



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, October 16, 2017
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, October 16, 2017, 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 RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, and TREECE 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 September 18, 2017 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Ruffin.

The minutes of the regular meeting of October 2, 2017 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Pitzer.

Upon his request, Mayor Treece made a motion to allow Mr. Ruffin to abstain from voting on R138-17. Mr. Ruffin noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that he was a founding member of Columbia Alliance to Combat Homelessness (CATCH). The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Pitzer asked that B288-17 and B290-17 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B288-17 and B290-17 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Trapp.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC10-17 Board and Commission Applicants.

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

CITIZENS POLICE REVIEW BOARD

Davis, Bill, 2101 Domain Hill Court, Ward 6, Term to expire November 1, 2020

Smith, Darryl, 5 Lexibelle Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire November 1, 2020

Towne, Katelynn, 3700 W. Broadway, Apt. 1202, Ward 4, Term to expire November 1, 2020

COLUMBIA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Forbes, Pamela, 707 Donnelly Avenue, Ward 1, Term to expire November 1, 2020

Regan, Blaine, 1419 Wilson Avenue, Ward 6, Term to expire November 1, 2020

Salanski, Michael, 4103 Abbington Terrace, Ward 5, Term to expire November 1, 2020

COMMISSION ON CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Church, Jane, 400 E. Hinton Road, Apt. D, Boone County, Term to expire October 31, 2020

Thomas, Natalie, 827 Greenwood Court, Ward 4, Term to expire October 31, 2020

Vianello, Lili, 1005 Wayne Road, Ward 5, Term to expire October 31, 2020

SUBSTANCE ABUSE ADVISORY COMMISSION

Chaffin, Steven, 4321 Kentsfield Lane, Apt. 208, Ward 6, Term to expire October 31, 2020

Roelands, Jennifer, 2804 Ashwood Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire October 31, 2020

Willoughby, Blake, 1338 Ashland Road, Apt. F, Ward 6, Term to expire October 31, 2020

Mayor Treece explained the appointment to the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Commission was a Mayor's appointment with the consent of the Council. He commented that he intended to appoint Jeremy Root and asked the Council for its consent. He pointed out he had the opportunity to visit with four out of the six applicants and noted he respected Mr. Root's independence and legal expertise, especially in terms of identifying conditions of blight or conditions that might lead to blight and the "but for" test.

Mayor Treece made a motion for the Council to consent to his appointment of Jeremy Root to the TIF Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala. Those in favor of the motion were Mr. Skala, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Peters, and Mayor Treece. Those opposed to the motion were Mr. Ruffin, Mr. Trapp, and Mr. Pitzer. (See further discussion and another vote under General Comments of the Public, Council and Staff toward the end of the meeting whereby Mr. Root was appointed to the TIF Commission.)

TAX INCREMENT FINANCING COMMISSION

Root, Jeremy, 2417 Beachview Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire September 1, 2019

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC60-17 Brian Coley - 6th Street construction.

Mr. Coley explained he owned Coley's American Bistro on Sixth Street between Broadway and Cherry Street. He asked the City to take measures to mitigate large scale construction projects so impacts to small businesses were minimized, and for the City be held to the same efficiency standards as a private developer. He noted he also wanted to discuss the use of the public inconvenience fees. He stated Sixth Street had been closed eight weeks, going on nine weeks, in front of and on both sides of his business. Prior to the start of construction, there had not been any communication to his business by the City with regard to a timeline or what they could expect. He pointed out construction had been at a standstill for at least three of those weeks. He commented that they had seen a 30 percent decrease in traffic and revenues from last year over this same time period due to the construction. He noted the construction had occurred during four home football games and the Roots 'N Blues 'N BBQ festival, which were key times for downtown retailers. He understood the scheduled completion date was November 10, which meant two more home football games and 81 total days of street closure or 22.1 percent of the calendar year. He reiterated they had suffered financial impacts at the business. In terms of the public inconvenience fee, he believed it was a great tool to keep projects moving efficiently and effectively, and while he did not disagree with the use of those fees, he felt it was redundant to use them for repairs and the construction of sidewalks and roadways since budgets were already in place for those types of project. He suggested they be used to mitigate negative impacts of construction as that was the

reason the fees were collected. He understood governmental entities were exempt from paying the public inconvenience fee, and noted this meant there were not checks and balances to ensure city projects were moving along efficiently. He explained he had been told by a City employee and the contractor the two weeks of the standstill was due to one division of the City waiting for another division of the City to approve the closure of Broadway. He asked the Council to consider adopting a construction mitigation program to act as a liaison between all involved parties as it would improve communications and allow for businesses to plan in terms of cash flow, forecasting, scheduling, etc., and for the public inconvenience fees to fund the program. He pointed out he was not suggesting handing cash to businesses, but thought the fund could be used for payroll subsidies, advertising for affected businesses, etc. He understood issues included the irregularity in which the fees were generated and the complexity of every project and its impacts, but noted benefits would include the protection of local businesses and the fostering of community relations.

Mayor Treece apologized to Mr. Coley for this experience and noted he would ask staff to provide an update of that project at the end of the meeting along with the steps they would take to communicate with affected property owners.

Mr. Skala explained they could also discuss the potential of what was suggested at the end of the meeting as well.

SPC61-17 Sutu Forte - The music of Columbia's forest.

Ms. Forte commented that she was taken care of by her nature sanctuary, and that a sanctuary was defined as a place of refuge or safety, a nature reserve, a sacred place, or a haven. She pointed out composers throughout history had been inspired by walking in nature and played the music of her sanctuary, which included the Hinkson Creek, with the use of a tape recorder.

SPC62-17 Heather Benson - Children's safety, worried about pedophiles driving school buses and the policies that allowed this for months while under investigation.

Ms. Benson asked those in attendance with her to stand, and approximately 2-3 people stood. She stated they were present to bring awareness and resolution to a recent situation where a bus driver had been arrested for pedophile related charges. She understood every criminal had a first crime so it was impossible to completely eliminate every crime, but noted this bus driver had been under an active investigation since July with regard to those charges. On September 26, investigators had gone to the house of the bus driver to talk to him, but neither the Student Transportation of America (STA) nor the Columbia Public Schools (CPS) had been notified. As a result, the bus driver had been able to continue to pick up and drop off children for two days before turning himself in to the police. She did not feel this person should have been allowed to drive a bus this school year. She understood the STA and CPS had an extensive screening process with each employee prior to hiring in an effort to protect children, but those efforts were useless if they were not informed of investigations. She commented that the children had not only been put in potential danger on the bus, but also at home since the bus driver knew where they lived. She understood "innocence until proven guilty" was an American right, but noted interaction with a pedophile was not something from which most kids could recover. They could inconvenience one adult during an investigation or they could put hundreds of children in danger. She asked the Council to explain how this could have happened, why this person was allowed to drive a school bus, who knew about the investigation, why the STA and CPS had not been informed, if this person would still be driving a bus if he had not turned himself in to the police, and what they would do to prevent this in the future.

Mayor Treece stated he had reached out to CPS when he had seen this on the agenda, and understood CPS had done a background check on the driver, which had come back

clear. He pointed out the Boone County Sheriff's Department had been involved with the investigation, not the Columbia Police Department. He understood the Boone County Sheriff's Department had notified CPS and the vendor, and the bus driver had been fired immediately. He noted he was not sure where there had been miscommunication with regard to the concerns of Ms. Benson, but explained he would follow up with the Boone County Sheriff's Department and CPS. Ms. Benson stated she understood the police had gone to the bus driver's house to arrest him on September 26 and he had driven the bus that had picked up her children on September 27 and 28 to take them to school. She noted she also understood the investigation had started on July 24, which was before school had started. She explained CPS had indicated they had not been aware until it had been on the news. She commented that it was scary to think a pedophile would be able to drive kids to school. Mayor Treece thought they all shared her concern and believed the right people would address it.

SPC63-17

Lynn Maloney - Community Policing: Why not?

Ms. Maloney stated she had been pleased when Mr. Trapp had indicated the Council agreed with community policing and that they might endorse it, but noticed they had not endorsed it, and wondered why. She commented that the Columbia Police Department (CPD) would not practice community policing if they were not required to do so by the City Manager, and the City Manager would not do so unless asked by the Council. While they could not expect Chief Burton to lead the CPD into a fully successful community policing model, she thought they should be able to expect an endorsement of community policing to lead to important measures, such as the next police chief and new recruits knowing they were being hired into a police department that demanded community policing. She believed they needed to insist this was the expectation to which they would hold all future chiefs and officers. She commented that the three part essay on community policing by Chip Cooper in the Columbia Daily Tribune had drawn heavily from community policing in Lincoln, Nebraska. She stated community policing was not a program. It was a department-wide approach to all policing activities. It was not a grant like the one CPD had received to hire community outreach officers, it was not focused on neighborhoods like the three Strategic Plan neighborhoods Columbia had identified, it was not a special unit like the community outreach unit, it was not a new substation like the one they were funding, and it was not a foot or bicycle patrol. Community policing was also not soft on crime as had been indicated by Chief Burton recently in a Columbia Missourian article. She noted community policing, according to the Lincoln, Nebraska Police Chief, was values driven and focused on generating trust, goodwill, and strong relationships with the community, which made all of the difference in responding to and preventing crises in the community. It did not require a certain number of officers as had been claimed by Chief Burton, nor was it dependent upon a change in budgeting or expenses. She stated it was based on measureable outcomes. She understood Chief Burton had indicated the public should not have a say in police policy in a Columbia Missourian article and that the police did not have a say in changing law enforcement. She felt this was contrary to a lot of literature about community policing, and of the comments of the Lincoln, Nebraska and Prescott, Arizona police chiefs, who had explicitly stated the public was very much encouraged to work on policy for policing. She asked the Council to endorse community policing and to direct the City Manager to direct the CPD to start the necessary cultural transformations. She did not feel they could wait for the CPD to initiate this change. She understood they might not be able to get community policing with the current administration, but felt they could get it with a future police chief and officers. She believed Columbia could have community policing and a police department that was driven to build trust, goodwill, and strong relationships.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH34-17 Proposed construction of a 120-foot diameter single-lane roundabout at the intersections of Nifong Boulevard and Sinclair Road and Nifong Boulevard/Vawter School Road and Old Mill Creek Road/Country Woods Road.

PH34-17 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols, Ms. Anderson, and Todd Kempker, an engineer with Bartlett & West, the consultant for this project, provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer described the current traffic situation at Mill Creek Elementary School with traffic stacking on Sinclair Road and Nifong Boulevard in the mornings and afternoons, and asked if the proposal was for traffic to circulate on school property instead of the roads. Ms. Anderson replied they had discussed many options with the Columbia Public Schools (CPS), and the one CPS liked the most involved cost sharing for a parking lot whereby parents would go through the parking lot instead of stacking on Sinclair Road. Mr. Nichols explained it was typical for parking lots to be the pick up and drop off areas for most area schools.

Mr. Skala asked if the cost sharing would be between CPS and the City of Columbia. Ms. Anderson replied yes. Mayor Treece asked if it would be cost sharing for a parking lot. Mr. Nichols replied yes, and explained it was a suggestion to mitigate on-street pick up and drop off. He pointed out it would benefit the traveling public if traffic did not stack on Nifong Boulevard due to parents picking up and dropping off children.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the status of the study about the safety of roundabouts throughout Columbia. Mr. Nichols replied he thought the report would likely be completed in November. Mr. Pitzer asked if the data collected thus far had shown any difference in the safety of roundabouts compared to other intersections around the community. Mr. Stone replied staff was in the process of collecting all-way stop information as they had data collected for signals and roundabouts. The information they had collected thus far was similar to the results of nationwide studies in that roundabouts were safer for all modes of transportation.

Mr. Skala wondered if they should include language in future surveys to determine how people felt about roundabouts. Mr. Matthes stated that was a good idea, and noted he would look into whether that was possible.

Mr. Thomas understood a transportation research study that had been quoted had looked at 23 intersections that had been changed from either a stop sign or signalized intersection to a roundabout as it had shown a 40 percent decrease in crashes of all types, an 80 percent reduction of injury crashes, and a 90 percent reduction in fatal and incapacitating injury crashes. He asked if the safety improvement data could be shown specifically for a 4-way stop to a roundabout and for a signalized intersection to a roundabout. Ms. Anderson replied she did not have the report, but could provide that information at a later date. Mr. Thomas asked for an estimation with regard to the bulk of the safety improvements. Mr. Stone replied he thought it would be a signalized intersection to a roundabout in terms of major injuries, and noted there was more variability at 4-way or all-way stops with regard to the number of collisions as it was dependent upon the complexity, busyness, etc. of the intersection. Mr. Thomas asked if it was fair to say the bulk of the safety improvements was when one removed a traffic signal and replaced it with a roundabout instead of when one replaced stop signs with a roundabout. Mr. Stone replied yes if enough data was aggregated. In this particular instance, they had some fairly complex intersections as they had turn lanes. In addition, traffic volumes were high.

Mr. Thomas asked if staff was looking into improving signalized intersections with a

history of serious injury and fatal crashes by constructing roundabouts through the lens of the Vision Zero policy. Mr. Stone replied a crash analysis team had recently been formed in an effort to analyze the history of collisions.

Mr. Thomas asked about the crash history of the two intersections they were currently discussing. Mr. Stone replied it had been analyzed, but he could not recall the specifics. He did not believe they were at a level that was significantly concerning, but thought it could be in the future.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Stone if he recalled if there had been any fatalities at either of these two intersections. Mr. Stone replied there had not been a fatality in the last five years, and noted he could not recall any within the last 15 years. Mayor Treece asked if there were other intersections within the City that were on the list of potential intersection improvements that had a higher incidence of accidents or fatality accidents. Mr. Stone replied they had aggregate data for serious injury crashes. Fatality crashes involved many variables. He explained the strategy of safety advocates was to not chase certain locations, and to have a systematic approach instead. He noted they tended to promote roundabouts because it was a systematic improvement that led to better traffic safety. It was not typical for fatalities to occur at a single location often. Mayor Treece understood there had not been any fatalities at these two intersections. Mr. Stone stated that was correct. He commented that they had 6-10 fatalities per year across the entire city.

Mayor Treece asked for the status of the widening of Nifong Boulevard. Ms. Anderson replied it was in the preliminary design stage as the interested parties meeting was scheduled for October 26. She thought a public hearing would likely be held in January. Mayor Treece asked why these solutions would not be engineered or recommended with the entire Nifong Boulevard improvement project. Mr. Nichols replied the project would be funded with capital improvement sales tax funds, which included other projects like the purchase of fleet for the Fire Department, and the associated cash flow would not allow the Nifong Boulevard project to be completed with this proposed project. He noted they also believed the improvements of these intersections would help with the overall traffic flow during construction of the Nifong Boulevard corridor. Mayor Treece understood they had to do this because they were purchasing new fire equipment. Mr. Nichols explained the ballot included public safety projects, such as the north municipal center, renovations of fire stations, and the purchase of fire trucks, along with road improvement projects.

Mayor Treece asked if they knew how the future widening of Nifong Boulevard might affect these roundabouts. He wondered if the roundabouts would be built to accommodate an extra lane on Nifong Boulevard. Mr. Kempker replied the current widening project would stop just west of Forum Boulevard, and these intersections were beyond the widening project, which was why they were not tied together. These intersections were planned for a signal and a roundabout, and were also designed to allow for future expansion. It was the reason the sidewalks and some of the inlets were set back. Ms. Anderson pointed out the traffic studies that had been done for each project had been coordinated.

Mayor Treece understood there was the potential for a middle school to be built near the Sinclair Road intersection and asked if staff had talked to CPS in terms of any future improvements they might make to Sinclair Road with respect to shoulders, sidewalks, etc. Mr. Nichols replied he thought the CPS had submitted a traffic study, which was currently being reviewed. He noted staff would work with CPS with regard to impacts on the corridor. Mayor Treece asked how that would integrate with a potential roundabout at the intersection. Mr. Stone replied the current information indicated negligible impacts at that location. He thought the addition of a middle school along with 200 homes could create slight delays to the northbound and eastbound movements, but did not believe it was too much of a concern.

Mayor Treece stated he was curious about the cost sharing proposal with another political subdivision for a parking lot, and asked for a cost estimate. Mr. Kempker replied the total cost for the parking lot itself was estimated at \$250,000, so a 50-50 cost share would be \$125,000 each. Mayor Treece asked if this was typically done. Mr. Nichols

replied they had worked with CPS in the past to mitigate traffic issues although a specific project did not come to mind. He explained they were in the preliminary stages of working with CPS on this as an idea. It showed they, as a partner, were trying to solve the parent pick up and drop off problem. It was an idea that seemed to be agreeable to both parties.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Michael McMillen, 2005 Devonshire Drive, provided a handout and explained he lived about three-quarters of a mile south of the Sinclair Road and Nifong Boulevard intersection. He suggested the City look at the bridge over Mill Creek Road while it was considering the roundabout at this intersection as it did not have shoulders and he believed someone could end up in the creek. The creek was at least 13 feet deep on each side and the bridge did not have any guardrails. He assumed the City would replace the bridge at some point since debris was caught in it regularly during heavy rains and the water tended to rush over the road. He suggested it be improved sooner for safety purposes with at least guardrails.

Mr. Pitzer understood there was a stormwater related project in this area. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. It was in the CIP Plan. Mr. Pitzer asked what would be included in that improvement. Ms. Anderson replied she understood it was under design now. Mr. Pitzer asked if it would improve the safety on the roadway. Ms. Anderson replied she thought the surface would be redone due to the work involved in the project. Mr. Nichols pointed out it was a stormwater utility project. Mr. Pitzer asked for the timing of that project. Ms. Anderson replied she understood it was being designed now and would be done next year. Mr. Nichols explained staff could provide the timing of the project later, and noted it was a separately funded project. Mr. Pitzer asked if there could be savings by constructing everything at the same time or if it was too far removed from the intersection. Mr. Nichols replied he did not believe there would be much in savings due to the proximity of both projects.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought Sinclair Road would be a great candidate for safety improvements similar to what had been done on Clark Lane.

John Karle, 3606 Blue Cedar Lane, stated he lived across from Mill Creek Elementary and was concerned about safety. He noted his family and other families had to cross Nifong Boulevard, which was a thoroughfare. He explained that traffic sometimes continued to move even when the crossing guard was in the middle of the street. In addition, there was not sufficient lighting to cross when it was dark. He felt someone would get hurt if something was not done due to driver inattention. He suggested the crossing issue be addressed first, and to later address the need for roundabouts.

Mayor Treece asked if a roundabout would solve the issue. Mr. Karle replied no, and explained kids would still need to cross Nifong Boulevard. Ms. Peters asked if the crossing of Nifong Boulevard was west of Sinclair Road. Mr. Karle replied yes. He noted it was near the Old Mill Creek subdivision, and cars tended to speed by. He reiterated he was concerned for the safety of the kids and their families.

Mr. Pitzer asked if this was the crosswalk where staff was considering installing flashing beacons and a potential island. Ms. Anderson replied yes.

Gary Willis, 3812 Blue Cedar Lane, commented that he thought the roundabouts were great as they worked, but noted he was concerned about the crosswalk Mr. Karle had spoken to as well as it was dangerous. The roundabout would only slow people at the roundabout, and vehicles would build up speed going to work and home. He suggested something similar to what had been constructed on College Avenue as it included the opportunity to push a button so the light turned red. Drivers did not pay attention to the crossing guard. They would pay attention to a police officer, but it would be too expensive to have an officer there all day. He stated he would hate to see anything happen to any kid and asked for improvements to the crosswalk to be considered.

Leslie Rose, 3812 Blue Cedar Lane, agreed roundabouts worked where they were needed, but did not feel they were needed in school zones because traffic would

slingshot around the roundabouts, and the crosswalk was in between the roundabouts. She wondered how kids would be able to cross Nifong Boulevard in the mornings and afternoons. She explained she had counted 47 cars at certain times when she was trying to make a left turn. She believed the Nifong Boulevard traffic was out of control and was not sure they should make it move better as was being proposed. She thought traffic needed to be diverted instead, and suggested another road, such as Southampton Drive extending to Old Mill Creek Road or a brand new road, as there would soon be a new middle school. She reiterated her concern about the ability to cross Nifong Boulevard if the roundabouts kept traffic moving.

John Hamlin, 134 Southampton Drive, stated his two kids attended Mill Creek Elementary, but rode the bus, and he traveled through the area all of the time since he owned a mowing company. He commented that drivers tended to get mad and honk their horns at him for driving the speed limit. He thought a light at the crosswalk as had been suggested by Mr. Willis would be beneficial. He noted he was happy to stop and let students cross on College Avenue at the light. He pointed out a flashing caution light was located near Rock Bridge High School to inform drivers of students crossing and the need to stop, and thought something similar could work there.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Hamlin if he had trouble getting his trailer and lawn mowing equipment around the roundabouts. Mr. Hamlin replied he did not have problems on the normal roundabouts. He commented that some were more difficult to navigate or were not needed. He thought roundabouts served a purpose in certain areas, but felt some, such as the one on State Farm Parkway, were not needed.

Debra O'Haro, 2709 Woodbury Court, explained she lived in the Pines so she drove this route 5-6 times per day and agreed the crosswalk was dangerous. She was not sure people were conscientious of the school zone since it was only an hour in the morning and an hour in the afternoon. She commented that she was concerned about the roundabout at Sinclair Road because during high activity times, many people parked at Woodcrest Chapel and walked to Mill Creek Elementary. This meant they would walk where the roundabout would be placed. A new parking lot at the school might help, but there was always a lot of pedestrian traffic at Sinclair Road and Nifong Boulevard. She thought a signal might be better at that location.

John Harlan, 1708 Olympic Boulevard, asked if there was a way to place police officers at these intersections to direct traffic and slow traffic down as it would avoid the need for stop lights or roundabouts. Mayor Treece replied he thought there were temporary enforcement mechanisms that could be done, but did not feel that would solve the more permanent problem.

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

Mr. Ruffin asked if it was possible to address the issue of the crosswalk by installing a pedestrian flashing light sooner rather than later and separately from the proposed plan for the roundabouts. Mr. Nichols replied they would need to look at funding. He noted the pedestrian haven would likely require some widening so it would result in two standalone projects. If it was the desire of Council, staff could likely move forward with a phased approach. Mr. Ruffin asked if it would be similar to the one downtown in front of the Courthouse or on Broadway. Mr. Nichols replied it would be similar to the one on Scott Boulevard at Beulah Ralph Elementary School and on Old Highway 63 near Stephens Lake Park. Mr. Trapp noted there was one on Garth Avenue that was similar as well. Mr. Nichols noted they would have to meet ADA requirements for the push button approach, but could try to locate funding if directed by Council. Mr. Ruffin commented that if it was really as dangerous as everyone had indicated, he would prefer not waiting three years to address it. Mr. Pitzer wondered if CPS would be willing to cost share on that project. Ms. Peters noted they could ask. Mr. Skala agreed.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought the crosswalk was a separate issue from the roundabouts, and noted he thought the flashing lights downtown and on Clark Lane worked well as they were pedestrian activated. The addition of a safety island in the

middle would provide quite a bit of protection. He stated he was not sure they needed what was on College Avenue. Ms. Peters did not believe that worked well as the kids did not push the button because they did not like to wait. She thought something similar to what was on Broadway would be better. Mr. Nichols asked Ms. Peters if she was referring to the one at Waugh Street. Ms. Peters replied yes. Mr. Skala agreed they should move forward with something since the road improvements were years away. He also thought they might want to make the bridge a bit safer with guardrails. In terms of the roundabouts, he believed the data showed they were safer. He reiterated that he wanted follow up on all of the area roundabouts in terms of what people thought and whether they were performing to the projected levels.

Mr. Thomas stated he agreed there should be a high visibility signal for the pedestrian crossing and hoped it could be moved forward quicker than the proposed timeline for the roundabout. He commented that he was likely not going to support moving forward with either of the roundabouts due to the traffic volume and length of delay numbers. The traffic volumes were less than what they were at the Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows intersection. He also did not feel delays of one or two minutes during the peak hour warranted a \$2.5 million investment. He noted they had recently reduced bus service along that road from 40 minutes to 80 minutes in terms of pick up and drop off. He thought their priorities were wrong. If they invested in the bus system whereby it worked well, it would provide more efficient and economical transportation for everyone. People would also save money on the private side because car ownership would be reduced. In addition, the City would save money by not having to fund expensive road projects that encouraged more traffic.

Mr. Trapp commented that he thought it was important for the Council to approve this proposal for a number of reasons. There were obvious safety issues with regard to 4-way stop signs and signals compared to roundabouts. In addition, he understood Vision Zero pointed to roundabouts as being the solution. There were also cost savings with roundabouts. He noted this proposal had been listed as a ballot project and felt it was important to follow through with those projects. He believed their ability to convince voters to approve future ballot issues would be eroded if they did not follow through with projects identified on ballot issues when they had the capacity, and that this would impact the ability to complete other safety and traffic flow improvements. He noted he thought there would be some traffic calming with the lane shifts as they would not have long straightaways. He also felt roundabouts would remove some of the frustrations from the waits due to traffic congestion. He thought it made sense to cost share with CPS to address the stacking of vehicles and with regard to the crosswalk improvement. He understood roadway improvements did not move rapidly due to approval processes, and suggested comparing the time savings of doing the work in phases or all at once. He reiterated he thought they should approve these roundabouts tonight.

Mr. Skala explained there had been an effort a few years ago to increase development fees. He thought the inability to keep up with road improvements was a function of the amount of development in the southwest. The initiative to raise development fees from fifty cents to \$1 or \$3 depending on the development had been soundly defeated by the development community, who had raised about \$180,000. He stated they were not keeping pace with the population in terms of the necessary development charges to make improvements in infrastructure, which made development possible. He thought they needed to get back to that issue at some point. He noted he would likely support this proposal because he felt these two intersections needed to be improved and because it was a reasonable proposal, but pointed out residential development did not pay for itself. He stated it needed to bear more of the burden if it was driving traffic problems they could not address for many years.

Mr. Thomas commented that there were many intersections that needed to be improved and thought intersection improvement dollars should be targeted toward locations with serious crashes. The two proposed intersections did not have a serious traffic volume,

delay, or safety problem with the exception of the crosswalk that needed to be more visible.

Mr. Pitzer stated he thought it was important to move ahead with these two roundabout projects. He noted a number of safety issues had been brought up and they were on a path toward addressing those issues. He thought the parking lot at Mill Creek Elementary would reduce the need for pedestrians to cross. In addition, vehicles traveling at a lower rate of speed through the roundabout would help. He understood cars stacked up at stop sign and delays during peak times caused frustrations whereby drivers traveled at high speeds when seeing open road until they reached the next stop sign. He thought this would allow people to maintain a moderate rate of speed rather than aggressively accelerating and aggressively braking, which was the condition he observed most frequently now. He stated he also felt it was important to follow through on the projects the voters had indicated they wanted, and this was a project people expected would happen. Diverting funds to something else would generate mistrust in how the City was spending the resources the voters had granted. He commented that he was looking forward to these improvements and the safety aspects discussed. He noted he was also looking forward to continuing discussions with CPS on the cost share items mentioned and on Sinclair Road as the new middle school would generate additional pedestrian and bike traffic. He was not sure the City needed to be responsible for all of it when the middle school was driving the traffic.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans and specifications for the two Nifong Boulevard roundabout projects. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mayor Treece asked for the language on the ballot. He wondered if it said roundabout or proposed intersection improvements. Mr. Nichols replied he thought it had said intersection improvements, which was why they had the consultant do an analysis of the existing intersection, a roundabout, and a signal. Mayor Treece asked if the two intersections had been bundled. Mr. Nichols replied he believed they had been listed separately, and noted they had bundled them to obtain a better price and to be able to control the timing of the improvements as they did not want to disrupt both intersections at the same time.

Mayor Treece asked if the proposed cost sharing of a parking lot was a part of this project or if it would come back to Council as a separate item. Mr. Nichols replied an agreement would likely come back to Council if they could work something out with CPS. Mayor Treece commented that he felt that was worth a separate discussion. Mr. Nichols stated he understood.

The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Mr. Trapp directing staff to proceed with final plans and specifications for the two Nifong Boulevard roundabout projects was approved by roll call vote with Mr. Ruffin, Mr. Trapp, Mr. Skala, Mr. Pitzer, Ms. Peters, and Mayor Treece voting yes, and Mr. Thomas voting no.

PH35-17 Proposed installation of parking facility gate arm systems in municipal parking facilities.

Discussion shown with B291-17.

B291-17 Authorizing installation of parking facility gate arm systems in municipal parking facilities; ratifying the request for proposals issued by the Purchasing Division and authorizing a contract with HUB Parking Technology USA, Inc.

PH35-17 was read by the Clerk, and B291-17 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor Pro Tem Ruffin opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Mayor Pro Tem closed the public hearing.

Mr. Pitzer asked if they would have a combination of options. Mr. Brooks replied yes. He explained there would be a variety of different pieces of equipment. Some would be at the entrance and exit. Others would be automatic pay stations at all of the garages. There would be a gate arm at every garage at the exit and entrance. The validator and encoding would be used at the hotels and the Courthouse for jurors needing a validated ticket.

Mr. Pitzer asked if any projections had been conducted on how much revenue this might generate over the existing system. Mr. Brooks replied the company had indicated a ten percent increase in previous installations where there was not any access control. Mr. Pitzer asked what that would be in dollars. Mr. Brooks replied he did not have that information broken out as he would need to know what was currently generated for the hourly spots in the garages. Mr. Nichols explained they had those lumped with the permitting revenues, and the permitting revenues would not change.

Mr. Pitzer asked if this system was compatible with the current parking app. Mr. Brooks replied yes. He explained people could pay on their phone through the app or pay with the CoMo park card, cash, credit card, or debit card.

Mr. Skala assumed this had gone through an RFP process and this vendor met all of their needs. He asked if this had been the most expensive vendor. Mr. Brooks replied no. He stated they had received four bids. Three were disqualified for not meeting all of the terms, and the highest bidder had been one of those that had not met all of the terms. Mr. Nichols noted the advantage was that this was a scanner system and did not require the insertion of a ticket, which they felt would be problematic. They believed the scanner would be more efficient. Mr. Brooks noted a barcode would be printed in four different directions so it was almost impossible for someone to make a mistake when scanning the ticket on the way out.

Mr. Skala asked for a time frame on the project. Mr. Brooks replied he thought installation on the first two garages would occur in December and the others would be done afterwards. He pointed out the timing was dependent on the weather as some concrete and cable work needed to be done.

Mr. Skala stated he thought this would be appreciated and was excited it would allow for data collection. Mr. Brooks noted they were currently making educated guesses with regard to occupancy levels, and this would help tremendously.

Mayor Treece asked if this would read validation tickets from phones. Mr. Brooks replied yes.

Ms. Peters understood the cost of this project was about \$1 million and asked how often these would need to be replaced or if there was a warranty. Mr. Brooks replied they would purchase an extensive warranty along with spare parts. There was a concern that someone might tear up the gate arms so extras would be purchased. He noted this company also had a service engineer in St. Louis, which was relatively close to Columbia, in case there was a situation whereby staff could not resolve the issue. Ms. Peters asked for the expected time frame these would work. Mr. Brooks replied they had visited a system in Chicago that had been operating for at least 10-15 years. If the City maintained them, he thought they should be around 10-15 years at a minimum.

Mr. Trapp stated he was supportive of this project and was glad it would provide data. He explained he and Mr. Skala had co-chaired the Parking and Traffic Management Task Force and realized then the City did not have good data. It was likely the most important recommendation of the Task Force. In addition to data collection, this would provide a uniform mechanism for all of the garages. He understood the perception of the lack of parking was due to some people being intimidated by the garages or having a strong preference for street parking. He thought having a uniform system would encourage people to use the garages and help remove the perception that parking was difficult downtown.

Mr. Pitzer asked if this would allow for a display indicating how many spaces were available in the garage. Mr. Brooks replied they would conduct a pilot project on a piece

of equipment that would attach to this at one of the garages to determine whether the occupancy levels were current. He noted they understood this type of equipment had to be reset on a regular basis. They would test how it worked, and if it worked well, it would be expanded to the other garages. Mr. Pitzer stated he thought that would be helpful in addressing some of the concerns raised by Mr. Trapp.

B291-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH36-17 Proposed construction of the Antimi Sports Complex improvement project.

Discussion shown with B294-17.

B294-17 Authorizing construction of the Antimi Sports Complex improvement project; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.

PH36-17 was read by the Clerk, and B294-17 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp asked if the irrigation associated with this project would use city water or natural water. Mr. Griggs replied natural water. He explained there was a major irrigation deep well in the center of Cosmo Park that they pumped to the golf course and all of the nearby sports fields. It was filled from the various ponds around Cosmo Park.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Paul Blythe stated he was the Executive Director of Diamond Council, which was the youth baseball and softball program that primarily used the facility. He noted there were a few safety issues in terms of old fencing, walkways needing to be repaired, and foul balls getting into the stands, and this would greatly improve those issues. He explained these improvements would allow for more opportunities for tournaments, which would bring in revenues from sales and lodging taxes. He noted they were very much in favor of these improvements and hoped the Council would approve it.

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

Mr. Skala asked if there was lighting at these fields. Mr. Griggs replied yes. Mr. Skala understood those were not included in this improvement project. Mr. Griggs explained home plate would be moved further out. The outfield lights would stay the same and the infield lights were bright enough for adjustment to be made. The lighting would essentially remain the same. They were only improving the fields.

B294-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH37-17 Voluntary annexation of property located north of Gillespie Bridge Road and approximately 1,500 feet west of Louisville Drive (Case No. 17-172).

PH37-17 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked if there had been discussion with Mr. Overton with regard to providing space on his property for a park upon annexation. Mr. Teddy replied he thought that would be addressed in the applicant's presentation to Council. He did not believe there was anything onsite, but there was talk of another property.

Ms. Peters understood the Andrews property would not be annexed as R-1 zoned property because it was in the floodplain. Mr. Teddy stated zoning was immaterial because there was an F-1 overlay district that would trump R-1 in this instance since it was a large flood hazard area. He explained staff had not expressed support for R-1 zoning, and at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, the applicant had agreed to amend the application by accepting agricultural zoning. He noted it was used in that

manner now. Ms. Peters understood it would remain agricultural. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct in the foreseeable future, but a house could potentially be constructed on the very west side of the Andrews site with a floodplain development permit. Ms. Peters understood zoning would be discussed later, but noted there was no point in annexing the property if they did not anticipate approving the zoning. Mr. Teddy explained the applicant had asked for R-1 zoning as part of the annexation request. It would be the 17 acres at the west of this.

Mr. Thomas understood the black dots and dashes line depicted the city limits on the diagram shown. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas understood the urban service area was within the city limits. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct, and noted that had been discussed during the Breckenridge development. He explained it was an advisory boundary as they followed existing sewer areas. Mr. Thomas understood the reason the city limits was outside of the urban service area was due to the Breckenridge project. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Tim Crockett, 1000 W. Nifong Boulevard, explained a detailed presentation, to include discussions regarding a park and specifics as to the floodplain, would be made at the next meeting since this was the hearing on only the annexation.

Jay Kacena, 3001 Celtic Drive, described where he lived, which was a rural area in Perche Hills Estates, and explained he was representing the Association. He noted they had not had much time to prepare as they had not heard anything about this until they saw a sign on Gillespie Bridge Road. He stated they opposed this annexation because it would change their quality of life. Currently, he could not see his neighbors' homes. Although they lived nearby, all of the lots were at least 2 1/2-3 acres. He pointed out flooding was a major concern and provided a handout depicting the flooding. He noted it flooded all of the way to Coats Lane, and recently the bridge had to be repaired. If flooding were to shut down the use of bridge with another subdivision in area, it would create more traffic that really would not be able to function on the road. He reiterated the flooding affected the land all of the way to Coats Lane, and impacted part of the Overton property. He understood other subdivisions were being built in the area, but noted they never thought the city limits would extend to this area. He noted at least one farm behind Celtic Drive had been purchased for development, and stated he was concerned about sewer reaching those areas as those properties would then be developed. He asked the Council to consider their concerns and not increase development in the area.

Scott Mullins stated he lived on Gillespie Bridge Road, across the street from the proposed annexation, and explained the dynamics from city to rural county was like entering another world. After crossing the bridge over the Perche Creek, one went from houses next to each other to open land, and it put a smile on his face every day. They all had at least 2 1/2 acre lots and many had a lot more. They wanted to keep the division of city and country. He commented that he had just purchased the property a year ago so he could move out of the city, and the city might soon be in his front yard. He pointed out he could not see any other house from his property, and it was beautiful. He explained most of the property that would be annexed, if approved, was in the floodplain. He described the flooding in the area and on the property. Most of the 54 acres was in the floodplain, which meant it could not be built upon, and the developer would cram as many houses as possible on 17 acres at the corner in his front yard. The lot was previously a 40 acre lot, which had a 100 year old farmhouse that had been torn down. The barn, which had been on his property, had to be torn down because Boone County required more right-of-way. He commented that he was already frustrated, and this development would remove 100 year old trees and fill in the pond. He noted it felt like the development would hop from city to floodplain to city because building could not occur in the floodplain.

Heather Thomas explained she lived off of Coats Lane and believed this would result in excessive public infrastructure costs for the City of Columbia. Gillespie Bridge Road

would not be able to handle the additional traffic. She commented that it was the detour whenever I-70 shut down and it tended to flood even more than they were claiming. The entrance for the subdivision would be located on a hill, which was not safe. She stated she was agreeable to someone building on the land, but did not want it annexed. She wanted lots that were a minimum of 2 1/2 acres and preferred not to have cookie-cutter houses there.

Steve Stonecipher-Fisher, 1900 Surrey Court, stated he was on the City side of the bluff and noted all of the houses, even on their side, were about 1 1/2 acres. The lots in Boone County were 2 1/2 acres. It did not make any sense to allow 33 houses on 17 acres in the middle. He appreciated developers, but did not feel this project had been thought through. He believed the only reason this development had been proposed was because they wanted to get city services in this area to annex and develop more property. He was not sure a smaller, denser housing area in between made sense. There being no further comment, Mayor Treece closed the public hearing.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B214-17 Amending Chapter 24 of the City Code to add a new Article X pertaining to public utility rights-of-way management.

The bill was given third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked for an amended version of the draft ordinance prior to the Wednesday they would vote on it since this was complicated. He understood a number of utility companies had asked for input, and requested staff engage with them in addition to Boone Electric Cooperative.

Mr. Skala asked if all utility providers had been included in the discussions to date and those that would continue until a draft was released. Mr. Matthes replied this process had started over a year ago, and conversations had occurred at that point. He was not sure they had participated in recent conversations with anyone other than Boone Electric Cooperative. He asked the Council to send any other people that might be interested in the subject to him to ensure the conversations occurred.

Mayor Treece made a motion to table B214-17 to the November 20, 2017 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B288-17 Approving the Final Plat of Breckenridge Park, Plat No. 1 located at the western terminus of Smith Drive and approximately 3,000 feet west of Scott Boulevard; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-135).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Pitzer commented that the preliminary plat showed a southern part to the development and asked what had happened to it. Mr. Teddy replied the developer was platting the property in phases.

Mr. Pitzer noted there was reference of the applicant submitting the required in lieu of payment for the construction of a portion of the Broadway extension and asked for the amount of the payment. Mr. Teddy replied it was \$127,100, and was per the development agreement that had been approved by Council with the preliminary plat. Mr. Pitzer asked how that amount had been determined. Mr. Teddy replied he thought it was the estimated cost of the length of the "planned Broadway" that crossed the north or northwest portion of the property. Mr. Pitzer asked for the length of that section. Mr. Teddy replied he did not know. Mr. Pitzer asked if there was a deadline by which the road would have to be constructed in order to use the payment in lieu. Mr. Teddy replied it was not stated in the development agreement. He thought they had arrived at the cash

in lieu because the ordinances and plans indicated right-of-way should be given in this location. Normally construction would occur with the development, but since there was so much uncertainty about the alignment and constructability, they were not required to construct it. Mr. Pitzer understood some in lieu of payments had time constraints. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct, and noted there was likely a legal principle that indicated it needed to be spent within a reasonable period of time. He explained he did not know what might be a reasonable period of time. He noted there was not a claw back in favor of the developer in the development agreement. Mr. Pitzer understood there were not any plans for the Broadway extension currently. Mr. Teddy stated he was not aware of any. Ms. Peters asked where the burial mounds were in relation to this development. Mr. Teddy replied those were being protected, and they were on the Plat No. 1 side. Ms. Peters asked if sidewalks were included. Mr. Teddy replied all of the public streets would have sidewalks. Mr. Pitzer asked if these were all public streets. Mr. Teddy replied yes.

B288-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B290-17 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with RLR Properties, L.L.C. for the purchase of properties located at 7 Third Avenue, 9 Third Avenue and 19 Third Avenue.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Pitzer asked about the history of these properties. He wondered how long they had been vacant, how long the current owners had owned them, and how they had come to the attention of staff. Mr. Teddy replied he did not have the chronology, but could provide it. He understood Mr. Cole, the Housing Programs Supervisor, had contacted the owners of the properties as they were narrow lots in a central neighborhood and ideal for the construction of affordable energy-efficient housing. The strategy was to look for properties that might fit that profile and use Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) funds to acquire the lots. They then made them available to Community Development Housing Organization (CHDO) entities, such as Job Point, Habitat for Humanity, and Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA), for development.

Mr. Pitzer asked how many homes or lots were in the pipeline. Mr. Teddy replied besides these three, there were some on Fourth Street and Lynn Street. He noted they would be placed in the Community Land Trust in order to maintain affordability in the long term.

Mr. Pitzer asked if these lots had been advertised for sale. Mr. Teddy replied he did not know.

Mr. Pitzer asked how the \$65,000 in HOME funds would be used. Mr. Teddy replied it would be a subsidy to help get the affordable housing constructed. Mr. Pitzer understood it was not the entire construction cost. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct, and explained it was the estimated fiscal impact to the City of Columbia. Mr. Pitzer understood those were federal dollars. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. The City was a formula grant recipient of those funds. Mr. Pitzer understood no true City funds would be associated with the project. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. They were not spending any non-federal sources of funds.

Jerry Dowell, 1505 Canton Drive, explained he was a member of the Columbia Community Land Trust Organization and noted they had identified these three properties as ones they could put into the pipeline. There were three levels in the process of developing affordable housing, and those were construction, pre-development, and acquisition. He thought the federal government wanted organizations, like this, to develop a pipeline to have projects ready to go when funding became available. Those three

properties were also within one of the Strategic Plan neighborhoods. In addition, since they were on the same street, it would allow them to develop an entire street for homeownership.

Mr. Pitzer asked how the land had come to the attention of the Land Trust. Mr. Dowell replied he thought it had something to do with concerns of the neighborhood in terms of the upkeep of the alleyways on the backside. They were also close in proximity to other properties that were being developed.

Mr. Pitzer asked how long these properties would remain vacant until construction. Mr. Dowell replied he thought they would be in the pipeline for the next series of houses that would be built by the CHDOs.

Mr. Trapp explained they had been looking for bargains on the foreclosure list, and noted a realtor on the Columbia Community Land Trust Organization Board had mentioned these lots had been available for a long time. They felt three lots for \$45,000, which was about what they could spend, was a good investment. He commented that they liked the deep lots on alleys because there was a potential for a fourth structure, an accessory dwelling unit (ADU). He pointed out they had been able to take three lots and build four houses on Lynn Street and noted this focus on Lynn Street had generated interest from private development. He thought the Land Trust, in time, would be able to maintain the alleys through CDBG funds, which could also be used for infrastructure. He explained this was in a contained mini-neighborhood, and they felt a handful of properties on Third Avenue and Fourth Avenue would allow for stabilization and improve the entire area while maintaining affordability. He reiterated this was a result of a realtor knowing the properties had sat for a long time. He commented that traditionally the City had provided subsidies to build homes and helped people purchase those homes through the Homeownership Assistance Program. This had resulted in helping one family once. The land trust model required the house to be sold to an income eligible buyer so they would be able to help a new family about every seven years. He noted property values would continue to rise so it was important to purchase properties at lower prices for long term affordability while improving the alleys as part of the Strategic Plan.

Mr. Pitzer stated what had been seen on Lynn Street thus far was encouraging and would hopefully be a catalyst. He noted he was hopeful and encouraged the land trust model would be effective and do all of the things they envisioned. His only caution was with building too much of a pipeline too soon since this was a new program. He did not want to get a couple years into it and realize there was something about it that was not effective creating a backlog of properties. He commented that he had not seen any evidence that was occurring, but felt they needed to keep it in mind. He also felt they wanted to ensure they were not negatively impacting private development. He noted he had not seen evidence of that either, but reiterated that could be a concern with a backlog in the pipeline.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought the land trust idea was good, and believed they had spoken about capacity when initially discussing this pilot program in terms of testing it and in terms of liability and administration of the program. Mr. Teddy recalled discussion of not going too far too fast in terms of supply. As far as the CHDO program was concerned, he believed there would be demand for the lots as they received applications for funding every year. This past year, three CHDO entities shared in the allocation by agreement, but prior to then, there had always been competition for the funds that had exceeded the amount available. He thought those entities had the capacity to deliver houses in excess of the lots the City supplied.

B290-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B289-17 Approving the Final Plat of Tower Industrial Park, Plat 1-A, a Replat of Lot 3, Tower Industrial Park, located at the terminus of Tower Drive and north of Prathersville Road (Case No. 17-206).
- B292-17 Authorizing construction of renovations to Fire Stations #4, #5, #6 and the Fire Training Academy facility; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B293-17 Amending Ordinance No. 023301 to change the effective date for parking fee rate changes to January 1, 2018.
- B295-17 Authorizing an agreement with the Columbia Public School District for playground improvement projects at New Haven Elementary School and West Boulevard Elementary School.
- B296-17 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the issuance of birth and death certificates and associated technology activities.
- B297-17 Authorizing Amendment No. 3 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services relating to the Teen Outreach Program (TOP); appropriating funds.
- B298-17 Authorizing a letter of agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Stock Healthy Shop Healthy (SHSH) program as part of the Healthy Eating Active Living in Local Communities program; appropriating funds.
- B299-17 Authorizing an agreement for electric service with Boone Electric Cooperative for the sanitary sewer pump station serving Fox Creek Subdivision.
- B300-17 Authorizing the City Manager, or the Manager's designee, to enter into commercial recycling baler (CRB) program agreements with Columbia businesses.
- B301-17 Authorizing a master agreement with Midcontinent Independent Transmission System Operator, Inc. (MISO) for installation of data links to primary/backup control centers for the continued exchange of information

relating to the status of the electric transmission system.

- B302-17 Accepting a conveyance for water main purposes.
- B303-17 Accepting conveyances for sewer, utility and drainage purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- R138-17 Authorizing a social services provider agreement with Columbia Interfaith Resource Center, d/b/a Columbia Alliance to Combat Homelessness, for overnight emergency shelter services.
- R142-17 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of the Clary-Shy Community Park - Agriculture Park - Phase I improvement project.
- R143-17 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the west side of Old Plank Road and north of Glasgow Drive (1001 W. Old Plank Road) (Case No. 17-212).
- R144-17 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the professional engineering services agreement with Bartlett & West, Inc. for the Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road intersection improvement project.
- R145-17 Authorizing agreements with various arts and cultural organizations; authorizing agreements of up to \$500 per agreement for arts programming or services for cultural organizations.
- R146-17 Approving Preliminary Plat No. 3 of The Gates, a partial revision to Preliminary Plat No. 1 & 2, located on the south side of Old Plank Road and Wentworth Drive (Case No. 17-101).

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN (except for R138-17 on which he abstained), TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

None.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B304-17 Authorizing a collective bargaining agreement with Columbia Police

Lieutenants' Association.

- B305-17 Voluntary annexation of property located on the north side of Gillespie Bridge Road and approximately 1,500 feet west of Louisville Drive; establishing permanent R-1 and A zoning (Case No. 17-172).
- B306-17 Approving the Final Minor Plat of Arrowhead Lake Estates Plat 3, a Replat of Part of Lot 35a Arrowhead Lake Estates Plat No. 2, located on the east side of Lake Arrowhead Drive and approximately 1,200 feet north of Sinclair Road; granting a design adjustment to allow a tree preservation area and steep slope area to be incorporated into a residential lot; requiring dedication of a tree preservation easement (Case No. 17-167).
- B307-17 Approving the Final Plat of Athens Subdivision Plat 1, a Replat of all of Lot 281 and Lot 282 of the Original Town; granting a design adjustment relating to street intersections (Case No. 17-216).
- B308-17 Approving the Final Plat of Willow Falls, Plat No. 2 located on the south side of Sunnyridge Lane and east of Creasy Springs Road; authorizing a performance contract; authorizing a developer agreement; accepting conveyances for road access and temporary construction purposes (Case No. 17-82).
- B309-17 Approving the Final Plat of Kitty Hawk Manor, Plat No. 7, a Major Replat of a Part of Lot 66 & Lots 67-68 of Kitty Hawk Manor Plat No. 2 & Stinson Avenue, Vacated by Ordinance No. 13357, and a Tract Located in the North Half of Section 6, Township 48 North, Range 12 West, located at the terminus of Gypsy Moth Drive and approximately 1,400 feet west of Parker Street; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-210).
- B310-17 Approving the PD Plan for Schilb Antiquarian located on the west side of Providence Road (Case No. 17-211).
- B311-17 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with the Missouri Department of Conservation for a Tree Resource Improvement and Maintenance (TRIM) grant to update and expand the current Urban Tree Canopy Analysis and development of a web-based Story Map to provide educational outreach; appropriating funds.
- B312-17 Authorizing a non-federal reimbursable agreement with the Federal

Aviation Administration for a commissioned flight inspection of the Precision Approach Path Indicators (PAPI), Runway End Identifier Lights System (REILS) and Medium Intensity Runway Lights (MIRLS) on Runways 13 and 31 at the Columbia Regional Airport.

- B313-17 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Healthy Families Missouri Home Visiting program.
- B314-17 Authorizing a grant agreement with the State of Missouri - Missouri State Council on the Arts for the Parks and Recreation Department Annual Heritage Festival and Crafts Show.
- B315-17 Authorizing a business associate agreement with Application Software, Inc., d/b/a ASI and ASIFlex, for administration of the City's Health Flexible Spending Arrangement (Health FSA) and Dependent Care Assistance Program (DCAP).
- B316-17 Authorizing construction of the El Chaparral riparian restoration project on a City-owned tract located along the south fork of the Grindstone Creek; authorizing the Purchasing Division to call for bids or contract for a portion of the work.
- B317-17 Authorizing a software license agreement with Telvent USA, LLC relating to an electric and water outage management system.
- B318-17 Appropriating funds received from the University of Missouri for Flat Branch Watershed Relief Sewer Projects 1 and 2.
- B319-17 Approving the Clary-Shy Community Park - Agriculture Park Master Plan; authorizing construction of the Clary-Shy Community Park - Agriculture Park - Phase I improvement project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; appropriating funds.
- B320-17 Amending Chapter 6 of the City Code to streamline trade licensing requirements.
- B321-17 Amending Chapter 12 of the City Code relating to employment discrimination.

- B322-17 Amending Chapter 13 of the City Code relating to alarm systems.
- B323-17 Amending Chapters 1, 14, 15 and 16 of the City Code to update penalty provisions to be in compliance with statutory changes enacted by the Missouri legislature.
- B324-17 Amending Chapter 16 of the City Code as it relates to harassment and peace disturbance.

X. REPORTS

- REP80-17 Development of 47 Acre Tract located at 840 N. Strawn Road.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked about the house on the property. Mr. Glascock replied it would cost \$500,000 to fix the house, and staff was not recommending it be done. He suggested an RFP for the 22 acres on the east part of the lot. Mr. Skala understood the house was located there. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece stated he would disagree with that assessment. He was not sure they wanted to get into the business of flipping houses, but thought someone might want to pay more for the house with the property than they would if it was torn down and a vacant piece of property.

Mr. Pitzer asked what was triggering the need for the water main. Mr. Glascock replied the property needed to be annexed, and it was within the City's service territory. The only water line on the property was a two-inch line serving the house. The water main was needed to provide fire flow to the Central Missouri Humane Society (CMHS) and a future fire station. Mr. Pitzer asked if they had been aware of this previously. Mr. Glascock replied no. He explained the property had been given to the City and they did not know how it might be used. Mr. Pitzer asked if staff knew there would be a need to extend the water main. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Mayor Treece commented that he thought this could be a real opportunity. All of the land was outside of the city limits. The City's basis was zero as it was given as a gift. He did not want to commit to potential uses right now. He noted he was intrigued by the potential of this for the Fire Department and wanted input from the Fire Chief. He explained he was also intrigued by the potential for this for the CMHS as it connected to other Parks and Recreation Department land, but did not want staff to move forward with any type of agreement. He saw advantages to increasing the value of the property by annexing it into the city limits and platting it with some commercial property, particularly among the relocated Strawn Road. Any proceeds from the sale of commercial property could go into a real estate fund to be used for other strategic acquisitions. They had parks money to buy future parkland and corridor preservation money to buy street access and right-of-way, but did not have a pool of money to purchase other things, such as adjoining properties to the city limits, economic development opportunities, or items that would round out other existing city properties. He referred to the diagram and noted everything in red had the potential for resale. He explained he was not opposed to a future fire station or the CMHS going there, but believed it was a separate discussion. He preferred to see the lots platted and have the discussion on annexation and zoning like any other development. They could later decide the corner lot was suitable as a gift or service agreement with the CMHS, another not-for-profit, or the Fire Department. He

commented that even if they platted the road, it could be a potential developer cost by whoever purchased the property. He thought there could be a second tier of development where the house was located for an upper level residential development.

Ms. Peters understood sewer would need to be addressed in addition to the water main, which involved the Henderson Branch sewer main. Mr. Glascock replied they would tie into the Perche Creek sewer. It ran under I-70 and continued on northward.

Ms. Peters understood the CMHS had indicated to her the desire for property with public transit access. She did not believe bus service would extend to this property. She also wondered how any long term lease would be structured.

Mr. Glascock explained the reason for this report was to obtain direction from Council as to whether the property should be annexed or platted, and he was hearing it should be platted in three pieces. If the Council wanted to work with CMHS, they would have to enter into a memorandum of understanding with them.

Mayor Treece stated he did not want their lack of objection to be perceived as acquiescence to the CMHS proposal. He thought more discussion was needed. In addition, he felt they could plat more than three tracts. He explained he wanted to see the math on a potential sale of the property.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought they should keep their options open. He noted residential properties generally did not pay for themselves, but commercial properties could, and it was an intriguing idea. He reiterated they should keep their options open and see where the negotiations and discussions led.

Mayor Treece noted the relocated Strawn Road up to the Sorrell's Overpass could leverage MoDOT to an interchange off of I-70. He noted Columbia was losing one at the Business Loop by Eastwood Drive. Mr. Skala understood there had been discussion during public testimony for satellite or secondary commercial in this area. Mayor Treece pointed out it could connect to Scott Boulevard.

Mr. Trapp stated he liked the idea of platting and annexing the portion of the property depicted in red, and possibly the platting and annexing of it all. In large developments, it was common for donations to be made for parks, especially when in the floodplain. The CMHS was currently located on city land via a long term lease so it was not as large of a donation as it appeared, and that land, which was located next to the fire training facility, would revert back to the City. He understood there was a need for a fire station to serve the area, and suggested maintaining land for a fire station and to assist the Fire Department by assisting the CMHS. He did not believe any other non-profit had the capacity CMHS did with regard to animal welfare. In addition, the City's animal control officers were hosted by the outdated facilities at the current CMHS location. He felt access to land would energize their capital campaign and allow a state of the art facility, which would have great synergy with a dog park. He noted he loved the idea of fostering economic and commercial development with the other 22 acres. He pointed out this was a great problem to have, and thanked the Potterfields for the donation.

Mr. Skala understood the housing of dogs tended to be a noisy proposition in an R-1 area, and a dog park would provide a buffer. It was a nice feature. In addition, the commercial area had real potential.

Mr. Pitzer echoed the idea that they did not have to be too hasty in determining what to do with the property. He felt telegraphing the intention to eventually do something along the lines of everything that had been discussed could serve as a catalyst and the eventual building of an interchange, which would also be a tremendous catalyst for the area. He suggested they be careful not to act in haste when there could be a potential significant benefit to waiting until they had a timeline for all of this to play out.

Mayor Treece asked if there was any objection to asking staff to come back with a plat. Mr. Pitzer replied no.

Mr. Glascock asked for clarification on how the plat should look. Mayor Treece replied he was not an engineer. Mr. Glascock asked if what they had suggested was satisfactory for a plat. Mayor Treece replied he would anonymize it. Mr. Glascock asked

if they should plat just two parcels, one on the east and one on the west. He noted they could always replat it once Council determined how it wanted to move forward. Mayor Treece stated he was curious as to how much was developable and wanted to know the highest and best uses for the property. Mr. Glascock thought the hill would have to be leveled, and it would be used to build the road and fill in the floodplain. A lot of grading would need to be done, and there was the potential to hit some rock, which might require blasting. Mayor Treece stated he was not proposing the City do that work. Mr. Glascock explained it was up to them, as developers of the land at this time, to install the water line and infrastructure. The other option was to sell it as it was now. Mayor Treece understood they could sell part of it, keeping the parcels they wanted. Mr. Glascock agreed.

Mayor Treece stated he thought it was important to preserve the corridor and plat the property. Mr. Glascock noted staff would bring forward an annexation request with a road and two lots, one on each side of the road, for platting. Mr. Skala thought that made sense as they would not have to delineate the uses.

REP81-17 Columbia Vision Commission - Proposed Revised Ordinance.

Ms. Messina provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece commented that he would like for this to be further discussed at a work session. Mr. Skala agreed.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked the suggestions of the Columbia Vision Commission, and supported the idea of continuing that role and aligning it with the ongoing strategic plans.

Ms. Messina understood the Council was directing staff to set some time for a pre-council or work session discussion. Mr. Skala stated that was correct, and noted some ideas could emerge from the discussion.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a suggested role of the Commission in developing the 2019 and onward strategic plan. Ms. Messina replied it was not expressly in the suggestions. Mr. Thomas understood that was a possibility.

Mr. Trapp stated he loved the City's strategic planning process as it did a great job distilling department heads and the City Council. He noted he had been involved with strategic planning processes that had reached deeper into the community and believed the Commission could play a critical role in that regard. He understood the City was well underway with its current process, and saw the Commission as having a big role in the next strategic planning process.

Mr. Matthes noted they would get this scheduled on a future pre-council meeting schedule.

REP82-17 Proposed Resolution Establishing a Mayor's Task Force on Bi-Centennial Celebration Planning.

Mayor Treece explained Columbia's bicentennial was coming up. He noted the founding of Smithton had occurred around Garth Avenue in about 1818, and people had stayed there for about a year before realizing there was not any water. They then move toward Flat Branch Creek around 1819, and ultimately the Flat Branch Creek area had become the City of Columbia in 1820 or 1821. He suggested they have a thoughtful memorialization of Columbia's history over the next three years in terms of the bicentennial of Columbia and the 100 year anniversary of the Daniel Boone Tavern Building, which had its first meal served on October 13, 1917. He recommended an inclusive and diverse task force that looked at more than the dominant culture's influence on the development of Columbia. He noted Flat Branch Creek had been an important part of African-American commerce that developed into the Sharp End. He commented that he would like this to roughly correspond with the public improvement process for Founders Landing, which was the area of the McAdams' property where it adjoined Flat Branch Creek, so Founders Landing was complete at or around the bicentennial of Columbia. He explained he wanted the task force to be an effective working committee,

but also wanted there to be a lot of subcommittees, and wanted the support of Council in the adoption of a resolution at a future meeting. He noted this was also around the same time as the 200 year anniversary of the State of Missouri and the County of Boone, and there was a line in the draft resolution for a task force to communicate and work with various entities.

Mr. Skala agreed many groups could contribute to this effort.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked this idea a lot and the fact it would continue for 2-3 years. It reminded him of an amazing series in the Columbia Daily Tribune a number of years ago during the 150 year anniversary of the Civil War. He noted it had been very engaging to read about the day by day journal of what had occurred in this area.

Mr. Trapp thought it was a super idea.

Ms. Peters noted she had spoken with Boone County Commissioner Janet Thompson over the weekend and understood the County was looking into celebrating its bicentennial as well. She explained Commissioner Thompson was interested in some group activities or celebrations.

Mr. Ruffin pointed out the development of Founders Park was consistent with the Gateway project. He understood a memorandum of understanding would be coming forward from the Gateway Committee regarding the development of that area as well.

REP83-17

Training for Columbia Police Officers.

Deputy Police Chief Schlude provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp asked why community policing had come up during patrol activities and not during general incident response. If they were approaching community policing as an overall philosophy, he thought it should be instilled in every interaction the police had with the public. Deputy Chief Schlude replied the Columbia Police Department (CPD) had adopted the PTO model taught at the Southern Police Institute in Louisville, Kentucky. During the upcoming year, Lieutenant Matt Stephens would work with her operations support staff in experimenting to move from the mold they had been taught so they could discuss the suggestion of Mr. Trapp. She believed community policing was woven into a lot of this, and was delineated specifically in the C-block because that block was trying to teach things officers should be doing without having to be told.

Mr. Thomas asked if the PTO training was a solid training period or if it was interspersed with regular policing duties. Deputy Chief Schlude replied it was a solid training period. One could not be in a car alone before passing this curriculum. Mr. Thomas asked if the 120 shifts was equivalent to six months. Deputy Chief Schlude replied they worked five days one week and three days the next week so it was substantial and more than what used to be done. She noted they were making an effort to try to hire more people that were post-certified and had law enforcement experience, which meant this would be redundant to them. As a result, Lieutenant Stephens was going to experiment with an abbreviated program that would result in a fewer number of shifts. Mr. Thomas asked if it was one trainer for several trainees. Deputy Chief Schlude replied there were two training officers. Mr. Thomas asked if those trainers were with the officers the entire time. Deputy Chief Schlude replied yes, and pointed out the officer would not drive in the beginning. The training was based upon a lot of adult learning models whereby the officers watched the trainer prior to engaging in activities, and while the officers did the activities, they would be evaluated. Mr. Thomas understood there was some classroom format training and those were the ones she was hoping could be done online. Deputy Chief Schlude stated that was correct, and pointed out those would be for current officers as well.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the reason for the report. Ms. Peters replied she had asked for the report. She understood Chief Burton had indicated the officers had continuing education, and wanted to know what kind of training the officers received. She also understood there was a minimum to two hours of interpersonal perspectives, which included one hour of racial profiling. Of the other sixteen hours, two were on fair and impartial policing practices and two were on handling persons with mental health issues. She explained

she wanted to know what specifically the officers needed to be trained on and what they were doing to ensure officers had time to reflect and learn about issues. Deputy Chief Schlude pointed out these were very general descriptions. She noted they had done a block this past year specifically on people with autism that had fallen into the handling persons with mental health and cognitive impairment issues. It was not always a general overview. They tried to tailor the training by looking at issues that were trending and community specific issues.

Ms. Peters understood there was 16 hours of training on Blue Courage, and asked about it. Deputy Chief Schlude replied it came from the vein of officer well-being and taking care of oneself physically and mentally so the job could be done well when coming to work. It touched on honor, integrity, unconditional respect, etc. She described it as holding themselves at a higher standard as officers and thinking about the impact of the decisions they made and actions they took.

Mr. Skala pointed out the Citizens' Police Academy, which he had graduated from in 2009, had been discontinued, and thought some of these sessions might be useful to the public in general. Deputy Chief Schlude stated they had discussed the possibility of preannouncing dates for the same training given to officers to be offered to the public. At this time, it was a staffing issue. She hoped they could one day reinvigorate the Citizens' Police Academy. Mr. Skala stated he would like to see the program resuscitated.

Mr. Thomas understood there was a specific reference to SWAT training and asked if it was an accreditation. Deputy Chief Schlude replied there was a selection process for those officers. Mr. Thomas asked if the basic SWAT school of 40 hours was a one-time training. Deputy Chief Schlude replied yes, but pointed out they also attended advance schools for specialized training. In addition, they had 20 hours of training per month as an average depending upon staffing, weather, etc. Mr. Thomas asked how many officers were on the SWAT team. Deputy Chief Schlude replied they tried to keep it around 25 officers and noted they had a good relationship with area enforcement agencies that were willing to help if needed. Mr. Thomas asked if there was something equivalent to this for crisis negotiation or intervention. Deputy Chief Schlude replied the Crisis Negotiation Team (CNT) trained with SWAT a certain number of times per cycle. The CNT also participated in competitions that were very technical. Mr. Thomas understood that was considered a form of training. Deputy Chief Schlude stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas asked for the number of CNT officers. Deputy Chief Schlude replied around 10-12. She noted it was tough because both SWAT and CNT assignments were part time so they tried to maintain a balance of having enough officers in town if something were to occur. Mr. Thomas asked for the procedure when there was a crisis that might require SWAT or crisis negotiation. Deputy Chief Schlude replied the sergeant or lieutenant on shift could make the call to page them out, and they were paged out together most of the time or the CNT was notified something was happening. She explained debriefing also occurred after all incidents.

REP84-17 Columbia Police Department - CALEA Accreditation Process and Update.

Deputy Chief Schlude provided a staff report.

REP85-17 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

Mayor Treece explained this report had been provided for informational purposes.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Lynn Maloney commented that she was interested in crisis intervention, which had more to do with mental health, and understood there were two hours of that type of training, which was a tiny fraction of time compared to SWAT training. She noted Clarence Coats, who was known to have mental health issues, had been shot and killed by SWAT in May.

Mr. Thomas asked Deputy Chief Schlude to respond as he understood the CNT and CIT

trained with SWAT. Deputy Chief Schlude replied CNT was the Crisis Negotiation Team and CIT was the Crisis Intervention Team. The goal was to have every patrol officer trained in CIT. Mr. Thomas understood that was a lower level of training. Deputy Chief Schlude explained that was for the everyday interaction. She noted some of the officers might end up being negotiators, but it was not the goal of that program. It involved mental health awareness, how to deal with people in crisis, etc. CIT was a longer training course so it was hard to train on it regularly due to staffing constraints, and they were trying to find creative ways to get more officers through it at once. She understood the Law Enforcement Training Institute (LETI) had started training recruits in the academy so they came out CIT certified. They now planned to send those that had not received that training to sit in on that class. Mr. Thomas understood the goal was to have every officer trained. Deputy Chief Schlude stated that was the ideal goal. She clarified CNT was a specialized team whereby the officers were chosen and sent to very specific training. Mr. Thomas asked for the number of training hours. Deputy Chief Schlude replied she did not know the standard, and pointed out SWAT and CNT did a lot more training together within the past few years than they had previously. Mr. Thomas asked if the amount of training was similar for the two teams. Deputy Chief Schlude replied she thought so, and noted she felt a lot of CNT training occurred outside of Boone County. She stressed the training listed was the minimum requirement and did not mean they would not do more on mental health. She stated SWAT was a specialized team training every month based upon best practices for SWAT. Mr. Thomas understood CNT was doing the same. Deputy Chief Schlude stated that was correct. She explained the 24 hours of training required per year included the requirements of the State and anything else they could add. Mr. Thomas understood that included CIT. Deputy Chief Schlude stated that was correct and reiterated that was a separate training program. Two of the 24 hours of training every year had to be some type of mental health training.

Mayor Treece commented that the Law Department had informed him that they needed to revote on the appointment to the TIF Commission because the majority of the Council had not consented to it as required by ordinance. Ms. Volkert stated that was correct. She explained it said six members shall be appointed by the Mayor with the consent of the City Council. It was not worded as a nomination and then a majority vote. It was an appointment with consent. She pointed out there was case law that essentially indicated with that wording the appointment was treated like a vote in itself.

Ms. Peters understood this meant four of the six council members had to agree. Ms. Volkert stated that was correct. She explained the logic was that the Mayor was not included in the vote because it would then be redundant.

Mayor Treece stated he had spoken with the applicants. One had withdrawn and another had been asked to apply to the Commission by the staff person working on the project. The person he appointed was actively opposed by the applicant and had lobbied the Council. It was one thing for staff to advocate for the project, but it was another to try to stack the Commission. He noted the applicant and Mr. St. Romaine had asked to meet with him on the project, and he had declined to meet with them until the TIF Commission finished their process and had made a recommendation to Council. The process, however, did not work if it was not fair. He stated it was his intent to appoint Jeremy Root to the TIF Commission, and asked to have the consent of Council for that. If they wanted the staff or applicant to choose the members of the TIF Commission, he thought they should vote no.

Mr. Skala understood some members of the TIF Commission were unhappy with the advocacy of staff and the fact Mr. St. Romaine was funded through the City, but reimbursed by the applicant. He also understood there had been some lobbying and counterlobbying. He had full faith and confidence in Mr. Root, which was why he supported the decision to include him as an objective member on the TIF Commission. He noted he would continue to support that nomination as he was the best choice and

the least tainted.

Mr. Matthes commented that it was the policy of the City Council to be fully reimbursed for the cost of the TIF process. It was a decision to not subsidize an applicant. They were required to pay for all of the costs involved, including employee time. He noted Mr. St. Romaine had been the Deputy City Manager and the expert in the TIF process so he had asked Mr. St. Romaine via a temporary appointment to do what he had done in the past for all of the past TIF projects. He stated they had done business like they had through the entirety of the TIF policy. He pointed out it was routine to reach out to people to find interest in boards and commissions, and it was done for almost every commission.

Mayor Treece stated he did not need help recruiting applicants for the TIF Commission. It was a statutory commission with clear duties. He did not believe staff should be in the position of picking who served. Mr. Matthes noted staff did not have any voting influence and did not have any role in the decision making as that was up to the Commission and the Council. He thought there had been some confusion with regard to advocacy. He explained staff had opinions and had been asked at a meeting what they thought of the project. As a result, Mr. St. Romaine had answered the staff was positive about it. They were not lobbying for it.

Mr. Trapp commented that he felt there were a number of qualified candidates. He noted Mayor Treece could make the appointment, but it was then the duty of Council to weigh whether they felt it was an acceptable or the best applicant. He stated he was satisfied with anyone else on the list.

Mr. Thomas felt the bar was higher for this appointment than it was for a regular commission appointment because they normally only needed four affirmative votes. For this one, they had to have the Mayor plus four, so they needed five affirmative votes. Ms. Volkert stated that was correct unless someone were to abstain. She noted a case ten years ago analyzed something similar and had come to that conclusion, which was the reason she had come to this opinion. Mayor Treece pointed out that case had involved a fourth class city where the mayor and a majority of the council members had voted to fire the city manager. The city manager had sued and prevailed because of the way the ordinance was worded. He did not think this would necessarily apply to a first class charter city. Mr. Thomas stated he was only questioning why these particular mayoral commission appointments required a higher level of consensus.

Mr. Skala commented that he was still troubled by the advocacy issue. The members of boards and commission were citizens who were willing to volunteer their time and were answerable only to the City Council. It was a different form of information. They received staff information, which was very valuable professional information, and the information received by boards and commissions was independent and different. He thought staff should let the Council determine who was chosen to represent the citizens on the advisory boards and commissions. He commented that he also felt it was strange to take a vote away by virtue of the fact one nominated a candidate as he did not think this was a supermajority circumstance.

Mr. Ruffin explained he felt as though he was at a disadvantage because he did not know Mr. Root. He noted he only knew one of the candidates and had decided to support his nomination after speaking with him. He pointed out he did not have anything against Mr. Root, and thought there were a number of qualified candidates.

Mayor Treece agreed there were a number of qualified candidates and noted he had spoken with four of them. He stated Mr. Root was the only attorney that had applied and thought they would benefit from his perspective with respect to the "but for" test, blight, the conditions which might lead to blight, etc.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he had known Mr. Root for a long time and felt he was an incredibly intelligent attorney, but had voted against him. To his knowledge, Mr. Root was the only applicant that had been the public face to a significant lawsuit against the City. He understood this might be a positive for some people, but noted he did not feel

that necessarily made him completely independent and impartial in reviewing an application. He explained that was what had tainted his application for him.

Ms. Peters felt Mr. Root was fair in what he did, and pointed out, as an attorney, he represented different clients. She did not hold the lawsuit against him, and felt it would be good to have his expertise on the TIF Commission.

Mayor Treece made a motion to appoint Jeremy Root to the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved by roll call vote with Mr. Ruffin, Mr. Skala, Mr. Thomas, and Ms. Peters voting yes, Mr. Trapp and Mr. Pitzer voting no, and Mayor Treece not voting per the opinion of the Law Department.

Mr. Ruffin commented that he wanted to discuss the situation Brian Coley mentioned earlier this evening because he believed the majority of businesses that would be impacted by the same issues were located in the First Ward. He noted he had encouraged Mr. Coley to speak to the Council and to obtain a letter of support from the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) to explore if there was something that could be done to ensure small businesses in the downtown were not adversely impacted in such a profound way by city projects.

Mayor Treece thought the concept behind the public inconvenience fee was to develop a process to help small businesses impacted by street closures. He wondered what notification Mr. Coley had received. He suggested the City be held to the same expectations as private developers with respect to street closures and that barricades be adjusted to ensure access whenever possible. He asked what happened in this situation and what they could do to ameliorate some of his business losses.

Mr. Glascock explained the normal process was to notify all businesses before closing streets. He understood that had been done, but they had missed Mr. Coley. He noted they had tried to reach out and address the issue by placing signs on the fences. He pointed out part of the delay was his fault as the contractor wanted to close Broadway for 2-3 days and he did not allow it. Another issue was due to disinfection. They could not move businesses to the new pipe until it was disinfected and that also prolonged the street closure.

Mr. Skala noted Mr. Coley had mentioned weeks had gone by where nothing had happened and asked if it was weather related. Mr. Glascock replied the contractor had wanted to close Broadway 2-3 days, and when they were told no, they had to readjust their schedule for night closures, etc. to do the work without the closure of Broadway for an extended period of time. He also understood the disinfection had taken five days longer than anticipated. Mr. Johnsen explained the lines had to be flushed and tested for bacteria, and that process took over a week in terms of a clean bacterial test. This had caused a delay in connecting to the main line on Broadway. Mr. Glascock pointed out the fences had been pushed back over the weekend for the football game. He thought they should have done that more often.

Mayor Treece asked if signage could be placed on the fences indicating Coley's was still open. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Mr. Glascock noted another issue was the reconstruction of Lucy's and the location of a dumpster on the sidewalk. Staff had failed to realize the sidewalk was blocked. The dumpster was moved once that had been brought to their attention.

Mayor Treece asked who was responsible for communicating with the businesses. Mr. Glascock replied the inspector was the front line person. Mayor Treece asked which department was responsible. Mr. Glascock replied it was the Sewer Division in the City Utilities Department. The project involved a water line, but had been handled by the sewer utility.

Ms. Peters asked how much longer the street would be closed. Mr. Glascock replied he understood they were trying to make all of the necessary connections to the new line and

had to block it off so people did not fall into the pit. He noted the pit was filled in with gravel in order to pull the fences back.

Mr. Ruffin stated he went by there today and the street was still closed. In addition, he understood Mr. Coley had indicated in a meeting with him that there had been several days where he had to boil water in the restaurant. Mr. Johnsen stated he had not been aware of a boil advisory that had been issued for the area, but would check into it.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification on the normal process. He wondered if a notice was posted or if staff met with the business owner. Mr. Glascock replied staff would try to get in touch with someone in the business to let them know what was happening. They preferred to talk to the owner, but the owner was sometimes unavailable. Mr. Thomas asked how long before the start of the project the communication would occur. Mr. Glascock replied it should be done before closing the road. Mr. Thomas understood when communicating with the business, they would indicate how long they would expect the disruption to last, and asked if there was a procedure during the middle of that period to provide an update to the business. Mr. Glascock replied they should be providing updates. He noted he had not heard about the problem in this situation until it was too late. This was usually the role of the inspector.

Mr. Skala thought it was interesting they were talking about what should have been done. He understood people made mistakes, and thought they should establish a policy of addressing situations such as this in terms of pulling fencing back on game days, etc. He wondered if they should ask staff to come back with recommendations on a policy that would mitigate these kinds of problems from happening in the future. Mr. Glascock pointed out they always tried not to allow work on game days and even tried to pull stuff back the night before game days.

Mr. Ruffin asked Mr. Glascock if he was saying they already had policies and procedures in place to address these issues and that they were just not followed in this instance. Mr. Glascock replied this project had taken over a year, and the assumption was made that everyone had already been contacted. He noted they had not followed the process. They had made an error.

Ms. Peters understood a new policy was not needed. They just needed to ensure they followed the current policy. Mr. Glascock stated staff would do whatever was requested by Council. They could develop a new policy if needed, but they had something in place whereby they were supposed to meet with all property owners and tenants before starting a project.

Mr. Skala stated he thought they should follow the same rules they expected of private developers.

Mr. Glascock commented that the City had paid damages for some things in the past. Mr. Matthes stated they would reach out to Coley's to ask them to show what damages had occurred financially to determine if they could come to some remuneration.

Ms. Peters understood the only other business on the street was FedEx Kinko's. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Glascock apologized for this situation.

Mr. Skala asked for a list of city owned properties with buildings on them. He thought there had been discussion of converting properties in the Second Ward. Mr. Trapp explained some neighbors were putting together a proposal to lease a duplex. Mr. Skala asked if that was a neighborhood initiative and whether the City had a role in it. Mr. Trapp replied he was working with them in helping to develop a proposal, and had asked for assistance from the City Manager's Office. It would ultimately need the support of Council.

Mr. Skala reiterated his request of a list of City assets that had the potential for public use. Mr. Matthes stated staff would provide a report.

Mr. Skala recommended reading the July 2012 article on community policing in

Governing magazine entitled "Cathy Lanier Changes Policing in D.C. and Maybe Nation."

Mr. Skala commented that several of them had attended the National League of Cities University Leadership Summit in San Diego, California, and there had been a discussion about inclusion headed by Racial Equity and Leadership (REAL). He suggested they invite some members of REAL to Columbia so the public could listen to what they had to say about structural racism. He also noted he felt they were doing a lot of what was recommended. He thought there was talk about a shift from reactive policing to proactive policing and there was some understanding of the community policing philosophy. He reiterated he thought they should take advantage of the resources provided by REAL.

Mr. Trapp stated he and Ms. Peters were up for reelection and understood a notice was issued notifying people of the filing deadline. He suggested a press release be issued so they received free media about the filing deadline. He explained he had not been engaged until no one had submitted a petition ten days before the filing deadline and former Council Member Jason Thornhill had stated the Second Ward was apathetic. He asked the Council for support for issuing a press release stating the filing period.

Mayor Treece asked for the deadline. Ms. Amin replied the filing period opened on October 31, 2017 and closed on January 9, 2018. She stated her intent was for the official notice to be in this Sunday's paper.

Mr. Trapp suggested the press release be issued early Friday so it was covered Friday, Saturday, and Sunday, or to issue it whenever the City Clerk thought best.

Mr. Skala recommended the process of lining up to file be delineated. Mr. Trapp stated it was in the packet. Ms. Amin agreed it was in the packet she asked people to obtain prior to filing, and signs were placed on all of the doors telling people to line up at one door.

In response to the comments of Ms. Maloney at the beginning of the meeting, Mr. Trapp explained he, Mr. Ruffin, and Mr. Thomas had discussed the subject of community policing and were looking at language. They wanted to be informed by the NAACP process in case they made a recommendation. This was the reason for the slight pause before moving forward. He stated they planned to bring something forward for a vote.

Mayor Treece noted he appreciated the comments of Mr. Skala regarding Washington D.C. and the three-part piece by Chip Cooper on Lincoln, Nebraska. He explained he was also reminded of something Traci Wilson-Kleekamp had stated in that community policing was about our community. They could not take a prototype of another community's community policing effort and expect it to work. He admired them for letting the current process play out so they had engagement as to how the policing strategy would look.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he was disappointed to learn a few things this evening to include the fact they had to put in a \$500,000 water main in order to use the property on Strawn Road. He noted there had not been discussion of a water main in March when the donation of the property had come to Council for consideration. The memo associated with the donation indicated the short term impact involved closing costs and the long term impact was unknown. Tonight they learned they knew there would be a \$500,000-\$600,000 water main that would have to be installed when the property was donated. He felt the information the Council had received in March was incomplete in terms of what would be required to make the property useful and was disappointed by that fact because it had in a sense created an additional liability for the City. He asked that these types of things be disclosed going forward.

Mr. Matthes stated the question at hand then was the act of receiving a gift of property. There were not any direct costs involved in answering that question. There had not been a cost to the City for receiving the property. He explained the uses that were proposed in

this concept would have an associated water expense, which was why it was mentioned this time. At the time the property was received, there were not any uses in mind.

Mr. Pitzer stated he would argue that there was some information known about the potential long term fiscal impact to the City. The memo had indicated it was unknown, but some information was known.

Mr. Glascock stated it had been unknown to them because it could be converted to a park without any fiscal impact as a water main would not be needed. They really had not known what would happen with the property. They only knew there would be a minimal impact in receiving it. If they sold it, there would not be any impact. There was an impact for the type of development that had been proposed tonight. Going forward, they would annex and plat it. The water line would not be constructed until there was a plan for the property, and they could decide then who would pay the associated costs.

Mr. Pitzer understood the Council needed to ensure they were asking the right questions.

Ms. Peters asked for a status on Quail Drive. Mayor Treece replied they had received an update from Ms. Whitman at the last meeting. He noted she had come to thank the City as staff had improved the lighting situation. He pointed out she had asked for additional tree trimming and was unsure if that had been addressed.

Ms. Peters understood Ms. Whitman had also asked for some things for the kids to do and asked for an update in that regard. Mr. Skala stated Quail Drive was a dead end street and was not in a targeted Strategic Plan area. They had placed a community outreach unit officers there though. He commented that the report he had asked for with regard to an inventory of city owned properties was related to her request, and noted the City had been looking for parkland in that area for years. Mr. Matthes stated conversations were ongoing about a park in the area and staff was exploring other ideas.

Mr. Thomas commented that he supported the idea of a resolution endorsing a community policing philosophy from the City Council.

Mr. Thomas understood the permitting process for installing solar panels had changed. A solar panel installer had indicated to him that he might have to remove some solar panels that had been installed because three departments now had to approve it, and those included Utilities, Community Development and Fire. He thought there might be confusion within the City as to how the permit requests moved along to the different departments, and asked that the issue be reviewed. Mr. Matthes replied staff would look into the situation.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 11:34 p.m.