



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, November 21, 2016
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, November 21, 2016, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER and PETERS were present. The City Manager, the Deputy City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of October 17, 2016 was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Trapp. Mayor Treece noted the November 7, 2016 meeting minutes were not yet complete.

Mr. Thomas asked that B286-16 and B292-16 be moved from the consent agenda to old business, and R170-16 be moved from the consent agenda to new business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B286-16 and B292-16 being moved to old business and R170-16 being moved to new business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Skala.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI17-16

Bartlett & West presentation of Grand Award for Engineering Excellence to Public Works: Rustic Road Bridge Design and Construction.

Bob Gilbert with Bartlett & West explained they had received the 2016 American Council of Engineering Companies (ACEC) of Missouri Grand Award for Engineering Excellence for the Rustic Road Bridge, which was a partnering project involving Boone County and the City of Columbia. The project, which was completed in 2015, involved a deteriorating bridge. He noted a grant had been obtained to cover about half of the project cost and the project had involved some innovative construction methods, which included geosynthetic reinforced soil, integrated bridge system abutments, and tub girders. In addition, it had been open to the public within 25 working days. The University of Missouri also partnered with them by installing several devices to help monitor the bridge so this type of bridge abutment could be utilized in the future. He noted the City's Public Works Department was willing to look toward innovative approaches and secure other funding when there was not enough to go around. He stated Bartlett & West was happy to have been a part of this project, and presented the award to the City.

SI18-16

Presentation of 3M Foundation Check for CoMo Common Ground - Monarch Butterfly Habitat Restoration.

Dale Tidemann stated he was the Plant Manager at 3M and was happy to partner with the City of Columbia on the CoMo Common Ground Monarch Butterfly Habitat Restoration project. He presented a check in the amount of \$25,000 to preserve and

enhance monarch butterfly migration corridors and for pollinator habitat restoration within Columbia. Mayor Treece thanked 3M for their generosity.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC12-16 Board and Commission Applicants.

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

AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD

Cecil, Gregory, 1700 Oak Cliff Place, Ward 4, Term to expire December 1, 2018
Hunter, BJ, 4310 Montpelier Place, Ward 5, Term to expire December 1, 2018
McDonald, Bob, 1301 Strathmore Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire December 1, 2019
Whorley, Brian, 1802 Moss Creek Court, Ward 6, Term to expire December 1, 2019
Winter, Mark, 2502 South Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire December 1, 2017

CITIZENS POLICE REVIEW BOARD

Williams, Cornelia, 1632 Kathy Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire November 1, 2019

COLUMBIA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Salanski, J. Michael, 4103 Abbington Terrace, Ward 5, Term to expire November 1, 2017

COLUMBIA VISION COMMISSION

Corbin, Megan, 3709 Prescott Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire December 15, 2019
D'Agostino, Anna, 2812 Burrwood Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire December 15, 2019
Ortiz, Carlos, 2407 Pimlico Court, Ward 6, Term to expire December 15, 2019
Pass, Sasha, 2665 E. Alfalfa Drive, Boone County, Term to expire December 15, 2019
Wells, Jameson, 118 Oak Street, Ward 1, Term to expire December 15, 2019

COMMUNITY LAND TRUST ORGANIZATION BOARD

Cullimore, Daniel, 715 Lyon Street, Ward 1, Term to expire December 1, 2019
Dowell, Jerry, 1311 Weaver Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire December 1, 2017
LaBrunerie, Alexander, 611 S. Greenwood Avenue, Ward 4, Term to expire December 1, 2018
Prevo, Paul, 15451 N. Tucker School Road, Boone County, Term to expire December 1, 2019
Rhoades, Shirley, 104 Lynn Street, Ward 1, Term to expire December 1, 2017
Stanton, Anthony, 315 LaSalle Place, Ward 1, Term to expire December 1, 2018

MAYOR'S COUNCIL ON PHYSICAL FITNESS AND HEALTH

Burks, Taylor, 4905 Shadow Circle, Ward 5, Term to expire November 30, 2019
Pass, Sasha, 2665 E. Alfalfa Drive, Boone County, Term to expire November 30, 2019
Raine, Elizabeth, 3301 Belle Meade Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire November 30, 2019
Sublett, Corey, 1002 N. Golden Trout Court, Ward 4, Term to expire November 30, 2019

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC62-16 Alvin Cobbins, Chair, Columbia Vision Commission - Commission transmittal of its report and recommendations to Council, which is on the agenda under Reports.

Mr. Cobbins explained he would speak with regard to the Columbia Vision Commission and the work they had done over the last few months. He thanked the Council for its patience as it had taken a while to complete the report, which could be seen under the Reports section of the agenda. Columbia Imagined had been adopted by the City Council in 2008 and had a provision of gathering community comments every five years. He

explained they had held four community-wide sessions. He noted the vision was a continual and evolving process and asked the Council to keep that in mind. He commented that most of the goals, strategies, and objectives in the Columbia Imagined report had been addressed. They felt Columbia Imagined needed to be revisited since things had changed since it had been developed. He thought the thirteen topics could be reduced in number or be changed. He explained one of the comments that had come out of the community-wide sessions was a call for a community recreation center that was not tied to athletics. They wanted a place at which they could congregate and participate in things, such as culinary classes, piano lessons, or video production and editing. There had also been some discussion with regard to parking, and in particular, handicapped parking spaces. He understood Columbia met all federal and state guidelines as it related to accessible parking spaces, but many that had participated in the sessions felt more, larger accessible spaces were needed in the downtown area to accommodate vehicles with ramps. There had also been discussions as to how the City coordinated its planning processes, especially as it related to housing, whether community housing, student housing, or affordable housing. He believed there needed to be a continued effort to collaborate with all of the parties that had an interest or a stake in assuring the proper housing in all areas were met. He noted the Commission was looking for guidance as to how to proceed over the next ten years as those specific topics had not been addressed in the Columbia Imagined plan and some items included in the thirteen topics were not relevant today. During the last ten years, there had been great strides in strategic planning, but those documents had not been consolidated into one comprehensive plan. He suggested this be done. He explained the ordinance that had created the Columbia Vision Commission provided the ability to fundraise and seek grants to enable the work of visioning, and thought they could begin efforts to benchmark diverse plans, but this would need to be done at Council's direction. He stated the Columbia Vision Commission and its members thanked the Council for the opportunity to serve and noted they looked forward to continuing to serve and being a part of the progress. Mayor Treece thanked Mr. Cobbins and the other Commission Members for their work, and pointed out their early work was a major component of the City's strategic plan.

SPC63-16

Kolin Mattingly - Continued level of crime in the city.

Mr. Mattingly explained he had been a resident of Columbia since 2006, and he, his wife, and their one year old son currently lived at 3400 Ridgecrest Drive. On November 10, 2016, while at work in one of the State's correctional facilities, he had been informed by his wife of an armed robbery the previous evening on the same street as his son's daycare provider, which also happened to be a close friend. Upon further research, he had learned there had been three similar offenses within a thirty minute time frame. He commented that he was not a stranger to crime as he had previously worked at the local juvenile detention center and as a parole officer. He stated he was aware of the problem of understaffing at the Columbia Police Department as well as the efforts to address those issues, which included the failed Proposition 1 in November 2014 and the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence. He explained he was speaking out now because crime had hit very close to home. He noted he did not have any specific suggestions or ideas at this time, and asked that violent crime within the City of Columbia remain a top priority for the Council. He applauded the efforts of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence, but he did not feel anything substantial had come of the endeavor based upon his research other than "ban the box," which had required potential employers to consider all of an applicant's qualifications before inquiring about criminal history. In his day to day work, he was surrounded by approximately 18,000 male felony offenders serving varying sentences. Although there were many safeguards in place, it was not always pleasant and could be hostile. He commented that there were many times in various parts of the City, to include his own home, he had felt more unsafe and susceptible to physical harm to him or his family than at work at the correctional institution. He asked the Council to keep the issue of public safety in the forefront of the

discussion and to maintain a vigilant attitude in finding ways to bring staffing at the Police Department to acceptable levels through proper funding or other means of revenue.

SPC64-16

Lynn Maloney - The limitations of race neutral language.

Ms. Maloney stated she was representing Race Matters, Friends, and understood most people were uncomfortable talking about race. She noted she had been born in 1963, and her very optimistic, white, liberal parents had promised her segregation would be over by the time she was an adult, but at the age of 53, the disparities were only getting worse. Since 2008, the financial disparities were particularly egregious and growing. She stated the race neutral language that had come out of that time was clearly not effective. She commented that the Council had resources in terms of talking about race in city government. In January, Mr. Skala had shared the racial equity toolkit with the Council, and she had spoken about the ability to apply it to a lot of policies and projects. She noted it had not yet occurred to her knowledge. She explained the strategic plan was very ambitious and stipulated a number of race-based metrics. This was essential so they knew the baseline for many of the racial disparities and had the ability to compare and measure progress. Of the seven updates given on the Strategic Plan at the previous council meeting, not one had included a racial metric. She commented that they expected racial metrics to be included in future updates of the Strategic Plan. She believed the Henderson Branch sewer extension was another opportunity to use the racial equity toolkit. On July 5, they were pleased that four of the council members had explicitly mentioned social equity as part of the sewer extension project after three of their members had spoken, but a couple of weeks ago, when that issue had been discussed again, none of them had mentioned social equity as an issue. She commented that Race Matters, Friends planned to talk about racial equity at every council meeting because they felt it made a difference. They would continue to ask the Council to incorporate racial equity into policies and projects. She understood the sewer extension project would likely come back, and they expected the Council to use the racial equity tool kit to appraise that project. She stated race mattered.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH40-16

Proposed construction of traffic calming speed tables and speed humps along Rice Road between Hanover Boulevard and Shamrock Drive and along Kelsey Drive between Shamrock Drive and Lake of the Woods Road.

PH40-16 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked about the street types of Rice Road and Kelsey Drive. Mr. Stone replied Rice Road was a neighborhood collector and Kelsey Drive was a local street that currently functioned as a neighborhood collector and would until Rice Road was extended to Lake of the Woods Road.

Mr. Thomas understood there were certain street design standards, parameters, widths, clear zones, etc. that were related to the neighborhood collector street type. Mr. Stone stated that was correct, but noted most of these roads were constructed prior to their existing standards. Mr. Nichols pointed out the driveway spacings configured on these roads would not be allowed now. Mr. Thomas asked if the change in the street design standards had changed the speed at which people drove on a neighborhood collector. Mr. Stone replied yes for most neighborhood collectors that had been constructed recently. Mr. Thomas asked for the design speed for current neighborhood collectors. Mr. Stone replied the design speed would typically be 25-30 mph depending on the location. Mr. Thomas understood the design speed was the speed most people, or the 85th percentile, would drive if the street was built to those standards. Mr. Stone explained design speed was a little different than operating speed, but the goal was for

the design speed to be at what people operated. Mr. Nichols noted it also involved sight distance, stopping distance, etc. Mr. Thomas understood a street that was intended to have traffic at over 30 mph and with 15 percent of traffic going above 44 mph was not likely to be built under the current design standards. Mr. Stone stated that was correct, and noted most new neighborhood collectors operated close to 25-30 mph.

Mr. Skala explained the interested parties meetings had been well attended as it was of vital interest to those in the area. He noted the roads had been built to be wide for parking on both sides so the design had really exacerbated the speeding issues. They were trying to address those issues now.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Skala commented that he appreciated the work that had gone into the planning of this as there had been a lot of discussion in terms of using other methods, such as stop signs, etc. He thought the staff had presented a very convincing argument that the speed tables would disrupt cut-through traffic and provide additional safety for kids playing nearby. He stated he was looking forward to telling his constituents they would soon have deliverables that would help them out.

Mr. Thomas explained he really liked the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program in terms of the way streets were scored. He thought the program needed more money, and encouraged the Council to keep that in mind. He understood the list of streets that had been evaluated along with their scores was not available on the website, and asked for it to be made available. Mr. Stone replied they could, but noted it was only a snapshot in time so they would want to ensure that was known. Mr. Thomas agreed that should be explained. Mr. Nichols stated the City had hired a consultant to review and accelerate these projects.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to move forward with the installation of speed tables and speed humps on Rice Road, between Hanover Boulevard and Shamrock Drive, and on Kelsey Drive, between Shamrock Rive and North Lake of the Woods Road. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH41-16 Proposed construction of Phase II improvements to the pickleball court area at Albert-Oakland Park to include the installation of two new pickleball courts, lighting improvements, a small shelter, water fountain and construction of walkway connections.

Discussion shown with B299-16.

B299-16 Authorizing construction of Phase II improvements to the pickleball court area at Albert-Oakland Park to include the installation of two new pickleball courts, lighting improvements, a small shelter, water fountain and construction of walkway connections; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.

PH41-16 was read by the Clerk and B299-16 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood some of the tennis courts had been striped for pickleball, which was distracting to tennis players, and asked if the striping could be readjusted on some of those courts now that there were dedicated pickleball courts. Mr. Griggs replied it was possible, but noted he thought they would find that there was a higher demand for pickleball courts than tennis courts at this time.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Carole Kennedy stated she was representing pickleball players, and noted pickleball was the fastest growing sport in America. She explained they had three times more members than they did when they had previously come before the Council. Some of their members

had become so skilled that they were playing in tournaments and bringing home medals. The number of people playing pickleball in the Show-Me State games and the Senior games had also increased. They had been provided additional time to play at the ARC and were very appreciative because they lacked places to play indoors during the winter. The four courts at Albert-Oakland Park were used a lot now, so they were grateful for the addition of these two courts. They were also thankful the improvements included lighting. She asked the Council to authorize the building of the two new courts and wondered if they could be available by June so they could be used for the Show-Me State games. She wanted the Council to know that pickleball was a sport for all ages. If Council were to approve this tonight, it would give them one more thing to be thankful for on Thanksgiving Day.

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

Mr. Trapp commented that Albert-Oakland Park was in the Second Ward, and he was happy to have it. He thanked Mr. Griggs for the wind shelter, which was a repurposed bus shelter, at the Garth Nature Area and had noticed a picnic table had been moved to the area so it was being used. He noted it was a park user idea that had been championed by him.

B299-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B285-16

Amending Ordinance No. 022823 to extend the administrative delay on the processing of applications for a building permit to construct new multi-family units and demolition of structures which are at least fifty years old in specified areas to March 31, 2017.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. St. Romaine provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood some applications received for Windsor Street did not fall into the rubric of this administrative delay because they were received prior to it taking effect. Mr. Teddy explained a permit application had been received for a row house or town house type of building prior to the May 16 effective date of the administrative delay. The platting was only reconfiguring the property.

Mr. Skala asked if the overlay for the Benton Stephen neighborhood would be discussed as part of the Unified Development Code (UDC). Mr. Teddy replied yes, and explained a presentation had been made to the Planning and Zoning Commission outlining the changes.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he was glad the Council was considering this. He understood staff was currently telling the Planning and Zoning Commission that they had to wrap everything up by December 15 so staff had three weeks to pull together the report in order to provide it to Council, and did not believe that was enough time. He encouraged the Council to extend the administrative delay up front to June 30, 2016. This would provide the Planning and Zoning Commission and staff adequate time to really complete the work as they were making good progress. He also thought the Council would need to hold a lot of hearings on this issue.

Mayor Treece commented that he felt Council needed this sooner than later and asked for the thoughts of others. In addition to the Planning and Zoning Commission, they would receive information from the Parking and Traffic Management Task Force, the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure, and the Historic Preservation Commission. The Council typically had a first reading with a hearing and vote two weeks later. He understood they would likely need more time if the experience at the Planning and Zoning Commission level was any indication. During the budget process, they had a Saturday work session in addition to hearings and a vote. He agreed the Planning and Zoning

Commission was making progress, but noted he also did not want to extend their comment period only to have it duplicated at the Council level.

Mr. Skala stated he disagreed with Mr. Clark, and pointed out they could always extend the administrative delay again. He hoped this issue would be wrapped up before the next election. He was not sure why the Council could not start the process concurrently as the Planning and Zoning Commission was finished with its work. He thought the deadline helped focus the attention. He agreed they should schedule the idea of holding three public sessions with one potentially being on a weekend. He stated it would be incumbent on them to deal with the reports once submitted.

Ms. Peters asked if the Planning and Zoning Commission thought they would be done by the end of the year. Mayor Treece replied Mr. Teddy had indicated they would be done by the end of the year. Mr. Teddy stated January 5, 2017 was the meeting at which the Planning and Zoning Commission planned to vote. Mayor Treece stated he would prefer the introduction and first reading take place at the January 3, 2017 Council Meeting, but that would not occur if the Planning and Zoning Commission did not vote until January 5, 2017. He asked if it could be introduced by the January 17, 2017 Council Meeting. Mr. Teddy replied he thought there was a good possibility that could occur. Mayor Treece noted the first hearing could then be held on February 6, 2017. In addition, they could hold a Saturday session at some point, and the final hearing could be held on either February 20, 2017 or March 6, 2017.

Mr. Trapp explained he had voted against this when it had been proposed initially, but would support the extension tonight as it provided the right level of impetus to bring it to a conclusion. He thought having a Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) would be great in bringing the City together and it would be a much better product. He stated his appreciation of the work of the Planning and Zoning Commission and the Community Development Department staff as they had done an excellent job.

B285-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B287-16 Voluntary annexation of property located at the western terminus of Smith Drive, approximately 3,000 feet west of Scott Boulevard; establishing permanent R-1 zoning; authorizing a development agreement with Tompkins Homes and Development, Inc. and the Glen Smith Trust and Lillie Beatrice Smith Trust (Case No. 16-178).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if the development agreement included a number of items staff had requested in return for staff support of the plat. Mr. Teddy replied staff had requested commitments of the developer they anticipated Council would want. He noted they had done their best to request improvements or payments in lieu of improvements. In addition, there had been negotiations with a neighborhood group so some of the contents related to those negotiations. Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding the off-site improvements. Mr. Teddy replied dedication of right-of-way for a future West Broadway extension, the sidewalk that would connect to Louisville Park, and the speed table. Mr. Thomas understood those were on-site. Mr. Teddy stated there was an existing intersection so site-adjacent might be a more appropriate term for the traffic calming. He explained there was a paragraph on the burial ground since it was an unusual situation. Mr. Thomas understood there was an off-site improvement at Smith Drive and Scott Boulevard, and asked for clarification. Mr. Teddy replied a \$100,000 contribution would be not be due until 75 lots within the subdivision were platted. The thought was that they were not impacting the intersection until people started moving there. Mr. Thomas asked how that number had been determined. Mr. Teddy replied he thought it had been the

recommendation of the traffic engineer. Mr. Thomas understood the purpose was to add a left turn lane exiting Smith Drive on to Scott Boulevard, and asked if it would cover that cost. Mr. Teddy replied he did not know, but understood that amount was the recommendation of staff as an equitable contribution.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked the answer by Mr. Teddy in that staff negotiated agreements they felt the Council would want as he thought that was probably the right thing to do. In the longer term, he wanted to see a more systematic approach. He understood the City charged a very low development fee for roads, and thought they should try to increase it with a better communications campaign with regard to the need. He felt somewhat arbitrary exactions were negotiated with individual developers in individual situations, which left the developer with very little choice other than to agree and there was not really any formula leading to those exactions. In this situation, they were doubling the development fee with the \$100,000, but in other cases, they might triple it or not increase it at all. He suggested they find a way to more equitably recover the cost of major road expansions over the next 6-12 months.

Mr. Skala understood this was outside of the urban service area. If approved by Council, he wondered if they had to deliberately modify the urban service area through some process or if it was automatic. Mr. Teddy stated he did not believe the Council had to do anything special. He thought they de-facto modified it by acknowledging it was adjacent to the boundary. They did not have a standalone ordinance for the urban service area. It was a part of the Comprehensive Plan along with a multitude of other recommended things. He explained the drawing of the boundary had been a technical exercise and they had not gotten into the granular detail of looking at it tract by tract. They had enclosed areas that were outside the city limits that were committed to the city sewer. Here they only followed the city boundary even though there was a major sewer some distance west. Mr. Skala did not feel they should adjust the urban service area every time there was a revision. Mr. Teddy pointed out the Plan was scheduled for a five year review, and that would be the appropriate time to look into issues such as this.

Mr. Thomas stated he would support that process. He thought there was coalescing around the idea there was a certain size to which they wanted the city to grow within the next 20-30 years, and not beyond. He suggested they set a time frame and obtain more public input as to where people felt the city limits should be in the 30 years or an area the city limits should not go beyond. They could then establish ordinances that guided the process more firmly.

Ms. Peters understood they were being asked to annex this property into the City of Columbia tonight. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He explained the ordinance annexed the property and provided it with an R-1 zoning designation. He noted there was a separate resolution to consider the preliminary plat, which did not subdivide the property, but created a plan for subdivision. Ms. Peters asked if that was the time they would determine if the roads were appropriate for the space, whether there were two entrances and exits from the property, if there were any streets that would be placed over sinkholes, etc. Mr. Teddy replied the subdivision review would be the time to raise those questions.

Mayor Treece asked if this property was contiguous to the existing city limits. Mr. Teddy replied yes. Mayor Treece understood this did not involve a pre-annexation agreement. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood passage of this would result in annexation. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Mayor Treece asked if annexation was contingent on approval of the preliminary plat. Mr. Teddy replied he did not believe it was contingent on the preliminary plat.

Phebe LaMar, an attorney with offices at 111 S. Ninth Street, explained her client was seeking to develop the 90.8 acres located off of Smith Drive, west of Scott Boulevard. In addition to annexing and zoning the property, they wanted approval of the preliminary plat at the same time. She noted she did not believe a contingency had been included as they had anticipated it would all be handled simultaneously. She stated this was the

second time a version of this proposal had been submitted. The first had been withdrawn after it had been recommended for approval by the Planning and Zoning Commission in order to allow for additional discussions with the neighbors. Following withdrawal of that first proposal, they had spent hours via meetings, conversations, e-mail communications, and generally working with neighbors around the property in order to address reservations and underlying causes of concern. This had resulted in numerous changes. They had removed the PUD that had been originally proposed. They incorporated additional screening, well beyond what would be required, and traffic calming devices on- and off-site. They agreed to construct sidewalks requested by the neighbors off-site in addition to those that would be constructed on-site. They would record conservation and trail easements over the common areas in order to provide for a trail system, and had agreed to a trail connection later, after the trail was constructed. She noted the neighbors they had worked with were now all in favor of this proposal. In terms of the Native American burial site, they had consulted with the Anthropology Department at the University of Missouri, and following conversations, the letter included the packet had been provided. She stated they were proposing to do exactly what had been recommended. They had also agreed to provide to the University any artifacts that might be uncovered as they developed the site. She explained the proposal preserved an area around the mound that was larger than the State required buffer, and the developer understood he had to comply with all of the State requirements in this regard and planned to do so. This was discussed in the development agreement. She pointed out the proposal would provide city residents the opportunity to access the mound and learn some Native American history. She noted they had contacted the Osage Nation, which had expressed an interest in this site. She was told they had looked at the site, but they had not received any further response with regard to any interest in this site. Her guess from conversations with the University of Missouri was that this was not an Osage burial mound. She explained a number of items were included in the development agreement that would not have been required for the approval of the preliminary plat, such as the traffic calming device at the intersection of Smith Drive and Louisville Drive and the \$100,000 contribution toward the intersection of Smith Drive and Scott Boulevard. She pointed out right-of-way was being donated as well as additional street area to turn a neighborhood collector into a major collector. In addition, a sidewalk to Louisville Park was an off-site improvement that would not otherwise be required. She commented that in the end an amount in excess of \$350,000 would be spent pursuant to the development agreement in order to attempt to provide the City what was necessary to reasonably develop the property and to assist the neighbors.

Tim Crockett, an engineer with offices at 1000 W. Nifong Boulevard, stated this property was currently zoned R-S in the County, and the proposal before the Council tonight would be for about 133 single-family residential lots. This equated to a density of roughly 1.5 units per acre. He pointed out all of the utilities were either adjacent to or on the property, which they felt was important when talking about the urban service area. They had public streets, a waterline, and electric on one side, and sanitary sewer on the other side. He explained they would have about 48 acres of preserved open space, which was roughly 52 percent of the property. He displayed a diagram showing how this development would stay out of the steep slope areas and noted they would develop the site in full conformance with the stormwater management regulations of the City of Columbia. He understood there had been concerns as to how they would discharge from the site in terms of stormwater velocities and whether this would affect erosion, and pointed out they had addressed all of those concerns. He commented that the developer was an avid hiker, and this property would have just less than two miles of internal private trails. They would be owned and maintained as part of the common land, but would be available for public use via an easement. He noted it was a footpath trail and the developer was working with the Center of Urban Agriculture to incorporate some forest farming techniques to educate the public. He pointed out site configuration and traffic

flow had been a hot topic for the neighbors. They had originally requested a PUD for this project, which would have involved a higher density, and at that time, much of the traffic would have gone to a residential street to the south called Whitefish Drive. The neighbors had grave concerns with that layout so they altered it directing the traffic to Smith Drive. Since there were still concerns, they agreed to the current R-1 layout, whereby it was no longer a PUD and the density of the project was reduced. There was interconnectivity with Whitefish Drive, but traffic would be pushed to the Smith Drive extension, a collector street, which was designed to handle the traffic.

Mayor Treece asked if the 1.5 units per acre was based upon the total 90 acre footprint or the 48 percent remaining based on the 52 percent set aside. Mr. Crockett replied it was based upon the entire 90.8 acres.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Crockett to point out the location of the Native American burial mound. Mr. Crockett described the location utilizing a diagram. He noted the burial mound itself was about 30 feet by 40 feet. The State mandated that they preserve 50 feet beyond the limits of the mound. The lot itself was just under an acre in size and was contiguous to a much larger common area. The houses would be set back even further so the nearest home would be beyond twice the limit the State would require as a buffer area. He explained they would bring the trail network to the burial mound area and illustrate and show the burial site as it was significant to Columbia's history.

Mr. Crockett displayed the site plan, and noted it was supported by everyone as it provided vehicular connectivity while reducing the traffic flow on to Whitefish Drive. He stated there would be edible landscaping, whereby fruit trees and other edible vegetation would be planted in the common spaces, and Mr. Tompkins, the developer, would work with the Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture to plant and maintain it. He noted there were sinkholes on the property, but if developed properly sinkholes were not a concern. He explained they had talked to the Public Works Department and their own geotechnical engineers, and although they had conducted soil studies in the area, they would continue to do the work so they could identify where the road network could be located and where there was a no build zone. The no build zone would conform to Boone County regulations. He stated they had met with County staff and City staff to determine how the County would enforce regulations on a site such as this, and they had agreed with what the developer had proposed, which was acceptable to City staff as well.

Mr. Skala asked if Boone County had a different set of rules in terms of sinkholes. Mr. Crockett replied they had a set of rules regarding sinkholes. The City of Columbia was moot on the issue. He noted the County had been silent on some related issues, and in those cases, they had looked at communities with a high percentage of karst areas, such as Green County and Taney County, to determine what they did.

Mr. Crockett pointed out they were asking for a waiver in terms of cul-de-sacs. He explained City staff wanted them to connect two cul-de-sacs, which they would typically do. If they did that here, it would provide for an easier path to filter back to Whitefish Drive, the residential street to the south. By keeping the cul-de-sacs separated, traffic would be pushed to the north. He noted the neighbors had requested it as well.

Mr. Trapp understood Boone County had heritage tree protections unlike the City and asked if those protections had been able to be accommodated. Mr. Crockett replied yes, and noted there was verbiage on the preliminary plat with regard to the preservation of certain trees.

Mr. Skala understood there would be public access to the trail system. Mr. Crockett stated that was correct. He explained there were two parts of public access. The first part involved access to the Perche Creek Trail when it was built as they would provide public access from their development to the trail. They would also allow anyone to access their footpath network, which would be owned and maintained by the homeowners association.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that wonders could happen with high value, high home site price and a beginning level of standards. He stated the sinkhole issue

bothered him, and wanted the City to develop a technique to ensure they were not liable if the infrastructure failed. He asked that it be looked into. He understood this area was outside of the urban service area, and hoped this issue would be firmed up quickly as the idea was to discourage development outside of the urban service area. He wondered why this could not just be developed in the County, and encouraged the Council to rapidly develop their analytical model for considering these types of proposals. He also felt a transportation plan for the area needed to be developed to better analyze developments. He commented that the neighbors were important, but did not feel their perspective was adequate in representing core interests of the City. He asked the Council to really refine the process. He understood the homeowners association would pay for all of this, and suggested the City and neighbors have standing in case the homeowners association did not maintain it. He stated he was impressed with the proposal as it was better than many others they had seen, but believed more work needed to be done.

Mayor Treece asked for the average home price. Mr. Crockett thought Mr. Tompkins could better answer the question.

Ms. Peters asked why they wanted to annex into Columbia instead of developing in the County. Mr. Crockett replied they wanted access to city sewer. The City's policy was that any time property was contiguous to the city limits and it accessed city sewer, the property had to annex before accessing that city sewer.

Mike Tompkins, 6000 Highway KK, stated they were thinking the low \$200,000's as a starting price for the homes. He noted that was the price of starter homes in Columbia these days.

Mayor Treece asked if there would be additional covenants that established the homeowners association and addressed exterior attributes of the homes. Mr. Tompkins replied yes.

Mr. Skala understood the development agreement was in anticipation of what staff thought might be appropriate of this property. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He noted they were mindful of it being outside of the urban service area. He pointed out some traffic contributions had been made associated with a subdivision near Battle High School as well. Those had been based on regional studies. This situation was slightly different as a subarea traffic study had not been conducted. He commented that every tract would be unique and have a unique situation with regard to the road system. This would create a very different impact if it had been surrounded by Columbia public streets instead of only having frontage on one side. Mr. Skala stated he thought Mr. Thomas' comments with regard to exactions rang true here. A reason for proposing fees was to get away from exactions, but in this case, he thought it made sense, especially since it was outside of the urban service area. Mr. Teddy stated he liked the idea of a streamlined approach so the step by step was uniform in determining the figures, but he did not believe every tract of land was created equally with respect to the transportation system.

Mr. Thomas commented that he thought this had been an excellent process, and one from which they might be able to learn as they ran into contentious development proposals. Over a period of about twelve months, three neighborhood associations and the developer had come together in developing an acceptable outcome for everyone. He noted everyone had worked hard to accomplish it. One of the reasons this situation had been successful was that one of the neighborhood associations had been headed by a professional in the development industry and understood exactly how this process worked. Another reason was his own desire to be in the middle of the discussions as a council member in order to keep the process moving. This hard work resulted in the resolution of traffic flow issues, density concerns, discussion of the sink holes and burial mounds, etc. He explained each neighborhood association had a list of concerns, and they were addressed one at a time to result in this proposal. He noted there were several elements Mr. Tompkins, as a signature, had placed in his plans, such as the trail system and the edible landscaping. He stated the only issues that remained from this

annexation, zoning, and platting process were ones they would likely continue to discuss, such as the urban service area and development fees. He commented that he thought they could pass some laws to actually simplify the process and create better predictability and a fairer playing field so they had the kind of growth they wanted for Columbia. He understood there was a donation of right-of-way for a potential extension of Smith Drive to create a bridge across the Perche Creek to connect to Highway UU. This was in addition to another plan that would take Broadway across the Perche Creek to connect to Highway UU. He noted both were phenomenally expensive road projects that did not make sense to him. He understood CATSO had looked at this and had reaffirmed its desire to keep those two proposed road projects on the plan. He encouraged everyone to advocate against them as they would promote sprawl and go right through a neighborhood.

Mr. Trapp stated this was a very interesting process as it had brought up a lot of critical issues with regard to how they were developing as a city. He appreciated the accommodation for the sinkhole protection and the heritage tree protection in those rare cases when the County had stronger environmental protections than Columbia. He noted that was something he would take into strong consideration in terms of annexations along the edge. He stated he also appreciated the reason for the extra cul-de-sac and the elimination of the PUD, but noted those things decreased density and continued to cost them as a lower density sprawling community. He hoped they could find way to accommodate strong environmental protections while living with higher density. In terms of why this did not develop in the County, he commented that he did not believe they wanted a lot of high density in the County as it created a free-rider position. People coming into the City would become voting members, have a say in how City government worked, and pay property taxes. He noted they wanted to see them expand their footprint in order to fund needed services through the property tax format. If they allowed people to work in Columbia, drive on city roads, and use all of their services, those people would not be paying for it except through sales tax, which captured everyone in the region, and he did not feel that was wise or good. He thought they should only provide sewer service with annexation and pre-annexation agreements so people remained invested in Columbia and so Columbia grew smartly with strong environmental protections and higher levels of density. He stated they would have to educate and challenge everyone involved in the process if they were ever going to have functional transit, the ability to plow snow well, etc.

B287-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B288-16 Approving the Final Plat of Anthony's Addition Plat 2, a Replat of Lots 19, 20 and 21, Anthony's Addition to Columbia, Missouri, located on the northeast corner of Anthony Street and Dorsey Street; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-206).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp understood this was a final plat action and asked if it was a ministerial act on the part of Council. Mr. Noce explained the plat itself had to meet a list of criteria, but in addition to that Section 25-30 of the City Code discussed resubdivision. It indicated a resubdivision of land shall not be approved by the Council if the Council determined the replat would eliminate restrictions on the existing plat upon which neighboring property owners or the city had relied or the replat would be detrimental to other property in the neighborhood and the detriment to the property in the neighborhood outweighed the benefits to the subdivider and public.

Mr. Skala asked if this area was within the area impacted by the administrative delay. Mr.

Teddy replied yes.

Ms. Nauser asked for a comparison of the existing density and the potential density of this lot. Mr. Teddy replied he understood it currently had nine units, and thought it could accommodate more density if consolidated. Currently there were three lots of record, and city ordinances allowed a building to be placed over two or more lots of record with the caveat of meeting setback requirements if there was any space between the building and lot line regardless of whether it involved the same owner. A mechanism did not exist at this time to force an individual to reuse three lots as three buildings with side yards in between with R-3 zoning. He pointed out the Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) was proposing that all lots intended to be used as single building sites be consolidated so there would not be a single building that crossed lot lines. The three lot example would result in internal open spaces in the form of minimum setbacks between the buildings on the lots.

Mr. Thomas asked how many dwelling units could be constructed on a consolidated lot. Mr. Teddy replied he thought it could accommodate fifteen units assuming the other requirements were met. Mr. Thomas understood one R-3 lot the size of these three combined could accommodate a building with fifteen units. Mr. Teddy stated, theoretically, there could be one building with fifteen units.

Mr. Skala understood the UDO if approved as proposed could impact the density as it would be reduced to a lower level than the fifteen units. Mr. Teddy stated that was not necessarily true as they were not changing the lot standard for the R-3 zoning district. There would be a neighborhood protection standard that might have some impact as it would require a transition if there was a single-family unit bordering the parcel.

Mr. Thomas asked what it would take for the property owner to build a mixed use building if this consolidation were to occur. He wondered if that would require a rezoning of the lot. Mr. Teddy replied commercial was limited in the R-3 zoning district. Pre-schools and daycares were allowed, but offices or neighborhood stores were not allowed. The traditional approach had been for a planned district for a niche development such as the Lee Street Deli.

Ms. Peters asked if the owner of these three lots would be able to combine these lots and then ask for a mixed use development if the proposed UDO was approved. Mr. Teddy replied they would be able to combine the lots at any time, but noted they would have to submit a subdivision to do so. The mixed use would require it to go through the rezoning process. Ms. Peters understood the owners could come back and ask for this in the future once they had plan for what they wanted done. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He pointed out they could ask for a zoning change now.

Ron Lueck, a surveyor with offices at 914 N. College Avenue, stated he had prepared the plat per the request of his client. He explained there was not currently a redevelopment plan for this set of R-3 lots, nor was there a sale or demolition pending. This was a replat that conformed to the subdivision regulations of the City. It was not a site development plan. The replat would combine the three lots into a single lot. Since it passed the concerns of City staff, he implored the Council to approve it.

Mr. Skala asked why his client was seeking a replat. Mr. Lueck replied he was receiving requests to consolidate lots in many places around town. He thought people were concerned about future regulations in terms of R-3 zoned properties.

Mayor Treece asked if the combination of these three lots was mostly consistent with the adjoining lots or more inconsistent the balance of the neighboring lots. Mr. Lueck replied lots had been combined to the west of this location for development purposes. He stated this was a rental street. He understood this was an option of his client, and was what he had chosen to do. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Lueck if he thought the neighbors had relied on the expectation that their neighborhood would be mostly these types of structures. Mr. Lueck replied he thought 85 percent of the neighborhood was rental, to include everything to the west. He understood private ownership was to the east. He thought this was the cutoff area. Mayor Treece understood that might be the case for the zoning

and use, but not the plat in terms of the size of the lot. Mr. Lueck stated individuals owned the lots across the street. In addition, individuals owned the rental property to the west so they were not able to consolidate. Mayor Treece asked if the lots were 75 feet wide and 150 feet deep. Mr. Lueck replied it was likely 85-90 feet.

Janet Hammen, 1844 Cliff Drive, commented that Jeff Akers, the property owner immediately to the east of the subject site had intended to attend the meeting tonight to ask the Council to deny this replat as his house was zoned R-1 and had been designated a most notable property by the Historic Preservation Commission. She noted he had been unable to attend due to an illness and had asked her to speak for him. She stated they thought it was in the best interest of the East Campus Neighborhood to not approve this final plat. She explained the City Code provided the Council the decision-making authority to approve or deny replats as indicated in Section 25-30 of the City Code. She commented that these properties were currently in conformance with city ordinances, and a replatting action would allow non-conforming uses. She noted there was not any provision in the City Code for creating such non-conforming uses through replatting. She understood the City Code allowed non-conforming uses to be created only through annexation. This creation of non-conforming uses might have been allowed in the past, but it was not addressed in the City Code and should not be allowed. When this item was before the Planning and Zoning Commission, staff had told them this was strictly a ministerial action, but that was not the case per Section 25-30 of the City Code. The Council had the authority to decide to approve or deny the replat. She stated the owner of this property, Mr. Hinshaw, had indicated through his representative that there were no plans for this property, neither building plans nor plans to sell the property. As a result, Mr. Hinshaw would not lose anything if this was not approved tonight. The neighborhood would lose three lots with correct street frontage as a replatted lot would be addressed to Dorsey Street, which did not have a single dwelling facing the street on that side of the block. In addition, on the Anthony Street block, from Dorsey Street to Shockley Street, there were five dwellings facing Anthony Street at this time. On both sides of Anthony Street, from College Avenue to South William Street, there were more than 20 houses that faced Anthony Street. She asked the Council to consider the look of a three lot, 234 foot long stretch of building wall along Anthony Street when all of the other modest homes faced Anthony Street. She believed it would be detrimental to the property in the neighborhood. It would be different from anything else on the block, and the detriment to the neighborhood outweighed the benefit to the subdivider. The replat would be detrimental to Mr. Akers as there was a possibility of a large wall facing his house, and his street view would be harmed. The block of Anthony Street with the five houses would possibly be defaced with one large lot and only two houses on lots zoned R-1. She pointed out that if the plat was granted, the developer would not have to reappear before the Planning and Zoning Commission or the City Council. The developer would be able to develop the property according to the new code. She wondered if the developer was trying to evade what might be passed in the new unified code, and noted Mr. Hinshaw would not suffer any detriment by Council denying the plat. She reiterated he did not have any plans for his property and was asking for this tenuous benefit based upon possible changes to the UDO versus the neighborhood's tangible harm. She asked the Council to deny this replat.

Ms. Peters commented that she agreed that there was really no reason to replat this when Mr. Hinshaw did not have any plans to redevelop. Once it was replatted and Mr. Hinshaw decided to tear down the homes or redevelop the property, it would pretty much destroy the north side of Anthony Street as it involved three of the five lots on that block. She noted she had received an e-mail from Mr. Akers regarding the stormwater issues he had been affected by in the past, and hoped any new development there would address those stormwater issues. She stated she would vote against this.

Mr. Ruffin stated he was in agreement with Ms. Peters. He explained he did not have any rationale to approve this without a plan. It appeared to be pre-emptive to vote in favor

of the replatting. He commented that he would not support it at this time.

Mayor Treece commented that he though the replat was out of step the character of the neighborhood and really put the adjoining property owners at risk. It was certainly detrimental per Section 25-30 of the City Code.

Mr. Skala stated there had been an assembly of lots to increase density in the East Campus and Benton Stephens neighborhoods. He agreed they did not want sprawl and that they would have to become a more dense community in some regards, but there was an overriding influence as to what this would do to those neighborhoods. He did not feel there was any reason for the replatting other than in anticipation of some future event. He noted they had not even settled the Unified Development Code (UDC) issue, and believed that needed to be put in place as it would address overlay districts and impact the East Campus and Benton Stephens neighborhoods. Since no harm would be done by not approving the replat, he did not know why they would be obligated to move forward. He stated he would not support the replat.

Mr. Thomas asked what might be in the UDC that made the owner want to replat this property. Mr. Skala replied there were changes proposed in the UDC that would affect neighboring residential interactions.

Mr. Trapp commented that this was a tough one. He understood a building could be constructed on multiple lots in the current code, and thought it made sense to eliminate this in the new code because of problems associated with trying to sell a lot. It was a change in the favor of the applicant as it would be allowed currently, but they were looking at eliminating it in the new code for a good reason. As a result, he thought they should generally look at replats favorably. In terms of whether the neighbors had relied upon it, he did not believe they had relied upon this platting action because it would not be an issue until it came up with the new code. He stated he thought Ms. Hammen made some good points about the changing of the frontage in terms of a larger building faced to the side as it would cause some problems for the neighborhood. He did not believe they had relied upon standard applied, but they had to outweigh the benefits to the applicant. This as a mapping exercise only mattered to Mr. Hinshaw. It likely did not matter to the neighbors, but the implications of the changes to map created other issues. He thought in general they should weigh on the side of the applicant because density was something from which they all gained, but in this instance he felt Ms. Hammen made a compelling argument that tipped the scale in the favor of denial.

Mr. Thomas understood the building if built would front onto Dorsey Street and asked for clarification. Mr. Teddy replied he thought they were obligated to follow the averaging on Anthony Street regardless. The frontage was Anthony Street at this time because the short sides of three lots were on Anthony Street, but once it was consolidated into one lot, the slightly shorter side would be on Dorsey Street. The concern was that there would be a long building with lots and buildings across the street from it that were generally narrow. Mr. Thomas understood there were concerns about a big blank wall, and asked if there were absolutely no requirements for windows, architectural elements, etc. Mr. Teddy replied there were, but he was not certain as to whether they would be satisfactory to those concerned with neighborhood character. There were some things they did not have in the current code that were in the draft UDO. It was a starting point for Council discussion to determine if it got them to where they wanted to be with infill situations. He noted he had alluded to neighborhood protection standards and it had been confirmed there were R-1 lots to the east that were single-family use so there was a mandatory step down in the draft UDO. It was a limitation of height for a specified distance or extra yard spacing to visually reduce the mass as would be seen by the neighbor, and not the street view.

Mr. Thomas stated he had feeling similar to those of Mr. Trapp. He felt this was a good opportunity for increasing density. It would be an increase from nine units to fifteen units, which was moderate. He also thought it was an opportunity for small-scale retail in the neighborhood, which he believed a lot of neighbors would like. Having no proposal to look

at, however, made it dangerous to support. In addition, there had not been any communication as to the reason for wanting to consolidate the lot. He noted he would vote against this tonight.

Mayor Treece asked if that was a dirt road that went from the driveway to the alley for the middle unit. Mr. Teddy replied he did not know, but it did look as though it might be gravel. It appeared to be concrete from Anthony Street to the bump out of the building. Mayor Treece noted there was parking in the back on grass and asked for the requirement in the R-3 district. Mr. Teddy replied they would have to get that on an approved surface. He did not know if they considered this grandfathered or not. He thought they did because there were some areas in East Campus that had grown organically as gravel lots. The vehicle looked as though it was on turf, and they would have to police something like that.

Ms. Nauser stated she concurred with many of the sentiments heard this evening. She commented that they had previously discussed zoning being separate from the plan, but now they were saying they wanted to see the plan. They had always indicated they wanted higher density in the community and stop urban sprawl, but they tended to oppose PUDs because the neighbors did not want it near them. She wished they could move forward with one set of rules without intermingling them based upon who or what was before them. She commented that she understood this would likely not pass and would vote against it as well.

Mayor Treece pointed out this was not a request for a change in zoning. They were trying to aggregate lots whereby it was inconsistent with the plats of the neighborhood. Ms. Nauser understood, but noted if they had a rendering, there was a potential the Council would change its mind because it was more applicable to the desires of the neighborhood.

Mr. Skala commented that this was not a zoning request, and he believed the zoning should be separate from the plan as they were separate issues. In terms of increased density, generally speaking, he was in favor of it. He noted it was even a principle of smart growth, but it was also a complicated issue as what one property owner did could affect other property owners, and they had to balance those interests. It was not just an issue of more density being good as more density was good only in the right place. The sense of place was as important as increased density.

B288-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NO ONE. VOTING NO: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. Bill declared defeated.

B289-16 Approving the Final Plat of Cunningham Place Plat 2, a Replat of Lot 3 of the Revised Plat of Cunningham Place, and Lots 1, 2 and 3 of Mitchell Court, Columbia, Missouri, located on the east side of College Avenue and south of Paris Road 404 and 408 N. College Avenue); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-207).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked if it was fair to say everything around this area included apartments or whether there were any single family residences. Mr. Teddy replied there appeared to be several units in a row to the north and south, but he was not sure about the east. There was also some transition into non-residential zoning that occurred on the other side of the street.

Mr. Thomas noted there had been a reference to the granting of 20 feet of additional right-of-way to College Avenue at the request of CATSO and asked for clarification. Mr. Teddy replied he was not sure if it was at the request of CATSO, but it was a standard. College Avenue was classified as a major arterial, and there was a narrow right-of-way section due to the history of development along there. The additional right-of-way would

make 55 feet and provide 110 feet of total right-of-way if the program continued. He commented that they might just want to consider it land-banked right-of-way because there was not rampant redevelopment along College Avenue. Mr. Thomas understood the strategy was to take the right-of-way when there was an opportunity. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas asked for the standard for a major arterial. Mr. Teddy replied it would be 110 feet. It would be 55 feet on each side of the centerline. Mr. Thomas asked for the right-of-way of College Avenue currently. Mr. Teddy replied it was 70 feet according to Mr. Lueck. He thought they would be adding 20 feet to it.

Ron Lueck, a surveyor with offices at 914 N. College Avenue, explained the 20 feet would be provided per a suggestion of CATSO. It would provide the 55-foot half right-of-way off the centerline of Highway 163, which was North College Avenue. He stated there was not a redevelopment plan for this lot nor was there a sale or demolition pending. This was a replat that conformed to the subdivision regulations of the City, and was not a site plan. The replat would consolidate four lots. He implored the Council to approve this plat, and stated the time to oppose any future development would be at the time a site plan or site development plan was presented.

Janet Hammen, 1844 Cliff Drive, commented that she believed Section 29-30 of the City Code applied to this situation as well. There was not a plan so there would not be any harm done to the developer, but there was a great possibility of harm to the neighborhood. She noted Mr. Lueck had mentioned it could be looked at again at the time of a site plan, but she did not believe anything would come back to the Planning and Zoning Commission or the City Council once this replat was approved. She asked the Council to not approve this replat.

Ms. Peters asked if anything would come before the Council if this property was redeveloped. Mr. Teddy replied it would not if the proposed building or buildings met the zoning regulations. It would just be a permit process, and if a variance was needed, it would be heard by the Board of Adjustment.

Mr. Trapp commented that he thought they had the same method of decision-making in this situation as the previous item in terms of whether the neighbors had relied upon it. Until the proposed Unified Development Code (UDC), one could develop on multiple lots. He understood the proposed change was triggering this action at this time so that criteria did not apply. They then needed to determine if the benefits were outweighed. He stated he thought College Avenue was an appropriate place to look at increased density as there was a public good to density. He did not believe this had the issues of changing the facings of the building. In addition, there were already protections with the Benton Stephens overlay district for any new building. He thought the same method of analysis should lead them to a different conclusion when applied in this case.

Mr. Skala stated he felt this was a recurring theme, and thought it might be happening because they had an administrative delay in place. He believed this was almost an identical situation with the exception that it was on College Avenue. He understood the neighborhood felt strongly about the nature of how this development was occurring in an area that was supposed to have been protected to some degree with the urban conservation overlay. They were now rolling that conservation overlay into the UDC. He would prefer it be a separate instrument and wanted to see what happened at the end of the process as to whether or not that would determine how this property owner moved on this particular piece of property. He commented that he would be consistent on these types of requests until they made a determination on the UDC and ensured the urban conservation overlay protections were in place. He did not plan to approve this plat.

Ms. Nauser stated she agreed with Mr. Trapp in this situation. She thought they needed to consider each request individually, and not take a blanket approach to everything. She believed College Avenue was an appropriate location for higher density as it was a MoDOT road and there was already a lot of high density in the area. She noted she would be inclined to support this request, especially since they had the overlay, which would afford some additional protections for any development that would occur here.

Mr. Thomas asked how many units would be allowed if the property were to be consolidated. Mr. Teddy replied approximately thirteen. Mr. Thomas understood currently there were four separate lots and asked how many would be allowed. Mr. Teddy replied that would be hard to determine. Mr. Thomas understood it would be fewer than 13 units. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct if they assumed there was not any crossing of lot lines. He thought one of the four lots was irregular and was not a building lot. It was only a sliver of property.

Ms. Nauser understood if this property were to be redeveloped, it would have to conform to the stormwater and other ordinances. Mr. Teddy stated it was less than one acre so there would be some concession to accommodate it as a small site. They would not have to accommodate on-site detention.

B289-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, THOMAS, NAUSER. VOTING NO: TREECE, RUFFIN, SKALA, PETERS. Bill declared defeated.

B306-16 Amending the FY 2017 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Police Department; amending the FY 2017 Classification and Pay Plan by adding and closing classifications.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Chief Burton provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood this was the very same proposal people previously wanted to get away from, and asked if a lot of the people had changed or if these were some of the same people that had changed their minds. Chief Burton replied a lot of them had changed. He noted the older group that had been on this four-day/ten-hour schedule previously had convinced the younger ones to try it. He pointed out he thought it only needed to be managed properly. They wanted every opportunity to make this successful, and this would help them with that.

Mayor Treece asked how many vacancies they had in the Police Department. Chief Burton replied seventeen. Mayor Treece asked what it was when adding those on injury, disability, or family medical leave. Chief Burton replied he thought six officers had injuries, but not all were work related. He explained they had also asked investigative personnel to work a patrol shift. He noted it was getting critical in terms of staffing, and that was the reason it would be important to properly manage the four-day/ten-hour schedule as it was not quite as efficient as the twelve-hour shift. He stated they would make it work if it improved morale.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B306-16 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Mayor Treece asked for the need for the amendment. Chief Burton replied it had to be budgeted out of a different part of the organization. He noted that had been an oversight, which the amendment would fix. Mr. Matthes explained the amendment was the correct description of where the position was in the organization.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Ms. Nauser to amend B306-16 per the amendment sheet was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B306-16, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B286-16 Voluntary annexation of property located on the west side of Highway PP and north of Mexico Gravel Road (3891 North Highway PP); establishing permanent R-1 zoning (Case No. 16-196).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas stated there was a reference to the green line payment system for water connection and asked for an explanation. Mr. Teddy replied that meant someone else had built an oversized line. Green line meant there were additional payments that were due to compensate for the oversizing. Mr. Thomas understood there was already a water utility connection fee. Mr. Teddy stated green lining recognized that one individual might oversize a line, but it did not exclusively benefit them whereas the demand for a six or eight-inch line that ran through the a subdivision was exclusively created by the homes that tied into it.

Mr. Skala understood the urban service area connoted the idea that development could occur under the right circumstances, but it was incumbent upon the developer to provide some of the infrastructure necessary to service that particular area. In this case, that requirement was satisfied with the lift station. He also understood this would be connected to a line that had sufficient capacity assuming the pump station worked the way it was supposed to work. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. There were no concerns expressed regarding capacity in terms of where the sewer would tie into the existing system. Draining it by gravity immediately to the west, however, would not be recommended at this time.

Charlie Lohse stated he lived on Highway PP and thought there would be a sewer issue in the area. He understood there would be a pump line that no one could connect to and they would likely dig for a mile or longer to get the line to where it was needed. Part of it would be along Highway PP and down Wyatt Lane. He wondered how much disruption there would be in terms of driveways, etc. He commented that water pressure was not the greatest in the area either. He thought they would take out some of the trees. Minimum seemed to be more than the minimum, and the trees were usually replaced with a few littler trees.

Mr. Skala asked if the sewer work would require a good deal of excavation. Mr. Teddy replied he had not examined any construction plans on it.

Ms. Peters asked if the Utility Department had weighed in on this. Mr. Teddy replied yes, particularly with regard to the sewer. Ms. Peters understood they did not believe it would be a problem. Mr. Teddy stated there was a tendency to avoid lift stations because they had to be maintained, but sometimes it could not be avoided due to topography. The Utility Department recommendation was to not tie directly into the system to the west.

Keenan Simon, an engineer with offices at 1901 Pennsylvania Drive, commented that they had worked with the City in terms of the tie-in point. They were proposing a lift station route that would follow the west boundary, and they were in negotiations in obtaining an easement agreement from the property owner to the south to allow the force main to run on the west boundary. When it hit Mexico Gravel Road, it would turn west. He noted this route seemed to minimize the amount of disturbance for the lift station as well as the number of driveways that would be disrupted for it to be built. He described the full route utilizing the diagram shown on the overhead. He understood the Wyatt Lane sanitary shed was at about 20 percent capacity, and they would be adding an approximately 30 percent. He pointed out the water main to the east was 16 inches and had been installed about three years ago so it had sufficient capacity for the development.

Carolyn Lohse, 3821 N. Highway PP, commented that she agreed with her husband

about the sewer system, but felt there was another problem as well. She explained Highway PP was not a straight road. There were two hills and her driveway was at the bottom of the two hills. She noted the school bus picked up her granddaughter there every morning. The placement of a street almost directly across from her driveway would create a traffic problem. She did not believe a stop light or stop sign was needed, and did not feel the streets should be that close together. She commented that this development would also disturb the wildlife out there as they tended to cross Highway PP there because they had the protection of the hills to get to the wooded property and there were places for them to hide, eat, etc. They also ate from the fields. She was concerned about the wonderful animals out there.

Mr. Skala asked where her home was located. Ms. Lohse described its location utilizing a map that was displayed.

Ms. Peters understood this would be a vote on the annexation, and asked if there was a plat associated with it. Mr. Teddy replied there was a resolution on the agenda for a 78-lot preliminary plat. Ms. Peters asked if there was any chance of moving or readjusting the streets. Mr. Teddy replied the Council had received correspondence in the packet indicating the subdivider wanted to discuss the location of a stub-out street to the north boundary of the property. He noted they would typically try to connect properties on all four sides of the subdivided tract for future planning purposes. It provided the ability without the obligation to extend a street through if there was ever a resubdivision. Otherwise all access would go to the major roads.

B286-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B292-16 Appropriating funds to finalize and close out the Chapel Hill Road improvement project.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood the money to build the sidewalks was paid by the developer that had developed the houses to the south. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas understood the timing was just wrong to go ahead and build the sidewalks. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. He explained if the developer would have constructed them, the City would have torn them out with the road. As a result, they typically collected the money to put toward building the project. In this situation, money was left over so they transferred it to another capital improvement project.

B292-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SKALA (Mr. Skala stepped out during the vote.) Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

B290-16 Approving the Final Plat of Wyndham Commercial Corner located northeast of the intersection of Scott Boulevard and State Rout KK; authorizing a performance contract.

B291-16 Vacating a stormwater drainage easement on Lots 69 and C1 within Bristol Lake Plat 1 located on the north side of Bradington Drive and

northwest of Bristol Lake Drive (Case No. 16-180).

- B293-16 Appropriating and transferring funds relating to the Grissum Building renovation improvement project.
- B294-16 Authorizing an agreement with PNC Bank, National Association, Lexington Steel Corporation and LexWest, LLC to facilitate warehouse storage of carbon steel at the City's transload facility.
- B295-16 Authorizing a contract of obligation with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources to satisfy financial assurance requirements for proper closure and post-closure care with respect to a permit for operation of a solid waste disposal area.
- B296-16 Authorizing permit holder and certifier registration designations relating to the electronic filing of discharge monitoring reports, in compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Electronic Reporting Rule, with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources Water Protection Program.
- B297-16 Accepting conveyances for water, utility and electric purposes.
- B298-16 Accepting conveyances for drainage and utility purposes.
- B300-16 Authorizing Amendment No. 2 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for maternal child health services; appropriating funds.
- B301-16 Authorizing a subrecipient monitoring agreement with Boone County, Missouri relating to acceptance of the FY 2016 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program Award to purchase equipment for the Police Department; appropriating funds.
- B302-16 Accepting funds from the Community Foundation of Central Missouri to be used for FY 2017 annual arts agency funding; appropriating funds.
- B303-16 Authorizing a first amendment to antenna agreement and memorandum of agreement with Cellco Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, relating to the lease of property and space on the Shepard Water Tower (1160 Cinnamon

Hill Lane).

- B304-16 Authorizing a first amendment to tower agreement and memorandum of agreement with Cellco Partnership, d/b/a Verizon Wireless, relating to the lease of City-owned property located at 1313 Lakeview Street (Grissum Building).
- B305-16 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri, on behalf of its Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital, for emergency veterinary services.
- B307-16 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code relating to payment of floating holidays for certain fire department employees.
- R169-16 Authorizing a professional architectural services agreement with Simon Oswald Associates, Inc. for design services relating to the renovation of the Columbia Police Department facility located at 600 E. Walnut Street.
- R171-16 Authorizing an agreement with WebQA, Inc. for software services relating to open records requests.
- R172-16 Authorizing agreements for FY 2017 Signature Series Funding under the Tourism Development Program; transferring tourism development funds to the Parks and Recreation Department for the Heritage Festival.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R173-16 Approving the Preliminary Plat of Fox Creek Subdivision located on the west side of Highway PP (3891 N. Highway PP) (Case No. 16-197).

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Keenan Simon, an engineer with offices at 1901 Pennsylvania Drive, commented that the location of the exit onto Highway PP was determined by MoDOT in terms of sightseeing distance. It was the only acceptable location MoDOT would allow them to exit traffic on Highway PP. He asked the Council to allow them to remove the stub road to the north, which was located in the northwest portion of the property. He understood Section 25-42(c) indicated that when a new subdivision adjoined unplatted or undeveloped land, new streets shall be carried to the boundaries of such land unless vehicle access was unnecessary or inappropriate. He stated they felt the stub road was inappropriate and

unnecessary. The lots to the north were estate lots. All of the lots had been developed and were home sites. In addition, there were two stream buffers that cut through the site and would impede development to the north. He noted the proposed Unified Development Ordinance (UDO) would define areas with slopes steeper than 4:1 as sensitive areas, so that would also impede development. He stated they had met with the neighbors to help work toward solutions, and the neighbors directly to the north were opposed to the stub road to the north as they wanted their privacy.

Mr. Thomas asked if there were any plans to do anything in the tree preservation common lot, such as a trail or landscaping. Mr. Simon replied Lot 26 would be the tree preservation area and noted they were also in negotiations with the Parks and Recreation Department for part of it to be developed into a neighborhood park. They thought the area close to the intersection with Highway PP would provide an excellent location for a neighborhood park. Mr. Thomas suggested they consider creating public easements between some of the lots to provide more access from the sidewalks to the common lot going north from the road as he thought that would be an amenity that would allow people to get around the neighborhood more easily. Mr. Simon commented that they had a trail system proposed within the stream buffer boundary so that would fall in line with what the developer wanted to do.

Ms. Nauser asked if the tree preservation for this area was essentially just the stream buffer. Mr. Simon replied yes, for the most part. It was where the majority of all of the trees were located on the site. Ms. Nauser thought there had been a large swath of trees around the top on the other side as well. Mr. Simon stated there was a wooded area that ran to the east out toward Highway PP. Ms. Nauser understood there would be a 100-foot buffer along the creek and those would be the only trees that were preserved. Mr. Simon explained the requirement for the tree preservation plan was to maintain at least 25 percent of the existing climax forest, and they were sitting at roughly 28-30 percent range.

Mr. Trapp asked if this was approved tonight if it would include the stub road to the north. Mr. Noce replied yes. Mr. Trapp stated he found the argument of the applicant compelling in that a stub road to the north would not be needed. He noted he was a big fan of connectivity, but in this case, it might be overzealous.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend R173-16 so the requirement for the northern stub road was removed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Ms. Nauser stated she did not find that stub road necessary with all of the estate lots to the north.

Mr. Thomas stated he thought he had seen a plat without the stub street. Mr. Teddy explained the plat in the packet included the stub street. Mr. Skala asked if that was the version that had been shown to the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Teddy replied no. He explained the one that had been presented to the Planning and Zoning Commission had shown the stub east of the greenspace. It was then moved to the west. Now they were trying to be responsive to the property owner.

Mayor Treece understood a motion was on the table to amend the preliminary plat to eliminate Bobwhite Lane. Mr. Trapp stated that was correct.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Ms. Nauser to amend R173-16 so the requirement for the northern stub road was removed was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala asked for the starting home prices for this development.

Jim Krogman, 2900 Chinaberry Drive, explained their lots would sell from about \$39,000 to \$42,500, and the project price would be from about \$160,000 to \$210,000 depending on whether it was a slab or a walkout.

The vote on R173-16, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO

ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R174-16

Approving the Preliminary Plat of Breckenridge Park located at the western terminus of Smith Drive, approximately 3,000 feet west of Scott Boulevard; granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations as it relates to direct driveway access on Smith Drive (Case No. 16-179).

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Tim Crockett, an engineer with offices at 1000 W. Nifong Boulevard, commented that what was shown as a sinkhole protection zone was just that. It was an expanded protection zone. It was not the actual sinkholes themselves. The sinkholes were much smaller and much more compact.

Ms. Peters asked where the land preservation was located for Broadway. Mr. Crockett replied it was what was shown in the far northwest corner identified in yellow in the diagram.

Mr. Thomas understood right-of-way had also been granted to make Smith Drive wider. Mr. Crockett stated that was correct. They had increased the right-of-way for Smith Drive as directed by City staff in the event Smith Drive was extended. It preserved the corridor.

Ms. Peters asked if consideration was being given to lengthening Smith Drive to connect to property further out. Mr. Crockett replied this development allowed for Smith Drive to extend further to the west should the Council ever decide to extend it. He noted they were not promoting it, and it was not on the CATSO plan at this time. They were only allowing it to take place if needed in the future.

The vote on R174-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R170-16

Authorizing a grant agreement with Wilkes Boulevard United Methodist Church, Inc. for the provision of homeless day center services.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if this had been discussed at the time of the CDBG funding discussions. Mr. Teddy replied it was put into place in the last round. He noted they had done this before with other types of funds, such as program income, which was a payback from loans and was beyond what was expected. Mr. Thomas understood these funds had been originally allocated for the proposed homeless day center whereby the City had purchased the land, but the proposal had not moved forward. Mr. Teddy explained there had been concern as to how it would work out and City staff was still working with the neighborhood with regard to a possible reuse of the land.

Mr. Thomas stated the day center at the Turning Point was working really well. Mr. Teddy agreed. He noted they had hired a professional manager and it appeared to be a good facility for a major need in the community.

Mr. Trapp explained there would be fencing and an expansion of the men's room area to include more showers. It was a good use of these funds since they had been intended for day center services. He pointed out he was on the Turning Point's advisory board in a non-voting role. He did not feel it was a conflict, but wanted it known. He noted the Turning Point provided an excellent service to the community and reiterated this was a good use of the funds.

The vote on R170-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B308-16 Approving the Wyndham Commercial Corner C-P Plan located on the northeast corner of Scott Boulevard and State Route KK (Case No. 16-205).
- B309-16 Approving the Final Plat of The Vineyards, Plat No. 3 located at the western terminus of Stone Mountain Parkway; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-128).
- B310-16 Approving the Final Plat of Fox Lair, Plat No. 3 located at the western terminus of Fort Sumter Court and west of Buchanan Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-203).
- B311-16 Vacating an existing sanitary sewer easement located on the northwest corner of Nifong Boulevard and Santiago Drive (Case No. 16-165).
- B312-16 Vacating an unused trail easement that was acquired as part of the Hominy Creek Trail Phase II project.
- B313-16 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to change the speed limit on portions of Providence Road and Battle Avenue.
- B314-16 Authorizing Amendment No. 7 to the general cooperative agreement with the Boone County Regional Sewer District relating to sewer service to property within Arrowhead Lake Estates - University Estates and located on the west side of South Arrowhead Lake Drive and the payment of special and regular fees for sewer connection to the Cascades Pump Station.
- B315-16 Authorizing a power purchase agreement with Crystal Lake Wind III, LLC for the purchase of wind energy.
- B316-16 Accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B317-16 Authorizing recreational trails program project agreements and a land and water conservation fund project agreement with the State of Missouri - Department of Natural Resources; appropriating funds.

- B318-16 Authorizing a grant agreement with the State of Missouri - Missouri Arts Council for the Parks and Recreation Department Annual Fall Heritage Festival and Crafts Show.
- B319-16 Accepting a grant from the 3M Foundation for CoMo Common Ground for a monarch butterfly habitat restoration project; appropriating funds.
- B320-16 Appropriating funds for the purchase of City of Columbia flags to have available for resale.
- B321-16 Amending Chapter 13 of the City Code as it relates to pawnbrokers.
- B322-16 Authorizing an agreement with the County of Boone, Missouri for the second assignment of legacy assets related to Public Safety Joint Communications.
- B323-16 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with the County of Boone, Missouri for server relocation and disaster recovery services.
- B324-16 Amending Chapter 17 of the City Code as it relates to parks and recreation.

X. REPORTS

- REP85-16 Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) Board of Directors - Annual Membership.
- Mayor Treece explained they had received a slate of directors from the Downtown CID and under their petition of organization, the City had 30 days to respond from the date of the correspondence, which was received on November 10, 2016. He stated he intended to respond to it before bringing it back to the Council for appointment.
- REP86-16 Vision Commission Five-Year Review and Report.
- Mayor Treece noted they had heard from the Chair of the Columbia Vision Commission earlier in the evening. He thought they might want to discuss whether they wanted the Commission to continue or if they wanted them to come back in five years with another report card. He believed Mr. Cobbins made some good comments on the recommendations. He encouraged the Council to take a look at those.
- REP87-16 Student Housing Vacancy Report.
- Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.
- Mr. Skala commented that there had been an article in Vox Magazine with regard to student housing and outlying housing. He thought it was an interesting read and encouraged the Council to look at it. He noted it was a compliment to some of the hard data they had here.

REP88-16 Snow Priority Routes Report for 2016/2017.

Mr. Trapp stated he liked the idea of the addition to the snow routes without formalizing it. He commented that people were really patient for two days, and then started calling the house with increasing amounts of alarm and displeasure.

Ms. Peters understood there were first and second priority streets and asked if there were also third and fourth priority streets, and asked how those first and second priorities were decided. Mr. Nichols replied the priorities had been established by Council in prior years. Staff was proposing to conduct a pilot program to determine if they could add connector roads. They wanted to determine how efficient they could be prior to adding to the priority list and wanted to make the Council aware in case they received inquiries. He noted staff would come back to Council with a report after the pilot was completed.

Ms. Peters asked how staff tracked which roads had been plowed. Mr. Stone replied the City utilized a GPS tracking mechanism.

Ms. Nauser commented that she felt past problems with regard to snow removal involved miscommunication or the lack of information. She did not believe people realized the snow plows had to drive out to the salt dome and back to the neighborhoods, which took at least 30-45 minutes in some areas of town. She suggested people be informed of that along with the fact the plows did not always start at the center of the community and work their way out. This was alternated with every snow event. She believed it would be helpful for people to be informed of these things. Mr. Nichols pointed out the "comosnow" website had a lot of that information. Ms. Nauser suggested an informational video as well.

Mr. Skala thanked the staff for the website, and hoped people would become accustomed to using it. He appreciated the work they had done and noted he would be willing to help in any way.

Mr. Thomas stated he had received requests for a couple of streets to become priority streets. He thought in both cases they were sloping down to a main road. He asked if it was too late to change the priority roads at this time. Mr. Stone replied staff analyzed the snow routes throughout the entire year in preparation for the snow season. It was easiest to do the same priority roads every year, but they understood priorities might need to change so they tried to become more efficient. He understood Sussex Drive had been one of the streets, and they had requested to be part of the priority neighborhood system, so they might be taken care of in that manner. Depending on the results of this testing, they might be able to expand into other streets if they were able to do so with the one-ton trucks they had. He noted they would keep this in mind while they evaluate the efficiency of the pilot. Mr. Thomas thought Sussex Drive functioned like a collector even though it was not a collector. Mr. Stone stated it was similar to Rainbow Trout Drive, which was a priority street. Mr. Thomas thought the other street was Glenbrook Court, and it involved a safety issue. Mr. Stone explained they usually tried utilize a brine mixture at the intersections with arterials and collectors with steep hills. They monitored other areas, and Glenbrook Court was not the only road with grade issues. Mr. Thomas understood staff had a consistent methodology and Glenbrook Court fell outside of it at this time.

REP89-16 CIP Fund Summary.

Mr. Thomas thanked staff for providing this report.

REP90-16 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, thanked the City for hosting the recent Homelessness Summit. It had been followed by a play entitled *Street Stories* on Friday night at First Christian Church. He thanked the City for CDBG funds as that had helped Habitat for Humanity years ago. He commented that a lady from Washington D.C. had spoken at the Homelessness Summit and had mentioned houses were first needed. They needed the landlords to open the doors to low-income tenants. He stated that he had talked to a HUD official that had attended the Summit as well with regard to his efforts to save some 1950s red brick buildings that were structurally sound. He noted beautiful structures were being gutted and updated south of Worley Street and west of Garth Avenue. He pointed out no landlords had been present at the Homelessness Summit. He commented that he had helped Ann Carlson create the Ann Carlson Emergency Food Pantry when he was younger. He noted there was a food drive at Schnuck's tomorrow, and this was his eighth year helping the homeless. He asked the City to help the police, homeless, and churches by feeding the homeless a second meal at noon of healthy foods until housing situations could be resolved. He understood there was commercial food preparation at Millersburg, and suggested stressing recycling by asking the homeless to keep the streets clean.

Mayor Treece noted the terms for those appointed to the Airport Advisory Board and the Community Land Trust Organization Board. Bob McDonald and Brian Whorley would have terms ending in 2019, B.J. Hunter and Greg Cecil would have terms ending in 2018, and Mark Winter would have a term ending in 2017 for the Airport Advisory Board. Dan Cullimore and Paul Prevo would have terms ending 2019, Anthony Stanton and Alexander LeBrunerie would have terms ending in 2018, and Shirley Rhoades and Jerry Dowell would have terms ending in 2017 for the Community Land Trust Organization Board.

Mr. Trapp agreed the Homelessness Summit had gone well. City staff, in partnership with Boone County and the United Way, had done a good job. He noted the United Way had really spearheaded the event. He explained there would be follow up as the committee had not yet completed its work. He commented that "housing first" was the move. It was the idea of placing homeless people in permanent housing rather than having a transitional step of shelter or getting people ready for housing as that was no longer considered the best practice. He stated placing people in housing and providing them with supportive services to try to help them be successful was considered best practice now.

Mr. Trapp asked the Council to reconsider a vote they made at their last meeting with regard to Creek Ridge, Plat No. 2. He explained it hinged upon a long cul-de-sac, and noted he agreed with staff in taking a hard line on cul-de-sacs, but thought the case should have been made that this platting action was needed in order to complete the deal of the Parks and Recreation Department purchasing a nice piece of parks land at a good price. They also needed the longer cul-de-sac to provide access to the park. The park had been brought up, but had not been made the centerpiece of the argument. If they would have considered it from the perspective of providing access to the park and facilitating the park transfer, they would have seen one long cul-de-sac was probably a price worth paying.

Mr. Trapp made a motion for leave of Council to authorize reconsideration of Creek Ridge, Plat No. 2. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Skala understood some information had not been presented in the manner it maybe should have been presented, and some other information had been left out as part of the decision process. He thought this was good practice if they found there was new information that might significantly affect a decision made.

Mayor Treece asked if this would go back to old business as a reconsidered item. Mr. Trapp replied he understood it had to go back through the process again. This only waived the 90 day waiting period to reconsider an issue. According to Ms. Thompson, this action required a certain set of procedures. He understood it would have to go back to the Planning and Zoning Commission and then come to the City Council.

Mayor Treece asked if the facts that were omitted had not been in the staff report or in the presentation to them. He wondered why it had to go back to the Planning and Zoning Commission instead of just putting it on a City Council agenda. Mr. Trapp replied he was responding based on the analysis of Ms. Thompson, and she had indicated that action required a certain set of procedures that included the Planning and Zoning Commission. Mr. Skala wondered if the rationale was that the Planning and Zoning Commission had not had that information either.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Mr. Skala for leave of Council to authorize reconsideration for Creek Ridge, Plat No. 2 was approved by voice vote. (Ms. Peters had stepped out of the room during the vote on the motion.)

Ms. Nauser commented that she had been contacted by a constituent with regard to Southampton Drive near Rock Bridge High School as vehicles were stopping to allow vehicles from the high school parking lot to pull out to go west. Some people felt the stopped vehicles would make a turn into the parking lot so they were driving past them on the shoulders, which was creating a dangerous situation. She asked staff to look into the situation to determine how often it was happening and whether there might be a solution with limited turns or discussions with school officials.

Ms. Nauser understood the City required tree preservation of 25 percent, and noted she did not feel trees in stream buffer areas should be able to be counted toward that 25 percent as it had an appearance of double-dipping. She thought this should be revisited and suggested only allowing a certain percentage of the stream buffer to count toward tree preservation.

Mr. Thomas wondered if this was something the Community Tree Task Force could review. Mr. Skala noted the Environment and Energy Commission had participated in topics such as this in the past as well. Ms. Nauser asked that this issue be sent to the Community Tree Task Force and the Environment and Energy Commission for their review and recommendations.

Mr. Skala commented that he had attended the National League of Cities Conference in Pittsburgh and Mr. Matthes had done them proud in his presentation with regard to incentive based budgeting. It had almost dominated the stage in terms of questions from the audience and had been a great presentation.

Mr. Skala stated there were two tracks at the National League of Cities Conference, and one was Racial Equity and Leadership (REAL). He commented that it was a shame he could not address the comments with respect to the Racial Equity tool kit because they had started to address some of the issues. In addition, he had brought back some more resources, which he planned to share with the Council in the future. He noted the other track was the University Communities Council, and the local government, Pittsburgh, had a unique way of encouraging interaction between them and the institutions. He explained they partnered with them by providing incentive funds for pilot projects. One example involved traffic lights. They had teamed up with Carnegie Mellon University to provide the equipment necessary to time the lights with radar and cameras to increase the efficiency for travel times and emissions. He thought this interaction was something Columbia might want to try to groom.

Mr. Skala commented that Jim Hunt, who had come to Columbia to provide advice on amazing cities, had written an *Amazing Cities* book, and page 152 of that book featured Columbia. He explained there were about three pages of very nice things about Columbia in the book, to include the painted utility boxes and City Hall. He stated he would share it with the Council.

Mr. Skala explained he provided the Council with some material with regard to the PACE program, which was a residential property assessed clean energy program. He asked staff to provide a report regarding the PACE program as he thought it might be time to take another look at it.

Mr. Thomas understood it was a financing tool. Mr. Skala stated that was correct. He asked the Council to take a look at the information he had provided until they received the report.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought they ought to have a butterfly house at Stephens Lake Park or elsewhere. He noted there was a butterfly house in the suburbs of St. Louis and kids tended to be drawn to it. He stated he would love to work with anyone with an endowment or anyone that wanted to try to move forward with something like this.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 11:17 p.m.