



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, March 5, 2018
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, March 5, 2018, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, and TRAPP were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of February 5, 2018 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Pitzer.

Mayor Treece asked that R29-18 be moved from the consent agenda to new business. The agenda, including the consent agenda with R29-18 being moved to new business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Pitzer.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI3-18

Patrick McKenna, MoDOT Director - Recognize the City of Columbia for its highway safety efforts, most notably its Vision Zero program; and promote MoDOT's Buckle Up/Phone Down initiative.

Mr. McKenna thanked the City for the opportunity to speak on the elimination of traffic deaths and injuries on Missouri highways, which was a vision they all shared. He stated he was grateful the City had accepted the MoDOT challenge by becoming a partner in its statewide safety campaign, the Buckle Up/Phone Down initiative. The campaign tackled two of the most effective actions drivers could take to stay safe when behind the wheel, and they were fastening seatbelts and putting down cell phones. As part of the Buckle Up/Phone Down campaign, MoDOT was challenging Missouri individuals, businesses, and organizations to follow its lead of promoting phones down when driving and making seat belt use a matter of policy. To date, more than 300 businesses and organizations and 2,000 individuals had taken the pledge. He understood this was not an easy policy to implement as it required a culture shift since so many people used cell phones in all aspects of life. Internally, at MoDOT, there had discussion about customer service, but safety had to be first in terms of their employees and others on the roadways. He noted a MoDOT employee had died in April of 2016, and the debate about this policy ended at that time. He did not feel they could ask anyone to behave on the roadways in a manner in which they were not willing to behave themselves, and noted they had to lead by example. He pointed out legislation at a statewide level with regard to this topic had not been passed over the last 20-plus years, so they had to change behavior through other methods. He commended the City of Columbia for being aggressive and proactive in attempting to eliminate all traffic deaths and serious injuries by 2030. He also applauded the Council for amending the City Code on careful and prudent driving to include

distracted driver behavior. It took bold vision and leadership to enact change, and Columbia was leading the way in modeling the effort. He commented that traffic fatalities were not mere statistics as they involved family members, friends, coworkers, and neighbors. He agreed one traffic related death was too many and thanked the Council for forging a path to zero traffic fatalities. He presented the City with a plaque made from a recycled road sign on behalf of MoDOT, the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission, and the Missouri Coalition for Roadway Safety for its work to save lives on Missouri roadways.

Mayor Treece thanked Mr. McKenna for this recognition.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC11-18 Brian Johnstone - Shepard Blvd/Rollins Trail in regards to the lack of mode shift possibility & 2006-2016 research safety issues along Old 63 between Broadway & Stadium & along Stadium between Old 63 & Ashland Road.

Mr. Johnstone explained he was a resident of Bluff Dale Drive and felt safety and mode shift had not been adequately address with regard to the Shepard Boulevard/Rollins Street trail project. He believed clear delineation of conjecture and substantive facts would result in responsible and satisfying outcomes. He commented that Alignment 4 involved the area where Bluff Dale Drive intersected with Old 63, and the route going south on Old 63 to the Stadium Boulevard intersection and then west on Stadium Boulevard to Ashland Road. Since 2015, he had repeatedly heard statements that the existing bikeway and walkway along Alignment 4 represented significant danger to both cyclists and pedestrians, and felt this type of communication lacked actual support and created unworthy arguments. He stated he had reviewed data provided by the Missouri Highway Patrol online crash reporting site, and 362 pedestrian accidents had been recorded in Columbia in a 12-year period of March 2006 to February 2018, but only two had occurred in Alignment 4. The accidents had occurred at the Stadium Boulevard and Old 63 crosswalk intersection, which had recently been renovated with better signage, wider crosswalks, and pedestrian signals. He noted 265 bicycles accidents had been recorded in the same period of time in Columbia, and none had occurred in Alignment 4. He felt an accurate representation of the near accident-free status of Alignment 4 might encourage more utilization of the existing walkway and bicycle path. He understood mode shift potential was a measure of how many people would change their transportation modality from cars to bicycles and/or walking, and the City of Columbia had determined the promise of mode shift existed in high populated areas, primarily University student residences, within a 3.5 mile radius of campus. He explained he had interviewed students, residents, and managers of housing complexes east and south of campus, and there had been an overall high level of satisfaction on the part of students and residents on the availability and use of shuttle services operated by Greenway Shuttles. General consensus was that it was too far and problematic to ride a bike to campus. In addition, many respondents did not own a bicycle. He noted shuttle management had indicated they transported about 4,100 commuters weekly to and from campus and downtown. The free bike lending operation on the University campus had estimated about 300 bikes had been lent out in a five month period, which averaged at about two per day, and the majority of reported rentals were used for recreational purposes. He believed significant mode shift in this area would be negligible, and asked the Council to take this information into consideration by supporting the equitable assignment of tax allocations and federal funds to areas in Columbia that truly had a need for safe connections to school, work, and necessary resources. He provided a handout to the Council.

SPC12-18 Kim Dude-Lammy - Drink specials ordinance.

Ms. Dude-Lammy, 3109 Appalachian Drive, commented that the City of Columbia had recently been named the drunkest city in Missouri by the Center for Disease Control, and felt none of them were likely happy about that designation. The National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism estimated over 1,800 college students had lost their lives to alcohol related incidents annually, and over 600,000 were injured. In addition, there were close to 100,000 alcohol-related sexual assaults each year. Colleges and universities along with the towns in which they existed could no longer ignore the detrimental impact high risk drinking had on their reputation. She noted the misuse and abuse of alcohol on college campuses was a concern throughout the country. This year, several campuses had witnessed tragic student deaths and had garnered very negative publicity. The headlines did not just impact the college or university as it also impacted the economy of the community because when student numbers decreasing affected businesses negatively. She commented that for many years, the Wellness Resource Center had been dedicated to helping students make healthy choices by educating them on responsible decision-making with regard to alcohol. Although progress had been made, she felt much more could and needed to be done. She explained it was extremely challenging to educate a student to drink in moderation when the business community was rewarding students for drinking in excess through drink specials, such as penny pitchers, quarter draws, \$5 all you can drink, and 75 cent triple wells. The National Institute of Alcohol Abuse and Alcoholism indicated that restricting drink specials was a low cost and highly effective way to curb excessive drinking. Research had shown a correlation between alcohol consumption, binge drinking, and driving under the influence to the price of alcoholic beverages. As a result of these studies, researchers at the National Highway and Traffic Safety Association reported policies restricting drink specials could have a positive impact on public health and lower rates on alcohol related deaths and criminal behavior. She stated data they had from the Missouri Assessment of College Health Behaviors, which was a survey done out her office and on 20 campuses throughout the State of Missouri, had showed high risk drinking in bars was increasing in 2017 for the University of Missouri campus. Over the last five years, they had seen a 27 percent increase in the number of students drinking at the bars and a 40 percent increase in the number of Mizzou students that had indicated the bars were where they consumed the most amount of alcohol. She noted the University of Missouri data supported the national research in that the price was the deciding factor in how much a student drank. Seventy percent had indicated they would drink less if the cost of alcohol was higher. She commented that the proposed drink special ordinance would not eliminate drink specials. It would simply require it to not be cheaper than \$2 for a standard size drink, which was 1.5 ounces of hard liquor, five ounces of wine, or 12 ounces of beer, and the purpose was to decrease the number of unbelievably cheap drink specials, such as quarter draws, penny pitchers, bottomless cups, and triple wells. She believed the ordinance would create a level playing field so no bar would have an unfair advantage over another. She explained she had been on the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission (SAAC) for over 25 years, and during that time she had been vocal about making bars and restaurants smoke-free and with regard to the nuisance party ordinance. She felt both had positively impacted the health of students and the safety of the community. She did believe they could educate themselves out of this problem, and thought they needed good policies that encouraged responsible drinking behavior by students and the rest of community. She asked the Council to consider addressing drink specials in an effort to make the community safer.

SPC13-18 Pat Fowler - Workforce housing down payment assistance as a recruitment tool for firefighters and police officers.

Ms. Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, understood Mr. Pitzer had held a press conference on a down payment assistance proposal for police officers and firefighters. She appreciated the fact he wanted to get out in front of the conversation with regard to how to spend the budget surplus, and noted she wanted to get out in front of his proposal because she thought they could push forward in an interconnected fashion to accomplish more with the identified \$500,000. She suggested it be spent in a way that would pour love and support into the core neighborhoods in the downtown area by encouraging police officers and firefighters to become their central city neighbors. She commented that those in the central city had much to offer to the collective health of the community, and police officers and firefighters would learn that better as their neighbors. She understood the Council spent a lot of time on the predicaments of morale and compensation of police officers, and noted \$15,000, which was the upper limit of Mr. Pitzer's proposal, was enough for a 20 percent down payment in her neighborhood. She stated she worked in the construction industry, and when a company hired her company, it was both a contract and a relationship. She believed this applied equally to recruiting and retaining first responders. She understood the City was looking among its funding resources for revenues to fully fund the implementation of community policing, and felt it was time to be all in with that initiative. She noted community policing was about building relationships, which would be enhanced if the person lived next door or down the street. She suggested using the \$500,000 to push relationship building within the central city as it would underwrite the success of the community policing plan. She stated the three neighborhoods surrounding the downtown, North Central, Douglass, and Ridgeway, were within the strategic plan area and home to many children eligible for free and reduced lunches. More than a dozen churches fell within those same boundaries serving African-Americans, college students, and the refuge population. These were her neighbors and were the very citizens with which the Columbia Police Department needed to build relationships. She reiterated her request for the Council to think less about the open-ended nature of a program involving any house within the city limits and more about the targeted, strategic, long-term return on investment of this kind of interconnectedness with the central city. She commented that there were 700 affordable addresses in her neighborhood alone, and this program could impact the restoration and rehabilitation of some of that housing. She stated she hoped the Council would allow her to comment and share ideas if they decided to discuss this later in the evening, and invited them to walk the North Central neighborhood with her.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B47-18 Rezoning property located on the east side of Paris Road, north of Brown Station Road, from District PD (Planned District) to District IG (Industrial District) (Case No. 18-14).

B47-18 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood this property had been converted from C-P with a statement of intent and stipulated uses to PD after the adoption of the UDC, and asked about the list of uses. Mr. Teddy read the uses that would be allowed by the IG that were not currently permitted, and they included commercial recreation, a funeral home, hotel, tree or landscaping business, indoor recreation, an indoor adult entertainment establishment with a conditional use permit, a drive-in theater, a car wash as a standalone use, artisan

industry, heavy commercial, vehicle wrecking or a junkyard with a conditional use permit, light industry, machine shop, a mine or quarry, a bus barn, a rail or truck freight terminal, storage and wholesale distribution, heavy industry, and contractor and mechanical shops. In terms of how the building and site was managed, a 30 percent open space requirement was currently in effect along with a 35 foot maximum height and a 20,500 square foot limit of building on the two sites. The limits would be less with IG as there was not a specified maximum square feet with a base district. In practice, however, there would not be an oversized building due to the need to accommodate parking, landscaping, loading, etc. He noted the minimum requirement green space was 15 percent with the base IG zoning.

Mr. Pitzer asked if one PD plan would cover both parcels even though they were not contiguous. Mr. Teddy replied yes. Since the lots were subdivided, an applicant wanting final site plan approval could do one or the other or both sites at once. He commented that they usually saw one lot at a time when there was a subdivision with a planned district overlay, but there had been exceptions.

Mr. Pitzer understood a comment had been made in the minutes or staff report indicating the neighborhood protections under the industrial zoning district were stricter than what had been in the original specifications for the PD plan. Mr. Teddy stated the strictest buffering standard and a ten-foot minimum dimension for greenspace would be required. In addition, an eight foot tall screen device would be required. He noted the neighborhood protections would provide for an additional ten feet of setback, and there could be a further restriction with regard to the height of the building within the first 25 feet of a residential lot line.

Mr. Thomas understood a lot of the likely uses that would be allowed if the rezoning was granted to IG would also be eligible under the existing planned commercial district, but would require some additional work or an application to rewrite some of the details, and asked for clarification. He noted there had been a figure of \$25,000 for the technical assistance to go through the additional process. Mr. Teddy wondered if that was in reference to the preparation of a plan. Mr. Thomas stated he thought it might be and explained he understood some specific memoranda that had been tied to the planned district could be changed through some application process. Mr. Teddy noted an amendment of an existing planned district was always possible. A new plan could be submitted or even new criteria. He pointed out there was now more flexibility in adding and subtracting uses. He stated he was not sure about the reference to \$25,000. Mr. Thomas explained he thought it had come up during the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) meeting, and it was what the applicant had indicated as the cost.

Mr. Thomas understood a particular woodworking firm was interested in leasing this property, and asked if that use would be allowed now under the existing planned zoning district or if it would have to go through this process. Mr. Teddy replied he had not reviewed anything with any detail, but thought the key would be whether it was industrial, artisan, etc. Based on what he had heard, it would likely be an industrial operation requiring an industrial zoning. Mr. Thomas understood the applicant could ask for an amendment to the PD. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Jay Gebhardt, an engineer with A Civil Group, provided a handout and noted he was representing the Rader family with regard to this rezoning request. He commented that the property had been zoned industrial and had been changed to planned commercial in 2007 for strip mall type of facility, which had been a mistake because it had proven to not be successful over time. The additional uses IG would allow included light industry, artisan industry, commercial services, distribution, and mechanical contractor. He described the location of the lot, and pointed out Route B was an industrial corridor as everything to the south and across the street was industrial. He noted single-family backed up to the property, but it had backed up to industrial previously as they had changed the zoning to commercial.

Kevin Murphy, 3401 Broadway Business Park Court, stated he was with A Civil Group

and described the handouts, which included the neighborhood protections required for IG zoned property.

Mayor Treece asked what the property had been zoned when the current property owner had purchased the site. Mr. Murphy replied the northern portion had been C-P and the southern portion, which was the majority of the site, had been M-C, which was controlled industrial. They had then rezoned the M-C portion to C-P, and it had been during a time when they did not have the protections that were now identified in the UDC. He believed there were greater protections now, and commented that they could only develop about 60 percent of the lots due to the slopes, tree preservation, etc. About less than an acre of the smaller lot, which was about 1.9 acres, could be developed, and only about three acres of the other lot could be developed. He described the area around the proposed site, and explained it would not be unique for this property to be zoned industrial.

Mr. Skala asked if industrial categories, such as M-C, had been converted to PD with the adoption of the UDC. Mr. Murphy replied no. Mr. Skala understood those properties zoned industrial remained industrial. Mr. Murphy stated the areas in gray were zoned industrial. Mr. Skala understood those were not planned zoning categories, and they were all open industrial zoning categories. Mr. Murphy stated that was correct.

Mr. Murphy understood some might wonder why they did not just add uses to the current zoning, and noted the property had been zoned as a planned development since 2007 without any interest. In addition, the cost would be about \$25,000 to do both plans at once, and it would take about six months to go through that process. They currently had a vacant lot on an industrial employment corridor, which could be more active. He felt commercial and residential were the anomaly in this area of industrial.

Mark Farnan, 103 E. Brandon Road, stated he was present on behalf of Paris Road Plaza, LLC, the applicant, and noted several things listed in the new code were different now than when the planned development had been instituted on these properties, to include the industrial zoning district in terms of protections. He commented that there was a set of use specific standards in Section 29-3.3 of the Code of Ordinances now for light industrial, which had not been in place previously, and noted the real intense industrial uses would require a conditional use permit. He pointed out the operation and maintenance standards of the Code also provided protections in terms of noise, noxious fumes, etc., so those issues would be enforced by the City instead of being a deal between neighboring property owners.

Caleb Colbert, 601 E. Broadway, explained he was an attorney representing the applicant and wondered if the owner should be required work within a planned zoning district by coming back with amendment after amendment after amendment or if they should have the opportunity to rezone it to an open zoning district. He believed, from the perspective of the consultant that helped to draft the UDC, they should move away from planned districts and move toward open zoning, even for existing planned districts. There were several problems with planned districts, to include discouraging redevelopment as it would require an amendment any time something like parking needed to be changed, which was expensive. He noted planned districts were also confusing for everyone involved, to include the public and staff, and there were administrative costs as staff had to interpret the statement of intent, allowed uses, and plan for each property. Each planned district was essentially its own zoning district. In addition, planned districts encouraged a culture of negotiations and the "not in my backyard" reaction. He commented that the consultant had made a significant change in how planned districts operated. Under the prior code, an approved development plan never expired, but under the new code, a development plan would expire after three years. He explained an approved site plan for this property had existed for well over six years without any construction, and from the view of the consultant, a good strategy for land use planning would be to put these properties into an opening zoning district. He pointed out they were asking for a zoning classification they felt was appropriate and compatible with the adjacent uses. The properties to the south were zoned open IG, and the subject property

was adjacent to Route B, which was considered contractor alley. He pointed out a question from the public when the UDC was being considered was whether there would be an opportunity for planned districts to be changed to conventional zoning districts, and the consultant and staff response was that there would be that opportunity. He commented that they were trying to honor what they had been told to do during the UDC process and had chosen a zoning classification they felt was appropriate for the area. He asked for support for the request.

Larry Schuster provided a handout and explained the staff report to the PZC had indicated rezoning to IG would permit a number of odious uses, which were never intended or permitted by the existing planned district, and that staff did not support the requested zoning given the contextual uses and potential impacts on the adjacent residential development that could be generated by potential IG users. He commented that a planned district forced the developer to engage adjacent property owners, which was most important in the case of residential neighbors, and open industrial zoning in this location would remove residential neighbors from the process. He pointed out zoning followed the title of the property, and did not follow the owners. He believed personalities and financial accommodations should rarely be given consideration as part of a rezoning process. He understood the applicant had contended that there were adequate provisions within the Code of Ordinances to protect the neighbors, but those protections were only available on a complaint driven basis so the entire onus fell to the aggrieved party, which in this case would be the residential property owners. He did not feel that was fair. He commented that the applicant had failed to address four basic concerns they had raised early in the fall of 2017 other than saying the Code would address the issues and to trust the Code, and those included the control of noxious odors from wood stains, paints, and lacquers, the control of noise from saws, routers, planers, and sanders, the hours of operation for production, and the traffic from unregulated hours of operation. He pointed out the notice requirements had devolved since his time on the PZC, and asked the Council to deny the request to rezone this property to open industrial. He felt it was disingenuous to plead for an upzoning to ameliorate the decision to purchase property zoned C-P, and believed IG zoning in this location was poor public policy. He noted the industrial zoning that had been there since the 1960s had been M-C, which was controlled industrial, and the IG would be an upzoning to it as well.

Mayor Treece understood Mr. Schuster had indicated some concerns had not been addressed since 2017, and asked when he had been approached initially. Mr. Schuster replied he thought it had been August of 2017. Mayor Treece understood the applicant had indicated six months would be too long for the change in the statement of intent and C-P plan, but it appeared that timeframe would have been accommodated if they had started that process instead in August of 2017. It appeared as though they had taken the strategy to rezone instead of amending the statement of intent. Mr. Schuster stated that was correct.

Mr. Schuster pointed out he worked in construction, and as the excerpts of the staff report had indicated, odious uses had never been intended or permitted by the existing planned district. He felt this was a matter of trying a number of different zonings to see what would stick. He did not feel they should make this risk or gamble any more onerous than necessary, but also believed they did not want to transfer the risk taken to the neighbors. He stated the current zoning would force them to discuss issues with the neighbors, and pointed out they had supported every change except this one.

Mayor Treece asked if the Council would risk being characterized as being anti-development if they denied this request. Mr. Schuster replied they were always at risk of that, but they needed to do what was right.

Mr. Skala understood several properties south of the subject site were zoned open industrial. Mr. Schuster thought they had been M-C. Mr. Skala asked if they were IG designations or M-C designations, and if the IG designations had evolved from M-C. He asked if they had been converted from M-C to IG. Mr. Teddy explained M-C had been a

designation in the prior Code, and it was controlled industrial or manufacturing, and now M-C was mixed use corridor, which was a retail and residential mix of things and was not at all industrial. He commented that the IG could have been M-C previously. He explained they had folded all of the industrial classifications into IG with the new Code, and had enhanced the standards for compatibility. Mr. Skala understood the planned districts had been converted to IG. Mr. Teddy pointed controlled manufacturing had not been considered a planned district. It had included some performance standards, but it had not been a planned district. It had been a base district.

Mr. Skala asked for the distinction between M-C and open industrial. Mr. Teddy replied the old M-C was tighter on things such as outside storage in terms of the design of those areas so they tended to disappear. It required a higher level of site performance than the old M-1, which had been the most permissive zoning district.

Mr. Skala understood two properties on either side of Brown Station Road were now within the IG district and had buildings on them, and asked what was located on them. Mr. Schuster asked Mr. Skala if he was talking about the lot with Orscheln Farm and Home building and the one at the intersection. Mr. Skala replied he thought it was south of there on either side of Brown Station Road. Mr. Schuster replied on the northeast corner was Landmark Bank and on the southeast corner was Dollar General.

Landon Albertson, 1000 N. College Avenue, stated he was a commercial broker for The Company Real Estate and noted he did not represent the owner. He explained at least three clients in the last twelve months had been looking for smaller light industrial tracts, and believed Columbia was suffering from a shortage of small tracts zoned for light industrial uses. He felt these two tracts were well located for the requested rezoning, given the surrounding land had similar zoning and the proximity of the site to a major highway. He believed this request made sense as it would help create pockets of light industrial around town. It would also help fill a much needed gap in market inventory for light industrial use as there were virtually no light industrial lots of this size with the higher traffic counts despite the increase in demand. He commented that two major clients had looked at this site, but they had decided to move on to other communities because the existing zoning would take too much work and time.

Nile Kemble, 3000 E. Hanley Drive, explained he was the President of the Mexico Gravel Neighborhood Association and noted they were opposed to this proposal. He commented that the neighborhood was frustrated they had no knowledge of this request until Mr. Schuster had contacted him a week ago. He stated several tracts of industrial land nearby were vacant, and the ones adjacent to the subject site had been vacant for at least 26 years. He thought there was a lot of land north of Highway 63 that could be subdivided into smaller lots, and noted most of the people in support of this would not want it in their backyard. He reiterated the Neighborhood Association was against it.

Justin Jones stated he was the person that was interested in purchasing the site, and explained he currently operated his business at 8601 E. Trade Center Drive. He noted he and his wife owned a local cabinet shop that employed about 20-22 people. Fortunately, the business had grown quite a bit over the last three years, and he had outgrown his 4,500 square foot building. They currently operated out of three different locations with a total of about 8,000 square feet of building space, and it was difficult to manage as people were running back and forth from the various buildings. He commented that he had been looking for two years now for a 10,000-12,000 square foot building that was climate controlled and humidity controlled since he was dealing with lumber. He also needed overhead doors and a loading dock. He noted he had lost potential clients by not having a show room, and needed space for it, offices for his designers, and a place for cabinets that were completed but not yet ready to be sent out to job sites. He believed the subject site would be perfect because it would provide easy access to Highway 63 and I-70 to allow them to get to various locations in a timely manner, and because about 5,000 cars per day traveled by the site, which would help with advertising. He explained a friend and local banker had suggested he talk to Jay Rader, the owner of this tract, as it

was a perfect fit, but after Jay had spoken with his architects and engineers, it had been determined the zoning would not permit his use. They had been told it would take six months to rezone the property and had looked for other properties in the meantime with no success. He stated he would like this to move forward as quickly as possible as they loved Columbia and wanted to remain local.

Mayor Treece congratulated Mr. Jones on the success of his business and noted he would like for him to stay within the Columbia city limits also. He asked Mr. Jones which of the two lots he was interested in. Mr. Jones replied the southern lot, which was the bigger lot. Mayor Treece asked about his plans for the north lot. Mr. Jones replied they had only discussed the southern lot to date.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Jones if he had looked at any of the other vacant lots to the south. Mr. Jones replied no. He explained he had contacted Mr. Rader and had not gone elsewhere.

Mr. Ruffin asked Mr. Jones if he had developed any plans for the building. Mr. Jones replied he and Mr. Rader had discussed plans. Mr. Ruffin asked for the approximate square footage. Mr. Jones replied 10,000-12,000 square feet.

Ms. Peters asked Mr. Jones how he would deal with the smell, noise, hours of operation, etc. Mr. Jones replied they had standard business hours of 8 a.m. to 5 p.m. Monday through Friday with an occasional Saturday workday depending on the workload. In terms of staining and paints, he pointed out they used a water base finish over a lacquer base or oil base so there was not a harmful smell or the production of VOCs. He noted he still required the finishers to wear respirators, but there were not any harmful toxins or bad odors produced by the finish. Ms. Peters asked if they had to vent the air out of the current facility. Mr. Jones replied no, and pointed out the office where they met customers was in the finish room.

Mr. Trapp asked how many employees they currently had and how many they would have with the expansion. Mr. Jones replied they currently had 21 employees, and they could potentially hire a couple more. The reason for the expansion was that everyone was currently on top of one another and because they did not have storage space.

Jay Rader, 5612 Lightpost Drive, agreed there was plenty of IG zoned property available, but that did not mean it was a good fit or that the owners of the land would be willing to subdivide or sell it. One of the lots to the south was more costly than what they would charge, which would limit a lot of users. He commented that the use was primarily industrial all along Paris Road, and their property was an infill site. Due to its size and the new zoning rules, there were restrictions on the heavy industrial uses one might associate with the name of industrial. He thought industrial was likely the wrong name for this zoning classification. He stated he believed the concerns of the neighbors were clearly addressed by the new zoning code, and that all citizens should be able to trust the City to be able to enforce those rules. He understood pockets of industrial were located around the City and in surrounding areas, and felt that would ultimately lead to issues needing to be addressed, such as industrial next to residential, which was similar to the subject site. He pointed out a lot of residential was already abutting IG, and understood 32 residential lots abutted IG south of the Dollar General site. He felt there was a lot of precedent for it.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that they had heard once again about the lack of notification and noted there would not be a change unless initiated by the Council. He understood someone had made a decision 6-7 months ago to not redo the plan when that had been an option. He suggested rejecting this as that would result in supporting a plan and staff. It would also send a message of the desire to obtain input on how to make the process better going forward without rewarding people that had made a strategic decision that had lost them money. In addition, the backing of staff would ensure they would not have to continue to deal with these issues all of the time. He commented that the backing of staff was the only way to get it implemented and for people to come forward only with legitimate changes.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification as to why staff had recommended against this rezoning. Mr. Teddy replied it had to do with continuity. The Orscheln Farm and Home property was a retailer, which was allowed in the existing PD and IG. The allowance of retail uses in an IG was a change that had been made in the course of developing the UDC. He commented that one of the zoning classifications was mostly commercial retail and office services, and the other was mostly the making, storing and shipping of things, but there were also overlapping components. The site already had the Orscheln Farm and Home facility, and cross-access had already been built for a shared driveway system. It had been important and was one of the reasons it was a planned district. He noted staff likely had concern with the mixing of industrial and retail customer traffic. In addition, there was abutting R-1 on the north and east. He felt it was odious.

Mr. Ruffin commented that there appeared to be sufficient protections in the Code, but there might not be a system in place to ensure the protections were followed, and asked how they could ensure the neighborhood protections would be enforced. Mr. Teddy replied it would be done through the permit review. He explained staff would apply all applicable requirements of the Code when a site plan was submitted for review. Mr. Ruffin asked about situations after the site was in operation. He wondered if there would be oversight. Mr. Teddy replied they would send staff out to review any complaint.

Mr. Skala stated he saw a lot of parallels between this property and the property that had been across from Centerstate, which included the conversion from the old method of dealing with zoning and the new UDC. He understood some of the properties had been converted from commercial to planned district and some had been zoned IG if they had been controlled industrial. He noted staff had recommended denying the requested rezoning, and Ms. Loe, a member of the PZC, had indicated there had been some conflict in her vote so it had been closer to a split vote. He commented that they often ran into the grandfather clause when shifting to a new method and some prerogatives had been preserved with the existing zoning since it ran with the land instead of the owner. He thought they might want to ask the PZC to review potential changes to the UDC, to include splitting the IG category into a light industrial zoning category and a heavy industrial zoning category. He understood there had been residential to the south, but it was R-2 zoned property. In addition, he thought most of the industrial uses were past the intersection of Paris Road and Highway 63. He believed there had been an opportunity for the owner of the property to request the use required for cabinet making under the existing planned district and felt that would have been approved easily. He encouraged that approach as it would allow for a reasonable accommodation with the residential homeowners, the owner of this property, and the business owner. He stated he was inclined to vote against this rezoning proposal and hoped the PZC would provide feedback on the conversion of some of the original zoning categories to the new zoning categories.

Mr. Trapp commented that they had a critical shortage of industrial zoned small lots for small manufacturers like this cabinet-making facility, and believed that was squeezing their ability to create jobs as they needed a skilled workforce and places that had the zoning and ability to bring a project through. He thought it was important to recognize that up until 2007 the property had been zoned M-C, which had been converted to the IG category, so for almost 50 years it had that zoning. He stated there was a lot of IG property in the Second Ward that abutted residential, and he had not received complaints. He explained there were more complaints with commercial land abutting residential land, and noted Orscheln Farm and Home was a tough neighbor. He commented that he wanted more commercial and retail on the north side of Columbia, but it was not happening because land prices were only about 20 percent of the equation for development. The labor costs and productions costs for new facilities were the same on the north side of Columbia as they were on the south, but the rents that could be commanded on the south were higher, which was why the restaurants and entertainment centers were migrating to the south. He was not sure when they would see that kind of development on the north regardless of the zoning category. His hope was that more

employment centers and rooftops would lead to more commercial. He wished the property had developed as zoned, but it had not, and it did not seem likely per his conversations with the business and development community. He commented that the industrial corridor was on Route B, and there were a lot of protections within the UDC. Before they had those protections, people had relied on planned developments, which had developed a culture of negotiations. He thought they should look at opportunities for appropriate open zoning districts, especially in this case where they had a critical shortage of smaller industrial zoned lots. He stated he planned to support this.

Mayor Treece stated he appreciated the comments about light industrial and creating opportunities for artisan manufacturers like a cabinet maker, but believed that was only one piece as there was another parcel for which they would open the zoning up for anything. He felt this was a dramatic departure from the protections those homeowners had when they had purchased their property, which was for a planned development at this location. He stated he was not willing to jeopardize the protections of the homeowners for speculation by the applicant on the second lot. Had they pursued an amendment to the statement of intent eight months ago, he believed it would already have been approved. The applicant instead chose open zoning at the risk of the nearby residents and the adjoining property owners.

Mr. Pitzer agreed there were similarities with a recent previously heard case involving a request for open industrial zoning and the ramifications of being near residential areas. He thought the impression was that this Council had asked to go more into the direction of open zoning instead of continuing to amend some of these planned districts, and understood there were a number of legacy parcels that would confront this issue. He believed the decisions made 6-8 months ago were based on the interpretation that Council wanted them to go to open zoning and remove some of the negotiations involved with planned districts. He did not feel that had been a mistake in strategy by them, and thought that should be recognized. He commented that there were some important differences between this case and the prior one. He noted this property was along an industrial corridor and there were a lot of similar type businesses and traffic. He pointed out there were a number of protections that existed now that had not existed previously, and he did not feel a lack of enforcement should be the problem of someone that wanted to develop the land. It was a City problem if they were not enforcing the rules they had adopted, and they needed to enforce those rules. He thought this case was significantly different than the prior one, and that this was an appropriate use of the land.

B47-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: SKALA, THOMAS, TREECE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

PR25-18 Establishing a revised policy for intergovernmental relations; adopting legislative tracking priorities for the 2018 federal and state legislative sessions.

B48-18 Approving the Final Plat of Red Oak South Plat No. 2, a Resubdivision of Lot 2 of "Red Oak South, Plat No. 1," located southwest of the Grindstone Parkway and Norfleet Drive intersection; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 18-21).

- B49-18 Authorizing a right of use license permit with Spring Creek Homes Association of Boone County for installation and maintenance of a private neighborhood identification sign within portions of the Vawter School Road and Foxcreek Way rights-of-way.
- B50-18 Authorizing construction of the FY 2018 sanitary sewer main and manhole rehabilitation project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B51-18 Accepting conveyances for sewer, drainage and utility, and temporary construction purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B52-18 Accepting conveyances for utility, water utility, electric utility and underground electric utility purposes.
- B53-18 Accepting a donation from Central Bank of Boone County, Missouri for the 2018 Fair Housing and Lending Seminar; appropriating funds.
- B54-18 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for animal control services.
- B55-18 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for public health services.
- B56-18 Appropriating funds to offset expenses for Columbia Values Diversity Celebration activities.
- R26-18 Setting a public hearing: declaring the necessity for the proposed installation of active warning devices at the Columbia Terminal Railroad's (COLT) intersection with Mount Zion Church Road in Hallsville, Missouri.
- R27-18 Setting a public hearing: declaring the necessity for proposed construction of Phase I of the Sports Fieldhouse project located in A. Perry Philips Park to include a 41,000 square foot sports fieldhouse with four hardwood basketball/volleyball courts, office space, restroom facilities, multipurpose rooms, concession area, parking lot, extension of the entry road from Ponderosa Street and the installation of walkways, landscaping and exterior lights.

- R28-18 Setting a public hearing: consider the FY 2017 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER).
- R30-18 Transferring funds for the purchase of a service van for the Fire Department.
- R31-18 Transferring funds from the Department of Public Health and Human Services' FY 2016 General Fund savings to the City Manager's Office for the Vision Zero project.
- R32-18 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with Community Foundation of Central Missouri for administrative and office support services.
- R33-18 Authorizing an annual agreement with Columbia Access Television (CAT) for operation of a public access channel in FY 2018.
- R34-18 Authorizing an agreement with Columbia Missouri Community Housing Development Organization for HOME funds for construction of an affordable home to be located at 700 Oak Street.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R35-18 Expressing support for a comprehensive, independent performance audit of the City by the Missouri State Auditor; directing the City Manager to obtain estimated costs for conducting such audit.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece explained he had brought this up at the end of the prior council meeting and understood Ms. Thompson had drafted the resolution based upon a similar resolution that had been adopted by the St. Louis Board of Alderman. He noted he had received several requests to have an independent look at the City's finances. While a financial audit was conducted every year, they had never had a performance audit by the State Auditor to his knowledge. He thought this would be great opportunity to help improve public confidence and to demonstrate they were an effective organization when it came to the most basic budgeting and financing obligations. He commented that if the Council chose to adopt this resolution, it would be an invitation to the State Auditor's Office that would be evaluated. If the invitation was accepted, his expectation would be a negotiation as to the scope of the audit, and the Auditor's Office would then provide a cost estimate. The Council could then determine how they might budget and pay for the audit.

Maria Oropallo, 208 E. Briarwood Lane, stated she was speaking as an individual even though she was on the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee (FAAC). She explained the City of Columbia participated in an independent annual audit of the Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR) every year. The publication provided in-depth information

about the operations and financial position of the City, and was prepared in accordance with the Generally Accepted Accounting Practices (GAAP), which was the standard adopted by the Security and Exchange Commission. The audit was conducted by an outside independent firm of licensed certified public accountants. She noted the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee (FAAC) would actually present that audit at the next council meeting. She commented that the audit basically attempted to answer the question of whether the City was reporting its financial life in conformance with the highest standards of GAAP. The audit involved performing procedures to obtain audit evidence about the amounts and disclosures in the financial statements the City had presented. In making those assessments, the auditor considered internal controls relevant to the preparation and fair presentation of financial statements. It asked whether those that had access to the general ledger made sense and whether there was proper segregation of duties. It did not express an opinion on the effectiveness of internal controls. She pointed out a performance audit was an audit of sound financial management, namely of the economy, efficiency, and effectiveness with which the audit entities had carried out their responsibilities. It was an independent examination of the efficiency and effectiveness of government undertakings, programs, and organizations with due regard to the economy and the aim of leading to improvements. Performance audits were referred to as value for money audits, or operational audits in some places. She explained the performance audit in a public sector took place in an environment where the responsibility of management was given to the auditors, and it measured whether acquired resources of the right quality, quantity, and time and place were at the lowest possible cost. It was the first E, economy. It looked at whether there was achievement of an optimal relationship between the output of services or other results and the resources to produce them, which was efficiency, and whether there was achievement of policy objectives, operational goals, and other intended effects, which was effectiveness. She commented that there was a lot of information about the difference between the internal auditing they currently did and a performance audit, and noted a performance audit evaluated management measures in order to ascertain the achievement of the three E's. Internal auditing assessed compliance, risk management, and governance controls. She stated she had one suggestion if the City undertook a performance audit, and that was to follow the Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA) best practices and policies that contributed to improved government management. She suggested they not continue to do things the way it had always been done as tradition sometimes outran efficacy, and an audit of the type Mayor Treece had suggested needed to keep that in mind. They needed to know if it was self-imposed, something they had always done, or a requirement.

Ms. Peters asked Ms. Oropallo if she felt a performance audit was a good idea. Ms. Oropallo replied yes. She commented that she had been on the FAAC for four years, but could not tell them much about the City's finances. She thought that had to do with the City having 54 different budgets.

Mayor Treece stated he had looked at the most recent audit, and the transmittal letter from the CPA had indicated the report was intended solely for the information and use of the FAAC and management, and was not intended and should not be used by anyone other than those specified parties. He asked Ms. Oropallo if that included Council. Ms. Oropallo replied she would have to ask them that question. Mayor Treece noted the FAAC was advisory to Council so he assumed it did. He asked Ms. Oropallo if the members of the FAAC had received copies of the audit. Mr. Oropallo replied they had received a nice presentation from one of the partners and copies of a nine page report that indicated the City had not broken any laws. She was not sure how that could be considered full reporting. Mayor Treece understood the disclosure letter from the CPA indicated they did not express an opinion on the effectiveness of the City's internal control, that material weaknesses might exist that had not been identified, and they did not express an opinion about the objective of the audit even though they worked for the

FAAC. Ms. Oropallo commented that if they looked at any major city, they would see the exact same language. This was the same across the State of Missouri and the United States as it was boilerplate language. She understood they had looked at accounts that were over \$750,000 very carefully, and wondered about the accounts that were at \$699,000. She pointed out something had to rise to a level of concern before it was looked into, and the auditors did not look at everything. She explained it was not comprehensive, but it was a surprise in that staff could not prepare for everything that would be reviewed, and as a result, they assumed the City was doing a good job of reporting. It did not mean it was the right use of the money.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Oropallo if she knew what the City paid for the annual financial audit. Ms. Oropallo replied she did not as it was dealt with through staff. Mayor Treece asked Ms. Oropallo if she knew how long the City had used this firm. Ms. Oropallo replied this particular firm was in its seventh year with the City as they had won a second five years. She noted she had expressed a grievance that it was the same person presenting the audit to them every year. The FAAC had met with other people in the firm in the fall, but the final report was given by a different individual, who happened to have been the one that had given the other final reports. She reiterated she did not feel that was appropriate. Mayor Treece asked why it would not be appropriate. She replied because the letter received in Columbia was almost identical to the letter a city in Colorado had received. She had raised the issue because she had wanted a different set of eyes looking at it, but that was not how audit firms operated. It felt routine, and she did not think it should be routine. She reiterated it was not an extensive audit as only some accounts were picked via very strict criteria. She did not doubt they were doing a thorough job, but it felt like an exercise rather than an actual audit. She noted a performance audit would look at things differently. It would be much more detailed and have a value attached to it.

Mr. Trapp asked how much would be a reasonable amount to pay for a performance audit. Ms. Oropallo replied she did not know. Ms. Peters noted Mr. Matthes had indicated it was about \$100,000 for a financial audit. Mayor Treece understood that was what the City currently paid for a financial audit. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Ms. Oropallo stated a performance audit would be much more extensive involving more staff and auditor time.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Oropallo if she had ever seen a copy of the contract for the financial audit. Ms. Oropallo replied yes, and noted it was boiler plate and essentially the same for every community the size of Columbia and larger. She explained not everyone did audits the way they did. She stated it was a good exercise, but she would not put a lot of weight behind it.

Mr. Pitzer asked Ms. Oropallo if there had been any specific information she had asked for and not received from the auditors. Ms. Oropallo replied the FAAC did not ask for anything from the auditors as the auditors chose what they would review based upon certain criteria. This year, for example, they had looked at two accounts that were over \$750,000.

Mr. Pitzer commented that the language contained in the letters was likely written by the lawyers of the auditors, and that receiving anything other than the boilerplate language meant the entity audited was in trouble.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, noted the FAAC had received the full audit report and a copy of the CAFR, which included the financial statements that were audited. He explained there were some federal compliance audits, which were in addition to the audit of the financial statements and regulated by the rules set forth by the federal government. He commented that the financial audit was all about sampling and sampling to reach confidence levels, and they were very much in-depth when considering what they were meant to do. He suggested the Council make itself a part of the audit committee in conjunction with the FAAC. This meant they would be in the meeting with the auditors when they presented the plan, and could ask about risk factors, how they chose how

much to sample, etc. In terms of the proposed resolution, he was not precisely sure what it would do, but thought it was a good idea. He commented that he did not have any reason to not be satisfied with the financial audits, but agreed it might be worthwhile to have a performance audit about every ten years. He suggested inviting the State Auditor to a work session to explain the process so they knew what would and could happen with a performance audit.

Paul Love, 100 Sondra Avenue, explained he did not feel as though Council had been a good steward of his money and believed that was an opinion that had been shared by an awful lot of people. He commented that he, like other members of the Second Ward, wanted to make safety a priority, but did not trust the Council enough to provide money through a tax to do it. He thought this audit was something that was needed as it was different than a financial audit. He stated he was disappointed that Mr. Trapp had not been willing to immediately support this idea and encouraged him to vote in favor of it tonight as it would allow them to learn how much it would cost. They could discuss whether to move forward after they had an idea of the associated costs. He thought they would likely get a better deal from the State Auditor's Office as those auditors were likely paid less than private auditors. He encouraged the Council to approve this as it could be the cheapest way to buy confidence from the public.

Peter Norgard, 1602 Hinkson Avenue, commented that over the past few months, citizens of Columbia had been reading disturbing news suggesting a lack of clear and transparent management of certain operating divisions in the City. They had learned forecasted rates for energy consumption had been used to successfully increase utility rates charged to citizens and were continuing to be used despite the fact that actual growth of energy consumption had failed to keep pace with the projected consumption. The numbers in the water and electric divisions appeared to be so contorted that neither the increased revenues resulting from the rate increase nor the operating costs incurred by the department could be accurately conveyed to the general public, the City Council, and the FAAC. He stated they had no way of knowing where money was coming from and where it was going, and he found that lack of transparency completely unacceptable. From his perspective, an audit would inform the decision-making process by establishing a known starting point, which he believed to be critical in maintaining transparency in government. He felt it was less likely the public would be misled due to inaccurate assumptions about the starting point, and noted he was in support of this initiative even though he did not know what the audit would entail. He explained he liked the idea of the Council providing input into what would be looked at along with the exact scope so some confidence could be restored.

Brian Toohey, 2309 I-70 Drive Northwest, stated he was the CEO of the Columbia Board of Realtors and explained they had submitted a letter to Mayor Treece asking for an audit. They felt the audit would provide some transparency and dispel some rumors with regard to City finances. It might also help to provide insight into some areas that could be corrected.

Dale Roberts, 1301 Vandiver Drive, noted he was representing the Columbia Police Officers Association (CPOA) and explained they had also written a letter to Mayor Treece requesting an audit. They felt it would restore confidence in the City's finances, and believed that lack of confidence had been reflected in the inability of being able to pass the public safety tax in the past. He stated he thought there were some misconceptions about the financial management by the City that needed to be dispelled so they could regain trust with the public. He agreed state employees worked for less than employees in the private industry so it might be a bargain to use the State Auditor's Office instead of an outside auditing company.

Travis Gregory stated he was with the Columbia Professional Firefighters and noted they had also submitted a letter asking for an audit. He commented that they agreed it would help public confidence, and felt they would never get a tax base to grow with the City without that public confidence.

Mr. Skala commented that he did not think there would be much opposition for an additional review, but two questions remained, and those were whether the State Auditor would accept the responsibility of doing this and how much it would cost. He stated he had heard numbers from about \$100,000 to millions as it depended upon what they wanted. He noted he was happy to support the resolution so they could get those answers.

Mr. Pitzer understood by statute the State Auditor was required to perform an audit when there was an initiative petition or in certain whistleblower situations, and asked if the Auditor was required to engage in a case like this where it was requested by the municipality. Mayor Treece replied he did not believe a State Auditor would be required to perform an audit. The City of St. Louis had initiated an invitation, which she had accepted. He thought there might have been a couple of other political subdivisions that had asked the State Auditor to perform an audit as well.

Mr. Pitzer understood it had been said that this had been modeled after the St. Louis resolution, but he thought they had invited her to perform the audit and had received the cost afterwards versus ahead of time, and it had resulted in three years and \$1.5 million. Ms. Peters stated she would hope to receive the cost estimate in advance. Ms. Thompson pointed out the Council was required to have the funds appropriated for that purpose prior to authorizing the audit, and it was the reason the resolution had been drafted in this manner. It put forward the request. She pointed out she thought there was some question as to whether it was allowable, but that it was up to the State Auditor. She explained St. Louis was different in that they were considered a county and the State Auditor could review counties by request. She noted acceptance by the Auditor was the first hurdle. They would then need to receive an estimate, and appropriate the funds necessary.

Mr. Pitzer commented that an independent, outside judgement was always a good thing, but the key questions were time, cost, and scope. They had to also consider the amount of staff time involved. He stated if they were to go down this road, it would be difficult to put any ballot initiative in front of the voters while the audit was ongoing. He thought individual bond issues might be different, but he did not see how they could move forward with any tax initiative if they went down this route. He noted he planned to support this resolution and looked forward to any feedback.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought it was worth finding out more.

The vote on R35-18 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R36-18 Establishing an Integrated Electric Resource and Master Plan Task Force.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked who drafted the resolution. Ms. Thompson replied the Law Department drafted the resolution. Mr. Thomas understood some resolutions were drafted by council members and then reviewed for legality by the Law Department. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas understood the resolution had been presented to the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) and asked if any changes were made following that meeting as a result of their comments. Mr. Johnsen replied yes, and pointed out the comments of the WLAB were in the memo. He explained he thought they had originally proposed a fifteen member board, and the WLAB had suggested eleven instead. As a result, staff suggested thirteen members, but noted this was a decision of Council.

Mr. Skala commented that he noticed the Board of Health had been included and understood the reasoning was due to the issues of safety with regard to transmission lines, but asked why there would be two Board of Health members appointed. Mr. Thomas stated he had noticed that in the memo, but the resolution only showed one

Board of Health member. Mr. Johnsen noted the resolution was the guiding document.

Ms. Thompson explained the resolution drafted by the Law Department included wording of a diverse cross-section for five of the members. The reason was that one person could represent more than one group, and it was up to Council to get that diverse representation.

Mr. Pitzer asked why the resolution included a representative of the Columbia Public Schools. He wondered if it was because they were a major customer. Mr. Johnsen replied they were a major customer and had been involved in some of the past processes.

Mayor Treece asked for the recommendations of the WLAB. Mr. Johnsen replied he tried to take their comments from the minutes and include them in the memo. He noted there had been five points, and listed them.

Mayor Treece commented that he had asked for a comprehensive rate study that compared rates for residential customers, commercial customers, and industrial customers, and understood the rate-making associated with the scope of this Task Force would be done after their work was completed. He wondered why it would not be done as part of their work so they were fairly evaluating it. He explained one of the experiences he had was that there tended to be over-engineering and a rate structure tied to that over-engineering, which resulted in a rate increase. He thought if they put a price tag on some of these considerations, particularly in terms of how it impacted individual residential homeowners, they might receive a more fair and balanced consideration of those capacity needs. Mr. Johnsen commented that the reason for the Task Force being involved early was because they would drive the scope of services, and he did not see any reason why they could not include those types of services in the scope.

Mr. Thomas explained one of the amendments he would likely suggest was to include as part of the purpose of the Task Force the studying of the cost to expand the capacity of the electric transmission and distribution system to accommodate a growing number of customers, the review of various strategies for recovering that cost, including a system equity connection fee method and the line extension policy, and a recommendation to Council. Mayor Treece commented that he and Mr. Thomas had discussed an equity connection charge and asked if that had been in the context of this issue. Mr. Thomas replied yes. He stated he had not been at the meeting when this resolution had previously been described by Mr. Johnsen, but he and Mayor Treece had discussed it outside of a meeting, and he had also mentioned that he wanted the cost of expanding the system to accommodate new customers to be studied by this Task Force at the following council meeting. He noted it could potentially be included in the contract, but felt it should be a part of the work of this Task Force so they knew the costs to expand the system and had a strategy to recover those costs. Mayor Treece stated he would support the amendment of Mr. Thomas, but pointed out he also wanted a rate study to be completed, particularly with regard to residential versus commercial versus industrial customers. Mr. Skala commented that he felt that would fit into the bullet point that discussed capacity requirements, but agreed the rate study should be in there explicitly and be associated with that bullet.

Mayor Treece asked if the Task Force would design the scope of the RFP, and if the RFP would come to Council for approval. Mr. Johnsen replied it could. He explained he thought the Task Force would be instrumental in putting the scope of services together for the RFP, and once the RFP resulted in a contract, the contract would come before Council for approval. If the Council wanted to see the RFP before it went to bid or if the Council wanted to see the output of the Task Force, they could do that. Mayor Treece stated that in light of their experience with Integrated Water Resources Planning, he wanted to see the RFP before it was let. Mr. Thomas agreed.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he was generally supportive of this proposal. He thanked Mr. Johnsen for admitting the process that had been used in the past had produced really bad results recently and that it was time to make changes to the process. He suggested the Task Force and staff develop the RFP, which would then be

provided to Council so they could provide further input. He commented that he had attended the WLAB meeting, and they had been clear about the Task Force consisting of eleven voting members, which would include the five of them and six citizens. They had also discussed whether to have any ad-hoc non-voting members. He did not believe there was any reason for a Board of Health representative or appointees of the City Manager. He understood the WLAB felt it was important to include a representative of the Boone Electric Cooperative and the University of Missouri-Columbia.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Clark if the WLAB had voted on the make-up of this committee, and whether they specifically said eleven people with five being WLAB members and six without any designation. Mr. Clark replied they had mentioned certain categories, but the key was eleven total people to include five WLAB members. He noted the WLAB had been afraid they would all not be included in this Task Force. He explained he had sent the Council his best interpretation of the back and forth discussion, and pointed out different people had different ideas with regard to the ad-hoc members.

Mr. Clark stated this Task Force would work with City staff and a qualified consultant to come up with a plan. He understood Mayor Treece was concerned with rate classes, and noted he did not feel the customer classes were adequate or up-to-date, and suggested they be changed. He commented that cost of studies were only as good as what one put into them, and stated capital costs needed to be included. He also suggested the Task Force be allowed to make recommendations of other things that should be included in their work, and for the Council to make it clear they would want to hear from the Task Force.

Mr. Trapp asked for the status of the load study and if Quanta Technology was doing that work. Mr. Johnsen replied Quanta was looking at the distribution system, and their work along with the work of Burns & McDonnell would be rolled into this process.

Mayor Treece thought the work of Quanta Technology and Burns & McDonnell would be done by the end of last year. Mr. Johnsen explained there had been a slow start. Mr. Pitzer asked if there was a financial penalty for that. Mr. Johnsen replied no. Mayor Treece commented that he did not know how many times he had conveyed a sense of urgency on these issues, and noted he recalled specifically asking if those would be completed by the end of the calendar year. Mr. Johnsen stated that had been the original intent. Mayor Treece asked if that was a performance problem or a management problem. Mr. Johnsen replied he was not sure. Mr. Pitzer asked if that performance would be taken into account if Quanta responded to any future RFPs. Mr. Johnsen replied yes.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to amend R36-18 by removing the members of the Board of Health and the Columbia Public School District, and to reduce the number of Task Force members to eleven members and two ad-hoc members.

Mr. Thomas stated he did not necessarily oppose that change, but wanted a more broad ranging discussion.

Mayor Treece explained he wanted to offer a different amendment, which might mean the amendment of Mr. Pitzer was not necessary. He commented that if he were to offer an amendment it would be to reduce the number from thirteen and two to eleven members consisting of five WLAB members and six members appointed by Council. Mr. Thomas asked if the six members would be at-large members. Mayor Treece replied yes. Mr. Thomas stated that was what he wanted to suggest as well.

Mr. Skala commented that they had used a matrix process in the past, which he believed had been a useful structure to narrow down an applicant list to a manageable level. Mayor Treece stated that had been done with the Mayor's Task Force on Climate Action and Adaptation Planning as every Council Member had submitted a name and those names were then reconciled. Mr. Skala explained the difference was that the Council received a matrix indicating who was nearing the final list for a consensus vote.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked the general approach Mr. Clark had espoused of the members of the WLAB and six at-large members. He commented that he thought the

inclusion of representatives of the Board of Health and the Columbia Public Schools was a reaction to the very specific concerns some had with transmission lines previously, and he did not feel that was a legitimate reason for including them. He agreed the University of Missouri was a tremendous user, and understood one of the reasons for the transmission line project, Option A, was because the University would increase its power capacity demand. He stated he had never heard a valid explanation for why they wanted so much power as it did not appear to be consistent with their own internal strategic plans. He suggested the University of Missouri be included in a non-voting position. He thought they should do the same for any utility surrounding the City. He stated he believed it would be good for a representative of the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) to be on the Task Force as well. He wondered if it might be too complex to make these changes tonight.

Mayor Treece noted that could be done, but pointed out the six members appointed by the Council could include a representative of the EEC, and that member might be a member of another organizations. Mr. Thomas understood they did not have to include it in the resolution and that they could just agree to it amongst themselves.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he thought they had specified certain stakeholders on the Mayor's Task Force on Climate Action and Adaptation Planning. Mayor Treece agreed they had. Mr. Pitzer thought that made this a little different. He agreed some very important stakeholders should be included, such as the University of Missouri and the surrounding utilities, as they could provide valuable input, but noted he was not sure whether they should be voting members.

Mr. Thomas stated he did not feel they indicated a member for each category for the Mayor's Task Force on Climate Action and Adaptation Planning. Mayor Treece noted they had indicated thirteen members from the listed specialties. Mr. Thomas thought the language had indicated including, but not limited to, and suggested they do that for this Task Force.

Mayor Treece commented that he would be happy to table this until they received the Quanta and Burns & McDonnell reports. Mr. Thomas thought that might be a long time, and suggested they move forward with setting up the Task Force tonight or at the next council meeting.

Mr. Skala noted there were so many pieces in flux and suggested delaying the adoption of this resolution as it would allow time to sort it out and have something on which they could actually vote.

Mr. Skala understood a comment had been made about what might be on or off of the table, and he thought everything was still on the table in terms of the transmission lines, whether it was Option A, Option E, etc. He did not feel they should hamstring this group. Mr. Thomas asked who had made that comment. Mr. Skala replied Mr. Clark had.

Mayor Treece asked how much an Integrated Electric Resource Planning consultant would cost. Mr. Johnsen replied the scope of services developed with the assistance of the Task Force would drive the cost. He noted he had previously estimated about \$1 million. He reiterated he thought it would be dependent upon the scope of services.

Mr. Pitzer commented that the City had done a lot of studies over the past year and had hired a lot of consultants that had done a lot of work, and thought that material could be compiled, researched, and analyzed from a staff and Task Force perspective in advance in order to provide a base to operate from moving forward. He was not sure they needed to pay a consultant to do all of that work when they had all of the information and the in-house institutional knowledge. Mr. Johnsen agreed there was work they would not reinvent, such as system descriptions, but they also did not want to pre-determine an outcome by including too much of the old information. Mr. Pitzer understood, but pointed out they were not starting from scratch. Mr. Johnsen agreed and noted all of the old reports would be part of the purview of this. He reiterated a lot of this would be dependent on the scope of services.

Mayor Treece stated he wanted to make sure they got it right if they were going to spend

over \$1 million on a consultant.

Mr. Skala commented that a part of the scope of services could be to review some of the older studies.

Mr. Thomas understood the Task Force would develop the RFP of the consultant and was not sure this resolution really said that.

Mayor Treece made a motion to table R36-18 to the March 19, 2018 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pitzer.

Mr. Trapp asked what would be done in the interim. Mayor Treece replied they would prepare an amendment changing the scope and make-up of the committee. Mr. Thomas asked Mayor Treece if he would invite input from the other Council Members. Mayor Treece replied yes.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he did not feel it was clear as to who had the final authority on the RFP, and wondered if they wanted to discuss that now. Mayor Treece understood they wanted the RFP to come back to Council before a contract was executed. Mr. Thomas thought they wanted to see the RFP before it was issued. Mayor Treece agreed. Mr. Pitzer explained the Task Force would assist staff with several items in the resolution, and it was not clear who had the final say on determining the scope of the RFP. Mayor Treece stated he thought the RFP needed to come back to Council to be approved. Mr. Pitzer clarified he meant between the Task Force and staff. Mr. Thomas agreed that was something else that would likely need clarification. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Pitzer if it was his desire to have the Task Force craft the RFP. Mr. Pitzer replied he would give them that authority. Mr. Thomas thought they would likely need technical support from staff. Mr. Pitzer agreed.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Pitzer to table R36-18 to the March 19, 2018 Council Meeting was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Amin understood Mr. Pitzer had withdrawn his earlier motion to amend R36-18 by removing the members of the Board of Health and the Columbia Public School District, and to reduce the number of Task Force members to eleven members and two ad-hoc members. Mr. Pitzer stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas asked when revisions to this resolution would need to be made in order to include those revisions on the agenda for the March 19, 2018 Council Meeting. Mayor Treece replied 5:00 p.m. Friday. Mr. Thomas understood the Council would need to provide comments by Wednesday or Thursday. Mayor Treece stated that was correct.

R29-18

Authorizing an agreement with Columbia STEM Alliance, Inc. to provide financial support to build a collaborative network of educators, business partners and organizations to inspire interest in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) careers and generate a robust workforce for the community in support of the City of Columbia's Strategic Plan.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece commented that he thought this was a great cause and believed it was important to recruit students into science, technology, engineering, and mathematics, particularly young women and people of color. He explained his concern was with the amount of money and whether this was an appropriate use of taxpayer dollars. In preparing for tonight's meeting, he had checked if the not-for-profit was in good standing, which it was, but he had also noticed that Mr. Nichols was a member of the Board. He asked Mr. Nichols if that was in his official capacity or his personal capacity. Mr. Nichols replied it was in his personal capacity. Mayor Treece noticed Mr. Nichols had used the

City's address in the incorporation papers. Mr. Nichols stated he had been with the Columbia STEM Alliance for about four years, and they had been incorporated for about two years. Mayor Treece commented that his main concern was that this did not meet his expectation for transparency, and since it had been recommended out of the Public Works Department, that disclosure in the council memo would have been helpful. He explained he had removed it from consent because it gave an appearance of being sneaky, and \$35,000 was a lot of money. He wanted to make sure they were using that money appropriately, and stated he could think of dozens of ways to support STEM that did not involve giving a grant of taxpayer money to a not-for-profit. He noted they could encourage apprenticeships and mentorships, give City employees time off to work with kids, create an incubator at the Airport, etc. He commented that the department director sitting on the board of a group that receiving taxpayer dollars did not meet his expectations. He explained he hated to say that because it was a great program and Mr. Nichols did a great job as director, and understood that was not his intent, but it was the type of issue a state audit would find troubling. He noted he could not let it go through on consent, and thought they should have additional discussion on it.

Mr. Skala stated the memo had identified STEM as coming from the Columbia Public Schools and understood the connection to the City was due to the Strategic Plan and the targeting of underserved areas, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Nichols replied the intent was to give students in the Strategic Plan areas an opportunity in STEM. He noted it was also a part of the job preparation and economic development initiative. He commented that the initiatives would spark awareness and pointed out it was something they could measure in terms of whether it was helping to move people in that direction. He explained the Columbia Public Schools had limitations with STEM, and this provided outreach. He asked Ms. Roberson if she had anything to add from the perspective of the schools.

Christine Roberson, a member of the Columbia STEM Alliance, Inc. Board and a teacher at the Columbia Area Career Center, stated she taught Project Lead the Way - Biomedical Sciences at the high school level. She understood the City's Strategic Plan had referred to Project Lead the Way - Engineering and Computer Science. She pointed out she was present as an individual and was not representing the Columbia Public Schools or the Career Center. She explained this funding would allow for specific field trips that might not happen otherwise providing students with an early opportunity to experience what STEM could be. She commented that she believed there was a mindset of how scientists and engineers looked, and felt providing opportunities for first graders to learn about STEM fields would carry them through the difficult math and science classes in middle school and high school. She explained students that finally understood at the high school level were at a disadvantage in trying to follow through with a STEM career because they did not have the experience at the elementary school and middle school levels. She stated she was a part of the STEM Alliance because she believed they needed to create an ecosystem where STEM careers could flourish, whether at a technician level with a two year degree or at a PhD level. She noted there were tremendous career opportunities and jobs they could bring to the community if they inspired students early and provided them with experience outside of the classroom.

Mr. Ruffin asked how students were recruited. He wondered if it was through Columbia Public Schools and how they determined who was qualified or could participate in the programs. Ms. Roberson replied they had multiple initiatives now, and the microbits initiative was one that was open for students to learn about how to program a microbit. She explained it was an introductory lesson for using computer programming, and students that progressed through a certain amount of training were allowed to keep the microbit. She stated they were not choosing individuals from schools, but they were looking at schools with higher needs, and when recruiting, they made an effort to reach out to underrepresented populations. Mr. Ruffin asked if the program was being run through the schools or if students were required to go offsite to access these services.

Ms. Roberson replied the students were experiencing the current main initiative at school, but there were plans in the works involving non-profits offsite. The funding related to Elementary Title 1 field trips was specifically supported through the school system for transportation reasons to ensure students could get there to participate. She explained she had taken a trip to the wastewater treatment plant as a third grader, and still remembered it. In addition, she did one of the demonstrations that had been shown there with her students now. She noted that was the spark they were trying to get into motion.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he did not feel this was a sneaky situation, but thought it was a matter of being oblivious. Too many of them, to include himself, were oblivious to things. He was surprised no one at the City had thought about a possible conflict of interest. He did not feel this was a discussion about the value of STEM education, and suggested it be expanded to STEAM. He wondered if someone had run this by the Law Department or the City Manager's Office. He commented that City employees were on a couple of boards and commissions, which he did not feel was legal. He thought this should not have come forward from the Public Works Department. He noted he did not feel the amount was outrageous, but believed it should have been handled in a different way.

Mayor Treece reiterated he thought this was a worthy program. He was just concerned about the process by which they gave money. If it would have been a grant from the City to the Columbia Public Schools, he felt that would be different. This situation created a perception that a certain not-for-profit had an inside track regardless of the amount as there were many worthy programs. He pointed out this was not their money. It was taxpayer money. As a result, he wanted to ensure they did this thoughtfully and deliberately.

Mr. Skala agreed this was a worthy goal, but wondered if they should hold off on this in order to discuss alternatives.

Mayor Treece commented that when they typically contracted for services with a not-for-profit, the contract included services to be delivered. It was usually a very specific scope of services. This situation appeared to be one where they received the money and would then tell the City what had been done. He was not sure that passed the expectations of the public regardless of the worthiness of the cause.

Mr. Skala suggested a review process in terms of how these things surfaced to ensure there were no appearances of any conflicts of interest.

Mayor Treece stated \$35,000 would fix a lot of potholes, and he had received a lot of comments about that recently. This did not mean potholes were more important than STEM, but they had a never ending list of projects. He felt they needed to use the money on meeting the City's mission first.

Mr. Pitzer asked what other funding the STEM Alliance received. Mr. Nichols replied they had received a one-time contribution with the intent to work with local businesses to gain more support.

Mr. Matthes commented that the Council had decided to spend this money on STEM as part of the budget process, which included \$20,000 from the Department and \$15,000 from the Council's savings allocation. He asked if the Council would feel more comfortable if they moved forward with an RFP process to honor the decision previously made, or if they were changing their mind about the budget.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Matthes if he was saying this had been on the spreadsheet of surplus items. Mr. Matthes replied yes. Mr. Thomas stated this was the first time he had realized that during this discussion. Mr. Matthes explained it was a part of the Strategic Plan. Mr. Nichols noted \$15,000 from Council was designated for the STEM initiative associated with the Public Works Department. Mr. Matthes stated the non-profit had started prior to that, and it was a partnership between many organizations. Mr. Thomas asked for clarification. Mr. Matthes replied there had been a list of many specific ideas within the umbrella of the Strategic Plan, to include this.

Mr. Pitzer asked where the idea came from for this specific piece. Mr. Matthes replied it

had come out of the strategic planning process. Mr. Pitzer asked who had come up with the idea. Mr. Nichols replied it had been a part of the discussion for STEM initiatives in terms of job creation and economic development.

Mr. Skala asked if they had discussed this in generalities and if the STEM Alliance had stepped up to become involved in this grant type situation. Mr. Matthes replied it was like the other items. They had a dollar amount and idea, and would then come back to Council with specifics. This resolution was the recommendation on how to implement the concept. He noted there was not an actual conflict as Mr. Nichols would not be paid any of this money, and had been donating his own time serving on the Board. He understood, however, that there might be the appearance of a conflict. Mr. Skala asked if the selection process had already been made. Mr. Matthes replied he did not know of any other entity doing this in Columbia. He reiterated they could move forward with an RFP process if it would provide them piece of mind.

Mr. Thomas asked about the level of detail provided at the time they had approved the fiscal year 2018 budget and the method of spending the fiscal year 2016 surplus. Mr. Matthes replied that information could be provided to the Council. He pointed out it had not been particularly detailed. Mr. Thomas understood it was about at the level of supporting the strategic plan initiatives. Mr. Nichols read the list. Mr. Thomas stated that helped.

Mayor Treece commented that he felt this was more than an issue of optics as the memo had not disclosed Mr. Nichols, the Director of the Public Works Department, as being on the Board of the STEM Alliance. He reiterated his concern was not the merit of the program or whether they should contribute to it. It was the fact the disclosure had not been made as that tended to undermine public confidence. Mr. Thomas stated he felt they kind of knew because the STEM initiative had been included in what they had voted on in September. Mayor Treece pointed out he was questioning the not-for-profit and the make-up of the not-for-profit.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed with the concern of Mayor Treece and thought that should be addressed. He noted he was reassured that they had discussed the issue previously, and understood Mr. Nichols had not had a role in the selection of STEM Alliance.

Mr. Matthes commented that it was a fair point to bring up the fact Mr. Nichols was on the Board of the STEM Alliance as it could create the appearance of a conflict as it had done so tonight, and Mayor Treece was right in pulling this off of the consent agenda to clarify it. In the future, he agreed they should disclose if staff members were serving on a committee with which the City was thinking about funding, and noted they would incorporate those in the guidelines for departments for when they created the paperwork for council meetings.

Mr. Ruffin understood the Council had agreed to do something related to STEM, but had not identified a specific organization that would receive the funding so this was a new proposal to fund this not-for-profit. In the past, they had not given money directly to a not-for-profit. They had always had a contract for goods and services. He thought they should support this, but noted he would feel more comfortable supporting it if he had a specific proposal in hand and knew exactly what they were planning on doing and how it would benefit the City's initiative. This would ensure they were buying goods and services through the STEM Alliance organization. He pointed out they did not have that now. Currently, it was only a donation. Mr. Matthes commented that the agreement included four things they were buying, but it was vague, and he read from the contract. Mayor Treece pointed out what was read did not include four things. Mr. Ruffin agreed and noted it was not specific.

Mayor Treece stated the bylaws of the not-for-profit indicated the mission was to promote STEM in central Missouri. He wondered if this taxpayer money would be used in central Missouri or only in the Columbia community. In addition, as stated by Mr. Ruffin, there was not any tangible deliverable within the contract. He thought more metrics were needed. Mr. Ruffin stated he agreed. He commented that a reason he had presented

this in this manner was because an afterschool program through his church included workshops in robotics, which was a STEM program, via volunteers from the University of Missouri Math Department. As a result, he knew these kinds of initiative were happening elsewhere. If the City was going to partner with the STEM Alliance, he believed a clear proposal was needed. Mr. Matthes stated he thought they should go through the RFP process as it would allow them to ask for proposals, and anyone doing the work could submit a proposal. Mr. Ruffin noted that was a legitimate way to pursue this, but he also wanted to honor the recommendation of Mr. Nichols. He wondered if there was some way to work with the organization that had been recommended as that would be good too.

Mr. Nichols stated they could come back with a contract with more specifics with regard to how the money would be spent. Mr. Skala stated that would be helpful and would satisfy some of the uncertainty.

Mr. Trapp commented that this reminded him of the time they provided funding to Cradle to Career with the first iteration of surplus funds as the previous mayor had served on that committee. They had now reached a point where they had full time staff and had added to the capacity so it had been money well spent. He stated the STEM Alliance struck him as the same general approach as they needed to do more with STEM and this was an opportunity to grow this coalition and partnership. He noted he would be comfortable with an RFP process, for staff to come back with something that had more detail, or with supporting this tonight.

Mr. Matthes noted the Council could approve this tonight with the understanding that he would not release the funds until they had received a detailed description of the program. They could also come back with an RFP.

Mr. Skala stated clarification would be sufficient for him, but pointed out he thought they should correct the process of disclosure. Mr. Matthes noted that would be done.

Mr. Thomas suggested they consider this as a sole source contract where they selected a supplier and then asked them to provide a scope of services and budget. He recommended they not vote on it tonight.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to table R29-18 to the May 7, 2018 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

B57-18 Appropriating funds to conduct condition assessments, asset inventory bar coding and Level I energy audits on 23 City-owned and occupied facilities.

B58-18 Authorizing the installation of active warning devices at the Columbia Terminal Railroad's (COLT) intersection with Mount Zion Church Road in Hallsville, Missouri; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; authorizing a supplemental agreement for highway/rail crossing improvements with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission; appropriating funds.

B59-18 Authorizing construction of Phase I of the Sports Fieldhouse project located in A. Perry Philips Park to include a 41,000 square foot sports fieldhouse with four hardwood basketball/volleyball courts, office space, restroom facilities, multipurpose rooms, concession area, parking lot, extension of

the entry road from Ponderosa Street and the installation of walkways, landscaping and exterior lights; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.

B60-18 Appropriating funds for the replacement of a water utility truck.

X. REPORTS

REP18-18 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

Mr. Thomas understood \$85,000 was being moved from the Chapel Hill Road Sidewalk at Scott project, and asked if that meant that sidewalk would not be built or if it was surplus funding. Mr. Matthes replied he would have to obtain that information and get back to him. He noted he thought they did not have enough money in that project to move forward so they were moving it so they could accomplish the other project with the idea they would fund the other one again in the future. Mr. Thomas asked if the project would stay at a high priority on the sidewalk list for another year. Mr. Matthes replied yes, but noted he would research this and get back to him.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Ninth and Elm Pedestrian Scramble project was moving ahead as he had received an e-mail recently indicating it was uncertain now.

Mr. Nichols explained the Chapel Hill Road Sidewalk at Scott project would cost less than they had originally estimated because there were not any right-of-way or utility relocation costs. He thought they would be able to build it in the spring. Mr. Thomas understood the \$85,000 was surplus and the project would still be built. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct.

Mr. Nichols commented that the Ninth and Elm Pedestrian Scramble project would move forward in July. It was being coordinated with the repaving of Elm Street due to the sewer utility project that had been done last year. Mr. Thomas stated he had been under the impression that it would be coordinated with the sewer. Mr. Nichols replied the estimate from the sewer contractor to do the work at that time had been \$200,000 higher than had been budgeted. As a result, they decided to bid it again targeting intersection contractors. Mr. Thomas understood the project would still include the diagonal signals and the three phase approach. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct.

Ms. Peters understood they were trying to coordinate the Ninth and Elm Pedestrian Scramble project with the University of Missouri. Mr. Nichols stated they were coordinating in terms of when there was less student activity, so they were essentially waiting until the summer.

Mr. Thomas noted the Forum Pedestrian Bridge had been mentioned a few times and asked for clarification. Mr. Nichols explained that had been built with Non-Motorized Transportation funds, but the corrections that had been made after that project was completed had been done with the annual local funds so they did not have to go back to the Federal Highway Administration because they felt it would have been a slow process and was something on which they might not partner with the City. The surplus funds were then moved to other projects. Mr. Thomas understood the shoulder on the west side still needed to be resurfaced. Mr. Nichols stated that would be done with operations money. Mr. Thomas asked when that would occur. Mr. Nichols stated he would have to get back to Mr. Thomas on that.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he believed the Council should consider attending the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee (FAAC) meeting when the audit was discussed as it was only two hours in the fall and two hours in the winter.

Mr. Clark stated he thought the Council should vote on the RFQ or RFP with the scope of services in terms of the Integrated Electric Resource and Master Plan Task Force before it was sent out.

Mr. Clark agreed items associated with the Strategic Plan needed to be cleaned up. He understood the City could not provide operating grants, and suggested the Council ask Ms. Thompson to provide a detailed legal memo defining what the City could do in terms of grants and contracts. He agreed the perception issue was there with the STEM initiative and he would have suggested Mr. Nichols leave the room during that discussion if it had been him.

Mr. Thomas asked for a report on food waste composting, which included estimates of the potential total quantity of food waste collections, the potential for licensing private sector haulers to collect food waste, the possibility for a food waste drop-off and composting site at the Clary-Shy Agricultural Park, which could be managed by the Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture, and an overall recommendation on how they could divert as much food waste as possible away from the landfill and into composting operations, such as those used by the Parks and Recreation Department.

Mr. Thomas referred to the presentation by Kim Dude-Lammy earlier in the evening with regard to the negative impact of the drink specials downtown bars offered, and understood they had received a fairly strongly worded recommendation from the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission (SAAC) a few months ago asking for legislation. In reviewing the minutes, they had not really addressed the issue. It appeared as though they had gotten sidetracked with a parallel issue in terms of how they managed enforcement with existing enforcement laws. He stated he thought Ms. Dude-Lammy had made a strong case about this being something on which they needed to take action and agreed. He asked for a report on what other college towns did and recommendations on what they could do in Columbia. He noted he believed Ms. Dude-Lammy had made an excellent point in that it would be a form of relief to bar owners if the level was raised for everyone, and would result in less binge drinking.

Mr. Thomas understood they had discussed feather flags, which was a form of advertising, about two years ago with a general agreement that they wanted to regulate or eliminate the legality of such flags, and both Mr. Teddy in the Community Development Department and Ms. Thompson in the Law Department had been involved in the discussions, but since then it had fallen through the cracks. He asked for a report so a feather flag ordinance would start moving forward again.

Ms. Thompson stated the Law Department and the Community Development Department had discussed this, and the Community Development Department was well aware of the request. They had worked on the Unified Development Code (UDC) and had not brought up the sign code since then. She understood they were working on putting something together. Mr. Thomas thanked Ms. Thompson and noted that would be the response to his request.

Mr. Skala commented that he took umbrage to the comments of Mr. Clark with regard to the level of experience he had and his understanding.

Mr. Skala suggested the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) look at potential tweaks to the UDC, namely the possibility of a two-tiered industrial zone, one that had less of an impact and the other currently termed IG. He asked that they provide recommendations to the Council.

Mr. Skala asked for clarification regarding any settlement with CenturyTel. Ms. Thompson replied he would have to talk to her individually.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he had held a press conference about ideas he had in terms of recruiting and retaining public safety officers, and noted the genesis of that idea had come from all of the ongoing discussions they had held regarding funding for public safety and the move toward community policing, which had been endorsed recently. He believed there had been a high number of vacancies and turnover in public safety, particularly in the Police Department, in recent years. Although some of it was natural, he felt it was abnormally high, so he had tried to think of ways they could address it, and that had led him to the idea of rental assistance for new hires and home purchase assistance given certain qualified criteria. He commented that 95 positions had come open in the Police Department over the past five years, and this year, they could bring on 48 new members depending on how many people retired and how quickly they were replaced. Since this was a large percentage of the Department, he believed it would behoove them to find ways to retain some of that best young talent. He stated he was not saying this was a perfect idea and was open to suggestions. These were ideas that had been tried and implemented in larger cities, like Philadelphia and Atlanta. He noted he thought it would be great if they could include a way to reward and compensate some of the longer serving officers who had sacrificed for many years, but had not figured out a way to do that within the legal constructs they had. It was something, however, they needed to continue to consider. With the consensus of support from the Council, he wanted to ask Mr. Matthes to include that in discussions they had going forward with regard to the budget savings from fiscal year 2017.

Mayor Treece understood Mr. Pitzer was proposing to use the current fiscal year savings. Mr. Pitzer replied it would be from the prior fiscal year, 2017. Mayor Treece asked for the balance of that. Mr. Pitzer replied it was about \$2.8 million total, and under the previous plan, it was split with 50 percent going to the departments and the other 50 percent for the discretion of Council. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Pitzer which half he was thinking about using. Mr. Pitzer replied that was open to discussion. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Pitzer for the fiscal note. Mr. Pitzer replied \$500,000 had been his proposal. He explained it was hard to estimate. His idea was \$5,000 and a matching grant for down payment for five years of living within the City of Columbia, and \$10,000 for ten years, and an additional amount for a Strategic Plan neighborhood. It would depend on the interest and where the homes were located. He stated he viewed this as a test program by establishing a pool of money that had become available. If it was successful, they could look into replenishing the fund.

Mr. Ruffin asked if he anticipated the \$500,000 would be spread out over a number of years or if it would be allocated in one year. Mr. Pitzer replied he thought it would be a successful program if it went quickly and allowed them to retain a number of young people for a long time, but in reality he expected it to be drawn out for a number of years.

Mr. Skala commented that there was a lot of merit to this discussion and there was a lot of precedence for it, even in terms of community policing. He thought it likely had some application in terms of the unfilled positions they had, but agreed they had to determine how they could provide incentives to those that were already in those positions. He understood they were still short officers, and the cost of new hires was about \$100,000 per year and \$2 million for a 20 year career. They needed a revenue stream for those new positions, and could not use one-time funds. Those could only be used for incentives, like housing. He thought they needed to keep in mind that they would have to generate community support to a future revenue stream to enhance capacities.

Mr. Pitzer pointed out he was not talking about adding new positions with this idea. This would be for positions already budgeted and allocated, and the down payment program would be available to any officer regardless of tenure. Mr. Skala understood that was assuming they had a savings as it seemed to be on a cycle. Mr. Matthes noted they had another year of savings last year, even though they had been an every other year phenomenon in the past.

Mr. Thomas stated he really liked the initiative. He believed there were a lot of details and different ways to design the program, and thought they should have a discussion in that regard. He noted he also wanted to see how these programs had worked out in those other cities, if there was enough historical data. It appeared to achieve a number of goals, such as making Columbia a little more attractive to work in than it was currently and encouraging officers to live within the city limits of Columbia, which he thought was important. He felt it would create a tremendous benefit if they could provide an additional incentive for officers to live in high crime neighborhoods, whether a strategic neighborhood or an area determined through a new evaluation when they got further into community policing. He stated he would like to explore it further and obtain public feedback.

Mayor Treece commented that the numbers Mr. Pitzer had thrown out were alarming to him in terms of turnover. He noted he also wanted to support veteran officers. He thought it would be helpful to find the sweet spot for when they burned out, whether it was five or seven years. He stated he did not know if a retention bonus was out of bounds when it came to the state statute. He noted they had created positions for twelve new police officers without raising taxes and there were still eleven vacancies. He felt they needed to address the root problem at some point, which might not be the lack of pay. He had heard from many that the officers just wanted to get to the midpoint on the salary scale. He was not sure how they could do that without ongoing revenue. He stated he was not opposed to flushing out more of the financial details associated with Mr. Pitzer's idea, but noted he wanted to protect taxpayers with the investment. He suggested they include this with the community policing initiative to determine if this was something the community would support.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, clarified she had not mentioned earlier that she wanted police officers to live in her high crime neighborhood. She had stated she wanted them to live among them so they stopped treating them differently because of their address. She noted this was a problem with the older officers and an opportunity with the younger officers who had a true love for the community as she felt they should love them back. She commented that she had been a part of the planning process to do some home remodeling and restoration for seniors, and when driving down Worley Street or Ash Street, she remembered the faces of every senior citizen they had helped. She listed other endeavors and noted people then treated and thought about each other differently than they had previously. She asked that there be a way for citizens to be a part of the process by identifying homes and helping to bring them to a certain standard. If the money was focused exclusively in the Strategic Plan areas, they would see the benefits that came from it. Helping others changed how one viewed the neighborhood and community, and there was a lot of talent and volunteer energy. She thought they should be targeted about how they could make a difference in how they treated each other.

Mr. Thomas commented that what Ms. Fowler had said about policing was the meaning he was trying to convey, and apologized if he had not articulated it well.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Pitzer how he wanted to proceed. Mr. Pitzer replied he would like this to be included in the budget discussion going forward. He thought it would be worthwhile to include it as part of the community policing strategy as well to allow for further discussion.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he thought the treatment of priority routes during the recent ice events had been fantastic from what he had experienced. He believed there had been more ice events than snow events lately, and noted they did not have as formal of a policy for treating roads during ice events as they did with snow events. He understood ice was difficult and every event was different, but noted it could also be a completely paralyzing event even with very small amounts. While the priority routes were treated well, it did not do a lot of good to those that could not get to the priority routes. He suggested they have a discussion in that regard as he wondered if there were additional trucks or drivers that could be repurposed for ice that could not be used for plowing snow,

whether there were ways to reposition things throughout the community, or if they could have a partnership or qualification program whereby private vendors meeting certain criteria could treat cul-de-sacs or the areas at the bottom of a hill that would never receive treatment by the City because the ice would likely have melted by the time City staff could get there. He thought some might want to take on a private expense based upon certain criteria. He asked for information in the form of a report so they could have that discussion.

Mr. Skala understood there were different procedures when preparing for ice versus snow, and there were liability issues with private companies doing work on public streets. Mr. Pitzer explained that was the reason he had brought up standards set by the City.

Ms. Peters commented that they had heard twice recently that neighbors had not been informed of rezoning issues, and thought Mr. Zenner had indicated through an e-mail that the City was not required to notify neighbors any longer with the new UDC. She wondered what they needed to do to readdress that situation as she thought that was a problem if that had been removed in the adoption of the UDC.

Mr. Skala asked if that was true as he thought there were still some notification requirements, especially with regard to neighborhood associations.

Ms. Thompson thought those within 185 feet were notified, and pointed out 185 feet was not very far. It was the equivalent of two residential lots.

Mr. Matthes stated staff would provide a report as there were nuances in that notification was not the same for every type of action.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 10:59 p.m.