



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, April 4, 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 Monday, April 4, 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 PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS and NAUSER were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of March 21, 2016 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Trapp asked that R35-16 be moved from the consent agenda to new business.

Mr. Thomas asked that R34-16 be moved from the consent agenda to new business.

Ms. Nauser asked that B76-16 be moved from the consent agenda to old business. Mayor McDavid noted a citizen had asked for B75-16, B76-16, and B77-16 to be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B75-16, B76-16, and B77-16 being moved to old business and R34-16 and R35-16 being moved to new business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Thomas.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI8-16

Howard B. Lang Jr. Award Presentation.

Mayor McDavid commented that it was a pleasure for him to present the Howard B. Lang Jr. Award for outstanding volunteer service. The award had been created by Leo Hill, who was Columbia's first city manager and had worked with Howard Lang, Columbia's mayor from 1953-1957. He explained Mr. Hill had established the award to honor the memory of former Mayor Lang by selecting someone annually who would be recognized for significant volunteer activity, impact, and initiative in support of the City of Columbia and its mission. He stated this year's winner was Mary Anne McCollum, a former mayor of Columbia and a wide-ranging city volunteer. He noted Ms. McCollum had served Columbia for many years as the Ward 2 City Council Member from 1985-1989, Mayor from 1989-1995, and a member of the Columbia Housing Authority Board since 1997. He explained Ms. McCollum had worked to improve Columbia's economy and had championed civil rights. She had helped secure donations to establish and build the original Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial and had served on the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial restoration committee. She had formed and chaired the inaugural committee for annual Columbia Values Diversity Celebration, and in cooperation with the University of Missouri, she had helped plan the opening ceremonies and reception for major donors of the first Show-Me State Games in 1985. He stated she had helped develop the Columbia wetlands project, which was an economically sound method for treating wastewater while providing a wildlife habitat. In addition, she had created the concept and served as a member of the task force that had formed Columbia Regional Economic Development Incorporated (REDI). He explained much of Ms. McCollum's current city volunteerism was through the Columbia Housing Authority where she served on the Board of Directors. In that role, she worked to improve housing and housing opportunities for low income citizens by

making residences safer, more efficient, and better maintained and equipped, and by creating an environment that led to self-sufficiency for that diverse population. He thanked Ms. McCollum for her excellent volunteerism to the City of Columbia, and presented her with the award and a \$1,000 cash gift, which he understood she planned to donate to Patriot Place to establish a dog park, helping to make it a home for veterans and their furry companions.

Ms. McCollum thanked Mayor McDavid and the City Council, and explained she had been shocked when she heard she would be a recipient of this award. She stated she was humbled and honored to have been chosen to receive it. She thanked Mr. Baker, the selection committee, and Khaki Westerfield, the daughter of Howard Lang, who she truly admired for all of the work she had done throughout the years. She commented that it had been 27 years to the night, April 4, 1989, when she was elected mayor, and former Mayor Hindman, who was in the audience, had replaced her on April 4, 1995. She explained she had been elected mayor when she was 45, which had provided her a number of years to continue to work in public service. She introduced her sister Julie and her husband Tad, who moved to Columbia in 1984 when she was still mayor. She thanked Phil Steinhaus, the current CEO of the Columbia Housing Authority, and Genie Rogers, the current Columbia Housing Authority Board Chair and her first appointee to that Board when she was mayor in 1990. She stated it was a privilege and honor to continue serving on that Board. She recognized Kee Groshong and noted the two of them had worked on numerous ballot issues together over the past 27 years. She mentioned the USS Columbia Committee members that she had seen that evening, and Georgalu Swoboda, who had helped established the Columbia Values Diversity Breakfast. She was pleased and proud the event continued today. She introduced her friend and companion, Larry Stevens, who had been a constant support throughout the years, and thanked him. She described the most recent project the Columbia Housing Authority had taken on, Patriot Place, and noted it included 25 one-bedroom apartments. She stated those who knew her knew of her love for animals so she planned to use the \$1,000 gift to establish a dog park at Patriot Place as there were benefits to furry companions. She looked forward to Pooch Park at Patriot Place, and thanked her friends for coming out tonight. She stated she appreciated their friendship and everything they had done to help her over the last several decades. She commented that it had been a privilege and honor to have worked with so many citizens in continuing to keep Columbia the best place to live, work, raise a family, and retire. She thanked the Council for their dedicated service, and thanked Mayor McDavid for his service over the past six years.

Mayor McDavid thanked Ms. McCollum for her legacy of service to the City of Columbia.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC15-16 Peggy Placier - Comments on Pillar 4 (Recommendations 4.1-4.3) of the Columbia Police Department's December 15 report on 21st Century Policing.

Ms. Placier stated she represented Race Matters, Friends, and explained they wanted to keep the attention of Council on the Columbia Police Department (CPD) report that had been organized around the pillars and recommendations of the President's Task Force on 21st Century Policing. She explained she would speak to community policing and crime reduction, and noted effective crime prevention was based on community trust, communication, and accountability. She commented that Pillar 4 began with those values, but then argued that funding for additional patrol staffing was the most significant obstacle to acting on those values. She stated Race Matters, Friends recognized the practical limitations of resources, staffing, and time, but the duty of any public servant was to do the right thing even when it was hard. She thought voter support might be based on community trust, communication, and accountability. She urged the Council to ask how the CPD shared power with community members and whether CPD was accountable to the community. Recommendation 4.1 indicated law enforcement agencies should consider adopting preferences for least harm resolutions, such as diversion programs or warnings and citations, and the report cited the

formation of the community outreach unit, whose goals were consistent with community policing. Given the target areas of the activities of the community outreach unit, she felt community meant the black and low income residents of the First Ward. She commented that often public officials avoided mentioning race, which allowed them to avoid thinking about how race framed the problem. The report indicated the community outreach unit was having a positive impact, but the costs were significant. Race Matters, Friends urged the Council to ask how thoroughly the officers were prepared to develop relationships with black residents and to demand an accounting of the costs and benefits of the community outreach unit. She understood another sign of progress cited was the 2015 agreement between the CPD, the Sheriff's Department, the School District, and the Juvenile Division to allow schools discretion to handle incidents before referring students to the Juvenile Division. Even if a student was referred, the Juvenile Office had alternatives to avoid adjudication. CPD had also implemented least harm resolutions for adults in cases of marijuana possession, traffic violations, and homelessness. She urged the Council to evaluate whether the least harm practices were applied equally regardless of the racial identity of the student or adult. Recommendation 4.2 indicated that community policing should be infused throughout the culture and organizational structure, to include evaluating officers on their abilities to engage the community. The report argued this was a noble concept, but difficult with current staff numbers and volume of calls. She understood the CPD had hired consultants to determine how time might be found in the schedule to implement community policing, and based on those findings a new patrol schedule had been slated for February. She urged the Council to ask if the new schedule had been implemented, if the data showed time savings had resulted in community benefits, and whether all officers would be evaluated based upon community engagement. Recommendation 4.3 had indicated law enforcement agencies should engage in multi-disciplinary community team approaches for planning, implementing, and responding to crisis situations. She stated the CPD utilized a national system to plan for threats, such as civil unrest. At the time of the report, she understood 35 percent of the officers had completed crisis intervention team training, thus a substantial number were prepared for a worst case scenario, but wondered about the everyday community interaction that took much of an officer's time and how they could prevent civil unrest similar to what occurred in Ferguson. She explained the aim of Race Matters, Friends was to urge the Council to take the CPD report seriously as a policy document and to evaluate the efforts and performance of the CPD in ensuring public accountability through the open reporting of data and involving community members in decisions.

SPC16-16 Arnie Fagan - Leadership, Management and Customer Service Failures at the Solid Waste District Utility.

Mr. Fagan explained trash trucks were waking residents along the alley connecting Eighth Street and Ninth Street between Broadway and Cherry Street. The trucks normally arrived between 5:30 a.m. and 6:30 a.m., and the noise lasted about ten minutes. It involved the backing up of the truck and mechanically emptying five metal dumpsters, which included smashing them against the truck. He explained he and his wife were impacted as they lived about 200 feet away and he had received complaints from tenants as well. He explained he had recently lost a professional tenant, a physician, and one of the things he had mentioned was the noise from the trash trucks. Mr. Fagan commented that this was a real issue if they wanted professional tenants in the downtown. He stated he and his wife had been woken up at least 45 times since December 14 when he and others had met with the Solid Waste Utility Manager, Cynthia Mitchell, to inform her of the situation. In February, a peace disturbance complaint had been filed with the Columbia Police Department to try to resolve the situation since nothing had been done. He now hoped the Council could assist in resolving the situation. He explained the problem started after the trash compactor was removed from the private alley at the northeast corner of the parking garage, and requested the compactor be returned to where it had been previously. He did not believe the dumpsters should be located in the alley as they were smelly and provided less room for vehicles to get through the alley. He understood the dumpster had been moved because the new solid waste employees were not experienced enough to remove the compactor to empty it neatly without smashing the neighboring building, which he did not feel was a good excuse. He asked the City to do something to address this situation.

Mr. Skala asked for suggestions as to how the situation might be improved. Mr. Fagan replied he would recommend the previous trash compactor be returned to its previous location as it would allow trash to be picked up once a week instead of 2-3 times a week since a larger volume would be compacted. This would help in less blockage of the alley and contribute to safety and aesthetics as well. He noted it had previously been there for 20 years. Mr. Skala understood the trash compactor would eliminate the problems. Mr. Fagan stated that was correct.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH12-16 Consider the FY 2016 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Annual Action Plan.

Discussion shown with R40-16.

R40-16 Approving the FY 2016 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Annual Action Plan; approving a CHDO agreement with Central Missouri Community Action for the development of property located at 3606 Woodside Drive.

PH12-16 and R40-16 were read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy and Mr. Cole provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp thought staff continued to do a good job in administering these important federal funds as these funds were invaluable to the agencies involved and low-income individuals. He noted it was also good to see this investment in the central city area.

Mr. Skala stated he appreciated the efforts and understanding of staff as to what was really important in terms of the underserved in the community, and noted he would support the plan.

The vote on R40-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

PH13-16 Voluntary annexation of property located on the southwest corner of Brown School Road and Range Line Street (Highway 763).

PH13-16 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Trapp stepped out of the meeting room.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood this would allow the process to move forward so the Planning and Zoning Commission could render a recommendation. Mr. Teddy explained the Planning and Zoning Commission had already heard the zoning request, and that it would come to the Council with a unanimous recommendation of approval. Mr. Skala asked if all of the issues had been resolved. Mr. Teddy replied the Council would consider a development agreement.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Matthew Kriete, 1113 Fay Street, stated he was a civil engineer with Engineering Surveys and Services and noted they represented the owner of this property. He explained the development agreement and zoning items were being introduced tonight. This involved the annexation of 70.6 acres and the property was fully serviced by utilities. It would be zoned with multiple zoning districts in order to provide transitional zoning as one moved from Range Line Street westward, from a more intense to a less intense development. The existing use of the property would remain in the foreseeable future. Although they were not considering the development agreement tonight, he pointed out there were a couple of atypical situations. The intent was to develop Lot 7 first, and because staff did not want any flag lots to Range Line Street, they had to find street frontage. As a result, there would be a delay in constructing White Tiger Lane until Lots 3, 4, and 6 developed. He explained they would ask that the extension of Boone Industrial Drive be delayed as staff was recommending it be fully constructed. They believed developing the road right away would create an awkward situation as the City would have right-of-way they could not access but would have to maintain. It had the potential for

creating a haven of crime because it would not be accessible. He noted they would propose constructing a private cul-de-sac built to City standards about 600 feet off of Range Line Street. It would essentially be a private driveway until the right-of-way was acquired. He commented that his client was working diligently in negotiating the acquisition of the right-of-way, but there was a potential it would happen. He commented that they could realign the road further north if the right-of-way was unable to be acquired in order to service the property, except for a small piece near the intersection with Range Line Street.

Mr. Skala understood Mr. Kriete had mentioned an issue in terms of crime prevention, and asked for clarification. Mr. Kriete replied his concern with regard to crime was that long roads that did not have frequent traffic could become easy locations to do illegal activities. Mr. Skala understood the reason to move the road further north was so it was used more frequently. Mr. Kriete stated the idea of the 600 foot extension was to provide for a shorter area, which would have some use from the development on Lots 7 and 5. If it were extended further, it would likely not be used. The idea of moving the road further north would be an option if they were unable to obtain the right-of-way for the road. He thought they should look at the idea of the shorter section for now, which would be a private road until the right-of-way could be acquired. It created an awkward situation if the property owner was unwilling to selling the land for a reasonable market rate price.

Ms. Nauser stated she had concerns with private roads and noted there were problems associated with private drives in the Fifth Ward currently. She explained she would prefer another option other than a private drive.

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

Mr. Trapp returned to the meeting room.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B63-16 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with Vineyards Columbia, LLC for the acquisition of property located southwest of the intersection of Route WW and Rolling Hills Road to be used for park purposes.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

B63-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SKALA. (Mr. Skala stepped out and did not return until after the official vote was taken.) Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B64-16 Approving the Final Plat of The Vineyards, Plat No. 5 located southwest of the intersection of Route WW and Rolling Hills Road (Case No. 16-73).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood the future South Grindstone Trail would pass close to this property, and asked if it would be located on the same side of the creek as this park or the other side. Mr. Griggs replied it would be on the same side, and described the route utilizing a drawing on the overhead. Mr. Thomas asked for the anticipated construction timeline for the trail. Mr. Griggs replied it was currently not funded and would have to be included in the next round of ballot issue projects.

Ms. Nauser understood this was in keeping with the spirit of the results of the citizens in terms of the parks survey and the approval of the parks sales tax extension. Mr. Griggs stated they were dedicated sources of funding. Mr. Skala understood the funds could not be used for public safety. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct.

B64-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B75-16 Amending Chapter 12A of the City Code as it relates to billing practices for the stormwater utility.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood none of the changes in this and the other two bills would affect the amount people would pay or the policies on billing and revenue. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. He explained the intent was to only make it fit the billing system. They did not intend to affect revenue or customer charges with one exception whereby they found twelve customers at the Airport that had been overlooked in a previous revision. Those customers were now included.

Mr. Thomas asked for a high level explanation of the results of these bills. Mr. Windsor replied a good example involved the water rates. Currently, the City had 149 irrigation and water rates, which was one of the reasons the Airport had been overlooked. The new system would use a calculation instead of a specific number and would reduce the number of rates needed. It only referenced the primary ordinance. Mr. Thomas understood it would simplify the Code and relate the different categories and situations to each other in a way they should be related. Mr. Johnsen explained it also would affect the billing system they would soon utilize.

Mr. Skala understood this filled in the gaps for some of the exceptions that had previously been left out. Mr. Johnsen explained they had also taken this opportunity to codify some department policies. Mr. Skala understood this did not affect policy or rates, and it was only a way to capture exceptions. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. Mr. Windsor thought a good example involved some recycling processes that were not previously in the Code of Ordinances and were managed by policies.

B75-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: PETERS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B76-16 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to commercial and multi-family housing refuse and recycling services and fees.

Discussion shown with B77-16.

B77-16 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to water and electric fees, billing and rates.

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked if the City previously did not charge for recycling for commercial customers or if it was at a substantially reduced rate. Mr. Windsor replied the policy had been to provide a reduced rate, and this would allow it to be codified. Ms. Nauser commented that she would like the City to find a way to incentivize recycling amongst commercial customers. Mr. Windsor explained a reason the City was required to charge commercial customers was because significant costs were involved. Commercial customers had the option of choosing other suppliers, except in certain situations. While the City wanted to make it attractive, someone would have to pay for those costs. Ms. Nauser stated she understood, and explained she was concerned because she saw dumpsters full of cardboard boxes at companies that refused to recycle due to the additional cost of recycling.

Mr. Skala understood a reduced rate was being provided as an incentive to help with the recycling stream. Mr. Windsor stated that was correct, and explained it was lower than the trash rate they would pay. Mr. Skala understood it was in the interest of increasing the recyclable stream. Ms. Peters asked if it was working. Mr. Windsor replied he would need to review the data. He stated part of the process of moving to the new software was to ensure everyone was paying what they were supposed to pay, and they were going through the process of checking everything. He pointed out waste minimization staff was working with commercial customers to try to help them understand this option existed. He thought they could provide Council a status at some point in the future.

Mary Hussmann, 210 Ridgeway Avenue, asked for clarification with regard to multi-family

housing. She asked if a duplex was considered multi-family. Mr. Windsor replied multi-family would consist of over four units. Ms. Hussmann asked if the fees would increase for a structure with four units in a residential area. Mr. Windsor replied fees were not being changed. Ms. Hussmann pointed out they wanted to keep everything the same in the residential areas.

Mr. Trapp explained residential properties paid for recycling as it was built into the solid waste rate.

Mr. Skala stated he would look forward to the evaluation as to whether the reduced rate was incentivizing recycling for commercial properties.

B76-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B77-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B62-16 Voluntary annexation of property located on the southwest corner of Wyatt Lane and Wilson Turner Road; establishing permanent R-1 zoning (Case No. 16-54).
- B65-16 Approving the Final Plat of Steeplechase Estates Plat 5 located on the east side of Howard Orchard Road and north of Steeplechase Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 15-225).
- B66-16 Approving the Final Plat of Steeplechase Estates Plat 6 located on the east side of Howard Orchard Road and north of Steeplechase Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 15-226).
- B67-16 Accepting a conveyance for sewer purposes (Case No. 16-91).
- B68-16 Authorizing an improvement and maintenance agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the College Avenue Safety Enhancement (CASE) Project.
- B69-16 Authorizing Amendment No. 4 to the general cooperative agreement with Boone County Regional Sewer District relating to sewer service within Happy Hollow Estates.
- B70-16 Accepting conveyances for sewer, temporary construction and utility purposes.
- B71-16 Accepting conveyances for water and electric utility purposes.
- B72-16 Amending the FY 2016 Annual Budget by adding and deleting a position in the Finance Department - Administration Division.
- B73-16 Accepting a donation from United HealthCare for wellness promotions and programs for City employees; appropriating funds.
- B74-16 Appropriating funds for Share the Light Program.
- B78-16 Vacating sanitary sewer and storm sewer easements located on the south side of Worley Street (1312 W. Worley Street); accepting conveyances for utility and drainage and sanitary sewer purposes (Case No. 16-55).

- R36-16 Declaring the results of the March 15, 2016 special election relating to an initiative ordinance to prohibit residential roll carts and automated refuse collection vehicles.
- R37-16 Authorizing an artist's commission agreement with Madeleine LeMieux relating to the Traffic Box Art Program.
- R38-16 Authorizing adoption and restatement of the 401(a) Plan for the Police Chief; authorizing execution and administration of plan documents.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R34-16 Setting a public hearing: construction of a single-lane roundabout, splitter islands and five-foot sidewalks and the installation of additional street lighting at the intersection of Fairview Road and Chapel Hill Road.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked about the comments at the interested parties meeting. Mr. Nichols replied there were about 17 positive comments, 22 comments opposed to the roundabout, and one comment indicating indecisiveness. Ms. Peters asked if reasons were given. Mr. Nichols replied some felt it was unnecessary for the intersection. He explained staff was trying to get this project started before other capital projects that were on the horizon. Nifong Boulevard was scheduled to be improved in 2020, and two intersections on Nifong Boulevard would be improved in 2018. He pointed out Chapel Hill Road had experienced a tremendous amount of traffic when Phase II of Scott Boulevard was under construction, and they anticipated a similar situation with the Nifong Boulevard related projects. He noted this was an approved ballot project as well.

Mr. Thomas stated he was interested in the number of those that were for and against the project as he did not recall anyone having a positive comment. Mr. Nichols commented that he thought some people had been confused, and felt they would install something similar to what was down the street at Rollins Road. Mr. Thomas agreed there had been a lot of confusion and antipathy toward the one at Rollins Road and Fairview Road. He noted he had been in e-mail conversations with almost every resident in the subdivision immediately south of this location, and they were almost entirely unified against this project. As a result, he wanted more information. He explained he had asked staff for the speed study that had been done at Rollins Road and Fairview Road because he wanted to show the neighbors what was happening there and how this one would be designed differently. Mr. Nichols stated displays of the roundabout had been at the interested parties meeting, and he thought those in attendance were not necessarily opposed to the project after they understood the differences and only wanted other features included. He noted staff would provide the speed study.

Mr. Thomas stated he also wanted the actual counts for the traffic that backed up at the Chapel Hill Road and Fairview Road intersection, which would show the need for the roundabout. He understood traffic had backed up down the hill to the bridge at the County House Branch when Scott Boulevard was closed, but he had not seen more than 10-15 cars at other times. He explained he wanted to see the actual data with regard to congestion at the intersection to determine if it warranted spending this much money to improve flow. Mr. Nichols understood he wanted the level of service analysis.

Mr. Skala noted there were many traffic needs in Columbia, and suggested they focus on projects with more support without equivocation.

Mr. Nichols pointed out this resolution would set the public hearing to allow for the dialogue to determine whether the project was supported.

Mr. Thomas asked if staff would be opposed to delaying the public hearing to allow more

informal communication with the neighbors. Mr. Nichols replied staff could accommodate a delay. Mr. Thomas suggested bringing this back at the July 5, 2016 Council Meeting. Mr. Nichols stated that would not create a problem for staff. Mr. Matthes asked Mr. Thomas if he wanted to set the public hearing for that date or table this resolution, which would set the public hearing, to that date. Mr. Skala suggested they table this resolution for a month to allow some communication and then set the hearing date. Mr. Thomas understood the public hearing would then be the first meeting in June. Ms. Peters replied that was not necessarily correct as they could set the public hearing date in May.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to table R34-16 to the May 2, 2016 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

R35-16

Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located at the western terminus of Smith Drive, approximately 3,000 feet west of Scott Boulevard (Case No. 16-13).

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood the public hearing would be held on April 18, but that would not require a vote, and they would vote on the issue on May 2. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mr. Trapp stated the neighbors had requested he move this to a date at which he could be at the meeting since he would miss the April 18, 2016 Council Meeting. He was interested in pushing it back one meeting, but understood Mr. Thomas might want something different.

Mr. Thomas thought there was an evolving negotiation between several impacted neighborhoods and the developer, and suggested they allow time for that to take place. He understood the developer was happy to delay the public hearing on the annexation to May 16. He thought that could be done or they could table the resolution setting the public hearing for a month like they did with R34-16.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to table R35-16 to the May 2, 2016 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought was a reasonable approach to take on an issue that was controversial.

Ms. Thompson pointed out there were time frames by which the City had to act on certain petitions. Mr. Teddy stated the annexation petition had been certified on March 24, 2016 and believed State Statute required them to act on it within 60 days. Mr. Thomas understood the motion on the table would delay this resolution setting the public hearing to the May 2, 2016 Council Meeting. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct so they could then set the date of the hearing at the May 2, 2016 Council Meeting for the May 16, 2016 Council Meeting. He noted that would push to the zoning items to June. Mr. Thomas asked if the 60 days applied to the zoning items. Ms. Thompson thought it only applied to the annexation.

Mr. Thomas understood the public hearing had to be held on May 2 in order to avoid the resubmission of the annexation petition, and the vote would occur on May 16. He stated he did not support that timeframe. Mayor McDavid asked what would happen if they did not hold the hearing. Mr. Thomas asked if it was a lot of work to resubmit the petition. Ms. Peters wondered if the property would automatically be annexed in that situation. Ms. Thompson replied it would not automatically become annexed. She thought it might automatically be denied, but it was not something she had researched prior to the meeting. Mr. Thomas asked if it would create a lot of trouble to reapply. Mr. Teddy thought that was a question for the applicant. It was not any trouble for staff.

Mr. Thomas stated this would be a controversial annexation and development, and did not feel holding the hearing on May 2 with the vote on May 16 provided enough time for conversation.

Mr. Skala pointed out they always had the option to delay action further depending upon whether or not progress was made.

Mr. Matthes suggested tabling this item for one meeting in order to provide staff the opportunity to look into the timing and consequence questions. This would still allow them to meet deadlines if they had to proceed.

Mr. Thomas withdrew his previous motion to table R35-16 to the May 2, 2016 Council Meeting. Mr. Trapp, who seconded the motion, was agreeable to the withdrawal of the motion.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to table R35-16 to the April 18, 2016 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

R39-16 Amending Resolution No. 32-15A which established the Community Tree Task Force.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked for the scope of the Task Force via the original resolution as she was concerned about the reference to tree care on private property. Mr. Teddy replied it had been expressed in Section 1 of the original resolution, which was adopted in February, 2015, and he read that section.

Mr. Skala understood this Task Force needed more time to finish their work. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct, and noted the Task Force had been productive throughout its eleven meetings as could be seen by their report.

Mr. Skala pointed out the Council had the ultimate veto power to address the concerns of Ms. Nauser.

Ann Koenig explained she was Chair of the Community Tree Task Force and noted their interpretation of providing private property owners with general tree recommendations was to conduct educational workshops on tree care, such as how to plant, prune, select, and locate trees.

Ms. Nauser asked if she thought this Task Force would recommend a tree board whereby citizens had to ask permission to plant trees, remove trees, etc. as that was a concern of hers.

Ms. Koenig replied that was a legitimate concern. She explained the Task Force had been reviewing the City's tree ordinances and making recommendations that would then come before Council. She thought they had been very respectful and cognizant of private property rights in their review. She stated they had not had any meeting with the agenda of trying to do anything on private property or influence any private property rules or regulations.

Mr. Ruffin asked for more information with regard to the educational programs that had been initiated in terms of where and how people could learn about those programs. Ms. Koenig replied they had enhanced the webpage the City Arborist had managed with information regarding how to care for trees, what trees to select, staying away from utility lines, etc. They also had held the MidMo Taproot Series, which was a series of general public programs on how to care for trees, to include insect disease, how to tap trees for maple syrup, tree selection, and tree pruning. Those were held in the evenings at restaurants where people could eat, drink, and socialize while learning in order to get a different crowd.

Mr. Skala asked if the Task Force had discussed coordination with GIS in terms of a tree canopy. Ms. Koenig replied they had come to the Council about six months ago to ask for support for the idea of a Master Plan, which would incorporate GIS partnerships, and the City had a request for qualifications to develop an Urban Forest Master Plan. She thought that was the process whereby people would collaborate with maps in terms of canopy assessments and goals.

Ms. Nauser understood the Urban Forest Master Plan could help identify locations of certain species of trees if there was an outbreak of a disease, which would then allow resources and information to be presented to property owners. Ms. Koenig explained the Urban Forest Master Plan would assess tree species, their conditions, and their locations, so it would allow them to identify where the largest and most vulnerable trees of a specific species were located if there was an outbreak of a disease.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought the reason the Council had asked the Task Force to focus on education and private properties was because the City already had robust tree programs through the Parks and Recreation Department and a number of other departments. He did not believe it was meant as a step toward a tree board.

Mr. Skala commented that the Council had two sources of information, and those were staff and volunteer boards and commissions. He noted both provided different perspectives and believed the blend of those two sources of information were incredibly valuable in making decisions based on the facts of the professionals and the thoughts of the community. He stated he did not have any problem extending the lifetime of this Task Force in order to allow

them to accomplish their goals.

Ms. Nauser explained she valued the trees on her property and understood the community valued the trees within the community. She noted she would not be supportive of a tree board that dictated what people could or could not do with trees on their own property. She thought this Task Force had done a considerable amount of good work and stated she would support the continuation of their educational efforts.

The vote on R39-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B79-16 Voluntary annexation of property located on the southwest corner of Brown School Road and Range Line Street (Highway 763); establishing permanent PUD-12, O-1, C-P, C-3 and R-3 zoning; approving a statement of intent (Case No. 16-34).
- B80-16 Authorizing a development agreement with Christiansen Investments, LLC for property located on the southwest corner of Brown School Road and Range Line Street (Highway 763) (Case No. 16-34).
- B81-16 Rezoning property located on the south side of Green Meadows Circle and the north side of Green Meadows Road from R-1 to PUD-5; approving the Woodhaven Age-In-Place Apartments 410 Green Meadows Circle PUD Plan; approving less stringent screening and landscaping requirements (Case No. 16-76).
- B82-16 Granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations, and a waiver from the requirements of the City Code, relating to construction of a sidewalk along a portion of the south side of Nifong Boulevard and east of Peachtree Drive (110 Nifong Boulevard); accepting a deed of dedication for roadway purposes and conveyances for street and utility purposes (Case No. 16-50).
- B83-16 Approving the Final Plat of Paris Road Village - Plat No. 2, a Replat of Lot 5 of Administrative Plat 2 of Lot 1, Paris Road Village, located on the east side of Paris Road, approximately 400 feet south of Vandiver Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-42).
- B84-16 Approving the Final Plat of Russell Subdivision - Plat 5 located on the northwest corner of Russell Boulevard and Rollins Road (709 Russell Boulevard); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-70).
- B85-16 Authorizing an annexation agreement with Jerome and Jeannie Taylor for property located on the north side of Happy Hollow Drive and west of Highway 163 (801 E. Happy Hollow Road) (Case No. 16-46).
- B86-16 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code relating to self-service storage facilities (Case No. 15-199).
- B87-16 Authorizing construction of the MKT to Parkade Bike Boulevard Project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

- B88-16 Accepting a conveyance for street purposes.
- B89-16 Authorizing a generators sale agreement with MBS Textbook Exchange, Inc. for the sale of two (2) generators and associated switchgear.
- B90-16 Accepting a donation from the Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Columbia Lodge #207 for improvements at the MKT Trailhead at the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial at Battle Garden and MKT Forum Nature Area Trailhead; appropriating funds.
- B91-16 Authorizing a facilities and services agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the use of Peace Park for the Fourth of July Celebration and Fireworks Display.
- B92-16 Authorizing Amendment No. 2 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for WIC local agency nutrition services.

X. REPORTS

- REP26-16 Appointment of Business Loop Community Improvement District (CID) Board of Director Member.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to appoint Felice “Franky” Brown to serve the remainder of the term ending in April, 2017. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

- REP27-16 East Walnut Alley Right-of-Way Vacation (Case No. 16-93).

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked about the maintenance of the alley with this change. Mr. Teddy replied it was currently a public alley so the City had maintenance responsibilities for it. He did not currently know what utilities might be within or under it and explained staff typically evaluated whether there needed to be maintenance of a utility corridor at the very least. They would also solicit opinions regarding its use as a service alley. Mr. Skala understood that evaluation would be consistent with this request. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He noted they currently did not have the benefit of comments from all departments. He noted staff had started the practice of bringing these requests to Council via reports because it was sometimes too late for Council to raise any questions when it came forward as a bill.

Mayor McDavid made a motion directing staff to prepare an ordinance to vacate a portion of the east-west alley located between 203 E. Walnut and 115 N. Providence Road. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Ms. Peters noted the report had indicated no utilities had been identified as being located within the alley at this point in the review process, and asked if staff had looked into it. Mr. Teddy replied they had reviewed the maps they had available to them showing the location of City utilities. Ms. Peters understood no one had really reviewed it. Mr. Teddy replied only a preliminary review had been done.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Ms. Nauser directing staff to prepare an ordinance to vacate a portion of the east-west alley located between 203 E. Walnut and 115 N. Providence Road was approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP28-16 Final Report of Mayor's Task Force on Pedestrian Safety (Case No. 16-100).

Leeann Johnson, a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Pedestrian Safety, stated she was a 28 year nurse on the helicopter, and for the past three years, she had been the Trauma Manager at the University of Missouri Hospital - Level 1 Trauma Center, so she had seen trauma first hand. She thanked Mayor McDavid for establishing this Task Force as she believed preventing people from getting hurt was very important. She commented that nationally there had been a rise in the number of pedestrians struck. In Columbia, from late 2014 to early 2015, four people had been killed and six people had been injured after being struck by vehicles. There had been a fatality this March as well. She explained the Task Force had come up with sixteen recommendations, and their priority recommendation was to adopt Vision Zero, which was a philosophy of transport systems, designs, and operations that maintained three key principles. Those principles were that safety was the most important factor in transport planning, traffic deaths and serious injuries were avoidable and therefore unacceptable, and transportation systems should be designed so that user errors were not fatal. She noted this program had been very successful in other cities and thought it could be very successful in Columbia. She stated she had lived in Columbia for 33 years and was very proud of it, but thought they could do better when it came to pedestrian safety. She listed and described a few other recommendations, to include a policy of one percent for safety education, a comprehensive and ongoing safety education and communication campaign as many people were confused by new infrastructure such as the flashing yellow lights, an ordinance prohibiting cell phone usage and texting while driving, reducing the speed limits, and new programs for road safety, audits, and assessments. She implored the Council to review the report and consider the recommendations. She thought the Task Force had been effective, diverse, and engaged, and thanked those who had participated.

Mr. Skala understood there had been some resistance to Vision Zero by the Board of Health and asked for clarification. Ms. Johnson replied she was not aware of this, and explained there were many Vision Zero concepts. The one she was speaking to had been adopted in New York City, Seattle, and Denver.

Mr. Thomas thanked Ms. Johnson and recognized James Beattie and Katie Essing, other members of the Mayor's Task Force on Pedestrian Safety who were in attendance. He agreed it was a very diverse and engaged group. He thanked the various staff members that had helped to facilitate the process as well.

Mr. Ruffin stated he was appreciative of the work and consistent engagement of the Task Force members. He noted Mayor McDavid had asked him to co-chair the Task Force because many of the fatalities had occurred in the First Ward, and not for his expertise on the issue. As a result, it had been an incredible learning experience for him. He commended Mr. Thomas for his hard work, vision, and knowledge as that had guided this process to completion.

Mayor McDavid thanked the members of the Mayor's Task Force on Pedestrian Safety for their hard work and noted he was delighted with the product. He thought the community would endorse the concept of Vision Zero. He asked if an addendum could be added to the report showing the data with regard to accidents. He understood nationally pedestrian injuries had increased, but thought there should be benchmark data for Columbia so future Councils could see if they could bend the curve. Mr. Thomas stated that data was available and the Task Force had just chosen not to include it in the report. Mayor McDavid noted he thought it would also be useful to find data on comparable cities, such as Lexington, Kentucky, Ames, Iowa, etc. This would allow them to create a report card of impacts on injuries compared to other cities. He commented that this would take a lot of work and envisioned the next Council discussing it at work sessions. He thought there were some suggestions that would be opposed by the public, such as red light cameras. He recalled speed cameras being controversial in St. Louis, and felt a 20 mph speed limit would be difficult to sell to the public.

Mr. Skala stated he liked the idea of the Vision Zero approach as there was data that suggested they could improve the situation. He also supported the idea of prevention in terms of public health. He commented that he, his wife, and daughter had been hit at an intersection by a car turning left two years ago. He thought the benchmark idea of Mayor McDavid would be compelling to the public in order to pursue this as a strategy moving forward. He applauded the efforts of the group because he believed they should try to prevent preventable accidents.

REP29-16 Correspondence from the Environment and Energy Commission on rental energy efficiency and the proposed Home Energy Score (HES) or Columbia Water and Light Efficiency Score (CWLES) requirement.

Jan Dye stated she was the Chair of the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) and explained this report was an effort to increase energy efficiency in homes used by students and lower income or elderly citizens. The Commission was proposing a provision in Section 22-186, which involved the rental certificates landlords had to obtain in order to rent properties. The Commission felt this change would significantly improve the quality of housing available and allow for a long term commitment to energy efficiency. She noted they agreed with the Building Construction Codes Commission in that they did not feel enough was being done to address the lack of modern energy efficiency in already existing older homes. While newer building codes could address deficiencies in new buildings, they could not do anything to address older homes that had been built before energy efficiency was a concern. The EEC believed energy efficiency was important for all homes, and not just owner-occupied homes. She understood these were not easy conversations, but felt the conversations needed to occur. Anything that could be done to reduce energy consumption as a community was important. She explained the City of Columbia had assisted the U.S. Department of Energy in developing the Home Energy Scores program. By adopting the proposed ordinance as part of the rental code, Columbia could continue to lead in its commitment to energy efficiency. She stated the EEC would like the Council to ask staff to draft an ordinance for their consideration.

Mayor McDavid commented that a lot of people in Columbia owned rental property, to include retired couples with one or two duplexes or a home, to supplement their retirement. He noted they had previously discussed finding ways to incentivize landlords through an open data system, but had been unable to agree upon a method due to individual variations. He stated he would be concerned if he was one of those retirees because he would not know what this meant or how it would be measured. He wondered if a score of six would cause property owners to not be able to rent their properties and asked what they would do if 10 percent of the rental units were not in compliance. He suggested the EEC interview stakeholders to find out their thoughts, and to be clear on which model would be utilized and whether it worked elsewhere. He recommended the EEC come back to Council with an amended report after having talked to stakeholders.

Ms. Peters understood data for rental properties were in the report. The report had indicated half of the rental units that had been tested would have surpassed the recommended standards initially, and 99 percent of them would have afterwards. She agreed with Mayor McDavid in that she would want to know what exactly was involved and how much trouble it would be to do.

Mr. Skala stated he believed it was a good idea to collect as much data as possible and to discuss the issues. He believed they needed to incentivize improvements to rental properties and create an index. He pointed out the index might even help some rental property owners market their properties. He noted this issue impacted affordable housing as utilities caused many properties to become unaffordable. He commented that he did not believe it was fair to ask the EEC to flush out all of the details, and the particular level at which they made decisions was at the purview of the Council when they had a draft ordinance before them. He understood it would be controversial, but felt it was worth discussing.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to draft a proposed ordinance consistent with the recommendations of the EEC for consideration by Council. The motion failed for the lack of a second.

Ms. Nauser understood they had identified inefficient properties as the problem, but did not feel they knew what they wanted to accomplish. She wondered if they wanted all rental properties to be within a certain level of efficiency, and thought they needed to know what that level was and how much it would cost to get to that level. She noted the costs to property owners would likely be put back into the cost of the rental property, which would make some affordable properties less affordable. She felt the ramifications of this were huge. She explained she was working with a family whose biggest concern was finding a place to live due to their credit and did not feel they had identified the people they were trying to help. She believed this needed to be thought out in terms of unintended consequences. She commented that she would rather help people obtain jobs, training, etc. so they were not in this

predicament.

Mr. Thomas stated he thought it was important to consider the payback time in terms of the financial analysis. If the initial investment in energy efficiency resulted in a reduction of monthly utility bills and the payback time was short, he felt it was a good investment. Ms. Nauser asked if they knew how long the average person rented property. Mr. Thomas replied this was not related to an individual person. The landlord would presumably pay for the energy efficiency improvement and raise the rent to cover those costs, but the utility bills would be less and overall there would be a savings for the landlord and tenants.

Mr. Trapp believed that was a fair point, but agreed with Mayor McDavid in that they needed more information and needed to include stakeholder engagement prior to drafting the ordinance. He provided the plastic bag ordinance as an example. It had been a painful public discussion and the State of Missouri had later stripped Columbia of its rights to regulate plastic bags. He was afraid something similar could happen with this issue. He agreed with Mayor McDavid in that there were many individuals in the community with rental properties, and noted their decisions could be overturned from the top or the bottom. They could not get too far ahead of the citizenry even out of good will, and the best way to know how the citizenry felt was to engage stakeholders. He believed EEC meetings would be a great place for this discussion, and felt the unfortunate outcome that had resulted for plastic bags might not have resulted in that manner if they had taken a slower and more deliberative process.

Mr. Skala commented that several interns had researched the issue and had filed a report 2-3 years ago, so they were not approaching this without any information whatsoever. This was not new. It was a continuing discussion, which he felt was appropriate to carry into the public arena from the perspective of the City Council. He agreed it would be controversial, but felt it needed to be discussed. He noted he was not opposed to obtaining more information, but was not in favor of delaying moving forward on the issue as had been done for the past 10 years.

REP31-16 Development Code Update Project.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked how people would be able to notify the City of their concerns. She noted she had been contacted by a constituent who was concerned about only having three minutes to share concerns over an issue this large. She asked what staff had envisioned. Mr. Teddy replied he would not address how the Council conducted its business because that was up to them. He thought staff could suggest to the Planning and Zoning Commission to allow for the advanced solicitation of interest when speaking at a particular meeting so they were able to get a sense of how much time each person might need, whether they were speaking on behalf of a group, etc. Another suggestion could be to ask for detailed comments in writing that could be forwarded to the Commission so the oral comments were kept relatively brief.

Ms. Nauser commented that the Council had held separate meetings in the past when there were issues of this magnitude, and suggested something similar be done for this issue. Mr. Skala thought that was a good idea. Ms. Peters agreed as well.

Mayor McDavid stated his experience was that more concerns would be voiced the closer they were to considering an item such as this, and that would create the bigger challenge. People would become progressively more intensely involved as they were closer to the end. He wished the Council the best.

Mr. Skala commented that he believed they needed to dedicate a meeting for this item alone as it could potentially be a big change. He also thought they needed to offer people more than three minutes.

Ms. Peters understood some people were concerned about how this code would move forward and how it would be used. She also understood test cases were being reviewed and asked if there were any plans other than the one four-hour meeting to explain the code to citizens as opposed to expecting them to understand the code well enough to provide a three minute opinion. She asked if any informational or neighborhood meetings had been planned prior to this going to the Planning and Zoning Commission so they knew whether they needed to object. Mr. Teddy replied they had planned to dedicate some public information meetings, which were held on Tuesdays, to the development code. It would allow the public to indicate what concerned them or what they wanted to know. He pointed out they would not operate under the pretense that they were explaining the entire code on those Tuesdays.

Ms. Nauser understood the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) was performing its own test studies and asked how this schedule would coordinate with those tests and the addressing of any discrepancies prior to holding any public hearings. Mr. Teddy replied he would ask the CID make the request for time to be allowed to present the results of their tests to the Planning and Zoning Commission at one of its early meetings. He thought the CID would be done before the ordinance came to the City Council.

Mr. Matthes noted five Planning and Zoning Commission meetings were planned to try to focus on particular issues, so if someone was interested in the entire code, they could attend all five meetings. If they were only concerned about one piece, they could economize their time. He explained this could also be discussed at pre-council meetings and the Council could decide on the number of meetings it wanted as well. He pointed out there was no deadline so everyone could feel comfortable to certain degree before they moved forward.

Mr. Trapp commented that a natural deadline was the fact the current code would remain in place until they moved forward with this code. He noted the ten story building at Ninth Street and Locus Street would not have been allowed under the new code because there was a six-story cap on Ninth Street. He cautioned those that felt there were not enough protections for downtown to not delay the process because the current code was what had to be met until the new code was adopted. He thought they would want to take public comment and move through the process deliberately. He agreed they could not have brought it forward any quicker as there would likely have been people who thought it was too restrictive for business or it did not provide enough protections for neighborhoods. He stated they would have to win over one of the sides if a consensus, which was hard to come by, could not be attained.

Mr. Skala thought Mr. Trapp had a great point and noted he had taken umbrage to the comments that the Council had moved the goal post with the interim C-2 zoning changes as they had not taken the rights of anyone away. They had only addressed a few items so there was more scrutiny, such as a building over ten stories. He agreed there was a sense of urgency now that they were close, and felt they needed to get this in front of the public so they could become engaged and the changes could be made.

REP30-16 **Administrative Public Improvement Project: MKT Trailhead Improvements - Independent Order of Odd Fellows, Columbia Lodge #207 Donation.**

Mayor McDavid understood staff would move forward unless there was an objection expressed by the Council. No objection was expressed.

REP32-16 **Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.**

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

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, suggested the City adopt some of the ideas implemented by Boone Electric Cooperative as incentives. He understood they had an annual meeting of energy saving ideas, which included rebates and other items. He recommended the City provide incentives to help the landlords make improvements.

Mr. Elkin suggested safety meetings to address employees getting hurt. He commented that they had to remember some of the employees were fairly young and might not think about the proper way to lift an item.

Mr. Elkin stated he had parked on the west side of South Tenth Street as he was attending a funeral at the Missouri United Methodist Church, and upon leaving the funeral and walking back to his vehicle, he had hit the metal leg of a sign that had been placed on the east sidewalk. He noted he had flown several feet and asked who he needed to speak to at the City. Mr. Matthes asked Mr. Elkin to contact his office.

Mr. Trapp reminded everyone to vote tomorrow.

Mr. Skala commented that Patriot Place was a remarkable project that purported to be a tremendous asset for the community, and he hoped they could move beyond homeless veterans in the future. He noted there would be a tiny home demonstration project in the near future. He thought there were some good projects coming forward to help address issues of

the underserved in the community.

Mr. Skala thanked Mayor McDavid for his service to the City of Columbia.

Mr. Skala reminded everyone to vote tomorrow as there were some important local issues to include the race for the mayor and two incumbent races.

Ms. Nauser asked for a report regarding the issue Mr. Fagan brought up earlier in the evening. She wondered why the trash compactor has been moved. Mr. Matthes stated staff would look into it. Ms. Nauser understood it was a difficult situation when people wanted to live in an urban environment, but downtown living came with downtown noise. She felt they had the duty to remove trash, but wanted happy residents as well.

Mayor McDavid commented that Cory Ridenhour had contacted him on behalf of the Cascades neighborhood with regard to the sewer fee for their swimming pool property with two toilets and two sinks. The cost was previously \$14, and they had been upgraded to commercial and were now paying \$600 per month. He asked staff to look into it. Ms. Nauser stated she would forward him the information she had received on it.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 9:40 p.m.