



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, May 16, 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, May 16, 2016, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE and RUFFIN were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of May 2, 2016 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Ms. Nauser.

Mayor Treece understood there had been a request to withdraw an item from the agenda. Ms. Amin explained R57-16 could be removed from the agenda as the applicant was no longer moving forward with the project and the requested temporary street closures were now not necessary.

Mayor Treece asked that B122-16 be moved from the consent agenda to old business and R58-16 be moved from the consent agenda to new business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B122-16 being moved to old business, R58-16 being moved to new business, and R57-16 being removed from the agenda, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Trapp and a second by Mr. Skala.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC5-16 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

Escott, Bill, 3807 Steinbrooke Terrace, Ward 5, Term to expire May 16, 2020

Whorley, Brian, 1802 Moss Creek Court, Ward 6, Term to expire May 16, 2020

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Hammen, Janet, 1844 Cliff Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire May 1, 2021

BOARD OF PLUMBING EXAMINERS

Stretz, Chad, 310 Cumberland Road, Ward 5, Term to expire May 31, 2018

COLUMBIA COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Regan, Blaine, 1419 Wilson Avenue, Ward 6, Term to expire November 1, 2017

COLUMBIA HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD

Lewis, Max, 1201 Paquin Street Apt. 609, Ward 1, Term to expire May 31, 2020

Robinson, Edward, 1100 Kennesaw Ridge Road #301, Ward 2, Term to expire May 31, 2020

COLUMBIA VISION COMMISSION

Ortiz, Carlos, 2407 Pimlico Court, Ward 6, Term to expire December 15, 2016

DISABILITIES COMMISSION

Graham, Chuck, 102 W. Green Meadows Road, Ward 5, Term to expire June 15, 2019

Haynes, Vera, 4813 Aztec Boulevard, Ward 3, Term to expire June 15, 2019

Jones, Christina, 1501 Westwinds Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire June 15, 2019

Zeterberg, Dawn, 608 Hunt Avenue, Ward 1, Term to expire June 15, 2019

DOWNTOWN COLUMBIA LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

Gray, Randy, 301 Edgewood Avenue, Ward 4, Term to expire May 1, 2019

Maze, Susan, 902 N. Seventh Street, Ward 1, Term to expire May 1, 2019

ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY COMMISSION

Midkiff, Kenneth, 1005 Belleview Court, Ward 4, Term to expire June 1, 2019

Reddy, Chada, 2701 Chapel Wood View, Ward 4, Term to expire June 1, 2019

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Doyle, Mary Kaye, 307 Maplewood Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire September 1, 2016

HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION

Ortiz, Carlos, 2407 Pimlico Court, Ward 6, Term to expire December 31, 2017

LIQUOR LICENSE REVIEW BOARD

Gardner, Brian, 3707 Teakwood Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire May 1, 2019

MAYOR'S COUNCIL ON PHYSICAL FITNESS AND HEALTH

Nall, Robyn, 1009 Otto Court, Ward 1, Term to expire November 30, 2018

Ortiz, Carlos, 2407 Pimlico Court, Ward 6, Term to expire November 30, 2017

Riel, Kayla, 1220 Frances Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire November 30, 2018

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Henry, Chad, 115 Gipson Street, Ward 2, Term to expire May 31, 2019

Hutton, Linda, 2252 Country Lane, Ward 3, Term to expire May 31, 2019

PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION

MacMann, Michael, 410 Hirth Avenue, Ward 1, Term to expire May 31, 2020

Strodtman, Rusty, 4009 Quinton Court, Ward 2, Term to expire May 31, 2020

YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL

Chapelaine, Abigail, Ward 5, Term to expire June 1, 2019

Cho, Kristine, Ward 4, Term to expire June 1, 2019

Cox, Laura, Boone County, Term to expire June 1, 2017

Keithahn, Helen, Boone County, Term to expire June 1, 2019

Marks, Trenton, Boone County, Term to expire June 1, 2019

Nguyen, Michael, Ward 4, Term to expire June 1, 2019

Popescu, Ilinca, Ward 5, Term to expire June 1, 2019
Prenger, Micah, Ward 6, Term to expire June 1, 2019

The Council also reappointed Matt Leuchtmann, Ron Rowe, and Ian Thomas as the non-voting liaisons to the Youth Advisory Council to a one year term expiring on June 1, 2017.

The Council asked that the vacancy for the Integrated Water Resource Planning Committee be readvertised.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC20-16 Dzung Nguyen, Dane Steinhauer, Sloane Scott: Representatives of the Columbia Youth Advisory Council - Provide annual report to City Council, and highlight the YAC areas of concern and the community service carried out to address those concerns.

Dane Steinhauer commented that after a year, the Youth Advisory Council (YAC) had been able to find its identity. He explained they had considered homelessness and inequity in the community, and had chosen to focus on the cycle of poverty in the area. He noted YAC recognized teen pregnancy as an issue that had a great impact on continuing the cycle of poverty for young people. He explained the cycle of poverty was the set of factors or events by which poverty, once started, was likely to continue unless there was outside intervention. He stated they had learned the Columbia Public Schools had a program in place, CRIBS, which helped young parents graduate from high school, and had decided to raise awareness and funds for the program. YAC members were able to spread the word about CRIBS and had collected funds to supply the program with hundreds of emergency go-packs. He noted the YAC was recommending the City Council increase outreach and support of CRIBS and other similar programs through the City's social equity strategic plan.

Dzung Nguyen stated the second endeavor by YAC involved raising awareness of human trafficking as they had learned the I-70 corridor was one the highest human trafficking locations in the world and studies had shown that poverty was one of the leading causes of human trafficking. She understood the Central Missouri Stop Human Trafficking Coalition and Christian Chapel Church supported an event called the Freedom Walk each year, and the YAC decided to help by launching awareness and fundraising campaigns at schools. The action plan included a facts and figures awareness campaign and YAC members had distributed marketing materials, recruited participants for the Freedom Walk, and raised funds for local agencies. The Freedom Walk had over 300 participants and was a huge success.

Sloane Scott explained she was the Chair of YAC and noted both YAC community action efforts this year had focused on issues related to the cycle of poverty. She felt both topics needed additional attention in order for the youth in the community to lead productive, successful lives. The YAC recommended the City continue to develop partnerships with key agencies to ensure a safety net was in place. Partners, such as the Columbia Public Schools, Boone County, the Health Department, the Youth Community Coalition, and the Youth Empowerment Zone, could continue to disrupt the cycle of poverty. She commented that the social equity strategic plan should focus on building positive relationships to help young people escape the cycle of poverty. The YAC urged the City Council to consider allocating incentive-based budget surpluses toward these programs.

Mayor Treece thanked the speakers for their service on the YAC.

SPC21-16 Scott Denson - Pillar 6 of the President's Task Force on Policing in the 21st Century and the CPD's response.

Mr. Denson explained he was a member of Race Matters, Friends, and was commenting on Pillar 6, which involved officer wellness and safety, and the Columbia Police Department (CPD) report. The Task Force had made eight recommendations with corresponding action items. With regard to recommendations 6.1, 6.3, 6.4, 6.5, 6.6, and 6.8, the CPD reported a willingness to cooperate and help with data collection and research where indicated. The CPD had also reported it was requesting funding for safety equipment and training where needed. He stated he would focus on Task Force recommendation 6.2, which indicated safety and wellness issues affected law enforcement at every level of status, duty, or tenure and that line officers were more likely to adopt procedures and change practices if they were advised to do so by managers that modeled the behavior encouraged. The recommendation went on to say, the policies, program, and practices could and should be implemented at the local level. The CPD reported fitness was evaluated every two years and mental health was not assessed. The CPD also reported the City had expansive programs related to employee wellness and safety, to include access to the employee assistance program, training specific to depression and stress management, access to blood pressure and glucose screening, tobacco cessation, weight management, reduced fees for ARC membership, and blood pathogen training. In reviewing gaps and areas of improvement, the CPD indicated the City had focused on preventive health effectively, but maintenance, the frequency of evaluation, and policies addressing post-event concerns, such as death benefits and disability compensation needed to be examined further. He noted it failed to mention mental health. He commented that simply providing access to mental and physical health services was not effective enough. They wanted mentally, physically, and emotionally healthy individuals comprising a healthy Police Department. They did not want officers to contribute to the community as only law enforcement officers, but rather as peace officers. He believed they needed a community of police officers if they wanted the Columbia community to be more than a collection of utilities and other city services by providing the services instead of just access to services. He thought this could be done by providing space and on-the-clock time for the authentic sharing of real concerns, and by supervisors and managers modeling that behavior.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B113-16 Calling a special election on the question whether to increase the gross receipts license tax on hotels and motels.

Discussion shown with R59-16.

R59-16 Expressing the City Council's intent to the citizens of Columbia to rollback any voter approved gross receipts license tax imposed on hotels and motels in excess of four percent (4%) prior to the expiration of twenty-three (23) years.

The bill (B113-16) was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser explained some constituents were concerned the decreased enrollment at the University of Missouri would impact ridership, and asked if there was data as to who used the airport. Mr. Matthes replied he thought a reduction in the use by the University would be made up by the other 80 percent of the market since it was such a small slice

of the market. He did not believe there would be a sizable impact on the demand for air service and noted air service had grown quite a bit over the last five years.

Mr. Skala asked if the other 80 percent was partly Jefferson City. Mr. Matthes replied yes. Mr. Skala asked if Jefferson City was being lobbied in terms of convincing the FAA that funding for the airport was beneficial. Mr. Matthes replied there had been conversations, and pointed out Jefferson City had been a major partner in the revenue guarantee. He believed there would be support to do something for the terminal, and thought everyone was waiting to see what Columbia did first.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification with regard to the plans involving the FAA and the steps for the new terminal. Mr. Matthes replied there was a federal process that would need to be followed, which included a planning process. The work done by Parsons Brinkerhoff provided a rendering, floor plan, and study of what would be needed in the future. They would try to size the building for what was not only needed now, but what would be needed in future, and would build it modularly so it could be expanded easily in the future. They would communicate the preferred alternative to the FAA, but the FAA would not provide any funding until the City established some funding. Parsons Brinkerhoff had estimated a cost of up to \$38 million to produce a new terminal and the FAA had a program for cities the size of Columbia whereby they would fund half of the terminal up to a maximum of \$20 million. He noted the Council had expressed a desire to try to reduce costs where possible while still meeting the City's needs. He reiterated he thought everyone was waiting for the City to move forward in terms of the process.

Ms. Peters understood the City was projecting \$10 million would be collected from this tax so they would still be \$8 million short, and asked how it would be obtained. Mr. Matthes replied they believed there was great benefit to the State of Missouri as well as regional partners, so they would be asked to help fill the gap. In addition, there was an option to charge for parking to fill the gap.

Mr. Ruffin asked when ground would be broken for the project if this issue were to be placed on the ballot and was passed by the citizens. Mr. Matthes replied it was subject to the federal process, but noted he was confident it would be within five years. The federal government liked to fund projects in amounts of \$5-\$8 million, so the project would be phased. Three years was the most optimistic timeframe, but he believed it would be closer to five years.

Mr. Skala asked how the City would deal with the increased operating costs of an improved facility. Mr. Matthes replied he did not believe the operating costs would be much more than they were today. He explained the airline was a tenant of the airport and they bore the business expense of the day-to-day business. The City only owned the building so their major costs would include snow removal from the runway, cleaning the airport, operating the snack bar, paying the utilities, etc. They would provide other services when possible. He commented that operating an airport tended to cost far less than operating an airline. He noted there would be an incremental increase, but dedicated funding had already been established via a portion of the transportation sales tax.

Ms. Nausser understood the current building would remain once the new airport terminal was completed, and asked if it could be sold or leased to another organization to offset some of the costs and whether the expansion would allow the capacity to increase general aviation services which would provide income. Mr. Matthes replied yes. He explained they would not have a public use for the building after they were moved into the new terminal so it could be sold or leased, and he thought there would be intense interest from a general aviation perspective. He noted he believed the general aviation function would benefit from this project as well.

Ms. Nausser understood the land surrounding the airport had been purchased by a developer and asked if anything at the airport would be compatible with the anticipated growth there. Mr. Matthes stated there was an economic benefit to the airport as it tended to entice companies that needed to be close to an airport. He commented that a

terminal closer to Route H would be beneficial as well.

Mayor Treece explained the Council had asked staff to review the proposed terminal budget during the pre-council meeting that had been held on the subject. In addition, a staff person for Senator McCaskill had been in attendance, and he had conveyed a sense of urgency to try to secure support from the FAA with the help of the consultant during this Administration. He noted he had conversed twice with the Jefferson City Mayor with respect to their support, and thought the action of Council tonight along with the approval of voters in August would likely be the show of good faith needed. He suggested they pay down the debt if the construction costs came in under budget or if the tax generated additional revenues in order to minimize reliance on that additional gross receipts tax.

Mayor Treece asked the City Clerk to read R59-16 so they could consolidate the public input on it along with B113-16.

The resolution (R59-16) was read by the Clerk.

Steve Bales stated he was a member of the Columbia Hospitality Association (CHA) and was representing the CHA and his hotel property, Wingate. He displayed a video, which indicated the CHA represented a majority of the 36 hotel venues in the City of Columbia. Four years ago, the CHA had gone on record as not opposed to raising the lodging tax by one percentage point, but opposition had formed when officials were unable to present a legitimate plan to properly utilize the increase. They did not feel there should be a tax prior to a plan and did not believe a final cost could be projected until the outstanding application to the FAA was filed. In addition, they felt the other sources of funding needed to be finalized. They understood \$8 million of net parking money had been publically represented as a source, but many officials had rejected parking as a revenue stream. They stated no bona fide lender would finance a multi-million project without a qualified business plan and insisted on responsible planning and accountability on the use of funds their members and guests would provide. They believed Columbia's airport was an exit airport as the vast majority of people using the airport were leaving the area to travel elsewhere. The consultants had proposed a \$38 million terminal upgrade, which did not include airline incentives or the exponential increase in operating costs. The City only had an agreement with one carrier airline, which could be canceled with a simple 90-day notification, and the major entities that drove travel to Columbia would bear the additional expenditures for the lodging tax. They understood the lodging tax was deemed a temporary tax, but without a sunset clause, it could remain in effect for at least a generation. They believed there were other needs, such as an indoor sports facility, a conference and convention center, and the modernization of the Boone County Fairgrounds, and wondered what type of negotiating power the City would have with airlines with an initially empty \$40 million terminal expansion. They did not feel they knew the City's intentions for the use of the new lodging tax revenue as the ordinance language was too vague, and suggested other revenue sources be considered, such as a restaurant table tax, a fractional increase on the citywide sales tax, increased passenger fees, and public-private general aviation infrastructure partnerships. They believed the City needed to prepare a coherent business plan.

Matt McCormick, 300 S. Providence Road, stated he was the President of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce and noted they were in support of the expansion of the airport and the special election to increase the gross receipts license tax on hotels and motels to help fund the expansion of the airport. For many years, this had been the top priority of the Chamber of Commerce, and many of their members had helped fund the revenue guarantee. They continued to support the airport and its expansion. He thought they needed to build on the upward trajectory of the airport and its successes to fix those items that were broken and not in compliance. He believed they also needed to plan for future growth, and an improved airport would help with future economic development and the ability to provide air service to attract more conventions and businesses. The Chamber Government Affairs Committee had endorsed this proposal and the Chamber Board of Directors had unanimously supported the expansion of the airport and this

special election. He asked the Council to put this issue on the ballot.

Randa Rawlins explained she was representing Shelter Mutual Insurance Company and its various subsidiary companies whose headquarters was located in Columbia. She stated she was present to offer the support of Shelter to the ballot measure for the increase of the gross receipts tax. Shelter, through its employees, was a frequent user of the airport and encouraged the City and its citizens to do whatever was necessary to upgrade the terminal and airport services. They had 1,000 employees on their Columbia campus and another 2,000 agents and employees throughout the operating territory that traveled to headquarters from time to time. They believed improvement of the airport was crucial to the continued economic well-being of Columbia. She noted Shelter also used a substantial number of hotel rooms during the year for its corporate activities and felt the additional expense they would incur would be a good investment in the community. They believed any minimal impact to Shelter would be outweighed by improved airport services. She reiterated they supported this effort and asked the Council to vote to submit this tax issue to the vote of the citizens.

Karen Miller stated she was a Boone County Commissioner and represented the Commission as an ex-officio member of the Missouri Innovation Center and a member of the REDI Board of Directors, and noted future plans for the airport was a question of many businesses they had tried to attract. She thought it was extremely important for the community to support this and pointed out the discussion could continue after it was placed on the ballot. She did not feel everything needed to occur tonight. She thought they should vote to place it on the ballot to allow citizens to have conversations and ask for clarifications. She commented that she personally used the airport for every flight she took if at all possible, and thanked the staff at the airport as they did a phenomenal job in a very small space. She encouraged the Council to place it on the ballot for the citizens to make the decision.

Andrew Beverly explained he worked for Columbia Bank Shares, but was present tonight as a representative and longtime Board Member of Veterans United Home Loans. He commented that the airport had a huge impact on the ability of Veterans United to recruit. He noted Veterans United hired hundreds of graduates of the University of Missouri each year, but they also recruited specialists outside of the area. Like many, he flew out of the airport frequently, and would overlook the tired image it projected. He explained they recently recruited a man from Boston, Massachusetts, who had flown in and out of Columbia, and wondered what he thought of the airport. He believed fixing the airport was long overdue and was important to the future of the community, and noted the airport terminal had a huge impact on the image of the community. He encouraged the Council to place this issue on the ballot so something could be done about it.

Greg Steinhoff, 5708 Sundance Drive, commented that in 2007 when he was the Director of Economic Development of the State of Missouri, the enplanements out of the airport were at 10,000 and they were on essential air service. He had watched his home town lose hundreds of jobs because the airport was not sufficient for an outside international company to invest in Columbia. The airport had a huge economic impact in terms of the recruitment of employees to Shelter and Veterans United, the recruitment of students to the University of Missouri, and when trying to bring scientists from around the world into Columbia for conventions. It was the image of this town to many from the outside. Fifty years from now, they had planned for the current facility and it was now time for another facility that could last another fifty years. He stated he believed the hotel tax was an appropriate way to fund the public portion of the terminal, and noted Kansas City was at a 7-8 percent lodging tax while Columbia was only at 4 percent.

Gary Thompson, 2102 Whitegate Drive, stated he served as the President and Chief Executive Officer of the Columbia Insurance Group and noted they were actively doing business in fourteen states with four other offices scattered throughout the country. They could drive to two of those offices, but could not drive to the offices in Austin, Texas or Atlanta, Georgia, so airport service was critical to their business. Prior to the air service

in Columbia, they had been forced to drive to Kansas City or St. Louis. He noted their vendors and partners were also able to utilize the airport in Columbia now. He reiterated the airport was very valuable to their organization and encouraged the continued support of Council in allowing this ballot measure to come before the citizens so airport service would be improved.

Justin Gay, 2301 I-70 NW, explained he was representing Emery Sapp and Sons and his family, and noted they were in favor of the terminal expansion. They believed it would have a positive economic impact in terms of future business in Columbia. An improved economic impact could create new tax revenues, which would in turn assist in strengthening police and fire services, improve existing infrastructure, and maintain and improve parks and trails. It would also help in creating new jobs, which in turn could keep local residents and graduates of area colleges in Columbia. He stated an improved airport would increase the possibility of new destinations for residents and new businesses in the community, and noted he was excited for the future potential.

Tec Chapman, 1401 Hathman Place, stated he was the Executive Director for Services for Independent Living and pointed out the current terminal had a lack of access and compliance with the American with Disabilities Act. Nationally, 11 percent of all domestic air travel involved people that used wheelchairs or had other movement disorders and people that were blind. This meant that about 120 people with those types of disabilities had departed from Columbia last year. He commented that according to a recent survey, \$17.3 billion annually went to the travel industry by people with disabilities, and their average stay was five days. This did not include the companion that many might have brought with them. This shows the disability travel market had a greater impact than ever on the industry and broader economy. In the past two years, more than 26 million adults with disabilities had traveled. He noted 30 percent that had traveled had indicated they would have traveled two or more times had the airline and airport been more accommodating. He understood 46 percent of travelers with disabilities used the internet to determine the level of accommodation and accessibility at airports, at hotels, and for ground transportation. The same survey found 72 percent of travelers with disabilities had faced physical obstacles or miscommunications with their airlines, but more importantly 65 percent experienced problems with the airport in terms of specific accessibility features. In 2014, the U.S. Department of Transportation had reported 47 percent of disability related complaints were due to inadequate assistance provided to passengers that used wheelchairs. He commented that he thought everyone should be able to expect the same quality of service and the same supportive assistance in every setting. For those that required special assistance, this was not a matter of convenience. It was a matter of critical necessity.

Mayor Treece understood the Columbia Regional Airport currently did not have an elevated concourse that went directly to the door of the airplane and asked if the wheelchair user had to be physically lifted up the steps. Mr. Chapman replied he understood there was a ramp, which was questionable in the winter. Mayor Treece asked if the passengers were utilizing their own chairs or the airline straight-back chairs. Mr. Chapman replied he thought they typically used their own chair and would then use the airline straight-back chair. He noted there was an option of a lift, but most of the people he knew were terrified of the lift. Mayor Treece asked if that was a scissor lift. Mr. Chapman replied yes.

Matt Jenne explained he was an owner of Addison's and Sophia's restaurants and had been a member of the Airport Advisory Board off and on for eight years. He noted he had joined the Board eight years ago because he felt the airport represented a significant bottleneck to the economic growth of Columbia. Great strides had been made in terms of increasing service, but the current bottleneck was the size of the airport as it was holding them back from increasing the number of flights and providing better service. He thought this tax represented a reasonable step to get the airport to where it needed to be, and that it should occur as soon as possible. Five years from now was a long time. He

stated he thought this should have been done five years ago. He suggested this be moved forward as quickly as possible as it would not get any better otherwise.

Brian Milner, 3107 Woodbine Drive, stated he was representing the University of Missouri in place of Gary Ward and in support of this issue. He noted the Research Reactor was the best in the country from a production standpoint. They were consistently making radioisotopes used for the treatment of cancer and other diseases, and he believed Columbia could be a destination similar to the Mayo Clinic or the Cleveland Clinic. He explained a number of the things they created had to get to patients or companies in a very short timeframe, and thought they could bring people to Columbia through a partnership with MU Healthcare and Boone Hospital instead of shipping them out.

Mr. Skala commented that he had an intense interest in the area of radioisotopes and understood plans were in process for expanding Discovery Ridge, accelerating particles, etc. He asked for clarification regarding some of those plans. Mr. Milner stated he was present tonight because the University felt it was a partner with a number of other agencies in the region to get things like this done for the region. They had a \$10 million plan to expand the Research Reactor by leveraging \$2 million received from the State of Missouri. He also understood a couple of companies were moving to Discovery Ridge to partner with the Reactor to create additional opportunities. It was not a hypothetical situation as it was already happening, and they wanted to see the expansion of the airport move forward.

Greg Cecil, 1700 Oak Cliff Place, explained he was on the Airport Advisory Board and had been Chair of the Board for the past few years. He commented that he hoped the issue would be placed on the ballot because he thought the expansion of the airport was very important to the community. He noted he had been a supporter of the airport for a long time, even when flights were only to St. Louis, but things were much better now. He pointed out the City was continuously talking to other airlines about coming to Columbia and it was not a simple process as it took time, influence, and money. He thought this would be a great start and noted nothing had been taken off of the table. They would still look at other funding opportunities, such as parking fees, rental cars fees, etc. He stated a person renting a car at the airport in Kansas City would pay \$4 per day for the Sprint Center. He thought they should put this on the ballot and let the citizens decide. He commented that they had not kept up with the airport, and some things, like the runway, could have been addressed years ago. He explained the things that had changed in Kansas City and St. Louis had provided an opportunity for Columbia. He believed this was an opportunity to build something that would bring in a lot of people from the area and would make them proud. He felt more and more people would use the airport as the community grew and it would enhance the opportunities for the University. He reiterated his hope that Council would place this issue on the ballot.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, stated he hoped the Council would place this issue on the ballot, and wondered what would be the average increase for a night's stay in a local hotel as a result of the tax. He did not feel one percent on an \$80-\$100 room rate would make much of a difference to someone that was willing to pay that amount for a room. He commented that the Springfield/Branson National Airport was advertising in the Columbia market, and thought they saw an opportunity in the Columbia community's failure to act.

Donald Warren, 4608 Pierre Street, explained he was one of those that had stayed in Columbia after going to school here. As a citizen, he asked the Council to have a plan in place prior to having friends and family that visited pay for a tax from which they might not benefit. He did not believe anyone was against having a good airport, expanding the airport, or even paying an extra one percent, and thought the concern was for a plan to be put in place. He suggested a public-private partnership with the University and to talk to Jefferson City. He reiterated he felt a plan should be in place prior to putting it on the ballot as some citizens might not understand the issues.

Mike Kelly explained he had served on the Convention and Visitors Advisory Board for the

last eight years, and was currently the General Manager and Director of Operations for Tiger Hotel. He thought it was important to note the hotel industry was not against the airport, but this would cause them to be capped at five percent and they wanted improvements at the Fairgrounds, a convention center, etc. that would bring in people to stay at the hotels. He commented that 90 percent of the use of the airport was for Columbia citizens, and as a result, he believed a usage tax, such as a sales or restaurant tax, would be more appropriate. He stated they were against the use of the hotel tax as they were capped at five percent. They would not have any more money to provide for improvements to the Fairgrounds or Discovery Park. He reiterated their support of the airport, but did not feel it should be funded with a hotel tax. He asked that they consider other funding sources, such as a restaurant table tax.

Ms. Nauser understood the community had provided a TIF for the Tiger Hotel, which involved \$1.8 million over the next ten years. Mr. Kelly stated he was not certain of the details as he had only been with the hotel for three months. Ms. Nauser commented that the Tiger Hotel relied upon a TIF with the idea that the community would continue to grow and noted she was confused as to why they were against this one percent tax, which would likely equal about \$1 per a night's stay. Mr. Kelly stated they were not against a one percent tax. They were only against charging it for hotel stays because it would be dedicated to the airport for the next 23 years. He felt the TIF had been established to enhance the downtown, which he believed it had done. Prior to the TIF, the Tiger Hotel was essentially non-existent and the other downtown hotel needed to be renovated. Those projects had brought in more sales revenue than hotel tax. Ms. Nauser clarified she was not saying they were bad investments. She only questioned the opposition to utilizing the hotel tax for the airport. Mr. Kelly stated his concern was that they would be locked at the five percent.

Alyce Turner commented that she looked forward to having the opportunity to vote on this issue. She stated she had recently visited Duke University, and they had a lovely airport. The artwork was very impressive. She noted she could not wait to see the artwork that would be placed in the new terminal. She understood the hotel tax in Jefferson City was seven percent, and felt this one percent increase to five percent was a moderate ask.

Teri Weise, 3007 S. Rodeo Drive, stated she was the Director of Sales at the Holiday Inn Executive Center and understood the gross receipts tax had been increased in 1999 from two percent to four percent by a ballot initiative. At that time, one percent or half of the two percent had been dedicated to promoting tourism and developing an attraction or attractions that would create more business. It was seed money to invest in things that would bring hotel business to the area. Money had been spent through the Convention and Visitors Advisory Board for various items, to include the YouZeum, which was a failed project that had cost \$250,000, and Johnson Farms, another project that did not work out. She commented that these projects had local interest, but did not attract visitors from outside of Columbia. She noted they had also invested money in the Missouri Theatre and it had not made it either, although the University of Missouri now benefited from it. In 2012, the Council rewrote the ordinance to enable the funds of the hotel tax to be used for economic development. The terminology of the ordinance had been modified by including words that had changed the scope of the 1999 ordinance. She agreed the airport could be deemed economic development, but that had never been the intention of the voters that had passed the tax in 1999. She believed the Council had circumvented the will of the voters by changing the wording to meet their needs. She commented that it was easy to support something one did not have to pay and did not impact one's business directly. She agreed a new airport would be wonderful, but it would still need airlines and be reasonable in price. She did not feel it was reasonable for most people to fly out of Columbia, which was why many still traveled to Kansas City and St. Louis. She asked how they knew they would have airlines with affordable airfares after it was built. She also asked why a broader tax, such as a sales tax, was not pursued. She asked if this tax was chosen because it was the easiest tax to pass at an August election when

no one would vote. She wondered why other mechanisms had not been pursued. She commented that they did not want to be the bad guys in this situation, but they wanted someone to view it through their eyes in terms of the intent of the money. She believed the money was intended for tourism and attractions. She noted Disney World was an attraction, but the airport was not an attraction. She asked the Council not place this on the August ballot and to work with them to develop something they could all support.

Mayor Treece asked if the Holiday Inn Executive Center would actively support a one-eighth cent sales tax increase. Ms. Weise replied yes as it was a lot less for their customers and themselves than the one percent gross receipts tax.

Ms. Nauser asked Ms. Weise if she would support it as a dedicated tax for the airport versus police and fire, which sales tax funds tended to go toward. Ms. Weise replied yes if it got them the airport.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he did not believe there was an adequate nexus between the people coming to stay in hotels and this tax, and until there was a true nexus he did not think this should be approved. He did not feel it bred trust. He suggested this be tabled to allow time for discussion. He believed the City's share of the cost of the terminal should be funded by a variety sources. He thought a small dedicated sales tax might be appropriate along with a hotel tax. He noted the City had not issued general obligation bonds, and felt large capital projects could be funded with bonds and a modest property tax increase could then be used to pay off the bonds. He believed a mix across the various stakeholders made the most sense. He commented that he agreed with the comments of Ms. Weise and suggested the Council follow her recommendations.

Mr. Trapp stated he believed economic development filled hotel rooms, and provided construction workers and developers as examples. He commented that new economic development in the airport had been identified by every knowledgeable stakeholder as a lynchpin to the community's economic development strategy, and those would fill up hotel rooms. The previous tax might have been geared toward conventions and visitors, but the ordinance language clearly stated it included tourism and economic development. He pointed out the Council was not approving the tax by placing it on the ballot. They were offering it to the August electorate. He believed a lot of people voted in August even though it was not as many he thought should vote, and noted not many people voted in April. He explained they had to consider other taxing jurisdictions and what they might bring forward to not overly crowd the ballot. The airport was desperately in need of revitalization. He commented that he had recently traveled to Domenica, which had half of the population of Columbia and an average income of \$300, and they had a nicer airport. He understood airline personnel would sometimes gasp with regard to the ramp and it was a travesty to people with disabilities. He felt this was long overdue. They had gotten great use out of this airport and the doublewide trailers purchased from the Columbia Public Schools. He pointed out sales tax was already paying for a good portion of the airport, and this was an obvious source if they wanted to have a diverse funding portfolio for the airport. He understood the one percent had come from the hoteliers when they were considering a larger amount, and the reason there was a five percent cap when other communities had seven percent was because of lobbying activities by the hoteliers to the Missouri Legislature. It would not be capped at five percent if the hoteliers would lift their lobbying pressures, and they could then look at other things that could mutually benefit and grow tourism in Columbia. He pointed out the hotels rooms were filled when the University held its events, and agreed they had to take active and engaged efforts to ensure the hotels were filled throughout the rest of the year. He commented that final plans could not be completed until they had money to spend to invest in the project to generate the plans and cost estimates. He thought this was a good first step. He noted they had determined flights were needed first, and they had those flights. It was now time to improve the terminal.

Mr. Thomas asked if about 20-25 percent of the transportation sales tax currently paid for

the operations at the airport. Mr. Matthes replied \$6 million went to streets, \$4 million went to transit, and \$2 million went to the airport. Mr. Thomas understood that was about 17 percent.

Mr. Thomas asked if the operating cost of a terminal twice the size would scale proportionate to the size. Mr. Matthes replied no. He explained it would be an incremental cost. He stated they were already serving double the amount the building should accommodate. Mr. Thomas understood he was talking about the number of people as opposed to the square footage. Mr. Matthes stated the square footage was half of what it should be for the number of seats served through the airport. If it were proportional to the number of flyers, it would be a third of an increase, but it was not proportional to the number of flyers. The role of the airport was to clean the airport, make sure the lights were on, remove the snow from the runways, etc. Mr. Thomas understood the plan was to continue to fund operations of the airport when the new terminal was built at approximately a similar percentage of the same transportation sales tax. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. He explained staff did not feel it would be much of an increase to operate a new terminal and that it would continue to be funded by that sales tax.

Mr. Thomas asked if any surplus from the one percent increase in the gross receipts tax on hotels and motels could be eligible to be used for operations until the end of the 23 years if they did not pass R59-16. Mr. Matthes replied he did not believe so. Mayor Treece and Mr. Skala agreed. Mr. Thomas understood it had to be for capital costs. Mr. Matthes stated it had to be for airport terminal improvements as that was how it was worded. He did not believe it could be used for salaries or something similar.

Ms. Nauser commented that she thought the need to increase airport capacity for economic development and growth had been a part of her platform when she ran and was elected in 2005. She explained she had utilized this airport since moving to Columbia and recalled flying to Kansas City in a propeller plane whereby they had to change seats to distribute weight when there were only 9,000 enplanements at the airport. She stated she had flown to many airports and believed the ease and convenience of the Columbia Regional Airport was great. She noted she had never had a bad experience there, but they needed to go to the next level. She explained they were working on a plan to submit to the FAA in order to obtain the 80 percent federal grant to expand the airport, and pointed out nothing had been taken off of the table. She believed this was the first of many conversations. She understood many people had asked why this was a dedicated tax and not a general tax, and noted she preferred a dedicated tax. She noted she had seen the federal and state governments divert money from general taxes even though it was supposed to be used for a specific purpose. She stated this would be a 23-year dedicated tax, and the number of years could be decreased if the airport improvements could be paid off sooner. She commented that many people had spoken tonight indicating the need for an airport in order to expand a business or get employees and tourists to Columbia. Since the University of Missouri had joined the SEC, they were at full capacity every football weekend. They were also at full capacity at graduation, and people traveled from across the country to this community. Traveling through the current airport would be fine today, but it was precarious in the winter to get off the plane when there was snow. Travelers then had to walk through the cold to a doublewide trailer. She thought an upgrade to the airport was long overdue and believed it had community support. She pointed out she would prefer to utilize sales tax for police and fire services as they were almost tapped out on what they could request in terms of sales tax. She suggested they be wise on how they apply sales tax as it was causing them to outprice themselves in the region. She stated she would support placing this item on the ballot for the community to decide.

Mr. Skala commented that this had been a very robust and valuable discussion. He noted they had the ability to accommodate a new and enlarged capacity for general aviation, which he thought had tremendous potential for the community. This capacity would also include security, which was something they did not have currently. He stated

he was also interested in the potential for the University of Missouri's Research Reactor in terms of the radioisotopes that had to get to places in a timely manner. Time wasted in a truck meant part of the value of the radioisotope, which was a lifesaving product, was also wasted. It had tremendous potential in terms of economic development beyond travel for sports teams and passenger travel. There was a potential for a real production facility and an enhancement of the University's mission to teach students about these radioisotopes and the development of new ones. He noted there was also an issue in terms of ADA accessibility at the current facility. He pointed out they had not committed to \$38 million, and were only voting to determine whether to place this issue on the ballot for the citizens decide. He believed this was necessary and beneficial and would vote in that manner. He pointed this issue had been discussed at two work sessions, and a consultant had been hired to help develop a plan. He noted some of this was negotiable, and they had to find out who was on board to assist. In addition, they had to demonstrate to the FAA they were serious about the project, and the only way to do that was to have something in hand to show how the community was willing to help. He reiterated his support for placing this on the ballot.

Mayor Treece stated he had shared Mr. Clark's concern regarding the lack of a nexus between an airport terminal and a gross receipts tax, but after reviewing the issue and reading a couple of competing legal opinions, he thought it likely exceeded the nexus. He believed this was a catalytic project that would transform Columbia's economy well into the future and really meet the peak and projected demand they wanted. He commented that the ADA requirements alone were compelling to him to make the change. He thought it was an obligation for them to make the airport accessible for consumers with disabilities and wheelchair users that needed to utilize that airport to travel. He explained he was supportive of the local, regional, and federal pot of support to spread the obligation to ensure it was serving the entire community and region.

B113-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mayor Treece stated he thought of R59-16 as conservative viewpoint that prioritized their debt, and noted they would pay down the debt in order to roll back the one percent if any additional money was received, if the project came in under budget, etc.

The vote on R59-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

B114-16

Calling a special election on the question whether to continue the collection of local sales tax on out-of-state sales of motor vehicles, trailers, boats and outboard motors.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if this was a step toward capturing sales tax on internet sales. Mr. Matthes replied not really. He explained this tax was already collected when a vehicle was licensed. Mr. Thomas understood this would close a loophole that had been created. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct and noted the estimate from the Missouri Department of Revenue was that it was about \$500,000 per year to the City of Columbia, which was an important amount of revenue.

Mr. Thomas asked what he was confusing this with as he recalled three pieces of legislation. Mr. Matthes replied the use tax. Mr. Thomas understood this was not the use tax. Mr. Matthes stated it was not that use tax. Mr. Thomas understood it was a use tax, but a different use tax.

Ms. Nauser commented that people were purchasing cars, trucks, boats, etc. through the internet all over the country, and this would continue to increase along with the impact to the amount of money the City received. She commented that these were source of funding that helped pay for police and fire. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct.

B114-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B115-16 Approving the Final Minor Plat of Compass Church Subdivision located on the northeast corner of Silvey Street and Worley Street; authorizing a performance contract; granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations relating to sidewalk construction subject to a condition (Case No. 16-85).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood staff had initially denied the request based on all four factors considered as part of the review, and asked for clarification. Mr. Teddy replied the policy resolution that applied to subdivision plats along streets that were unimproved listed the four factors. One factor was the cost of constructing the sidewalk relative to the cost of the proposed development, and the applicant had submitted an estimate of \$81,500 to build the entire sidewalk. Staff did not have a cost estimate of the future project to weigh this cost against, which was why they did not find the factor to be supported. The second factor was whether the terrain was such that sidewalks or walkways were physically feasible, and the church had indicated it would be difficult but still feasible as it was not impossible to build a level five-foot concrete sidewalk there. The third factor involved whether the sidewalk would be located in a developed area on a low traffic volume street without sidewalks. He explained staff had considered consistency with the surrounding environment. The Smithton Villas, the Smithton single-family subdivision, Park de Ville, and Worley Street were all built with sidewalks, so they were generally not absent from the area. Mr. Thomas understood that factor had been listed in case it was a rural community that had lived without sidewalks for a long time, which he did not believe was the case here. Mr. Teddy explained the applicant felt Silvey Street did not carry much traffic as there was a fairly precipitous drop as one headed north. He noted the subdivision shown nearby was a PUD that had been approved but was not built.

Mr. Thomas asked how long ago that subdivision had been platted. Mr. Teddy replied he thought it might have been platted in 2006 or 2007. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Teddy if he expected it would be built. Mr. Teddy replied he thought it would be built at some point, but could not say when.

Mr. Thomas asked if the 490 feet was from Worley Street to the northwest corner of the property. Mr. Teddy replied no, and illustrated the area on the overhead. Mr. Thomas understood there was a path in the park and the church had offered to build the short diagonal connector and a crosswalk across Silvey Street at that point by the driveway. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct, and explained it had not been a proposal prior to the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. It had come up at the meeting, which was why it had been recommended subject to the City traffic experts reviewing it. He agreed with them in that they were perhaps overdesigning by putting in a crosswalk at this time. They had full crossings at Worley Street and Smithton, and this walk really did not connect to the homes along there. Mr. Thomas noted it would go further if the PUD was developed. Mr. Teddy thought it could then be reevaluated, but at this time, it was a bit premature. There was also a concern of it being too close to a driveway and potentially other issues, such as sight lines. Mr. Thomas understood the traffic engineers did not feel the crosswalk was appropriate so it had not been included. Mr. Teddy stated it was not in the proposed ordinance. Mr. Thomas asked about the diagonal connector. Mr.

Teddy replied that was in the proposed ordinance.

Jerry Campbell, 4920 Boothe Lane, Rocheport, stated he was a representative of Compass Church and asked those in attendance who were in favor of the variance to stand. Approximately 50 people stood. He asked the Council to approve the variance and plat this evening. He explained this issue had delayed the church project and had caused distress. This was a request to create connectivity between the current sidewalk structure, their property, and the trail around the church property that was being used as a park through an agreement and their relationship with the City of Columbia. He commented that they wanted to maintain the relationship as people did not realize it was church property and it could become an issue if something changed. He explained the sidewalk variance had begun with a much longer sidewalk, and was reduced to 400 feet due to the acceptance of the walkway around the park property. He reiterated that they were asking for the variance and plat to be approved.

Judy Johnson, 1516 Key Street, explained she had been with Compass Church since 1980 and pointed out there was a steep hill nearby, which they called prayer hill as people prayed their way up and down it. She thought there would be quite a grade difference when the street was improved in the future, which would affect this sidewalk if they were required to put it in at this time. She believed it might require it to be torn out and reconstructed.

Mayor Treece asked if this variance would create a precedent for future similar projects. Mr. Teddy replied he thought they reviewed all variances on a case by case basis as there were unique facts. Mayor Treece understood the final plat would combine the open space with the church so it was not an actionable plat in the future. Mr. Teddy replied it would make a single lot of this site, and strategically for the church, it would enable a water service line to run to the water main on Worley Street.

Mr. Ruffin stated this was in the First Ward and immediately behind his home so he had walked the area many times and had visited the church several times. He noted he had also been given a tour of the building plans, which were amazing. He commented that the partnership with the City was unusual and something that should be continued and be recognized as important to the neighborhood. He encouraged Council to support the variance.

B115-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B123-16 **Establishing an Administrative Delay on the Processing of Applications for a Building Permit for Multi-Family Housing in Specified Areas.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece noted he had asked for this item and explained there were amendments for a couple technical items. He commented that he had attended the REDI Board Meeting when the University of Missouri had announced they expected 2,630 fewer students this fall, and of that amount, 1,500 were undergraduates, which meant about 1,100 were not coming back for the graduate student program. As a result, the University was closing dorms and mothballing other dorms. He thought the Council needed to be very concerned that they were not inadvertently contributing the luxury student housing bubble. The reality was that no one made money when facilities were only 80 percent occupied. To the extent the City was using these room calculations for infrastructure projections, those projections would be off if tenants were not paying monthly rents, which meant they would either have to raise utility rates for everyone or extend the amortization on the debt they had.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B123-16 per the amendment provided to Council tonight.

Mr. Skala understood it was a clarification of some of the text and incorporated demolition.

Ms. Thompson clarified the motion was for the amendments provided to them this evening. She explained an amendment sheet had been provided in the council packet, and there were two small wording changes to that version that were included in the amendments provided to council tonight. Those included a change to Section 3 so it stated Hitt Street instead of College Avenue and a change to Section 5 so demolition permits were included on the exemption for any permit on file as of May 16. Those were the differences between the proposed amendments included in the packet and the proposed amendments that had been provided to Council tonight. The overall changes were reflected in the diagram on the screen and the shaded area was the one mile area that surrounded the designation from Elm Street down Hitt Street to Stadium Boulevard on the south and back up Providence Road. The administrative delay in terms of processing applications for building permits for new multi-family units and the demolition of structures which were 50 years old would be within the shaded area. It would not be in the interior of what she would call the doughnut, and it would not be in the exterior either. The ordinance provided a stop gap for any project that met certain criteria, and those criteria were set forth in the ordinance to allow building permits for multi-family units to come forward. She pointed out a multi-family building permit would be for three or more dwelling units and the proposed amendment clarified it would include the construction of three or more units on a single lot for the purposes of the administrative delay, even if they were by single-family or duplex units. This meant someone could not build five duplexes on a single lot as it would be considered a new multi-family construction in terms of the administrative delay. She noted it also included the rehabilitation or remodeling of an existing structure if they were currently in a different use, but pointed out it provided for a stop gap in the event someone desired a building or demolition permit issued during the period of the administrative delay. The person would come to the Council with a request per the criteria set forth in the ordinance and the Council could decide whether it would be an appropriate project to move forward.

Mayor Treece asked if it was Ms. Thompson's opinion that the proposed ordinance was time limited, geographic specific, had an alternative remedy, and passed her legal test. Ms. Thompson replied yes.

Mr. Thomas understood Section 3 laid out the conditions under which Council would make a special exception to the denial of a building permit and asked if that applied to a demolition permit as well. Ms. Thompson replied those exceptions were set forth in Section 4.

Mr. Thomas understood Section 2 included the addition of multiple structures on a single lot and asked if that was covered under Section 3 as that section appeared to only refer to a multi-family structure and not multiple single-family dwellings on a single lot. Ms. Thompson replied it would be covered under Section 3 as well. She explained they defined for purposes of Section 2 a new multi-family structure or series of structures. Mr. Thomas understood a definition had been created there that applied in Section 3. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas understood this was designed to slow down or put a temporary stop specifically on luxury student housing, but it seemed to catch a lot more potential development than just luxury student housing if it prohibited developments as small as three dwelling units. He thought it was important to remember that they wanted to influence the balance of downtown residents and encourage more non-student housing developments. If this delay stymied projects that were designed for non-student housing, such as those with one-bedroom apartments or those for professionals or seniors, he did not feel they would do what they wanted with this. Mayor Treece stated those projects would not be affected by this ordinance if they were already in the pipeline. Mr. Thomas thought some might not be at the point of the pipeline referred to in this ordinance. Mayor Treece pointed out there was still a remedy to bring those projects forward. Mr. Thomas asked why they needed to start at such a low level of three dwelling units. Mayor Treece wondered where they would draw the line and noted he did not believe any

of them wanted to see the continued erosion of retail downtown. He explained he also wanted to ensure they were paving the path for a quick and thoughtful discussion of the uniform development code whereby they would hopefully fix most of the problems and encourage the types of development described by Mr. Thomas. He did not feel they could continue to allow the hasty submission of proposals that had contributed to increased demolitions and people's frustration with rampant overdevelopment at the cost of taxpayers and ratepayers in the neighborhoods.

Mr. Skala commented that in addition to placing a temporary hold on high-density student development while they considered the integrated development code, they were trying to prevent the cascading effect that had been taking place in adjacent neighborhoods, such as East Campus and Benton Stephens, for some period of time. There had been a concerted attempt to cobble together parcels to construct higher density developments in essentially R-1 neighborhoods even though some of the zoning was within the R-3 district. He noted the Benton Stephens neighborhood was coming together to reevaluate the urban conservation overlay in terms of what else they wanted to see in their neighborhood. He believed this language was important as it addressed issues in the adjacent neighborhoods as well.

Ms. Thompson explained the reason multi-family housing was stated was because technically any type of administrative delay had to apply specifically to an administrative task that staff performed, and staff issued permits for multi-family, single-family, and duplex houses. They had to define it in terms of the types of permits staff issued. She commented that there was an issue with the type of housing whether it was single-purpose built or intended for professionals, families, etc. The Council would have the opportunity to sort through those issues on a political level when someone brought a project forward. From a technical drafting standpoint, it had to be defined as an administrative task the staff performed.

Ms. Nauser stated the map was difficult to read and asked if the Benton Stephens neighborhood was included in the doughnut. Ms. Thompson showed the location of the Benton Stephens neighborhood using the overhead.

Ms. Nauser commented that she struggled with the purpose of this ordinance other than to stop development in the downtown, and asked how they could determine who a landlord would rent to as a luxury 1, 2, or 3 bedroom apartment not meant for students could still have students residing in them. She stated she did not think the apartments near Buchroeders Jewelry were being promoted to students and believed they were being promoted to high-income professionals, and asked how the City could stop someone from renting to a student that could afford the apartment.

Ms. Peters understood there was a square in the middle whereby anyone could develop whatever they wanted and there was then a one mile circle around it whereby development would be prevented. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. She explained the vast majority of what was included in the center was University of Missouri property and Greek Town on the west side. The Greek Town projects would be allowed to move forward without seeking special recognition. She noted sororities and fraternities were already a special category for construction since they had a common dining facility, but pointed out any other multi-family annexes in the area would be allowed to move forward. The light white colored area in the center was Greek Town. There was also a tiny area near the Heidelberg Restaurant.

Mr. Trapp asked about the small area in the upper right corner. Ms. Thompson replied that was the Heidelberg Restaurant area. Ms. Peters understood it was the University Avenue and Ninth Street area.

Ms. Nauser asked how many people in the community were actually college students. Mr. Matthes replied that was a difficult question to answer, but he thought the most recent estimate he had heard was 45,000. Ms. Nauser understood these 45,000 people needed a place to live. Mr. Matthes stated the 45,000 included people that were students in some way.

Mayor Treece commented that the market analysis he had seen from two years ago had showed the market had been overbuilt by 900 beds. Ms. Nauser asked if the market analysis had been provided by a developer. Mayor Treece replied no, and explained the information had come from the University of Missouri when they had stopped construction on their dormitory plans. He thought they were creating a scenario whereby they would have obsolete and distressed properties in a few years. He wondered what the rush was and stated he thought it was prudent to review this over the next six months. This would allow them to take their time and get it right as downtown would still be around in six months.

Mr. Thomas asked if they thought the unified code would be adopted within six months. Mayor Treece replied he understood the time table was to get it through the Planning and Zoning Commission to the City Council by September, and this would expire in December. He commented that he would be willing to revisit the issue at that point if necessary.

Ms. Nauser asked for the objective of this ordinance and wondered if it was to stop student housing because they were afraid of a bubble or if it was to force people to stop until new rules were in place which would allow the City to gain something they did not have today. Mr. Skala replied he viewed this as a temporary pause during which time they could solve any problems so a pause would not be necessary again in the future. He thought it would allow time for some consensus as to how they developed in the downtown, and that they could make significant progress on the integrated development code in the interim to solve some of the problems they had discussed. He noted he tended to agree with Mayor Treece in that there was not a rush, especially since there were options for exceptions.

Ms. Nauser wondered how this would prevent a luxury student housing bubble if people could build beginning December 2, 2016. Mr. Skala explained they did not know how the integrated development code would look until they deliberated and received recommendations from the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Jim Meyer, 104 Sea Eagle Drive, urged the Council to oppose the administrative delay for three general reasons. He believed many of the findings in the draft ordinance were little more than unsupported assertions, did not feel the Council was competent to manage the supply of rental property on the market in Columbia, and thought the ordinance was a gross violation of the property rights of downtown landowners. He felt it was ridiculous to assert that housing constructed for the student market would not be repurposed in the event demand in that market slackened. He believed property owners always sought the highest and best use of their property. If the student segment of the market declined, there would be another higher and best use for the property, and most likely a different residential use. He pointed out many millennials preferred urban living at higher rates than previous generations. He commented that he had encountered many people through his real estate business that were interested in living downtown, but did not have options. He understood all residential development would be subject to this moratorium and not just student housing. He noted there was also an assertion that the original intended purpose of C-2 was being usurped as C-2 included rental, office, and residential uses. The City could not expect to micromanage the ratios of these uses as that was handled through the market and was beyond the power of the Council. He believed contentions regarding utility infrastructure were also highly dubious as the City had not made infrastructure analyses in a transparent manner. He commented that he had attended a council meeting last year at which Ms. Nauser disputed the argument of infrastructure availability. Her contention, as he recalled, was that the only founded issue was electrical service and her comments had not been refuted. He stated he thought it was within the City's power to address the electric capacity issues, and believed it was also an obligation. He did not feel the Council could not control the rental market and noted price signals indicated demand was high relative to supply. The City had nothing at risk when it intervened unlike the market players that had investments at risk, and restricting

supply would only drive rents higher. It was not a policy outcome the City should welcome. He did not believe the City had made a strong case that this ordinance protected public health, public safety, public welfare, or property rights. He felt this ordinance inverted those priorities and urged the Council to oppose it.

Tony Grove, 2911 Lake Town Drive, stated he opposed the ordinance and explained he and his family owned Grove Construction, which had been involved in multiple projects in the downtown involving both residential and commercial developments. He commented that they did not target students or ask for college students to apply to live in their units. He explained the reason he was before the Council was because he felt a broad band was being placed on the downtown area. He thought they might want to address who and what they wanted to stop. He noted they were involved in multiple projects for themselves and clients, and none would have units with more than two bedrooms, but there would be more than two units per property. The largest property they had included twelve two-bedroom units and there was a need for those types of developments in the downtown area. He thought their developments in the downtown area had been beneficial, and they had less than 12 percent student occupancy in those developments. He stated they did not turn students away, but they built nice developments and did not want vomit in the hallway or beer in the elevators. He asked the Council to not turn down good developments. He pointed out they also had developments in the doughnut shaped area that had benefited neighborhoods.

Ms. Nauser asked Mr. Grove if they had projects in the works now. Mr. Grove replied they had spent thousands of dollars on projects that had not yet been submitted. They had a two-bedroom, two-unit project that was about three weeks away from when they could submit an application for a permit. It was in a pre-existing building on a second story.

Ms. Nauser understood this administrative delay would cost Mr. Grove and his partners time and money, and with code changes the development would have to be reviewed again by the engineers and architects to ensure they met the new codes. Mr. Grove stated that was correct.

Ms. Peters understood the development included two units and that would not be affected by the administrative delay. Mr. Grove stated that was correct, but it was only one project. He commented that they had done other projects in the past and provided an example of a six-unit development. He did not agree with delaying smaller density developments and thought it would affect the spirit of the downtown area. He was also concerned with harming people, like him, that were here prior to the increase in student housing and would remain afterward.

Mr. Skala commented that he did not agree with the comments of Ms. Nauser as she believed it would be an onerous burden to come to the Council to obtain an exception. That language was included so developers could come to the Council in an effort to not lose their investment. Mr. Grove pointed out that took time and money from the standpoint of the developer. Ms. Nauser noted there was not a guarantee it would pass either.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Grove if he was the contractor for the projects described or the developer at risk. Mr. Grove replied it depended upon the project. Mayor Treece asked about the twelve two-bedroom development. Mr. Grove replied that project had been completed, and had been a public-private partnership with the City. Mayor Treece asked for an example of something that was in the pipeline. Mr. Grove replied one would exempt from the ordinance, and he could not discuss some of the other developments. Mayor Treece asked if they would be renting by the bedroom or the unit. Mr. Grove replied they did not rent property by the bedroom for any of their developments. Mayor Treece stated they could bring that forward to the Council. Mr. Grove understood, and explained it created a burden to do so from a development and financial standpoint. Mayor Treece asked if any of those projects would be in the pipeline during the next six months. Mr. Grove replied yes.

Danielle Perez, 105 Hickman Avenue, explained she was a twenty-something year old non-student who had two jobs and had lived here for about six months. She noted she chosen Columbia because she loved the diversity, culture, and community here. It saddened, sickened, and concerned her that historic buildings were being torn down and that small businesses were being bullied for the sake of student and family housing when people like her could not benefit from those places due to the cost. She commented that she was worried about her jobs as they were in beautiful and historic buildings. She asked the Council to consider why some people chose Columbia as many might leave if the culture changed. She understood students were important to Columbia, but noted they would not be around as long as her.

Wayne Hawks, 3212 Westcreek Circle, stated he was terribly concerned about Columbia and noted he had shut down all of his developments to include apartments near Stoney Creek Inn. He was the developer, owner, and financier, and was proud of the developments he had built. He pointed out he did not sell his developments either. He explained he had many concerns. He did not believe they had enough electricity for the downtown and did not feel the sewer situation was adequate. The new developments were not meeting the stormwater requirements and the community was under a federal guideline in terms of the Hinkson Creek as it was an endangered stream. He suggested the City, the University, Boone County, etc. get together for a common agenda whereby they could all benefit. He reiterated he was a developer and had literally shut down his entire operation. He was now only going to build two single-family homes in Columbia. He commented that the University had major problems as there would be 5,000 fewer students and \$60 million less than in the past. He knew of two researchers at the University that were leaving and taking their research dollars with them. He reiterated his suggestion of everyone getting together to discuss how to move forward.

Ms. Peters asked Mr. Hawks why he shut down his plans for apartments near the Stoney Creek Inn. Mr. Hawks replied he shut it down due to the cost and because they had concerns. He explained he had some of the higher-end rental units in Columbia, and noted they would undercut everyone in town until all units were rented. He thought this was what the out of town investors with a lot of money would do as well. He commented that those in California felt people in Columbia were idiots for letting all of this out of town money develop properties cheaply. He thought they needed to be careful because otherwise everyone would have to pay higher taxes as there would not be enough money to pay the bills. The situation with the University was uncertain and the City was in complete violation with the Clean Water Act. He pointed out the problems could be solved, but he was finished developing in Columbia and would move on to other places.

Mayor Treece commented that his inclination was to let the private sector sort these issues out, but felt that only worked if the market was in equilibrium, and asked Mr. Hawks if he thought the market was in equilibrium or distorted due to the conditions described. Mr. Hawks replied he did not think the market knew where it was right now and noted there would be a shortfall due to the University as they would not have as high of an enrollment as hoped. He explained he was a cold-hearted businessman that looked at the bottom line.

Syed Ejaz stated he was with the Missouri Students Association, the undergraduate student government at Mizzou, and believed there were two discussions occurring in town. One was a more economic and price heavy discussion in terms of whether there was a bubble and the price points and the other was where the developments should be located, i.e. downtown or elsewhere, and how that impacted sewage, electricity, transportation, etc. These discussions did not have a place as they happened in the comments section of the newspaper and sometimes at council meetings. He agreed with the previous testimony in that they should have everyone together in one big room to discuss the issues, and this should include the developers, the consumers, the policymakers, those with institutional knowledge, etc. They could then decide if they were at an equilibrium price point, where the 45,000 students should live, etc. He stated

he was in favor of a six month moratorium on new developments because it allowed them to pause and get everyone in the same room. He thought they would miss an opportunity if they passed this ordinance, but did not get everyone in the same room.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, explained he was the President of the Board of Directors of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association. He noted Bob and Tony Grove did wonderful work, and appreciated the costs mentioned by Tony Grove, but pointed out those in his neighborhood also had costs and consequences due to the increased development in the downtown area and due to the way the City's sewer systems functioned. He stated he was sorry this was focused on student housing because he thought that was an incorrect approach and noted there were ways to define purpose-built housing. Four bedrooms with four toilets in one unit was purpose built in his mind. They had sewage in the basements when that many new toilets were incorporated into a system that had not been built for it so they had costs too. He thought it behooved them to take care of everyone in the community. He believed the developers could afford to come before the Council more easily than the residents of his neighborhood could fix the plumbing under their homes and down Flat Branch Creek. If the City figured out a way to do this effectively, they might have a more level playing field. He commented that when cities had approached rewriting their zoning and subdivision code to the extent it was being considered in Columbia, they often paused in order to figure out where development and redevelopment might go.

Alyce Turner, 1204 Fieldcrest, stated she was speaking as a resident that had lived in Columbia for 36 years, and noted the rate and type of growth she was witnessing in the downtown was not fun. She explained she was one of the few people she knew in her age group that came downtown on Saturday nights, and venturing on Broadway was not much fun any longer. In addition, not many people she knew would go downtown now. She commented that a number of small businesses in the entertainment field that did not deal exclusively with students had mentioned less people coming to their businesses. This was not the diverse downtown she had hoped to see when the downtown had started growing. She stated she very much supported a pause and believed it was supported by the community.

Clyde Bentley, 1863 Cliff Drive, commented that "piling on" was a phenomenon when an action took on a life of its own. It defied logic, real emotion, and civility. It just happened and took over. He believed they had this situation in terms of apartments, the legislature with the University, etc. He stated the solution to this was to pull away and take a pause. He felt this was a pause and a good pause. It had a safety valve so small developers could still come to Council for their projects to be considered. He did not believe any developer would go bankrupt in six months. It could change some things, but no one would go bankrupt. He thought it was a good time for a pause as they had spent a lot of money and time on a new zoning code, and needed time to review it. He reiterated it was time stop and take a break.

Scott Wilson, 901 E. Ash, stated he was the newly elected Chair of the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DCLC) and noted their support for the proposed temporary delay in issuing occupancy permits for high density student housing in the downtown. The DCLC was charged with studying downtown development and recommending development guidelines for downtown. In 2014, the Council asked the DCLC to look into the infrastructure problem downtown, and after holding town hall meetings and spending hundreds of hours with City staff, they had prepared a report to the Council in October of 2014. Unfortunately, a lot had changed in the downtown since then given the incredible amount of student housing that had taken over blocks and blocks of the downtown. The issue for the Council was that the taxpayers and neighborhoods were subsidizing student housing developments downtown by paying for the majority of the infrastructure and parking. He did not believe this was an antibusiness situation, and noted every business owner he had spoken to was worried about their business downtown in terms of adequate parking for customers, rent prices increasing, more student housing instead of retail or

office space rentals, etc. He thought most business owners would say at least 30 more retail shops or offices were needed in the downtown versus 300 more student housing beds. He commented that it was not surprising that developers were against the six month delay, but six months was a short delay when evaluating how downtown would look, function, and generate revenue for the City for the next 50 years and beyond. He pointed out any developer could come to the Council and ask for a waiver. He thought the pause was necessary and overdue, and he encouraged the Council to vote in favor of it.

Janet Hammen, 1844 Cliff Drive, explained she lived in East Campus and urged the Council to support this temporary delay. She noted her neighborhood was one of the most densely populated neighborhoods in the City. They had a historic district, which was unfortunately not a local district, and were suffering losses of their history every year. She pointed out it was not only the downtown that was suffering. The surrounding neighborhoods consisting of affordable housing or historically relevant housing were also affected. She thought this legislation was very forward-thinking. The Council had a downtown moratorium 6-8 years ago, and the downtown still grew. This was a temporary delay to evaluate the new zoning and subdivision codes in terms of what they would offer the City. She understood overlays were being considered in the neighborhoods surrounding the downtown, and asked the Council to vote in favor of this proposed ordinance. She did not feel it should be delayed any longer as they needed to preserve the quality of life in Columbia.

Pamela Jones, 1519 St. Michael Drive, commented that she had lived in Columbia for over 30 years as she had come to town for graduate school in art history, and noted she loved this community. She explained she loved its quiriness, its beauty, its history, etc. She understood businesses were important, but pointed out they were not everything, and some businesses might be suffering due to all of the building without any thought to how the community would look in the future. She believed there needed to be a sense of purpose. She stated she was in support of a freeze on demolition and the building of new apartments in the downtown and the near vicinity. She commented that she had only spoken to the Council once before and that was to try to save an historic house at Blue Ridge Road and Old 63, which ended up being fruitless. She recalled the Council asking the developer if there was anything of historic value in the house and the developer indicated there was not, even though there had been as the property was the homestead of an early founder of Columbia and the graveyard of the family was still on the site. There had been great significance to the property. She understood the developer had indicated he would put a shopping center there to provide groceries for those in northern Columbia as that was desperately needed. The house was demolished and the shopping center had never been produced. She commented that outside entrepreneurs and local property owners should not be able to profit exclusively at the expense of the majority of the citizens of Columbia and the quality of life here, and thought a code or zoning laws were needed that would allow for everyone to feel as though they were a part of the community. She did not believe anyone should be excluded because profit was the main motive, and felt they needed to stop lurching from one historic crisis to the next. She asked the Council to support this proposed ordinance, and to work on something so everyone felt they were a franchised member of the community during the delay.

Sara Ferrill, 501 W. Ash Street, stated she was a City employee that worked in the Community Development Department, and noted she was an expert in real estate, real estate development, and the degradation of real estate. She urged the Council to look at the area around Saint Louis University as the area was not inhabited and it was an incredible loss and eyesore as the developers had not repurposed those buildings. She commented that she could not show anyone where she lived when she attended Mizzou as it was in the East Campus neighborhood and had been torn down. There was a nice new building there and the rent was about five times the amount she had paid. She explained, as a mother, there were times she needed a time out because she was not

thinking rationally, and if she and her child sat down together to talk, they could come to a better decision, which would likely come from a point of compromise rather than reacting. She noted studies showed luxury student housing caused an artificial inflation of property values and rents, and there were a lot of properties that were uninhabited in the West Ash Street area and rents were increasing. As a single mom, she felt she was barely able to make it. She believed the student housing bubble was coming, and understood the student population at the University of Missouri was 35,000 and was only estimated to go down. She did not want to have to explain to her daughter why her favorite places were no longer around, why people were making out, or why there were drunk people around. She wanted her to live in a community of which she was proud.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he supported the proposal for the administrative delay. He was disappointed in the whereas statements in terms of why this was being done and the findings of fact. He noted they were subsidizing residential development with public money or the lack of public services to the tune of 80 or 95 percent of the cost of the public capital infrastructure needed. If the City continued this, they would subsidize the growth of this derivative economic development, which was likely to cause economic chaos. He asked the Council to add this provision to the ordinance as one of the whereas statements. He suggested the effective date be changed to May 2 or April 19 for a complete building permit application to be submitted, and not just a foundation and footings permit application, as those were the dates when the development community had been put on notice this was coming. He thought this would prevent people trying to rapidly submit applications and would incorporate the permit applications for the entire development. He stated he fully supported this and noted the Council had the power and right to do this. He did not believe it violated peoples' property rights as individual owners had the rights to occupy, develop and sell their properties. He commented that there were also public rights, such as air rights, and government rights, such as police powers, liens, taxation, zoning, etc. He suggested the delay be nine months instead of six months so they had a better chance of getting the uniform development code done. This delay would provide the time to have a broad based discussion.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, stated he agreed with Mr. Clark and thought the delay should be for one year. He commented that the CID on the Business Loop had affected purchases there whereby any dollar purchase had increased by two cents. He noted taxes for schools had increased as well, and suggested residents purchase used vehicles so they could pay less in personal property taxes. He stated he thought the speaker who was a builder that stopped building had a powerful statement in that he had the money but knew when not to build. He commented that they needed affordable housing and the student speaker was a great example of why it was needed. He thought they wanted people to stay in Columbia without working themselves to death to pay rent. He asked if the parking garages could be built taller to address parking issues.

The motion made by Mr. Skala to amend B123-16 per the amendment provided to Council tonight was seconded by Mayor Treece, and approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser voting no.

Mr. Thomas commented that he thought they needed to have a discussion to make it clear what they planned to do during this six month administrative delay. He understood they would complete the unified development code update through the lens of how they wanted downtown to develop and how they did not want it to develop, and it was on its own timeline. He noted there were several other items he had heard that were a part of the public discontent, and thought they needed to commit to address those as well. One item was the protection of historic buildings. He understood they first needed to define a historic building so they could then incorporate it into protective policies. He thought they should have an easily understandable system for knowing how much infrastructure

capacity they had. For example, a trunk sewer could carry the waste of a certain number of dwelling units or toilets. He believed the engineers knew the capacity when they sized a sewer. He hoped they could move to a situation where they could look at a map of the entire sewer system of Columbia and determine the capacity of each sewer. He wanted the same for electricity. He commented that he thought they had a good review process for verifying whether capacity existed in those infrastructure systems, but it was not obvious to anyone. He believed parking needed to be addressed during this time as well. He noted a workshop on downtown parking had been held 7-8 months ago, and a recommendation was to set up a parking and traffic management task force. He thought this should be done as quickly as possible by studying the downtown parking supply and demand. He suggested they look at towns they wanted to be like in terms of the amount of parking and the type of public transportation system they had, and make recommendations with regard to how they should treat parking in the unified development code. He believed the last thing they should do if they wanted to preserve and have a downtown he thought most people desired was to mandate additional parking to be constructed to continue the status quo of the only mode of transportation for people in downtown Columbia was the private automobile. He thought they needed diversity in the way people traveled and students and young people were ripe for this. He commented that he also thought they should honor the attention the Missouri Students Association (MSA) had paid to citywide issues that affected students. He understood the MSA had voted to ask the City to create a student housing task force. He was not sure they wanted to do exactly that, but felt they should engage with the students on the issues of housing and transportation.

Mayor Treece noted they knew the uniform development code was at the Planning and Zoning Commission level and the Council was scheduled to receive it in September, and hoped they could get it sooner if everyone kept working together. He explained he had asked the new Chair of the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure to quickly conclude their recommendations and to consider a recommendation of the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council for a simple dashboard to give developers the predictability they needed to know whether there was sufficient sewer, electric, etc. infrastructure districtwide versus parcel by parcel. He stated he believed they had a blueprint or roadmap for historic buildings, and thought the MSA recommendation and suggested wording of a student housing task force was probably a good idea if the University would also participate so they had clear metrics of projected enrollment numbers. He commented that they had good data on parking he thought could be incorporated as well.

Mr. Skala stated all of the items suggested by Mr. Thomas to review were reasonable, and agreed they needed to do some things over the next six months. He believed some of this would be accomplished in the context of the integrated development code. He commented that historically there had been a desire to increase residential development downtown with the idea it would be relatively low density residential housing. He noted the C-2 zoning district had been set forth for retail and commercial and did not have the parking capacity, sewer capacity, etc. that high density student housing demanded, but the Council had nested residential within the context of C-2 instead of requiring a conditional use permit without any expectation this would happen. High density student housing and out of town developers were unforeseen consequences. He thought they needed to consider this in their review of the development code. He explained he was particularly galled that they broke some of the promises made to the neighborhoods with regard to relief for sewer problems and had exacerbated the situation by increasing the capacity in a way that could only mean they would tear up the MKT Trail for a trunk sewer or with sewers backing up in the First and Fourth Wards. He did not feel this had been managed well. He noted the delay was an opportunity to do a better job in terms of the development code, discussions to bring people together, etc., and he hoped this would not take longer than six months. He thought this would allow them to be at a better trajectory with a better plan for the evaluation of projects.

Mr. Trapp commented that he did not think this ordinance was wise, necessary, or prudent. An administrative delay seemed to be a reaction to a crisis, and he did not see a downtown that was in crisis. The downtown was booming by every objective measure of downtown health. In spite of the testimony heard tonight, he routinely came downtown at lots of different hours and saw people of all ages still enjoying the downtown. Occupancy rates had been higher than they had ever been. The Downtown CID sales tax had far exceeded expectations. A basic principle of smart growth was to place residences where people wanted to go so they could reduce sprawl and traffic. He noted no one moved to Columbia to live in high density student housing in the downtown. People moved here to go to the University or work because they liked the community, and they would come regardless. He stated a lot of this growth had already occurred. They had three options of what they would do with growth in the student housing market. They could accommodate it downtown or near downtown, at the fringe, or not accommodate it all. Accommodating it at the fringe led to large developments and more traffic on the few north-south passageways. If they did not have student specific housing, the students would rent from the general housing market, which meant they would compete with families with regard to affordable housing. He could not believe that restricting supply would bring prices down as it went against every rational thought with regard to economics. If there was indeed a student housing bubble, he thought those issues would be vetted by banks much more carefully than before the economic downtown of 2008, and they would bear those costs. If there was a housing bubble, they would see a reduction in prices, which would help with the pressures of affordable housing. He noted they heard testimony from Mr. Hawks that he had already lowered his rents. He understood a negative of this ordinance was the addressing of high property values. He did not believe anyone ran on reducing peoples' property values and did not feel that was a rational argument for a policy proposal. Higher property values created some difficulties for some people, which needed to be addressed by policy measures, but were overall healthy for the community. He commented that he disagreed with many of the whereas statements in the ordinance. He did not believe housing posed a direct and immediate threat to the long term health and well-being of the community, and thought sprawl and edge development had a direct threat to the long term health of the community as it was harder to serve for police and fire and affected response times. A lot of economies of scale were gained by increasing density. He felt the only way they would have functional transit was if they stopped being a low density sprawling community and found ways to live together well and more densely. He believed the best place to do this was in the downtown, which was the center of the community and where most people wanted to go. Saying they could not build multi-family housing near the places people wanted to go was antithetical to rational and smart growth. He agreed the idea of sense of place needed to be honored through policies, and the uniform development code was a step in the right direction. He noted they already had steps in place in the interim C-2 legislation that had passed as it required first floor commercial in certain areas so they could protect the retail nature of the downtown. He commented that there were more retail business in the downtown than ever and more dollars being generated through retail in the history of Columbia. He reiterated downtown was booming by every objective measure. Downtown Columbia was a beautiful and wonderful place to spend time and money, and it was an increasingly great place to live as the students had brought amenities that they would all take if they wanted to live downtown, such as Lucky's and Walmart. He noted he did not think the market would bring a downtown grocery store, but it did, so as a policymaker, he had more faith that these issues would sort themselves out without the Council having to take a heavy hand. He believed any growth pressures had been relieved by the misadventures of the University of Missouri over the last year and did not think they would see the same rate of development and growth. If there were still growth pressures, the Council could not stop it, but they could direct it, and they would be directing it anywhere outside of the doughnut. He noted

sewer backed up from the sewer treatment center so regardless of where it was located, the associated sewer was flowing to the same treatment center. He commented that he disagreed with Mr. Skala's assertion that they had shortchanged people as they had spent 80 percent of the last sewer ballot for remediation of the existing system. He understood the only specific project that had been delayed to bring the downtown projects forward was the Haystack Acres pumping station. He pointed out some of the issues were due to the floodplain and others were intractable due to how things were done in the past, and the City was addressing those issues in a robust manner. To say otherwise was a disservice to what they were trying to do. He asked people to consider the consequences as positive projects would be caught in the delay. In addition, there would be unforeseen consequences in terms of projects developing outside of the doughnut and what that meant and whether they would have the necessary administrative protections there.

Ms. Nauser stated they all loved Columbia, and noted she, like others, were transplants that had moved here because it was a college town, which made it a vibrant place to live, but they tended to hate students and did not want anything built next to them. By forcing students to live in the periphery of the town, they were forcing them to get in their cars and drive downtown. She noted many liked to talk about smart growth and understood smart growth policy involved infill and high density. It was about building near the amenities, walkability, a transit system whereby people did not have to utilize cars, etc. The proposed ordinance would prohibit infill development in the downtown area, and would force people to build in the periphery. She wondered if they wanted students in the Discovery Ridge area instead as they would have to get in their cars and drive to campus utilizing only a couple of routes. She thought they would prefer people living downtown and walking since they would be close to campus. If they did not live in the periphery or the downtown, they would then live in the neighborhoods. She commented that she received a lot of complaints regarding students encroaching into neighborhoods as they tended to create more trash, noise, parking issues, etc., and the City had trouble addressing those issues since they could not determine how many people were actually living in the buildings. She felt this would be another unintended consequence. She understood some were saying this would only be a six month delay, but it would really push projects back over a year. She noted some felt this was necessary due to a student housing bubble, and pointed out the federal government with their student loans was the reason for the bubble. They were borrowing money they did not have to pay back for 5-10 years, which allowed them to pay luxury student apartment prices. Student loans were easier to receive and students were allowed to borrow more money now than they had in the past, and people were building to accommodate needs since they would be paid. This was what was setting the market rate and the reason most college towns were so expensive. Too many people had government money they could use today and pay back tomorrow. Government was interfering with the market by creating surpluses and shortages, and today they were discussing creating a shortage. Anyone that had been thinking about building would now have to wait another year because they would not be able start any construction project in December. Projects would start in the spring and would likely not be ready until the following semester. She commented that shortages created greater costs and surpluses lowered costs. For the past two years, they had been discussing infrastructure. They had addressed funding and had completed the plans for the Flat Branch sewer. The voters had graciously approved a stormwater fee increase so they could take care of more stormwater projects. They recently held a two hour meeting about future energy supplies. She believed infrastructure was in place. This past budget year, they had increased the connection fees, and Columbia had one of the highest sewer connection fees in the State. They had water connection fees and were discussing electric connection fees. She noted they were trying to collect more money upfront for infrastructure projects. The City had received money from people building in the downtown through development agreements. She thought some of the

developments combined had provided \$1 million in infrastructure. She agreed they had a problem, but did not feel this was a good solution. She reiterated she was concerned about the unintended consequences of pushing developments further in the periphery or students living in homes in neighborhoods. She stated she would not support this administrative delay as it would cost developers money, whether local or not local, and because she felt the end users could be affected the most.

Ms. Peters commented that due to the demographic decline at the University along with fact two more large student apartment buildings would be up and running next fall, she wanted to see how it all affected student housing in Columbia. She agreed the more student housing they had, the cheaper it would be due to supply and demand, but felt they needed to get a better handle on development in the downtown. She explained she had been downtown Saturday night at 9:30 p.m. and it had been great. There were a lot of people out and it was vibrant. She noted this issue affected the neighborhoods surrounding the downtown, and believed demolishing historic properties because people felt they could make more money by putting as many units as possible on a piece of property was a problem for the neighborhoods that supported the students. She pointed out East Campus had supported students over the years, but they wanted to keep their homes and neighborhoods intact. She stated she would support this proposed ordinance as she did not feel six months would be a horrible inconvenience. She noted the local builders could come to Council for consideration for their projects, and did not feel that would be too difficult.

Mr. Ruffin stated the divergent points of view on the Council provided sufficient evidence that more discussion was needed about this matter. They did not all embrace the same vision for the City, the downtown, or the surrounding neighborhoods. He viewed the six month delay as an opportunity to pause so they could continue development downtown in a more intelligent way. It was not a permanent freeze on downtown development. It was only a delay, and it was an opportunity to get all of the constituents together to share information. He noted he felt he often lacked sufficient information as he did not know what was in the pipeline. He saw a vibrant and thriving downtown, but also thought they might have enough student housing in the downtown. The only way to know was to take a pause and continue the discussion. He stated he planned to support the administrative delay.

Mr. Skala commented that he took umbrage at being lectured to about smart growth since he had been involved in smart growth for many years. He stated smart growth was far more than increasing density in the downtown area. It was also about a sense of place. There were ten tenets of smart growth, so it was not just about density, and the sense of place was about balance. He noted they were not talking about the entire community as they were only talking about the downtown area, and felt they had an obligation to address the issue. He explained one of the overwhelming issues constituents had raised with him was the happenings in the downtown and if anything would be left for adults. He commented that he wondered what would happen to the secondary housing market as the students were moving from existing rental properties to downtown, and questioned why the landlords were not concerned as their properties would not be as attractive. He stated this was a temporary administrative pause. He did not feel the pause was for rent control, etc. It was about restoring the peoples' trust and a sense of balance in terms of the downtown area. He agreed the market had a large role, but thought they could guide and direct the market according to the comprehensive plan and other documents they had. He reiterated he thought six months was reasonable especially since there were ways to accommodate exigencies they might not anticipate. He commented that he viewed this delay as an intended consequence to fix unintended consequences.

**B123-16, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: TRAPP,
NAUSER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

- B122-16 Amending the FY 2016 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Police Department - Operations Division.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece explained he asked for this to be removed from the consent agenda because he had some concern over spreading the patrol division too thin to make the command staff less thin. He understood this had been in practice the last six months, but noted he had not been on the Council the last six months, and he wanted to put as many resources on the street as possible. Chief Burton stated he agreed, and explained the issue was supervision. They had enough lieutenants in patrol, four, to have command staff on every shift, but the sergeants were spread too thin to be able to keep up. They generally had two sergeants on a shift, and any major incident would take a sergeant out. In addition, a sergeant could be sick or on vacation. They sometimes had one sergeant working the shift by themselves, which greatly reduced the ability to supervise. The addition of lieutenants to the shifts provided three supervisors to choose from, and one was a command officer that worked with the officers.

Mayor Treece asked for the command ratio of lieutenants to patrol and how it compared to other cities of similar size. Chief Burton replied there were four lieutenants in patrol, and each lieutenant was assigned to a 12-hour shift, so two were on days and the other two were on nights. He explained they were doing the best they could under the circumstances, and they had to supervise. Mayor Treece understood, but noted officers were on the street working 12-hour shifts and were also spread too thin. He thought more resources were needed on the front line.

B122-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: TREECE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B116-16 Appropriating funds for the installation of active warning devices at the Columbia Terminal (COLT) Railroad's crossing with O'Rear Road.
- B117-16 Accepting conveyances for sewer purposes.
- B118-16 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with Boone County Family Resources for additional funding for the Parks and Recreation Department's Career Awareness Related Experience (CARE) Program for youth employment placement and mentoring services.
- B119-16 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with Boone County Family Resources for additional funding for the Parks and Recreation Department's Adapted Community Recreation Program.
- B120-16 Authorizing an inspections participation agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the summer food service program for children.
- B121-16 Amending the FY 2016 Annual Budget by adding a 0.25 FTE cashier position in the Finance Department - Treasury Division; transferring funds.
- R52-16 Setting a public hearing: reconstruction of the Runway 13-31 and Taxiway B turnarounds and installation of runway lighting, directional signage and runway markings at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- R53-16 Setting a public hearing: construction of a concession/restroom facility at

- Gans Creek Recreation Area.
- R54-16 Authorizing an agreement with Ultramax Sports for sports development funding under the Tourism Development Program for the 2016 Go Girl Marathon.
- R55-16 Authorizing the First Addendum to Agreement for professional engineering services with SEGA, Inc. for the Boiler 8 nitrogen oxide (NOx) reduction project at the Municipal Power Plant.
- R56-16 Authorizing a Second Amendment to the software license and services agreement with SunGard Public Sector, Inc. for a Records Management System (RMS) for the Police Department.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R58-16 Authorizing agreements for tourism development funding for competitive bid fees and sponsorship support of youth and amateur sporting events and large meetings and conventions.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Schneider provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece explained his concern over this involved a discussion that had been held at a joint meeting with the Columbia Public Schools and Boone County regarding Columbia losing an amateur sporting event to the City of Springfield because the City of Springfield had offered a cash incentive to the sponsoring agency. He was worried they would open themselves to an arms race of offering economic development incentives, in this case to a quasi-public agency that was booking high school athletic events. While Columbia competed well geographically, he was not sure they would compete well financially with larger venues like St. Louis and Kansas City. He thought this merited discussion with regard to whether the Council wanted to have oversight as to how those funds would be used at a certain level. He believed Ms. Schneider had good judgement as to how apply it, but he also knew there was a lot of competition to secure those games for Columbia. He did not want to exhaust the fund and felt there needed to be some payback for the investment. Ms. Schneider stated she agreed, and noted they would look at the return on investment from the dollars used. They wanted to know if it was helping the entire City, and if it was helping only one entity or multiple entities. She pointed out they would also look at the time of year of the event. She explained she would look more seriously at something that would happen in August, December, and January, and provide more funding to events that came during slower occupancy times.

Mayor Treece encouraged support from the private sector in terms of those entities that were directly benefiting, such as the mall, hotels, etc. He understood the City of Springfield had done this.

Mr. Skala asked Ms. Schneider if she had autonomous discretion or if the Council would be involved. Ms. Schneider replied it would come to her and she would provide it to the Convention and Visitors Advisory Board to review it as well. Mr. Skala understood this would not rise to level of the City Council unless she felt a need. Ms. Schneider stated that was correct. She explained she thought she would come to the Council if a really large amount was involved.

Ms. Nauser asked if economic impact studies were done on the use of tourism funds. Ms. Schneider replied studies were done. Ms. Nauser asked if there was an annual

report or if someone had to come to their offices to review it. Ms. Schneider replied they actually had just received a report this week for the True/False Film Festival. They did studies for larger festivals, such as the True/False Film Festival and the Roots 'N Blues 'N BBQ Festival. She explained those came to Council, and noted she would send this one to them once she was finished reviewing it. She pointed out they did not complete a study on every event because it was costly, but they did do them every 2-3 years for their eight signature series events to ensure they still brought money to the community.

The vote on R58-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. 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.

- B124-16 Authorizing construction of a concession/restroom facility at Gans Creek Recreation Area; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division for a portion of the project.
- B125-16 Amending the FY 2016 Annual Budget by adding and deleting a position in the Public Works Department - Regional Airport Administration Division; amending the FY 2016 Classification and Pay Plan by adding a position.
- B126-16 Amending the FY 2016 Annual Budget by adding a videographer position in the Community Relations Office - The City Channel Division.
- B127-16 Authorizing grant agreements with the Mid-Missouri Solid Waste Management District for the purchase of a commercial recycling roll-off truck, commercial food waste containers and commercial recycling containers; appropriating funds.
- B128-16 Accepting conveyances for water and electric utility purposes.
- B129-16 Accepting conveyances for sewer and temporary construction purposes.
- B130-16 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the 2016 Missouri State Senior Games and Show-Me STATE GAMES.
- B131-16 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services for the Show Me Healthy Women program.
- B132-16 Authorizing an agreement with KMI L.L.C., d/b/a Wynwood Townhouses, for the lease of property on Aztec Boulevard to be used for the Police Department's temporary northeast substation.
- B133-16 Appropriating funds for reinstallation of a City-owned public art sculpture located at the intersection of Cliff Drive and Ann Street.
- B134-16 Authorizing a right of use permit with Columbia Hotel Investments to allow construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of a heated sidewalk loop within a portion of the Cherry Street right-of-way.

X. REPORTS

- REP42-16 Correspondence regarding the Alcohol Policy from the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought they should try to move forward with regard to a more robust

policy as alcohol continued to be a problem. The Commission had done its job of bringing it to the Council so he thought they as Council should direct staff to put the recommended ordinance together. Mr. Skala stated he agreed. Mayor Treece understood staff would bring forward an ordinance.

REP43-16 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

Mayor Treece understood this had been provided for informational purposes. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, asked if the Council had any questions for him. Mayor Treece asked if a court had ever ruled on speculative damages for a change of zoning when there was no change of use. Mr. Clark replied that was not his area of expertise.

Mr. Clark stated he thought the work session on the transmission lines had been very useful, and noted they were in a ten year process because the City had such as terrible planning process. He believed this process had a very poor problem definition. He asked the Council to talk to some architects about the definition of a building program statement. It needed to incorporate what they wanted the project to do, and would likely incorporate more than three things along with constraints. He understood staff looked at the CATSO map when considering community impact, but felt community impact should have included the schools and the houses in the area that would be disrupted. The City's view of this type of planning was unbelievably parochial and insular. He suggested the Council insist on outside assistance as he did not think this type of planning could be conducted by staff. He thought the City should have hired an outside consultant to help staff to construct the building program statement for the upgrade.

Mr. Clark commented that he was glad Mr. Hawks had spoken tonight. He suggested the Council listen to him, and not to City staff, in terms of whether there was sufficient electricity downtown. He noted he did not believe there was a functioning market when they had a University that was dumping unfunded mandates to the City government for streets, police, fire, etc. There was also not a functioning market when the City was subsidizing residential development at 80-90 percent. He reiterated he did not feel they had a market to rely on to remotely have the market allocate costs for reasonable efficiency. He believed it was up to the government to correct those externalities to get to a place of something resembling a functioning market. If they used market principles, they needed to insist on a market.

Mr. Clark stated the reason for the delay was to ensure local and out of state developers did not continue to take advantage of the City by developing a code that guided quality development.

Adrian Levy explained he was a concerned youth citizen with a petition for road signage at the intersection of Chamberlain Lane and Route K. The development growth in that part of City, which included the Cascades and the Oak Park neighborhoods, were making that intersection dangerous without proper road signs. He commented that a motivating factor for the petition was an accident that had occurred at the intersection of Chamberlain Lane and Route K on February 4, 2016, which resulted in a four year old child being severely injured. He believed accidents involving motorists, incoming traffic, and pedestrians would continue to increase without signage. He asked the Council to consider his petition signed by 20 people in the Oak Park community for a road sign at the intersection of Chamberlain Lane and Route K. He noted he could likely obtain signatures from the Cascades neighborhood if necessary. He stated the consideration of Council of his request would send a strong message to the community that the City was open and willing to take serious requests from concerned youth citizens. He explained he was motivated to come forward because he had witnessed the crash when going to school on that day and because he saw risk of possible accidents every day. In addition,

his teachers had encouraged students to become active participants in the community. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Levy where he attended school. Mr. Levy replied Rock Bridge High School. Ms. Nauser stated she would ask City staff to look into the situation. Mayor Treece said he was sorry Mr. Levy had to see the accident and was happy he took the next step to come to Council to talk about it. Mr. Skala suggested Mr. Levy consider applying for the Youth Advisory Council. Mr. Levy provided a copy of his petition to Council.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that he thought Columbia needed more youth to come speak to the City Council.

Mr. Elkin asked the Council to require any developer to purchase building products locally as revenues were lost when companies utilized non-local products. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Elkin if he knew the City of Fort Collins, Colorado, had already tied the issuance of an occupancy permit to a use tax equivalent to the amount of sales tax the builder would have paid had they purchased all of their materials within city limits. Mr. Elkin stated he thought that was fantastic.

Mr. Elkin commented that an enormous amount of lint was building up in the exhaust fans in public restrooms, and he felt it was a health and fire issue that needed to be addressed.

Mr. Ruffin asked if it was possible to provide more outreach and support of the CRIBS program as had been recommended by the Youth Advisory Council or if there was already something in place the City supported that helped young, single parents. Mr. Matthes replied he thought there was some support, but not necessarily for the CRIBS program. He explained a report would be provided.

Ms. Nauser commented that although the speeds on Route K had been lowered, there were a lot of people pulling out on to Route K at that intersection, so she could see how it could cause problems. She asked if staff could reach out to MoDOT for a stop sign or something else to address the situation at Route K and Chamberlain Lane.

Ms. Nauser understood there had been two accidents recently on Old Mill Creek Road and pointed out it was the alternative route people had to use due to the Scott Boulevard closure. She commented that there were two 90 degree turns and people drove at high speeds on the roadway. She asked if anything could be done to reduce the speed or for a stop sign while it was being used as a detour.

Mr. Skala commented that he and Mr. Trapp had received complaints with regard to the excessive noise at the Whiskey Wild establishment, and understood they were paying the fine while continuing to operate like normal. He asked if there was anything that could be done. Mr. Matthes replied he would discuss the issue with staff and provide a report to Council.

Mr. Skala asked if there were any new developments with regard to the eastside police substation. He wondered if they had rented or leased a place. Mr. Matthes replied they had come to an agreement on a location, and noted he would provide him an update after the meeting.

Mr. Skala stated he liked the new format for the agenda. He felt it was much improved as it allowed them to follow along and click on links.

Mr. Trapp explained he had met with the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission (SAAC) and they were willing to hold a special hearing regarding pawn shops. The SAAC wondered if the Police Department could provide a report, which included the practices in

other communities, and he understood Deputy Chief Jill Schlude was already researching the topic. He also wanted to be clear on the proposed expansion to secondhand dealers. He noted he had suggested the changes be approached in a phased system, but Family Pawn preferred everything be brought together. This made sense since pawn shops were already heavily regulated by the State, and if they were going to further escalate this, which he thought was necessary, it would be better to make those changes at the same time they expanded the regulation to unregulated sectors that competed directly with them. He stated the SAAC wanted to see this narrowed so stakeholders that would not be affected by this were not included. They knew there was not a market in children's clothes in terms of stolen goods, but that sporting goods, video games, gold, etc. were stolen and used at secondhand goods dealers and totally unregulated. He commented that he had become more and more convinced about the need for something as he had talked to stakeholders and investigated the situation, but agreed it probably should be done all together. He thought it would help to have the right stakeholders present if the police could narrow down the focus.

Mr. Trapp pointed out this issue had been tabled to June and noted he would recommend it be tabled again for another three months. Ms. Thompson suggested the Council withdraw that particular bill so there was not one pending that might not be relevant to the current discussions. A new bill could come forward later. Mr. Trapp stated that made sense, and asked that his intention to withdraw be stated on the agenda instead.

Mr. Trapp noted he had a constituent contact him regarding the nexus between cats roaming the streets and baby bird trying live, and asked for a public advisory to remind people to bring their cats in during the baby bird season. After this conversation, he had seen both a bird and a cat at the Garth Nature Area, and thought there was unplowed ground in terms of animal licensing. They had very little participation because animal licensing fees were not really promoted by the City, and it was unclear to many as to whether cats were supposed licensed. He thought they could get greater participation and new revenue to do more to educate the public if they targeted an increase in the growth of animal licensing fees toward animal welfare types of activity. As they continued to develop and create island-like ecosystems rather than one giant one, animals would push more animals to extinction so it was a legitimate issue. Mr. Skala noted frogs and animals other than birds were also affected.

Ms. Nauser asked if cats were subject to the same leash laws as dogs. Mr. Trapp replied no.

Mr. Trapp commented that there were also health risks in regards to toxoplasmosis, which was in cat feces and affected 25 percent of the population in terms depression, schizophrenia, and other mental illnesses. They talked about power lines and kids, but not cats in the sandbox in school playgrounds. He stated he thought they could do more than they were as a community, and would like to see them move forward as they were able and suggested a report to launch the process.

Mr. Thomas understood staff wanted to delay the establishment of a parking and traffic management task force until after the downtown development administrative delay was over, and asked for clarification. Mr. Matthes replied staff thought it would be faster to discuss parking as part of the intellectual work that would be done during the administrative delay than a task force that was usually given a year to provide results. He suggested a shorter timeframe if Council decided to move forward with a task force. He pointed out the City already had 2-3 boards that touched on an area of parking, and noted the Council could canvass them. He stated it was up to the Council in terms of how to proceed.

Mr. Thomas stated his impression after the workshop last September was that there was a lot of energy to be on a parking and traffic management task force and to move forward quite quickly, so he preferred to form a task force now and provide them six months to

review parking in the downtown along with options for parking codes as part of the unified development code.

Mr. Thomas made a motion directing staff to move forward quickly with legislation to establish the parking and traffic management task force and for them to study downtown parking first. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Skala stated he did not see any reasons these discussions and recommendations could not occur in parallel.

Mayor Treece asked for the current status of the smart growth parking audit and the recommendations that had come out of it. Mr. Thomas replied there were four recommendations, and the first one was to form a 12-month citywide parking and traffic management task force to implement the other recommendations and possibly recommend the formation of a permanent commission. Other recommendations were to work with Olsson Associates, the transit consultant who was now well into its 14-month review, to develop metrics for calculating the share of journeys being taken by different modes of transportation and recommending specific mode share objectives and strategies, and to increase the transportation demand management programming from GetAbout Columbia to encourage and incentivize other organizations to promote alternative transportation. They had agreed to hold off on the access of circulation plan for the foreseeable future. He reiterated the plan as of January had been to form the task force and have the task force implement the other two recommendations.

Mayor Treece asked if there were any objections to the motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Skala directing staff to move forward quickly with legislation to establish the parking and traffic management task force and for them to study downtown parking first. There were none.

Mr. Matthes stated staff was happy to draft legislation to establish the task force. He understood the task force would need to come back in six months with the mission outlined in the report. Mr. Thomas noted it should include the review of possible parking codes in the downtown. Mr. Matthes asked if that was all it should include. Mr. Thomas noted that was the first piece because they wanted that done as the development code was being discussed. He wanted the task force to review mandatory parking requirements and other aspects of the development code that related to parking.

Mr. Matthes noted they would also need to know the number of members, etc. Mr. Thomas thought that had already been discussed, and stated he would provide Mr. Matthes the information he had in that regard. Mr. Skala noted these groups usually consisted of five, seven, or nine members, so it was an odd number and was manageable. Mr. Trapp agreed he thought they had already discussed the membership. Mr. Thomas noted Ms. Christensen would likely remember as she had been managing it.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mr. Skala made a motion to adjourn. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nausser. Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 11:46 p.m.