some of the data was dated as there was likely more current information available. With regard to the comments of Mr. Skala, he noted it had constantly been a situation where they were trying to catch up with growth and make the improvements that should have been made 5-10 years ago. He

thought they should look at the prior CIP ballots and associated projects if they wanted to discuss which wards had benefited from the most percentages of funds. If it had been handled properly in the past, the percentage might be different now. He noted they were constantly trying to catch up. He reiterated he thought it made logical sense to widen Forum Boulevard to four lanes from Green Meadows Drive to Nifong Boulevard. It would complete that corridor and would improve the flow of traffic. In addition, this was a good time to make the improvements as they could introduce some savings due to all of the other work being done at the same time.

Mr. Thomas commented that the MoDOT data was not that old as it spanned from 1997, 2001, 2003, 2006, 2009, and 2013, and it did not show any growth in traffic at three points on Forum Boulevard, south of Stadium Boulevard, south of Chapel Hill Road, and north of Nifong Boulevard. He stated the Green Meadows Road and Forum Boulevard roundabout should have been designed to be a single lane roundabout in both directions as he had proposed and believed they could still go back to that design as they had not started the work on that project. He suggested designing Nifong Boulevard as an intersection with two lanes each way on Nifong Boulevard and one lane each way on Forum Boulevard, which was essentially how it existed now on Forum Boulevard. If they widened Forum Boulevard along this stretch, it would just create a self-fulfilled prophecy whereby this would become the reason they had to do the next stretch, and it would continue to undermine efforts for a more sustainable and efficient city.

Mr. Skala stated he was willing to do the research historically and was also willing to support the \$12 million dollar project. He was only questioning the \$1.1 million addition in terms of whether it was necessary as it could be added later. He agreed the amount of growth that had occurred in the southwest was considerable, and they were always trying to catch up, but noted they were also trying to catch up in the northeast due to growth.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Skala to remove the widening of Forum Boulevard, which included the double left turns, from this project was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Skala and Mr. Thomas voting yes.

Mr. Trapp commented that the last CIP had been heavily weighted toward the Second Ward, which was why he had not jumped on Mr. Skala's crusade for the north side, which he was supportive of in general. He stated he thought the Nifong Boulevard improvement project was important, and the Forum Boulevard widening project was a big reason people had voted in favor of the CIP ballot issue. There were a lot of things to like about it as it would include sidewalks, pedways, signalized crosswalks, and pedestrian refuge islands. It was not all just about cars. It would also encourage some mode shift, and would address some unsafe and congestion issues that were getting worse. He agreed it was expensive, but noted it was needed. He stated it was relatively targeted in terms of the roads that could potentially be expanded, and the needs had been identified. He believed it had community support and thought they should move forward with it.

Mr. Thomas stated he believed this was a very well designed project as a whole with the exception of the Forum Boulevard piece, which he did not feel was justified. He commented that he liked the landscape architecture idea as he believed they had to make roads pleasant places to be for all road users. He also liked the focus on safety as the videos had shown they had some really dangerous situations. Through a vision zero lens, he felt this would be a big net benefit.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans and specifications for the proposed construction of the Nifong Boulevard corridor improvement project and, the Forum Boulevard improvement project. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece and approved unanimously by voice vote.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

R164-17 Approving the Preliminary Plat of CPS Middle School Subdivision located east of Sinclair Road and south of Chesterfield Drive (Case No. 17-226).

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer commented that the amendment sheet had a number of different changes and he did not quite understand the reason for the changes. He provided the number of years the subdivider would have to submit items for final approval and discussion regarding failure to submit a total of one-fourth of the preliminarily approved lots as examples, and asked for clarification. Mr. Teddy replied it was a multiple lot plat when it had previously been a single lot plat, and this had led to certain conditions, such as the one involving one-fourth of the preliminarily approved lots. He noted it really applied to residential subdivisions when there would be large groups of lots. Ms. Thompson explained those were also changes in the Unified Development Code (UDC) at the time it had been adopted, and the language that had been inadvertently included in the ordinance was language that had been used prior to the UDC. This had been caught, and they thought it best to include it in the amendment sheet. She noted that referred to the reduction from the seven years of conferring of rights to five years for a preliminary plat and all of the other qualifications.

Mr. Pitzer understood there would now be sidewalk all of the way up to Nifong Boulevard. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct as there would be several offsite projects, including a City project to close a gap, and the Columbia Public Schools (CPS) would contribute to another project.

Mr. Pitzer noted he had asked for the diagram displayed to be included with the material for the meeting and wondered if there was any way to have it publically accessible. He thought it was important for everyone to understand the number of different things that were going on as it was somewhat confusing.

Mr. Pitzer understood the remaining places lacking sidewalk were south of the school to the neighborhoods to the south and that those cost estimates had been included on the diagram. Mr. Teddy identified those locations, and noted there had been some preexisting homes fronting on Sinclair Road at the time the subdivision was annexed into the City. Mr. Pitzer understood a part of Sinclair Road further to the south was in Boone County, and asked if there had been any discussions with the County. Mr. Teddy replied he did not know if there had been discussions, but generally speaking the County did not build new sidewalks.

Mr. Pitzer stated he thought it was important to point out the City and CPS were making contributions.

Mr. Thomas asked staff if they could clarify which segments already had sidewalks and the plan and timeline to fill the gaps for those segments that did not have sidewalks for the distance from the school site to Nifong Boulevard. Mr. Teddy replied there was not a sidewalk currently from Southampton Drive to Nifong Boulevard, and the estimated cost was \$300,000 and would be funded by CPS. Mr. Thomas asked if that was part of the contract agreement or a development agreement with CPS. Mr. Teddy replied that was the representation that had been made with the resubmittal of this plat. If the City executed this plan, which included the acquisition of the park from CPS, CPS would then have the means to build a sidewalk in the area. Mr. Thomas asked if the City had a means to purchase the land for the park. Mr. Teddy replied he would have to let others respond to that question. Mr. Thomas stated it appeared to be a shell game with the City purchasing land from CPS for \$300,000 and that \$300,000 then being used to build a sidewalk between Southampton Drive and Nifong Boulevard. Mr. Matthes commented that he was not sure how much the park would cost at this time. He noted the City

tended to always purchase the park next to a new school. Mr. Thomas agreed they often did. Mr. Matthes agreed it was not done at every school, but was the norm, and had been done at Battle. CPS had purchased it and the plan was to purchase the park piece from CPS. Mr. Thomas asked if it was in the CIP. Mr. Matthes replied it was not specified in the CIP and noted they would find the funds over time. The working agreement was to find funds to purchase a park between the school and the neighborhood. A sales price had not yet been negotiated. Mr. Thomas asked if that half-mile of sidewalk would be built before the school opened in 2020. Mr. Matthes replied there was not a performance contract or anything similar at this time. It was a verbal agreement between CPS and the City, and it would enable them to get their construction project started and establish how the site would look. He explained they had discussed other things and there had been a verbal commitment to make these connections with regard to the sidewalk. He noted the City already had projects programmed for the other gaps between the school and the north section. Mr. Thomas asked if those were definitely scheduled between now and 2020. Mr. Matthes replied yes.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Pitzer if he was satisfied with that situation. Mr. Pitzer replied it had been represented to him that all of this would be done before the school opened. Mr. Matthes stated that was the goal, and they had the time to get it done. He was not sure if the park would be purchased by then. He commented that they were not connected materially, and both would happen. In addition, it had been verbally agreed to that they would work toward it.

Mr. Pitzer understood the arch culvert project would be the first item under construction, asked if that included sidewalks. Mr. Matthes replied it was designed to be wide enough for the sidewalk, and could be extended if the road was ever widened.

Mr. Pitzer stated Mill Creek Elementary was on the west side of Sinclair Road and the new middle school would be on the east side, and most of the sidewalks would be on the east side, and asked if the plan was to direct pedestrian traffic to cross in one certain area. Mr. Matthes replied the safest crossing would be at the roundabout, and that was where they would want to direct people. Since most of the existing sidewalk was on the east side, they also wanted to connect those to maximize the investment.

Mr. Skala asked if any sidewalk improvements would be endangered with any improvements to Sinclair Road in the future. He assumed any future road improvement would have to be toward the west. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. He explained that as development occurred they would ask for the necessary half-widths as part of the platting process. The sidewalk for this project would be far enough back where possible to accommodate it. He noted some pieces, such as the pieces to the north, would be right next to the road, but they would come back out where they could. He felt the north was very unlikely to develop so they were confident in that choice at this time.

Mayor Treece asked if the City was bound by this graphic in any way. Mr. Teddy replied it was informational. Mayor Treece asked if the school parking lot with construction in 2019 and a proposed cost share agreement between the City and CPS would come before the Council. Mr. Teddy replied he thought that had been discussed during the intersection project discussion. Mayor Treece understood it was not a part of this project. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Mr. Matthes noted that project had not been decided at the Council level yet. Mayor Treece asked if it was the practice of the City to build parking lots on public school property. Mr. Matthes replied they would both benefit. Mayor Treece asked how they would both benefit. Mr. Matthes replied pulling parking into the lot helped with the issue of traffic backing up at the intersection, and noted the traffic congestion would be relieved to a certain extent. Mayor Treece understood the City had required Tolton High School to add more spaces when they wanted to add onto their stadium. Mr. Matthes explained Mill Creek Elementary was not adding any facilities. By building a school south of there and taking the whole traffic system into account, it would actually lighten traffic loads for the regional system. Parents were

currently driving further away from where this school would be located so this was better globally since it was more localized. Adding the parking lot would help the entire system. Mayor Treece stated he wanted more discussion on that before they represented it. Mr. Matthes commented that it would be brought back for more discussion. It was reflected on the diagram because they wanted to capture everything they had discussed, but it was not a part of the platting action.

Peter Steipleman, the Superintendent of CPS, thanked Mr. Pitzer for the conversation earlier involving Rock Bridge High School because two years ago they had promised the Rock Bridge community they would connect to another road in order to alleviate some of the traffic congestion in that area. He noted they had allocated money for it, but the conversation had stalled, so he was grateful it had started again.

Mr. Steipleman explained Gentry Middle School was overcrowded with 900 students, and they had the opportunity to build a new middle school on Sinclair Road. He understood there had been questions and concerns the last time this had been presented. They had since had the opportunity to talk to the Council and meet with staff about those conversations and the commitments CPS was willing to make to ensure the project moved forward.

Kristi Powell stated she was the President of the Cascades Homeowners Association and thanked Mr. Pitzer for his work to get some of the north side of the middle school clarified, but wondered what would be done on the south side. She wondered if there were plans for sidewalks on the south. Mr. Matthes explained the current policy framework was that sidewalks were built at the point at which the land developed, and that was the technique that would be used here. He understood there would still be some gaps, which would have to be dealt with in a different way, and that had not been solved tonight. Ms. Powell asked for clarification on the different way. Mr. Matthes replied it could be built and charged to the property owner, and noted there were other methods as well. Ms. Powell understood there was not really a plan and it was a wait and see type situation as they would wait for development to address it similar to what had occurred at Battle. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct as that was the public policy. Ms. Powell commented that she was concerned about not providing safe passage between Cascades and the middle school and a potential park. She would love for CPS, as a developer, to hold a high standard of safety for all of the neighborhoods surrounding any school built and to encourage different methods of transportation, such as biking and walking. She stated her neighborhood would love to see something safe put in place prior to the middle school being completed. As a private citizen, she had the experience of being a teacher in a trailer at Gentry with over 30 kids, which at the time did not have intercoms or phones, so she had no way to get help for any incident and understood the danger of an overcrowded classroom. She commented that she also understood the danger of an unsafe roadway as a teacher and administrator in Jefferson City as one of her students had been hit in front of his school, which had been built on a road similar to Sinclair Road, and it had been a miracle as to how the Council in Jefferson City had come up with funding for sidewalks and lights after that incident. She stated she did not want any teacher, administrator, or council member to know how that felt. She asked them to make Sinclair Road a priority so there could be safe passage for students.

Fairouz Bishara explained she was the Principle at Gentry Middle School and noted that when she had accepted this position she had been promised another middle school so she had the ability to manage the school without twenty trailers. She commented that for the City it was a matter of sidewalks, and for her it was a matter of equity. Gentry had 920 kids when other schools in the district only 500-700 kids. She stated her families had been extremely gracious, and the quality of education was great because the staff was amazing and went above and beyond in dealing with overcrowded classes. The students were amazing as well as they only had 2-7 minutes to eat when waiting in line 12 minutes to get their lukewarm lunch since there was not a kitchen and time to warm

the food. She noted kids also had to wait in line to go to the restroom since there were not enough restrooms for everyone. She understood the need for safety, but felt the Council needed to understand the need to educate children with the quality of education CPS had committed to provide. She asked the Council to partner with them to ensure this project moved forward in a timely manner because the kids were affected every day by the lack of this new middle school. She explained she would love to serve a different and more diverse population, but they did not have room others. She asked the Council to help make room for others, and to provide the same opportunities for kids in this part of the community that they were providing in other parts of the community.

Mike McMillen provided a hand out and explained he was the Secretary of the Heritage Woods Homeowners Association. He understood CPS had indicated that it might add another facility on the property in the future, which would compound the traffic problem in the area. He displayed a diagram and noted the sewer had been relocated from upper left corner to the Heritage Woods subdivision, and noted he did not know if that sewer line could accommodate the flow that would be generated by a school. In addition, the sewer line would go through the property that would be potentially purchased by the City. He pointed out a majority of this property would drain into their subdivision because they were downhill from the subject site, and did not believe there was any provision for stormwater runoff at this time.

Mayor Treece asked staff to address the stormwater detention. Ms. Peters asked if the sewer lines could also be addressed. Mr. Teddy replied the sewer capacity issue was a part of the due diligence of the CPS team as they had visited with the Sewer Utility. Mr. McMillen understood an engineer had looked at the property, but he was not sure where the pond would be built.

Ben Ross stated he was with Engineering Surveys and Services and noted there would be a future school. He explained the middle school opened at 7:30 a.m. and any elementary or early childhood school would open later, and this had been addressed in the traffic study they had prepared, which the City had reviewed and approved. The peak traffic would not be any worse since the timing was different. The sanitary sewer was an 8-inch diameter pipe which only served a handful of residential lots currently so there was enough capacity for a school and any development on Lot 2, such as a bathroom or any other park amenity. The middle school would hook to a sewer at the southwest corner and go the opposite way. It would not flow into the Heritage Woods neighborhood. In terms of stormwater, he agreed the Heritage Woods neighborhood was downhill from the Sinclair site. The middle school project would include a very large stormwater detention basin, and the water that flowed out of the stormwater detention basin after the building was constructed and the large parking lot was built would be less than what flowed there today. He explained water would be captured in the detention basin and would be released slowly so the peak would be less than what it was today. He understood the Heritage Woods neighborhood had reached out to CPS, and CPS had hired his company to make a few site visits to document the conditions and to take those conditions into account when doing the design work. He reiterated they would not increase peak flow on to the property.

Mr. McMillen commented that he welcomed the school to the neighborhood and it was not his intention to slow the project down any as they had been cooperative to work with in the past.

Barbara Wren, 615 Bluff Dale Drive, commented that if this Council were to make a different decision than former councils on the Shepard to Rollins trail, it would free up Parks and Recreation funds to help pay for the park and GetAbout funds to help with the sidewalk gaps.

Mr. Pitzer noted he had asked for this to be tabled a couple months ago in order to look at the safety issue and to get everyone on the same page in terms of what was happening with Sinclair Road. As was seen by the complicated graphic, a lot of small projects would be completed over the next couple of years. He stated the safety issues

were better and he appreciated CPS making the gesture to go forward with funding the sidewalk to the north even without any other commitment. He understood this was not perfect, but felt it was important that this conversation had occurred as there was a much greater realization of the need to continue to look for ways to prioritize safety in the area, especially if a second facility was built. He also believed there was opportunity for development in the area that would add to the vehicle, foot, and bicycle traffic. It was not a problem that would go away, but the school was very much needed and its construction needed to start as soon as possible so it could open by the date CPS had promised to its constituents. He commented that he was very much aware of the need for an additional middle school in the southwest as only one middle school out of the six in Columbia was south of Broadway. The new school would go a long way in alleviating some of the significant overcrowding issues the Principal of Gentry Middle School had mentioned. He stated he would support approving this plat this evening while continuing to look for opportunities to address what he believed were the remaining significant safety concerns, which included the southern part of Sinclair Road.

Mr. Skala commented that there were time exigency issues as the school needed to be built and accommodations were being made for sidewalks to the north. He suggested considering the method used along Clark Lane, which would also occur along Ballenger Lane, and explained that involved safety shoulders to provide the opportunity for bicyclists, pedestrians, and, in this case, school children at least some measure of safety. It would allow for something versus nothing at a much lower cost while providing a substrate that would eventually be suitable for improvements, such as sidewalks, curbs, gutters, etc.

Mr. Thomas stated he agreed with the comments of Mr. Pitzer and appreciated the fact he had raised the safety issue a couple of months ago. He also appreciated the collaborative spirit of CPS staff and City staff to come up with some kind of solution. He agreed it was not perfect, but noted they would keep looking for ways to fill the gaps. He did not believe they wanted to hold this project up any longer and thought they had drawn attention to the issues. He stated he would support the plat. He commented that they needed to consider the cost of growth and explained the reason they were in this situation was because they had subsidized new development through all of the different institutions and infrastructure systems. He felt a development fee was needed for new schools as CPS had to manage a continually growing budget of building new schools from current tax payers, which was not logical or fair. He hoped they could start a conversation in a serious way and include electricity, roads, sidewalks, etc. as part of the discussion.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend R164-17 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on R164-17, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

B3-18 Approving the Preliminary Plat of Bluff Creek Estates Plat 9, a Revision to part of Bluff Creek Estates Phase 1, located on the east side of Bluff Creek Drive and north of Grindstone Parkway; granting a design adjustment to allow more than thirty (30) lots to be platted without a secondary point of access; granting a design adjustment to allow residential drives on a collector street (Case No. 18-29).

Discussion shown with B4-18.

B4-18 Approving the Final Plat of Bluff Creek Estates Plat 9 located on the east side of Bluff Creek Drive and north of Grindstone Parkway; authorizing a

performance contract (Case No. 18-7).

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked for clarification regarding the comment about the bridge. Mr. Teddy replied he believed the original thought had been that Bluff Creek Drive would link to the north some day in the future as it had been a feature in the major roadway plan, but it had not been in the CIP, and it was a much larger project in proportion to this four lot subdivision. Mayor Treece understood this did not have anything to do with the bridge and it would not trigger any requirement to build it. Mr. Teddy stated it did not trigger any requirement for the bridge, and they were not planning on that connection to be made. Mayor Treece asked if the developer was responsible for half of those costs. Mr. Teddy replied he did know what the original terms were, and they were out of their performance contract. He did not believe it was ever a developer obligation to build the bridge. The City, in the past, would build the major drainage structures, including bridges over blue-line streams.

Ms. Peters understood the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) thought it was okay to replat this for these 4-5 lots, but felt the houses needed to be sprinklered. Mr. Teddy stated those were not their specific words, but they felt the requirements of the ordinance should be met, which meant to either provide an alternate access or meet the fire code alternative.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the original preliminary plat was still in effect. Mr. Teddy replied it was not as it went back to the 1990s. There was a five year from establishment rule in place now.

Ron Shy, 5600 S. Highway KK, explained his company had developed this plat, and they felt this tract was much closer to the intersection than the lots to the north. It had been the policy of the City that anytime there had to be a bridge over a stream, it was the obligation of the public. Any culverts or similar items were the obligation of the developer. The thought long ago was for the bridge to be constructed, which was the reason for many lots to the north, but there had never been a big push by the City or the residents for it. He commented that this would likely be the only four lots in the subdivision that would be sprinklered, which did not seem logical since they were closer to the intersection, and that was the reason for the request for the design adjustment.

Justin Barnes stated he was representing the Elvin E. Sapp Revocable Trust, which was the owner of the property, and explained that when the site was developed in 1992, the developers had actually widened it to a 38-foot street and had paid for the extra thickness in anticipation of a bridge being built. As Mr. Shy had indicated, he did not believe there had been any motivation by the City nor the residents to construct the bridge. He commented that they believed reducing the 10-lot preliminary plat to four lots was better as it provided a buffer between the highway and existing residents. He noted they would also utilize existing infrastructure with the exception of about 300 feet of sewer that would be extended to provide for the four lots. He noted they had spoken with a subcontractor with regard to sprinkler systems for the four lots and they had indicated it would be about \$6 per foot. The covenants required 2,000 square foot minimum structures, so it would add about \$12,000 per house. He explained they would not want to go down to four lots without the design adjustment. He asked for clarification regarding the preliminary plat that had been approved in 1992 in terms of whether it was valid. Mr. Teddy replied they were essentially resetting it. Mr. Barnes asked whether the ten lots would still be in place if the four lot plat with the design adjustment was denied. Mr. Teddy replied there had been a passage of time since it had been approved. Mr. Barnes commented that if the design adjustment was denied, they would prefer not to reduce the development to four lots. They would rather have the ten lots.

Mayor Treece asked for clarification as to whether this plat involved four lots or five lots. Mr. Barnes replied it was actually five lots as it would include the common lot. There would only be four buildable lots. The common lot would keep the trees between the

existing lot owners on Bluff Creek Drive and Highway 63. Mayor Treece asked if they would then be done with this area or whether they would come back requesting a flagpole lot or something behind those properties. Mr. Barnes replied if the five lots were approved whereby they had four buildable lots with a common lot and that was all they would plan to do, and they would deed the common lot to the homeowners association. Mayor Treece asked if they had discussed this with the homeowners association. Mr. Barnes replied they had spoken with the management company of the homeowners association and they did not oppose it. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Barnes if he had attended their neighborhood association meeting. Mr. Barnes replied no and explained they had only spoken with the management company. He thought the management company had sent an e-mail, and they had represented to him that there was not any opposition to the design.

Mr. Skala asked for the size of the lots. Mr. Barnes replied he thought the buildable lots were about 80 feet.

Ms. Peters understood these homes would be a part of the homeowners association. Mr. Barnes stated yes, and explained it would be a continuation of the established subdivision.

Ms. Peters commented that Bluff Creek Drive was a wide road, which might need some traffic calming, and it had homes with driveways along the road. She felt it was reasonable to allow them to build on four lots instead of the 8-10 they had initially planned to construct per a previous preliminary plat. She noted she would vote in favor of it.

Mr. Trapp stated he understood the intent of the Fire Code and the UDC, but they had already allowed it to be developed with more than 30 lots. He noted he had been persuaded by the comments of Ms. Peters in that they were looking at four unsprinklered houses versus ten sprinklered houses. He noted they would also get four acres of trees, which was a nice tree preservation area, and it was a reduction from ten homes to four homes. He stated he was leaning towards approving it.

Mr. Thomas understood Ms. Peters' proposal was counter to what the PZC had recommended as they had denied the design adjustment. Ms. Peters stated that was correct, and pointed out the PZC had voted in favor of the plat so they thought the five lots were good, but also felt the homes should be sprinklered. Mr. Thomas understood if they were to go with the recommendation of the PZC, the builder would be required to install a sprinkler system in every home. Ms. Peters clarified it would be required in those four homes. The 44 homes further north were not sprinklered and neither were the other homes in the neighborhood.

B3-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B4-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B16-18

Authorizing an amendment to the agreement with Tyler Technologies, Inc. relating to the Columbia Financial Enterprise Resource System (COFERS) project and the purchase of transparency software; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Musgrove provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked for this to be removed from the consent agenda because he thought this was something that had been approved in a previous budget cycle when they had switched to the Tyler/Munis software package. It was essentially an open checkbook.com module that allowed taxpayers to see exactly where the City spent its

money in real time every day. If a check was cut or an expenditure was made, it would show up on the City's website. He stated he thought it was an important facet of open, transparent government, and was not unlike their public records portal, which he thought had worked well. He had expected this to already be online by the end of last year and had been surprised it was not. He understood this was the next step to bring it forward. He believed it was another way to shore up public confidence in city government.

Mr. Pitzer stated he agreed in that it would be a big improvement in terms of transparency and financial reporting as citizens would be able to view what was happening. He asked when the software would be live. Mr. Wyatt replied they anticipated it being live on September 1, 2018.

Mayor Treece noted the State of Missouri had something similar, which was called the Map My Accountability Portal, and assumed what they put into it was what they would get out of it.

B16-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B1-18 Calling the municipal election to be held on Tuesday, April 3, 2018 to elect council members for Wards 2 and 6.
- B5-18 Approving the Final Plat of Lenoir Subdivision Plat 2, a Replat of Lots 1 and 2 of Lenoir Subdivision, located on the southeast corner of the New Haven Road and Lenoir Street intersection (3300 New Haven Road); authorizing a performance contract; granting a design adjustment to allow sensitive lands to be incorporated into lots intended for development; accepting a tree preservation easement (Case No. 18-6).
- B6-18 Vacating a sewer easement on Lot C2 and Lots 345-348 within The Vineyards Plat 3 located on the south side of Stone Mountain Parkway and east of Fair Oaks Court (Case No. 18-2).
- B7-18 Authorizing a right of use permit with The Curators of the University of Missouri to allow construction and maintenance of a hot water distribution pipe, chilled water distribution pipe, storm sewer, control conduit, domestic water pipe, electric duct bank and electric manhole in portions of the University Avenue and Hitt Street rights-of-way.
- B8-18 Accepting conveyances for utility, drainage and water, street, pedestrian and sidewalk purposes.
- B9-18 Authorizing construction of a storm water management basin project for the area bounded by Garth Avenue, Sexton Road, Oak Street and Lynn Street;

authorizing the Purchasing Division to call for bids and/or issue a contract for the project.

- B10-18 Authorizing construction of the College Avenue sewer replacement project, between Rollins Street and Bouchelle Avenue; authorizing the Purchasing Division to issue a contract for the project.
- B11-18 Authorizing the filing of electronic reports and the execution of agreements with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Electronic Reporting Rule.
- B12-18 Accepting a donation from Walt's Bike Shop for the CoMo Bike Co-op program operated by the Parks and Recreation Department; appropriating funds.
- B13-18 Authorizing a memorandum of agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for access to the Missouri State Public Health Laboratory (SPHL) OpenELIS Web Portal.
- B14-18 Accepting grant funds from the United States Food and Drug Administration for employee training for conformance with the FDA Retail Food Program Standards; appropriating funds.
- B15-18 Adopting The City of Columbia, Missouri, Money Purchase Plan; authorizing the City Manager to execute the plan; authorizing the Director of Finance to administer the plan.
- B17-18 Amending the FY 2018 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Police Department.
- B18-18 Appropriating federal forfeiture funds for the purchase of a replacement K-9 officer and canine kennel for the Police Department.
- B19-18 Approving the Final Plat of University Centre Subdivision located on the west side of Providence Road and south of Locust Street; granting a design adjustment relating to street right-of-way width; providing for conveyance of a temporary construction easement for reconstruction of the sidewalk along Providence Road (Case No. 17-199).

R6-18 Authorizing an agreement with Job Point for vocational skills training for low to moderate income residents referred to the Alternative Sentencing Courts from the Boone County Circuit Court.

R7-18 Authorizing an agreement for professional services with All Environmental, Inc., d/b/a AEI Consultants, for facility condition assessments, asset inventory bar coding and Level I energy audits on 23 City-owned and occupied facilities.

R8-18 Authorizing the temporary closure of portions of sidewalks and streets along Paquin Street, Hitt Street and University Avenue to facilitate the construction of a building located at 1101 University Avenue.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

R9-18 Approving the Preliminary Plat of Centerstate Plat 14 located on the southwest corner of the Vandiver Drive and Mexico Gravel Road intersection (Case No. 18-35).

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece explained he had received a request to table this item because the preliminary plat was on this agenda while the annexation was scheduled for the next meeting. He thought they should consolidate the issues.

Mr. Skala asked if the request to table was from the applicant. Mayor Treece replied it was not a request of the applicant, and noted it was a request of someone in opposition.

Mr. Pitzer thought it was a rezoning and not an annexation. Mayor Treece apologized and stated that it was a rezoning, and not an annexation.

Mayor Treece commented that he believed they should consider the rezoning and whether the change from a planned district to an industrial district was appropriate before considering the preliminary plat.

Mr. Pitzer asked if there was a reason it was in this order. Mr. Teddy replied it was the desire of the applicant to move forward with the preliminary plat. Mayor Treece thought the preliminary plat would be non-operative if they chose not to rezone the property to industrial. Mr. Teddy explained he viewed it as providing authorization for a three lot plat in the existing planned district designation.

Tim Reed stated he was an engineer with Engineering Surveys and Services and explained this was the first step in the process to develop this property. It was designated as a major subdivision because they had to extend a waterline along Vandiver Drive across the front of these lots and because they had a short sanitary sewer extension. It was a legal lot currently, and the property owner only wanted to create three legal lots. It had fallen into the major subdivision category due to the waterline extension. The first step was the preliminary plat, and in three weeks, on February 5, the Council would consider the final plat along with the request to rezone the property. He noted they had chosen to bring the items together so they could be considered together, but legal lots and land use were separate issues.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Reed if it could all be consolidated into one hearing on February 5, 2018. Mr. Reed replied he did not know as he thought the preliminary plat had to be approved prior to the final plat, but stated he was agreeable to doing all three together. Ms. Thompson explained the preliminary plat had to be approved before the final plat, but it could be done at the same meeting.

Mr. Pitzer stated he would be happy to move forward with this discussion this evening as the next meeting already had a lot of items.

Mr. Skala commented that he was agnostic with regard to which approach to take. He did not feel it made much difference. This was simply about the legal definition of a lot, and the zoning would remain the same. He agreed many items were already scheduled for the February 5, 2018 meeting.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Lucinda Dunn, 4401 Mexico Gravel Road, stated she was the person that had submitted an e-mail requesting the Council consider tabling this item as she did not feel it made sense to decide this issue prior to the rezoning. She explained she had been at the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) meeting where a question had been raised by another homeowner in terms of how water runoff would be handled, and did not believe that question had been answered. She noted they had been told that evening that this issue would not come to Council until the February 5, 2018 meeting, so they were not prepared. She only learned at 3:00 p.m. this afternoon that this was on the agenda. She reiterated they had not had time to research the issue and get their questions answered, and they had significant concerns on both ends of Mexico Gravel Road. She believed there would be significant opposition at the meeting on February 5.

Ms. Peters asked if the concern was stormwater runoff or what might be built at this site. Ms. Dunn asked Ms. Peters if she was asking about her concerns on this particular item or the rezoning. She understood they were separate issues, but believed they were related, which was why she felt they should be addressed at the same meeting. She stated she would be happy to address her concerns with regard to the rezoning if it was allowed, and believed they should first discuss the use of the land as it could impact how it was platted. She reiterated all of the questions regarding water runoff had not been addressed, which she felt was related to the plat, and noted they had been led to believe this would not come up until the February 5, 2018 Council Meeting. She had only found out today that it was an item for the meeting tonight.

Mr. Skala asked Ms. Dunn if she understood the only thing they were discussing tonight was whether the land would consist of three lots instead of one lot, and the other items in terms of stormwater runoff and land use would be dealt with later. Ms. Dunn replied she thought the question regarding stormwater runoff was associated with platting per discussion at the PZC meeting. Mr. Skala understood the issues had been taken up by the PZC simultaneously. He believed the questions she was asking and her concerns would be discussed and addressed at part of the rezoning request. Ms. Dunn stated she believed it should all be addressed at the same time at the Council level.

Mr. Skala asked Mr. Teddy if Ms. Dunn had not been notified because she was beyond the distance for which they provide notification. Mr. Teddy replied they did not provide notice of the council meeting. They only provided notice of the zoning issue at the PZC meeting, and the plat happened to be on the agenda for the same meeting. He stated the zoning ordinance required readings at two council meetings and it was the desire of the applicant to move forward with the preliminary plat, which only required readings at one meeting. Approval of the preliminary plat would provide authorization to do a three lot subdivision, but it did not divide the lot. It only created a map of the intent to divide the lot. He stated the property was zoned as planned district now, so if the Council denied the industrial zoning at a later date, the applicant would still be obligated to provide site plans for the City to review. Mr. Skala asked if the neighborhood associations would receive notice of the rezoning issue that would be discussed in February. Mr. Teddy replied they did not notice items on council meeting agendas, but they announced which

council meeting those items would be on at the PZC meetings when the public hearing was concluded. Ms. Dunn explained she had found out about the issue because she had seen a sign regarding the PZC hearing. The sign had been put up on a Monday and the meeting was held the following Thursday, which was also the Thursday before Christmas so there was not any time for her to get the word out to the neighborhoods. She understood the City was not obligated to notify anyone that was not within 185 feet, and there were not any residents that close to this parcel of land, but it would still affect their daily lives and the value of their property depending on what was developed. She stated it had been divided into two separate meetings, and they had not known it would be on this agenda. She felt voting on this could predispose someone to voting in favor of the rezoning, and believed it should all be addressed at the same meeting. This would allow the public to be there and to be fully prepared to express their concerns.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he supported the request of Ms. Dunn, and felt if the PZC had considered the rezoning and preliminary plat at the same meeting, it was a good enough reason for the Council to consider both at one meeting. He stated he also believed the notification system needed to be fixed to let people know of the PZC meeting and potentially any follow up meeting. He suggested this be tabled to the next meeting. He also did not feel it was reasonable to pass a preliminary plat and final plat at the same meeting regardless of whether it was legal. He commented that he believed Ms. Dunn had a good case for tabling the preliminary plat to the next meeting to be heard with the rezoning since there had been issues with notification and timing.

Mr. Reed explained this was a platting issue. It was one irregularly shaped legal lot of 7.66 acres, and the property owner wanted to create three rectangular lots of approximately 2-3 acres each. It was a much more reasonable legal lot arrangement and was separate from the rezoning. He believed it made sense to approve the preliminary plat at one meeting and consider the final plat at the next meeting, which was what had been requested.

Mark Farnen, 103 E. Brandon Road, stated he was representing the applicant, Last Enterprises, and explained when this had initially been heard at the PCZ meeting, they had learned that there had not been any notification because there were not any neighbors immediately adjacent or even within 185-200 feet of the subject property. The closest neighbors were about a half-mile away, which was about 2,500 feet. He noted they had not reached out to the neighbors initially either, but had talked to them after the PZC meeting. The neighbors had not wanted to meet initially, but after a bit more discussion, they had agreed to meet. Since it was around Christmas, the neighbors had asked to meet after the first of the year. They had reached out to Nile Kemble and Laura Ertz on January 2 as they had provided contact information, and had followed up a week later. They had heard back from Mr. Kemble on January 10-11 and he had indicated he would poll his neighbors to determine a time to meet, but they had not yet heard back, and Ms. Ertz had indicated she would be in Texas until March and to contact her daughter in her stead. He commented that they were happy to meet with the neighbors, and had proceeded in the order they had been asked with the application for the preliminary plat first and the final plat and rezoning occurring later but at the same meeting. With all that being said, if the Council wanted to continue this item so it was considered at the same meeting as the final plat and the rezoning, which was February 5, 2018, they would be amenable as long as all three could be considered at the same time. They did not want a situation whereby another extension was required.

Mayor Treece made a motion to table R9-18 to the February 5, 2018 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved by voice vote with only Mr. Pitzer voting no.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B20-18 Rezoning property located on the southwest corner of the Vandiver Drive and Mexico Gravel Road intersection from PD (Planned District) to IG (General Industrial District) (Case No. 18-18).
- B21-18 Approving the Final Plat of Centerstate Plat 14, a Replat of Lot 1 Centerstate Plat 13, located on the southwest corner of the Vandiver Drive and Mexico Gravel Road intersection; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 18-17).
- B22-18 Approving a PD Plan Major Amendment for The Villas at Old Hawthorne located east and west of Old Hawthorne Drive West (Case No. 18-5).
- B23-18 Approving the Red Oak Marketplace PD Plan located on the southwest corner of the Grindstone Parkway and Norfleet Drive intersection (Case No. 18-20).
- B24-18 Approving the Final Plat of The Gates, Plat No. 4, a major Replat of Lot C1, The Gates Plat No. 2 & 3 and a tract located in the Southeast Quarter of Section 9 and the Southwest Quarter of Section 10, Township 47 North, Range 13 West, located south of Old Plank Road and at the current east terminus of Rivington Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-33).
- B25-18 Approving the Final Plat of Branham - Renfro Subdivision - Plat 2 located on the northwest corner of the West Boulevard and Stadium Boulevard intersection (1028 and 1100 Westwinds Drive); authorizing a performance contract; granting design adjustments relating to sidewalk construction along West Boulevard and Stadium Boulevard (Case No. 17-64).
- B26-18 Approving the Final Plat of Tuscany Ridge Plat No. 2 located on the east side of Brown Station Road and south of Napoli Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-235).
- B27-18 Authorizing construction of the Shepard to Rollins Trail Project (Trail Alignments 1 and 3); calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B28-18 Authorizing the acquisition of certain interests in real property for construction of the Shepard to Rollins Trail Project (Trail Alignments 1 and 3).

- B29-18 Authorizing construction of the Sinclair Road at Mill Creek Culvert Replacement Project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B30-18 Authorizing the acquisition of certain interests in real property for construction of the Bingham Road and Ridgeley Road PCCE #16 sanitary sewer improvement project.
- B31-18 Authorizing a solar project power purchase agreement with Truman Solar, LLC.
- B32-18 Authorizing a small generator interconnection agreement with Truman Solar, LLC.
- B33-18 Amending the FY 2018 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Information Technology Department - Geospatial Information Services Division; amending the FY 2018 Classification and Pay Plan by closing a classification and adding a classification.

X. REPORTS

- REP4-18 Condition of Sidewalks along Broadway from West Boulevard to Providence Road.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked for the timetable of the sidewalk master plan. Mr. Stone replied he understood the Community Development Department intended to do it this year. Mayor Treece asked if those were prioritized and how they were prioritized. Mr. Nichols replied he thought they were prioritized based upon the lack of sidewalks along arterial and collector streets. Mayor Treece asked how many sidewalks might be in the tier one or priority one category. Mr. Stone replied he would have to defer to Mr. Teddy for a response. Mr. Nichols thought they were updating the 2012 plan. Mr. Teddy explained that what they called the sidewalk master plan was really a plan for recommended new sidewalks on higher volume streets in an effort to fill strategic gaps. It was connected to a policy resolution a prior Council had adopted indicating those sidewalks in the plan would be built subject to the availability of funds. He noted it also included sidewalks on some local roads that were typically suggestions of the Columbia Public Schools.

Mayor Treece stated Lawrence Simonson had brought him an idea for tier one sidewalks, and understood the cost was about \$9 million to complete the priority one sidewalks. Mr. Nichols stated he thought it was likely more than that. Mr. Teddy commented that the estimates in the plan were all over \$100 per running foot because they typically involved the replacement of driveway aprons, utility relocations, etc.

Mayor Treece asked if they could do a prime vendor agreement for sidewalks for a 1-3 year period of time so they were addressing the issue every year. Mr. Nichols replied they currently had two term and supply contractors primarily for the ramp projects. He noted those projects were being done in good weather in anticipation of future mill and overlay projects. The way it was bid was not site specific because they wanted a cost per square foot for a term and supply contract, and the contractors had covered

themselves from the standpoint of traffic control and erosion control as part of the unit cost. If they had a specific scope of point A to point B, they could potentially control costs with a detailed analysis at a location. A generalized bid would include unknown costs to inflate the unit cost. It worked well when they were doing something quickly because there was already a bid and contract, but the cost was a bit inflated due to the unknowns.

Mr. Thomas commented that the sidewalk master plan appeared to be primarily for building new sidewalks in places they did not exist. He thought this request had been about renovating the sidewalks between West Boulevard and Providence Road on Broadway, and asked about funding strategies and opportunities for that type of renovation. Mr. Nichols replied it was the responsibility of the property owner to repair sidewalks per City ordinance. Mr. Thomas understood the City did not have any type of program which would put public money into the renovation of sidewalks. Mr. Nichols replied not to this scale. He stated he thought a policy resolution allowed the City to be involved for about half of a block to address an urgent, hazardous condition, and it had only been done in limited areas. A full scale project, such as this, would require the establishment of a CIP project or the burden would need to be placed on the adjacent property owners. He explained the City had taken on the responsibility of ramps because it involved the connection with the roadway, and it was funded as the ADA ramp project as part of the CIP. He noted there would be a time when they no longer had that funding.

Mr. Thomas thought this stretch should be one of the most walkable corridors in Columbia as it was a gateway into Columbia from the west and there were a lot of pedestrian generators and destinations there, such as the library, schools, and businesses, and the sidewalks were in pretty bad shape. He understood the cost, to include the ramps, was estimated at about \$1 million, and that they could apply the ordinance, which would be deeply unpopular. He asked if they had ever done the work and tax billed the property owners. Mr. Matthes replied it was rare. Mr. Nichols stated it had been a while since he had been asked to do it. Mr. Matthes noted it had been done in the past, but he could not recall the exact project, and it had been some time ago. Mr. Thomas commented that if they did not do it, the sidewalks would stay in this terrible condition, which was not really safe for wheelchair users and others. He wondered if they could use the ordinance to negotiate a deal with property owners for a cost share. He thought they could use funds from the capital improvement sales tax, and suggested a 50-50 cost share. Mr. Nichols noted they had used the 50-50 cost share in the downtown in the past per a policy resolution and at the direction of Council. This area, however, was outside the boundary within the policy resolution, which was why they had not brought it to Council as an option. Mr. Thomas understood the Council would have to pass a policy resolution or ordinance to allow this to occur for another area. Mr. Stone pointed out the 50-50 cost share was allowed up to Garth Avenue, but the area beyond it would be outside of the policy resolution. He noted the policy resolution allowed up to 100 percent, but it then created an issue as to when they would do 100 percent in another area. Mr. Thomas stated he was not comfortable with funding it at 100 percent.

Mr. Thomas asked if the residents in that neighborhood could form a neighborhood improvement district, and if it would be easier than tax billing. Mr. Matthes replied tax billing was the most effective tool in his opinion as it amortized the cost for quite a while. It would minimize the impact for many folks. He noted the philosophy behind the cost share was traditionally on who used the sidewalk.

Mr. Thomas asked if it would be possible to do an analysis to determine what the tax bill amount would be for a typical property, and wondered how the Council felt about expanding the existing policy resolution they had for the downtown to include Broadway as far as West Boulevard.

Mr. Skala understood a considerable amount of work had been done in terms of widening West Broadway, and it had been widely unpopular and had died as a result. Mr. Nichols noted there had been a study for three lanes, medians, sidewalks, and bike lanes.

Mr. Skala stated he liked the idea of some potential solution beyond a capital project as there were many capital projects that needed to be funded, such as the one on Paris Road.

Mr. Thomas commented that the Fourth Ward residents along there and immediately south of Broadway had been complaining about the conditions of the sidewalks. While they had not said they were willing to be tax billed, they had some interest in their improvement.

Mr. Trapp stated he would like to explore what had been proposed as they were not addressing the sidewalk repair and gap issue through current means. He thought they should consider the tax billing option.

Mr. Skala understood it involved the Fourth Ward. Mr. Thomas stated it affected the First Ward as well.

Mr. Nichols asked Council if they wanted staff to bring forward another report in terms of tax billing possibilities. Mr. Thomas replied he would like a fiscal analysis of the cost to homeowners. He also thought it should include a policy resolution similar to what they had for the downtown so they could do the same thing as far as West Boulevard.

Ms. Peters asked if they should consider expanding it. As a landlord, she had been told by the City that she had to deal with the concrete heaving in front of her property so she had to find someone who could cut down the sidewalk and make it a smoother transition. She noted she had also be told by the City that she had to fix curbs even though trash trucks had driven over them a few times breaking them down. She commented that this was not a new issue, and understood other landlords had been in similar situations. In addition, some sidewalks in the East Campus neighborhood were in bad shape. She wondered what the cost would be for the entire City instead of just Mr. Thomas' area, and if there was a cost per foot regardless of location. Mr. Stone commented that there was no easy sidewalk project. Mr. Nichols agreed, and noted they could provide some ranges for typical and non-typical scenarios, but the cost tended to vary with trees, utilities, fire hydrants, etc. It was a case by case scenario in many instances. Ms. Peters asked if they had to worry about utilities and other things if they were just replacing a slab of concrete that was already in existence. Mr. Nichols replied potentially. Mr. Stone noted they had to consider grades, walls, etc. Mr. Nichols commented that they would also need direction as to whether to replace it with the existing four foot sidewalk or with a five foot sidewalk, which was the standard now, and getting to the five feet could create problems. He explained the sidewalks were sometimes one foot from the right-of-way line, which would require temporary easements. He stated he was not trying to complicate this, but they sometimes had issues when providing one number. Ms. Peters commented that she did not want staff to have to go through too much work as she knew other areas of the community had the same sidewalk issues. Mr. Stone stated they could provide a few different estimates. Mr. Nichols agreed.

Mr. Thomas noted they could expand the policy resolution to cover West Broadway as well as downtown or the entire community in terms of the 50-50 cost share and tax billing. He was not sure if they wanted to go there yet or if they just wanted to move forward with a pilot project at this time. Mayor Treece stated he would suggest a pilot project with cost estimates. Mr. Thomas commented that staff had provided cost estimates to do the repairs so it was only a question of how it would fit into a tax billing formula. Ms. Peters understood the ordinances currently indicated the property owner was responsible for the sidewalk. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. Ms. Peters understood a change as suggested would be better for the homeowner. Mr. Nichols explained the reluctance to construct a sidewalk where it did not already exist was due to it being a liability to the property owner, and some people tended to resist it.

Mr. Skala understood tax billing had occurred in the past for the entire cost, and not just the 50-50 cost share. Mr. Matthes stated it had not been used much in Columbia, but it was common throughout the country. If the Council decided to move forward with a pilot, he suggested they include a trigger for the future use of something like this whereby they

surveyed the affected property owners to ensure the majority was agreeable prior to investing funds.

REP5-18 Resolution declaring the City Council's support for Community-Oriented Policing.

Mr. Thomas commented that about a year ago they had adopted a resolution declaring the need for a community engagement process about policing with a focus on community-oriented policing, and there had been a lot of community engagement involving the City Council, City staff, stakeholders, and the community at-large since then through the listening tour and the forums held by the NAACP. He felt it was clear that everyone wanted a community-oriented policing philosophy for public safety and a program that put that philosophy into practice, and with that in mind, he, Mr. Ruffin, and Mr. Trapp thought it was time to create a document that declared the support of the Council for it and directed staff to move toward the next step to get them there. He noted this was a draft document, and they wanted to hear what the Council and the public thought about it.

Mr. Skala provided a handout with a list of resource articles related to community policing for the Council to review in case it helped the conversation.

Peggy Placier, 209 S. Greenwood Avenue, stated Race Matters, Friends was excited to see this resolution, and the fact it recognized that the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence had done a lot of the groundwork as had been pointed out repeatedly in 2014. She commented that it was encouraging to see the endorsement of the philosophy and practices of community-oriented policing, but the planning, execution, and evaluation would be critical, and mentioned the specifics of the plan, how the community would participate and be engaged, and the execution beyond individual police officer training processes. She understood there was a lot of pre-packaged training on implicit bias, communication, etc. This was a philosophical, structural, and cultural change. She felt they needed to go beyond individual practices, and use what they had learned from the literature, the COU experience, the listening sessions, etc. She also believed they needed a strong evaluation plan to make people accountable to the public for all the time and effort that had gone into this as it was finally coming closer to fruition.

Rachel Taylor, 119 Clinton Drive, understood the resolution would formally adopt a philosophy of community-oriented policing, and thanked the Council because she felt heard. She stated this emphasized a partnership between the community and Columbia Police Department, and recognized the work of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence. She noted this discussed how this was not just a resource issue. They did not necessarily need more money to do community-oriented policing because they had already been successful in reducing crime with the community outreach officers in their targeted neighborhoods. She commented that the goal of this was not to increase appreciation of police officers, but to make the community safer, and suggested this be made explicit. She stated she would love for the community police officers to be appreciated as that was great, but it was not the goal. Changes in policy, practice, training, and mentorship were necessary. She asked that they be explicit in saying police officers would receive anti-racist mentorship because they deserved support and culture change was hard. Community policing was a change to the culture of the Police Department, and not the individual bias of police officers. She noted it would be the hardest part of the change. She urged the Council to discuss support for police officers going through this culture change. She believed the officers had good hearts and were highly motivated to make the change. She commented that she had grave reservations about the leadership of City Manager Mike Matthes, especially after his presentation at the Columbia Values Diversity Celebration as it had shown insensitivity to people of color, racial illiteracy, and an inability to read the audience. Showing before and after pictures and expressing his discomfort with them when they were dressed appropriately was a deeply racist thing to do and had offended many people in attendance. She suggested

appointing someone to oversee the City Manager if he was going to lead the effort. She noted she would also like to see evaluation metrics and a mechanism by which the community could hold the City Manager and the people he involved in the process accountable. This was not currently defined in the resolution. She hoped the Council would consider holding Mr. Matthes accountable for his remarks at the Columbia Values Diversity Celebration.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he was glad to see the Council was still working on this, and believed the resolution needed a lot of work. He referred to the second whereas statement and noted he did not feel that got to an equal partnership. He suggested it read "...evaluated in equal partnership of police professionals with members of the community." He thought partnership should come first as an emphasis. He believed the third paragraph had third tier and fourth tier ideas. He understood community-oriented policing included the engagement of the community in the policing process. Professional-oriented policing, which was what the Columbia Police Department wanted to call community-oriented policing, really only addressed substantive social problems within the police mandate. He did not believe that was good because it did not get to an equal partnership. He commented that the police and community would collaborate almost all of the time with community-oriented policing, but with professional-oriented policing that was only done when there was a problem. Professional-oriented policing also had an emphasis on problem analysis, and although encouraged, it was less important than community collaboration with community-oriented policing. He reiterated the need for equally shared decision-making authority, and felt it should be done through strategic planning for the Police Department with outside facilitators over a sustained period of time. He believed the strategic planning process was the perfect model for planning and for the interaction between the Police Department and its citizens. He suggested the resolution be refined to reflect that.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, commented that she wanted the Council to move forward with this initiative on community policing, but did not want them to forget there was still a problem that needed to be dealt with on a deeper level than just community policing. She stated she had been surprised by the number of interactions she had with the Police Department since she had moved into the city limits. Twelve years ago, she had been injured in a downtown robbery, and when she had come to, the Police Department had been magnificent in how they had treated her as a crime victim. She noted she had then moved to the North Central Columbia neighborhood, and felt safe there if she could choose her officer. She explained what she had experienced as a property owner in the North Central Columbia neighborhood had led her to believe the concerns she had heard from other citizens and citizens that were black or brown needed to be taken more seriously. After she had owned her house for a while, she had realized there was a drug house across the street, and had called the Police Department. She had spoken to Captain Nelson, who had asked her to write down the license numbers and what she observed, which she had reported back. In response, they sent an officer to the door, which made her vulnerable as she was then threatened. A few years later, an oversized tractor trailer drove down her street pulling the power off of her house, and the officer treated her as if she did not have any rights. The officer would not even provide the contact information for the driver that had pulled the power off of the house because he did not feel there was any property damage even though she would have to pay for the repairs to restore the power to her home. She stated she had filed a complaint with the current Police Chief, and had found out that the officer had written a long and detailed narrative about how abusive and disruptive she had been. She pointed out she had been in her nightgown at 6:00 a.m. As a result of these interactions, she felt how one was treated by the Police Department was dependent upon where one was and who one was. She noted she lived in a modest house in a modest neighborhood, and it had become very clear there was a difference in the community. She asked that they go forward with community policing with all intention, speed, and goodwill, and that they not forget there

was a deeper problem. She commented that based on her experience she could not image what it felt like for people that were racial minorities in the community.

Mr. Skala stated his appreciation for the work that had been done on this as he felt it was long overdue. He commented that he and Mr. Ruffin had attended a National League of Cities meeting last November, and had participated in some sessions involving Racial Equity and Leadership (REAL). A very powerful documentary entitled, *Race - The Power of an Illusion*, had been shown in one of those sessions, and he had asked the City Manager to obtain a copy for the City. It was a narrative of the history of discrimination and racial prejudice. He thought a public viewing would encourage this process and some aspects of community policing. He understood this was a draft resolution, and wanted to ensure both, the public and Council, were engaged. He did not feel it should just be handed to the City Manager to come up with the best language. He felt it needed to be a collaborative process if they wanted it to be successful, and asked to be made aware of the changes toward a final draft.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he thought it was well worth moving forward in support of initiating a community-oriented policing effort.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Thomas if he had a vision or plan in mind in terms of including input from a broad range of community members. He wondered if it would be similar to what had been occurring or something else. Mr. Thomas explained this was a draft of something he hoped would be finalized and voted on fairly soon. The June time frame involved the next step after the adoption of a resolution. The City Manager would be directed to work with staff and to consult with the stakeholders in developing a plan. A model for this was the Vision Zero process whereby they adopted a resolution and directed the City Manager to develop an implementation plan and a funding plan, which he had done. He understood this was more complicated, and that there would need to be transition plan. He commented that his thought was to let the City Manager decide exactly how to do this, and that language could be changed. The Council, in their direction, would imbed the need for all of the stakeholder groups to be consulted as the plan was developed. He understood this could take longer than June. Mr. Pitzer noted Mr. Thomas had indicated a lot of community engagement had occurred already, which was why he asked. Mr. Thomas agreed there had been a lot of community engagement, and felt developing a plan would be a big project. Once the plan was developed, they would make modifications and/or approve it, and they would later implement it. He noted there were still a few steps, and he did not think they should be too specific as to how the engagement happened. They just needed to ensure it happened at some level.

Mr. Skala commented that he was a little uncomfortable with the idea of going into this with some of them not understanding what they were in for in terms of funding. They had to have some concurrent ideas about funding and implementation as they developed the final draft. He did not want this to happen in a vacuum. Mr. Thomas stated the direction included asking the City Manager to develop a budget to implement the plan as part of the plan development, which included transitioning the Police Department to a community-oriented policing philosophy by drawing on what they had learned with the community outreach unit, national best practices, and community input. If that budget was different than the current Police Department budget, they would have to discuss how to bridge the gap.

Mr. Pitzer stated he was fully supportive of the idea, but when they got to the point of having a plan, they would have a Police Chief that was about a year away from his stated retirement date. He wanted to ensure the City Manager was able to recruit the best possible person for the position so he thought they might need to have a discussion about whether they would have a plan in place to hand to the new person or if they wanted to involve any new person in the discussion about how the plan was implemented. Mr. Thomas commented that he believed plans were dynamic and continually needed to be reviewed and revised as necessary. He did not feel starting the planning process now would take away that option. He thought it was important to make their philosophical

position clear with regard to community-oriented policing since they knew they would have a new Police Chief within the next few years.

Mayor Treece commented that he wished the Police Chief could have been with them tonight to provide his thoughts and vision in terms of implementation and how the transition would work. He asked Mr. Matthes to comment on the staffing and confidence issues that had been raised, and how they might replicate what had been done with Vision Zero in terms of staffing. He noted, at a meeting about four weeks ago, he had asked for a short-term six month strategy to address the spike in homicides they had seen in 2017. He explained everyone had assured him that community policing added value to the crime prevention strategy in terms of witness cooperation, etc. He was not sure they could wait until that plan was in place and transition into this model to address the problem, and wanted to know the top 5-20 things they could do to get on top of the crime issue they were experiencing. If they adopted this in a month, he wondered how Mr. Matthes would operationalize and execute it. Mr. Matthes explained he viewed this similar to Vision Zero and would take an approach that would be accomplishable. In this case, he would reach into the Police Department and provide an executive development experience for someone through an informal interview process. He thought there were many people that could do this effectively, but they would not want to hamstring a critically important function, so they would have to weigh many factors. His hope was to find someone that already understood policing, community policing models, and the community input process. He commented that they had already gathered a lot of data, and could gather more. He listed components of the process and noted it would be a full time job for at least six months to produce a plan.

Mr. Thomas asked Deputy Police Chief Gordon and Deputy Police Chief Schlude for their thoughts. Deputy Chief Gordon reminded everyone that the community outreach unit had been difficult to create in terms of staffing. It had essentially cost them the traffic unit as it had ended in order to create the other. He commented that they were hurting in terms of personnel. They currently had ten vacancies, which was not bad, as it was less than eight percent, but seventeen were in field training and five were in the academy. In addition, more could retire or leave this year. As a result, any personnel lost in the Department would be hard. In terms of operations, they believed in the community policing philosophy, but were concerned about staffing. He noted there had been eighteen calls for service in the queue when he had checked prior to coming to the meeting, and that was a lot of people that were waiting for officers. He commented that he had to consider the breaking point of officers mentally in terms of workload, and pointed out they would soon roll out the new RMS program, which would take officers several months to learn, and they would soon go through the actual accreditation process, which would be stressful because they would be tested. He asked the Council to keep those things in mind. He thought they should be good with RMS within 6-9 months, but he did not know how long the accreditation would take or when the evaluators would visit them. He agreed the community outreach unit was very successful, but those officers were dedicated to those areas. They did not get pulled off of those geographic areas for anything else. This was not the case for the other officers who had to travel all over town to handle calls. Deputy Chief Schlude stated she thought it would be important to educate everyone that would be involved in the process of the commitment they had made to the CALEA process as they had executed an agreement and were only about half of the way through the process. The assessment would occur next year, and they would hopefully receive accreditation then too. Since this was their first time going through the process, it would be extremely stressful on staff. She noted they would have to be mindful to not upend it inadvertently by not thinking about how CALEA might mesh into any possible changes made to the structure or policies.

Mr. Thomas stated he was not very familiar with CALEA, but assumed it was well aligned with community-oriented policing principles. Deputy Chief Schlude stated there were many aspects of CALEA that addressed some of these things, but there were parts of

CALEA that were very narrow whereby they had to have a policy on a certain item. There were also parts that were wide in that they only needed to have some direction with respect to a certain item. She explained they currently went to Sergeant Dochler, the accreditation manager, any time they considered a change to determine how it might fit into CALEA. This provided guidance so they did not inadvertently damage that process. She stated CALEA was the national standard and they were constantly updating things and looking at best practices. She noted the University of Missouri Police Department had been accredited for some time, and they had been helping the Columbia Police Department walk through the process.

Mr. Skala commented that he recalled discussions regarding CALEA back in 2008, and thought it was a pretty remarkable accomplishment to get the Columbia Police Department to sign on to that commitment. He believed the two could coexist, but agreed they needed to be mindful of the amount of work they both involved.

Mr. Trapp stated he believed CALEA, like all certification bodies, would ensure they were driven by feedback and operating in safe manner, and felt the two could be complimentary processes. As part of CALEA, he thought they would have to engage with the public. He understood there was an argument that this was a philosophical change, but it took officers on the street to respond to calls while still having some extra capacity for positive engagement and relationship building, and they were struggling. He thought if they could come together with a plan, it should ease the way toward gaining community support for funding. He appreciated the hard work and sacrifice of the officers, and understood deeply the strain they were under. He hoped this would not be a process that would make that worse, but felt it was something that would improve the situation in the long run.

Mayor Treece asked if they wanted to do this on February 5 or February 19. Mr. Thomas replied he thought it would be better to do it on February 19 to allow more time for the public to review it and provide feedback, and for the Council to discuss changes they might want to make.

Mr. Thomas commented that he had received five friendly amendments during dialogues with stakeholders and the public. One involved simplifying the language in the paragraph that discussed the vehicle stops reports, and to not preempt an answer to the question. Another change in the same paragraph was to specify the disproportions in traffic stops and searches were racial disproportions. A third suggestion was to emphasize that community policing also included command staff fostering an internal culture of respect for all ranks of officers and improving internal leadership through positive reinforcement, mentorship, and coaching as opposed to heavy handed punishment and threats of job loss. The fourth item was to include residents of the city that had been impacted by disproportionate minority contact by police officers in Section 3, and the final suggestion was for the reference to United Way to be the Heart of Missouri United Way.

Mr. Thomas asked how they wanted to proceed in terms of process. Mayor Treece thought this should be brought back as a resolution under new business at a future council meeting. Mr. Thomas asked if he should facilitate edits to this based on feedback received. Mayor Treece felt that was likely more desirable than an amendment sheet. He wondered if there was a way to put it on the February 5 meeting agenda even though they would not vote on it until February 19. Ms. Amin asked if they wanted to add it to the February 5 meeting agenda as a report. Mayor Treece replied it could be a report or they could put under new business with the caveat that they would delay voting until the next meeting.

Mr. Thomas wondered if they could lean on the Community Relations Department to issue a press release to notify the public they could comment on it similar to what they had done with the Listening Tour report.

Mr. Matthes understood this would be placed on the February 5 meeting agenda as a report and a resolution would be brought forward for February 19. He noted the deadline would be February 12. Mayor Treece asked for the deadline for the February 5 meeting

agenda. Mr. Matthes replied January 29.

Mr. Thomas understood they were looking to make one set of revisions before February 5 and a second set of revisions before February 19. Mayor Treece noted one revised document needed to be to the City Clerk by January 29. Mr. Thomas understood they would have another discussion on February 5, and would then provide a final set of revisions for a resolution to be presented for February 19. Mayor Treece noted that would have to be to the Clerk by February 12 for discussion on February 19.

REP6-18 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

Mr. Skala commented that he would like to pursue the idea of making some resources available like the film he had mentioned previously. Mr. Matthes stated they had a copy of it now. Mayor Treece suggested providing it to Nikki McGruder to be used as part of the Inclusive Journey Passport Series. Mr. Skala thought that was a great suggestion. He thought it would be beneficial for people to see it to get a sense of the history.

Barbara Wren, 615 Bluff Dale Drive, provided a handout and noted the Council would be voting on B27-18, which dealt with the Shepard to Rollins trail. She commented that she had been dealing with this for 22 years, but understood some on the Council were new to the topic. Over the years, there had been a lot of thoughts and a lot of different ideas. She noted the language in the resolutions and ordinances always indicated it was necessary or a necessity, and questioned whether this project was really a necessity. She stated the project had not been deemed a necessity when it was voted on in 1995, 2008, and 2010. In addition, since then, there had been improvements in the area that might have rendered it as not necessary or a necessity. The money would then be available to spend in other areas in terms of the Parks and Recreation and the GetAbout budgets. She explained she and others had met with someone from the Federal Highways Administration, and they had also felt Option 4 covered the need and Options 1 and 3 were redundant with what had already been done with GetAbout funds. She pointed out there had also been changes since the study had been completed by Transystems. There were now new apartment dwellers and the bus system had been eliminated in the area, which had been part of the mode shift. She commented that the existing ecologically functioning ecosystem would be disrupted by the project. It was currently handling floodwater and stormwater runoff. She asked the Council to look at the GetAbout funding in terms of equity as she believed a lot of money had been spent in the Sixth Ward. She wondered if the money could be better spent in others parts of the community. She stated Option 4 provided for the missing link at a much lower cost to the community, and asked the Council to revisit the options chosen. She commented that she had heard someone say they would rather have their children riding a bike through the woods than next to a street, but she disagreed as there could be an accident and there were not any safety call boxes nearby. She explained she had been involved in a bike accident as a child, and luckily someone had been with her because she had ended up in a ditch with a concussion. She believed the child would be safer riding on a sidewalk along Old 63 and Stadium Boulevard than through the woods where there might not be other people. She pointed out her cell phone did not work since there was a bad cell tower in the area.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, understood the Council had adopted R172-17 on December 18, 2017, which found the trail to be a necessity, and asked who had voted no on it. Ms. Amin stated she believed this was the resolution setting the public hearing, which was amended to hold the hearing on February 5 instead of January 16. Mr. Clark agreed, and noted it included language finding it a necessity to move forward with Options

1 and 3. He stated he was interested in who voted for or against it as he understood they had passed a declaration of necessity. Ms. Thompson clarified it was a resolution of necessity and it set the public hearing, and it was standard language that came from the City Code as a part of the process for public improvement projects. Mr. Clark understood, by adopting that resolution, the Council had decided it was a necessity. Ms. Thompson stated the Council had not passed an ordinance at this point. They had decided it was a necessity for the purposes of the setting the public hearing, and not in terms of proceeding with the project. Mr. Clark felt that was unclear from reading the language, and thought the items under introduction and first reading were also unclear. He understood the real vote on the necessity would be held at the February 5, 2018 Council Meeting, and if it was rejected then, the City would not move forward with the other plans. Ms. Thompson stated there were several stages at which there were opportunities to turn back. Mr. Clark commented that he thought they had actually voted when they set the public hearing when reading it. Ms. Thompson reiterated it was declaring the necessity of the project for the purposes of a public hearing. Mr. Clark stated he would back at the February 5, 2018 meeting to indicate why he did not feel it was necessary.

Mr. Clark asked the Council if they had participated in a strategic planning process in the past outside of the one the City had done, which he did not feel was thorough. He wondered if they were familiar with that kind of detailed work, which took longer than a weekend. Mr. Thomas commented that he had been through many strategic planning processes and had facilitated many as well. Mr. Clark stated he hoped he could count on Mr. Thomas knowing what a robust and thorough strategic planning process involved.

Mr. Thomas noted he had not been here two weeks ago when the electric utility staff had made a new recommendation on the transmission line project and the capacity needs in south Columbia, but was pleased it had been done. He commented that they had fought very hard 2-3 years ago for what now seemed like the wrong project, and as a result, he did not have a lot of confidence in a lot of the recommendations that came from the electric utility staff. He thought the formula for calculating the rate impact of solar net metering had been continually garbled to his way of thinking. Initially, an excessively high cost to energy that was free to the utility had been plugged into the formula, which would cause them to hit the three percent cap quickly. He understood this had been changed, but they now did not count the energy that was produced by net metered solar toward the renewable energy goals, and that was not logical either. The formula needed to be set out properly where an accurate estimate of how much energy was generated by net metered solar and a realistic cost to the utility was used in the formula. He also felt the way the cost of the expansion of capacity to the system to accommodate new customers was charged needed to be reviewed as they were adding 500-1000 new customers per year as the community grew. He had little confidence in the staff recommendation for the line extension policy, which started with an unjustifiable premise that every new customer had a cash contribution to the utility of nearly \$1,000. He stated he would like to find a consultant that would do a system equity connection fee study, which was the normal way that shared utility operations were done. He noted that was done with sewer and water, and he could not see any reason why they should not do it with electricity. As the integrated planning process started, he hoped a system equity fee study would be included in the RFP for the project discussed a couple of weeks ago. This would allow them to compare it to the line extension policy staff had proposed.

Mr. Thomas asked for a report on crosswalks. He explained there was a problem with people with disabilities in the community traveling by wheelchair in that they could not reach the button to activate the crosswalk due to the design. He understood there were ways to overcome the problem with extensions. He wanted the report to address how much of a problem this was and what the cost would be to retrofit some of the most

serious situations where there was the most need.

Mr. Thomas asked for an analysis on the parts of the community where people needed to cross the street and there were long stretches of highway with no safe places to cross. The first example he suggested staff to look at was between Green Meadows Road and the Reactor on Providence Road. It was the location where a lady was killed crossing the road after getting off of a bus in 2014. It involved about half of a mile high speed high volume highway with no safe way to cross. He wanted an analysis of those types of locations where there was a need to cross the road due to the land uses on either side, and for a plan and funding estimate to improve pedestrian safety. He thought that could come as a part of the Vision Zero program.

Mr. Thomas asked about the process now with regard to the Broadway TIF. He understood a contract would be developed and asked about the impact of Council with regard to the terms of that contract. He wondered how they would weigh in on it. Mr. Matthes replied staff was currently negotiating an agreement to implement the plan that was approved with the added request from a subsequent meeting with regard to clawbacks. It would be brought to Council once they were finished negotiating to vote yes or no on the agreement.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked the inclusion of clawbacks and an evaluation of the jobs created along with some of the other promises that were made.

Mayor Treece asked if it would be a yes or no vote, or if there would be an opportunity to amend the agreement. Ms. Thompson replied there should be an opportunity to do some amendment, but it would depend on which terms were impacted as it could not be related to the statutory findings. It could be things related to clawbacks and other items for the purposes of accountability.

Mayor Treece asked when the Council would have the opportunity to see it so he could draft his own amendments or ask staff to draft them in a form in which staff might feel more comfortable. Ms. Thompson replied they had a list based on comments made, but the agreement was not yet ready to view in draft form. She stated he could discuss those with her to ensure they were incorporated.

Mr. Skala asked if any potential changes or amendments would have to be renegotiated.

Mr. Matthes replied it was a negotiation process so any change would have to be accepted by both parties.

Mayor Treece noted that one of the comments that had come up in reviewing some correspondence on the original tower was consideration of a "when paid" clause to ensure all contractors and subcontractors were paid before the TIF was executed. It did not make sense that the bills taxpayers had paid for had not been paid.

Mayor Treece understood Mr. Thomas had not been at the January 2 meeting, and noted he shared his concern and lack of confidence in the management of the water and electric utilities. It was one of the reasons he opposed the rate increase for both water and electric and the projections that had been used. He did not have confidence in the billing either due to the number of errors. He understood some people had received a credit for sewer charges as they had apparently been overcollecting on sewer, and staff had chosen to just refund it instead of coming to Council. He asked Mr. Thomas if he had reviewed the discussion they had with respect with the engineering projections. He hoped he had been clear enough in that the RFP should include a comprehensive rate study that looked at the cost of service across residential consumers and institutional payers to ensure everyone was paying their fair share while also looking at the equity connection study to determine how they paid for expanding the infrastructure system. Mr. Thomas stated he had viewed the video for that portion of the meeting, and his comments a few minutes ago were really just reinforcing and supporting those comments in that he would like the system equity connection fee study to be a part of the process.

Mayor Treece noted he had been shocked by the price tag as he thought it would only be \$200,000-\$300,000. They had paid about \$750,000 7-10 years ago, and the current estimate was \$1.2 million. He thought they needed to do something to get on top of that as they had consultants on top of consultants.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 10:54 p.m.