



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Tuesday, September 6, 2016
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 6, 2016, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER (left at about 11:46 p.m.), PETERS, TREECE and RUFFIN were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

Mayor Treece explained the minutes of the regular meeting of August 15, 2016 had not yet been completed.

Upon his request, Mayor Treece made a motion to allow Mr. Thomas to abstain from voting on R120-16. Mr. Thomas noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that his wife, Ellen Thomas, was the President of the Board of the Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture, which was the organization requesting the waiver. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nausser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The agenda, including the consent agenda, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Ms. Nausser.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC9-16 Appointments to the Mayor's Task Force on Medical Tourism.

Mayor Treece appointed the following people to the Mayor's Task Force on Medical Tourism: Guy Collier, Jonathan Curtright, Kate Pitzer, Vivek Puri, Gene Austin, David Parmley, James Cook, Kevin Staveley-O'Carroll, and Lana Zerrer.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC44-16 Steven A. Smith, President & CEO of Job Point - Request for \$24,000 of Council Reserves to fund scholarships for training in construction trades, job readiness and job placement for clients referred/diverted from the Alternative Sentencing Courts/Local Jail.

Mr. Smith, 1603 Canton Drive, commented that for over 50 years, Job Point had consistently been in the forefront of assisting those with barriers to employment in obtaining and maintaining employment, which allowed their clients and those dependent upon them the opportunity to improve their standard of living. Job Point had provided economic equality long before it had risen to the level of community prominence it held today. He asked Council for the money remaining in the current fiscal year council discretionary fund, which he believed equaled \$24,000. The funds, if granted, would be

used to provide scholarships to students referred to them from the Boone County Circuit Court Alternative Sentencing Courts as the vast majority of referrals were residents of Columbia. While Job Point had worked with these courts for some time, they were undertaking a much more focused pilot referral program. The court commissioner would divert sentencing and refer the client to Job Point as part of conditions set. The client would initially receive 1-2 weeks training in their Job Works program, which assisted their clients with resume preparation, assistance with online job application, recorded mock interviews, etc. in applying for and securing a job. Upon completion of the training, if the client had shown acceptable attitude and commitment to further training, the next step would be to enter a trade specific program that would last 16 weeks. The primary programs were heating, ventilation, air conditioning, highway heavy construction, and construction in general carpentry trades. Specific certifications would be earned, and each client would serve an internship lasting four weeks prior to beginning a job search. Upon completion, Job Point would assist the client in obtaining and maintaining a job that fit their skills and life situation. He noted some preferred to stay local in a position with minimal travel, and in that case, there were numerous positions with the City, County, MoDOT, and private employers with livable wages, benefits, and retirement plans. Others might be willing and able to travel more extensively, and in that case, there were federal highway prevailing wage construction positions with strong benefits, per diem, etc. providing a higher salary potential. He stated they had recently placed a young man referred from drug court in a job at \$31 per hour base plus per diem and benefits upon completing the highway heavy construction class. He pointed out highway heavy construction employers as a group tended to be more open to employing to those with legal histories than others. He commented that while they could not guarantee the wage level each client would obtain, the strong local economy and the highway opportunities noted were very encouraging. He stated Job Point had a strong history with a recidivism record well below state and national averages. While this program might have a higher rate than normal programs, they were confident it could be successful enough to justify the funds requested. He noted they had also requested \$40,000 from Boone County, and were hopeful those funds would be granted. When combined with tonight's request and other available funding sources, they planned to provide services to 15-20 clients as a pilot program. The results obtained from the pilot program would allow them to apply for longer-term funding. He thanked the City for the support it had provided in numerous ways over many years with programs such as Job Works, the affordable housing programs, and scholarship funds through CDBG funding. He also thanked the Job Point Board of Directors and staff, who worked diligently to provide the services he had described. He asked those in attendance tonight on behalf of Job Point to stand, and approximately 16 people stood.

SPC45-16 Lynn Maloney - Meeting with Chief Burton, July 26th, 2016.

Ms. Maloney, Race Matters, Friends, agreed officers needed to be safe, but noted it was very disappointing that every time they had spoken to the Police Department and various officers about issues related to race, racism, racial profiling, and implicit bias, they immediately turned the topic around to officer safety. They had this experience the first time they had spoken with Chief Burton over a year ago and about nine months post-Ferguson because they wanted to know what would be done in the Police Department to prevent that type of event in Columbia. She understood they had not read the Ferguson Report, but had been aware that Darren Wilson had been acquitted and had addressed officer safety by doubling up officers in patrol vehicles. She noted she had been provided the opportunity to hear Chief Burton speak a few months afterward, and when a member of the audience had asked for his response to the Ferguson incident, he had stated Officer Wilson had not been found guilty. He had also indicated Officer Wilson had been a little guy, suggesting officer safety was the issue in the Ferguson incident. She pointed out Officer Wilson stood at six feet, three inches tall. This summer, they had become very interested in the vehicle stop report, and in July, Chief

Burton had stated he was confident racial profiling did not occur and that he had other data. Race Matters, Friends had thus asked for meeting to which he had obliged. She had asked about the extra data that confirmed for him that racial profiling did not happen, and he did not have any actual data. The lack of complaints with regard to racial profiling was the extra piece of information he had that made him confident racial profiling did not occur. She commented that as they asked more questions about how he had looked at the data, he indicated he had not looked at the data in terms of racial profiling because he was not aware it was an issue. He also stated that every year when the vehicle stop report was released, people accused them of racial profiling. She noted he had gone from not being aware to them having to deal with it every year. She stated it was difficult to have a substantive conversation with this much apparent confusion and conflict in answers. She explained she brought this up because they were having difficulty in their conversations and understood the City Manager and some on the City Council were interested in having public conversations about the kind of policing they wanted. She thought they might want to consider this in their planning for those conversations. She stated Chief Burton had invited her colleague to meet with command staff with regard to how they might do a better job of collecting and analyzing more data, and explained they had sent the Council notes from the meeting and what they wanted to see happen as a result of that meeting on July 26. She commented that officers had indicated they had grown up in Columbia and had never been aware of race or racism as an issue in Columbia. It seemed to be new for them, and they were puzzled as to why it was now an issue. This was disturbing to her, and another indication of a lack of awareness about the issues. She commented that the officers did not understand how they could have implicit bias because they had been taught by their parents that racism was not good. She noted implicit bias was not related to conscious belief, what their parents had taught them, sociological beliefs about race, or political views. This was an area that needed improvement as there was a very high correlation between implicit bias and shooter bias. A person with high implicit bias was more likely to discharge a firearm when making a split-second decision, resulting in harming or killing someone. She understood the Columbia Police Department did not have the resources to have any meaningful conversation about race, racism, the history of racism in Columbia, implicit bias, etc. If the City moved forward with having public conversations, she suggested they enlist the support of an outside professional facilitator, such as Karen Aoresty of the St. Louis Anti-Defamation League.

SPC46-16 Tara Warne-Griggs - Providing a summary of and comment on the meeting between Race Matters, Friends and senior staff within the CPD.

Ms. Warne-Griggs canceled her request to speak.

SPC47-16 Barbara Hoppe - Concerns about tree cutting and clearing on Scenic Rock Quarry Road from the Rock Quarry Road Scenic Roadway Stakeholder Advisory Group.

Ms. Hoppe, 607 Bluffdale Drive, explained she had been asked to speak to the Council tonight on behalf of the Rock Quarry Road Scenic Roadway Stakeholder Advisory Group, and noted two member of the Planning and Zoning Commission along with Betsy Peters, the Ward 6 Council Member, served on the Advisory Group. They also had stakeholders that lived and owned property on Rock Quarry Road and some general public representatives. She stated the Rock Quarry Road Scenic Roadway Stakeholder Advisory Group had been appointed by the Council to make recommendations to preserve and enhance Scenic Rock Quarry Road while improving travel and safety on it. She explained Rock Quarry Road connected Stadium Boulevard to Rock Bridge Memorial State Park. Its historic and natural beauty along with its value to the community had been highlighted as far back as the 1930s in a significant Planning and Zoning document. Many drove that road to not only commute but to also enjoy its natural beauty, and the

fall season was the best time of the year to enjoy the road due to the colorful tree overhang. Rock Quarry Road had been a part of the Tour of Missouri bicycle race route when it was held in Columbia in 2007 because it was such a beautiful and scenic roadway with curves and some steep inclines, and the bikers had raved about it. She commented that the Advisory Group had been shocked and disappointed to learn a large section of trees on the northeast portion of the road, between Stadium Boulevard and Capen Park, had been clear cut instead of only being trimmed. She displayed a photo, and explained it had been done by the City Water and Light Department, who had contracted the work to Asplundh Tree Service. They had been particularly shocked because in 2009, Boone Electric had begun excessive tree trimming along a different section of the road, which had been caught and stopped by contacting the then City Manager Bill Watkins, who in turn had staff inform Boone Electric of the Rock Quarry Road scenic roadway status. She noted Road Quarry Road was the City's only officially designated scenic road. She understood Boone Electric had adjusted their tree trimming policy to make it more tree-friendly. She noted they had been assured at that time that both the City and Boone Electric would not let this happen again, and tree trimming in the future would be more appropriate. She stated the Council had also voted to place scenic road signs along the road so people knew it was a scenic road and to help diminish any error. It was evident procedures had not been put in place to ensure this would not happen. She asked the City to formalize a procedure so this did not happen again. She also asked the City to replant native trees and appropriate vegetation. She understood it would take many years to restore the area, but felt it was important for present and future generations to enjoy this beautiful, scenic, and valuable road.

SPC48-16

Nina L. Hampton - Effectiveness of public assistance.

Ms. Hampton, 202 Baypoint Lane, explained she was representing Race Matters, Friends, and thanked the Council for the use of the Blind Boone Community Center for their book discussion this past month. It was a nice resource for the community and a wonderful venue for a book discussion. It also educated her on the Columbia Housing Authority's MAP program, which was available to low income families for after-school tutoring. The outreach coordinator had provide them information about opportunities to volunteer for tutoring and had invited them to a free Saturday morning breakfast, which three of the members had attended to pass out flyers in the neighborhood. She recommended people attend it on a future Saturday morning to meet people in the community. As a member of Race Matters, Friends, she had been led on a journey of advocacy for minorities, and recently experienced helping a grandmother find public housing for herself and her six grandchildren, ages 1 to 9 years old. She stated it had been challenging and personally rewarding, but the struggles of her friend continued. She compared her experience to an article she had read written by Lisa Fenn titled *Blind and Homeless to Judo Champ: How Dartanyon Crockett Fought His Way to Rio*. He had been a student at a poor school like many poor minority students, and had doodled on his paper "Destined for Greatness" which had caught Lisa's attention. He had indicated to her that he wanted to go to college and be a lawyer even though he had admitted he had never visited a college or taken the SAT because he did not have the \$27 to take the test. Lisa decided to help him, similar to her helping her friend Erin get medication she could not afford to buy. Ms. Hampton noted Erin had been successful in obtaining the medication needed through the County Health Department, and she thought that would be it, but it had not even scratched the surface, which was similar to Lisa's experience with Dartanyon. Lisa thought Dartanyon was fine since he was in college and had participated in the Olympic Training program, but he was not as he began to fail. He lacked the skills to function and lacked a stable environment. A life of abject generational poverty had taught him to endure and dream, but not to hope and plan. Ms. Hampton explained Erin's scenario escalated as she took custody of her grandchildren and needed a place to house and feed the children. After obtaining housing, she had to sign papers and arrange rides with family members because her car had broken down. Together they

had knocked down one roadblock after another garnering help along the way. She was now safely housed, but many other problems awaited her with six grandchildren. For Dartanyon it took years, but he was ultimately able to learn to pay bills, have healthy social interactions, talk to authority, utilize community resources, etc. They were things many of them did not think about if they had never been dependent upon public assistance. Most importantly, he had learned to talk about his trauma from living in poverty without shame and had learned about his history of poverty so he would not repeat it. She commented that they relegated the issues of public assistance to fail, and noted Lisa had indicated that only a person willing to enter into another person's world and walk with them could make real change. Running out of money had less to do with poverty than running out of useful relationships. She pointed out Dartanyon had indicated that a person needed someone who believed in them to be successful and that he wanted to be a social worker to help others. Ms. Hampton wondered how many more Erin's were out there and needed a hand to stay out of the cycle of homelessness and poverty. She commented that they could help break the cycle of poverty one person at a time.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- PH28-16 FY 2017 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
Discussion shown with B199-16.
- PH29-16 Changes to the sanitary sewer utility rate, sanitary sewer utility connection fee and hauled liquid waste rate.
Discussion shown with B199-16.
- B192-16 Adopting the FY 2017 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
Discussion shown with B199-16.
- B193-16 Amending Chapter 12A of the City Code as it relates to stormwater utility charges.
Discussion shown with B199-16.
- B194-16 Amending Chapter 13 of the City Code as it relates to hauled liquid waste rates.
Discussion shown with B199-16.
- B195-16 Amending Chapter 17 of the City Code as it relates to Parks and Recreation fees.
Discussion shown with B199-16.
- B196-16 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to sanitary sewer utility rates and sanitary sewer utility connection fees.
Discussion shown with B199-16.
- B197-16 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to solid waste rates and services.
Discussion shown with B199-16.
- B198-16 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to water rates.
Discussion shown with B199-16.
- B199-16 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to electric rates.

PH28-16 and PH29-16 were read by the Clerk, and B192-16, B193-16, B194-16, B195-16, B196-16, B197-16, B198-16 and B199-16 were given third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood the Water and Light Advisory Board had made a recommendation with regard to the electric rate increases, which was somewhat different from the staff recommendation, and asked if that was reflected in the amendment sheet. He wondered how they might receive that information. Mr. Matthes replied he presumed the Water and Light Advisory Board would communicate it to the Council. He agreed it was a point of information the Council might want before they finished their deliberations on the budget. He noted it would be provided to the Council.

Mayor Treece commented that some of the fee increases were being contemplated by the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure, and asked at what point their recommendations would be reconciled with this budget. Mr. Matthes replied this was an operating budget, so these were increases aimed to keep the business operational. He thought the charge of the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure had been to look at a more global system of problems with funding, such as whether they were where they wanted to be with funding, if the operating budget contained enough capital investment for infrastructure, and new ideas for funding infrastructure. He felt their charge was larger than the operating budget. He noted these were modest increases that had either been voted on or contemplated for quite some time. The sewer connection fee had been in process for about five years at this time.

Mr. Matthes described the amendments on Amendment Sheet 2 - August 26, 2016.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding the City's paternal leave policy, and asked if the City had twelve weeks of paid leave. Mr. Matthes replied employees could use sick time during the twelve weeks. He commented that the City was generous compared to other institutions in terms of sick time, and it could be used for maternal or paternal leave. Mr. Thomas asked if it included vacation. Mr. Matthes replied this was in addition to vacation. There was paid time off that was usable for maternity and paternity leave. He clarified the ability to take up to twelve weeks involved the Family and Medical Leave Act (FMLA), and an employee could build up that much sick leave. Mayor Treece understood FMLA was unpaid leave. Mr. Matthes stated it was paid. Ms. Thompson clarified it was paid if sick leave was built up. Mr. Matthes explained FMLA was a federal protection for employees whereby an employee could not be fired for taking up to twelve weeks of time unpaid or paid. In addition to the City provided the local benefit of paid time off in terms of vacation and sick time.

Mayor Treece asked for the City's current policy on paid parental leave. Ms. Buckler replied it was allowed under FMLA, and employees were allowed to take paid vacation, comp time, or sick leave simultaneous with FMLA. Mr. Thomas asked for clarification on the twelve weeks. Ms. Buckler replied up to twelve weeks were allowed per a rolling calendar year. Mayor Treece understood it was paid if the employee had enough sick leave or vacation. Ms. Buckler stated that was correct. If an employee did not have the accruals, it would be unpaid. In that situation, the insurance was kept intact, but they would not be paid. Mr. Thomas asked how sick leave was built. Ms. Buckler replied an employee received 18 day of sick leave per year. She noted there was not a cap on sick leave so it did not go away. Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding the twelve weeks. Ms. Buckler replied that was allowed per FMLA, the federal law. Mr. Matthes explained the employee would have to report back to work in twelve weeks. Ms. Buckler pointed out that was the case unless the employee had a reason they could not come back. There were times people had to be gone longer than twelve weeks. In those situations, they would look at the accommodation process and the transitional duty process. The City had many processes to try and get people back to work. Mr. Matthes stated parental leave was addressed in the current system, but it was not a dedicated maternity leave or paternity leave benefit.

Mr. Skala understood Job Point had asked for \$24,000 from the council reserve fund, and

understood there was also a council contingency fund, and asked for clarification. Mr. Skala understood the reserve fund was down to \$44,000, but had started out at \$100,000. He asked if the council contingency fund had been at \$98,000. Mr. Matthes replied at one point they were both at \$100,000. The council contingency fund was for the entire budget. The council reserve fund was for special requests, such as things they had not thought of or did not normally fund. Mr. Skala understood they were down to \$44,000 in the council reserve fund, and asked what they had in the council contingency fund. Ms. Peveler replied \$100,000.

Mr. Skala understood the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) had decided to take over the maintenance and operations of the downtown surveillance cameras, and asked for the total savings. Mr. Matthes replied he thought it would be under \$30,000 total. Mr. Skala asked if the money saved would go back into the general reserve fund. Mr. Matthes replied it was in the Police Department budget so it would fall back into the general fund. Mr. Skala asked if there were strings tied to it with respect to the Police Department budget or if it would just go into the general fund. Mr. Matthes replied there were not any strings attached. The Council had the discretion to decide where it would go.

Mr. Skala commented that if they decided to fund Job Point, they would have \$20,000 less in the council reserve fund. Mr. Trapp stated he thought Job Point was asking for the \$21,000 from the FY16 council reserve fund, not FY17. It would not come from this \$44,000. It would come from what they budgeted a year ago for FY16, and they had \$21,000 left in that account. Mr. Skala understood Job Point had asked for \$24,000. Mr. Smith replied they were asking for the remainder whether that was \$21,000 or \$24,000.

Mr. Skala stated he was becoming increasingly concerned with the Council starting out the fiscal year with only a fraction of what was necessary to cover contingencies or items appropriate for the use. It made sense for the money for the cameras to go to the Police Department budget, but it might also make sense to use those funds for requests similar to the request of Job Point. He thought they might want to think about this.

Mayor Treece commented that he thought there was an interesting nexus with the alternative sentencing population Job Point would target.

Ms. Nauser understood the travel and training budget for the Police Department had been reduced about \$64,000 from FY14 to FY17, and believed the community wanted more training for police officers. As a result, she suggested the money saved with regard to the cameras stay within the Police Department for travel and training. She noted they kept asking more of the Police Department while giving them less. She pointed out training was important, especially for police officers and firefighters. She would prefer cuts not occur in travel and training for those departments. She reiterated she would like the money saved by the Police Department on the cameras to be placed in the travel and training budget of the Police Department. Mr. Matthes stated it would be added to the next amendment sheet on the budget. Mr. Thomas asked what would happen if they did not make that amendment. Mr. Skala replied it would go into the general fund reserve account. He stated he believe it was an appropriate use.

Mr. Trapp explained he had been convinced by the staff presentation that next year might be a better target for the paid parental leave amendment he had requested. It involved a lot more money and was more complex than he had anticipated in terms of labor negotiations. He was happy the conversation had started, but next year was a more appropriate time to deal with it.

Mayor Treece stated he thought it was worthwhile to look into it. He noted he had looked at some legislation that had been introduced in Jefferson City that would create a mechanism for employees to have a deduction in their paycheck for that benefit, and the employer could choose to match it. The definition of paid parental leave was any new parent, even for an adoptive parent, or someone taking care of a loved one or parent, etc. He was curious as to who might want to access that benefit, whether they would be willing to pay for part of it if it meant a small deduction, and what the true costs might

involve. He reiterated he thought it was worthwhile bringing back new information on this topic.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he thought the decision made for current staff to help design the COFERS project was a tremendous disservice to the Council, although he felt this reorganization might be good. He stated he wanted to discuss B196-16 as part of the change did not deal with rates. The change to Section 22-262(a)(1) was major, and the proposal would change how they billed sewer to match their historic practice. This did not have anything to do with the rates. It had to do with the ongoing ten year discussion as to how the City should bill, especially with regard to master meters, etc. He did not feel this should have showed up as part of the budget. He understood this very issue was a hot topic at the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure meetings, and he did not believe the Task Force would agree with the historic practice. He suggested the Council divide the question when they got to B196-16 so they could deal with this issue separately and defeat it. He also suggested the Council look into how this became a part of the budget discussion at this time as he was disturbed by it.

Mayor Treece understood the language in question was the definition of a residential user for sanitary sewer. Mr. Clark stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood it would change the definition from a residential user served by one water meter to a residential user individually metered by one water meter. Mr. Clark stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood an apartment complex would be charged one sanitary sewer connection fee as opposed to 430 connection fees if they had 430 units. Mr. Clark replied he thought it would not only impact connection fees, but also base fees on a monthly basis. He admitted he was not an expert on the topic. He believed the master meter issue was technical in nature, but this was about billing with regard to who should be billed for what so there was horizontal equity in terms of the classes of users paying for things. Much of the residential downtown properties were zoned C-2, and much of that had not been individually metered for water, which was tied to sewer. He felt this change meant they would not be able to charge by the dwelling unit, and thought the Task Force should have the opportunity to weigh in on the issue.

Peter Anger stated he had been a local business person for about 30 years in the Columbia area as a professional photographer, and noted he was present to advocate for Columbia Access Television (CAT). He asked the Council to fund it at whatever level they could. He explained he knew it was important as he had made use of the wonderful cultural facility. He believed it was important to the community for different kinds of education and outreach. He reiterated he was advocating for as much money as they could provide to the facility. Columbia was a really wonderful, cultural area, and CAT could help enhance this while being a part of it.

Josh Chittum, 409 N. College Avenue, echoed the statements previously made regarding CAT as it was a vital part of Columbia's cultural community. He found no other organization in Columbia more diverse than CAT. It brought all people together regardless of class, color, or creed for the vital First Amendment right of free speech. He understood funding came from franchise fees, which was intended to go toward public, education, and government (PEG) channels. Of that almost \$600,000, the City of Columbia received approximately \$500,000 while the public channel would receive about \$35,000 in FY17. He understood the City would prefer to keep the money for itself, but asked the Council to increase funding for the people's channel, CAT, as it was the people's voice to get diverse viewpoints out to the public. He thought the only equitable thing to do was to maintain or increase funding for CAT. He implored the Council to at least fund CAT with the proposed \$35,000, but to provide additional funding from the City's over \$40 million budget for the public's First Amendment right.

Pat Holt, 3705 Monterey Drive, reminded the Council that CAT was a good resource for the community and that there was a lot of diversity in terms of the people that utilized its services. She thanked the Council for slightly increasing the funding, and asked that

they provide a little more.

There being no further comment, Mayor Treece continued the public hearing to the September 19, 2016 Council Meeting.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding B196-16. He understood staff was requesting a small wording change to Section 22-262(a)(1) from a residential user being a user of a dwelling unit connected to the City's sanitary sewer system and "served" by one water meter to "individually metered" by one water meter, and asked for the purpose of the wording change. Mr. Matthes replied it closed a small loophole whereby someone with many units and one water meter would get by with paying one sewer charge instead of many sewer charges. Mr. Thomas was confused as he felt it talked about one meter in both situations. Mayor Treece explained his interpretation was that it effectively exempted master metered dwelling units from having to pay this fee. Mr. Johnsen stated staff was really trying to clarify what they currently did, so when they sent a bill out for a sewer charge, it was based upon the water meter. He noted the base charge for sewer services was to cover billing practices. He commented that they sent out one bill based on the water meter along with the base charges for sewer. He explained they were trying to clarify what they did. It did not close any loop. It only clarified the current practice. If the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure wanted to recommend changes, they were free to do so, and changes could be made in the future. He reiterated this change was clarifying that they would charge one base charge to every sewer customer that was served by one water meter.

Mr. Thomas commented that he did not see that it clarified or changed anything as the wording would go from "served by one water meter" to "individually metered by one water meter." Both appeared to say the same thing to him. He understood the reason for the change per Mr. Johnsen was to track the actual cost of billing, and asked if the system actually tracked the cost of billing. He wondered if it tracked the elements of expenditures that were assignable per the water meter, namely the billing process, the reading of the meters, the maintenance of the meters, etc. He asked if those could be pulled out of the budget as a separate component so they could see the associated costs and compare it to the base charge to determine if it was accurately reflected in the base charge. Mr. Johnsen replied the base charges were determined by the cost of service studies. He commented that when they sent a bill with one water meter that had a sewer base charge, it meant the customer was only paying one base charge, which was based upon billing costs for the one bill sent. They did not send out charges for 5-6 base charges under one bill.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding whether staff separately tracked the costs assignable to a single customer or meter. He understood those costs were determined by the cost of service study, and asked if the cost of service study accurately took into account the cost to the utility of reading the meter, sending the bill, maintaining the bill, etc. Mr. Windsor replied yes. Mr. Thomas asked if that information could be provided to the Council. Mr. Windsor replied he could provide the Council the information from the cost of service study. He explained the City did not track the amount of revenue received from base charges and did not only spend that money on things related to customer service that were attributable to the base charge. Mr. Thomas understood the City actually collected more from the base charges to subsidize the cost of the service. Mr. Windsor stated the concept of the base charge was to cover customer related charges. There were multiple charges whereby a portion of the cost was allocated as a customer cost, and this included costs of the Law Department, cost of the Finance Department, etc. Ultimately, they pulled all of that information together to determine whether the base charge was at the cost of service for it. He noted they had gotten to this point in the electric utility. In terms of the water utility, they were only increasing the base charge for residential customers because the last cost of service showed they were below where they should have been. In addition, there had not been a rate increase for water for a couple of years, so they had not had the opportunity to bring it up. He stated water was

not at the cost of service recommended level, and sewer was closer to the cost of service recommended level. This was dependent upon the utility.

Mr. Thomas thought that if the customer charge or base charge was supposed to reflect the customer related costs, staff should be able to demonstrate that was the case by showing what it cost to do those customer related items. He asked staff to provide a description of how the base charge individual customers were charged related to the costs the utility incurred to do the individual customer related work. That would then determine what they charged per unit of water, electricity, etc.

Mr. Thomas stated he still did not understand the wording change in B196-16. Mr. Matthes explained the dwelling unit was most important in that phrase. When they said the dwelling unit was served by one meter, all of the dwellings in an apartment building could be served by one meter. With this wording change, the unit was individually metered by one meter. They were trying to refine the definitions by defining a residential user versus a non-residential user. The change was clarifying one was a residential user if it had an individually metered dwelling unit. Mayor Treece stated he read this differently. A duplex with one water meter would be a residential user served by one water meter, but it would not be individually metered. For a duplex with two water meters, each unit would be individually metered, and therefore be subject to two connection fees and two base charges. A four-plex with one meter would be served by one water meter and would be a residential user. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, and noted it would pay one sewer charge under the current language versus four sewer charges. Mayor Treece noted a four-plex created much more demand with one sewer charge than a duplex with one master meter. He explained this could be magnified by an apartment complex with 400 beds and one master meter. Mr. Windsor pointed out the volume was captured through the commodity charge, and not through the base charge. The purpose of the base charge was to capture the customer related costs unrelated to the amount of use. A four-plex, house, or business could have the same sized meter and the same usage, and under the cost of service analysis, which was a utility standard, there was not any justification for charging the four-plex four base charges when they only had one meter. They were all the same in the view of customer related costs. The commodity was billed on an individual unit basis. Mayor Treece stated he would like to see a comparison of duplexes, four-plexes, 100-unit complexes, etc. so he could see how the volume charge was recovered based on the individually metered financing and billing scheme versus a master meter billing scheme. He noted he wanted to see those based on current charges and those proposed by B196-16. Mr. Windsor stated the practice was the same. They were not changing the practice at all. They were only hoping to make the historic practice more clear.

Mr. Skala understood there was no attempt to change the policy with B196-16, such that they received multiple base fees. It was the same single meter. The volume charge was distributed dependent upon the number of units. This was a change in the language without any process change. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas felt the distinction between residential and non-residential users should be based upon the use of the building rather than the definition in B196-16. They had different uses in the zoning code and asked if a goal could be to adjust the system so billing categories of the utilities reflected the zoning code and the use of the buildings. Mr. Windsor replied there were a number of references, depending on the utility, in the current ordinance that helped define commercial versus residential. It would be a significant undertaking to try to pull all of those together. With the electric utility, there was a specific statement in the ordinances, which indicated residential customers could not receive three-phase service. In many of the older buildings downtown where residential units had been installed, they were actually served by three-phase service, so they were classified as commercial customers even though the usage was residential. He noted there were also issues with the Greek system, retirement homes, etc. He reiterated they could look into it, but it would require a major undertaking to try to redefine

residential and commercial types of operations. In some instances, the structuring of the rates was most important. It was more equitable for a larger building, like a Greek House, with a fairly high demand rate because they did not have the metering to move them down to lower levels. He reiterated it was something they could look into, but it would take some time.

Mr. Thomas understood B199-16 incorporated a two percent rate increase in the cost per kilowatt hour and that the Water and Light Advisory Board had indicated they preferred a one percent rate increase. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas asked for the reasoning behind the recommendation of the Water and Light Advisory Board. Mr. Johnsen replied he had hoped the Board would communicate their reasoning to the Council. It had been a long discussion and there were a lot of different thoughts and processes. He commented that he would hate to represent their final reasoning. Mr. Thomas understood there was time for the Board to communicate to Council before the vote.

Mr. Thomas stated he was concerned about that rate increase because they still did not have a connection fee for the electric utility. When a new customer joined the utility, they incrementally added to the cost of building infrastructure to provide electric service to that building, and there was not any recognition of the additional cost to the utility for that one time infrastructure cost. He understood there had been discussion of an electric line extension policy, and asked for a status on that proposal. Mr. Johnsen replied that had also been discussed at the last Water and Light Board meeting, and they would provide some concrete examples at a future meeting with regard to how it might be applied in terms of determining and recovering costs. Mr. Thomas asked what had happened over the last twelve months when this had first been discussed by the Board. Ms. Thompson replied they had been looking at the various options proposed in terms of whether it was an extension policy or a connection policy. The extension policy was much clearer as it related to a Hancock analysis. They needed more detail on the connection policy, and the facts and figures they had been looking at were somewhat aged. She commented that the Law Department, the Finance Department, and the Utilities Department would all need to work together to determine whether or not it would pass the Hancock analysis. Mr. Thomas asked how it was different from a sewer connection fee from a legal point of view. Ms. Thompson replied the sewer connection fee had been authorized by the voters. Mr. Thomas noted they had been able to increase the sewer connection fee without a vote. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. She explained they had to look at how the charges had initially been established, how they were applied, and how they had been increased over time. They needed to go back to the point of time when the Hancock Amendment was first enacted in terms of what portions of the utility charges were being supplemented by the general fund and what portions were not. She noted it took a rather extensive financial analysis to make the determination.

Mr. Skala commented that he had attended the Water and Light Advisory Board meeting and the result of the conversation was that they were going to bring back the consultant, who was an expert on fees and connection charges, to inform them so they could then make a recommendation to the Council. He thought they were trying to expedite the process by utilizing the consultant in terms of proceeding with an extension fee or connection fee. Ms. Thompson understood they would take the actual figures and apply it to some of the proposals so they could make a determination. The analysis done previously was based upon estimates. They would move forward with testing real numbers.

Mr. Thomas understood the Hancock Amendment was the reason they would have to go to the voters to propose an electric connection fee. Ms. Thompson clarified she had stated they needed to conduct a Hancock analysis on whatever fee was proposed, and they needed more details on what that fee would involve. A Hancock analysis was required for any new fee that might be established. Mr. Thomas understood the Council could increase a fee that had already been established. Ms. Thompson replied that was

correct if the increase was the result of the cost to provide the service. It did not mean it was a cost of service application. For example, if the general fund was subsidizing 25 percent of the costs when the Hancock Amendment had been enacted, it would need to continue to subsidize 25 percent of the costs. They could only charge back 75 percent of the costs. If the Council wanted to increase that percentage to 100 percent, voter approval would be required. Mr. Thomas asked when the Hancock analyses of these options would be completed. Ms. Thompson replied real figures were needed, and once those figures were provided by the Finance Department and the Utilities Department, they would look into it.

Mr. Thomas commented that the cost of running a utility could broadly be divided into three categories. One was the cost of building the infrastructure, and he believed that should be allocated equally by the number of users that connected to the utility so there needed to be a fixed connection fee that accounted for the cost of expanding the system. There should also be a customer related fee that involved the process of reading the meter, billing, etc. for that one customer. In addition, there should be a usage fee. He thought they could simplify this and make it fairer.

Mr. Thomas stated he would miss the next council meeting as he had an unavoidable work commitment, so he would not be voting on the bills, but wanted to share his recommendations. He noted he was not happy about supporting a two percent rate increase when there was not a charge for a new customer to help pay for their share of the very expensive one-time infrastructure cost. He had asked that another \$25,000 be found, and understood that had been interpreted to be another \$10,000 from the council reserve fund. He believed CAT should receive \$50,000 per year from the City as they were in peril of not being able to provide services otherwise. He also felt they should be funded from the regular budget and not the council reserve fund as had been done for many years previously when it had been funded by a part of the cable franchise fee. The City continued to receive the cable franchise fee, but allocated it differently. He stated he would support the \$35,000 for FY17, which appeared to be a consensus of the Council, but would try to build support to move the annual payment to CAT into the regular budget for the public broadcasting service and access to the television system to lots of people.

PH30-16

Construction of the Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road intersection improvement project.

PH30-16 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols and Bob Gilbert of Bartlett and West, the consultant for this project, provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked if the City had the necessary easements for the roundabout. Mr. Nichols replied the City did not have the easements for either the roundabout or the traffic signal project. Council would need to direct staff at a later date to acquire any necessary easements.

Ms. Nauser understood the estimated cost for the roundabout and traffic signal was \$958,000 and \$775,000, respectively, and asked if that included the cost to widen of Forum Boulevard from Green Meadows Road to Nifong Boulevard. Mr. Nichols replied it did not, and noted that would need to be analyzed as tapering to two lanes to the south might be necessary.

Ms. Nauser asked if there was any accident data from the roundabout that had been recently installed at Range Line Street, as this was somewhat similar. Mr. Stone replied there had been three collisions on June 2, June 3, and June 17, and one had been an injury collision. There had not been another accident since then.

Ms. Nauser asked if there was any accident data for the Forum Boulevard and Nifong Boulevard intersection. Mr. Stone replied he did not have that data, but could look it up and provide it at a later date.

Ms. Nauser commented that staff had shown videos of people driving relatively fast, at least over 40 mph, but the speed limit on Forum Boulevard at Green Meadows Road was

35 mph. As a result, she was not sure it was an apples to apples comparison. Mr. Stone explained they were mistakes made by people. Mr. Nichols pointed out that not everyone drove the speed limit.

Ms. Nauser asked if any consideration had been made for the people that traveled out of Woodrail Avenue in terms of a roundabout versus a traffic signal, or people coming from Club Village Drive and going north on Forum Boulevard. It was difficult today with the four-way stop even when it was not at peak traffic times. She was concerned it would be more difficult for people accessing Forum Boulevard to find a gap since people would be traveling at a steadier pace through a roundabout. Mr. Stone replied that had not specifically been analyzed.

Mr. Skala commented that he generally liked roundabouts as he thought they worked fairly well. He noted traffic conflicts had been shown for the four-way stop and the roundabout, but they had not been shown for a signalized intersection, and asked for clarification. Mr. Gilbert replied there was no change in the number of conflict points between a signal or stop controlled intersection. Mr. Skala asked if a signalized intersection reduced the number of conflicts even with the same number of conflict points. Mr. Gilbert replied no. He explained any of those 40 conflict points were possible at a signal. The difference was that severity increased with a signalized intersection over a four-way stop because the speeds were higher.

Mr. Skala noted some roundabouts had acute angles, and some people tended to speed up if they were taking a short right turn onto another road instead of yielding to those in the roundabout. He commented that the problem with the one on Range Line Street was that there was a blind spot for those traveling west bound on I-70 when entering the roundabout. They had very little time to decide whether to enter the roundabout or acknowledge the traffic that was coming. He explained a lot had to do with the design, and this roundabout design appeared to be straightforward.

Mr. Gilbert pointed out the conflict diagrams showed the number of conflict points on this specific partial dual lane roundabout. A single lane roundabout would have a different number of conflict points. He also noted that in proper roundabout design, approach speeds were adhered to due to the physical deflections they put into the curvature of the curbs. For example, the edge of the curb was actually coming in toward the center of the roadway for the north leg on Forum Boulevard because they wanted to introduce more horizontal deflection so drivers were made to slow down. The dogbone roundabouts designed by MoDOT had less deflection because of the dogbone nature, and it could lead to people not slowing down enough. He pointed out the roundabout also had to be designed to accommodate large vehicles, so the geometry, when roads were skewed, created problems to push large vehicles through, which led to larger, free flowing radii that allowed people to shoot a gap fairly fast. In those situations, they tended to install raised outer aprons to help direct passenger traffic to a slower and more deflected path. The Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road roundabout design was very square so the typical concerns of speeds entering the roundabout was easier to take care of with plain and simple roundabout design.

Mr. Ruffin asked if they had spoken with the Green Meadows Pre-School to see how this would impact them. Mr. Gilbert replied yes. He explained they had attended the interested parties meeting, and the City would need to continue working with them to accommodate their needs once a decision was made as to what project would be constructed.

Mr. Thomas commented that he thought it was particularly important to emphasize the safety benefits of a roundabout over a signalized intersection because the roundabout created a design speed approach and was consistent with a Vision Zero approach where safety was the highest priority. They wanted to ensure people could make mistakes without causing fatal or serious injuries. He stated he was always interested in the delay at intersections to judge how important it was to upgrade an intersection so it processed traffic more quickly. He asked staff to walk through the methodology of the Synchro

system in calculating the 46 second delay. He wanted to know the input data and how it was treated to come up with the average at peak hour. Mr. Stone explained Synchro was software created by Trafficware, a company that created the modeling program, and it was considered the national standard and was best suited for all-way stops and signalized locations. The bones within the program were based upon a highway capacity manual, which had been around for about 50 years. It utilized equations to mimic what happened in real life based on research done by universities. Mr. Thomas understood the input data was the actual traffic counts during that peak hour in January, and asked if it was only the number of vehicles during that hour. Mr. Stone replied a lot of the volume was based on that. He noted approach speeds and intersections nearby were involved in the analysis, but it mostly based on volume. He explained they recounted the intersection last week during the peak hour, and the numbers were similar. There had been about 200 more vehicles in the evening peak and 50 more vehicles in the morning peak. The traffic count was a snapshot in time, and as long as they did not pick a day with a large snow event or a no school day, it would generally represent what occurred at the intersection. Mr. Thomas asked staff if they were confident with the average delay of 46 seconds during the peak hour. Mr. Stone replied yes. He pointed out it would not be 46 seconds per car as it was an average delay. Someone might only have a 20 second delay, but another person might have a 90 second delay.

Mr. Thomas noted staff had shown a simulation of the roundabout and asked if that included the same peak hour number of vehicles and if an estimated delay could be determined per vehicle during the peak hour. Mr. Gilbert replied the simulator mathematically provided the delay for the roundabout, and it was at 9 seconds. The signal was at 22 seconds.

Mr. Thomas understood the cost estimate had increased from about \$600,000 to almost \$1 million, and asked for clarification. Mr. Nichols replied that had been the planning number in 2014, and the City had experienced higher costs lately. It would depend on the time of year the project was bid. It tended to cost less during the winter months. The larger estimate was a worst case scenario. He noted they did not know about right-of-way at this time. He explained they were experiencing some savings in some of the projects for the current ballot. They were also anticipating the receipt of Missouri Moves money for one or two of their projects, although nothing had yet been confirmed. Mr. Thomas asked for clarification on the theme of the Missouri Moves program. Mr. Nichols replied there had been six criteria and Columbia had weighted well.

Mayor Treece commented that if roundabouts were meant to keep traffic moving, it appeared as though they were forcing pedestrians to go out of their way to get to a crosswalk to get across the intersection. He asked for clarification on pedestrian safety and whether it was optimum given where the sidewalks were located and where people would likely walk. Mr. Stone replied roundabouts tended to be much safer for pedestrians, especially since a roundabout required looking in one direction. Cars were coming at the pedestrian from one direction, and the pedestrian would cross to a median island and then look in the other direction. An all-way stop or signal location required pedestrians to look in all directions. He commented that although the crosswalks were a little further out with a roundabout, pedestrians would utilize the haven because the circulating roadway had vehicles traveling on them.

Ms. Nauser asked for the difference in construction delays if they moved forward with the roundabout or the traffic signal. She wondered how traffic would be diverted to construct the roundabout. She felt there would likely be less disruption with a traffic signal. Mr. Gilbert replied they were not at a point in the design whereby they could say exactly how they would phase the roundabout construction in terms of time and delays. A factor in that determination for a traffic signal would depend on how the project was built in terms of how much of the existing pavement could remain, etc. Mr. Nichols pointed out the offset of the roundabout would possibly allow the use of existing lanes. He explained those issues had been discussed and factored into the estimated project costs. They

did not plan to close the intersection while it was under construction. Mr. Gilbert stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser asked if flashing signals would be located at the crosswalks regardless of whether a roundabout or traffic signal was constructed. Mr. Stone replied there was currently not a proposal to put in any kind of device with the crossings for the roundabout. They could pursue rapid rectangular flashing beacons or a HAWK in the future if it was deemed necessary, but they did not anticipate a need at this time. Ms. Nauser thought it might be needed due to the daycare and the fact there were quite a few pedestrians in the area. She stated she would like some visual to be provided regardless of which proposal was approved. Mr. Stone explained the Council could direct staff to include it, and noted the cost for rapid rectangular flashing beacons was about \$15,000-\$20,000. Mr. Thomas explained in his experience with roundabouts, vehicles were slowing down due to the deflections and would stop for the pedestrian to cross.

Mr. Skala commented that there was a history of building roundabouts in different configurations in Columbia and also for these roundabouts to be built by different governmental jurisdictions. Some of the roundabout configurations were simple, some had acute angles, some were perpendicular, etc. He asked about the history of the comfort level people had with roundabouts. He wondered if there were spikes in the number of difficulties early on or if it was more than some could handle. Mr. Gilbert replied, anecdotally, there was a short period of time for people to get used to it, and noted he recalled an instance of people driving the wrong direction during the first few days in a circular roundabout. He believed the problems associated with roundabouts corrected themselves very quickly. He pointed out the decision-making for this proposed layout was very simple compared to a full double lane roundabout. It was similar to choosing which lane to enter at an interchange. He reiterated he thought this particular layout was simple to navigate.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Tim Vicente, 1303 Torrey Pines Drive, provided a handout and stated he did not feel all roundabouts were created equally. He did not believe those that thought roundabouts were great had experienced roundabouts in residential areas or at an intersection of a four lane divided road and a two lane road. He noted he had been told the roundabout at Highway WW and Rolling Hills Road was similar as it involved four lane and two lane roadways, but there were not any homes nearby or much traffic. He thought it was likely built with the idea that it would have lots of traffic once the area developed. He understood the City of Columbia managed 21 roundabouts, MoDOT managed six roundabouts, and Boone County managed two roundabouts, so even though a lot of different roundabouts had been built over time, there was not any data for a roundabout involving a four lane divided road and a two lane road. He wondered if the proposed roundabout was big enough or if there would be enough land for it. He did not want to squeeze in the roundabout within the parameters of the existing buildings. He explained he had been provided the traffic count information, but noted there had not been a study of historic traffic patterns indicating a roundabout was necessary. He wondered about the parameters for deciding whether a four-way stop, a traffic signal, or a roundabout was needed. Based on the accident information provided, he felt every traffic signal needed to be changed to a roundabout, and noted they had managed to live through traffic signals for years. He understood the manual traffic count had been taken on January 21st and the high was 26 degrees while the low was 20 degrees, but there was really no other information with regard to traffic counts. He noted 35 percent of the traffic from the Country Club of Missouri going south on Forum Boulevard turned left at Green Meadows in the morning, and 77 percent of the traffic from Green Meadows Road turned right on to Forum Boulevard while 83 percent of the traffic going north on Forum Boulevard went straight through the intersection. He felt this would create a major conflict point for the roundabout and could cause a delay for those turning right due to all of the people going straight through. He thought a roundabout might work if everyone was respectful, but

noted staff had received many complaints of drivers not coming to a complete stop in order to beat the other vehicles into the intersection and had indicated it was difficult for pedestrians to cross when there were six vehicles in the intersection. He felt it would not take long for people on Forum Boulevard to realize they could beat others to the roundabout, which he believed could create problems. He described the traffic patterns during the lunch period and the evening peak time, and indicated it was similar to the morning traffic patterns. He stated he was not sure \$975,000 needed to be spent for a 46 second delay. He commented that the Institute of Highway Safety had indicated that roundabouts should not be used at intersections with highly unbalanced traffic flows, i.e. high traffic volumes on the main street and light traffic volumes on side streets. He believed they had that situation at this location and explained his reasoning. He suggested installing a right turn lane from Green Meadows Road to northbound Forum Boulevard and a left turn lane from southbound Forum Boulevard to Green Meadows Road. He did not believe other intersection improvements were needed at a cost of over \$770,000. He also suggested traffic lights with correct sensors to keep traffic moving on Forum Boulevard and for it to only activate to allow movements at Green Meadows Road when a vehicle was at that intersection. He asked those from his neighborhood to stand, and approximately 25 people stood.

Eleanore Wickersham, 3632 Augusta Drive, explained her house was located at the Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road intersection, and stated she did not believe there would be gap in the traffic unlike what had been shown in the schematic. Those trying to get out of the Country Club Villas would be trapped, particularly during the busy times of the day. She commented that the trouble with the intersection was that people could not see when it was their turn to go. She suggested the installation of simple traffic lights so they would know when to stop and go. She noted she had used roundabouts and liked them in some places, but had concerns about the double roundabout. Anyone traveling southbound on Forum Boulevard that wanted to go east on Green Meadows Road would have to get into outside lane, which meant cutting across and changing lanes if they were in the inner lane, and she believed this could be difficult. If they were unable to get into the correct lane, they would have to continue to go around the roundabout until they were able to safely change lanes wasting gas. She stated she felt the proposed signage was very confusing as well, and would be unsure as to what to do if she came upon it. She commented that she was also disturbed by this process as she felt those most affected should have been contacted first so they could have identified what they felt were problems and solutions prior to spending money on consultants and surveyors because staff was now trying to convince them to support what they felt was appropriate.

Pat Borgmeyer-Schwartz, 1208 Torrey Pines Drive, provided a handout and stated she did not support the proposed intersection improvements. She explained she was not opposed to roundabouts and had driven numerous single lane roundabouts in Columbia without any problems navigating them, but she considered the roundabout plan for the Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road intersection to be dangerous, especially for those on Green Meadows Road. The only reason she was able to turn left from Green Meadows Road on to Forum Boulevard at peak times was if drivers observed the current stop signs. She stated she had studied the plan diagram for the roundabout and found that drivers on Green Meadows Road would have to cross two lanes to turn left and four lanes to go straight. She believed this would be impossible during peak hours so drivers on Green Meadows Road would be trapped. She also wondered how parents of children at the Green Meadows Pre-School would safely drop off or pick up their children. She asked the City to reconsider the roundabout, and to either keep the stop signs, install traffic lights at the intersection, or find a way to provide drivers on Green Meadows Road the right of way. She understood it was hard to keep traffic moving on Forum Boulevard and this would benefit the drivers on Forum Boulevard, but she believed drivers on Forum Boulevard already felt they had the right of way and often did not stop or hurried through the stop sign, ignoring those drivers trying to enter from Green Meadows Road. She

encouraged the Council and staff to try to enter that intersection from Green Meadows Road during peak times so they could see the issues. She explained she believed engineers planned the roadways for what they felt was most appropriate for moving traffic and would not change their designs until someone died. She stated her father was killed on I-70 in 1982 when a driver crossed the undivided four lane highway, and a year later a cement wall had been erected. In addition, when it had been difficult to get in and out of the new Hyvee on West Broadway, a traffic light had not been erected until a woman died. She hoped the Council would reconsider the plans for a roundabout at the Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road intersection, and asked that those that had to cross Forum Boulevard from Green Meadows Road not be treated as guinea pigs. She reiterated her request to keep the stop signs, install traffic lights, or provide those on Green Meadows Road the right of way.

John John, 33 E. Broadway, explained he owned property in the area and believed the problem with the proposed intersection improvement was the imbalance. Only 700 cars came from the west while 14,000 cars went through the intersection, so less than five percent of the traffic came from the west. Another issue was the pulsing of the traffic lights. It was difficult for anyone on Doral Drive, Crestwood Lane, Woodrail Avenue, Canterbury Drive, Club Village Drive, or Scottson Way to get out because there was not any pulsing. Traffic lights created a pulse, vacuum, or void that allowed people to get through. He commented that he lived in the Grasslands so he could get downtown almost any day because there was pulsing at Stadium Boulevard, Rollins Street, and Stewart Road, creating voids to allow him to get out on to Providence Road. He noted it would be difficult for the 700 cars on the west side because 14,000 cars traveled on Forum Boulevard and were either continuing northbound, southbound, or coming from Green Meadows Road and turning south. In the morning and the evening, a car was coming through every two seconds. It was not enough time for people to sit, wait, and think since traffic was coming from all directions. He explained he had voted against the first roundabout, but liked it after it had been built, so he was not against roundabouts. He just thought a traffic signal might be better for this location since it would allow for pulsing to enable people on the side streets to get out. In addition, if this intersection became too dangerous, he was concerned traffic would move to Doral Drive, which was an unprotected intersection. Although roundabouts were great, he did not feel they should be installed everywhere and he did not feel one should be located at this intersection.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. John if his preferred solution would be a traffic signal at this intersection. Mr. John replied he thought a very simple traffic signal would be better. He pointed out the roundabout would keep Forum Boulevard flowing better, but as Forum Boulevard flowed better, people would move to Forum Boulevard creating more traffic and increasing the imbalance. He thought a light with four lanes all of the way down was the right solution.

Richard Shannon stated he lived on Green Meadows Road and had moved to Columbia about a year ago. He noted he was surprised the underlying assumption was that the City would continue to allow people to break the law at the current intersection. Green Meadows Road was posted as a 30 mph road, and he saw people going 45 mph on it. He did not want to see anything that would increase traffic on Green Meadows Road as it was in a residential neighborhood. He commented that the intersection of Nifong Boulevard and Sinclair Road had a four-way stop, and explained four-way stops did not work if there was a tremendous imbalance between traffic on a side street and a main road. He suggested a flashing yellow on Forum Boulevard and a flashing red on Green Meadows Road along with speed tables or speed bumps to slow people down. He would prefer the City hire a few more police officers than to proceed with the proposed intersection improvement as he understood the traffic division had been eliminated. In one year, he had only seen three people pulled over to the side of the road. He commented that the speeds people drove on City streets was excessive. He also felt

money was being spent on new construction, and noted holes on the bridge on Grindstone Parkway at Route 63 as well as the holes at the intersection of Green Meadows Road and Providence Road needed attention. He would rather see the City maintain existing roadways, install speed bumps to slow people, and have a police officer nearby during peak hours. He stated he was not in favor of a roundabout.

John Kruse, 5 Lucerne Court, commented that he was concerned for pedestrians with the roundabout option. He saw the traffic flow diagram, but noted it did not include anyone trying to cross the street. He stated a lot of people in the area walked and biked, and he did not feel traffic would stop with a roundabout. He suggested the Council look at the flow of the roundabout near the Dunkin Donuts as it was similar to a speedway at times whereby drivers accelerated when coming around the curve. He reviewed the information provided by staff and noted he did not have faith in the study by the Transportation Research Board, which included 23 observations across seven states in three situations. He commented that his studies involving the locking of dams on the Mississippi River included 750,000 observations. He was not sure there would be that many observations for roundabouts, but felt the study provided anecdotal information at best. He suggested they study the 21 roundabouts in Columbia to determine how they performed prior to moving forward. He believed a stop light would work better in this location.

Jerry Murrell explained he lived on Torrey Pines and read an e-mail from one of his neighbors, Bob Pugh, which reflected how many of them felt. He noted Mr. Pugh had indicated he understood the major justification for the roundabout was to move traffic through the intersection at the prime afternoon drive time. He went on to say he did not recall the backlog time quoted by the City, but it did not appear to be onerous, especially compared to Providence Road and Stadium Boulevard. In addition, assuming a high percentage of traffic moving through the intersection proceeded straight through to Forum Boulevard and Nifong Boulevard, that traffic was immediately squeezed into one lane and then encountered traffic signals. He believed traffic would be backed up to the roundabout. He thought traffic flow would likely improve in the morning assuming traffic proceeding on Forum Boulevard through the roundabout received relief by the flow of one lane to a two lane roadway. The geometry of the intersection with a two lane collector street crossing a four lane divided arterial street did not make sense, and a roundabout designed to accommodate this geometry would require quite a bit of land. The roundabout would add to the impermeable surface for little or no benefit. He also felt it would be much harder to walk across the intersection regardless of the direction. Presently all traffic should come to a stop. He believed the money could be better spent on bigger problems than this intersection. Mr. Murrell stated he agreed with Mr. Pugh and felt a traffic light would be a far better solution for their neighborhood.

Tracy Wilson-Kleekamp noted she was with the Greenbriar Trailridge Neighborhood Association and explained this felt piecemealed to her. She commented that she was prone to get upset when she was at the light at Providence Road and Green Meadows Road as the timing was off, and she felt the timing was off with a lot of lights. The entire area consisting of Stadium Boulevard, Forum Boulevard, Green Meadows Road, and Providence Road did not appear to work. She stated she was used to driving in Los Angeles and did not feel they had a fraction of the traffic delay and build up as they had in Columbia. She explained she was having a hard time with the roundabout, but was trying to be open. She reiterated she believed there was a problem with the way traffic flowed and that this would add an impediment. She understood the neighbors preferred a traffic signal. She reiterated there was not only a problem at this intersection. She believed the lights should have sensors and not be timed, and felt they needed 21st century technology so they moved better. She noted this was too much money to spend on another piecemeal project.

Taylor Duchmann, 3601 Scottson Way, described the location of his property, and explained the concerns mentioned previously were his concerns as well. He stated he had three kids that liked to walk around the neighborhood, and noted he would not take

them across the roundabout. He commented that the traffic flow on Forum Boulevard was a problem from Stadium Boulevard to Nifong Boulevard. If the speeds increased due to the proposed intersection improvements, he thought it would cause more problems at Crestwood Lane, Wilson's Total Fitness, etc. He stated he was also concerned about the loss of trees, and pointed out the houses on Scottson Way sat down so they would literally look out their windows and see the roundabout or traffic light.

Mayor Treece asked how often during the day the traffic on Forum Boulevard was a problem. Mr. Duchmann replied it was a problem for 30-45 minutes in the morning and in the evening. It was not an all-day problem. He commented that he liked roundabouts because they were faster and more convenient, but he did not feel one would work in this residential area. The only reason they had a problem was because people were using Forum Boulevard as a thoroughfare. People were traveling along it instead of Providence Road because they did not want to wait for the lights at Providence Road since they were not well timed. He stated he had been on the fence with regard to this issue, but he was not in favor of a roundabout or a traffic light at this intersection now. He thought traffic enforcement was needed instead. He suggested a police officer be assigned to the area for 30 minutes in the morning and evening peak times as that would solve most of the problems.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he thought the previous speakers had done a good job of demolishing this project. He wondered how this project had even gotten on the sales tax ballot. He agreed with Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp in that they needed to get away from piecemeal projects. He understood staff felt they needed to move forward with the project list that had been voted one by the people. He also understood staff was trying to take a proactive approach, but felt it was being done in a piecemeal way. He commented that he did not believe the City had much left in the sales tax budget and did not feel it made sense to move forward with this project. He suggested they use some of this money to conduct a large-scale south or southwest area traffic study. He recommended the City hire CBB as they had conducted a similar study for the northeast area for Boone County. This would provide a better view of how all of the roads interacted or would interact over a period of time. He did not feel City staff had the time, energy, or expertise to do this kind of study. He noted this type of study could then be the basis for setting priorities for future projects. He asked the Council to reject the proposed intersection improvements and to spend money on a broad area traffic study looking 20 years out.

Ted Boehm, 1108 Vintage Drive, commented that he was present to support the proposed roundabout at the Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road intersection. He thought the Public Works Department had done its homework and had answered all of the concerns pertaining to the proposed roundabout in the report given to the Council on August 1, 2016. There were several good points in the report, to include traffic control and safety. He thought the statistics from the Transportation Research Board needed to be repeated, and stated that following the conversion of 23 intersections from four-way stops and signaled intersections to roundabouts, the study found there was a 40 percent decrease in crashes and an 80 percent reduction in injury auto crashes. He felt this should be about improving traffic flow and safety at the intersection versus the ability to cross Forum Boulevard. He asked the Council to upgrade this intersection by constructing the safest traffic control plan available to them, which he believed was the roundabout.

Virginia Farquhar explained she lived at the corner of Green Meadows Road and Oak Lawn Drive, and stated she was opposed to a roundabout at Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road. She noted the article in the Columbia Daily Tribune had indicated it took approximately 45 seconds for each of the approximately 1,700 cars to go through the intersection between 4:45 p.m. and 5:30 p.m. She assumed the same was true in the morning. If this were a 24 hour a day, seven day a week problem, she could see the merits of a roundabout, but it was only a problem for a few hours in the morning and the

evening. The traffic flow was okay otherwise. She commented that she was more inconvenienced trying to back out of her driveway due to traffic coming from the east and west with cars turning off of Lynnwood Drive, Godfrey Drive, Oak Lawn Drive, Canterbury Drive, Belle Meade Drive, and Scottson Way. She sometimes had to sit in her driveway for a couple of minutes in order to back out. She noted she had been honked at, had cars ride her bumper for blocks, and had been given the finger when backing out. With the constant traffic flow of a roundabout, she might never be able to get out of her driveway. The trouble with traffic flow was not at the Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road intersection, but at the stop lights at Green Meadows Road and Providence Road, and Forum Boulevard and Nifong Boulevard. Traffic was backed up at both locations and sometimes took 2-3 light changes to get through, and each light change was approximately 2-3 minutes long. She wondered if it was worth spending \$958,000 to appease the approximately 1,700 people who did not have the patience to wait 45 seconds to get through the intersection, and stated the roundabout would not solve the problem until the stop lights at Green Meadows Road and Providence Road, and Forum Boulevard and Nifong Boulevard were changed to alleviate backed up traffic. She commented that she felt an ugly concrete roundabout would destroy the aesthetics of this neighborhood intersection. She thanked the Council for its careful consideration to not build the roundabout, and suggested the money be used to repair streets instead as there were many in need of repair.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, explained he traveled the intersection and recalled how difficult it was to get through when he was younger. He noted he now traveled it at times when there was less traffic, and stated it was sometimes difficult to know who had to go first. He suggested the need to look at stop lights with sensors throughout the entire community as there were many times he wasted fuel sitting at lights when no one was in sight. He recommended the City not proceed with a roundabout at this time.

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

Mr. Skala understood one of the reasons for the traffic flow problems was due to the fact the City did not have absolute control over all of the stop lights. Although the City might have 21st century technology with sensors, MoDOT tended to have 20th century technology when it came to some of the timing issues the City had to accommodate. He asked if it was correct that the City could ask about traffic flow issues and make recommendations, but did not have the capacity to make changes. Mr. Stone replied City staff worked closely with MoDOT to try move traffic. They did the best they could, but there were 60 seconds in a minute, and it had to be divided based upon traffic flow so Providence Road would receive more time than Green Meadows Road. There was limited capacity at Nifong Boulevard and Forum Boulevard because the number of lanes was not what it likely should be in order to move traffic, and there was a project for the future to improve that situation. He stated the City did not have control over MoDOT's timing directly.

Ms. Peters asked if the City had a traffic plan for the southwest area of Columbia. She understood they had already decided to not do the roundabout at Fairview Road and Chapel Hill Road, and thought that project was recommended to allow them to move forward with the expansion on Nifong Boulevard. She agreed it seemed to be piecemeal, but noted she was not sure it was as piecemeal as they thought. Mr. Stone explained CATSO was the governing agency for transportation improvements, and included in it was a model that generally showed how traffic would flow around the City. It was a macroscopic model of how traffic moved around the City or would move as it grew. It was based on projected development and other planning documents. That guided where they thought improvements should occur in the future, and it was updated every five years. All of those factors along with observations in the field went into what staff recommended. He pointed out it took time to place a project on the CIP ballot initiative, and was normally generated by someone that had concerns. He reiterated the guiding force was the

CATSO Transportation Plan. Ms. Peters asked if that had been looked at, and if this was the recommendation. Mr. Matthes replied CATSO had been in existence for decades and representation included the City, the County, and MoDOT. The main purpose of CATSO was to achieve a level where the federal government was willing to fund projects. He explained there was a technical board and a non-technical board associated with CATSO and he was on the non-technical board.

Mr. Ruffin stated he had reviewed the information prior to the meeting and had been persuaded that the roundabout was a feasible option. He commended staff for what he considered the best presentation he had seen in his year on the City Council. He asked what would be required to obtain easements to accommodate the size of the roundabout and for clarification on the comment made by the public indicating traffic would back up to the roundabout from the traffic signal at Forum Boulevard and Nifong Boulevard. Mr. Gilbert replied a small amount of right-of-way taking would be required at all four quadrants. They had tried to balance the location of this proposal such that it created the least impact on neighboring properties. At the time of the interested parties meeting and previous conversations, he thought they had all four quadrants accepting of the roundabout being a good solution. The next steps would be to take this into further design and ask the Council for approval to acquire those easements or rights-of-way. Mr. Ruffin explained the reason he had asked the question was because the document from Green Meadows Pre-School seemed to suggest they would lose about ten feet of their property in order to accommodate the roundabout. Mr. Gilbert stated the dimensions changed because they were on a curve, but the largest gap between the existing right-of-way line and the proposed right-of-way line was in the ten foot range at the thickest part of moon shaped area. Mr. Stone explained they had a planned improvement project for Nifong Boulevard that would accommodate higher flows at its intersection with Forum Boulevard. In the interim, staff would need to monitor it to ensure there was not queuing. Mr. Ruffin understood that improvement was not a part of this project. Mr. Stone stated that was correct and noted it was slated for 2020 or 2021. Mr. Nichols pointed out Council was considering an amendment with regard to project year.

Ms. Nauser stated she had lived in this area for ten years so she was familiar with the intersection. People did not know how to stop at the four-way intersection and be courteous to others. It was difficult to get through the intersection, and was worse during peak hours. She felt they had a case of over-engineering at this intersection. In her mind, this was a neighborhood. She was a firm advocate for roundabouts, but felt most were located in commercial areas. This roundabout would allow thousands of vehicles to go through without having to stop. There would not be a pause in the traffic as pointed out by Mr. John, and that would create severe difficulty for people trying to enter Forum Boulevard from neighborhood streets. She noted it was already difficult to make a left from Club Village Drive to go north on Forum Boulevard because there was not enough space in the traffic. She believed a roundabout would make this problem worse, and create a situation whereby people took more dangerous attempts when turning left. She stated she believed a traffic signal would solve the current problems while offering a good solution for the future. She commented that she did not agree with the statements indicating they did not plan as she felt this last CIP ballot issue had a lot of thoughtful planning for southwest Columbia and listed some of those projects. She believed a traffic signal here would alleviate the concerns of the residents that lived in the area, address the needs for good traffic flow, and allow the coordination of traffic signals along Forum Boulevard. She stated she would support a traffic signal, but would not support a roundabout at this location.

Mr. Thomas commented that he believed safety was the number one priority in designing and operating any transportation system, and felt the evidence was clear that a traffic signal was much more unsafe than a roundabout as long as the roundabout was well designed. The design of a roundabout with horizontal deflection and the narrowing of lanes to an appropriate level was effective at slowing down traffic to an approach speed of

about 15-20 mph, and at that speed, any collision would be relatively minor and collisions were less likely to occur because drivers would be able to avert a collision since they were going slower. In addition, it was safer for pedestrians based on his experience and his reading about pedestrian safety. He stated he would not support a traffic signal as they had seen the results of mistakes at traffic signals. He noted mistakes in a roundabout were less severe. He thought the roundabout was a good design and this was an appropriate place for a roundabout. He stated he did not think the roundabout at Rollins Road and Fairview Road was at an appropriate location because there was not enough right-of-way. In addition, the inability to place a vertical barrier at the center of the roundabout was a serious flaw. This one would have a vertical barrier in the center with an apron. He reiterated he thought it was a good design, would be safe, and would increase traffic flow, but noted he would not support it. He stated he would not support a proposal that had such strong opposition. If they wanted to install a roundabout, they would need to do a better job of making the case to the public at-large, and especially to the people that lived closest to it. He commented that he would side with those speakers that had indicated a delay of 46 seconds for vehicles during a one hour period in the afternoon was not an adequate reason to spend nearly \$1 million. He was happy they had analyzed the delay. If they left it at a four-way stop, with which he was very comfortable, he hoped they would continue to model that delay for measurements. It had been stated that traffic was increasing in the area, but he was not sure that was the case. He believed they should invest this \$1 million to improve the bus system and create better alternatives to driving as that was the more inexpensive and efficient way to solve traffic problems in the long run. He commented that they had been concerned about a 46 second delay for an hour during the day, but if someone missed a bus with the current system, they would have to wait 46 minutes for another bus during the peak time or 90 minutes during the off-peak time. The bus system was dramatically underfunded compared to other cities and the level of service provided to car drivers. He stated he would vote against the traffic signal and the roundabout.

Mr. Skala commented that he was reluctant to reject the advice of staff, but noted he was not as convinced as Mr. Thomas was with regard to some of the safety issues. He understood the traffic flow was unbalanced at this intersection, and therefore, believed it needed a different solution than the roundabout solution would provide. He thought they might be endangering pedestrians because his experience, even with single lane roundabouts, was that people would speed up at the roundabout instead of slowing down. He agreed a solution was needed at this location, and suggested a limited approach to a signalized intersection that reflected the traffic flow as it would serve the purpose better than a roundabout. He stated he would vote against the roundabout.

Mr. Ruffin stated he thought installing only a signal was insufficient and believed the entire intersection needed to be redesigned in addition to installing a light. He understood someone had referenced the possibility of a left turn and right turn lane, and felt something more needed to be done to increase safety and make it more efficient.

Mr. Trapp commented that he found the staff presentation compelling. He thought there was clear data that they needed to make a change and that a change to a light would improve the traffic flow situation, but would greatly increase the risk factor. If they were going to look toward a Vision Zero approach, it would demand a roundabout. There was a 40 percent decrease in crashes, 80 percent decrease in injury crashes, and 90 percent decrease in fatality crashes. He stated he would not support a signal as he did not believe that was a step forward. He thought they should improve the roundabout. He understood it would cost \$958,000, but noted the signal would cost \$775,000. It was nearly the same amount of money, and it would not be long before the signalized solution was the more expensive option due to maintenance requirements. Roundabouts did not require that ongoing electricity and signalization equipment. He pointed out they had carefully thought out, discussed, and vetted projects to place on the list they had taken to the voters, and had won the support of the vast majority of the voters. If they continued

to vote down project after project that had been listed, it would hurt their credibility with the electorate and their ability to pass future ballot initiatives to meet critical needs because they would question the Council's ability to follow through on what had been promised. He reiterated staff had made a compelling case, and noted he planned to support the roundabout.

Ms. Peters agreed the presentation by staff was very good, and noted she had planned to support the roundabout until they had been provided public comment. She stated that although she agreed with Mr. Trapp that they had included certain projects on the CIP list, she felt moving forward with those projects was based on whether they were appropriate with more analysis. When looking at the traffic patterns, she agreed with Ms. Nauser that a signalized intersection might be better than a roundabout. In addition, she did not feel they were not following through with what they had told the citizens they would do.

Mayor Treece stated he agreed a roundabout would change the complexion of the neighborhood. He also felt it was too much money to what amounted to a minimum inconvenience and interruption. He thought they could better align the precious budget with the citizen satisfaction survey that wanted more street maintenance. He believed there was better widespread use for these dollars.

Ms. Nauser agreed with the concern of not moving forward with projects on the ballot initiative, and explained she had not intended to remove the project. Her intent was to not construct a roundabout. She still wanted to follow through with intersection improvements, which was what the voters had approved. She did not intend to use this money for street maintenance, buses, or anything else. She believed this money should go to this intersection for an appropriate improvement.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for an appropriately engineered traffic signal for the Green Meadows Road and Forum Boulevard intersection. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought there were unacceptable safety risks with a signal.

Mr. Thomas explained he agreed with Mr. Trapp, and noted he believed the negative impacts to the neighborhood would actually be greater with a signal than a roundabout. When the light was green on Forum Boulevard, cars would whip up and down breaking the speed limit. The only way to control speed was with design, and a properly designed roundabout would control the speed extremely well. He stated he would oppose this motion.

Mayor Treece commented that he would rather see some lower intervention solutions, such as a left turn lane or a right turn lane, or other intersection improvement that could provide some additional safety and pedestrian access. Mr. Skala understood a left turn lane would require some sort of signalized intersection. Mr. Thomas asked Mayor Treece what problem he was trying to solve. Mayor Treece replied he was not trying to solve any problem, and that he was only trying to keep the promise of intersection improvements because 46 seconds was apparently too long to wait. He wondered if they could stack traffic at a right turn lane or a left turn lane. He suggested they ask staff to look at options.

Ms. Peters thought they needed to get away from the stop sign because it was confusing. It was not working well now, and would continue to not work well. She felt a signal would provide clear direction as to when someone could turn or needed to stop. In addition, the people on Green Meadows Road would not be able to access Forum Boulevard if they installed a roundabout.

Mr. Thomas reiterated he would not support the roundabout because there was far too much opposition. He did not believe government should force things against the will of those who were vocal and coming out to speak at a meeting. He stated he did not agree with the concern that vehicles would not be able to get out of the neighborhood on the west side of Forum Boulevard. Vehicles making the turn into the neighborhood would cut off traffic entering from the north, and that would create plenty of openings for traffic to get

out. He did not believe the delay would be significantly longer than it was at the four-way stop, and noted the traffic signal would create long delays. The roundabout was a good solution if there really was a serious congestion and delay problem, and a traffic signal was by far the worst solution as it would allow traffic on Forum Boulevard to speed straight through.

Mr. Skala stated they knew they needed an improvement at this intersection and the majority did not feel a roundabout was a good idea, which left only a few other options. One was to continue to maintain the four-way stop with some changes, to consider a signalized intersection, or to consider a hybrid of the two. He suggested they allow staff to come back with information that could provide them guidance by tabling this issue. Ms. Nauser understood they already had a plan for a traffic signal. Mr. Nichols stated staff would need to do some more work.

Ms. Peters stated she thought the engineers had already indicated what they would recommend, and that the Council now needed to tell them what they wanted them to do. Ms. Nauser stated she believed the people in the neighborhood wanted a traffic signal. She also believed that once the other improvements on Forum Boulevard were completed, a coordinated effort with regard to all of the traffic lights on Forum Boulevard would work.

Mr. Ruffin asked if it was possible to just expand the motion somewhat so that it also included re-engineering as determined by staff. He wanted to allow flexibility so it was not just the traffic signal. He explained they had discussed an intersection improvement and it appeared as though the motion was limiting the improvement to just a traffic signal. Mayor Treece stated that was his interpretation as well. Mr. Ruffin felt staff had the expertise to come back with a redesign of the intersection, which might also include a traffic signal.

Mayor Treece stated he intended to vote against this motion in order to get to that motion.

Ms. Nauser amended her previous motion, by making a motion directing staff to provide Council with intersection improvement options at the Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road intersection, including but not limited to a signalized intersection or other improvement, and excluding a roundabout. Ms. Peters, who had seconded Ms. Nauser's previous motion, was agreeable and seconded this amended motion.

Mr. Thomas stated he wanted to ask the Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission for their recommendation, and asked if that could be included in the motion. Ms. Nauser preferred not to include that in her motion.

Mr. Thomas understood they were not committed to a signalized intersection with this motion. Ms. Nauser stated that was correct. She explained staff could come back with a signalized intersection or another option. Mr. Thomas understood they could come back other options including a signalized intersection. He pointed out staff had already provided one signalized intersection option, but thought they felt it was a bit expensive. Ms. Nauser stated staff could provide that option, another option by reengineering this, or something completely different as long as it was not a roundabout.

The motion made by Ms. Nauser and seconded by Ms. Peters directing staff to provide Council with intersection improvement options at the Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road intersection, including but not limited to a signalized intersection or other improvement, and excluding a roundabout, was approved by voice vote with only Mr. Trapp and Mr. Thomas voting against it.

Mr. Thomas made a motion for the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission to review all of the data staff had provided and to make a recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Skala stated he did not have a problem with receiving more information.

Mayor Treece commented that he thought any board or commission was welcome to weigh in on the item.

Mr. Thomas noted he felt there had been a lot of concern with regard to pedestrian safety and access. The Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission had people that were very

knowledgeable with regard to this topic as they had people that traveled by walking and bicycling throughout the City. In addition, they read up on the issues. As a result, he wanted to see their expert comments reflected in the different designs and options.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Skala for the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission to review all of the data staff had provided and to make a recommendation was approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser voting against it.

Mr. Matthes stated staff would come back with a stop light approach and analyze other options including those suggested by the public.

PH31-16 Replacement of reciprocating engine/generators at the Landfill Gas Electric Generation Plant.

Discussion shown with B214-16.

B214-16 Authorizing replacement of reciprocating engine/generators at the Landfill Gas Electric Generation Plant; authorizing the Purchasing Division to enter into a contract for the purchase and installation of the replacement engine/generators.

PH31-16 was read by the Clerk and B214-16 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone attended the public improvement process meeting. Mr. Johnsen replied he thought a couple of reporters had been in attendance.

Mayor Treece asked how long the current generator had been with the City. Mr. Johnsen replied these first two had been installed in 2008. The engines had to be rebuilt every 20,000 hours, and within 60,000 hours, they had to buy new engines because they were mechanically fatigued. These were a little under ten years old. Mayor Treece asked how many would be replaced and how many the City had. Mr. Johnsen replied two would be replaced, and the City had three now. They were in the process of installing a fourth. Mayor Treece asked if there was a way to stagger them so they did not need to be replaced at once or if staff wanted them in this manner. Mr. Johnsen replied staff would like to run them as much as possible if they had the fuel to fire them. Mayor Treece asked about them reaching the 60,000 hour level. Mr. Johnsen replied generally if they were running, they wanted them to run with as high of a load as possible because their maintenance cycle was dictated by their operating hours. If they were on, they wanted them running as high as possible.

Mr. Skala understood two had been installed early on and were being replaced due to the number of hours. A third one had been installed later and there was the potential of a fourth. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. He noted this project was to replace the first two, and they had another project coming up for the fourth. .

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

B214-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH32-16 Replacement and upgrade of water mains along portions of Elaine Drive, Alan Circle, Kent Drive, Gregory Drive and Teresa Drive in the Gregory Heights Subdivision.

Discussion shown with B215-16.

B215-16 Authorizing replacement and upgrade of water mains along portions of Elaine Drive, Alan Circle, Kent Drive, Gregory Drive and Teresa Drive in the Gregory Heights Subdivision; determining that the work shall be done by City employees.

PH32-16 was read by the Clerk and B215-16 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked in which ward this was located. Mr. Johnsen replied it was actually outside of the city limits, but was in the City's water service territory that had been acquired from Consolidated Public Water Supply District No. 1. He thought it was just outside of Ward 3.

Ms. Peters asked how long the useful life was for PVC pipe. Mr. Johnsen replied it depended on the conditions where it operated, but he they expected to get 50-60 years out of them under normal life conditions. He noted they had some cast iron that had lasted longer. PVC had not been around long enough to truly know its life expectancy.

Ms. Peters understood this came into the City's water territory in 1995, and asked if staff knew when this had been originally laid. Mr. Johnsen replied no. He thought they had received some infrastructure detail when they had received this service area from Consolidated Public Water Supply District No. 1, but most of the information had been gauged upon the calls and the number of time they had to go to the area to fix water pipes. He pointed out they were not recommending the replacement of everything on the map as some of it had already been replaced when there had been a failure in the pipe. This would fill in the gaps and bring the entire area up to fire protection standards.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Margaret Booker explained her family owned property at 2403 E. Elaine Drive and they had partnered with the City on a larger circumference driven delivery project because they also owned the farm that was off the map, to the east and north. She understood work would start on that delivery main later this year. She stated she was likely the only person that had met with staff at the public comment meeting, and noted she was always thrilled to have that opportunity. She did not believe her neighbors had paid any attention to this, but pointed out she felt this would raise the quality of life and safety in this older neighborhood. The portion where the family owned property was located had been built in the early 1970s. The first streets in the subdivision were Gregory Drive, Vickie Drive, and Teresa Drive. She suggested providing more information in the initial mailing to property owners in terms of what the City was proposing and what it meant because she believed the fire hydrants were a big deal as there had been fires in the neighborhood. In addition, some people would have some displacement in terms of digging up streets and punching holes through back yards to move mains. She believed providing the information given to Council today would entice more involvement, especially from those in the County. She stated she looked forward to the work beginning.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, stated he lived in a mobile home and understood mobile homes were known for leaking pipes. He wondered if PEX pipes might be higher quality pipes than PCV pipes and whether that was worth exploring.

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

B215-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B219-16 Establishing a Community Land Trust Organization; authorizing the filing of documents with the Missouri Secretary of State; appointing a Board of Directors to the Community Land Trust Organization; authorizing a contract for services with Burlington Associates in Community Development, LLC

for consulting services to assist in the planning and development of a community land trust organization; transferring funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Cole provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if staff was proposing they go into Phase 2 now or if they were already in Phase 2. Mr. Cole replied they were not yet in Phase 2. Phase 1 was the feasibility so it would allow the opportunity to decide whether to move forward or not. Voting tonight would move them into Phase 2. The money had been allocated from council reserves. Mayor Treece understood there was a little over \$14,000 left, and that was the cost of Phase 2. Mr. Cole stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser asked if the \$16,660 had already been figured as a subtraction from the council reserves. Mr. Cole replied it would be in addition to what had already been provided. Ms. Nauser asked what that meant in terms of what was left. Mr. Matthes replied he would have to confirm that amount with the Finance Department. Ms. Nauser wanted to ensure it would not be depleted further.

Ms. Nauser asked if there had been any discussion with regard to requiring property owners to donate land, infrastructure, etc. Mr. Cole replied he understood there was disinterest in that from the Columbia Board of Realtors. He noted the City planned to protect CDBG and HOME investments, and pointed out there were examples of successful community land trusts without those donations as long as the CDBG and HOME investments were protected.

Mr. Cole clarified the full amount of money for Phase 1 and Phase 2 had been allocated, and they had not spent the Phase 2 funds. The \$16,660 was in addition to the Phase 2 costs. Mr. Thomas understood at the moment they did not have an approved plan for paying the \$16,660. Mr. Trapp asked if the money would come from FY 2017. Mr. Cole replied he did not know. Mr. Matthes thought that was up to Council. Mr. Thomas understood it was not in the FY 2017 budget at the moment. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Ms. Amin stated she understood that if this was approved tonight, it would come from FY 2016 council reserve funds because it was a part of the ordinance. Mr. Ruffin pointed out they had a request from Job Point for FY 2016 council reserves. Ms. Nauser agreed and asked if this could be continued to the September 19, 2016 Council Meeting so they knew from where the money would come.

Mayor Treece thought all of the money had been obligated from FY 2016, and they had only used half of it. Mr. Trapp explained Mr. Cole had stated they had allocated money for Phase 1 and Phase 2. This \$16,660 would be for additional expenses, such as outside counsel and filing fees for the independent non-profit status. Ms. Nauser asked if that meant they could not fund Job Point. Mr. Trapp replied yes, but pointed out they could wait until October if they wanted to support Job Point through their FY 2017 allocation.

Mr. Matthes stated this ordinance was written such that it went into full force and effect at its passage and transferred \$16,660 from council reserve to the land trust account. That would likely leave \$4,000-\$5,000 in the current year council reserve. He pointed out it would likely take time to arrange a written agreement about the transfer of funds, so it would likely extend into the next fiscal year. Ms. Nauser understood that meant they would not have much left in council reserve for FY 2017 for the full year, which was concerning.

Ms. Nauser asked if community gardens could be incorporated into the land trust purchases. Mr. Cole replied yes, and explained he had seen some examples of where that had been successful. He thought the lots fronting Sexton Road where a large bio-retention project was planned would make a great spot. He noted he had actually met with Community Garden Coalition members in this regard.

Mr. Thomas commented that he thought the Council was supportive of moving ahead with this community land trust, and understood it would take ongoing resources from the City. As a result, he thought this should be built into the budget, and asked if that was

possible for this \$16,660. Mr. Matthes explained this particular \$16,660 was for one-time expenses. Mr. Cole stated it was the first year start-up costs, which included legal and filing fees, so those would go away after the first year. He agreed there would be some ongoing costs.

Mayor Treece commented that other than this being a Council priority, he was not sure why they were paying for this out of the council reserve fund since it was of clear public interest. He suggested they use the reserves as a loan to the 501(c)(3), and for the 501(c)(3) to pay those costs back when they had a cash flow. As much as he liked the work of Job Point, he felt they had already invested money at this point on a project that needed to be taken to the next phase. He did not feel they should be paying the legal fees of a 501(c)(3) or any of the other associated costs. He preferred to loan the money to them for them to pay back.

Mr. Skala stated he thought that was a great idea as it could preserve the reserves.

Mr. Trapp explained he was concerned about encumbering a 501(c)(3) that did not yet exist with debt of \$16,660 as it would take time before it was operating independently. He understood there would be some earned income through an administrative fee, but they first had to form the organization and develop the legal structure so properties could be transferred. As a result, there was a timeline issue that needed to be addressed. They would build the houses, sell the houses, and move people in, and those people would pay \$25 per month. In a year or two years, they would have people beginning to pay on 4-9 houses. The other earned income revenue could come from increased value in the land trust, but that would not result in cash until there were ownership changes in the houses. He understood they had limited council reserves, and noted he had been part of the move toward being active in investing council reserve funds in high value, low cost projects, but felt this was a worthy expenditure as it had come out of the affordable housing symposium. If they wanted to support Job Point, he thought they could do that with FY 2017 allocations, without encumbering a group that would have enough difficulties moving from a City sponsored initiative to an independent community institution.

Mr. Skala agreed this was a worthy cause that they should follow through with, but felt the question was where the money should come from. He provided the Business Loop Community Improvement District (CID) as an example and noted they had a tremendous amount of debt. He thought there might be another solution whereby the funds did not come from the council reserves. If it was to come from the council reserves, he thought Mayor Treece had a point. He felt they needed to preserve council reserves because they could start out the fiscal year with nothing causing them to be unable offer anything if something were to occur.

Ms. Nauser agreed it was a worthwhile cause, but noted she could not approve this without knowing all of the costs associated with it. She suggested they table this until the next council meeting to provide staff the opportunity to gather more information regarding the financial possibilities. She thought they could encumber the non-profit and then forgive a certain amount per year if necessary. She noted there were many possibilities and explained she was hesitant to say they should move forward today if it meant they would only have \$20,000 in council reserves for FY 2017.

Mr. Thomas asked if \$16,660 could be found in the budget of the Community Development Department for this one-time start up budget. Mr. Matthes replied their budget was tighter than most. He explained he was struggling to figure out where they could spend money on a housing related issue, and nothing was leaping to mind. Mayor Treece asked about the \$141,000 they had in snow removal in FY 2016. Mr. Matthes replied the revenue had not come in during FY 2016 as anticipated, and they were rolling up all of the leftover money to try to balance the budget at the end of the fiscal year. It was hard to know if they had that amount in any particular budget.

Ms. Peters asked if it would be reasonable to postpone this for two weeks so they could think about how to fund the project.

Mr. Skala asked if anyone else had contingency funds. Mr. Matthes replied there were

council reserves and the contingency fund, and the contingency fund was for the entire City government. There was council contingency in FY 2016, but it was helping to balance the budget since revenues were down. He noted they had cut about \$3 million from the budget for FY 2017. He wondered if there was any CDBG fund balance that could be used. Mr. Cole replied the use of CDBG and HOME funds was out of the question for administrative costs due to regulations.

Mr. Cole stated he preferred not to delay a decision because it would detrimentally impact their ability to spend HOME funds in a timely manner since the annual HOME and CHDO funding process would occur next month and he needed a decision on this as it impacted how they would do projects in the future and create a cascading effect. He noted he had \$200,000 set aside for the Lynn Street cottages and thought they might be able to make up the \$16,660 within that project budget. This would also incentivize them to find donated legal assistance. He noted the bulk of the costs were associated with legal fees. Mr. Matthes understood that funding had been created by savings. Mr. Cole stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece explained he did not see this as encumbering the non-for-profit, and did not feel they would do them any favors by not being realistic in the start-up costs. He thought Mr. Cole had a great solution. While it was a priority of the Council, he thought they needed to be realistic and allow it to stand on its own viability.

Eugen Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, stated a 501(c)(3) had a possibility of taking seven years for application. Mayor Treece stated he did not agree. Mr. Elkin suggested applying to Central Bank of Boone County for \$5,000 for the non-profit organization.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, explained he was supportive of getting this land trust started and suggested they find the money to fund it. He understood the funding did not include only start-up costs as it also included some month-to-month costs. He noted his particular concern had to do with the structure of the board. He believed it was a conflict of interest and an inappropriate lack of separation of powers to have a sitting council member, even in a non-voting position, on the board. He suggested they eliminate it. He commented that the purpose of the next phase was to provide a really good learning structure to manage the City's HOME and CDBG investments in permanent affordability, and felt it would create issues if the board with a sitting council member made a recommendation to the Community Development Commission or the Council. He did not feel the council member could champion, vote, or say a word. He thought the person needed to recuse himself or herself entirely. He pointed out the Council would control the organization for the first 2-3 years through the approval of CDBG and HOME funds, and that was the only control they needed. He suggested the board have seven members with four from the neighborhood associations and three from the business and community groups. He reiterated he thought it would be a real problem if they had a sitting council member on the 501(c)(3) board.

Mr. Skala stated he did not believe there would be a sitting council member on the board. Mr. Clark noted the ordinance specifically stated "one city council member serving as a non-voting ex-officio member."

Mr. Clark reiterated he was very supportive of starting the land trust and looked forward to the growth of the land trust after they had a real affordable policy discussion, but felt it was a conflict of interest to have a council member on the board. He believed it would hamper the growth and the learning curve of the land trust, which would not be good for the land trust project or permanent affordability in Columbia.

Mayor Treece asked for a concrete hypothetical as to why having a sitting council member on the board was a conflict of interest. Mr. Clark replied the council member would be in the discussions of the board, and as a council member, they would be seen as the authority power. In addition, they would then vote on it when it came to the Council after participating in discussions at the board level. He thought the person would have to recuse himself or herself.

Mr. Matthes recommended Council amend the ordinance by deleting Section 6 with

regard to the financial issue as that would leave him room to find the \$16,660. He pointed out the council member appointed to the board would be a non-voting member.

Mayor Treece asked if the council member could be a liaison instead of an ex-officio member. Mr. Matthes thought the Council would want someone associated with the board for a few years until it was fully autonomous. He was agreeable to a liaison. Mr. Clark noted Council had total control over the approval of CDBG and HOME funding, which was a massive source of authority, and he believed it was all the authority the Council needed to guide and control the land trust as a standalone 501(c)(3). There was nothing wrong with the Council retaining the right to appoint people to the board going forward including former council members. He just did not feel a sitting council member should serve.

Mayor Treece commented that he had a problem with the initial land trust board including six members as it resulted in an even number. Mr. Clark stated that was why he had suggested four neighborhood association members. Ms. Amin pointed out if this was done, and three more members were added later, they would have an even number again.

Ms. Nauser asked who would provide guidance if a council member was not a part of the board during the beginning. Mr. Matthes replied he agreed with the recommendation of Mayor Treece with regard to a liaison role. The person would not be a member of the board, and would just be a liaison. Mr. Clark pointed out the proposed operating budget for the first year included community land trust coordination at \$6,200 for Mr. Cole's role. There was also something for stewardship coordination for other Community Development staff members. The staff would work with the board throughout the year. Mr. Cole explained the value was donated staff time. He described other costs and pointed out it was the operating budget for the entire year, and did not just include start-up costs.

Ms. Nauser commented that the draft of the establishment of the board provided even weight to neighborhood people, community people, and eventually the home occupants. Changing the numbers could change the equity of each group.

Mr. Trapp thought they would reach the trigger of seven homes fairly quickly so he did not feel the even number was a big issue.

Mr. Thomas stated many boards had an even number so he did not believe it was a big problem. If they had a tie, they could determine a tie breaking procedure. He did not feel it was an issue.

Mayor Treece commented that he liked the parity of three neighborhood representatives, three homeowners, and three community people, which he felt was more important than the even number.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B219-16 by deleting Section 6. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Thomas understood Mr. Matthes would find another way within the budget to fund the start-up costs, and that might include Mr. Cole's suggestion of the \$200,000 for Lynn Street project. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas asked if they were directing staff to find money somewhere. Mr. Matthes replied yes.

Mayor Treece stated he would encourage a loan versus a gift, but would leave it up to Mr. Matthes.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend B219-16 by deleting Section 6 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Nauser suggested they amend the ordinance to make the council member a liaison instead of a member.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B219-16 by changing "non-voting ex-officio member" to "non-voting ex-officio liaison" in Section 4. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Thomas asked if the change would make any material difference. Mayor Treece replied they would no longer be defined as a member of the board. Mr. Skala thought a

liaison had less interaction with the board. Mayor Treece pointed out that when the 501(c)(3) paperwork and articles of incorporation were filed, that person's name would not be included as a member. He thought it protected the Council from any liability the not-for-profit incurred.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought the liaison role was important, and noted he would be willing to serve as he had picked up some expertise on community land trusts and planned to continue if the Council decided it would be appropriate. He understood it was a strong preference of the consultant that they try to continue with as many members from the community land trust steering committee as possible so he would ask Council to strongly consider those that had served on the steering committee. He thought it had been helpful to bring the Council perspective to the steering committee and to understand the details of a fairly complicated process.

Mr. Thomas asked about the process for appointing the board. Ms. Nauser suggested an application process similar to what they did for regular boards and commissions. Mr. Thomas understood it would be similar to an advisory board. Ms. Thompson pointed out it was a 501(c)(3) so it would not be an advisory board. It would be a separate 501(c)(3) and the Council had the power to appoint the members.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a timeline or plan for appointments to the board. Mr. Cole replied his plan was to advertise the vacancies. Mr. Thomas asked if they were trying to make appointments by a certain date. Mr. Cole replied he would get with Ms. Amin and Ms. Thompson to determine what might be reasonable and how it would coincide with the filing of articles of incorporation. He hoped it would be done by the end of the year.

Ms. Amin pointed out the City Clerk's Office advertised vacancies for the New Century Fund Inc. Board, so she would assume this would be handled similarly if that was the process Council chose to use as it was a separate 501(c)(3) as well.

Ms. Nauser asked if applicants had to provide resumes in addition to completing the application. She preferred to have more than a one page completed application. Ms. Amin replied they could ask for a resume to be submitted with the application.

Mr. Skala thought this could follow the template of the appointment to community improvement district boards as well.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a healthy line item in the budget for insurance for the directors and officers. Mr. Cole replied they had included a line item for it.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend B219-16 by changing "non-voting ex-officio member" to "non-voting ex-officio liaison" in Section 4 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B219-16, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Ms. Nauser left the meeting at approximately 11:46 p.m.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- | | |
|---------|--|
| B210-16 | Authorizing a sidewalk improvements agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission as it relates to the MKT to Parkade Bike Boulevard Project. |
| B211-16 | Authorizing rights of use permits with DRI/CA Columbia, LLC for the construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of canopies, bike racks and a storm sewer in portions of the Ninth Street and Locust Street |

rights-of-way associated with a mixed-use building located at 131 S. Tenth Street.

B212-16 Accepting conveyances for street, sidewalk, drainage, scenic conservation bikeway/walkway, and temporary construction purposes.

B213-16 Appropriating funds to finalize and close out the College Avenue Pedestrian Crosswalks and Keene Street Pavement Improvement Projects.

B216-16 Accepting conveyances for water and electric utility purposes.

B217-16 Accepting conveyances for sewer, utility, drainage and temporary construction purposes.

B218-16 Appropriating funds received as reimbursement for a hazardous material spill to the Fire Department.

B220-16 Amending Chapter 6 of the City Code as it relates to miscellaneous corrections to the 2015 Edition of the International Residential Code for One- and Two-Family Dwellings and the 2015 Edition of the International Energy Conservation Code.

R118-16 Setting a public hearing: proposed HVAC improvements at the Activity and Recreation Center (ARC).

R119-16 Declaring the results of the election held in the City of Columbia, Missouri on August 2, 2016.

R120-16 Granting a temporary waiver from the requirements of Section 16-185 of the City Code to allow possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages for the Harvest Hootenanny fundraising event.

R121-16 Authorizing the temporary closure of a portion of Marcassin Drive between Greengate Lane and Old Hawthorne Drive; granting a temporary waiver from the requirements of Section 16-185 of the City Code to allow possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages for the Marcassin Drive Neighborhood Block Party event.

- R122-16 Authorizing various Adopt A Spot agreements.
- R123-16 Authorizing a housing site demolition and re-use agreement of participation with Boone County Family Resources for property located at 4632 Apple Tree Lane.
- R124-16 Authorizing demolition of a dilapidated structure located at 600 Mary Street; authorizing an exception to Ordinance No. 022823 relating to the administrative delay on the demolition of structures in specified areas; and authorizing a special taxbill against the property.
- The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS (except for R120-16 on which he abstained), PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: NAUSER. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:**

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R125-16 Authorizing a Third Amendment to the software license and services agreement with SunGard Public Sector, Inc. for a Records Management System (RMS) for the Police Department.
- The resolution was read by the Clerk.
Assistant Police Chief Gordon provided a staff report.
Mayor Treece asked if this would work on the same hardware. Assistant Police Chief Gordon replied yes. Mayor Treece asked how many cars had rugged laptops. Assistant Police Chief Gordon replied they had switched to semi-rugged laptops, and those were working quite well in every one of the cars. Mayor Treece understood this would all be loaded on those laptops. Assistant Police Chief Gordon replied yes, and explained they were going to dual authentication so the laptops could be removed from the cars and any place could become a substation. Mayor Treece asked if the City was buying the whole software package. Assistant Police Chief Gordon replied the RMS was being purchased as a whole. They had several modules one could choose from, and these were identified for purchase.
- The vote on R125-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: TRAPP (stepped out during the vote), NAUSER. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:**
- R126-16 Authorizing an agreement with Green Valley Rifle & Pistol Club, Inc. for range facility access and use by the Columbia Police Department for training purposes.
- The resolution was read by the Clerk.
Assistant Police Chief Gordon provided a staff report.
Mayor Treece asked if the relationship was still good. Assistant Police Chief Gordon replied yes. Mayor Treece asked what they would do if they had their own range. Assistant Police Chief Gordon replied he thought it would be very difficult to match this facility. Since NRA competitions were held there, they had some pretty advanced technology. He thought the price they were paying was a bargain when considering the incorporation of rifles and other things. Mayor Treece asked if they had an indoor range

as well. Assistant Police Chief Gordon replied no. Mayor Treece asked if they had access to an indoor range. Assistant Police Chief Gordon replied no. Mayor Treece asked if one was needed. Assistant Police Chief Gordon replied he was one of those that thought they should shoot outdoors as it was more likely where the incident would occur.

The vote on R126-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: NAUSER. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R127-16 Transferring ownership of a 2005 Barrett Horse Trailer used by the Columbia Police Department (City Vehicle #1151) to the Cedar Creek Therapeutic Riding Center.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Assistant Police Chief Gordon provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if any logos were on the trailer. Assistant Police Chief Gordon replied he had peeled them off himself and the license plates had been stripped.

Mayor Treece understood the City did not have any mounted police, even volunteer or officers with personal horses. Assistant Police Chief Gordon replied all of the horses were personally owned at the time. The mounted unit had been disbanded because it was not efficient. It was a great public relations tool they would have loved to have kept, but they needed the officers to be on lights, at intersections, etc. during football games. Mayor Treece thought it was an interesting model and the presence of a horse really had calming effect on crowd control. Assistant Police Chief Gordon agreed they were phenomenal for crowd control and public relations as people loved the horses, but they also had to keep in mind that they were personal animals so they wanted to be careful with their exposure to things. It was a great program, but it was just not efficient.

The vote on R127-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: NAUSER. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

Mr. Matthes commended Sergeant Dochler for living the values of the Council and the strategic plan as he had donated a very valuable horse to the Cedar Creek Therapeutic Riding Center.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

B221-16 Rezoning property located on the southwest corner of Madison Street and Orange Street from R-2 to O-P; approving the statement of intent; approving the True Properties O-P Plan (Case No. 16-141).

B222-16 Approving the Final Plat of Mikel's Subdivision Plat 2 located on the southwest corner of Madison Street and Orange Street; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-140).

B223-16 Approving the Final Plat of Hendren Hills Subdivision located on the north side of Proctor Drive and east of Creasy Springs Road; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-146).

- B224-16 Amending Chapter 6 of the City Code to allocate appeals of administrative decisions on trade licenses to the Building Construction Codes Commission and dissolving the Board of Electrical Examiners, Board of Plumbing Examiners and Board of Mechanical Examiners.
- B225-16 Authorizing a consolidated grant agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for transportation planning services.
- B226-16 Authorizing a revision to the supplemental agreement for highway/rail crossing signal improvements with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission and the County of Boone relating to the Columbia Terminal Railroad's (COLT) intersection with O'Rear Road in Hallsville, Missouri.
- B227-16 Authorizing an amendment to the financial assistance agreement with the Mid-Missouri Solid Waste Management District for the purchase of front loading recycling containers.
- B228-16 Accepting conveyances for water and electric utility purposes.
- B229-16 Authorizing construction of HVAC improvements at the Activity and Recreation Center (ARC); appropriating funds.
- B230-16 Accepting a donation from the Columbia Cosmopolitan Luncheon Club for park improvements at the Frank G. Nifong Memorial Park; appropriating funds.
- B231-16 Authorizing an environmental child care sanitation inspections participation agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services.
- B232-16 Authorizing Amendment No. 3 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for WIC local agency nutrition services.
- B233-16 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for WIC local agency nutrition services.

- B234-16 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri, on behalf of its Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis, for data collection and analysis services relating to socio-economic, housing, health and education community indicators.
- B235-16 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Traffic and Highway Safety Division for a DWI enforcement unit.
- B236-16 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Traffic and Highway Safety Division for DWI enforcement relating to sobriety checkpoints and saturation patrols.
- B237-16 Appropriating funds to cover the costs of FY 2016 medical and prescription drug claims and contributions to employee health savings accounts.
- B238-16 Amending Chapter 3 of the City Code to move the Airport Division from the Public Works Department to the Economic Development Department; amending Chapter 3 of the City Code to repeal Article II to eliminate the Airport Advisory Board; amending Chapter 3 of the City Code to enact a new Article II to establish an Airport Advisory Board.
- B239-16 Adopting the FY 2017 Classification and Pay Plan for changes effective on September 25, 2016; adopting the FY 2017 Classification and Pay Plan for FLSA overtime assignment changes effective on November 20, 2016; providing for FY 2017 salary adjustments relating to the Classification and Pay Plans; providing for a salary increase for eligible employees.
- B240-16 Establishing plan year 2017 active employee medical and dental premium rates, non-Medicare medical rates, and retiree dental premium rates for the City of Columbia; providing for payroll withholdings.
- B241-16 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to unclassified service and general benefit provisions.
- B242-16 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to increase the construction contract threshold relating to performance and payment bonds.
- B243-16 Amending Chapter 26 of the City Code as it relates to tourism fees and the license tax on hotels and motels.

- B244-16 Continuing the application and collection of the local sales tax on the titling of motor vehicles, trailers, boats and outboard motors that were purchased from a source other than a licensed Missouri dealer; providing for such tax to be repealed, reduced or raised in the same amount as the local sales tax is repealed, reduced or raised.
- B245-16 Authorizing a school resource officer agreement with the Columbia School District.

X. REPORTS

REP68-16 Public Inconvenience Fee (PIF) for Street, Sidewalk and Alley Closures.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if there were street and sidewalk closure requests in parts of the community other than downtown. Mr. Nichols replied rarely. Mayor Treece stated he did not see any issue with making this citywide in that case. In fact, he thought it was likely easier to do it that way. Mr. Nichols stated street or sidewalk closures in other areas were not usually for an extended period of time. He pointed out a recommendation in this report was for a seven day grace period.

Mr. Nichols explained the current policy was for the City Manager to authorize any closure of 30 days or less, and anything beyond 30 days had come to the Council for approval. They felt that might be too much time if they were trying to incentivize the work being done more quickly or putting more thought into how the construction would be managed.

Mayor Treece understood the reference to alley closures would be temporary closures. It would not be the vacation of an alley. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. He pointed out many of the alleys had utilities and the recommendation was to exempt utility work, but to include the re-facing of a building, tuck-pointing a building, etc.

Mayor Treece asked if the fee would apply if there was a covered walkway whereby the sidewalk could continue to be used. He wondered if the fee would be voided or if only half of the fee would be charged. Mr. Thomas felt covered walkways were fine if they provided safe access.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought this was a great idea and was glad Mayor Treece had brought it forward. He also thought it was a big change so they should engage stakeholders. He felt it was worth being thoughtful as there might have been things they had not considered.

Mayor Treece stated he felt this had been on the table since June and no one had contacted him with concerns about it. He understood they had received a letter from the Chamber of Commerce and was not sure if they had members that had concerns. He would convey a sense of urgency and believed they should have plenty of time to visit with staff in the weeks it would take for an ordinance to come forward. He did not feel it needed months and months of additional discussion. Mr. Thomas noted they could instruct staff to consult with the Chamber of Commerce since the request had been made as part of the process. Mr. Skala commented that in some respects this was a fairness issue for the community as well. He explained he was always in favor of obtaining input from stakeholders and advisory boards, and thought input could be forthcoming within this period of time or any other time as there was no reason the ordinance could not be amended for a compelling reason. Mayor Treece thought there had been fair warning and noted he did not want another street closure request prior to this being resolved.

Mr. Nichols asked if Council wanted to provide direction as to where the funds collected would go. Mayor Treece replied he thought it should be something pedestrian related or something associated with the loss of public use. He felt there was some discretion. Ideally, he thought it should be pedestrian related or accessibility related. Mr. Thomas agreed and suggested the sidewalk fund.

Ms. Thompson asked if Council wanted a fee for the parking lane closure in addition to the current parking meter bag charges. She explained currently the City charged for parking meter bags when metered spaces were taken up by construction crews. She wanted to know if there would be a lane closure fee in addition to the bagging and the lost revenue to the parking utility. Mayor Treece replied he thought there should be a lane closure fee if the lane was closed. If they were bagging the meters in order to provide a lane of traffic, the parking meter fee might be adequate. If they were closing a lane, the public was losing that asset. Mr. Thomas asked how the bagging fee compared with the lane closure fee. He wondered if there was parity. Mr. Nichols replied he thought the hood would be quite a bit more per day. Ms. Thompson stated they had the ability to do both, which was why she was asking. Mayor Treece commented that he would recommend doing both if they were losing both. Mr. Nichols agreed. Mr. Skala stated it made sense to him to assess a fee for both depending on the loss.

Mayor Treece explained the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council had taken a more aggressive stance on this fee as they thought it should be higher.

Mr. Matthes asked when Council wanted the draft ordinance to come before the Council. Mayor Treece replied two months ago. Ms. Peters suggested two weeks unless that was too quick. Ms. Thompson stated that was likely too soon because staff would have to have it done by Friday. Mr. Matthes stated it would be brought forward at the first meeting in October.

Mr. Thomas reiterated he thought staff should reach out to the Chamber of Commerce and obtain feedback from them. Mr. Nichols stated he would. Mayor Treece commented that he would be willing to meet with them if needed as well. Mr. Nichols stated he appreciated that.

REP69-16 Correspondence regarding lift-equipped taxis in Columbia from the Disabilities Commission.

Mayor Treece noted the City buses did not always run at a time that was convenient for people to go to movies, council meetings, church, etc., and at the moment, there was not an accessible taxi in the private sector. He thought the sidewalk closure fee could be used to enhance this accessibility issue. He wondered if there was a way they could encourage the private sector to have accessible vehicles.

Mr. Trapp stated he agreed this was something they should try to incentivize if they could think of a way to encourage it. He noted Services for Independent Living had excellent door-to-door transportation, but it was not a 24-hour service.

Mr. Thomas suggested they ask staff to research this and provide some ideas. He thought there might be solutions in other cities. Mr. Matthes stated staff would put some thought into it.

REP70-16 Correspondence regarding the use of Naloxone by City of Columbia public safety personnel from the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission.

Mr. Trapp understood the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission was supportive of the budget amendment he had recommended, which they would vote on at the next council meeting.

REP71-16 Recommendations on the FY 2017 Budget by the Parks and Recreation Commission.

Mr. Thomas understood a recommendation was that the 45 day hiring waiting period not apply to the Parks and Recreation Department, and noted he did not agree. Mr. Griggs

explained he thought the discussion was associated with the park rangers.

Mayor Treece noted another recommendation was to restore the police status commission for the park rangers, and he understood that had been done last week.

REP72-16 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Report.

Mr. Trapp thanked staff for providing words in addition to the account numbers as he understood that was done by hand and was not yet computer generated.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that there had been discussion on KFRU regarding students crossing major roadways and suggested a police presence since there would be a football game next weekend.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he had listened to Mr. Windsor with regard to his definition of a base charge with respect to electricity at the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure, and noted he completely disagreed. He felt that was an extremely narrow definition, especially when they considered how much of the distribution system was linked to that kind of fee. When looking at the base charge discussions of Burton and Associates in terms of the sanitary sewer, there were broader and more complex notions of what should be a part of the base fee. He felt the Council received a wonderful introduction to an arcane and complex system that had been developed over 50 years ago from one of the major architects of that arcane system. He guaranteed the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure meeting would make recommendations with some significant differences to that. He commented that Mr. Windsor's presentation had been interesting as he had revealed a number of biases, and noted Mr. Windsor had dismissed a social equity fee because it was not much of amount and they would not know how much they would receive. He understood Mr. Windsor was concerned with the stability of the revenue and the size of the revenue, which he disagreed with, as he felt new development should pay its fair share. He asked the Council to put aside everything that they had heard as it was a biased as self-serving way of thinking about the municipal utility. He suggested they wait for the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure report.

Ms. Peters noted the Rock Quarry Road Scenic Roadway Stakeholder Advisory Group had asked her to ask the City to come up with formal policies and procedures to be put into place so the clear cutting that had occurred along that roadway would not occur again. She also asked that native trees and vegetation be planted back into the corridor that had been clear cut. She requested a staff report with recommendations. Mayor Treece suggested the destruction along trails be included. He asked if the City had an arborist on staff. Mr. Matthes replied the City had an arborist. Mayor Treece understood the clear cutting of the trail for the Flat Branch Relief Sewer was supposed to have been more selective, and asked if the arborist had been out there monitoring the project. He thought this should be a part of the policy. Ms. Peters stated she understood someone from the Public Works Department had been out there and the clear cutting had been done as it was supposed to have been done. She noted the area needed to be replanted though.

Mr. Skala stated they revisited this issue a number of times, and they often asked the question as to why it was necessary to take such wide of a path. He thought things had improved in the intervening years, but the answer was often that it was for safety purposes if they were trenching as they needed a wide space so the trench did not collapse on those working in it. He understood it was not the answer they wanted to hear, but it was a problem that went way back. In addition, there was an issue with the amount of impact downstream as there was a cost downstream. He thought it was certainly worth defining so these types of things did not continue to happen.

Mr. Skala asked about the status of the Benton Stephens parking permit program as he thought it was ready to go. He also asked about the urban conservation overlay the neighborhood had worked on recently. He requested a status on both issues.

Mr. Ruffin acknowledged the passing of Liz Schmidt, who was the mother of former First Ward Council Member Fred Schmidt. He noted Ms. Schmidt had been a true activist and champion for social equality and justice in the community. He pointed out she was the first recipient of the Columbia Values Diversity Award and the first woman on the Planning and Zoning Commission in 1971. He stated there was a great article on her life in the Columbia Missourian. He understood her memorial service would be in November. He hoped the City would be able to send something official to recognize her contributions to the community.

Mr. Trapp stated he had received a call from a constituent that lived on Strawn Road that had indicated a business had drained its pool into a creek causing a fish to die. It had been reported to the Department of Natural Resources (DNR), who was currently investigating. In the course of the investigation, DNR had indicated a City permit was needed in order to discharge pool water into streams. The constituent wanted him to inquire about that process because it seemed inappropriate, so he stated he would inquire.

Mr. Trapp provided an update on the pawn shop ordinance reform, which included secondhand dealers, and noted the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission would hold a public hearing tomorrow at 7:00 p.m. He explained he had visited with many pawn shops and secondhand dealers. He noted the Police Department were the architects of the current draft ordinance, which had evolved considerably based upon stakeholder input. He explained he was also working with Mr. Clubine in the City Manager's Office on a general event on brainstorming solutions to prevent theft.

Mr. Trapp stated he would support the Job Point request for \$21,000 from the council reserve fund and asked staff to bring forward the appropriate legislation.

Mr. Thomas explained the Youth Advisory Council (YAC) was re-forming for its 2016-2017 year and were interested in any particular projects the Council would like them to undertake. He suggested they work with City staff by reviewing the three focus neighborhoods of the social equity program in terms of how it was affecting youth in those neighborhoods. He thought it would be nice to obtain a report from them as to how they felt it was working for young people. He was also looking for suggestions to pass on to the YAC.

Mayor Treece stated he might have a suggestion, but noted he would have to think about it.

Mr. Skala stated he would endorse Mr. Thomas' suggestion as he felt the feedback could be valuable.

Mr. Thomas asked if the request could be passed on to YAC as a request from the Council. Mr. Matthes replied staff would pass it on.

Mayor Treece commented that there had been a huge public safety issue with regard to opioid abuse and one of the ways to intercept access to heroin, opioids, and synthetic pain killers, etc. was through a prescription drug monitoring program. The State of Missouri had been reluctant to create a statewide database even though all of the other 49 states required pharmacies to keep a database. He understood St. Louis County had recently created its own prescription drug monitoring program and had hired a vendor that had been willing to create the database. He asked the Law Department and the Public Health and Human Services Department to look at their epidemiology charge to

determine if there was a way to compel that type of reporting under that same mechanism. He understood St. Louis City and St. Charles County would opt into it to lower the costs for everyone for every pharmacy to participate. He thought the chain pharmacies were likely already doing this in every state other than Missouri. He stated it was a great way to intercept smurfing, drug shopping, etc.

Mr. Skala noted the Board of Health had some expertise in epidemiology as well and thought that might be another place to obtain input.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 12:28 a.m.