



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, March 6, 2017
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, March 6, 2017, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. Nadia Gresham, a sixth grader at Jefferson Middle School led the recital of the Pledge of Allegiance, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, and PETERS were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of February 6, 2017 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Ms. Nausser. Mayor Treece noted the February 20, 2017 Council Meeting and February 25 Special Council Meeting minutes were not yet complete.

Upon her request, Mayor Treece made a motion to allow Ms. Peters to abstain from voting on R32-17. Ms. Peters noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that she owned the subject property. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and was approved without objection.

Mr. Skala asked that B60-17 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

Upon his request, Mr. Skala made a motion to allow Mr. Thomas to abstain from voting on B60-17. Mr. Thomas noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that he had worked for the PedNet Coalition for many years and still supported their work as a volunteer. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nausser and was approved without objection.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B60-17 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Ms. Nausser.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI3-17

Presentation of the Fiscal Year 2016 Financial Audit.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, explained he was a member of the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee, and noted this had been a challenging year for the Finance Department and next year would be almost as challenging. This past year involved the implementation of the COFERS reporting system so they had been running the old and the new systems in parallel, and this audit report had been based upon the old system. In addition, about a year ago there had been a change in leadership in the Finance Department as John Blattel had retired and Michele Nix had been hired. Also, Ron Barrett, a senior accountant that had been very much involved in the COFERS project had retired. He commented that the generally accepted standards required the auditor to maintain and promote effective two-way communication between the auditor and those charged with governance. The Finance Advisory and Audit Committee had been established by the City Council to be the intermediary. As a result, they had met with the auditors last August for planning purposes and more recently when the audit reports

were completed. One of the four deliverables received was the staff's management representation letter, and the Committee was not involved in it. The second was the CAFER report, and the independent auditor's report was about the basic financial statements. The auditor's responsibility was to express an opinion on the financial statement within the CAFER report, and they had not made any major adjustments. He stated the opinion letter indicated they believed they had adequate evidence to support it was sufficient and appropriate to provide a basis for their opinions, and read some of the opinion. He commented that there were two other specific reports that had been presented each year. This year they looked at CDBG, HOME, and the highway and road construction program, and in their opinion, in all material respects the City was in compliance. The fourth report was similar and involved the airport with regard to the passenger facility charge. The auditors indicated they felt the City complied in all material respects with the types of compliance requirements that could have had a direct or material effect on that program. He stated the staff had accomplished a tremendous amount of work. They were massively overworked and more help was needed as the knowledge they provided was key to the work of the Council. He noted two members of the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee had retired, Ed Scavone and Vic Arnold, and the committee wished them well. The two new members were Lisa Evans and Diane Suhler.

Mayor Treece stated he assumed the Council would receive copies of the audit. Mr. Clark noted he hoped they would receive hard copies of it, and pointed out it was on-line.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC14-17 Dane Steinhauer and Taylor Livingston - Youth Advisory Council City Report.

Mr. Steinhauer provided a handout and explained he was the Chair of the Youth Advisory Council (YAC). Ms. Livingston stated she was the Vice Chair of the YAC.

Mr. Steinhauer commented that the 2016-2017 YAC was pleased to report on the City's strategic plan. In one of their first meetings, Mr. Thomas, the Ward 4 Council Member, had charged them with giving the youth perspective on mental health, poverty, drug and alcohol abuse, and building bridges. In addition, the YAC had been asked by the Council to identify and work to increase positive recreational opportunities for teens. While researching local youth perspectives concerning access to mental health services, the YAC came to the consensus there was a severe lack of awareness of mental health resources amongst the youth of Columbia. Beginning in 2016-2017, students in Boone County had begun to take a self-assessment three times per school year to identify those suffering from symptoms of mental health threats, and he believed this would help raise awareness of mental health services. Recently, a YAC member of Hickman High School had proposed a program to promote mindfulness and stress reduction through personal awareness. Students in other Columbia Public School (CPS) high schools organized annual suicide awareness and prevention programs to let young people know they were not alone and people cared. Drug and alcohol prevention was also considered under the umbrella of mental health, and many services were available through the mental health community, but there were very few programs beyond the D.A.R.E. program that students were aware of that directly addressed drugs and alcohol. The YAC agreed the best preventative measures were those related to more positive recreational opportunities for teens. He commented that although poverty was still a reality for many Columbian residents, there were simple programs providing access to resources that reduced the negative impact of poverty on the youth of the community. During the January YAC meeting, a local boy scout presented the idea of a districtwide clothing drive organized to

provide students access to additional resources. This was something that had been done at Battle High School for those that needed food and clothes, and helped disrupt the cycle of poverty. It was currently being implemented at Hickman High School and Rock Bridge High School. Through this effort the YAC had come to the conclusion that further development of school resource closets along with coordinating annual food and clothing drives would help disrupt the cycle of poverty in Columbia. He stated the disruption of poverty should also be a priority for the City Council, CPS, and other relevant organizations.

Ms. Livingston explained that in an effort to better understand the process of building bridges in the community, consultants, Glenn Cobbins and Judy Hubbard, had shared their experiences with YAC. She noted Mr. Cobbins and Ms. Hubbard had indicated the single most important thing was to treat people with dignity and respect in terms of building bridges and create stronger connections between the impoverished youth and the privileged youth of Columbia. She felt a great way to do this was through programs like the Wake Up campaign, which had been created by CPS students to raise awareness about issues of inequality, injustice, and intolerance. The purpose of the campaign was to foster proactive discussions that used dialogue to move beyond emotion, bias, and debate. She commented that the YAC identified ways to increase positive recreational opportunities for teens, which included encouraging extracurricular activities to expand opportunities through organizations, soliciting help from local businesses and non-profits to host youth specific events, such as free movies, paint the town, and neighborhood basketball games, and encouraging the City to increase support for organizations and non-profits that provided young people with positive social experiences. She stated the YAC was pleased with the City initiative to address inequality through the strategic approach. Currently, many services were available that had the potential to provide an array of resources and stability. She explained the findings of the YAC had confirmed that although there were a variety of community services available, additional outreach efforts were necessary to teach young people how to access and utilize the available resources. The YAC was recommending the City launch a media campaign using a variety of formats to disseminate information that would raise awareness of the services available and to teach people how to use them.

Mayor Treece thanked Mr. Steinhauer and Ms. Livingston for their service on the YAC.

Mr. Thomas echoed the thanks of Mayor Treece, and noted the Council would take a close look at this as they reviewed the strategic plan going forward.

SPC15-17

Ethel Stewart - Mayor's Task Force on Medical Tourism

Recommendations reviewed and presented on February 20, 2017.

Ms. Stewart thanked Mayor Treece for the opportunity to provide feedback on R117-16A, which involved the Mayor's Task Force on Medical Tourism. She understood the goal was for engagement and the study and evaluation of medical, health, and wellness services provided within the community along with opportunities for promotion and support of medical tourism within Columbia. In review of the recommendations and dependencies, she did not feel these fully addressed the goals and the eight purposes that had been outlined in the resolution. She commented that she had a few questions, to include whether the citizens of Columbia wanted the city to become a medical destination, whether the Task Force would consider expanding recommendation No. 5 so it incorporated residents of Columbia who would be the primary end user of the program, whether the Columbia could quantify the economic impact it hoped to realize, whether the Task Force could quantify or make available the data to support substantial numbers of patients, why Columbians chose to outsource their care to other metropolitan areas, how level the playing field would be for the varying business sizes, would dental care, physical therapy, speech therapy, etc. be included, had sustainable, programmatic, operational, creative elements been developed to be competitive, and whether there were entertaining options were for patients and caregivers. She suggested the Council define for the people

of Columbia why government was interested in medical tourism or becoming a medical destination and what benefits were hoped to be achieved. She also suggested the Council revise the key members of the Task Force so a private practice representative, health and wellness representative, and a behavioral health representative were included. As a public health professional, she asked those involved to be careful in not exploiting the sick and vulnerable during a time that might be economically stressful for them. She also asked that the spoken and unspoken concerns of many in the medical community be addressed through transparency, meaningful involvement, and over-communication.

SPC16-17 Rebecca Graves - Remarks on the recent resolution to conduct a Community Engagement Process about Policing in Columbia.

On behalf of Race Matters, Friends, Ms. Graves commended Mr. Thomas for introducing and the City Council for passing the resolution to conduct a community engagement process about policing as it was the right thing to do for the community. She noted she had friends that worried about their children in terms of being profiled and killed by the police. She stated she also had friends that worried about their spouses that were police officers in terms of someone pulling a gun on them or hunting and shooting them down. She commented that it pained her that this had been painted as an either/or and winner takes all fight. There was not a winner or loser. She believed they could become a beloved community through reconciliation and coming back into agreement, and this could be done by seeing the humanity in each other, finding values and stories, listening deeply, meeting with each other at their homes, houses of worship, on the street, etc. She stated it was in that spirit she looked forward to the process set out in Section 3 of the resolution of engaging the community in conversation and listening. She commented that she also looked forward to them engaging their neighbors and community members from all sections of Columbia, to include neighborhoods with high crimes and those with low crime, neighborhoods with money and without, groups representing expertise in race and implicit bias, groups representing the police, and representatives from the University of Missouri, the schools, the Chamber of Commerce, etc. She awaited the coming process of engagement and the advent of community policing in Columbia. As a beloved community, it was possible for all of them to have equal justice and protection and equal feelings of respect and safety. She again commended the Council for passing the resolution and looked forward to the City's full support of the process.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH2-17 Consideration of the Unified Development Code.

Discussion shown with B43-17.

B43-17 Repealing Article III of Chapter 12A and Chapters 20, 23, 25 and 29 of the City Code; enacting a new Chapter 29 of the City Code to establish a Unified Development Code; amending Chapters 2, 6, 13, 24 and 27 of the City Code as it relates to the Unified Development Code (Case No. 16-110).

PH2-17 was read by the Clerk, and B43-17 was given third reading by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

David Brown, 501 Fay Street, stated he was an attorney representing the East Campus Majority Housing Association, whose membership included owners of more than 50 percent of the lots within the East Campus Urban Conservation Overlay District. He commented that they agreed the East Campus and Benton Stephens overlays were good, but noted he would speak against the proposed amendment to the East Campus overlay ordinance. The present ordinance restricted the amendment of the East Campus overlay ordinance via a petition of more than 50 percent of the parcel owners or a request

of a committee the Council considered representative of the overlay district, and neither requirement had been met. He stated he sent a letter on January 23 for inclusion in the public record urging the Council not to make any amendment to the East Campus overlay because the procedure in the ordinance had not been met. He understood the amendment was to that procedure itself and that staff had offered the opinion that the procedure for amending the overlay was unlawful. He did not feel that was a sound legal analysis. He understood it had been based on the Lamar case, whereby the City contracted out its power to act in the future, and the power of a future council could not be contracted out in terms of a discretionary act. The East Campus overlay procedure was completely different. The City had legislated a procedure from its zoning requirements. It had not contracted out its power to act in the future. It had established by legislation a procedure for amending its zoning ordinances. Missouri Statute 89.050 provided that a city could determine the procedure to amend its zoning requirements. He commented that in his opinion, it was lawful and did not need to be removed, and felt the City had to comply with it in order to amend the overlay, which had not been done. He stated Missouri law indicated zoning districts had to be uniform, universal, and non-discriminatory, and there was no express authority to use overlays. There was no Missouri case law where an overlay had been challenged, and it had been affirmed a city had the authority to do an overlay. At a minimum, overlays, if allowable, had to be uniform, universal, and non-discriminatory. The East Campus overlay was a spot overlay in one particular geographic area. It was not a general overlay, meaning it could be overlaid on zonings anywhere in the community in a uniform, universal, and non-discriminatory way. This problem had been compounded by having a second overlay in Benton Stephens. It was obviously not uniform, universal, or non-discriminatory. He pointed out this was a potential problem with which no one complained because everyone believed both the overlays were good. He commented that there would be a legal challenge if the Council approved the amendment suggested by staff, and this would call into question the entire overlay scheme in Columbia jeopardizing the urban conservation overlays in the community. He reiterated the amendment procedure currently in the ordinance that required the petition or a committee recognized by the Council was a lawful procedure for amending zoning, and if it was not followed, the City could not lawfully amend the ordinance. He suggested it would be unwise to do this because it would draw a legal challenge that would unnecessarily put in jeopardy two perfectly good urban conservation districts.

Mr. Skala understood the East Campus Urban Conservation Overlay District had primarily been sponsored by the neighborhood association, and there was now a challenge with another neighborhood association in the area. He asked if the second neighborhood association had been recognized by the City. Mr. Brown replied no, but explained it was recognized by the State of Missouri, while the other neighborhood association was not. He stated they had a lawfully organized, chartered, not-for-profit corporation that represented more than half of the parcels within the overlay district. The other group was not a legal entity, and they were not sure who they represented.

Ms. Nauser asked if a petition had been signed by 50-plus percent of the parcel owners. Mr. Brown replied all of the members of the organization he represented were landlords, and they represented over 50 percent of the parcels and had signed and submitted a petition asking that the ordinance not be amended as a demonstration that the 50 percent requirement asking for an amendment had not been met, and could not be met.

Mr. Trapp understood Mr. Brown was saying that the adoption of the Unified Development Code (UDC) as written would generate a legal challenge based upon changing the process of the East Campus overlay district. Mr. Brown stated that was correct. The only change being made to the overlay was to amend the process for amending the overlay, and it was very unwise to do as it would draw a legal challenge.

Mayor Treece noted they were not changing the overlay. Mr. Brown stated they were not changing any substance of the overlay. They were proposing to change the procedure for

amending it without following the existing procedure for amending it.

Jay Hasheider, 1812 Cliff Drive, explained he owned rental property within the Benton Stephens Community Association at the corner of Windsor Street and Melbourne Street, where he had lived for 13 years. His interest in the UDC had to do with the parking requirements, specifically any proposed reduction of parking requirements for residential multi-family developments. He commented that he very much favored Columbia doing everything it could to reduce the dependence on cars as he felt the survivability of the planet depended on this locally and globally. He did not think it was a good idea to try to get there by simply reducing parking requirements in the zoning codes. He stated there were a number of well-intentioned Columbians that felt reducing parking requirements was a good first step, but he did not agree. A decrease in the use of single passenger automobiles would take more than a one-dimensional approach. He thought they needed to identify the full public contribution that was needed each year to keep the current transportation system operating as there were hidden subsidies imbedded in road construction costs, maintenance, snow removal, traffic control, parking, etc. He believed these needed to be identified so car owners were responsible for those cost, and the revenue should then be used to help develop a workable transportation system that meant creating more densely populated areas around town. An example was a parking benefit fund whereby revenues from parking permits could be used to make neighborhoods safer for walking and biking. The carrot and stick approach needed to both be used at the same time. Applying only one would not achieve the goal, and it could work the opposite way. Parking had been reduced for R-3 zoning in the first Benton Stephens conservation district, which had been adopted in 2001, and the intention was to encourage the use of bicycles and create less parking areas, but it had not had that effect. It had simply shifted parking from the lots into the streets and rights-of-way. The streets in Benton Stephens were now clogged with parked cars, and many streets, which once easily handled two-way passages, were essentially one-way streets now. It created difficulty for garbage trucks, emergency vehicles, and other vehicles. Parking reduction alone would not reduce car ownership. It simply moved parking from off-street to on-street, and the cost of parking had shifted from the private entity to the public entity. It also created a community whereby long-term residents felt less comfortable living in those areas causing them to live elsewhere and commute to town. He encouraged the Council to pass the UDC without any reductions to parking requirements as had been proposed by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC), and suggested the parking requirements be increased instead. He also suggested they begin a communitywide effort to vision a comprehensive transportation plan for the future on the heels of the passage of the UDC.

Jim Meyer, 104 Sea Eagle Drive, stated the police powers of local government were to be limited exceptions to the more general rights of citizens. They were to be used specifically in cases to protect public health, public safety, and public welfare. He believed the welfare of the public should be broadly construed not to advantage of one subset of the public over the rest. The most salient characteristic of private property was that it was private, and it should be used for the private purposes of the private owners and should not be managed for the benefit and enjoyment of others. He commented that he felt this code was deeply dismissive of the private property rights of its citizens. He did not believe any public purpose was served by the City micromanaging the fenestration requirements, the vertical façade composition, and the other architectural details of downtown buildings. It was another unwarranted intrusion on the property rights of landowners and did not serve any public purpose. He stated he opposed the neighborhood protection standards, particularly because they applied to all lots within the R-MF district that contained a principle use other than single-family or two-family dwellings. In a district where three-family or higher density was used, the density had to be contained by building height, buffering and screening requirements, etc. for property abutting R-1 or R-2 districts. He felt it was unreasonable, and pointed out Table 4.4-4 in

Section 29-4.4(e) discussed the use of the subject property and not the zoning of the subject property. The comment below the table indicated screening and buffering shall be installed as defined in the table where residential use had been established on a parcel zoned for mixed-use or commercial and the adjacent property was proposed to be developed or redeveloped with a non-residential use. Someone purchasing a vacant lot or tearing down a building to create a residential use on the lot, even if in an area zoned for more intense use, could create spillover effects impacting their neighbors. It would not affect a neighbor in its existing use of the existing building, but it would affect the neighbor if they wanted to develop a vacant lot or redevelop an existing building. The residential user was privileged and could burden the property rights of all of the other landowners. He felt this destroyed the principle of equality before the law. In terms of the tree preservation requirements in Section 29-4.4, he understood a sentence had been added indicating it could not include trees located within a stream buffer, right-of-way, or utility easements. He did not feel the City had any idea how much additional tree preservation this would create and how much developable land it would take out of circulation. This would only result in increased land costs to an unknown degree. He understood the concern was the clearcutting of trees due to power lines, and suggested exempting only that from the 25 percent requirement instead of making it so broad. He did not feel sewer lines often caused tree clearing. He believed it needed to be narrower to protect affordable housing in Columbia. He explained he also had issue with the number of subdivision entrances required.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Meyer if he would feel better if an amendment was proposed changing the residential use to a use that was zoned R-1 or R-2. Mr. Meyer replied yes if the trigger was zoning.

Mel Zelenak, 1800 Woodrail Avenue, explained he was one of the constituents that had signed the petition referred to by Mr. Brown regarding the East Campus area. He noted he wanted to speak on a document the Council had received on March 1 from Wendy Kvam, which had described the process that had resulted in the East Campus overly district. It was a two year process that had taken into consideration feedback from non-resident owners and resident owners in the area, and ended in a win-win situation as both non-resident owners and resident owners had their voices heard. The concern with the proposed amendment was that it took away from the original intent of why the East Campus committee had been formed. The process currently in place had been agreed to by all parties involved. That process and the assurance of all stakeholders in the neighborhood having their voice heard could go away with the proposed amendment. He commented that if they had known in 2001 or 2003 that there was a chance that all of the good faith effort they had put into the formation of the original overlay would be taken away down the road, they might not have come to the table at the beginning. He explained that even now they were the last to hear about changes in the neighborhood. He asked that the original overlay remain intact, and for the proposed amendment to be removed. He pointed out they had an organization that was recognized by the State of Missouri and truly representative of over half of the parcels in the East Campus neighborhood, and if the Council decided to not strike the amendment, he asked that the City recognize their group so they could provide feedback and comment on the issues that might impact them.

Ms. Peters understood there were 15 days of notice, and then an interested parties meeting and a public hearing so there was a lot of notice. She viewed this as a much more public process, which ensured they were heard, but understood they did not feel that way. Mr. Zelenak explained he had owned property in the East Campus neighborhood for 14 years now, and had never once been considered a member of the current East Campus Neighborhood Association (ECNA). He stated he had tried to submit his dues two weeks ago and received notice that what had been submitted was not enough and had received information on the additional process that was necessary. In the 14 years he had owned property in East Campus, he did not recall ever receiving

anything from the ECNA letting him know what was happening. He commented that there had been three specific projects non-resident owners had attempted to bring forward to resident owners in the past, and their requests had been met with silence. He noted his concern was that they would not receive notice. He understood the President of ECNA would receive notice, but he did not believe he and other non-resident owners would receive notice. It would take something being posted in the paper or a yard sign that he just happened to see and that felt they should all know from day one so they all had a voice. That was not happening now.

Tim Crockett, 1000 W. Nifong Boulevard, understood steep slopes were anything of a 4 to 1 slope or greater per Section 29-5.1. He contended a 4 to 1 slope was not necessarily a steep slope or environmentally sensitive area. As an owner of a geotechnical engineering firm, he was familiar with the testing of soil stability, and they always looked for a 3 to 1 slope because that meant the slopes were stable. Soils could handle a 3 to 1 slope, and 4 to 1 was not a critical slope. He pointed out the building codes referred to a 2 to 1 slope. He commented that a 3 to 1 slope was appropriate and was consistent with the Boone County and MoDOT requirements. It was also consistent with what was viable in the field. He asked the Council to consider making a change so it was a 3 to 1 slope. He understood Section 29-5.2 indicated a preliminary plat would expire in three years unless 25 percent of the preliminary plat was developed. The current regulation was seven years unless a single final plat had been developed. He noted the PZC had asked developers for years to show them the big picture. They did not want to see a small preliminary plat on 20 acres when they owned 100 acres as they wanted to know so they and others, such as the schools, could plan accordingly. He provided Old Hawthorne as an example and noted it could not have taken place if 25 percent of it had to have been platted within three years. He understood an extension could be requested, but that would not go over well when trying to obtain loans and committing to off-site infrastructure improvements. He asked for the time frame to be extended. He commented that the length of a cul-de-sac could be 750 feet now, but the proposed new code would reduce it to 300 feet. He suggested cul-de-sac lengths remain the same as they were now. He stated he was also concerned about the number of entrances required for subdivisions. He explained 30 units, 30 single-family houses, 15 duplexes, or roughly two acres of R-3 zoned property could be accessed via a single access. Anything more required another access. He was concerned this would create a situation whereby a lot of single access points lined up along the major roadways. He understood the 30 units came from Appendix D of the Fire Code, and noted Boone County had adopted that, but had since changed it from 30 to 50 because they realized 30 was too small. Currently, the requirement in Columbia was 100. In terms of climax forest preservation, he thought the stream buffers should count towards that 25 percent requirement. This proposed requirement would place an extra restriction on good, developable property, forcing development further out and creating less density. He asked that it be reconsidered.

Mayor Treece asked if the PZC had vetted the steep slopes, climax forests, and stream buffer issues. Mr. Crockett replied it had been vetted by the PZC. He understood the original proposal for steep slopes had been a 15 percent grade, and after they had asked for it to be changed, it was changed to 25 percent. He noted they had asked for a steeper grade, and were asking for that again. Mayor Treece understood the 25 percent was the difference between 15 percent and 33.3 percent. Mr. Crockett stated they had actually asked for a 2 to 1 slope or 50 percent, but they were now asking for 3 to 1, which would be a stable slope.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Crockett if he had an opinion on requiring a roundabout at every 4-way intersection of a new development. Mr. Crockett replied he did not feel they should be required at every 4-way intersection. There were a lot of 4-way intersections that did not warrant the need for a roundabout as there were a lot of costs associated with them and they utilized a lot more property. He did not feel they were needed at low impact 4-way intersections.

Ms. Nauser stated they had an amendment sheet to adjust the expiration of a preliminary plat from three years to five years and asked Mr. Crockett for his thoughts. Mr. Crockett replied any extension would be appreciated, but they would prefer it remain at seven years as it was now. He understood the reason for the reduction was that codes changed, but pointed out the preliminary plats that were in effect now were not exempt from those regulatory changes. Ms. Nauser asked for an idea of how long it took for a subdivision such as Old Hawthorne to fully be developed. Mr. Crockett replied there were a lot of variables, and Old Hawthorne, which began 10-12 years ago, was still not built out. Thornbrook had built out in a little over 16 years. Ms. Nauser recalled there being a lot of public discourse with the Old Hawthorne development, and thought that discourse would continue every time a plat extension or revision was brought forward. Mr. Crockett agreed.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Crockett on his thoughts on the UDC in terms of whether it was mostly good, mostly bad, etc. Mr. Crockett replied he thought there were some places that needed work, like any document of this size. He noted it was a step in the right direction and they would learn a lot by the first few projects.

Mr. Skala asked Mr. Crockett if it would make him feel better if they provided for an appeals process through an intergovernmental advisory body in order to address unintended consequences. Mr. Crockett replied he thought that would be beneficial, but one thing that would make him feel even better was if the process was similar to what had been done for the stormwater regulations. They had found a lot of holes and issues with the document, and staff ultimately rewrote a whole section. Staff had indicated it would be a living document and had treated it as a living document. The result was a much more workable document than it had been previously. He commented that the items he had mentioned tonight would likely be appealed on a regular basis.

Austin Ball, 4000 White Pine Court, explained he was real estate appraiser and an owner of property in the East Campus neighborhood. He commented that he believed there were benefits to students living in the East Campus area since it was close to the University campus. It reduced traffic congestion and the carbon footprint. He pointed out he owned two houses in East Campus, and only one had a garage. He noted there were about 3-4 bikes and he had tenants that would leave bikes for his new tenants. He stated East Campus had an existing overlay that had been written prior to his ownership in area, and believed the inclusion of resident owners and non-resident owners was how the overlay should be written as equal representation was important and fair. He asked the Council not to let the work of so many resident and non-resident owners go by the wayside by enacting a universal one-size-fits-all neighborhood protection standard. He asked for the neighborhood protection standards to be sent back to the PZC for further consideration and recommendations, and for the ECNA overlay district remain intact and untouched. He commented that he had not reviewed the entire UDC, but had found language that was troubling, such as the change in the use of a neighboring lot being able to undermine the original investment of a property owner. It appeared as though the property rights of the property owner were less important than the neighbor's rights. If he owned an R-3 lot and the neighboring R-1 lot, he wondered if the R-1 lot would impact what he could do on his own R-3 lot. He explained he had yet to see in the marketplace where a once permitted use on a property was restricted, limited, or minimized, and the said property value increased. He asked the Council to interview appraisers, the assessor, and realtors prior to passing the neighborhood protection standards. He reiterated his request that the neighborhood protection standards be sent back to the PZC for further consideration and recommendations and that the ECNA overlay remain intact and untouched from the way it was originally written and intended.

Chris Provorse, 1115 Kennesaw Ridge Road #806, stated he was present on behalf of the Spencer's Crest Condominium Association Board of Directors and represented 216 unit owners. He explained they had a concern of the protection standards being triggered if there was severe damage to one of their 27 buildings, meaning they would then not be

able to rebuild in the same format. They felt their roof pitch would put them above the two-story height requirement and screening would be required between them and their R-1 neighbors directly to the east. He pointed out they had existed with their neighbors for 20 years. They were also concerned about the setback requirements. He asked for clarification or an amendment that would allow them to rebuild if there was substantial damage or complete destruction from severe weather, fire, etc. If that could not be done, he requested the issue be sent back to the PZC for further review and consideration.

Mayor Treece referred to Section 29-6.5 and understood it grandfathered all existing structures and allowed any lost structure to rebuild in substantially the same configuration, height, etc. He thought it satisfied the concerns of Mr. Provorse. Mr. Provorse stated that was fantastic if that was the case, but noted they had heard it would not be grandfathered if it was more than 75 percent destroyed. He was concerned about a tornado destroying the structures and them not being able to rebuild in the existing footprint. Mayor Treece stated he thought they would absolutely be covered in that situation. The UDC indicated any structures that were legally constructed may continue in use and any residential dwelling units which were damaged or destroyed could be reconstructed in substantially the same configuration as before the damage or destruction.

Ms. Nauser asked for staff to comment. Ms. Thompson replied the nonconformities as it related to residential structures were covered for acts of God, nature, and public enemy, and multi-family residential was considered residential. She pointed out there was a difference between the existing code and the proposed code in that the proposed code had not carried over the destruction by fire or explosion. Ms. Nauser asked for the reason for the change. Ms. Thompson replied she did not know if it had been intentional or just something they had not noticed previously. Mr. Zenner stated there was probably no harm in adding back those standards. He thought it was likely overlooked. Ms. Thompson stated she would add that to the list of amendments.

Mr. Trapp asked about the overall affordability of condominiums versus single-family housing and those that were resident owners at Spencer's Crest. Mr. Provorse replied they were a very affordable development. Almost everything on the market now was sub-\$100,000, and they had 2-3 bedroom units. The unit owners were primarily first-time homebuyers, such as young professionals, graduate students, and retirees. Mr. Trapp asked Mr. Provorse to talk about the sense of community. Mr. Provorse replied he believed they had a strong community as they certainly heard from their residents, and they had a number of amenities available to them for recreation and other gatherings. He noted he knew most of the neighbors in his building. Mr. Trapp asked if the lack of a front door facing the street inhibited interactions with the rest of the neighborhood or lessened the accountability of the resident owners. Mr. Provorse replied he thought they were more accountable since they all faced the breezeway because it was harder to hide. Mr. Trapp stated he had been through there many times and it was a fine development. It was a credit to the area and the neighborhood as it lifted the area up.

Mr. Thomas understood the 75 percent rule did not apply to residential structures and it only applied to non-residential structures. Mr. Zenner stated that was correct. Ms. Thompson agreed that was correct, but pointed out it had to come into compliance with other site features that would be required, such as landscaping. Mr. Thomas asked about the setbacks, height, etc. Ms. Thompson replied they would have to comply with the setbacks. She clarified the code allowed for substantially the same configuration. Mr. Thomas understood the question was whether the neighborhood protection standards would cause a larger setback to be applied than was the case when the building had been constructed. He asked if this would allow them to build back on the exact same footprint or if the additional setback of the neighborhood protection standard would apply. Ms. Thompson replied the structure should be able to be built on the same configuration. Ms. Nauser understood Ms. Thompson had indicated they would have to comply with landscaping and other items, and the layout of the buildings might not allow for those new

buffers to be accommodated. She asked if that meant they would have to go before the Board of Adjustment (BOA) for a variance. Mr. Zenner replied yes. It was the way the process was set. The applicant would have to show it had a hardship and could not comply with the other provisions. He explained the current code did not allow the residential nonconforming structure to be replaced. The proposed code advanced the concept of allowing an individual property owner to re-establish the nonconforming density and setbacks of the exact same type of building. If they did not do this, they would basically promote the reconstruction of the nonconforming building along with nonconformity with all of the other design aspects and advancements made for every other location throughout Columbia. Those would be applied equally unless a variance had been received through the BOA. He noted the hardship standard might apply to the standards they could not physically meet. Mayor Treece understood there was access to the BOA for hardship across all of the proposed zoning designations. Mr. Zenner stated that was correct. He thought it was important to know that was an option in the event something was destroyed if there was a hardship.

Caleb Colbert, 601 E. Broadway, stated he was present to discuss the neighborhood protection standards and the regulating map in the St. James Street area of the M-DT district. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Colbert if he was representing clients. Mr. Colbert replied he was representing John Ott with regard to the M-DT discussion, but not on the neighborhood protection standards. Mr. Colbert noted he agreed with previous speakers and PZC members that were asking for the neighborhood protection standards to be sent back to the PZC for further review. If it had been something that had been brought forward on its own, they would have had a long, lengthy process for that provision itself so they could think through all of the unintended consequences. He asked the Council to remove the neighborhood protection standards from the UDC and to send them to the PZC for review. He commented that by doing this, it would not leave people defenseless. He referred to Table 4.1-2 and noted they already had increased setbacks for commercial and industrial property that was adjacent to any residential district, which would include R-1 properties located in an R-3 district. The proposed code doubled the side yard and rear yard setbacks relative to the current code. He noted the landscaping and screening table required a 6-8 tall foot screening device and a 10 foot tall landscaping buffer in some cases. In addition, the overlay districts still applied. Those that might be protected by the neighborhood protection standards would not be left without any recourse. He thought the benefit of sending it to the PZC for review was so they could identify the scenarios they would come across repeatedly, such as the common ownership of adjacent lots, common developments, and places where the residential zoning was out of character with the general character of the neighborhood. He provided examples of R-1 properties that might impact other lots. He commented that if the Council was not willing to send the neighborhood protection standards back to the PZC, he thought at a minimum an appeal process should be created. He suggested well-defined criteria be developed for the BOA to consider. He displayed a list of common scenarios they might see again and again, which he noted he had provided to the Law Department. He commented that John Ott owned the parcels located at the intersection of St. James Street and Ash Street, and those lots were included in the M-DT district. Those parcels in the corner were rezoned C-2 in 2008 from M-1 and R-3 with the support of the neighborhood association and the restriction of uses permitted on the lots. He noted the deed restrictions had since been recorded. He noted he did not believe the townhouse/small apartment classification was appropriate for the St. James Street area as it had historically been zoned industrial, which would not permit residential. By putting that area in a zoning classification that only allowed residential, it appeared to be a taking. It would defeat a property owner's reasonable investment and expectations.

Mayor Treece asked for the process with regard to how those parcels had changed from the beginning of the zoning reform process to now. Mr. Colbert replied generally speaking they had been completely left out, included as urban general, or included as

townhouse/small apartments. He would have to defer to staff as to when they were included at what stage and when they were left out. Mayor Treece asked what Mr. Colbert wanted for those lots. Mr. Colbert replied their preference was urban general if they were going to be in the M-DT district. Mayor Treece asked what they were now. Mr. Colbert replied urban general. He understood there was an amendment before the Council this evening, and they wanted to express their concerns. Mayor Treece asked if Mr. Colbert was saying the uses changed with the current map or if they were not changing high enough. Mr. Colbert replied they were okay with the map the way it was today as it would allow mixed-use. Mayor Treece asked how they had gotten to the map they had today. Mr. Colbert replied it had developed out of the amendment process. Mayor Treece asked if it had been through the vote of the PZC. Mr. Colbert replied yes, and explained this specific issue had been discussed at PZC.

Mayor Treece stated one of the concerns he had was with the residential anomalies, such as Hubbell Drive, as they were desperately trying to preserve their areas, and asked how much engagement there had been with them in this process. Mr. Colbert replied he could not answer that question. Mr. Zenner explained the area in question had been included in the November 2014 Module 3 presentation by Clarion. The integrated draft, which was produced in October 2015 had also included this area. There had been discussion at the public level as it related to this particular corner. He thought the map series that had been provided showed these particular streets were identified as apartments/small townhouse in November 2014 and October 2015. As staff had evaluated the integrated draft between January and April 2016 with regard to the redevelopment potential of the Ameren site and the existing conditions in the particular area, it was changed and presented back to the public at the July 7, 2016 meeting and carried forward into the September 2016 public hearing draft and through the rest of the process. The PZC had discussed rolling back the boundary toward the end of its public hearing process. It had been passed at one meeting and then reconsidered and readjusted at another meeting. Mayor Treece asked why it had been reconsidered. Mr. Zenner replied it was the result of the development that was already there today, which included the distillery and the other commercial development in the area. Mayor Treece commented that what he thought made the area unique was the opportunity of the live/work element, and asked if the residential component would be adequately preserved. Mr. Zenner replied he thought leaving the urban general in place would promote more live/work relationships while reducing the potential exposure of a taking of the property as a result of the downzoning that would ultimately occur. From a planning perspective, there was greater protection of Hubbell Drive with urban general.

Ms. Nauser asked Mr. Colbert for clarification as to what he was requesting. Mr. Colbert replied they were opposing the amendment to take the existing C-2 and M-1 out of the M-DT district. They were opposing Amendment No. 17.

Susan Horak, 1014 Sycamore Lane, commented that she was a realtor, citizen, and commercial office complex owner. She noted her and her partners had recently purchased a property that adjoined residential single-family dwellings, and they were concerned with some of the proposed regulations. She felt a lot of this was driven by what had occurred in the downtown, Benton Stephens, and East Campus. She commented that she loved East Campus as that was where she had grown up, and understood they had worked hard to come up with an overlay for the area, which she hoped would be maintained as they had expected. She urged the Council not to adopt the neighborhood standards. She believed it sounded good in theory, but it hamstrung good developers along with developers that might come up with concepts that the Council might not like. She asked the Council not to require all doors to face the road as it was an architectural control decision. She could not see how that was a safety or public concern issue. She commented that for many years she had a dream of building an apartment complex whereby the 8-unit structures were in a square with the middle being a park. She noted that although she would likely never do this, these regulations would

not allow for that type of diversity. She stated Spencer's Crest was really nice, and the people that lived there liked the way their buildings looked. She understood the regulations were created to limit apartment buildings on a skinny long lot and the cramming of too many units on a lot, but they were too far-reaching as everything would be regulated. It hindered diversity and architecture. She stated she did not want to live in a city where everything looked like a strip mall and all of the doors were facing Providence Road or Green Meadows Road. She noted her building had a Providence Road address, but faced Green Meadows Road, and wondered if she would have to be re-addressed. Building C faced the residential area, and did not face a road. She stated the area had been developed to feel like a cove of offices and it had a good sense of community. She commented that she wanted a road behind her building to be able to park back there as she did not want people to know she was alone when working late. She explained her building burned down in 2004 in the Colonies area off of Forum Boulevard and the firefighters had fought it from every side. She believed these regulations would create issues limiting the ability of firefighters to keep buildings behind hers safe due to fencing, trees, etc. She felt parking behind buildings was beneficial for a variety of reasons to include leaving more parking open in the front for customers. She noted they had coexisted with their neighbors for over 30 years.

Ms. Nauser commented that Mr. Land had submitted a list of 54 properties he was aware of that would be severely impacted by the proposed UDC in terms of redevelopment, and her property had been included. She understood it was currently O-1 with a height regulation of 45 feet and had adjoining R-1 and PUD properties. Under the proposed code, the property would be M-OF with a 25 foot redevelopment height regulation and ten feet of screening, etc. She asked if some of the buildings were currently 2-3 stories tall. Ms. Horak replied her buildings were all single-level buildings. They had recently acquired an older building from Reece-Nichols, which was two-story. She stated they were concerned as these regulations would de-value their properties since they would be limited to smaller footprints, etc.

Mr. Skala explained this process had started with Imagine Columbia, which was a visioning process, and it had led to the comprehensive plan and the review of the zoning codes. He asked Ms. Horak if she had taken part in any of those processes. Ms. Horak replied no. She reiterated she felt much of this was the result of what had happened in the downtown. She pointed out her neighbors could ask for their own overlay district if they had concerns and did not feel one-size-fits-all regulations were needed.

Ms. Nauser asked Ms. Horak in her years as a realtor if she noticed animosity between people that had purchased a house next to a commercial or office property. Ms. Horak pointed out Spencer's Crest had been built prior to the adjacent homes and did not believe anyone should object to it being rebuilt as it stood now. She did not feel there was a lot of animosity in Columbia. She commented that people that purchased property next to an existing commercial property usually received a better deal and had made allowances for the nuisances. In addition, most people were told by their realtors when purchasing next to commercially zoned property. She noted she had sold homes to 2-3 nurses within walking distance to the Smiley Lane clinic after the clinic was built because they wanted to walk to work.

Ms. Nauser commented that Columbia was trying to build a walkable community and in order for that to happen, services and places to go needed to be within walking distance.

Mike Tompkins explained he was concerned about the cul-de-sac length within Section 29-5.1 as 300 feet was too short. He commented that he was trying to provide what buyers wanted and most wanted to live on a cul-de-sac or non-through street as they considered them to be safer, and noted he wanted to continue to offer those types of developments. He provided a list of a few roads that would not qualify under the proposed UDC. He asked the Council to change the length back to 750 feet. He noted he was also concerned about the number of subdivision entrances that would be required as the current code was based upon 100 units and the proposed code indicated 30 units. He

commented that much of the terrain in Columbia would not allow for this as many areas were on hilltops with the main road down in the valley, and creating multiple entrances would be difficult and expensive. He provided the Bellwood Subdivision in west Columbia as an example, and noted the entry road required the cutting and filling of quite a bit of dirt. He did not feel it made sense to do this every few blocks. The Vineyards in east Columbia worked fine with just two entrances. He wondered if they really wanted connections every few blocks on to Highway WW. Most residents of housing developments liked the small community feel achieved by limited entrances and most of Columbia's current neighborhoods did not meet this threshold. He thought the current 100 lot requirement should remain. He understood the proposed code would significantly alter the already restrictive 25 percent tree preservation in a bad way. Currently they protected 25 percent of the trees in a climax forest, and most of the time the trees were along stream corridors. In a residential development, it made sense to count those trees into the 25 percent figure because it was the nature of housing development to put houses on the tops of hills and along ridges. He believed trying to keep trees on top of the hill would be problematic. This new burden would add significantly to the cost of lots and housing in Columbia, and would also lead to sprawl. He asked the Council to consider removing paragraph 3 and continuing to allow trees in the stream corridor to count. With regard to Section 29-5.2, he did not feel three years was enough time in terms of the expiration of an approved preliminary plat. In today's environment, it took 1.5-2 years to get through the preliminary plat approval process when creating a new development as they met with the neighbors, negotiated with staff, discussed the project with individual PZC and Council members, etc. He noted he had spent in excess of \$200,000 recently on a project just to get to the preliminary plat stage. He pointed out he also tried to bring the product to market as it was needed, and during the planning process there could be an oversupply or the slowing of demand. He explained he wanted the ability to slow the process if needed versus starting over in terms of time and money. He understood subparagraph 4 discussed the final platting of at least one-fourth of the preliminary plat, and believed it should be changed for the same reasons. Currently, they had to complete one final plat within seven years, and historically, city leaders had wanted to see plans for entire properties. He did not feel they should be forced to build what they might not be ready for as it would have the effect of piecemeal development. They would see little sections of land preliminarily platted one bit at a time making it easier to comply with the proposed requirement. He asked the Council to consider reinstating the seven year expiration and eliminating paragraph 4 completely. With regard to Section 29-5.1, he did not feel steep slopes should be factored in as part of sensitive areas and should also not be excluded, but he agreed they should stay away from extremely steep areas and bluff areas. He commented that throughout the history of Columbia, houses had been built at or on steeper areas, and provided a list of neighborhoods whereby vast swaths would not have been allowed if these steep slope rules had been in effect. The difference between when those were built and now was that they now had stormwater ordinances along with detailed stormwater infrastructure that controlled water on steep slopes. What they built today worked well and was closely monitored by the City's engineers and inspectors. He asked the Council to respect they were doing better work today than they ever had in terms of controlling runoff as he felt the new regulation was an overreach. He asked the Council to remove subparagraph (b). Ms. Nauser understood he wanted the expiration of preliminary plats to be returned to seven years. Mr. Tompkins stated that was correct as he felt that barely long enough. Katherine Lee commented that she had been on the Parking and Traffic Management Task Force and also served as the Vice Chair of the Public Transit Advisory Commission. She understood there was an amendment to change the parking requirement in the downtown from 0.25 parking spaces per bedroom to 0.75 parking spaces per bedroom, and noted the Task Force had wanted it to remain at 0.25. She commented that she would not have provided the same opinion two years ago as she had since changed her

mind. She noted she believed they all wanted this same thing, and that was what was best for the community. She explained the most eye opening experience for her on the Task Force was the parking management strategies. She had learned it was not how much one had and was more of how it was used. They first looked at how much parking they had and how it was being used. There was so much discussion on the topic that the Task Force ended up recommending a permanent commission be established to further study the issues since there were a lot of strategies and best practices that could be utilized. She understood not everyone would ride a bicycle, and noted this was not about wanting people to ride a bicycle. It was about using the community's space in the most efficient manner possible. Since they could not create more land, she believed what they did with the land they had was crucial. She thought they wanted a vibrant, active community that served businesses, residents, and people of all economic statuses. When thinking about parking, she felt they needed to consider better planning, sustainability, etc. so they were using what they had and it worked best for everyone because they would never have enough parking lots. She suggested they think about the big picture of living, walking, and working when looking at minimum parking requirements. They needed to consider what would make the community vibrant and usable for all users. She was concerned they would find they had more parking than needed if they went to 0.75 spaces per bedroom, and asked that they consider keeping the requirement at 0.25.

Allan Moore, 550 S. Rangeline Road, stated he was a downtown business owner and a downtown property owner, and noted he wanted to endorse the amendments that had come out of the PZC process. He understood Paul Land had provided a document with several issues, and explained he also wanted to endorse the suggestions and concerns of Mr. Land. He noted he was a former member of the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) and stated he wanted to endorse the comments and amendments suggested by them in their letter dated February 15. In terms of expanding the downtown storefront areas beyond Broadway and Ninth Street, he suggested that not be done. He felt it would be better to let the market dictate the need for storefronts as there had been a few examples where it had not worked out particularly well. He also suggested some design flexibility in the code so it could be residential or commercial as time went by to allow the market demand to be met. He commented that parking was a tough issue, and he had seen it had become more and more difficult for the businesses and their employees to find parking downtown because they had to compete with students and long-term parkers. He noted they did not want to lose downtown businesses. He asked if there would be time allowed for everyone to review the code again after all of the amendments were considered prior to the Council voting on it. Mayor Treece explained the intent 2.5 hours ago was to take public comment and adopt amendments so they would lie on the table for the next two weeks. He was not sure what they would do now.

Scott Wilson, 501 S. Garth Avenue, stated he was the Chair of the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DCLC), and explained the DCLC had provided a written report to the City Council. He urged the adoption of the UDC with any amendments as needed. He pointed out it could be amended in the future as well. The DCLC had been involved in informing the proposed code since at least 2010 and with the Charrette report even prior to then. They felt this was a culmination of years or decades of work. He commented that the DCLC had discussed at length the ongoing parking problem in the downtown. It was a problem in the downtown because all of the parking garages were full with the possible exception of the Fifth and Walnut garage, which apparently varied month to month. This meant businesses looking to come or stay downtown did not have parking. In addition, the metered spots in the core of downtown were often also full or near capacity. He pointed out downtown businesses relied on convenient parking for their customers. He stated the DCLC recommended the parking ratio be increase in the M-DT from 0.25 spaces per bedroom to 0.50 spaces per bedroom as they felt residential

developments should provide their own parking without relying on taxpayer subsidized parking options, such as the municipal parking garages and street parking. There had already been significant spillover in the surrounding historic neighborhoods and the City lacked the ability to enforce current parking rules or to pay for the neighborhood parking programs. He noted this problem would only increase when the new student developments were completed later this year. They believed adequate project based residential parking was as necessary as long-term planning for additional parking garages, comprehensive regulatory enforcement, and better transportation in addressing the downtown and neighborhood parking issues. Starting at 0.25 would not provide any room to negotiate down to try to attract different types of residences to the downtown. He commented that the DCLC felt the urban storefront overlay should be increased from its current limitation of Ninth Street and Broadway as it would ensure the downtown had adequate retail space to continue to serve as an economic engine for the community and would preserve pedestrian traffic throughout downtown. He understood the PZC had expanded the ground floor uses to include office use so the only real limitation was on apartments. This would protect the historic facades downtown and limit lot accumulation for the sole purpose of demolishing structures and constructing single purpose housing. He noted that once those blocks were gone, they would be gone forever. In addition, once the market decided the ground floor was residential, it would never come back as a storefront. He commented that the DCLC had also discussed exemptions from parking or open space requirements for smaller developments, possibly for those under ten bedrooms, but they had not voted on that issue. He cautioned the Council not to try to cure every individual complaint with an amendment to the code. Unique or strange sets of facts should not be used to set the rules for the other 99 percent. Some of the anecdotal stories they heard might be unique to the one particular development and there might good reason for it. He pointed out variances would still be allowed through the BOA for individual developments that could show a reasonable exception from the code requirements. He noted the DCLC had also discussed neighborhood protections and had run out of time in terms of a vote, but they strongly recommended the historic neighborhoods be protected from larger developments that did not fit the character of the surrounding neighborhood or were in such scale as to dwarf the neighboring houses, particularly with regard to the scale of the mass of the building immediately adjacent to a single-family home. Historic neighborhoods in the center of the community needed to remain neighborhoods with affordable homes. He commented that the suggestions made were not criticisms of the code as they felt the code had been greatly improved by the thousands of hours of hard work to date, and it was much improved over the current zoning regulations from the 1950s. He stated, for years, developers had asked for a set of rules that would allow them to have by-right development, and the new code provided it. He did not know if it would limit some of the extreme profit-taking they had seen, but did not feel it was an unlawful taking of property rights. It was reasonable to protect the future of downtown and the investments of property owners and businesses in the downtown. He urged the Council to move forward with the adoption of the proposed UDC.

Ms. Nauser asked Mr. Wilson if he was talking about the properties downtown in terms of neighborhood protections or in general. She felt the standards would severely limit the redevelopment of properties in her ward. She asked if the standards should be adopted across the entire community or if they should be applied only to the downtown area. Mr. Wilson replied he did not feel it was true to say that it was a taking because one could have built a ten-story building last week and could not do so now.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Zenner to inform their opinion on the height and the nonconformity issues. Mr. Zenner replied the letter provided to Mr. Land had a few facts that needed to be clarified. The height restriction in the R-MF district had not been reduced from 45 feet to 25 feet. It remained 45 feet in the M-OF district. The reduction was within 25 feet of the property lines. He noted Mr. Land had overstated the restriction without any clarification as to where it applied in relation to the property. The height

limits in all of the zoning districts would remain the same with the only exception being within a certain distance of an R-1 or R-2 zoned or a single-family or two-family used property.

Ms. Nauser stated her concern was for commercial property next to a residential property that had existed for 30 years as this code would put restrictions on them solely due to the fact they abutted R-1 or R-2 zoned property. Mr. Zenner explained there would only be an impact through redevelopment. Ms. Nauser understood and was concerned they would be precluded from redeveloping their property. Mr. Zenner noted the individual property owners would still have to comply with the required setback on the property today and would only have the height restriction within 25 feet of the property line. They would still be able to use their full developable area. They would only have to step down adjacent to the residential lot. The goal of the neighborhood protection standards was to provide protective standards to less intense development that might have co-existed for years.

Rhonda Carlson, 1110 Willowcreek Lane, commented that Willowcreek Lane was one of the at least 1,000 foot cul-de-sacs in the community, and it had existed well since 1989. She stated the neighborhood protection standards were all generated for the downtown and the older neighborhoods. The neighborhoods built within the last 30 years were laid out and zoned appropriately. Most of the people in the development and business community felt the proposed UDC had been developed to protect the downtown and older neighborhoods, and this was why most of the comments heard were to send the neighborhood protection standards back to the PZC for further review. She noted they did not necessarily apply to the newer areas in Columbia. She commented that she was on the Spencer's Crest Condominium Association Board and did not feel the development would be grandfathered if they had to go to the BOA for exceptions. If a building were destroyed, eight unit owners would be impacted and would have to wait for a hearing to redevelop, which she felt was a hardship. She thought the grandfathering issue needed to be addressed. She listed other condominiums that would be impacted. She stated she also believed conditional use permits needed to remain with the BOA. She was concerned the granting of conditional use permits would become political and that it could take up to the 90 days before they were heard. She thought it only needed to be heard once and any appeal could then be heard by the Circuit Court.

Mayor Treece explained he was trying to imagine a scenario that would not be covered under Section 29-6.5 and was unable. Ms. Carlson stated she always tried to plan on the worst case scenario. She noted Spencer's Crest was unique in that it was a land lease property so the buildings had a right to set where they currently sat.

Mr. Skala understood the buildings at Spencer's Crest could be built to exactly the same footprint as they had today if something were to happen. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct as there was an exception for residential dwelling units whereby they could be reconstructed in substantially the same configuration as before the damage and destruction regardless of the amount of damage or destruction. Ms. Carlson understood screening, etc. would require them to go to the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Zenner stated that was correct. It would be treated the same as any other property that had a hardship associated with meeting the requirements. No class of residential development would be treated differently. Ms. Carlson felt that meant the property would not be grandfathered. Mr. Zenner commented that it was grandfathered to the extent of the residential use that was nonconforming due to its placement. It might be larger in bulk and density than might be otherwise allowed by zoning today. The previous version of the code had prohibited this if there was 75 percent or more of a loss. The proposed code advances the concept of allowing a property owner the right to build to the density and bulk the owner previously had. It did not grandfather any of the other nonconformities because they had advanced as a community over time since the project had been originally built. The BOA had the authority to grant relief to those advancements.

Annette Triplett, 201 W. Broadway, stated she was the Executive Director of the PedNet

Coalition and noted the PedNet Coalition was opposed to the UDC amendment to increase downtown residential parking minimums. She felt the amendment was entirely contrary to the recent recommendations of the Parking and Traffic Management Task Force of which she was a member. She commented that the Task Force was generally in favor of reducing or eliminating the minimum parking requirement, and particularly in favor of a fee-in-lieu system, but had decided to recommend keeping the parking minimums at the current rate of 0.25 per bedroom until the issue could be further considered by a permanent parking and transportation management commission. At no point was the Task Force in favor of increasing the parking minimum requirement. She pointed out the 2015 Smart Growth parking audit had found there had been sufficient parking in the downtown area with parking available in garages at all times in highly underutilized permit parking areas. The data did not support a parking shortage in the downtown. She stated there was not a parking problem, but there was a parking management problem. As a result, she did not feel the City should triple the required residential parking minimums. She felt that would have the effect of drawing more motor vehicle traffic into the downtown area and exacerbating congestion. It would also work against the City's many efforts to encourage a more sustainable balance of transportation, which included walking, biking, and public transit. She commented that minimum parking requirements polluted the air and water, encouraged sprawl, raised housing costs, excluded poor people, degraded urban design and historic preservation, and damaged the economy. She asked the Council to oppose the amendment to increase downtown residential parking minimums.

Michelle Windmoeller, 705 Rockcreek Drive, explained she spent a lot of life riding her bike, walking, taking the bus, and driving a car downtown, and she had never had trouble finding a parking space. She commented that she supported the Smart Growth study as there was lots of parking in the downtown. She understood the amendment would triple parking for residential buildings in the downtown, and noted she was opposed to that amendment. She pointed out studies had indicated decreases in parking in the downtown helped to contribute to vibrant downtowns. Parking lots did not help with the vibrancy of downtowns and did not help in terms of the tax base either. She asked the Council to not increase the parking minimum. She thought it should be kept at 0.25 per bedroom as was recommended by the Task Force.

Lawrence Simonson, 2706 Hillshire Drive, asked to see the data that supported an increase in the parking minimums as a benefit to Columbia, the downtown, and the surrounding neighborhoods. He did not want the antidotes, the emotional bias, or any perceptions. He wanted the data as he believed the data had shown them that Columbia had adequate parking. They were only mismanaging how they utilized the parking. He commented that the data was also showing that young people were driving and owning cars at a vastly lower rate than 10 years ago. The forced construction of the parking supply would slow down the essential transition to healthy, sustainable economic transportation with a much lower car ownership. He agreed with Ms. Triplett in that minimum parking requirements subsidized cars, increased traffic congestion and carbon emissions, polluted the air and water, encouraged sprawl, raised housing costs, excluded poor people, degraded urban and historical preservation, reduced walkability, and damaged the economy, and pointed out research had shown parking requirements had these effects and more. It was disheartening as the Task Force of parking and traffic professionals and stakeholders appointed by the Council had reviewed the issue and had recommended keeping the parking requirement the same. He urged the Council to oppose the amendment to increase the minimum parking requirement and to focus on the data instead of the emotion.

Mayor Treece asked if the Task Force had done an audit of the actual students that lived downtown in terms of the percentage that brought cars with them. Mr. Simonson replied he did not know if they had specifically looked at students. He understood they had looked at spaces.

Mr. Skala noted he and Mr. Trapp had been Co-Chairs of the Parking and Traffic Management Task Force and pointed out it was an advisory group like any other advisory group such as the PZC. This number was not sacred in that the Council had to follow that advice or guidance. He explained he had attended the Smart Growth Conference in St. Louis recently, and they had encouraged people to get to 0.50 parking spaces per bedroom in downtown urban areas.

A break was taken from about 10:02 p.m. to 10:29 p.m. due to a tornado warning.

Mayor Treece asked for Kristen Heitkamp as she was the next speaker. Ms. Heitkamp was no longer in attendance, and therefore, did not speak.

Mayor Treece commented that given the circumstances he was inclined to hold a special meeting this Saturday or on Monday, March 13. The Council was agreeable to holding a special meeting Saturday afternoon.

Ms. Peters asked if they would allow public comment or if they would only address amendments. Mayor Treece replied the meeting would be for them to discuss amendments, and noted he would be willing to recognize any Council Member that wanted to inquire of someone who knew the amendments. He suggested they preserve the balance of the public comment to the March 20, 2017 Council Meeting.

Mayor Treece made a motion to hold a special meeting on Saturday, March 11, 2017 at 1:00 p.m. with regard to PH2-17 and B43-17. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

There being no further comment, Mayor Treece continued the public hearing to the March 11, 2017 Special Council Meeting.

PH3-17 Construction of a driving range, to include the construction of hitting tees, target greens, irrigation installation, tree buffer plantings and connecting concrete cart paths, at the Lake of the Woods Golf Course.

Discussion shown with B56-17.

B56-17 Authorizing construction of a driving range, to include the construction of hitting tees, target greens, irrigation installation, tree buffer plantings and connecting concrete cart paths, at the Lake of the Woods Golf Course; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

PH3-17 was read by the Clerk, and B56-17 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Skala stated he thought this would be a nice addition to the facilities at the Lake of the Woods Golf Course.

B56-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B45-17 Approving the Addison's South C-P Plan located on the southwest corner of Vawter School Road and Frontgate Drive (Case No. 17-48).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked if the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) had recommended a right-in/right-out on Vawter School Road. Mr. Teddy replied the PZC could not agree on

approval or denial so it was a 4-3 split decision. Five votes would have been needed to approve the plan. Staff had indicated in the report that Council could deny the plan as recommended by the PZC or refer it back for reconsideration in light of the additional traffic control and traffic calming measures proposed by the applicant. Ms. Nauser did not feel that change would warrant this item having to go back to the PZC. Mr. Teddy agreed another choice would be for the Council to add conditions to its approval. Ms. Nauser commented that she felt a right-out would cause traffic to go through the neighborhood. Mr. Teddy thought that was a fair statement if traffic originated from the south.

Ms. Peters understood the current plans did not include a right-in/right-out on to Vawter School Road, and included full access on to Frontgate Drive. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct and showed the access points on the diagram on the overhead.

Jay Gebhardt, an engineer with offices at 3401 Broadway Business Park Court, stated he was representing the three owners and described the two access points. One was on Frontgate Drive, which required a cut in the existing island, and the other was on Frontgate Lane. He pointed out Frontgate Drive was a north-south road, and Frontgate Lane was an east-west road. The PZC had recommended denial by a 4-3 vote. Since the majority of the neighbors had expressed support for an Addison's to be located there, they understood this to be a message that the perceived cut-through traffic within the neighborhood needed attention. After the PZC meeting, they had worked with City staff, members of the Council, and the neighbors to address their concerns, and this had resulted in some changes. He noted the first change involved asking the Council to remove all parking on the west side of Frontgate Drive, which abutted the commercial area, as the neighbors had voted to ask that this removal of parking not be done at this time. If there was a problem, they would come back to the Council asking that the parking be restricted. He described the changes to the intersection of Frontgate Drive and Frontgate Lane, which included a curb-bump out, a painted crosswalk, and signage indicating no right turns except for local traffic. He displayed a diagram showing changes to the pedestrian crosswalk located about 150 feet south of the intersection, and noted it included 4-foot bump outs to narrow the pavement and a painted crosswalk. He commented that the neighbors voted to widen the cutout through the island on to Frontgate Drive to encourage left turns and additional signage prohibiting right turns except for local traffic. The owners would paint a left turn arrow on the pavement and the neighbors had approved that idea. He pointed out there had not been unanimous agreement on all aspects of these items when they had met with the neighbors, but they felt the neighbors had been provided the opportunity to work with them to make it better, and what they were proposing had been voted for by the majority of the neighbors who had attended the meeting. Staff had recommended this be denied or sent back to the PZC, but that had been the recommendation prior to them becoming aware of the progress that had been made with the neighbors. He asked the Council to consider the changes they had worked out with the neighbors and to approve the request with the changes outlined.

Caleb Colbert, an attorney with offices at 601 E. Broadway, commented that they were not asking for a change in the zoning. This had been planned commercial for twenty years and the lot arrangement and access had been in place for ten years. They felt the plan proposed complied with the underlying zoning and the lot arrangement that had been approved. As had been mentioned, the Council could deny this, send it back to the PZC, or approve it with conditions. He asked that the Council approve it with the conditions as they had been able to address the concerns of the neighbors. He pointed out this was about 1.5 acres of an 18 acre commercial site at this intersection, and the first development would impact how the rest of the commercial property developed. Per the statement of intent, this site could include a fast food restaurant, car wash, etc. He believed Addison's was a perfect fit for this area.

Mr. Ruffin asked for the time line on construction.

Matt Jenne, 2735 W. Mill Creek Court, explained he was a co-owner of Addison's and Sophia's restaurants along with his partners, Adam Dushoff and Jeremy Brown. He commented that they were proud to be a part of Columbia's local culinary scene over the past 18 years and looked forward to many more years. He stated they felt this project would enhance southwest Columbia and that the neighbors in the area would love having a restaurant close to home. He believed this was a great example of mixed-use development and would enhance the walkability of the area. With approval tonight, they anticipated 8-10 months of planning and construction. They had received feedback from the surrounding neighbors and the Copperstone residents had taken it upon themselves to conduct an informal survey, which resulted in 24 of the 25 respondents indicating they approved of the plan. He asked those in attendance that were supportive of the plan to stand, and approximately 25 people stood. He understood some neighbors might still be concerned about cut-through traffic and noted they would do a number of things to try to address it. He commented that when they opened, they would add about 60 new jobs, and thought many employees would be able to walk to work from the surrounding neighborhoods. As the first commercial development in the area, he felt they could be the cornerstone to commercial development similar in nature. He stated they wanted to be good neighbors and would continue to communicate with the neighbors to make Addison's as good as it could be as they believed happy neighbors made happy customers.

Mayor Treece thanked them for working with the neighbors, and noted he thought they would be a great fit for the area. He commented that he was uncomfortable with requiring an entrance on Vawter School Road.

Mr. Skala stated he thought this fit in nicely with the comprehensive plan and the neighborhood.

Kenny Hubble, 4110 Frontgate Drive, explained he had spoken against the plan at the PZC meeting because of the traffic concerns, and commended the owners and representatives of Addison's for their efforts in listening to the residents of Copperstone. He noted he was now in favor of the proposed plan. He pointed out they still had concerns with regard to cut-through traffic, but felt the applicants had done everything they could at this time. He asked that the Council consider the plan as proposed.

John Hall, 4307 Granite Springs Drive, explained he had conducted the survey referenced and the one person that had been against the plan had indicated he wanted an entrance on Vawter School Road. He stated he had been impressed by the ownership and the suggestions they had made.

Ms. Nauser commented that she was impressed by the fact those who had previously been against this proposal were now in support and that no one had come to speak in opposition. It showed developers and applicants could work with neighborhoods by listening to concerns and making compromises. She understood this was not the perfect solution, but it was a good solution. She noted she understood the concerns of the neighbors as the neighborhood had been affected by cut-through traffic when Scott Boulevard was being improved, and believed the applicants had developed a good compromise. She commented that commercial could co-exist with residential properties and they had envisioned neighborhood commercial in 2007 whereby people in the surrounding neighborhood could safely walk to the commercial establishments. She stated she would vote in favor of this and did not believe it needed to be sent back to the PZC.

Mr. Thomas commented that he was excited this would be a walkable restaurant for many homes and appreciated the hard work of the applicants to convince those that were doubtful that this would be an asset to the neighborhood. He thought the traffic calming designs proposed would be effective at discouraging cut-through traffic.

Mr. Skala stated this was another example of people working together to realize achievable goals, and the idea this was happening with 95 percent of the people in support of this proposal in a residential neighborhood was the realization of a

long-standing commitment of creating neighborhood node developments. He did not feel this rose to the level of needing to be sent back to the PZC, and noted he would support it.

B45-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B55-17 Authorizing an agreement for professional architectural services with Architects Design Group / ADG, Inc. for design services relating to the construction of a Columbia Police Department North Precinct facility in the Auburn Hills Subdivision; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp understood the public engagement process was optional in the scope of work. Mr. Nichols stated there would be three interested parties meetings, which might not involve the architects, but would include City staff.

Mr. Trapp asked if there were still plans to include a community room. Mr. Nichols replied yes, but noted he was not sure how many square feet would be involved. The entire facility with this budget would likely be about 23,000 square feet.

Mr. Thomas suggested staff go beyond the normal interested parties process in terms of community engagement. He understood there had been facilitated meetings in the neighborhood as part of the strategic plan process. He preferred something along the lines of those meetings with targeted outreach and inviting people to look at plans in a facilitated way. He stated the evidence showed deeply engaging the local residents was a benefit in terms of a community oriented policing program, even in terms of the design of the building. Mr. Nichols explained the process was to have a meeting at the 30 percent point of the review of the plans and at the 90 percent point of the review of the plans. Mr. Thomas asked if some of the strategic plan resources could go into this interested parties meeting so it was more than just an interested parties meeting. Mr. Matthes replied they would do more than the normal approach. Mr. Thomas wondered if the consultants working in that neighborhood could work with the engineers and architects in this engagement process. Mr. Matthes stated that could be done.

Mr. Skala asked if this would be a LEED building. Mr. Nichols replied yes, and noted LEED was a requirement as part of the scope of services.

Eric Miller, 2120 Forum Boulevard, explained he was the Vice President and one of the owners of PW Architects, which was the associate architect on this project, and noted the same team that would work on this project had recently completed work on the Boone County Emergency Communications Center. He stated they would attend any meetings they needed to attend to make this successful.

Mayor Treece assumed a police precinct was highly specialized in some of its features and was glad they had a local resource. Mr. Miller stated his firm would be involved throughout the process.

Mr. Trapp commented that he believed this would be a great addition to the Second Ward, and thought it would be catalytic with the Centerpointe Hospital developing across the street. That area was supposed to be the Cherry Hill of the north, but none of the commercial property had developed due to the economic downturn and the concerns about crime. He hoped this would spur other development in the area. He stated he was pleased the neighborhood was feeling a sense of ownership for the area, and hoped they would see this area turnaround. He was excited for this step toward that turnaround.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Police Department was involved in this process. Mr. Matthes replied yes. He explained the Public Works Department would build the project for them. Mr. Thomas understood representatives of the Police Department would be at the meetings previously mentioned. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, and explained they

were already heavily involved. Mr. Nichols pointed out they would dictate space needs, etc. The Public Works Department was only getting it through the public process.

Mr. Thomas stated this was a very exciting project in an area that needed help. He understood Nashville, Tennessee had recently built a couple new precincts in high crime areas and it had involved a community engagement process. He suggested they look at best practices from those projects.

Mr. Skala commented that this fit into the strategic plan and it would address police needs north of I-70. He stated he was happy to support it.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B55-17 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B55-17, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:

VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS.

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

B61-17 Amending Chapter 11 of the City Code to establish a prescription drug monitoring program.

Discussion and vote shown with B62-17.

B62-17 Authorizing an intergovernmental user agreement with St. Louis County, Missouri relating to the prescription drug monitoring program; appropriating funds.

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Browning provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece thanked Ms. Browning for her outreach to the provider community. He noted he had seen some of the e-mails between her, people in her department, and the pharmacists, physicians, etc., and they had answered each of their questions one on one, which he felt ameliorated any procedural or operational concerns. He noted the feedback he had received had been enthusiastic and caring in the need for this program. He commented that if someone was doctor shopping or prescription shopping, there was not a mechanism to address the issue unless the pharmacist recognized an oddity. He stated he had the impression many thought this was something they should have done a long time ago, and understood this was likely something chain pharmacies were already doing. Ms. Browning stated that was correct. She explained she had spoken with several of the bigger chain pharmacies and was told their corporate offices would handle all of the reporting. Mayor Treece understood it was seamless for them. Ms. Browning stated that was correct. There was one person at the corporate level that took care of hitting the submission button at the end of the day. Mayor Treece asked how this would be handled by a Kilgore's, D&H, or other smaller pharmacy. Ms. Browning replied the D&H representative had indicated he had checked with their software company, and they would be able to transmit the data. Mayor Treece understood in terms authority, they were using the same epidemiology authority they used to regulate tobacco, etc. Ms. Browning stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser understood this would cost the City \$15,000 annually, and asked how this was funded for those communities that had a state-mandated program. Ms. Browning replied the cost was likely covered by the state.

Ms. Nauser commented that every magazine had advertisements for mind altering drugs, and pointed out when she recently had surgery, the hospital had tried to give her narcotics even after she had told them she did not want any. They had written her a prescription when she was discharged even though she had told them she did not want it. She had been forced to take the prescription with her and had to shred it when she got

home. She asked if there had been any conversations with those prescribing these types of medications at an alarming rate. She felt that needed to be addressed as people were getting hooked on those drugs after surgeries. Ms. Browning explained this was a big conversation at the national level. The CDC had put out guidelines in the past year with regard to prescriptions. She commented that there had been a big emphasis on pain over the last several years, and hospitals were evaluated on how they managed the pain of the people they treated. A system had been created that judged the care and treatment at hospitals and by providers based on a standard of how someone's pain was managed. She agreed it was a systems issue. Ms. Nauser explained she had a problem with monitoring and tracking people that legitimately had a need as they were made into a criminal. Ms. Browning stated the system would only monitor for trends and triggers would be set.

Mr. Trapp understood there was some possibility of obtaining federal support because they provided support to those states with monitoring programs. He also understood Missouri was the only state without a drug monitoring program. He noted this system would be larger than Columbia as all of the communities that adopted into the system would be covered. Ms. Browning stated that was correct, and pointed out as more counties and jurisdictions joined, the number of people covered would increase. Mr. Trapp understood they were already picking up most of the population of the state now with those that had already elected to participate.

Mayor Treece asked if St. Louis County had passed this on to the prescriber as the cost was about \$11 per prescriber per year. Ms. Browning replied it was \$7 per prescriber, and there was an additional administrative fee based on the proportion of prescribers in the jurisdiction. It was about \$14,873 per year.

Jerry Dowell stated he was representing the Columbia Chamber of Commerce and noted he wanted to speak on behalf of the monitoring program as it was actually a part of their legislative package for the General Assembly. They were happy the City of Columbia and Boone County were proceeding, and wanted to state their support.

Christina Goldstein stated she was an orthopaedic spine surgeon at the Missouri Orthopaedic Institute and her interest in the prescription drug monitoring program started after she had operated on a patient last year who had passed away about two weeks after surgery from either a drug overdose or because of complications from a spine infection related to intravenous heroin use as she had become hooked after being prescribed oxycodone and oxycontin for a back injury by her primary care provider. She commented that she was surprised when she had moved to Columbia that Missouri was the only state that did not have a prescription drug monitoring program. She stated she believed the points of Ms. Nauser about punishing the end user were valid. In 1996 when the American Pain Association introduced pain as the fifth vital sign, physicians did not have much choice in altering their prescribing habits in order to comply with reducing the pain of patients because pain was a very subjective experience. In order for physicians to provide appropriate care to their patients, help minimize pain, and achieve adequate patient satisfaction, which they were graded on and paid based upon, it was important for compliance. She noted she was not saying they were supposed to give every patient the narcotics requested, and pointed out pain as the fifth vital sign had now been dropped by the American Medical Association because they now realized it was not a good idea. Another challenge as a physician was that it was difficult to identify patients that were doctor shopping, so she feared prescribing medication to patients that needed it and would use it safely. She stated she had personally cut back on all of her prescriptions to all of her patients. She believed this program would help identify high-risk users, high-risk prescribers, patients that required help for their addiction early on, and strategies for widespread methods for decreasing abuse and addiction in the communities.

Ms. Nauser asked if the removal of pain as a vital sign would cause the trend to go the opposite way by maybe starting with ibuprofen rather than the strongest narcotic possible. Ms. Goldstein replied yes. The recommendation of the Center for Disease

Control (CDC) with regard to methods to treat pain was to always start with the lowest dose of the most effective medication. The problem was that there was a culture and an expectation in the United States by patients. She explained that as a spine surgeon, a huge percentage of her time in clinic was spent educating patients about the safety and dangers of medications and alternative treatments, such as anti-inflammatories, injections, etc. Many patients would come in requesting these medications by name and when she would indicate she did not feel they were safe, it was harder for her to take care of them post-operatively. She noted they were not happy, but eventually understood. Ms. Nauser commented that it was encouraging to hear there had been a change. Ms. Goldstein stated the pendulum would eventually shift, but it would take time, so the prescription drug monitoring program was needed.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Goldstein if she had done her practice or rotation in a state that had a prescription drug monitoring program. Ms. Goldstein replied she was actually a Canadian transfer so she had only worked in Missouri in the United States. Compared to Ontario, where she had trained and which had the highest rate of oxycodone prescriptions in all of Canada, the expectations of the patients she treated in Columbia, Missouri in terms of the amount and duration of treatment with narcotics was phenomenal.

Mayor Treece asked about the addictiveness of oxycodone and other similar narcotics. Ms. Goldstein replied it depended upon the patient as patients had different levels of addictive-type personalities. Compared to other medications, such as Tylenol-3s, she thought they were likely more addictive, but noted she did not know the actual physiology behind it.

Mayor Treece commented that he had been told by parents that their high school seniors were prescribed narcotics after having their wisdom teeth removed more so than was needed for that episode or acuity. They were then stealing from the medicine cabinet or friends. Ms. Goldstein noted it was not always the patients who were affected as it also impacted family members.

Mr. Skala stated some people were drug shopping for recreational purposes before becoming addicted when he was in the military in the late 1960s. He asked Ms. Goldstein if she saw that now. Ms. Goldstein replied she had been fortunate in her practice in that she had not yet identified a patient who had become addicted after surgery, but she had only been in practice 2.5 years. She commented that she did see patients that had a history of polysubstance abuse or narcotic abuse that had often had issues with cigarettes and alcohol, so they tended to have addictions to multiple types of substances.

Ms. Nauser asked if oxycodone had been approved for children. Ms. Goldstein replied she did not know. Ms. Nauser wondered how this prescription drug monitoring program affected someone that was not of legal age and if data would be collected on the parent. Ms. Browning replied the data would be tied to the patient because it would go through the pharmacy.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, stated he truly believed there were drug addiction issues, and thought the issue of physicians being paid to dispense for pain needed to be addressed. He was concerned about the City having to pay \$15,000 annually and wondered if the customer would have to pay more for their medications as a result. He suggested this be looked into before voting on this issue.

Ms. Browning commented that St. Louis was applying in April for Bureau of Justice Administration funding on behalf of the State of Missouri, and would know if they would be awarded that funding in September or October. If they were awarded the funding, it would take care of the first couple of years of coverage. As a result, an appropriation of council reserve funding was not needed as it would not happen until after the start of the FY 2018 budget whereby they could plan for it. Mayor Treece asked for clarification. Ms. Browning replied it would be the amount for this year since it was unplanned. She suggested they strike Section 2 and renumber Section 3 to become Section 2 of B62-17.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B62-17 by removing Section 2 and renumbering Section 3 to Section 2. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Beverly Fries, 3512 Hedgewood Drive, asked about the statistics of drug overdoses in Missouri compared to all of the other states that had prescription drug monitoring programs. Ms. Browning replied she did not have that data with her. She noted it was a significant problem in some states, such as Kentucky. She pointed out this was only a tool. She understood the Council had voted to provide money to the Fire Department to purchase naloxone to carry in vehicles for overdoses, and if she recalled correctly, there had been over 350 calls in Columbia during the past year due to overdoses.

Ms. Fries noted data from the CDC had indicated the five states with the highest rates of drug overdose deaths were West Virginia with 35.5 deaths per 100,000, New Mexico with 27.3 deaths per 100,000, New Hampshire with 26.2 deaths per 100,000, Kentucky with 24.7 deaths per 100,000, and Ohio with 24.6 deaths per 100,000. She understood states with statistically significant increases in the rate of drug overdose deaths from 2013 to 2014 included Alabama, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Maine, Maryland, Massachusetts, Michigan, New Hampshire, New Mexico, North Dakota, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Virginia, and all of those states had active prescription drug monitoring programs. She noted the national average drug overdose rate increased 6.5 percent, but Missouri, which did not have a prescription drug monitoring program, only had an increase of 4 percent. She thought Missouri might be doing something right compared to these other states.

Mayor Treece commented that he thought any overdose was sad and preventable, and believed the prescription drug monitoring program was important in terms of public safety.

Roger Fries, 3512 Hedgewood Drive, commented that the CDC had indicated that 41 states had a prescription drug monitoring program in 2010, and it was 49 states now, but the growth in deaths had risen from 7.27 per 100,000 people to 9.23 per 100,000. He understood the rate in Kentucky had been lower than in Missouri prior to their prescription drug monitoring program, but was now higher. He stated he was not convinced the prescription drug monitoring program worked. He believed that when someone became hooked on narcotics as a result of an operation or medical issue, they found something else, such as heroin and other illegal drugs. He thought the government already had too many databases and there were hacking issues along with people not securing the information correctly. He wondered if St. Louis County or the company that would conduct the record keeping would be careful with the information. He thought a strung-out user would hack the information and go to someone's house looking for drugs. He did not feel this information should be collected.

Mr. Trapp commented that he thought it was important to move forward with this program. The population level data might not be as clear as they would like and addiction was a multi-faceted issue. This would only be one tool in the toolbox, and it was a widely accepted near-universal best practice. He noted he had used a similar system within the Medicaid system, which allowed them to identify patients that had multiple providers and provide life-saving substance use disorder treatment. The opioid epidemic was real and was not something that only happened to criminals. People fell into very innocently. He commented that many prescribers were still cavalier about the risk of substance use disorders, and noted he knew countless people that had lost their lives to opioid overdose. During his ten years at the Phoenix Programs, opioid disorders went from 1 out of 30 to 1 out of 3, and the age of the average patient had dropped. It was a cross-class, race, and education level phenomenon. He thought local action could make a difference and applauded St. Louis County for moving forward during the inactivity of the State of Missouri. He pointed out they would be joining the same system and the information would be widespread. He expected this to go across almost all of the Missouri counties quickly, and they would then have a statewide system because it

would create a powerful inducement for people shopping doctors to the few isolated counties that were not a part of the system. He noted the naloxone the Fire Department now carried had already saved a life. If this system saved one life, he thought it would be well worth it. He was glad they would follow St. Louis County's lead. He pointed out health information was uniquely protected and all providers were intensely trained and had extreme cognizance of people's privacy. Every agency had protocols in terms of protecting confidential protected health information. They had not seen data issues in the 49 states that had a prescription drug monitoring program. It was not an issue of serious concern whereby opioid dependency and the loss of life were serious concerns.

Mr. Skala stated he had heard from physicians in his network of physicians and they were loyal to the idea of moving forward with the prescription drug monitoring program as it was at a reasonable cost. He commented that he agreed with Mr. Trapp in that there were protections and redundancy. He also felt this would create a real benefit for the victims and the doctors. He thought this was a small price to pay for the benefits of the program.

Ms. Nauser commented that she was generally a sceptic and felt this would punish the end user, but was encouraged to hear the guidelines had changed. She hoped they were able to help people that became hooked on the awful drugs and address the over-prescription of the drugs. She agreed addiction was a horrible disease, and it was painful for families and friends of those with addictions or those that passed away from overdoses. She stated she would support this after hearing the comments tonight, but noted she also had concerns about information being collected in databases.

B61-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B62-17, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Thomas stepped out of the meeting room.

B60-17

Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the PedNet Coalition relating to the disbursement of funds received from a Missouri Foundation for Health Grant for the Vision Zero project; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Skala asked from where the money would come. He understood some of it would be funded by the PedNet Coalition, but there were other stipulations as to the City's responsibility for the remainder financially and in terms of staffing. He thought they had still been in the decision-making process when they had adopted Vision Zero with regard to staffing and funding. Mr. Matthes replied the funds would come from PedNet for the first year. The Vision Zero work called for the creation of two jobs to implement the plan, but it was something they could not afford. This would allow them to add to the jobs of two employees. Mr. Skala understood existing employees would have this added responsibility. Mr. Matthes pointed out it would fall to the City's budget in future years.

B60-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSTAINING: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Thomas returned to the meeting room.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B44-17 Rezoning property located on the east side of Brown Station Road, between Blue Ridge Road and US Highway 63, from District M-R (Research, Development and Office Park District) and District M-C (Controlled Industrial District) to District R-1 (One-Family Dwelling District) (Case No. 17-45).
- B46-17 Approving the Sinclair Road PUD Plan located on the east side of Sinclair Road and north of Cascades Drive; granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations as it relates to direct driveway access onto Sinclair Road (Case No. 17-50).
- B47-17 Approving the Final Plat of Sinclair Road Plat 1 located on the east side of Sinclair Road and north of Cascades Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-49).
- B48-17 Approving the Final Plat of Christiansen Deline Subdivision - Plat 1 located on the southwest corner of Brown School Road and Range Line Street (Highway 763) (Case No. 17-40).
- B49-17 Approving the Final Plat of Bass Crossing, Plat No. 1 located approximately 700 feet south of Prathersville Road and east of Range Line Street (Highway 763); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-47).
- B50-17 Vacating a portion of Pannell Street located between Wilkes Boulevard and its existing terminus at the northeast corner of property addressed as 702 Range Line Street (Case No. 17-57).
- B51-17 Vacating a drainage and utility easement on Lot 605 within The Vineyards, Plat No. 6 located on the southeast corner of Pride Mountain Drive and Oakville Ranch Drive (Case No. 17-58).
- B52-17 Appropriating funds relating to a Freight Enhancement Program grant agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the purchase of a railcar unloading ramp and development of an automotive loading and unloading facility at the Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT) transload site.

- B53-17 Appropriating retained earnings funds to the Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT).
- B54-17 Accepting conveyances for utility and electric utility purposes.
- B57-17 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for public health services.
- B58-17 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for animal control services.
- B59-17 Accepting grant funds from the United States Food and Drug Administration/Association of Food and Drug Officials for the Boone County voluntary national retail food regulatory program standards project; appropriating funds.
- R29-17 Setting a public hearing: proposed replacement of Bridges #5 and #7 and, if funding allows, Bridge #8 on the MKT Nature/Fitness Trail.
- R30-17 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Allstate Consultants, LLC for design services for the Discovery Parkway extension project from Discovery Drive to Rolling Hills Road.
- The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:**

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R31-17 Finding the structure located at 706 Fairview Avenue is a dangerous structure; authorizing an exception to Ordinance No. 022992 relating to the administrative delay on the demolition of structures in specified areas.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if it was so unsafe they did not want to wait for the expiration of the temporary administrative delay. Mr. Teddy replied it was a voluntary demolition, and the application had been made on behalf of the owner by a local home builder. He understood they intended to replace the structure, and thought it might help them out to have an additional couple of weeks. Mayor Treece asked if it was zoned R-1. Mr. Teddy replied he thought it had been zoned R-3, and it was a good sized lot. The indication was that the applicant wanted to build a house on it, so he assumed the plan was to replace the house with a single-family house.

The vote on R31-17 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

Ms. Peters stepped out of the meeting room.

- R32-17 Finding the structure located at 403 Lawrence Place is a dangerous structure; authorizing an exception to Ordinance No. 022992 relating to the administrative delay on the demolition of structures in specified areas.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece understood this was not a replacement. It was only a demolition. Mr. Teddy stated staff did not have a plan. There was another adjacent property owned by the applicant with a beautiful Georgian Revival house on it.

The vote on R32-17 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSTAINING: PETERS. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

Ms. Peters returned to the meeting room.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B63-17 Approving the Final Plat of The Brooks, Plat No. 1 located on the west side of Rolling Hills Road and approximately 1,500 feet south of Richland Road; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-135).
- B64-17 Approving the Replat of Columbia College East Subdivision located on the southeast corner of Range Line Street and Wilkes Boulevard (Case No. 17-56).
- B65-17 Approving the Final Plat of The Villas at Old Hawthorne Plat 9, a Replat of a portion of Lot 5 of Old Hawthorne Plat 1, located on the north side of Screaming Eagle Lane and approximately 850 feet east of Old Hawthorne Drive (Case No. 17-66).
- B66-17 Granting a variance from the requirements of Section 25-48.1 of the City Code relating to construction of a sidewalk along a portion of the north side of Proctor Drive, approximately 550 feet east of Creasy Springs Road (811 Proctor Drive) (Case No. 17-16).
- B67-17 Vacating right-of-way, temporary turnaround, drainage and utility easements between Lots 2 and 3 within the Final Plat of Sutter Industrial, Plat 3 located northeast of the intersection of Paris Road and Waco Road (Case No. 17-52).

- B68-17 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking on a portion of the north side of University Avenue, between College Avenue and Ann Street.
- B69-17 Authorizing a third supplemental agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for transportation enhancement funds relating to the non-motorized (GetAbout) pilot project.
- B70-17 Authorizing STP-Urban Program Supplemental Agreement #2 with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the Providence Road improvement project from Turner Avenue to Stadium Boulevard; appropriating funds.
- B71-17 Accepting conveyances for sidewalk, street and temporary turnaround purposes.
- B72-17 Authorizing an agreement with Robert M. Doroghazi for replacement of existing three-phase electric service on property located at 115 E. Bingham Road.
- B73-17 Authorizing a first addendum to the power purchase agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the sale of wind energy and associated credits produced by Crystal Lake III.
- B74-17 Authorizing replacement of Bridges #5 and #7 and, if funding allows, Bridge #8 on the MKT Nature/Fitness Trail; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B75-17 Authorizing the City Manager to execute a grant of easement for sewer purposes with Boone County Regional Sewer District for the construction and maintenance of a force main sewer line across two tracts of land managed by the Parks and Recreation Department located adjacent to Creasy Springs Road.
- B76-17 Authorizing a facilities and services agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the use of Peace Park for the Fourth of July Celebration and Fireworks Display.

- B77-17 Authorizing Amendment No. 3 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for public health emergency preparedness services.
- B78-17 Authorizing an educational affiliation agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri, on behalf of the University of Missouri-St. Louis College of Nursing, to provide health clinical experience and instruction for nursing students.
- B79-17 Authorizing an agreement with Columbia Public Schools for the Healthy Eating and Active Living (HEAL) program.
- B80-17 Accepting a donation from Central Bank of Boone County, Missouri for the 2017 Fair Housing and Lending Seminar; appropriating funds.
- B81-17 Authorizing a license agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the use of a portion of the Columbia Regional Airport for certified instruction and training programs for police and fire education.
- B82-17 Authorizing an air service agreement with United Airlines, Inc.
- B83-17 Authorizing a charitable contribution agreement with the Larry W. Potterfield Revocable Trust for the donation of property located at 840 N. Strawn Road.

X. REPORTS

- REP16-17 Correspondence by the Commission on Human Rights regarding Welcoming Cities.

Ms. Thompson provided a staff report.

Kelly Pascucci, 1107 Merrill Court, commented that welcoming cities started with the false premise that among them there were unwelcoming people and they were compared to sanctuary cities. It was a scheme to flood communities within the United States with many legal and illegal immigrants without regard to public safety. This was done by preventing local officials from asking people about their immigration status or refusing to use local resources to detain immigrants. In late 2014, the Task Force on New Americans had been created with the goal of providing protection to 13-15 million immigrants moving them on to citizenship. She understood the Task Force had discussed the importance of designating these illegal refugee statuses and making them aware of their rights as they pertained to massive income credits to the tune of \$35,000 in some instances, free medical care, free in-state tuition, zero percent personal loans, and credit cards. This was all at the expense of taxpayers. It was also made clear that the protected class of illegal aliens from South America, Mexico, Haiti, Syria, Africa, and the

Middle East would not be interested or expected to integrate, and instead they would navigate their way through society and culture until they dominated. She believed it was an insult to taxpayers of Columbia to say creating a welcoming city here was just and equitable as it disregarded their status and safety. She commented that she was strongly opposed to the City of Columbia formally or informally being designated as a welcoming city and perverting the true American dream.

Mr. Thomas stated he proposed they find a way to provide the \$200 so Columbia could rejoin the Welcoming Cities program. He understood welcoming cities were guided by the principles of inclusion and creating communities that prospered because everyone felt welcomed including immigrants and refugees. There was no question that different cities could exude different feelings to different people, and it was a value they had in Columbia.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to provide the \$200 from the council reserve fund. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Skala stated he was supportive of this idea, and asked how long Columbia had been a part of the Welcoming Cities program and when the fee had been established. Ms. Thompson replied she thought 2014 was when the first request had come to be a part of the Welcoming Cities, and Columbia had elected to participate then. She thought there had been some concern about funding and funding loss for sanctuary cities, and noted this did not create a sanctuary city so she did not feel there would be a loss of federal funding associated with it.

Mr. Skala asked if it was appropriate for the \$200 to come from the council reserve fund. Mr. Matthes replied he thought it might be more appropriate to fund this from an account that had been established for boards and commissions to share.

Mr. Thomas revised his motion so the \$200 would come from the general board and commission account. The revised motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Ms. Nauser asked why they would want to spend this \$200 as they would not get anything out of it. Mr. Thomas replied it had been requested by the Commission on Human Rights. Ms. Nauser commented that they did not need to provide everything everyone requested. She did not see what they would get out of this other than a placard, and the print shop could create a placard. She felt \$200 here and there added up. She commented that anything related to a Clinton Global initiative would never obtain her support.

Mr. Ruffin asked if the City would be listed somewhere as a result. If they were going to make this investment, he thought they should receive some recognition for it. Ms. Thompson replied there was a website, www.welcomingamerica.org, and they listed welcoming cities and counties on that site along with expectations of the communities.

Ms. Nauser thought the City was already working toward an Inclusive Communities program. Mr. Matthes noted the Department of Public Health and Human Services was providing training, and one specific course was called Building Inclusive Communities. Ms. Nauser felt they were already doing something, and this would require another planning document.

Mayor Treece understood they had requested \$200, but one of the attachments had indicated there was no membership fee to join Welcoming Cities, and asked if that was old information. Ms. Thompson replied that was old information. Mayor Treece noted it appeared as though the Council had adopted a statement to this effect in 2014 and he did not believe that position had changed. It was much different than sanctuary cities as well. He viewed this as the interconnectivity between government and the business community and not-for-profits that encouraged entrepreneurialism and economic assimilation.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Trapp to allow the Commission on Human Rights to spend \$200 from the general board and commission account for the Welcoming Cities program was approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser voting no.

REP17-17 Citizens Police Review Board: Strategic Planning Subcommittee Report.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas stated he was happy to see discussion of community oriented policing in the recommendations, and understood they had expressed a desire to be a part of the community engagement process for policing.

Darrell Smith explained he was the Chair of the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB) and commented that this document had been discussed at the last CPRB meeting. He noted he did not have concerns with the content, but had concerns with regard to the way it was presented. If they required the Columbia Police Department (CPD) to have more restrictive use of force, he wondered if they would put the citizens as well as officers at a greater risk of harm because they were delaying use of force or using a level of force that might not be appropriate. He agreed the community had to be included, but training was also needed as most people would not understand use of force or appropriate use of force. He pointed out even former board members had wondered why the officers could not shoot someone in the leg, and this was not an understanding of use of force and use of deadly force. He reiterated he agreed the community had to be a part of the decision making process, but there needed to be a common base of understanding. He noted bullet point three had indicated the CPRB recommended the CPD take into consideration the creation of additional liaison officers, and although he loved the idea, he wondered how they would determine what group would get a liaison officer. He commented that all police officers should have the ability to communicate and deal with members of the public regardless of the subgroup they belonged to with a police force that was properly trained. He did not feel they should marginalize people by saying they needed a special person to serve as a mouthpiece because they were not able to make their voice clear to police. He questioned the meaning of bullet point 4, which indicated the CPD should establish a Serious Incident Response Team. He commented that he applauded the desire of the Council to interface with the community, but was concerned about taking steps that would remove officers from the streets because it could put communities at a greater risk of harm. With regard to bullet point 5, he thought they should look at whether officers fit the community in terms of efficiency, effectiveness, knowledge, etc. versus whether a box was checked.

Mr. Thomas understood Mr. Smith was the Chair of the CPRB. Mr. Smith stated that was correct and noted he was speaking on behalf of himself. This report had been generated by a subcommittee. Mr. Thomas asked if this report had been signed off by the entire CPRB or if it had been fed through. Mr. Smith replied it had been fed through by the subcommittee and voted on, and noted five members were on the subcommittee and there were only nine total members of the CPRB so it would have passed regardless.

REP18-17 Water and Light Vegetation Management.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked if the pollinator habitat would consist of native plants. Mr. Johnsen replied his understanding was that they would be native to the Missouri terrain. Ms. Nauser asked if hazardous neonicotinoid pesticides would be limited in their use. Mr. Johnsen replied this would be administered preliminarily through the Office of Sustainability, and noted he would check to ensure they did not utilize those pesticides.

Ms. Nauser asked if this would be a pilot project for medians and other areas in the community. Mr. Johnsen replied it would be similar, but not exactly the same as he was not sure of the growth levels. He noted they were trying to keep the vegetation out of the power lines with this program. The other program would likely involve sight line issues so there would be different height requirements.

REP19-17 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

Mayor Treece understood this had been provided for informational purposes.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that the many exhaust fans throughout businesses in Columbia had lint hanging from them, which he felt was likely a fire hazard and health issue.

Mr. Elkin noted he had heard negative comments on the radio regarding the dairy farm.

Mr. Elkin understood Columbia had the St. Frances House and the Harbor House, and wondered if they needed a facility that took in women and families.

Ms. Nauser asked for a report on the feasibility and cost to not build the new substation and to upgrade existing substations instead. She noted she wanted that information available to whomever would take her place on the Council. She stated she would appreciate it if the report could be done by April 3, but understood if the information could not be collected by then. Mr. Matthes commented that he was not sure they could provide a report by then as it would take electrical engineering work and analysis.

Ms. Peters understood B68-17 would amend the City Code to prohibit parking on the north side of University Avenue between College Avenue and Ann Street, but thought it should be between College Avenue and Rock Hill Road. She wondered if that was a mistake. Mr. Matthes stated he would look into it.

Ms. Peters commented that asphalt patches had been placed on University Avenue, which was a brick-lined street. She understood these were temporary patches and asked how long they would remain and what the plans were for actually fixing the road. Mr. Matthes stated staff would come back to her with those answers.

Mr. Trapp commented that in response to Mr. Elkin, the Lois Bryant House accepted women, and Harbor House accepted families. He agreed there was a greater need, but thought he would point that out.

Mr. Thomas stated he would miss the April 3 and May 1 Council Meetings.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 12:42 a.m.