



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, March 20, 2017
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, March 20, 2017, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, and TREECE were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of February 20, 2017 was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Skala.

Mayor Treece noted the February 25 Special Council Meeting, March 6 Council Meeting, and March 11 Special Council Meeting minutes were not yet complete.

Ms. Nauser asked that B70-17 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B70-17 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Skala.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC3-17 Board and Commission Appointments.

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

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION CODES COMMISSION

Neyens, John, 6406 Shallow River Road, Ward 6, Term ending August 1, 2018

COMMISSION ON CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Toigo, Alan, 1416 Shannon Place, Ward 4, Term ending October 31, 2019

Mayor Treece noted the Youth Advisory Council had asked the Council to delay advertising a couple of vacancies since they only had one more meeting this school year. The Council was agreeable.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC17-17 Howard Hutton - Racial justice and social equity regarding the process of Community Policing.

Mr. Hutton was not in attendance.

SPC18-17 Sara Maslar-Donar - Would like to bring the council's attention to a local nonprofit called the Day Dreams Foundation.

Ms. Maslar-Donar, 3601 W. Broadway, provided a handout and explained she wanted to inform the Council about the Day Dreams Foundation. The Day Dreams Foundation was made up of 13 board members that worked to make sure every child in Columbia that wanted to participate in an extracurricular activity, such as ballet, soccer, horseback riding, and cooking classes, could participate. She noted Day Dreams was founded in 2014 by Joe Bradley, a graduate of the University of Missouri and a very productive Columbia citizen who volunteered with Big Brothers/Big Sisters. In 2014, his little brother through the program, who was nine years old, had wanted to play football, but his grandmother could not afford the registration cost, so he asked his family and friends to chip in to help pay for it, and that was how the idea of Day Dreams was born. Generous community support allowed them to help lower income families with kids in Columbia that wanted to participate in extracurricular activities. She provided examples of participants and the activities they had chosen along with stories of how participating had impacted them. Since 2014, 85 kids had received scholarships from the Day Dreams Foundation, and \$25,000 in activity fees and \$3,000 in equipment costs had been spent. All of this money had been donated by generous individuals and businesses in Columbia or had been raised at one of their fundraising efforts. In addition to providing scholarships, she pointed out they made sure the kids receiving the scholarships were working hard in the classroom and the community by asking them to complete a few service hours and keep their grades up while on the scholarship. She explained she had joined the Day Dreams Foundation Board this fall, and although she had always been passionate about the organization, she had joined because she had seen firsthand, as a reporter, why this organization was needed. She stated she had seen too many arrests of young men and women, 17-25 years old, and was familiar with the connection between crime and low income stricken families. She noted the families they helped had a combined income that fell below the lower income level, which often meant the family was working hard to afford the basics, but could not afford anything extra, and the extras were often so important in terms of the people they might associate with and for their development. The kids would sit at home or wander the neighborhood after school, which in her experience would often lead to them meeting role models that might not have their best interest at heart. She did not want to see another 18 year old charged in the shooting death of another 17 year old in Columbia. She would prefer they be busy playing football, basketball, etc. over the summer to even be involved. She commented that Day Dreams provided options and opportunities many kids did not have due to their circumstances, and they deserved these opportunities as much as any other kid. Extracurricular activities provided a way for kids to learn structure and discipline, gain role models, and a path to college as extracurricular activities were crucial on a college application. She reiterated the goal tonight was to inform the Council of the Day Dreams Foundation and what they hoped to do for children in Columbia ages 18 years old and younger. She noted their motto was "every kid deserves to be a star" and their goal was to help each child's light shine a little brighter. She asked the Council to pass their name on to constituents or anyone else that might need their help in order to expand their influence a bit further.

Mayor Treece asked about their fundraising efforts and when kids aged out of the program. Ms. Maslar-Donar replied scholarships were provided to those 18 and under, and they also provided one college scholarship. It was for \$1,000 and was available to any high school student that had been accepted to a two- or four-year college that qualified for free and reduced lunch. She noted extracurricular or volunteer work was strongly considered as well. With regard to fundraising, she explained they held a trivia night in the winter, had recently held a bubble soccer tournament, and would hold a gala in July. Although not fundraising, she pointed out they currently had a bracket to go

along with March Madness for the proposals they had received from schools and other organizations whereby the public could go online every day and vote for their favorite. Last year, Lange Middle School won the \$1,000 prize for the establishment of an archery club and Midway Elementary School received \$250 for a robotics club.

SPC19-17 Laura Mitchell - Perspectives on policing from the True/False documentary festival.

Ms. Mitchell, 1103 Jean Ray Drive, stated she was a member of Race Matter, Friends and explained she viewed two documentaries at the True/False film festival that highlighted two different ways to run a police department. One, which was called *Whose Streets*, was filmed in Ferguson after the Michael Brown shooting by people that lived inside of the community. There had been a lot of footage of people trying to live their lives, keep their kids in school, and make ends meet. There were also images of non-violent protests, which were different images than the national coverage that showed looting, riot gear, beatings, people being dragged, tanks in the streets, and tear gas being used on people. She noted it had impacted Columbia since many students had a connection to St. Louis, and had led to the student protests. Another documentary, called *The Force*, was set in Oakland, California, which had a well-known, corrupt police department and was the third most dangerous city in the United States. They had been under a federal judge's rule to make it better, but it was not until a new chief with a zero tolerance policy was hired that things improved. There could no longer be illegal activity or the framing of people. He also had people sign a form when pulling a weapon, which resulted in the decrease of weapons being pulled to one-fourth of what it had been. She commented that as people began to trust the police more, they were more cooperative. She noted that the police chief had ultimately lost his job due to a sex scandal involving an underage prostitute and many police officers even though he had not been involved.

Ms. Mitchell pointed out Race Matters, Friends had also spoken out about a proposal to extend the sewer system to Midway, which was largely the request of two large business owners outside of the city limits. She understood they had agreed to annexation and a case was being made for the financial benefits of the taxes Columbia might collect. In addition, one of the owners had even offered to donate a piece of valuable property to the city. She thought they needed to consider the irony of extending sewer to that area when so many sewers in the First Ward that were backing up and were broken. She also pointed out that annexation would increase the area Columbia police and fire would have to serve. She did not feel the center of the city would gain anything from the proposal, and believed City services would be more overextended than they were now.

Ms. Mitchell commented that they could continue cracking down on people that broke the law to the point they alienated the community or they could admit there had been abuses and they were committed to correcting the problems, like the Oakland police chief had done. She was not sure the cost was more to have community police officers than it was to have officers that were increasingly armed, and thought they could work with citizens to solve crime versus pursuing them on every charge possible causing them to give up on the system. She hoped Columbia would work with its citizens.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH2-17 Consideration of the Unified Development Code.

Discussion shown with B43-17.

B43-17 Repealing Article III of Chapter 12A and Chapters 20, 23, 25 and 29 of the City Code; enacting a new Chapter 29 of the City Code to establish a Unified Development Code; amending Chapters 2, 6, 13, 24 and 27 of the City Code as it relates to the Unified Development Code (Case No. 16-110).

PH2-17 was read by the Clerk, and B43-17 was given fifth reading by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Tim Waid commented that he felt the process was broken, and democracy and transparency had been defeated. The East Campus Majority Housing Association had submitted a petition of the majority of parcel owners within the East Campus Urban Conservation District requesting that no changes be made to the overlay, and this Council had denied that request. He stated the Association had been formed in May, 2016 after a secret meeting of the East Campus Neighborhood Association (ECNA). Non-resident homeowners had not been contacted and the ECNA began attempts to revise the overlay without their input. They had asked the ECNA President for participation in the overlay revision as required by law and their invitation had been denied. He noted they had pleaded with their council representative to facilitate their inclusion in the overlay revision, and no mediation was offered. They had also asked the city planner to include them in the overlay draft as it was integrated into the UDC during the review by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC), and even though they had crafted the overlay in 2003, they were shunned from discussion. He reiterated democracy and transparency had been defeated and discrimination and secrecy had triumphed. He commented that he believed the original language of the overlay in the amendment section was lawful, and the changes proposed would render that overlay as unlawful. He stated they were a trusting and vigilant group, and felt that even though the Council had changed the language of the overlay, it had not changed the spirit of the overlay. They understood the ECNA had drafted changes to the overlay, and they believed this Council would require those changes to be approved by a majority of the property owners within the overlay district and that all future changes would require non-resident homeowners and occupant owners in the drafting stage and majority approval in the legislative stage. He commented that although the process was broken and the revised overlay was illegal, they would not seek remedy at this time. They planned to reserve that for future scenarios in which their input and approval was not present. If those conditions were not met, they were confident the legal system of common law would decide the legal perspective on the revised overlay was uncommon and ill-advised. He stated they looked forward to working with the Council democratically and transparently on future issues that impacted the East Campus neighborhood and all stakeholders within the overlay district.

Mr. Thomas understood the revisions to the overlay Mr. Waid had referred to were the changes to the process for changing the overlay. Mr. Waid stated currently the revisions were the process of the legislative action and any amendments. Mr. Thomas asked if there were any other revisions in the version the Council had before them. Mr. Waid replied not that he was aware of. Ms. Peters asked Mr. Waid if he had been able to read the language in the proposed code. Mr. Waid replied he had, but what had been included had been different than what had been provided to the PZC. Ms. Peters understood the process for amendments had changed, but believed the rest was the same. Mr. Waid stated he supposed it was, but did not know since there was not a notation. Mayor Treece commented that the overlay had not changed. Only the process for amending it in the future had changed, and it actually provided more notice than they ever had before. He noted he would dispute the characterization of the process by Mr. Waid as he felt this had been the greatest democratization of a city council process he had seen in the last ten years. There had been four public hearings at the city council level and they had taken every comment, which had resulted in over 40 potential amendments.

Don Emery, 1804 Murifield Drive, stated he had been in Columbia for 44 years, and had been in the real estate business and had been in the East Campus neighborhood for over 40 years. He wondered how many of those that had complained about the East Campus and Benton Stephens neighborhood had lived there before 1957, and displayed a 1957 and 2003 zoning map as most of the area was zoned R-3. He questioned whether a council member that owned 18 properties in the East Campus neighborhood should vote on policy changes. He commented that the original zoning was important and wondered

why a person should be able to purchase a property in a zoning area and then downzone the property so it affected his property or other people's property values in the neighborhood. If he owned farmland, and utilities were placed through the property, he would be compensated. He asked the Council if they were prepared to pay people for devaluing their property. He understood people complained about the ugliness of the apartment houses, and displayed six high-rise garages owned by the City and the University of Missouri, which others might feel were ugly as well. He noted an apartment complex had been built on 1401 and 1403 Wilson Avenue, which he felt was beautiful as it matched the fraternity next door. He explained he had listed those properties in 2000, and they had homes on them that were death traps. He understood a council member would likely tear down a house in the area that should be torn down, and wondered why buildings in Columbia were considered historic if they were 50 years old.

Ms. Nauser asked if zoning was considered when homes were appraised. Mr. Emery replied he thought should be, and explained a property with \$1,000 in income per month was worth \$120,000 with a low interest rate. It made a difference if the appraiser understood rental property. Ms. Nauser asked if a lender could call on a note if a property owner downzoned their property from R-3 to R-1. Mr. Emery replied he did not know, but suspected, if known, it could hurt the person borrowing the money depending on the loan and lender. He commented that it would deflate the value of properties. He also felt the ability to not build across building lines would devalue his property if he owned three adjacent lots.

Andy Waters, 300 Lindell Drive, understood Amendment #45 would add R-MF to the M-DT protection standards, and was sure this would do a great job of protecting residences east of downtown that saw potential development as a threat, but subjecting the entire M-DT to these restrictions would create real problems in other parts of downtown where there were not problems without the restrictions and where no one would benefit from more restrictions. He asked the Council to consider some of the unintended consequences of applying single-family protections to multi-family lots, and to picture all of the businesses from the corner of Stewart Road and Providence Road to Broadway and east on Broadway to Garth Avenue, which included Taco Bell, Lucky's, and Office Depot. He noted all of those commercial lots would face new height restrictions, new screening requirements, and a setback of up to 50 feet with Amendment #45, and downtown density would be reduced because the 32 acre Columbia Cemetery, which shared a border with many M-DT zoned lots, was zoned R-MF. He wondered who they were trying to protect, those buried in the cemetery, and noted the cemetery itself owned some of the commercial properties and relied upon those investments to assist with the upkeep of the cemetery. Those investments would be devalued by Amendment #45. He pointed out he was on the Columbia Cemetery Board, but was not representing the Cemetery Board. He stated the restrictions would also apply to commercial lots next to high density development. He questioned applying the same protections to the public housing apartments along Park Avenue, from Providence Road to Seventh Street, which were multi-story, multi-family buildings, as they were giving to the small, historic homes on the other side of downtown as he felt it was inappropriate. He understood the owners of commercial lots could go to the Board of Adjustment (BOA) for a variance, and while it might sound trivial to some people, it was not. In addition, he questioned the purpose as they gained nothing for the trouble they would cause people whose investment in the community should be encouraged rather than discouraged. He pointed out people who owned single-family homes on multi-family zoned lots could get additional protection by downzoning to R-1 or R-2, which had been done in the past and could continue to be done under the proposed code. He agreed a good way to protect residents that lived in small homes around downtown was needed, but did not feel Amendment #45 was the appropriate solution as it created too much collateral damage in other parts of the downtown.

Mark Farnen, 103 E. Brandon Road, explained he was not representing any individual or

business although he would associate his remarks with the previous speaker. He understood at least five more amendments would possibly be considered tonight and a lot of people on both sides of many issues were concerned with the impact of the UDC as it was a complex document. He noted he feared all of the changes going into effect at once, and asked the Council to be moderate in their approach for any other amendments. He thought they should err on the side of the status quo if needed or provide an exemption if needed. He suggested they not do something to solve one problem that might have a cascading effect on other items that were not broken. He thought they should encourage people to utilize the PZC as a resource as the new code came into effect. He understood the intent of Amendment #45 was to provide protection to those that lived next to downtown, but felt that had been done over a year ago in anticipation of the new code as they had changed the eligibility rules for downzoning property. Downzoning could be done any time during the year and fees to initiate the process could potentially be waived to make it easier and cheaper for anyone interested. If a single-family house on an R-MF lot wanted to downzone to a more appropriate zoning, the new code might give them the protections they sought without having to pass this amendment. He asked the Council to make this work for everyone.

Tim Crockett, 1000 W. Nifong Boulevard, stated he was present in support of Amendments #41-#44. Amendment #41 discussed the length of cul-de-sacs. The code allowed for a 300 foot maximum length cul-de-sac and special provisions if warranted. He noted Amendment #41 would change the 300 feet to 500 feet, and while he was appreciative of the 500 feet, he explained he would prefer the existing 750 feet. The length of the cul-de-sac did not impact services, such as snow removal and emergency services. The issue was the tangent length, the extra length of pavement between the two, as vehicles would still have to turnaround whether the cul-de-sac was 300 feet or 750 feet. He commented that he believed the traffic calming issues around town had been relieved due to more current design standards, which included the inclusion of more cul-de-sacs. Amendment #42 discussed the number of lots off of a single access point. He understood the fire code referenced 30 lots, but noted this did not limit the Council as they could adopt something different. He also understood the Fire Department might allow for some leniency as it was proposal driven. He asked for clarification as to how it would be reviewed on an individual basis. He stated Amendment #43 involved steep slopes, and it was an issue that concerned him. He asked the Council to allow for steep slopes of up to 33 percent. If they were to grade a site today, he could place a building, a road, or a bridge on anything that was 33 percent or less by code without any additional testing or consideration, and anything over 33 percent was deemed a critical slope. He wanted the same for steep slopes. The 33 percent had been identified on the building side, and he wanted the same for the zoning side. He explained Amendment #44 involved trees in the stream buffer. He asked that some credit given to trees in the stream buffer. He pointed out not all trees in the stream buffer were protected, and if they were not part of the climax forest, those trees could be removed. He noted they did not have the same provisions and protections as those in the climax forest.

Caleb Colbert, 601 E. Broadway, explained he was present on behalf of John Ott, a downtown property owner that would be impacted by Amendment #45, and stated he would echo the comments of Mr. Waters and Mr. Farnen in that Amendment #45 was too broad in its application. He displayed a diagram showing the proposed zoning and the properties along Providence Road that would be in the M-DT district and impacted because the cemetery would be zoned R-MF. Another concern was that the cap on the building height would drop below the maximum building height allowed in R-1, R-2, and the R-MF districts. He did not feel they should restrict development in the M-DT district as it was the area they had determined they wanted density and growth, and did not think they should cap the building height in that zoning classification at less than what they would allow in R-1 or R-2. He noted a 50 foot setback was a significant setback, particularly in the M-DT district, as a 50 foot setback could result in losing one-third of a

lot in certain circumstances. He thought that could be problematic down the road. He commented that Amendment #45 would also trigger a requirement of building a 4-6 foot tall masonry wall along the common lot line, and stated he did not feel the aesthetics of that would be a positive for the M-DT area as the goal was to promote connectivity and walkability. He wondered if property owners in the M-DT area could downzone from M-DT to R-MF to impact their neighbors. By allowing the R-MF district to trigger compliance with these requirements, an opportunity was created for someone to take the gamble to impact a neighbor. He thought that was something they would want to avoid.

Mark Stevenson, 3212 Shoreside Drive, thanked the Council for their time and effort on this very complex matter. He commented that he had been blessed with many friends that were professionals in all areas of real estate, and the realtor slogan was for the highest and best use of land. Codes in the United States had become more and more complicated and numerous over time. They had reached far beyond fire protection and now bordered on infringement on aesthetics and taste. The proposed UDC was over 400 pages, and was one of many codes, and only a few had read it. Excessive regulation and legislation diluted the ability of government personnel to enforce the codes, and it was more difficult to agree on the meaning of the codes. He noted enforcement was often complaint driven rather than uniformly applied, and stated he was aware of many instances where violations were not discovered, ignored, or allowed. He commented that he felt this code was too punitive and restrictive, and did not feel it would accomplish the goals sought. He understood the City had paid \$150,000 to Clarion to write the draft and noted he would be happy to provide that same amount to the City to throw it away. He thought they had good codes now that only needed to be enforced and fine-tuned.

Jim Meyer, 104 Sea Eagle Drive, commented that he too opposed the proposed code, but thought it was inevitable that the Council would pass a version of it, so he asked the Council to consider very carefully the amendments that Mr. Crockett had spoken about earlier. He thought it would have a great impact on the future affordability of housing in the community. He believed a lot of the attention had been focused on the downtown, East Campus, and Benton Stephens areas, and the changes to the subdivision regulations had not gotten the kind of consideration and public discourse as the other portions of the code had. He thought they would do great damage to the community if they did not modify the code as had been suggested by Mr. Crockett.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, understood there had been discussion of the formation of a small group of intermediaries, other than the staff and the PZC, to look at this and provide recommendations, and believed that was a terrible idea. An enormous amount of resources had been invested into the education of the current PZC members, the development of a working relationship between the professional staff and the PZC, and between the current PZC members. It was a good working group, and he did not want to see the group change. He believed they should be the only group to review items associated with the UDC. He did not feel anyone in the community would have the level of education in material matters and the working process necessary. He asked the Council to honor the PZC and staff by directly running any necessary items back through them. He commented that he thought the amendment he had proposed with regard to moving the M-DT back to Orr Street, etc. would satisfy the people that were objecting to Amendment #45 more than approving Amendment #45. He stated the intensity of things in C-2 or M-DT was much more intense than in a neighborhood. He explained 3 x 300 x 100 would be the income appraisal of his house, and it would be that regardless of whether his property was zoned R-1 or R-3. In order to break his home up into apartments with stoves, kitchens, etc., he would need R-3 zoning, but he could still rent his home with R-1 zoning if he did not break it up into apartments, and that was how the appraiser had appraised his house. He thought some of the issues of losing value needed to be looked into more carefully. He stated he looked forward to the Council supporting the PZC and staff.

Dee Dokken, 804 Again Street, explained she was representing the Osage Group of the

Sierra Club and wanted to address the steep slopes and stream buffer/tree preservation issues. The Sierra Club strongly opposed the 25 percent maximum slope limit in the current proposed code as steep slopes should be defined as greater than 15 percent. She stated 15 percent was the maximum slope recommended in the natural resources inventory and the East Area Plan, which were produced with a lot of City and County resources and public input. The 15 percent limit was important to protect against erosion, excessive bulldozing and soil displacement, cost of infrastructure, and loss of scenic views and natural habitat. She hoped someone tonight would make an amendment to change the proposed code back to the original 15 percent. She read from the East Area Plan, which indicated steep slopes were typically considered gradients greater than 15 percent and that in addition to erosion and water quality problems, when disturbed, steep slopes presented challenges for design and installation of streets, sewers, and other services. It also indicated the costs associated with substantial grading, blasting, filling, and stabilization of steep slopes often made development of such sites more costly. Ms. Dokken stated the natural resource inventory had calculated that only 2.6 percent of the land in the Columbia area studied was greater than 15 percent. With regard to stream buffer and tree preservation, the Osage Group of the Sierra Club supported the current wording that indicated none of the required stream buffer could be used for the required 25 percent of climax forest to be preserved. The City had already determined that both stream buffers and climax forest were important to protect as Columbia developed. She asked the Council to oppose any amendment that would allow overlap between the stream buffer and climax forest requirements as it would weaken the protections. She stated it was important to save the groundcover, shrubs, willows, sycamores, etc. along streams for water quality, stormwater control, natural habitat, and human enjoyment. It was also important to preserve the upland climax forest if one was lucky enough to have it on their land. She again read from the East Area Plan, which indicated climax forest occurred when a forest had progressed through early succession of pioneer species to a point where it was dominated by primarily oak, hickory, and other hardwoods and this mixture of species remained relatively constant for an extended period of time, often hundreds of years. Ms. Dokken commented that for many of them the oak/hickory climax forest was the signature landscape of Missouri, and much beloved by animals, birds, insects, wildflowers, mushrooms, and humans. She thought it deserved preservation of at least 25 percent whether or not there was a creek on the land. Peter Norgard, 1602 Hinkson Avenue, understood people had spoken about how Amendment #45 could potentially impact the value of land, which was valued by the dollar because it was an easy and concrete way of evaluation. He commented that those people were not wrong by evaluating and valuing land in that manner, but there was another way to value land. Those who lived in neighborhoods valued the neighborhood over the monetary value of land, so they were frustrated in hearing their neighborhoods talked about in terms of money. It was about people and community to them. They were concerned with how quickly their neighborhood was changing. He explained he moved into the neighborhood because he valued the way it was, and he did not have a problem with landlords or renters as he participated in that business himself, but believed there needed to be some balance in the neighborhoods. Those in portions of the community that were not pressured in terms of redevelopment did not feel the pressures and stresses they felt. He asked that consideration be given to how they felt and for the support of Amendment #45. He did not agree with every aspect of it, but noted he appreciated and respected the neighborhood protections it would provide for those communities that were impacted by redevelopment. Alyce Turner, 1204 Fieldcrest, commented that she was in support of more balance and structure of development in the downtown, and was concerned about granting exemptions. She noted 40 percent of businesses that were single-story could only go up and could not go back because there was not much room. She thought they should maintain what had been proposed. In terms of parking, she stated she was personally

tired of so many city-supported parking places. Anyone developing in the downtown needed to provide parking or encourage other forms of transportation. She also stated her support of protecting the neighborhoods near the downtown as they were precious to Columbia.

Traci Wilson-Kleekamp commented that she hoped equity was a driving force in the decision the Council would make. She understood equity meant different things to different people. She stated she saw a lot of people with privilege speak and act in ways that others could not, and believed it was the job of the Council to balance the scales so people without that kind of privilege were also heard even when they were not there.

Pat Holt, 3705 Monterey Drive, stated she was concerned about the new parking posts in certain areas of the downtown as they were only posts with signs on them. There was not a place to pay a meter and only an app could be used to pay to park. She wondered what anyone without a smart phone or someone who did not want their phone connected to a bank account could do in those situations. She understood it limited where they were able to park. In addition, there was a 45 cent charge every time the app was used. She asked if the meters would be fixed. Mayor Treece replied he believed they were all in transition and would all be coin operated, but wanted to ensure any further comments were germane to the UDC at this time.

Peter Yronwode, 203 Orchard Court, commented that members of the Council were relatively affluent, and most did not live in the central core neighborhoods, which were most in need of the protection standards now being considered, and noted he and many of his friends still lived in the central core neighborhoods. He asked the Council to imagine renting a house with a big yard and other amenities for years, and pointed out that although they might be paying rent to a landlord, they felt as though it was their home. He also asked them to imagine a house down the street being razed and the development of multiple 4-plexes without any trees, gardens, or kids. He stated the streets then became block long parking lots, and driving, walking, and biking were now difficult and dangerous. If one lived downhill, runoff would fill the yard, and ten times as many showers and toilets would fill the ancient six-inch sewer and sometimes even the basement. He commented that many would then move away, and soon those homes would be razed for multi-family developments as well. He understood the landlords were just exercising their property rights, but asked about the right to a quiet life on the block. He stated this was happening every day in the threatened neighborhoods. Owners were cashing in now because they feared paltry new limits on the right to exploit their property might be imposed. While they had dithered and debated for years, the scenario had played out in an unseemly rush, and without protection now, there would soon be nothing left to protect. He commented that returning these neighborhood protection standards to the PZC for debate meant that for months and years nothing would be done and more destruction and disruption would occur. The proposed standards were minimal and insufficient, but they were far better than nothing. They were better than inaction and further debate that served only the greed of speculators at the expense of the majority of residents less able to exert their right to a decent human scale existence. He believed delay served the wealthy minority at the expense of the less prosperous majority, and felt that was unfair, undemocratic, and unworthy of a city that had declared itself dedicated to civil, people-centered, harmonious, and egalitarian goals. He asked the Council to pass the amended neighborhood protection standards now.

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

Ms. Nauser made a motion to amend the Unified Development Code associated with B43-17 by adopting Amendment #41. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Skala understood any substantive amendments would need to be held over to the next meeting, and depending on when they voted on the UDC, it could require a review and recommendation by the PZC. He suggested they deal with the amendments today, and ensure the decision on the UDC was made at the next meeting if any amendments were adopted.

Mayor Treece pointed out the amendments would not be held open. They would either be approved or rejected. The final UDC, i.e. B43-17 as amended, would not have a final vote until April 3 if amended further. He stated he was inclined to vote against most amendments because if none were adopted they could vote on the UDC tonight, but he was also open to discussion.

Ms. Nauser commented that she thought it would be unfair to not consider the amendments solely because they wanted to vote on the bill tonight when they had the opportunity to vote on it at the April 3, 2017 Council Meeting.

Mr. Trapp explained he only planned to bring forward Amendments #46-#48 if they were not significant changes or unless another significant change was made. Like Mayor Treece, he wanted to wrap this up tonight.

Ms. Nauser understood her amendments were not significant changes. Ms. Thompson stated she thought Amendments #41 and #42 were not substantive as they were within the bookends. In the existing code, there was a 1,000 foot cul-de-sac length and in the proposed code, it was 300 feet. The amendment was in between those bookends so she did not consider it a significant change requiring it to be held over. This was the same for Amendment #42 as the existing code allowed for 100 lots, the proposed code allowed 30, and the proposed amendment was in between. She did not feel that was the case with the remainder of the amendments.

Mr. Trapp asked about Amendment #46 as it was closer to the existing code. Ms. Thompson replied the problem with Amendment #46 was that it was more complicated because of the way the code was drafted in terms of it being form-based. The reduction of the side and rear yard setbacks had not been discussed and it was more of a significant change as it would affect every single property throughout the City. Mr. Trapp noted the amendment would just change it to what was in the existing code. Ms. Thompson agreed it was in the existing code, but there were other protections as well. Mr. Zenner noted that was correct as there were other buffering standards that would apply. Mr. Trapp commented that he still did not see the difference. Ms. Thompson explained a lot of people had talked about and relied upon the current 20 feet when considering the interactions between the neighborhood protections and the setbacks. Mr. Trapp reiterated the existing code was 10 feet, the proposed code was 20 feet, and the amendment would take it back to 10 feet, and pointed out there were still additional neighborhood protections that would add on to the 10 or 20 foot length. He did not understand why restoring it to the original code was significant. Ms. Thompson explained her concern with it was that it was more widespread throughout the code. It was not just a single, small provision in the code. They were looking at a more substantive impact on the code when it came to that particular amendment. Mr. Trapp understood Amendments #41 and #42 were relatively constrained areas of law and would potentially be restored closer to what had originally been written. Ms. Thompson stated they had a smaller impact on the code. It was something that was applied in very few circumstances. Mr. Trapp noted he understood.

Ms. Peters commented that she wanted to pass this tonight, but agreed with Ms. Nauser in that she did not want to rush through these amendments or vote them down in order to be able to pass the UDC tonight. She felt they should consider the amendment and continue to be as thoughtful in the process as they had previously. Mayor Treece stated he agreed.

Mr. Skala understood Ms. Thompson felt Amendment #45 was a significant change. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct because it had a widespread application.

Ms. Nauser understood the proposed code would drastically reduce the length of a cul-de-sac. She asked how many houses would fit on a cul-de-sac of 750 feet versus 300 feet. Mr. Crockett replied it would be about 18-20 homes on a 750 foot cul-de-sac and 8 homes on a 300 foot cul-de-sac. Ms. Nauser noted they would drastically reduce the number of homes per cul-de-sac, and believed this would create more problems. She stated she was unsure about the logic in reducing the cul-de-sac length so drastically.

Mr. Zenner explained the reduction was the result of the change in the block length. The block length went from a maximum of 1,000 feet to 600 feet, and was based on the idea of creating walkable environments. He agreed the creation of shorter roadway lengths potentially increased the amount of pavement they would have to maintain, but noted they would also increase efficiency as it related to utility services. Shorter block segments also offered the opportunity for better emergency access and circulation within neighborhoods. The 300 feet was half of the 600 foot block length. The proposed 500 feet in the amendment was a compromise as it related to the 300 feet versus the 750 feet. There would not be a need for a block length maximum if they allowed anything above 500 feet. Ms. Nauser understood 500 feet would fit within the block length. Mr. Zenner stated that was correct, but pointed out 300 feet would be ideal. The option existed to go between 300 feet and 750 feet without having to ask for a design modification within the code. The applicant would need to make a reasonable argument as to why the increased length of the cul-de-sac was necessary. Nothing above 750 feet would be allowed without exceptional cause, and it would have to be approved by Council.

Ms. Nauser asked Mr. Crockett if he thought 500 feet would be acceptable. Mr. Crockett replied yes. He thought 600 feet would be better for consistency purposes with the block length, but noted 500 feet was better than 300 feet.

Mr. Thomas stated he did not understand why shorter street segments would result in increased pavement. Ms. Nauser noted there would be more cul-de-sacs in the subdivision. Mr. Thomas thought that would be dependent on the size of the lots. Mr. Crockett explained there would be more cul-de-sacs per lot. Since they lost efficiency, they would increase the amount of pavement. It was a function of layout. The most efficient street was a long straight street. He noted shorter lengths of cul-de-sacs would result in less efficient layouts than straight sections of street. A longer cul-de-sac length allowed for the tangent area, which was the longer area of a straight street.

Mr. Skala commented that he had assisted with the street standards and understood a grid street system was more efficient because it would facilitate connectivity and pedestrian, vehicle, and utility traffic. At the time they were working on street standards, they did not have the capacity to deal with the cul-de-sac length. He believed that was the beginning of the discussion that had led to this change in the code.

Mr. Trapp asked Mr. Zenner to respond to the remarks of Mr. Crockett. Mr. Zenner replied he was not an engineer or designer of subdivisions, but believed a grid system within a neighborhood or community was generally a much more efficient method of design in moving people even though it might not be as intriguing or interesting. He pointed out not all property within Columbia was capable of being able to have a grid laid on top of it due to topography, and noted that was the reason they had a curvilinear network. This was also the reason they had to look at each individual request.

Mr. Thomas stated he did not understand the snow plow issue either since both sides of the street were plowed at the same time. Ms. Nauser explained she tended to receive the most complaints from those living on cul-de-sacs. Mr. Thomas understood that was because they were left to the end. He did not feel it made a difference in the efficiency of providing the service. In terms of the efficiency of moving through a neighborhood, he could see that a grid system would allow for more efficiency. He stated he was a strong advocate for cul-de-sacs being required to have bicycle and pedestrian easements connecting the cul-de-sac bulbs to the main roads or other cul-de-sac bulbs to allow for efficient active transportation movements through the neighborhoods.

Mr. Trapp commented that they should deny this amendment as he believed shorter blocks would lead to greater walkability. He thought fewer cul-de-sacs would be created since they would be shorter and that this was an incentive for more grid type streets. He understood this was a move toward fewer cul-de-sacs, shorter blocks, and more walkability, which he believed would make up for the additional pavement.

The motion made by Ms. Nauser and seconded by Mr. Skala to amend the

Unified Development Code associated with B43-17 by adopting Amendment #41 was defeated by roll call vote with Mr. Trapp, Mr. Skala, Ms. Peters, and Mayor Treece voting no, and Mr. Ruffin, Mr. Thomas, and Ms. Nauser voting yes.

Ms. Nauser noted Amendment #42 would change the access requirement from 30 lots back to 100 lots, which was what they had today.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to amend the Unified Development Code associated with B43-17 by adopting Amendment #42. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters.

Mr. Crockett understood there were provisions beyond the 30 units per access point if the development involved a larger plat or if it would be platted in multiple phases to provide additional points of connectivity. His issue was that there were not provisions indicating how that would be reviewed or determined. He wondered if they could have 100 points off a single point of access as he believed it was allowed. He wanted to know what the criteria would be to determine this.

Mr. Skala understood a neighboring development could intercede in terms of access. Mr. Crockett stated that was correct. There were too many unknowns. He commented that he did not want to create a situation whereby multiple developments along Scott Boulevard created more accesses along that very busy arterial roadway when there might be other developments with access points in the future. His fear was that they would end up with single points of access down major roadways that were too close to each other.

Ms. Nauser asked Mr. Zenner for his thoughts. Mr. Zenner replied Mr. Crockett had a point in terms of the criteria by which the fire official would make that determination as the fire official had the authority to waive the standard per the fire code. He explained they were trying to avoid a disconnect between the codes while allowing the greatest amount of discretion and application of best practices in the design of subdivisions and the transportation network. He noted they had regulations on managing roads such as Scott Boulevard, and they would have to look at the broader picture. They could not look at development in isolation, and there were provisions within the code requiring the interconnectivity of subdivisions. He believed the problem was that they were looking at the standard in isolation without looking at the rest of the process.

Ms. Thompson explained the challenge was that the fire code indicated more than 30 units with a single access point could not be developed unless the structures were sprinklered or without the fire official's permission. For consistency purposes, that was mirrored in the zoning code. Ms. Nauser asked for clarification regarding the sprinklering requirement. Ms. Thompson replied it was required for new construction unless there were other points of access or permission to exceed the number of units per points of access.

Ms. Nauser asked Mr. Crockett if this conversation eased some of his concerns. Mr. Crockett replied he understood it was in the adopted fire code, but it would now be in the zoning code with a big change from 100 to 30 units. He hoped they could agree on a modified number and then change the fire code as well.

Fire Chief White commented that there were three exceptions that could be made by the fire code official in the currently adopted fire code. The 30 units could be exceeded if all of the structures had sprinklers. Another exception could be made if the plat showed there would be connectivity to another point of access at some point. The "some point" could not be eventually. There had to be a time line for completion and it had to be within reason. It could not be 50 years from now. They would work with the developer, but noted they would also need some assurances the connectivity would take place within a reasonable time frame. A third exception could be made due to topography, which would be reviewed on a case by case basis. He explained they would not make an exception for a 40-60 lot situation that did not fit within one of the three exception categories.

Ms. Peters understood there were standards and design modifications, and asked if the design modifications could be approved by staff, and if anything beyond that would need Council approval. Mr. Zenner replied any design modification had to go through the PZC

process with the platting application, and ultimately that design modification had to be approved by Council as part of the legislation. A design modification was similar to a sidewalk variance. He pointed out a variance in the subdivision regulations was very different from a variance in the zoning ordinance. A variance in the zoning ordinance was based on hardship, and that was not the case for a variance in the subdivision regulations. It was a design variation from the expected standard in the subdivision regulations. If an applicant was capable of producing the same expected standard, but in a different manner, it was referred to as a design modification. From an administrative perspective, they were not suggesting they be authorized to approve the design modification. Those would still be subject to the approval of Council because it was a regulatory standard. The threshold for being able to approve it at the Council level was a little less than it would be for a variance.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought harmonizing the fire code with the zoning code made sense, and that they should deny the amendment.

The motion made by Ms. Nauser and seconded by Ms. Peters to amend the Unified Development Code associated with B43-17 by adopting Amendment #42 was defeated unanimously by roll call vote with Mr. Ruffin, Mr. Trapp, Mr. Skala, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Nauser, Ms. Peter, and Mayor Treece voting no.

Mr. Skala commented that at the last council meeting they had approved Amendment #36, which changed the use-based language to a zoning-based designation, as had been recommended by the City Counselor, and noted he concurred with that recommendation. Since they had passed that amendment, some of the neighborhood protections were removed. The idea of including the R-MF category along with the R-1 and R-2 categories seemed like a reasonable way to deal with the scale and balance issues and to restore some of the protections in a few isolated cases. He noted Amendment #45 only affected the interface between the M-DT and residential areas, particularly on the northeast side near the Arts District and in a couple of other places. He did not feel it would affect the cemetery as it would be for new development and redevelopment. He commented that it would restore the idea of scale and balance of the neighborhood protections, and noted he believed it made sense to separate the M-DT from residential uses. He pointed out there was always recourse for relief if there was a hardship or an onerous burden through the BOA.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend the Unified Development Code associated with B43-17 by adopting Amendment #45. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece.

Mr. Ruffin asked how there would not be an impact if the cemetery was zoned R-3. Mr. Zenner replied the impact would be on an M-DT property adjacent to R-MF, R-1 or R-2 zoned properties. He commented that any redevelopment against the cemetery property line would have to abide by the increased 50 foot setback from the common property line.

Mayor Treece stated the cemetery was a red herring, and the more appropriate property description was in the St. James Street and Hubbell Street area where they had single-family properties in what would be an R-MF district with M-DT adjacent to it. He thought they could all agree R-3 was not the appropriate description for the 100-year cemetery.

Mr. Skala commented that if there was R-3 in the North Central adjacent to the M-DT, it would apply there as well. He thought those in a predicament were those single-family homes that were blanket zoned to R-3 in 1957.

Mayor Treece wondered why some felt everyone should have the opportunity to upzone their property, but no one should have the opportunity to downzone their property. He stated he was inclined to support the amendment.

Ms. Nauser asked why commercial property owners had to pay for the sins of what councils did years ago. She understood this only applied to redevelopment, but noted that was a big expense if they had to comply with the setback lines. The building could

not be constructed in the same configuration, and they then might not have that business. She understood they could obtain a variance, but that had a cost of time and money, and the variance was not a guarantee. She did not know why they continued to vilify commercial developments in the community.

Mr. Trapp commented that the law would not look at the intent. It would look at where it applied. Although they might intend it for Hubbell Street, it would also apply to all of the commercial properties that adjoined the cemetery. It would then create the extra barriers to redevelopment. He noted 50 feet was a lot for smaller lots. He appreciated the intent, but did not feel this was the vehicle as it was too broad. He thought they should reject the amendment.

Mr. Thomas stated he agreed with Mr. Trapp. He noted, a long time ago, he had written to Mr. Kroenke as he felt the area he owned would make a good location for a compact, mixed-use village of affordable homes. It was close and walkable to downtown and would require low car ownership. He thought it was misguided to reduce the effectiveness of a vibrant development with setbacks due to it being next to the cemetery, which happened to be zoned R-MF.

Ms. Peters asked staff for their thought on this amendment. Mr. Zenner replied while he thought the intent was noble, he felt the setback standards needed some work. He believed that was a greater issue than the zoning designation. He understood this amendment was intended to protect the fringe neighborhoods immediately adjacent to the M-DT zoning district, which historically had the conflict of increased density. He commented that Council could direct staff and the PZC to review this situation along with the other neighborhood transition standards they had already asked them to review as he thought they could craft something that met the intent of Mr. Skala in a cleaner and simpler fashion.

Mr. Skala agreed his intent was to restore some balance due to the change recommended by Ms. Thompson, which he thought was proper. He pointed out they knew the UDC would likely require some tweaks, and noted adjustments to the setback requirements could be made whether or not this amendment was approved. He noted there had been a lot of "what ifs" in terms of development next to the cemetery. There would not be an impact unless someone wanted to develop right now, and if they did, there was recourse for an exception. He commented that he thought this was likely something the PZC should review further. He understood Ms. Nausser felt they were picking on the business community, but believed the same could be said of the residential community as some of them felt the same way. He thought they should provide as much of a buffer as they could toward the residential areas adjacent to the downtown as that was where the density would be located. He stated he would like to see the amendment succeed, but if it did not, he wanted to revisit the issue in the future.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Mayor Treece to amend the Unified Development Code associated with B43-17 by adopting Amendment #45 was defeated by roll call vote with Mr. Ruffin, Mr. Trapp, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Nausser, and Ms. Peters voting no, and Mr. Skala and Mayor Treece voting yes.

Mr. Trapp commented that since they had not made any substantial changes, he would defer the amendments he had proposed, and asked that they come back as ordinances. He noted they did not have to come back immediately, but he did not want it to be an inordinate amount of time. When this was done, he asked that churches be added to the building orientation issue related to proposed Amendment #48 as they rarely had front doors on the street and could be in any zoning classification. He did not want churches to become nonconforming buildings as he would like them to be able to build on the same footprint if they were destroyed by an act of God.

Ms. Nausser understood several amendments had been withdrawn at the March 11 meeting because they were going to be sent back to the PZC for further review, and

asked about the process going forward. Mayor Treece replied he would rather not prescribe to the PZC what they should take up again. He would rather let them have some discretion and to be able to take a break from the UDC. He stated he also wanted to give the UDC a chance to work, and to hear from the PZC and others as to what was and was not working by the end of the year or the first full year of implementation. He did not feel there was anything in the ordinance that required the Council to assign tasks to the PZC. Mr. Zenner explained the typical process was that when an amendment was presented by a citizen or staff, they asked the Council if the Council was inclined to have the amendments processed given the working relationship between the PZC and the Council. Mayor Treece thought any amendments that had come out of the public input process that the Council had not rejected should be on the table for the PZC to further consider.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed there ought to be a time out period, but noted he would like to pursue the creation of a committee to consider issues and appeals resulting from the UDC. He thought it could be a group of three or five people and could include an officer of the PZC, the BOA, and the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DCLC). He asked staff to bring back a resolution with suggestions of who might be on the group and how it would function. He thought a committee might be useful in navigating the document through the PCZ and then back to the Council. Mr. Thomas commented that he felt the suggestion of Mr. Skala for another committee was cumbersome, and wondered why that would be more effective than simply having the PZC take up any issues when they had spent so much time and energy studying and listening to people already. Mr. Skala stated he thought that was where any issues should wind up, but he also believed there was value in bringing in the BOA and others that were knowledgeable about the process. He felt it would help facilitate the conversation. Mr. Thomas felt all of those people could participate in the PZC public hearings. He did not feel another panel would add anything to the process. Mr. Matthes noted the PZC could hold a meeting with the stakeholders Mr. Skala had in mind to have the conversation.

Ms. Nauser understood the PZC had indicated they had not had enough time to review all of the neighborhood protection standards, and did not feel they should wait another year before reviewing them. She thought they should have them set before they determined how they worked. She wanted to send some of these issues and amendments back to the PZC. In terms of the suggestion of Mr. Skala, she felt another committee would just create another bureaucratic level. The PZC was well-versed in the issues and had dealt with them since the inception. She noted she was also concerned about bringing new people into the discussion that had not been previously involved.

Mayor Treece stated he thought there was some merit to having another committee as it might de-escalate some of the issues from rising to the level of the PZC. Once they adopted the code, the Community Development Director would have a lot of discretion. He thought within the first 12-18 months, there would be considerable hiccups and this committee could advise the Community Development Director rather than provoking a PZC or BOA hearing. They could also present a report to Council at the end of the 12 month period as to whether the project or scheme fit within the spirit of code as had been adopted. He noted this did not need to be decided now. It could be determined in the future when a resolution came forward.

Mr. Ruffin asked if a nonconforming structure would be able to rebuild on the original footprint if it was destroyed by a natural disaster or an act of God as there was some confusion, especially with regard to percentages. If the damage was more than 75 percent, he wanted to know if the nonconforming structure would be able to rebuild on the original footprint. Mr. Zenner replied the standard was broken into two components. One dealt with non-residential and one that dealt with residential. The non-residential was the same as the current nonconforming standard, which indicated the building could be reconstructed without being in compliance with the adopted zoning standards for that district if destruction was less than 75 percent. If it was destroyed greater than 75

percent, it was required to comply with the zoning district standards. The second nonconforming provision was new, and it dealt with residential used properties. If a building was destroyed regardless of the extent of destruction, the building could be rebuilt in substantially the same configuration as it previously existed prior to the destruction. It could be non-compliant as it related to setbacks based on its footprint and other aspects of the code. It would be allowed to be built back provided no greater intensity in the number of units or bulk, meaning height of the building itself.

Mr. Ruffin stated his concern was that this could create undue challenges for some of their smaller, locally owned businesses if approved the UDC with the current wording. Mr. Zenner pointed out that was the current wording in the code, which existed today. They had not changed anything with regard to small businesses.

Mr. Trapp commented that he had spoken a lot with regard to protecting density and connectivity, which in some cases pushed back on the neighborhood protection standards, and wanted people to understand that was in the overall context of all of the neighborhood protections enshrined in the UDC as there were a lot of good items in it. Overall, he felt this struck a balance that served the community well and better honored their values than the previous code. There was a lot of clarity and consistency with Columbia Imagined. Honoring planning was something he had always heard as an important value. He pointed out there were items in the UDC for the development community as the universe of things that could be built by right had expanded. By unifying subdivision and zoning, they had eliminated any conflicts. The number of things that could be done by right in the current code was small due to the conflicts, and removing those conflicts increased those numbers. In addition, the reason for the additional parameters and standards was because the community had become accustomed to a negotiated process to protect community values, sense of space, and the environment. Those were not enshrined in a consistent body of law that could be applied, and there was ample opportunity for people to go in front of the BOA for special circumstances. He commented that he thought there was still work to be done with regard helping small businesses avoid that process. He did not feel some of those issues had to go to the PZC, and could just be drafted for Council consideration. He noted he did not want to make any substantial change to delay what had been a contentious five-year battle, which some stakeholders felt had happened too quickly. He recognized Helen Anthony, who had served the Fifth Ward and who he considered the impetus of this at their very first strategic planning session when she insisted they include growth management as a strategic objective of Columbia and suggested they put \$100,000, which grew to \$150,000, to hire consultants recognizing the hard working staff would never be able to do the exhaustive work without some help. He pointed out this was something he had been involved in almost his entire time on the Council, and was happy to see it come to culmination tonight. He stated he thought this was something they could all be proud of, and noted he was proud of the staff that had worked so hard on it and the PZC that had unanimously recommended it be adopted. He hoped the Council would do the same. He understood there had been battles, but most were along the edges. Most of the code was well within the large center all of them operated in all of the time.

Mr. Skala stated this by far was the most important vote of all the decisions he had been asked to make in his role on the City Council and the PZC. He agreed Helen Anthony had been a big contributor, but recalled Jerry Wade, Barbara Hoppe, and others talking about this progression from the early visioning process, Imagine Columbia. Later, the growth management planning idea had come along, and Roy Dudark, the former Planning Director, had drafted a first version of the growth management planning document, which had grown into a movement supported by Helen Anthony and others to convince the Council to allocate \$150,000 and go through the comprehensive planning process. Ultimately Clarion became involved, and there had been tremendous work by the PZC and others. He noted the role of the Council was to provide some balance and scale for all of

the community members, which included the business community, development community, and the residents of Columbia. He commented that the UDC was a remarkable document, and this was the best City Council he had been a part of as everyone was great when it came to governance and the fact they all wanted to do the right thing. He pointed out this was not the end as there would be some unanticipated consequences and some items would likely have to be further discussed. He appreciated the work of the community and the staff to make this actually happen. He noted he intended to vote in the affirmative.

Mr. Thomas stated he agreed with the comments of Mr. Trapp and Mr. Skala, and thought this process had been a good one. He thought they would want to follow up on the Parking and Traffic Management Task Force recommendation of forming a permanent parking and traffic commission to look at a lot of the parking issues that had been discussed, especially the issue of not requiring parking for 20 bedrooms or less, and then requiring 0.50 if there were more bedrooms. He thought they likely did not want a sharp increase, as zero spaces would be required for 20 bedrooms and 11 spaces would be required for 21 bedrooms. He felt a sliding scale might be more appropriate. He suggested they look at an in-lieu-of fees as well as he believed that was the goal for the parking requirements.

Ms. Nauser commented that this document was a work in progress. It had been recommended for approval by the PZC in its entirety, and people had been provided the opportunity to come to the Council with concerns. She thought the Council had done a good job of listening and compromising. She agreed it was not perfect, and pointed out there were a lot of items in it with which she did not agree. She believed everything would be worked out over time, and encouraged everyone to continue to stay involved. She thought Jerry Wade was likely happy this was finally done after so many years. She reiterated this was not a perfect document, but believed it was a step in the right direction, and outstanding issues would be ironed out in the future.

Ms. Peters stated she agreed developers were not all evil, and without developers Columbia would be in a sad shape. She thanked them for their help in trying to move this along even though many were not happy with the document. As someone that lived in East Campus and drove through Benton Stephens often, she believed landlords tended to get a bad rap as they were the ones that provided a lot of the historic preservation and maintained a lot of the older buildings. She agreed it was frightening when they tore down the house next door, but felt they generally did a good job. She noted she looked forward to working with the landlords and resident property owners on the neighborhood protections. She thought this UDC was a good document and a good way to go forward.

Mr. Ruffin agreed the UDC was a good document. He believed the process had provided sufficient opportunity for various people to be heard, and pointed out it was a living document as it had some flexibility within it. He understood the desire to resolve as many of the issues as possible, but noted they would be able to determine what the problems were over time and adjust from there. He stated he was ready to support the vote at this time as well.

Mayor Treece recognized the entire Community Development Department, but especially Pat Zenner for his work on the UDC. He understood Mr. Zenner had kept a spreadsheet of over 1,000 comments and a comparison of the original code, actions taken, etc. He also thanked the PZC for their work and understood several members had attended the various council meetings involving this topic. He thought, on balance, they had reformed the outdated zoning code and strengthened neighborhood protections by increasing the parking requirement in the downtown and beginning to require sufficient infrastructure before development occurred.

The vote on B43-17A was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

- PH4-17 Consideration of the FY 2016 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER).
- PH4-17 was read by the Clerk.
Mr. Cole provided a staff report.
Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.
There being no comment, Mayor Treece closed the public hearing.
- PH5-17 Proposed replacement of Bridges #5 and #7 and, if funding allows, Bridge #8 on the MKT Nature/Fitness Trail.
- Discussion shown with B74-17.
- B74-17 Authorizing replacement of Bridges #5 and #7 and, if funding allows, Bridge #8 on the MKT Nature/Fitness Trail; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- PH5-17 was read by the Clerk, and B74-17 was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.
Mayor Treece asked what would be done with the timbers. Mr. Griggs replied they would try to use the metal similar to what they did on Bridge #12, but he was not sure what they would do with the timbers. Mayor Treece stated he was not sure how solid they were, but hated to see them discarded when they had lasted this long. Mr. Griggs thought some of them were pretty bad, but noted they would look to see where they could be utilized, if it was possible to utilize them. He pointed out they had not gone out to bid for the demolition work so they could definitely look into it. Mayor Treece suggested a bench, bus stop, etc.
Mr. Skala asked when Bridge #6 had been rebuilt as he recalled a tour whereby the underneath of the bridge was in pretty bad condition. Mr. Griggs replied he thought it had been at least six years ago.
Mayor Pro Tem Ruffin opened the public hearing, as Mayor Treece had stepped away for a moment.
There being no comment, Mayor Pro Tem Ruffin closed the public hearing.
- B74-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: TRAPP (Mr. Trapp stepped out during the vote on this bill.) Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

VI. OLD BUSINESS

- B66-17 Granting a variance from the requirements of Section 25-48.1 of the City Code relating to construction of a sidewalk along a portion of the north side of Proctor Drive, approximately 550 feet east of Creasy Springs Road (811 Proctor Drive) (Case No. 17-16).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.
Mr. Trapp asked if staff had visited the property. Mr. Teddy replied he thought they had. He noted he had not inspected it, but had been by the site. He thought the staff member than had prepared the report to the PZC had because photos were taken.
Mr. Trapp asked if the nature of the transaction was factored into the hardship. He knew there were not tremendous geological challenges except for a maple tree in the preferred alignment and some grading that might create some water discharge issues. He noted this was a \$55,000 transaction to carve off the small rental house and allow the property owner to maintain ownership of the land in the background. Mr. Teddy thought the minutes and application materials had spoken to the drainage concerns as the street had

not been built with a fully improved cross section, curb and gutter, storm drains, etc. They would want to be careful with how the sidewalk was designed so as to not introduce ponding. He thought \$10,000 had been given as an estimate, but noted he was not sure who had provided that estimate. Mr. Trapp stated he thought it was the applicant's estimate, and pointed out she had also spent \$9,000 on engineering fees to get this far in the process. He felt \$20,000 for a \$55,000 transaction was extensive. Mr. Teddy commented that he thought the Council could consider the scale of the development.

Ms. Nauser asked what precipitated the request for the variance. Mr. Teddy replied subdividing the lot, and noted it had gone through Council for a two lot subdivision.

Ms. Nauser noted she had not seen a sidewalk around the park from the pictures that were shown and asked for clarification. Mr. Teddy replied the only sidewalk was in green on the diagram displayed. Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding the yellow line. Mr. Teddy replied it was the sidewalk master plan recommended project in the long term should Council identify funding for an additional CIP project as it would link to another sidewalk providing a route to school.

Mr. Ruffin asked if the proposed sidewalk would connect to anything. Mr. Teddy replied no as there was not any subdivision activity to the east or west. The nearest recent subdivision would be the one at the corner of Creasy Springs Road and Proctor Drive.

Peggy Hendren, 407 W. Phyllis Avenue, stated she was the owner of the subject property, which was a rental property, and after her husband had passed away in 2010, she had gone into debt due to the rental property. As a result, she decided to keep the wooded property to enjoy with her grandson, and get rid of the house. She noted the property sold for \$55,000 and she had received \$39,000 from it. She explained she had also spent \$9,000 in engineering and surveyor fees in this process, and the issues were still unresolved. She understood her request for a sidewalk variance had been denied because staff felt things could be done to reduce the cost. She commented that her engineer had worked with staff to try to come up with a solution from December to the middle of January accruing another \$700 in fees. She realized she needed to stop incurring fees since they could not reach a resolution.

Ms. Nauser asked how many feet from the centerline of the road the sidewalk would have to be located, and whether it would be in front of the telephone pole or if the pole would have to be moved. Mr. Teddy replied the sidewalk would have to be maneuvered to get around the pole and keep the ADA clearance. Normally a sidewalk was placed a foot within the right-of-way line. The sidewalk might have to be curved a bit.

Ms. Peters asked if there were sidewalk standards. Mr. Teddy replied yes, and explained there were sidewalks around town with poles at the edge of the sidewalks.

Ms. Nauser asked Ms. Hendren if the property on the right hand corner of the photo was owned by her. Ms. Hendren replied no, and showed where her property was located. Mr. Trapp stated the subject site looking west was the property.

Mr. Trapp commented that he normally took a hard look at sidewalk variances because sidewalks were a public good. He thought there was limited potential for connections for the sidewalk, but felt the tininess of the transaction should allow for the variance. He noted 25 percent of what she had garnered from the property had already been spent, and the division of this property had created a \$55,000 house, which would allow for someone with very modest means to break into homeownership. She was keeping the other portion as the property as it had been in her family for years, and she was not planning to develop it. He noted she was not making any money off of it, and it being an unimproved road created some real engineering difficulties. In looking at the site, more than half of it had a concrete area that served functionally as a sidewalk. The stormwater was also sheeted off with the way the road was designed. He did not feel it made sense to tear it out because it was not suitable for sidewalk standards only to build a new sidewalk that did not connect as the new sidewalk would be less usable. The sidewalk built for Bear Creek Village ended abruptly at a ditch and did not go anywhere on both ends, so no one used it. There was also a wicked hill on Proctor Avenue so there was not a lot of

walkability or ADA possibilities with a sidewalk. If they built a sidewalk in the future, he thought it was a cost they could socialize across the city. He did not think they would gain anything by making the property owner build it now.

Mayor Treece understood when they had considered these types of requests in the past the property owner had deeded the right-of-way for the future sidewalk construction, and asked if that had happened here. Mr. Teddy replied they would normally get a half-width as part of the platting process, but was not sure what that dimension had been deemed in this case. He noted the lots had already been divided and the property owner had three years to construct the sidewalk. Mayor Treece understood the subdivision had triggered the need for the sidewalk. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct, and at the time the subdivision had gone to Council, there had not been any indication of the need for the sidewalk variance.

Mr. Thomas stated he would not support the variance request. He thought this was a great example of why that procedure had been put in place. There was a sidewalk one lot away to the west and a couple lots away to the east. The purpose of requiring sidewalks to be built under these particular development transactions was to incrementally create the network. He stated he would be happy for the parking area to function as the sidewalk and for the sidewalk to be built as long as it was accessible for wheelchairs, but could not support the variance request.

B66-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B68-17 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking on a portion of the north side of University Avenue, between College Avenue and Ann Street.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece understood there was an amendment sheet to change Ann Street to Rockhill Road.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B68-17 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B68-17, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B82-17 Authorizing an air service agreement with United Airlines, Inc.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Button provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood the private sector had raised funds to assist in the City's obligation to guarantee revenue, and asked about its success. Mr. Matthes replied it had been successful with the original air service guarantee, and his understanding was that these funds had already been raised by their partners. An air service guarantee fund would be created again, and once this was approved, the City would be able to accept the funds.

Ms. Nauser understood they only had to use those funds once with the previous guarantee. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, and pointed out the interest earned had been greater than the amount spent over the course of it. They had been able to return contribution with interest to all of their partners. Ms. Button stated they had the same intention with the fund this time.

B82-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES:

RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B83-17

Authorizing a charitable contribution agreement with the Larry W. Potterfield Revocable Trust for the donation of property located at 840 N. Strawn Road.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser understood there was a park just across the other side of Strawn Road. Mr. Glascock replied yes, and stated he assumed a portion of this land would be added to the park.

Ms. Nauser asked if the house could be turned into a community building similar to the building at Stephens Lake Park, which could be rented, understanding the parkland would ultimately be split from the home by a road. She preferred to use it for other purposes than to tear it down. Mr. Glascock pointed out the home was down to the studs on the first floor due to water damage, so the City would have to fix that if the house were kept.

Mr. Thomas asked if the donation of the land had been freely offered or if it had been solicited by City staff. Mr. Glascock replied it had been freely offered.

Martha Brownlee, 701 S. Greenwood Avenue, commented that the ethics code of her profession as a psychologist was that one never entered into dual relationships because it put one at risk for being influenced in ways that one might not want. It sounded as though this property, which was worth at least \$1 million, was property the City had not sought. It was simply offered. She understood Mr. Potterfield stood to gain significantly by the City putting \$4.5 million into a sewer line to Midway, and stated this seemed like a conflict of interest. It appeared to be a quid pro quo situation.

Traci Wilson-Kleekamp stated she agreed this looked a bit weird and felt the timing was interesting. She believed separation was needed to do no harm. She questioned why Mr. Potterfield was giving the property to the City as that had not been specified in the report. She felt it looked fishy.

Mr. Thomas asked for the estimated cost to build the new interchange to I-70 and connect it to Scott Boulevard and the north circular route through this property. Mr. Glascock replied he had not reviewed the total cost and had only looked at the right-of-way cost, which was \$9 million. It would be an expensive project. Mr. Thomas asked if this was the right-of-way the City would need to acquire if the interchange was to be built. Mr. Glascock replied the \$9 million was associated with the yellow line on the diagram from Route E all of the way down, and not just the interchange. Mr. Thomas understood by accepting this land, the City would not have to acquire that one portion. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. He noted if the interchange were built, the property around it would be a prime commercial area from which the City would benefit if they chose to sell it. Mr. Thomas asked if the land was already within the city limits. Mr. Glascock replied no, and pointed out it would need to be annexed. The city was on both sides of it.

Mr. Thomas stated he recalled \$68 million as the estimated cost of connecting Scott Boulevard to I-70, and did not feel it was a realistic project. He also did not feel it would be good for Columbia to build it. He commented that he was not sure how that related to accepting the land donation, and only wanted to express his thoughts that the Scott Boulevard extension and interchange was not a good plan.

Mr. Glascock explained the right-of-way would be acquired when the property was platted for development. The interchange would be a cost to the City.

Mr. Ruffin asked about the history of the land as he was curious about the house. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know, but understood it was a 12,000 square foot house with nice features except for the first floor. It had a water leak one winter when it was not occupied so the floor and sheetrock had to be removed from the first floor.

Mr. Skala asked if the interchange stood to benefit Mr. Potterfield directly. Mr. Glascock

replied he did not believe so as he did not think Mr. Potterfield owned any other property in the area except on the other side of the creek. Mr. Skala thought one factor might be that it would help development move to the west. Mr. Glascock Mr. Potterfield had never mentioned it in their discussions.

Ms. Nauser asked for the number of north-south crossings. Mr. Glascock replied in that area, there was one at Midway and another at Stadium Boulevard, but the outer roadways were not connected so one had to cross at the Sorrells overpass. He noted the creation of this interchange would relieve traffic on Stadium Boulevard, and the planning for it was likely 40-50 years out. Ms. Nauser hoped they did not wait that long to address Sorrells overpass. Mr. Glascock understood the bridge replacement was on MoDOT's list, but stated he did not know the timing of it.

Ms. Peters asked if this was part of the CATSO plan. Mr. Glascock replied it was.

Mayor Treece stated he thought the deal was a little curious, but noted it would not change his decision tree on extending sewer to Midway. For him certain things needed to happen, and the acceptance of this donation did not change those factors. He pointed out he was more concerned about what the City intended to do with the property. He could see them dividing the property and saving what they needed for the road corridor while selling off the house, preserving a portion for a fire station or police station, and selling off the rest with the profit going into a real estate revolving fund that allowed the City to make strategic acquisitions. This would allow them to purchase properties such as the McAdams property without using phantom, hidden money. They could use proceeds from real estate sales and create a more sophisticated real estate strategy. He thought this might be a way to do it in a significant way without much risk on the part of the City. He understood the house was stabilized, but did not want to create a shelter house, event center, etc. He believed this was a strategic acquisition.

Mr. Skala thought this was perceptive as there were ideas that fit within this donation. He concurred this did not affect his decision on the Henderson Branch extension. He believed this property was desirable should growth demand they move in that direction.

Ms. Nauser stated she felt the City had failed to land bank property in the past as it was not really politically correct to do so. This was an opportunity to receive land by donation for a potential police station or fire station, which they already knew was needed in the area. She noted this was needed in the southwest area of Columbia as well and the Sinclair Farms was likely the last large tract in the area before getting to McBaine and the water treatment facility. She stated available land continued to move further out so when they needed service buildings, it was harder and harder to acquire property. She thought it was beneficial to move forward any time they had the opportunity to obtain land in strategic areas where there was already a deficiency or a future need. She thanked Mr. Potterfield for making the donation. She did not feel this would sway the vote of anyone on any other issue. She noted she would like an animal shelter to be considered as animals were near and dear to her heart.

B83-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B70-17

Authorizing STP-Urban Program Supplemental Agreement #2 with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the Providence Road improvement project from Turner Avenue to Stadium Boulevard; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser asked when work would start on this project. Mr. Nichols replied bids had been received last week, and the contracts were currently with MoDOT for their

concurrence. Construction would begin May 15, which was the day after commencement ceremonies at the University of Missouri. The intersection improvements would be phased along the corridor. Ms. Nauser asked when the sidewalks would be done. Mr. Nichols replied that was not critical to the corridor so the timing for it would be left to the contractor. He explained there was also the potential for coordination with a water main project. Ms. Nauser asked about Birch Road. Mr. Nichols replied he had received the e-mail and staff was currently evaluating it. Council had not directed staff to make improvements to it at this time. Ms. Nauser understood. Mr. Nichols stated they would evaluate Birch Road after this project was completed because it would take on more traffic than it did now.

Mayor Treece asked about the bids. Mr. Nichols replied they had two bidders. Mayor Treece asked who would be the contractor. Mr. Nichols replied the apparent low bidder was Sam Gaines Construction. They had done the work on Hominy Phase 2 at The Links and were currently working on Highway 50 in Jefferson City. Mayor Treece asked how the bid compared to the estimate. Mr. Nichols replied it was the same as the engineer's estimate, which was \$2.3 million. The other bid was \$3.1 million. Mayor Treece understood the plan had been approved in 2015 so this was three years later.

B70-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B63-17 Approving the Final Plat of The Brooks, Plat No. 1 located on the west side of Rolling Hills Road and approximately 1,500 feet south of Richland Road; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-135).
- B64-17 Approving the Replat of Columbia College East Subdivision located on the southeast corner of Range Line Street and Wilkes Boulevard (Case No. 17-56).
- B65-17 Approving the Final Plat of The Villas at Old Hawthorne Plat 9, a Replat of a portion of Lot 5 of Old Hawthorne Plat 1, located on the north side of Screaming Eagle Lane and approximately 850 feet east of Old Hawthorne Drive (Case No. 17-66).
- B67-17 Vacating right-of-way, temporary turnaround, drainage and utility easements between Lots 2 and 3 within the Final Plat of Sutter Industrial, Plat 3 located northeast of the intersection of Paris Road and Waco Road (Case No. 17-52).
- B69-17 Authorizing a third supplemental agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for transportation enhancement funds relating to the non-motorized (GetAbout) pilot project.

- B71-17 Accepting conveyances for sidewalk, street and temporary turnaround purposes.
- B72-17 Authorizing an agreement with Robert M. Doroghazi for replacement of existing three-phase electric service on property located at 115 E. Bingham Road.
- B73-17 Authorizing a first addendum to the power purchase agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the sale of wind energy and associated credits produced by Crystal Lake III.
- B75-17 Authorizing the City Manager to execute a grant of easement for sewer purposes with Boone County Regional Sewer District for the construction and maintenance of a force main sewer line across two tracts of land managed by the Parks and Recreation Department located adjacent to Creasy Springs Road.
- B76-17 Authorizing a facilities and services agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the use of Peace Park for the Fourth of July Celebration and Fireworks Display.
- B77-17 Authorizing Amendment No. 3 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for public health emergency preparedness services.
- B78-17 Authorizing an educational affiliation agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri, on behalf of the University of Missouri-St. Louis College of Nursing, to provide health clinical experience and instruction for nursing students.
- B79-17 Authorizing an agreement with Columbia Public Schools for the Healthy Eating and Active Living (HEAL) program.
- B80-17 Accepting a donation from Central Bank of Boone County, Missouri for the 2017 Fair Housing and Lending Seminar; appropriating funds.
- B81-17 Authorizing a license agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the use of a portion of the Columbia Regional Airport for certified instruction and training programs for police and fire education.

- R33-17 Setting a public hearing: proposed reconstruction of Taxiway C at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- R34-17 Setting a public hearing: proposed demolition of structures located on City-owned property at 1104 Worley Street and 1105 Again Street to correct storm water and sanitary sewer issues.
- R35-17 Adjusting the stipends for city council members in accordance with Article II, Section 7 of the Home Rule Charter for the City of Columbia, Missouri.
- R36-17 Authorizing an agreement with Columbia Access Television (CAT) for operation of the public access channel in FY 2017.
- R37-17 Authorizing the public sale of Sewerage System Revenue Bonds, Series 2017.
- R38-17 Authorizing the public sale of Special Obligation Improvement Bonds (Solid Waste System Project), Series 2017.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R39-17 Finding the structure located at 512 McBaine Avenue is a dangerous structure; authorizing an exception to Ordinance No. 022992 relating to the administrative delay on the demolition of structures in specified areas.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

The vote on R39-17 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE. 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.

- B84-17 Authorizing the issuance of Sewerage System Revenue Bonds, Series 2017.
- B85-17 Authorizing the issuance of Special Obligation Improvement Bonds (Solid Waste System Project), Series 2017.

- B86-17 Approving the Sinclair Estates O-P Development Plan located on the northeast corner of Southampton Drive and Sinclair Road (Case No. 17-63).
- B87-17 Approving the Final Plat of Sinclair Estates located on the northeast corner of Southampton Drive and Sinclair Road; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-65).
- B88-17 Approving the Final Plat of Fox Creek Subdivision Plat 1 located on the west side of Highway PP (3891 N. Highway PP); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-24).
- B89-17 Approving the Final Plat of Cobblestone Cottages Common Area, a Replat of Lot C1 Cobblestone Cottages, located on the southeast corner of Route K and Old Plank Road; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-35).
- B90-17 Vacating a utility easement on property located at 1110 and 1114 Wilkes Boulevard, adjacent to Pannell Street (Case No. 17-72).
- B91-17 Vacating utility, water and sewer easements along the south and east sides of property located at 1900 I-70 Drive Southwest (Case No. 17-41).
- B92-17 Appropriating funds received from Dunafon Enterprises, Inc., for payment in lieu of construction of an internal bridge over Mill Creek and a sidewalk along a portion of the east side of Scott Boulevard, to the Scott Boulevard Phase III street improvement project (Vawter School Road to Route KK).
- B93-17 Authorizing the City Manager to execute a quitclaim deed to the State of Missouri, through the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission.
- B94-17 Authorizing construction of the St. James Street and St. Joseph Street PCCE #24 sanitary sewer improvement project; authorizing the Purchasing Division to call for bids or contract for the work.
- B95-17 Accepting conveyances for temporary construction, drainage, utility and BMP purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.

- B96-17 Accepting conveyances for underground utility, electric utility and water utility purposes.
- B97-17 Authorizing Amendment No. 2 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services relating to the Teen Outreach Program (TOP); appropriating funds.
- B98-17 Authorizing a financial memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Social Services - Family Support Division to expedite the filing and processing of electronic Medicaid applications for provision of presumptive eligibility for the Show Me Healthy Babies and MO HealthNet programs.
- B99-17 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Carollo Engineers, Inc. for an update of the preliminary design report relating to the expansion of the McBaine Water Treatment Plant; appropriating funds.

X. REPORTS

- REP20-17 Commission on Human Rights 2016 Annual Report.
Mayor Treece understood this had been provided for informational purposes.
- REP21-17 2017 Pavement Management Plan Report.
Mayor Treece understood a work session had been held on this issue previously, and that this had been provided for informational purposes.
- REP22-17 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.
Mayor Treece asked when the Council would receive a review of the preceding fiscal year in terms of money left over from each department and amounts overspent or underspent. Mr. Matthes replied the audit was complete so they had the overall number. They were now calculating the portion for each department. The larger number was public as it was in the audit report.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Steven Turner stated he was speaking for himself with regard to the cold weather outside. He noted he had been on the streets for several years in the rain and without any heat. The bus station was the only place that had been open to keep warm as other places that were open were businesses. He kept a tree limb with him, which he had on day one. He reiterated the bus station was the only place he could go to get warm. Mayor Treece asked how many other people like him needed help. Mr. Turner replied he thought there were likely many. He commented that he did not have any remorse or animosity. He only wanted the Council to know what little was available to the homeless. Mayor Treece thanked him for reminding them and asked Mr. Turner if he could connect him with some support services.

Mr. Ruffin asked Mr. Turner if he had been in Columbia the entire time he had been homeless. Mr. Turner replied yes. Mr. Ruffin asked how long he had been homeless. Mr. Turner replied 5-7 years.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, asked Mr. Turner to tell his friends to come to the Council as well as it helped to see faces. He commented that some people were not welcome at certain facilities. He asked the Council to get something started so the homeless could have hope as more success stories were needed. He noted he had a lady friend that was in a homeless shelter today. He reiterated assistance was needed.

Ms. Nauser stated the election was April 4, and noted she wanted to remind the public that the gentleman that tried to recall her was running for a position.

Mr. Trapp explained Janet Thompson had sent the Council a letter asking for support as Boone County was pursuing an integrated tool focused on criminal justice and homelessness data. It was technical assistance grant and the response to the RFP was due on April 7. He thought the strongest way they could offer their support was via a letter of support signed by all of them. He noted he had a sample draft that could be shared with everyone. He thought there was a huge intersection between the jail population and folks that were struggling with homelessness, as so many aspects of homelessness were criminalized. They received tickets, but then did not pay those tickets, which resulted in warrants and arrests. He felt they could better serve people with more information. He understood it had been endorsed by Kelly Wallis, Keith Hoskins, jail administrator, Rusty Antel, Kelli Canada, University of Missouri School of Social Work, Mary Epping, court administrator, Katie Wilkins, Veterans Administration, and Steve Hollis.

Mayor Treece asked who the letter would go to. Mr. Trapp replied the funding agency. Mayor Treece asked what it would entail. Mr. Hollis replied he thought Boone County was trying to assemble letters of support from the major stakeholders, which included Columbia. The letter would go to CHS, which was the intermediary non-profit that was administering the federal funds. Mayor Treece stated he would like to read the letter, and noted he was inclined to support it.

Ms. Peters stated she was also inclined to support it as she had seen the e-mail.

Mr. Trapp noted Ms. Amin could share the letter with everyone as he had provided it to her.

Mr. Skala asked for a resolution to come forward establishing a committee with the heads of the PZC, BOA, and perhaps the DCLC that was relevant to the decision made today with regard to the UDC so they could discuss it.

Mr. Skala asked that the PZC review the issue of 50 foot buffers in relation to the R-MF district they had discussed earlier today, and provide a recommendation.

Mr. Skala thanked the staff that had been involved in the UDC as it was a big deal since it had lots of implications. He also thanked those in the public that had participated in the process.

Mr. Skala noted he would miss the April 17 and June 5 council meetings.

Ms. Peters explained she spent part of her weekend cleaning up Rock Quarry Road as there had been a litter clean-up event from 7:30 - 9:30 a.m. on Saturday. She noted it had been coordinated by the Office of Neighborhood Services, and the street crews from the Public Works Department had come out to ensure there was a truck behind and in front of them so they were not run over. She wanted to thank those involved for taking the time on a Saturday to ensure the citizens were safe.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 10:49 p.m.