



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Tuesday, September 5, 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 Tuesday, September 5, 2017, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Boy Scout Troop 233. The roll was taken with the following results: Council Members PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, and THOMAS were present. The City Manager (left at approximately 9:48 p.m.), Deputy City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of August 21, 2017 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Ruffin.

Mr. Thomas asked that B247-17 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

Ms. Peters asked that B246-17 and B256-17 be moved from the consent agenda to old business and that R123-17 be moved from the consent agenda to new business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B246-17, B247-17, and B256-17 being moved to old business and R123-17 being moved to new business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Thomas.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC53-17 Laura Wacker, Peaceworks - Input, concerns, and an offer of assistance with moving the Climate Action Plan forward.

Laura Wacker, 1617 Paris Road, explained she was the Sustainability Coordinator for Peaceworks and thanked the City Council for agreeing the need for a Climate Action Plan and Mayor Treece for joining the Climate Action Network. She stated she was excited the City would work to follow through on the commitment to reduce the production of greenhouse gases. In 2006, the Council had voted for a similar action, but had not followed through, and the City's emissions had gone up overall even though the per capita emissions had gone down. If it had not been for the Columbia Water and Light energy efficiency and renewable energy programs, the per capita emissions would have likely increased as well. She believed Columbia, as a community needed to do better, and noted communities like Lawrence, Madison, Urbana, and Kansas City had better per capita greenhouse gas emissions scores. She suggested the City of Columbia act in a decisive and bold manner as she wondered how they would handle torrential downpours

of increasing intervals, like Hurricane Harvey, if they did not take drastic measures to reduce carbon emissions. She listed other extreme weather events, such as the severe monsoon season in Asia that had resulted in over 1,200 deaths due to flooding, the drought in Italy that was crippling food production, and the burning of many acres of trees in Montana due to wildfires. Prior to the recent resolution, a coalition had been meeting on this subject, and they hoped the Council would agree with their vision of Columbia becoming a leader in the carbon footprint reduction in the Midwest. She understood Georgetown, Texas, a community that was powering its municipal power plant from renewal sources, had seen its energy policy as an economic development tool, and hoped Columbia could do this as well. She noted Kansas City had recently resolved to procure 100 percent of the electricity for municipal operations from renewables in three years. In addition, ten states had set goals of 50-80 percent reduction in carbon emissions by 2050. She believed Columbia had many advantages to allow them to be better. She stated they wanted Columbia to commit to a 100 percent reduction of carbon emissions by 2050. There were great minds at the University of Missouri, Columbia had a well-educated public, and the City of Columbia and the University of Missouri had the benefit of their own utilities. She noted those concerned about what Columbia was doing in terms of climate change included the Sierra Club, Renew Missouri, Citizens Climate Lobby, Show Me Solar, Protectors of Water and Land, People's Visioning, the Columbia Climate Change Coalition, and the Interfaith Care for Creation, and pointed out several of their members wanted to be on the planning committee for this project. They stood together in expressing the desire to see a climate action plan developed as expeditiously as possible and for the City to have a consultant on board by the end of October. She stated the Council had the important role of setting goals for the Climate Action Plan and hoped they would agree that a 100 percent reduction in the carbon footprint by 2050 was a good goal. She commented that she thought the work could begin immediately and without waiting for the consultant to decide how to proceed. She provided building codes mandating efficiency, continuing incentives for efficiency, installing electric car charging stations, and city energy use as methods to attain zero emissions. She stated they were here to help and hoped the process could move forward as soon as possible.

SPC54-17

Laura Mitchell - Other costs of racial bias in policing.

Laura Mitchell, 909 S. Greenwood Avenue, explained she was a member of Race Matters, Friends, and felt some officers might have more bias than others when dealing with the community of color, but noted there were also policing policies that had resulted in different consequences for minority persons than those of the white majority, which was referred to as institutionalized racism. She understood three neighborhoods in Columbia had been identified as having a high percentage of violent crime that was often gang-related, frightening, and hard to control, and the current model of policing, which was referred to as saturation provided for additional officers in those neighborhoods that were making more frequent stops. She pointed out there were still good people living in bad neighborhoods, and they tended to be caught in the net that was thrown out to catch others. She explained there was a price to alienating parts of the community, and that was to make them suspicious of the police. She displayed statistics from the Prison Policy Initiative showing the number of people incarcerated in the United States at this time, and pointed out 70 percent of people in local jails had not been convicted of any crime. They were generally people that could not afford to post bail. According to the *Justice Initiative* written by Gary Oxenhandler, the cost was about \$40 per day to keep someone in the Boone County Jail. In Missouri, 30,000 people were in prison, making it one of the top five states per capita, and the biggest single line item in the State budget was attributed to jails. She understood Governor Greitens wanted to address this by reforming the prison system, and pointed out New Jersey had eliminated cash bail

because it unfairly targeted the poor. The options now were to stay in jail because of a being flight risk or a danger to the community or to be released. She noted there had been a 20 percent drop in the jail population this past year as a result of this. She understood searches were requested of lot of people of color that were pulled over due to the smell of marijuana, but on the other side of town, there was more binge drinking, drug experimentation, sexual assault, and alcohol poisoning, and very few of those people had to go to jail because they could be bailed out. She commented that there was a high cost related to police misconduct even if the officer was not prosecuted as communities had paid out millions and billions of dollars due to police misconduct or wrongful death. She asked the Council to consider supporting efforts to eliminate cash bail and the current policing structure, and to find ways community policing might be more cost effective.

SPC55-17 Puri Wilson - Acknowledgement of our native sanctuary in Missouri.

Puri Wilson commented that she was retired registered nurse who had lived in Columbia for the past 37 years and was representing Its Our Wild Nature. She explained she had been born in the Philippines and had spent her childhood and college years enjoying the native plants and trees in her grandmother's backyard and garden. She had a lot of fond memories walking in grass paths, loving nature, and marveling at the diversity of humans interacting with animals and plants. She had arrived in the U.S. in 1978, and when she had come to Columbia in 1980, she had been very impressed with the vastness of the landscape and the greenery and cleanliness of the environment. She soon began growing her own plants without regard to whether they were native. She commented that five years ago, when living in the country, she had noticed the decreasing presence of bees, but after her retirement a year ago, she had realized every voice raised in support of wild life could make a difference and make things happen by working together. She stated she believed native wildlife was seriously threatened and that they were losing their natural habitat at an alarming rate as the increasing population required more and more land for roads, homes, schools, businesses, etc. She explained Jane Goodall, a great environmentalist, had indicated the single most important thing they could do was to create and maintain wildlife corridors. This required native plants and undisturbed native areas, such as creek banks and riparian corridors. She commented that a typical person could help by making their backyard and front yard a wildlife haven so it supplied basic food, water, cover, etc. as it would provide for the needs of a lot of species of wildlife. If enough people did this in certain areas and neighborhoods, birds, butterflies, and pollinators would then have a corridor linking them from one area to the next. This would allow them to stay so they could all cohabitate. She suggested they bring nature back to Columbia so they had sanctuaries of peace and quiet in their backyards where they could walk on grass instead of cement or gravel. She displayed a photo of her nature sanctuary, which was also known as the Altis property and a great place to reflect and rejuvenate. It was located in her backyard, off of Bluff Dale Drive, and was accessible to the public. She explained she was in the process of reducing her lawn size by creating new plants and transitioning her non-native ornamentals to native species, and felt every person that discovered the beauty and rewards of going native would add to the habitat of wildlife.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- PH30-17 FY 2018 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
Discussion shown with B230-17.
- PH31-17 Consider changes to the sanitary sewer utility rate, sanitary sewer utility connection fee and waste hauler disposal service fees.
Discussion shown with B230-17.
- B220-17 Adopting the FY 2018 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
Discussion shown with B230-17.
- B221-17 Amending Chapter 11 of the City Code as it relates to Public Health and Human Services Department fees.
Discussion shown with B230-17.
- B222-17 Amending Chapter 12A of the City Code as it relates to stormwater utility charges.
Discussion shown with B230-17.
- B223-17 Amending Chapter 13 of the City Code as it relates to hauled liquid waste rates.
Discussion shown with B230-17.
- B224-17 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to parking fees.
Discussion shown with B230-17.
- B225-17 Amending Chapter 17 of the City Code as it relates to Parks and Recreation fees.
Discussion shown with B230-17.
- B226-17 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to transportation fares.
Discussion shown with B230-17.
- B227-17 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to solid waste rates and services.
Discussion shown with B230-17.
- B228-17 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to sanitary sewer utility rates and sanitary sewer utility connection fees.
Discussion shown with B230-17.
- B229-17 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to accounts and billing and water rates.
Discussion shown with B230-17.

B230-17 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to electric rates.

PH30-17 and PH31-17 were read by the Clerk, and B220-17, B221-17, B222-17, B223-17, B224-17, B225-17, B226-17, B227-17, B228-17, B229-17, and B230-17 were given third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if Option 4, which was the new staff proposal, would eliminate the need to raise paratransit fares. Mr. Matthes replied these options did not include finding other ways to pay for paratransit services or for free service for special events. He felt those issues, which involved \$75,000, could be delayed if they could get to a \$500,000 reduction. Those would only help to reach the 5-year window sooner.

Mr. Thomas understood Option 3 included a flex route for three other routes, the orange, brown, and purple routes, in addition to the light green, dark green, and pink routes, and asked if that combination would save the full \$500,000 needing to be saved. Mr. Matthes replied yes.

Mr. Thomas stated he wanted to start moving toward the Olssen and Associates recommendations and believed the flex routes had been proposed for all six of those routes. Mr. Brooks explained they had proposed flex zones that would cover the majority of the routes, but not all of the routes in their entirety.

Mr. Thomas asked how staff envisioned the process of designing the flex routes. Mr. Brooks replied he thought they would want to research other cities that were utilizing flex zones as there were not very many, and it would be new to them. The reason staff had suggested Option 4 was because it would provide time to implement a flex zone in a lower use area to determine how it would work before moving forward with the entire Olssen proposal.

Mr. Thomas understood the Saturday schedule would be utilized for the entire week with Option 4. Mr. Brooks stated they would still begin at 6:25 a.m. during the week instead of 10:00 a.m., but the off-peak rotation would occur all day for those routes.

Mr. Thomas stated he was not very excited about Option 4, and explained he would rather look at the ridership at different times of the day if they were going to reduce service to determine if they could tailor the routes to when most people were utilizing the routes.

Mr. Skala commented that he was not excited about any of the cuts, but noted it appeared Option 4 would have the least impact on ridership. He thought they could then shift to flex routes for Option 3 in the future when it became necessary and the flex routes were ready for success. He understood both would restore the original savings of \$505,000. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas understood staff felt replacing three routes with a flex zone would save about \$250,000 per year. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas commented that he wished they had been able to implement the Olssen and Associates proposal without a deficit because they could then experiment with replacing the low ridership routes with flex zones and put that extra money into better service on the routes that were well used.

Mr. Pitzer asked about the change in frequency of bus service by moving to the off-peak schedule. Mr. Brooks replied the light green and purple routes were 40 minute routes, and the change would mean one route would run for 40 minutes and then a switch to the other route would occur with that also running for 40 minutes so there would be 80-minute headways between stops.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the flex system would require different equipment. Mr. Brooks replied yes. He explained they would likely want to use smaller vehicles for the flex service, but they did not have many smaller vehicles. Mr. Pitzer asked if staff had determined a cost estimate. Mr. Brooks replied the current cost of the smaller vehicles was about \$60,000-\$70,000 each, and they thought they would likely need 4-5 additional smaller vehicles. Mr. Pitzer asked if they would lose money if they were to get rid of the larger vehicles they no longer needed. Mr. Brooks replied the federal government would not allow the City to sell those for a profit so he would need to look into it more closely.

Mr. Thomas understood Mr. Brooks had indicated that in order to implement the flex system, the City would need to purchase 4-5 vehicles at \$60,000 per vehicle. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct. He thought they would need additional smaller vehicles unless they did a modified flex system whereby they did not pick people up at the doorstep, but instead asked them to get to a certain bus stop for pick up. Mr. Thomas understood the concern was for big vehicles traveling into neighborhoods. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct as they had already received complaints. In addition, the larger vehicles were difficult to maneuver on streets with cul-de-sacs. Mr. Thomas asked if the \$300,000 of vehicle purchases had been factored into the savings or if it had been considered a capital expense. Mr. Brooks replied it had not been factored. He explained some grants were on the horizon for them to purchase smaller vehicles, but they had intended to use those as replacements for current vehicles that were beyond their useful life. If they moved to the flex system, they would just retain those vehicles. He noted they were likely 6 months away from finalizing the purchase of those vehicles.

Mr. Trapp understood Option 4 could be a transition for staff to learn how to do flex routes and build capacity, which could then lead to something more like the proposal of Mr. Pitzer. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct. He explained it was helpful that there was already quite a bit of paratransit ridership in the area of the pink route due to a dialysis clinic being located nearby, and this was where they would start the pilot project.

Mr. Matthes continued the staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding the one percent ballot and five percent operating breakdown. Mr. Matthes replied it meant that of the six percent, one percent was the result of a ballot that had passed. Mr. Thomas understood the voters knew the one percent was coming when they had voted for the ballot. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas felt all six percent involved operating expenses. Mr. Matthes replied the ballot involved more capital and maintenance projects, and noted the operating costs could include projects as well, which it did in this situation.

Mr. Matthes continued the staff report.

Ms. Peters asked how the amount of capital reserves was determined. Mr. Matthes replied it was based upon what they wanted to achieve in terms of projects, and some of it was ballot funded while others were funded with operating funds. He noted a past Council had asked for smaller annual increases versus higher increases every three years, and therefore staff had planned for that method. The timing could be changed again. The primary way to lower the amount spent was to push projects further out into the future.

Mayor Treece asked how the projects that had been identified for cuts had been determined. Mr. Matthes replied they had looked primarily at most recent decisions, and provided the backflow program as an example as it had previously not been in the budget. They had recommended only reducing it by half. He noted the Council could choose something else as these were only the recommendations of staff. Mayor Treece asked if any other reductions had been considered or rejected. Mr. Johnsen replied they had been asked to provide a list of potential reductions and explained he would have to ask the staff of each operational division why they had chosen what they had chosen. He understood this was what they felt would fit the best based on different scenarios. Mayor Treece asked if they had been given any parameters to consider in making the recommendations. Mr. Johnsen replied the only direction provided was to consider reductions in accounts that would be minimally impactful and would make sense given the amount of reductions. Mayor Treece asked if it was suggested they cut the most politically popular programs. He commented that he would prefer a full list of possible reductions from which they could choose. Mr. Johnsen stated they would provide more if that was the desire of Council. Mayor Treece explained he thought this Council had made backflow prevention and other programs a priority, and the last in, first out approach was not a realistic approach. Mr. Johnsen stated he would ask the divisions to double the amount of reductions so the Council could determine what they would like to reduce.

Mayor Treece noted he would like to be provided real time expenditures and revenues to determine if they were making progress in closing the gap. The January 31, 2017 report had indicated revenues for the electric utility were up eight percent and production expenses were down nine percent. As a result, he thought they might be closing the gap. Mr. Johnsen explained the water and electric utilities were seasonal so revenues and expenses fluctuated depending on the season. As a result, it was hard to evaluate within the existing year where they would be at the end of the year. Mayor Treece noted they were close to the end of the fiscal year now. Mr. Johnsen agreed, but understood the report referred to had been as of January or February. Mayor Treece explained he had referred to that report because it was the most recent one available. He stated he wanted to see where they were in closing the gap in meeting the cash target. Mr. Matthes commented that they would provide more current numbers.

Mr. Skala understood budget targets were determined as part of the budget process and asked if they considered best and worst case scenarios in terms of fee increases and whether the Council would be agreeable to those increases. He wondered if there was a list of potential cuts or if this was a reactive process whereby the list had just been generated during the last couple of weeks. Mr. Glascock replied he had asked for the list of potential reductions based on the comments made at the budget work session. He pointed out items on the CIP list did not get cut. They were only pushed back to future years. They looked at what they might be able to hold off on without impacting the system.

Ms. Peters asked if what was displayed illustrated the impact of no rate increases. Mr. Matthes replied yes. He explained they wanted to show that the outcome could be any variation between what had been proposed to be adopted, something less, or nothing. This showed the impact of no increases in any of the utilities. Ms. Peters understood all of the proposed rate increases would generate about \$200,000. Mr. Matthes stated no as it would generate much more. He explained they were trying to show each fund and how the change would impact that fund. It was not each idea, it was each fund. He described the impact to the general fund in terms of revenues and expenses, and noted there were similar impacts to the other funds. Ms. Peters asked for the projected increase to the budget if all of the rate increases were approved. Mr. Matthes replied it would be the opposite of the numbers shown for each fund.

Mr. Pitzer understood staff was projecting a decline in revenue by almost \$2 million if there was not a rate increase for the electric utility, and asked if that was correct. He also understood that even with a one percent increase next year, the projected revenues would decline. The amendment sheet, however, showed a \$1.3 million effect of the rate increase. He asked if there would be an almost \$2 million decline in revenue if there was not a rate increase. Mr. Johnsen replied he would have to look at the numbers to understand the specifics, but generally revenue increases were affected by the two factors of rate increases and customer growth. Mr. Pitzer stated he understood. Mr. Matthes understood the FY17 budget showed \$136,463,283. Mr. Pitzer explained he was looking at the estimated number because he assumed that had updated numbers, and it showed \$139,004,283. He stated that could be further discussed later. He noted in FY18 there was a miscellaneous expense of \$1.6 million, but in FY17, it was zero, and asked for clarification. Mr. Johnsen replied he did not know at this time, but pointed out staff would provide an answer later.

Mayor Treece understood the City had closed on the sale of the Sutter property in March or April and that those proceeds had gone back to the utility. He asked which fund benefited from that money. Mr. Matthes replied the electric utility. Mayor Treece asked if staff viewed that as a net increase to the target cash reserve or if they were holding it for something special. Mr. Johnsen replied it would be an increase to the cash reserve, but money had been taken out of the cash reserves to pay for it originally a few years ago. Mayor Treece understood that had created a negative impact a few years ago, and it was now creating a positive impact. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct, but noted it had

created an overall negative impact. Mayor Treece asked which month the money had been deposited. Mr. Johnsen replied he did not know the accounting process behind it. Ms. Thompson stated it had occurred this fiscal year. Mayor Treece agreed and thought it had happened in the spring. Mr. Matthes explained it was a \$3 million expense a few years ago and was a \$2 million revenue this spring. Mr. Skala understood the money had gone back into the same fund from which it had come. Mayor Treece understood that was the electric target cash reserves. Mr. Thomas pointed out \$500,000 was being held in escrow so not all of it had come back permanently. Mayor Treece agreed.

Mr. Matthes continued the staff report.

Mr. Trapp asked if they would be able to implement the neighborhood parking program if they made the budgetary change as he understood they needed staff time and capacity in addition to money. He wondered if just adding money would allow the program to proceed. Mr. Matthes replied it would allow them to start the implementation process as there was not a specific program to fund at this time. These funds would allow for a manager for the program and enforcement efforts. Mr. Brooks reiterated they did not know what the program would cost at this time because they did not know the scope. They did not know if enforcement would be required 24 hours a day, seven days a week, only on weekends, the number of blocks, etc.

Mr. Thomas understood the parking program had been implemented in one neighborhood. Mr. Brooks agreed, but noted it was close to the regular enforcement area, making it easy to absorb. They did not know what it would take to expand the program to more neighborhoods. Mr. Thomas understood the lack of capacity to research the issue and engage the neighborhoods in order to design the program had been holding up the process. Mr. Brooks agreed. He commented that the Parking and Traffic Management Task Force that had worked from July to December had made some strong recommendations about forming a commission and hiring a consultant to look at the parking needs citywide, and noted staff had been waiting to be directed prior to moving forward. Mr. Thomas stated he thought they would be provided direction tonight to establish the commission.

Mr. Skala explained he had served on the Parking and Traffic Management Task Force and believed a commission was needed as the focus of the Task Force was to provide input on the Unified Development Code (UDC). He noted he had also been the Chair of a Subcommittee of the Task Force that had dealt with some of the neighborhood issues, including the parking permit program, and there had not been a consensus with regard to parking meters in the neighborhoods. He understood staff preferred an increase to the cost of parking meters instead of an increase in the cost of parking permits, but thought businesses would not be happy with parking meter increases as it would increase the cost to their customers to park. He stated the neighborhood parking program was a long time coming and each neighborhood was different. He commented that there had been success in the Arts District with the pilot project, but pointed out they did not have to do what was done there everywhere as they could stripe areas to keep people away from other people's driveways, provide hangtags only, etc. He noted they did not have to utilize parking meters.

Mr. Matthes continued the staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Cheryl Price, 511 Parkade Boulevard, stated she was Chair of the Public Transit Advisory Commission and explained the Commission had not had a chance to meet since Option 4 had been proposed, but she personally thought most people would be satisfied with that option. She understood the concern with the flex routes was the need to schedule everything ahead of time, similar to the process with paratransit. She believed conducting a pilot flex zone program with the pink route would give them a chance to determine the scheduling demands while still providing the most service to the most people, which she thought should be the goal. She understood people preferred not to schedule a day in advance even if the routes were running 80 minutes apart, and

reiterated she believed Option 4 was a good choice.

Ms. Price commented that Ms. Zeterberg, who served on the Public Transit Advisory Commission and the Disabilities Commission, had to leave, but had asked her to relay to the Council to not raise the paratransit fare. Ms. Price asked the Council to not raise it by more than \$1.50 if it had to be raised.

Steven A. Smith, 1603 Canton Drive, noted he was President and CEO of Job Point and explained he was asking for \$250,000 from the FY16 general fund savings to go toward a down payment on property at 400 Wilkes Boulevard. He stated Job Point had a long and strong relationship with the City of Columbia, which was continuing to grow and reap mutual benefits, and pointed out they had placed a number of their clients in city jobs over the years. He commented that the purchase of the property at the current interest rates would save money because they would no longer have to pay rent. It would also allow them to serve more clients. The economics of the strategy was similar to why most of them owned their own homes instead of renting. He stated no other entity in the State of Missouri provided the comprehensive programming Job Point provided as most only included one or two of the three primary programs they had, which were youth build, the rehabilitation unit, and trades classes. They served 400-500 clients per year, and most were City of Columbia residents. He commented that they had played a significant role over the years in growing the local job force, lowering recidivism, assisting clients in overcoming barriers to employment, and thus reducing poverty. He explained they had applied for CDBG funds for this purpose this year and had been the highest rated proposal that was not funded due to the lack of funds. He noted Section 3 of the 2016-2019 City of Columbia Strategic Plan specifically indicated how Job Point itself assisted in meeting strategic goals, and pointed out Job Point addressed several other sections of the Plan as well, such as affordable energy-efficient housing for low-to-moderate income first time homebuyers. He stated the executive summary of the Five-Year Consolidated Plan for CDBG funds called out the specific goal of providing vocational training to 70 participants, and contracts awarded to Job Point had historically been the primary reason the City had met those requirements. Enhancing the number of clients served by Job Point would assist the City in meeting its federal requirements. He noted they had recently placed three clients in Federal Highway jobs with base pays exceeding \$40 per hour, and two of the three were minority clients. He understood the Council received numerous worthy requests for scarce city funds, but felt few would provide the same return on investment as this would. He reiterated the savings from owning versus renting would allow them to serve more clients that would obtain more jobs, pay more taxes, and pull themselves and those they support out of poverty, which would ultimately enhance Columbia. He noted they would be willing to restrict the funds in accordance with CDBG rules, which meant it would in effect be a loan as they would have to return the funds if they sold the property without reinvesting in a similar property or if they did not use the funds for the purpose originally designated. He thanked the Council for their consideration.

Ms. Peters asked where Job Point was currently located. Mr. Smith replied 400 Wilkes Boulevard. He explained they rented the building now. Ms. Peters asked if this was where they would stay. Mr. Smith replied yes. He explained they would purchase the building they currently utilized. Ms. Peters asked for the purchase price of the building. Mr. Smith replied a specific price had not been negotiated, but he believed it was \$1.2-\$1.25 million based upon a three-year old appraisal. The money they were requesting was for the down payment on the property. They would look for additional funds to pay down the mortgage. Ms. Peters asked if they had organized a capital campaign. Mr. Smith replied no. He explained they were waiting for a lead gift prior to organizing a capital campaign, and they likely could not have afforded it until this year. They were now in the position to purchase the property, especially with current interest rates.

Mr. Ruffin asked if Job Point had a board of directors. Mr. Smith replied yes. Mr. Ruffin

asked if they were a volunteer board. Mr. Smith replied yes. Mr. Ruffin asked if they would be willing to serve as the capital campaign committee. Mr. Smith replied they would set up a capital campaign committee and a number of them would serve on it. It would not be exactly the same members as they would look for other expertise. Mr. Ruffin understood it should not cost them anything. Mr. Smith thought there might be a minimal cost. He commented that in the last fiscal year, every member of the Board of Directors had donated to Job Point, and the total cash donations were over \$40,000. There were also a few thousand dollars of pledges outstanding that were yet to be paid and a number of in-kind gifts. He stated they had a very strong and committed Board.

Ms. Peters asked how much the current rent was per month. Mr. Smith replied \$9,750 per month. He noted it was fair market rent and had not been raised for several years.

Mr. Trapp asked if an amendment would need to be made to bring Job Point back into the allocation process. Mr. Matthes replied he understood it was currently in the proposed budget so they would reject the amendment to remove it if they wanted it included.

Pat Holt, 3705 Monterey Drive, stated she supported funding for Columba Access Television (CAT) and asked the Council for its support. She commented that CAT was valuable to the community as it provided educational opportunities for people of all ages and affordable production services for local non-profit organizations and fought for equality and equity of voice throughout all segments of the community. She noted she had recorded League of Women Voters events, Angela Speck explaining the eclipse, several town halls, and other programs for viewing on CAT or YouTube. She stated she had worked alongside many different socio-economic layers of society and had learned from them, and believed CAT provided a productive way to bridge the gap of ageism, racism, and sexism. Due to the participation of interns, it also encouraged town and gown participation. She asked the Council to vote in favor of approving the proposed funding of \$35,000 to CAT this upcoming fiscal year, and noted she would support additional funding as well if there was that opportunity.

Mary Hussmann, 210 Ridgeway Avenue, asked who would be impacted by the rate increases. She wondered if it would just be the resident families or if the University of Missouri, various colleges, and apartments would be required to pay more as well. Mr. Matthes understood Ms. Hussmann wanted to know if the proposed increase would be across customer classes or only one specific class. Mr. Johnsen replied it would be across all customer classes and rate structures. The only exception was that there was a lot of focus on the base charge for the water utility to drive that amount toward the cost of service study numbers. Mayor Treece understood that was the case to the extent the existing rate structure was equitable.

Shelly Silvey, 3712 Godfrey Drive, explained she was representing CAT as the President of the CAT Board of Directors and noted she empathized with the Council for having to make such hard fiscal decisions to benefit the public as CAT had recently been through such cuts. They were currently operating with a staff of one and had moved to save on rent and utilities. Every financial decision over the past year had been made with longevity and survival in mind. She commented that even with massive cuts, they had seen a renewed interest in CAT through increases in membership, classes, non-profit organizations utilizing their facilities with video support on their channel, and fundraising. She stated the majority of their budget was funded by the City of Columbia, and although they were currently relying on reserves, they appreciated the support of \$35,000 through the City's general budget and hoped for continued support.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, wondered, with regard to flex zones, how staff would choose which zone to test, etc. He encouraged the spending of money to allow Olssen and Associates to work with staff on this process. In terms of the solid waste increase, he understood the residential rate with the bags was in the black and had been supporting all of the other solid waste items. He questioned the statement of reducing the number of bags to save money unless something had changed significantly and suggested raising rates on the other services that were in the red as it sounded like

political payback for the vote against moving away from the black bag system. He wondered why there would be a rate increase in the sewer utility when none of the projects would occur in this next year. He commented that the budget process started early and believed the Council could obtain more information earlier in the process. In terms of the residential parking permit program, he understood the City had insisted they accept parking meters because that would fund it. He did not feel those that lived there should have to pay for it. He asked the Council to look into the use of enterprise revenues to fund major capital projects as he felt a lot of the problems were a result of past decisions, such as that. He was also not sure they should rely on enterprise funding instead of bond funding, and suggested a consultant be hired to explain the positives, negatives, etc.

There being no further comment, Mayor Treece continued the public hearing to the September 18, 2017 Council Meeting.

Mr. Thomas commented that he thought he liked Option 4 for the bus system overall as it achieved the budget reduction needed and would allow them to conduct a pilot flex route project. He understood the black route would be adjusted to cover some of the area the dark green route would lose, and the dark green route was the only route that would be completely cut. Mr. Brooks explained the vast majority of the ridership of the dark green route would be picked up by light green and black routes. Mr. Thomas stated he hoped they could evaluate the pilot as it progressed because he felt that was a good step for the bus system. In terms of parking, he noted he supported a ten cent per hour increase to fund additional staff for enforcement as he believed enforcement was lacking and many of the parking issues were a result of weak enforcement. It would also help neighborhoods develop and potentially pay for parking permit programs. He commented that he was conflicted on the utility increases at the moment and pointed out his main concern was the equity between low volume users and high volume users and current users and future users. He understood these increases would follow previous cost of service study recommendations, but he was not sure he agreed with those cost of service study recommendations.

Mr. Trapp pointed out an amendment would in fact be needed if they wanted provide funding for Job Point, and asked staff to prepare an amendment sheet. He thought it would be appropriate for the City to be a lead supporter to allow them to develop a capital campaign. He explained he had made the same argument for Welcome Home when they had decided to support their capital campaign, and noted the lack of fundraising capacity spoke to the need. Having run a similarly-sized non-profit organization, he understood it was a difficult environment with funds primarily geared towards programming. The ability to obtain capital funds was limited. He believed this was an appropriate use of one-time funds and noted it was consistent with the strategic plan. He commented that he did not feel it showed favoritism to Job Point to say their mission overlapped with the City's strategic objective of living wage jobs as an answer to poverty. He stated he thought they could magnify their ability to have impact through partnerships as government was not able to answer all of the great social ills, and they would have to look at more partnerships. In terms of the rate increases, he explained he had asked himself if they were adequately funding their investments in infrastructure. The projects they had pulled from the CIP list were chosen based on what they could afford to do and not necessary the projects that needed to be done. He was concerned about continuing to starve it of funds because of a problem with a particular policy as it would punish the City in terms of water quality, etc. He thought there was a good case for all of the rate increases and pointed out they were never popular. He noted Ameren had raised its rates, but just did not do it via a big public process. Mayor Treece stated there was a 10-month process for Ameren to raise its rates whereby over 100 people reviewed it. In addition, they had to justify it before the Public Service Commission. He commented that the Council had only received the proposed rate increases 30 days ago and felt it was unacceptable to expect them to approve them *carte blanche*. Mr. Trapp noted Ameren did not have a local

process that was covered by the local media so those increases tended to go unnoticed by the public unlike the City's public process. There were a lot of processes in Jefferson City, but they were not as close to the hearts of people. He agreed Council had the responsibility to monitor the municipal-owned utility, but did not feel starving the utility of necessary funds was the best way to manage it. He planned to vote to adequately fund infrastructure because he understood the huge unmet needs involved.

Mr. Skala commented that it was very frustrating to receive reports for rate increases without the corresponding reports needed to inform them and the boards and commissions that were supposed to inform them, but noted he was prepared to support some rate increases if the rate increases embodied a progressive structure as he preferred to decrease the amount paid on the low end and increase the amount paid on the high end. If he received assurances this was how they were structured when possible, he stated he could support the rate increases. If they could not reach a consensus, he noted he would suggest a compromise of granting half of the rate increases in the short term until they could be provided the necessary data to adjust the figures for the next fiscal year as he was reluctant to agree to all of the rate increases without that information, but also did not want to cut necessary programs. He understood the City had been accused by some of hiding \$305 million in a Swiss bank account and that a citizen had analyzed the budget and did not feel that was the situation except that there might be \$8.8 million in surplus. He noted he planned to ask staff to review that analysis. He also understood some felt Columbia should have enough income to provide the services needed and wondered where all of the money was disappearing to if that was not the case. He felt the increase cost of service fees and permits were a reflection of the torrid pace of growth within Columbia as it had been the fastest growing community in Missouri. It was a direct result of the cost of unsustainable growth and concomitant expansion of required city services. He agreed there were lots of benefits to growth, but noted there were also tremendous costs. He stated they were trying to catch up with costs of torrid growth with a shrinking budget. In terms of the general fund savings, he explained he believed incentive based budgeting was a good idea because it created an incentive for Departments to be creative. He understood Mr. Pitzer had suggested they put the remaining money of about \$160,349 into a fund for future fire stations. He agreed future fire stations should be funded, but felt the amount was a pittance in terms of paying for a fire station. He suggested the money be used to implement the strategic plan. He explained he had participated in a number of East Area neighborhood meetings, which were a result of the strategic plan, and the people in those neighborhoods wanted sidewalks and street lights. He thought the money should be used for infrastructure in the implementation of the strategic plan so they could do some of the projects requested by those in the underserved areas. He stated he wanted this money placed in an infrastructure fund in the context of the implementation of the strategic plan.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he needed more information before he could make a decision on the rate increases. He understood the utilities operated on their own with their own revenue sources and own expenses, but felt a for-profit enterprise would face a steep challenge if they asked for a rate increase based on the level of customer service and customer satisfaction experienced over the past year. He thought there was a lot of funding for the implementation of the strategic plan. The math could be done with regard to its percentage compared to the percentage used for the pension. He believed it was imperative to set aside a portion of the funds for public safety since it was such a need in the community and felt they were not fulfilling their obligation if they did not do so.

Mr. Ruffin stated he was still waiting to be persuaded that the utility rate increases were necessary and was concerned that in a year when they were raising rates in so many areas, they were also talking about increasing the hourly rate for parking to fund a program that would be targeted toward specific neighborhoods. They would be asking everyone to pay for a program that would benefit only a few neighborhoods. He explained

he was waiting to be convinced that this was fair and equitable. He commented that the work of Job Point was unquestionably valuable and consistent with the strategic plan. He noted they provided excellent service as he knew several young people that had benefited directly from their programs. He had seen how it had not only changed their lives, but had changed the lives of their children and parents so it had a generational benefit. He believed, however, the proposal by Job Point was a bit premature as they did not know how much the building would cost and did not have a plan or vision as to how the additional funds would be raised. He felt it was premature for the Council to allocate the money at this time. He stated he wanted to see a more comprehensive report or proposal from Job Point that addressed how they planned to secure the funds to purchase the building. He suggested the money be held in reserve until that information was available. Mr. Trapp state he would okay with bringing the Job Point proposal forward at a later date when they had a firm plan in place if they held the funds in reserve in the meantime.

Mayor Treece explained monopoly and investor-owned utilities like Ameren had a very specific and very formal rate setting process that went through the Public Service Commission. It was about a 10-month process and an independent attorney went through all of the financial records to determine if the proposed rate they were asking for was acceptable based on the impact to consumers, the revenues of the company, and an acceptable profit margin. He noted he was trying to adopt the same formal process for their own monopoly utility as people did not have a choice as to whether they had Columbia Water and Light as their utility provider. He wanted to ensure they were scrutinizing and being highly skeptical of all of the numbers they brought to Council. Part of his frustration was that they did not have accurate numbers. It was all based on forecasts and projections and financial reports that were 8-9 months old. He wanted to know where the Sutter property money and the \$1.6 million in miscellaneous expenses Mr. Pitzer mentioned earlier were banked. He commented that he would draw a distinction between the sewer and stormwater rate increases as he felt they had done a good job of engaging the public, presenting accurate information to the Council, and taking the input and priorities of Council and making it part of their agenda. In addition, they were under a pretty rigorous agreement with the Department of Natural Resources to make the capital and infrastructure improvements they all wanted. He could not say the same for the water and light utilities, which was why he wanted them to be highly skeptical and expect the information requested to be delivered in a timely fashion before proceeding with those rate increases.

Ms. Peters asked what Boone Electric did when they had rate increases. Mayor Treece replied they were a mutually owned cooperative so they had a board of directors that was elected by their members and their members received a rebate when they had revenues that exceeded expenditures.

Mr. Thomas commented that he did not view the residential parking program as a benefit for a particular neighborhood. He viewed it as a long term strategy to ensure people were not cheating the system by parking where they should not park. The problem was that they were trying to implement tighter parking restrictions downtown so people were parking in the nearby neighborhoods. If they addressed the issue in the nearby neighborhoods, he felt they could enforce parking downtown, create a more balanced choice, and improve the bus system, which could lead to a less car-oriented paradigm.

Mr. Skala explained he would likely favor an increase in the parking permit fees to fund some of this, but would likely not favor an increase in parking meter rates due to the downtown merchants and the burden it would place on people that parked downtown. Mr. Thomas stated he was agnostic as to whether there was an increase in the permits or the meters. He only wanted to move forward with the neighborhood residential parking program as he believed it was a good program that had to be funded in some manner. Mayor Treece noted he would also favor permits over meters.

PH32-17 Proposed construction of the Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road intersection improvement project.

PH32-17 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols, Ms. Anderson, and Todd Kempker, a consultant from Bartlett and West provided a staff report.

Mr. Matthes left the meeting at approximately 9:48 p.m., and Mr. Glascock, the Deputy City Manager joined the meeting.

Mayor Treece asked how those traveling east and west on Green Meadows Road that did not want to turn right would enter the traffic of the roundabout without having to be forced in the right lane and exit on to Forum Boulevard. Mr. Kempker replied if one was heading westbound on Green Meadows Road, the goal would be to get to the splitter island so the two lanes would need to be crossed. It operated the same as any dual lane or partial dual lane roundabout. With a full dual lane roundabout, it would be slightly more confusing and difficult because there were two lanes entering into the roundabout. The proposed roundabout only had one spot for the person to be headed toward.

Mayor Treece commented that both of those lanes would be full of cars if the congestion was as bad as the photo had indicated. Mr. Kempker understood that was a concern and noted a video had been created by the City of Columbia to illustrate how traffic would flow. He stated that if one counted the cars in this video and compared it to the vehicle traffic data on Forum Boulevard at peak times, the video had a higher traffic count. The City had inflated the traffic slightly because of the expected growth. He understood the skepticism, but explained traffic would not back up if they had the right traffic solution in the right place. The reason traffic backed up today was because everyone that went through that intersection had to stop. At a roundabout one could go straight on through without having to stop, which meant the queue would never develop. He noted he also reviewed some studies and displayed a graph. The bottom axis of the graph was the Forum Boulevard traffic, and the other axis was the capacity of the roundabout based on the traffic on Forum Boulevard. It was essentially showing the number of gaps. He explained he was not concerned about the Country Club Villas movement because if there were enough gaps coming the other way, there would be enough gaps for them because it was only a third of the traffic than from the other direction. The graph actually showed the other movement, and the curve illustrated there were enough gaps for 600 cars per hour in the intersection. One side of Green Meadows Road had about 300 vehicles. The pre-school side of Green Meadows Road only involved 75 vehicles. When looking at the actual traffic upstream of the queue that developed because people were stopping, people could make a left turn 6-8 times per minute on average, meaning the wait was about 8-10 seconds for a gap. He believed those from the pre-school and Country Club Villas would have to wait 6-8 seconds for a gap with a roundabout. The signal would create a wait on red of about 90 seconds. As a traffic engineer, he believed the roundabout would provide a lot more gaps and less wait times for Green Meadows Road than a traffic signal.

Mayor Treece asked if doing nothing had been an option for the 57 people that had provided input. Ms. Anderson replied she did not recall the nine different opinions provided. She explained the comment sheet did not provide any options. It only asked for comments. Most people indicated what they wanted and why. Mayor Treece asked if doing nothing was an option or if something had to be done. Mr. Kempker replied this intersection fell outside of the range of an all-way stop option. It was operating at a level D or F when an intersection should operate at a level C or B. It was operating, but causing more of a delay than an intersection should at this location. Mr. Nichols explained the leave as it was option did not rank high when reviewed for both safety and capacity. Mayor Treece asked if it was at a level D all times of the day or just an hour in the morning and in the evening. Mr. Kempker replied intersection capacity was always controlled by peak times. Any intersection would function fairly well at non-peak hours.

The level of service was based on peak times.

Mr. Skala noted people tended to be more cautious by yielding to vehicles within the roundabout when first utilizing them, but as people became more accustomed to them, they tended to try to beat the vehicles within the roundabout. He asked if the modeling in terms of incidents of accidents had taken that into account. Mr. Kempker replied the studies had included time frames of longer than one year, and the numbers had indicated crashes were less in frequency and severity than signals. He also noted the City was collecting statistics on roundabouts in Columbia. In terms of speed, he explained they were purposeful in designing roundabouts to certain speeds. The curves were purposefully included to slow or stop traffic. He noted the roundabout had been designed for speeds of 15-20 mph. Someone might be able to drive 25 mph, but it was not designed for 35 mph traffic. Mr. Skala commented that it was amazing the speeds some people drove on roundabouts.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Tim Vicente, 1303 Torrey Pines Drive, explained he was representing a group of citizens that would be impacted by a roundabout and noted he had a petition signed by 150 people. Signatures included people from Country Club Villas 1, Country Club Villas 2, and the pre-school, but most were signed by those residing in Country Club Villas 2. He noted he also had a letter that had been sent to Mr. Pitzer by Don Johnson, the President of Country Club Villas 1, indicating they did not like the roundabout option. He understood 27 people had indicated they liked the roundabout, but many others had indicated they did not. This was a conversation about a 4-lane and 2-lane roundabout and the neighborhood that could be impacted by the roundabout in terms of safety. He described what they had today in that it was a residential setting with homes or a pre-school at every corner. He displayed the roundabout at Old Hawthorne as it was the same size as the roundabout that would be placed at the Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road intersection, and noted there were no homes around that 4-lane and 2-lane roundabout. He thought the Council should consider the impact of a slab of concrete in the middle of a residential community. He questioned if the roundabout that would be constructed at this intersection was the right size for the traffic on Forum Boulevard or if they were just squeezing it in the existing right-of-way. If roundabouts were good in terms of safety, he wondered why they did not convert every intersection within the City of Columbia to a roundabout. He commented that a left turn out of Walgreens, Providence Bank, and D. Rowes was a huge problem today and those living in the Woodrail neighborhood could barely turn left on to Forum Boulevard at this time. He believed it would be worse for those people if there were no breaks in traffic. He explained he had monitored driver etiquette at roundabouts and felt no one waited to allow someone else through the roundabout. He understood 80 percent of the traffic on Forum Boulevard was through-traffic, and did not believe that traffic would ever stop with a roundabout. He felt more people would travel Canterbury Drive with the roundabout if those from Green Meadows Drive could not get into the flow of the roundabout easily. He understood 27 percent of the traffic from the Woodrail neighborhood toward Nifong Boulevard turned left, and it would be harder for them to navigate with four lanes. He also felt pedestrian safety would be worse because those accelerating into the roundabout would not see people crossing the roundabout. He pointed out the Highway Safety Institute had indicated a roundabout was the best choice where there was an unbalanced traffic flow with high volume on the main street and light volumes on the side streets, and believed this intersection was unbalanced in terms of traffic flow. He was not sure how staff could say the Institute report did not pertain to this intersection.

Mayor Treece asked how many homes were in the Villas. Mr. Vicente replied there were 64 units in Villas 2 and 59 units in Villas 1. Mayor Treece asked if there was another exit out of the neighborhood. Mr. Vicente replied one could go to Doral Drive as it led right into Forum Boulevard. Mayor Treece understood there was a median there and those traveling Doral Drive to Forum Boulevard could not turn left. Mr. Vicente stated one could

cut across.

Mr. Vicente believed a traffic signal could be a solution as they could include sensors to even the traffic flow when traffic on Green Meadows Road was light, and that could help to avoid the 90-second or 2-minute delay. He reiterated a roundabout would create safety issues at two other intersections. He also understood Mr. Thomas had indicated traffic was not increasing on Forum Boulevard, and had not increased in 20 years between Chapel Hill Road and Nifong Boulevard. He commented that spending \$975,000 on a roundabout at the intersection of Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road had been a bad idea a year ago, but one year later, the City wanted to spend \$1.16 million. He wondered why anything needed to be done.

Mr. Skala asked Mr. Vicente if he was an advocate for stop lights. Mr. Vicente replied he was against a roundabout.

Bob Roper, 3404 Woodrail Terrace, explained he had lived at this location, which was near the Green Meadows Road and Forum Boulevard intersection, for over 15 years and noted the intersection continued to become more and more of a challenge and problem. He stated he was not surprised to see improvements to the intersection on the list of projects needing attention two years ago when they voted for the capital improvement sales tax extension. He commended staff for its analysis and for providing citations of studies that had been conducted on roundabouts as a compelling case had been made. He stated he thought the roundabout was the right option for this intersection, and the main reason was how much safer it was than the other options, particularly in terms of serious injury and fatality accidents. Roundabouts made it difficult to be T-boned at 50 mph. Any collision would be angled and involve slower speeds. He understood roundabouts were safer for pedestrians and bicyclists, which was why the Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission had voted to support the roundabout at this intersection. Another reason he was supportive of the roundabout was because it was more efficient as it would reduce the delay in getting through the intersection even with slower speeds. He commented that this was not a Fifth Ward only issue as it was a City of Columbia issue as there were not that many north-south corridors. Forum Boulevard was an arterial street and Green Meadows Road was a collector street, and the roundabout was best equipped to handle traffic from growth. He agreed the roundabout was expensive initially, but in the long-term, it was likely the cheaper option. Once built, the maintenance and repair issues were minimal compared to those of stop lights. He stated he had faith in the City staff and engineers. Since he was not trained as a civil engineer, he did not feel his non-professional judgement should be substituted for their expertise. He suggested they give deference to the professionals. He pointed out the citizens had voted on this two years ago as part of the capital improvement sales tax extension. The project did not appear in the ballot language, but there was a list of projects associated with the ballot proposal, and this was one of the projects on the list. He stated the ballot issue had passed with a 65-70 percent approval rate citywide and within the Fifth Ward. He hoped the Council would be mindful of the voters.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Roper if he recalled whether the vote was for a roundabout or just intersection improvements. Mr. Roper replied he thought it was for a roundabout. Ms. Peters stated she thought it had just been for intersection improvements. Mr. Nichols explained some of the projects specifically indicated roundabouts while others did not. He could not recall how it was worded for this intersection.

Eleanore Wickersham, 3632 Augusta Drive, explained traffic was backed up bumper to bumper every night, which was why she was concerned there would not be gaps for those on Green Meadows Road to get to the roundabout. She thought they would end up like those in the Grasslands neighborhood who were trapped due to the traffic on Providence Road. She noted the Country Club Villas 1 Homeowners Association had voted to oppose the roundabout. They had 59 units with at least two people in each unit, so she felt they trumped the 27 people that had indicated they were in favor of the roundabout. She also understood many in Country Club Villas 2 and the Sedona neighborhood did not

want a roundabout either. She stated she was not sure why they were discussing this again when it had been voted down before. She agreed something needed to be done because it was a dangerous intersection, but did not feel it should be something that would make life more difficult for them. She noted she was concerned about emergency vehicles being able to get to the many elderly people that lived in the neighborhoods and about the disruption that would be caused to construct it. She also wondered if the waterline near the intersection would be relocated or buried deeper, and if the cost for it had been considered. She believed simple signals would be the best solution. She stated her appreciation for the time staff had put toward this project, but felt they were biased. She understood roundabouts were trendy, but thought those living nearby deserved the best and not what was trendier or cheaper. The gentleman that had studied the intersection to determine how often there would be gaps had done that in July when the students were not in town, and as a result, she did not feel they could rely on that information. She pointed out the Council was there to represent what the people wanted and most did not want the roundabout.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the vote by the Homeowners Association had been unanimous. Ms. Wickersham replied no. Mr. Pitzer asked for the vote count. Ms. Wickersham replied she did not recall.

Mr. Glascock noted the project list associated with the capital improvement sales tax ballot (B113-15) had "Forum & Green Meadows Int Imprvmnt (Roundabout)" listed.

Glenn McElroy, 3420 Woodrail Terrace, explained he represented Woodrail Unit 8, which included three condominiums and a total of five people, and commended staff for a thorough report and thoughtful recommendation. He noted he drove this intersection at least twice a day, and more times than that on many days. He believed there were only two options that made any sense at this time, and those were the partial double lane roundabout, which was recommended, and to do nothing. The other four options were a waste of money in his opinion as they would solve very little if any of the issues. The recommended partial double lane roundabout was a step forward in addressing current issues and investing in the future by preparing for anticipated growth and anticipated increases in traffic. Doing nothing would not address anything, and would kick the can down the road requiring it to be dealt with later when it would cost more and be more difficult to accommodate. He pointed out he had questioned roundabouts when they were first introduced to Columbia, but had since had the pleasure of dealing with the many roundabouts of various sizes in Fort Collins, Colorado, and felt they worked extremely well. He agreed they were a little intimidating when first encountered, but noted one was able to catch on quickly in terms of how they worked. He commented that Woodrail Unit 8 strongly supported the approval of the proposed partial double lane roundabout as recommended by staff.

John Frerking, 4108 Southern Pine Court, commented that he lived southwest of this particular intersection and was an engineer that was not working on this project but had worked with the City of Columbia on other projects in the past. He noted he had a newspaper article that had the wish list of projects the citizens would vote on in August of 2014, and it referenced a roundabout. Near the end of the article, it had indicated the City Manager had stated the projects on the list were placeholders and that the City would address the projects in some way. He agreed the list likely did not tie the project down to one thing or the other, but it did indicate it would be addressed in some fashion. He commented that the intersection was under capacity at the current level of traffic and had been for quite some time. This would only get worse so it needed to be addressed whether via a roundabout, J-turn, or traffic signal as they would all work operationally. He noted he drove the partial double lane roundabout at Range Line Street and I-70, which involved a lot of traffic, on a regular basis and gaps appeared. He thought the J-turn would be an unusual option, and as a corridor user, he asked that he not be led to the temptation of going through a red light at 10 p.m. at night while waiting at the intersection for the light to change. He stated he supported the roundabout recommendation.

Richard Royer, 1515 Woodrail Avenue, stated he was President of Woodrail Homeowners Association No. 4, representing about 60 homes on the north side of Woodrail Avenue, west of Forum Boulevard. He explained the Association had not met for a formal vote so his comments only reflected the canvassing of about two-thirds of the members over the course of the summer through backyard conversations. He thanked the staff for its great work even though there were areas in which they disagreed. He commented that conversations with regard Forum Boulevard had been ongoing for over four years when staff had indicated part of the long-term plan was to do something about the Green Meadows Road and Forum Boulevard intersection due safety issues at a meeting at the Country Club of Missouri as it had been the highest ranked accident intersection along the corridor. He stated he had talked to 54 residents throughout the Association over the course of the summer about what to do since they generally agreed something needed to be done, and 37 felt the roundabout idea was the best, most practical idea to keep traffic moving. Fifteen were in favor of a conventional traffic light and two did not care what was done. He explained he agreed with most of his neighbors in favoring the roundabout, largely because of the safety factor as he believed someone would be killed by someone running a red light if there was a traffic signal. He was impressed with the statistics provided by staff in that there would be a 62 percent reduction in the opportunity to hit someone in a roundabout than other conventional options, and thought that was important to the discussion at hand.

Glen Ehrhardt, 2906 Shoreside Drive, explained he was the President of the Lake Woodrail Homeowners Association, which included about 200 homeowners, and noted they had not had a formal vote on this subject even though they had discussed it extensively. He complimented and commended staff for the work they had done. He stated he had lived in this neighborhood for 14 years and the traffic had increased considerably at this intersection. He believed the traffic would continue to increase in the years to come. He explained he drove through the intersection approximately four times per day. In the morning, he had to cross over to turn south on to Forum Boulevard from his neighborhood, and it only took a few seconds most mornings. Upon arriving at the intersection of Green Meadows Road and Forum Boulevard was when traffic tended to grind to a halt. It often took 90 seconds to 2.5 minutes to turn east on Green Meadows Road. He stated the capacity of the intersection was lacking and felt a roundabout would solve the problem. In the evening, when traveling west from Green Meadows Road to Forum Boulevard, traffic backed up considerably because there was only one turn going west on Green Meadows Road. Cars waiting to turn left were keeping cars from turning right on to Forum Boulevard. A roundabout would eliminate this and allow traffic to go through. He commented that he believed because the traffic backed up past Canterbury Drive now, many people tended to cut through on it, and felt the roundabout would eliminate this. He pointed out there was also cut-through traffic on Lake Woodrail from Lynnwood Drive to Crestwood Lane to Forum Boulevard going both directions, which a roundabout would eliminate. He explained that when the intersection was backed up during peak capacity, it was difficult, if not impossible, for fire trucks, ambulances, and police cars to expeditiously go through the intersection because they had to wait for traffic, which was stacked in all directions. He believed a roundabout would help address that situation as well. He asked the Council for their support and consideration of the roundabout proposal.

Richard Hadfield, 16 Lucerne Court, noted Lucerne Court was cul-de-sac, which was located catty-corner to Green Meadows Pre-School, and 36 years ago, when he had moved there, it was a cute little community. Green Meadows Road was at the end of Columbia. There were no churches, banks, or grocery stores. Forum Boulevard stopped at the creek as there was no bridge across the creek. He had watched traffic grow to the point it was nearly impossible to get off of their street and on to Green Meadows Road in the mornings and late afternoon. They were at the mercy of any kind motorist to let them out. If they wanted to turn west, away from the intersection, they had to edge out slowly

to ensure they would not be hit by an oncoming car. He commented that the City employees and engineers had studied the intersection and had recommended the roundabout as the safest solution, which he supported. The traffic would constantly move with a roundabout making it easier for them to get off of their street at all times. He believed a four-way traffic light would be a disaster for them. Traffic would be totally stopped when it was red with no one letting them out, and when traffic was green, there would be a mad dash to get through before the light turned red again. He felt the push for the four-way light by some citizens was due to the fear of not knowing how to drive through a roundabout, and noted anyone could log into YouTube and look at any of the hundreds of videos that showed how they were to be used. He stated it was not a fad of traffic control as they had been used in Europe since the eighteenth century. He had personally driven through them and walked around them in Europe and had walked around them in Columbia, and had never been hit walking or driving a car through a roundabout. He commented that he had been amazed at all of the facts that had been posted for them online, especially the page of documentation indicating the safeness of roundabouts. He asked the Council to listen to the engineers they had hired and paid dearly to do the job they had asked them to do.

Damian Schroeder stated he was with Green Meadows Pre-School, and although they had preferred the roundabout, they had been concerned about its impact on the pre-school. The initial roundabout concept would have impacted half of the parking lot and a sidewalk would have been located only three feet from the corner of their fence. Due to the impact, they had indicated support for a traffic light the last time this issue had been before the Council. They were now supportive of the roundabout as it was by far the best in terms of safety.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Schroeder if the pre-school would be able to keep the crayon fence with the roundabout proposal. Mr. Schroeder replied yes.

Mr. Schroeder stated the roundabout was safer and would digest traffic more quickly than any other option. The gaps would be there. He understood some did not believe that since they had not seen gaps previously, but he believed there would be gaps.

Mayor Treece asked how many kids attend the pre-school and how many parents came to the pre-school twice a day to pick up and drop off their kids. Mr. Schroeder replied there were 100-115 kids and 30-45 staff members.

Laura Hutton, 15 Lucerne Court, stated she lived on a cul-de-sac with only eight houses, but they were impacted by the traffic problems of this intersection, which was why she supported the roundabout if an improvement was made to the intersection. She noted she did not know that not doing anything was even an option at this point. She believed they should listen to the experts, and those experts felt the safest design for the intersection was the roundabout. She explained her daughter had attended the Green Meadows Pre-School for more than three years, and they felt more comfortable driving her there than walking her there because crossing it by foot was not safe. When improvements to this intersection had been discussed a year ago, she had not been supportive of the roundabout because she did not understand how pedestrians would navigate a multi-lane roundabout. Now that the engineers had showed them exactly where the crosswalks would be, it made sense and she felt it would be safe. She stated her street would be negatively impacted by a four-way stop so if they did not move forward with the roundabout, she would strongly encourage not doing anything.

Bonnie Epps, 4550 Old Mill Creek Road, commented that three roundabouts were being proposed as one would be on her street and understood the cost at Old Mill Creek Road and Nifong Boulevard was estimated to be \$3 million, the cost at Sinclair Road, which was only three block away, was estimated and \$3 million, and this one would cost over \$1 million. She was worried about the cost as there were other needs like water, sewer, etc. She noted she had moved to Columbia in 1960 and agreed there had been growth. She commented that there was a stop sign down the road on Nifong Boulevard where a huge bus stopped, and this scared her to death as people were coming around the bend.

She stated she was not in favor of the roundabout, and explained she lived in a great neighborhood where people would waive her through so she generally did not have to wait longer than 46 seconds.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he liked the fact staff had balanced safety along with capacity, but did not know how all of the projects in this area had been identified for the 2015 ballot when they did not have a large area south/southwest transportation plan that looked at Nifong Boulevard, Forum Boulevard, Green Meadows Road, Bethel Street, etc. He believed a change at this intersection would impact other areas and did not feel any of these projects should be funded until they had a plan as a larger analysis was needed. He agreed with the roundabout as they could move more traffic at lower speeds, but thought some of the capital improvement sales tax money should first be used to fund a south/southwest area transportation plan as they would then have meaningful foundational data.

Weldon Webb, 1408 Torrey Pines Drive, stated he could fill up this room with expert reports that were wrong and believed there was a chance this one was wrong as well. He commented that there were a number of 18-wheelers that traveled this intersection to turn left or right, and that movement would be difficult creating the need for repairing the roundabout when it was run over. He endorsed using this money for an area plan as was suggested by the previous speaker because he did not believe this would solve the problem and felt it would create more problems.

Steve Schultz, 3410 Chatham Drive, stated he lived a couple of streets down from Green Meadows Road to the east and had lived there for 13 years. He explained he worked for a design engineering company, but was not involved with this project, and was representing himself as a resident. He believed there was a need for this project as it was currently unsafe. He noted he would not allow his son to travel through the intersection on his bicycle now, but would with a roundabout. He understood the Council had approved a Vision Zero plan a few months ago, and felt that should trump any other options as roundabouts were the safest choice for these types of intersections in terms of pedestrians, bicyclists, and vehicle traffic. He did not feel they had any other option if they truly believed in the Vision Zero plan. Roundabouts were a trend because they were safe. Currently six vehicles would travel to this intersection at one time, and the delay was the result of determining who would go next and those traveling the same direction did not always go at the same time. As a result the wait could be 10-15 seconds per movement. He stated he had cut through on Scottson Way in the past and to the northeast in order to avoid the traffic, and that created a safety issue on those other streets. If traffic flowed better, he would not cut through on other streets.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, suggested they not do anything at this intersection and wondered if they could utilize traffic calming measures instead. He pointed out seniors, like him, tended to not like anything new that would cause confusion.

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

Mr. Pitzer asked if 18-wheelers and buses would be able to navigate the proposed roundabout. Mr. Kempker replied yes. It would be sized to handle any truck movement the City felt was needed.

Mr. Pitzer noted Mr. Vicente had shown pictures of the concrete roundabout on Highway WW and pointed out this area was unique in the sense there was a wide median and it was established. He thought the entire Forum Boulevard corridor was a jewel in the sense they had a wide boulevard in an urban setting. He asked what could be incorporated into the island so it was not just concrete. Mr. Nichols replied they could stamp the concrete or use other techniques on it. He noted the splitter islands could accommodate landscaping like the middle island of the roundabout. They would team up with a landscape architect as they moved forward with the final design to bring those qualities to the design. They would also hold concept reviews and have discussions regarding the look of the roundabout. The purpose of this public hearing was to provide direction so staff could move forward.

Mr. Ruffin asked for a proposed timeline. Mr. Nichols replied they were already a year behind so they would move forward as quickly as possible. Ms. Anderson thought construction would likely occur in the summer of 2019 if everything fell into place. Mr. Nichols explained the process would involve moving utilities, acquiring rights-of-way, working with property owners, etc., and those were time consuming items. In addition, it was ideal to start construction when school was out so there was less traffic.

Mr. Thomas stated he would support the roundabout this time as it was clearly much safer than a traffic signal due to speeds and the deflections created by roundabouts. He agreed with others in that the staff presentation was excellent as it provided important information in an accessible manner. In addition to safety issues, the aesthetics were better. He hoped they would have landscaping in the central island as it would make an enormous difference in the appearance of the roundabout along with the way motorists would approach it. He believed the roundabout would also process traffic quicker than a four-way stop. He explained he still had concerns as the average delay at the intersection during the peak hour was 46 seconds and it was not much of a problem the rest of the day. They would spend \$1.2 million to improve this intersection since it was at a level of service of F. He pointed out earlier in the meeting they had discussed reducing the level of bus service, and people in this same part of town would now have to wait 80 minutes for the bus instead of 40 minutes. He wondered what that level of service would be considered. He did not feel it was a factious comparison. He thought it would be better to invest in more efficient modes of transportation as tax dollars would then be used more efficiently and noted this was an equity and environmental issue. He pointed out 25 percent of the greenhouse gas emissions in Columbia were transportation related, which would decrease if they improved transit. He reiterated he liked the design of this roundabout and was confident it would provide increased safety over a signalized intersection. He noted he would support this mainly because he did not want to see a signal installed at this intersection.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he had spoken to a lot of people about this issue and had received a lot of opinions. He noted he firmly believed doing nothing was not an option. He did not believe the intersection was safe and did not feel it worked. There was too much confusion as it had increased in congestion and complexity. He felt the four-way stop had outlived its usefulness. He pointed out he had pledged during his campaign to support improvements to this intersection and to listen to the will of the voters whenever possible. Like Mr. Thomas, he did not feel a traffic light was a viable option as it would be less safe and would create more problems. The J-turns were not an option either. He believed the roundabout was the best option of everything that had been proposed. He commented that he was a numbers guy and had looked at safety and traffic flow. Vision Zero had been adopted by the Council before he was elected, but it had become a driving force for a lot of the decisions they made. Looking at this intersection through that lens, the roundabout was the best option. He believed it was critical that traffic calming measures be included for Canterbury Drive and Scottson Way before construction. He explained he felt the roundabout was in the best interest of the entire Fifth Ward as it would improve traffic flow for the entire corridor and all of southwest Columbia. It was also the first step in a series of improvements that he believed was the closest thing to a comprehensive plan they had in terms of Nifong Boulevard, Vawter School Road, etc. He commented that he also agreed with Mr. Thomas in that the landscaping for the center island was critically important, and pointed out he would be on top of requiring that feature.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion directing staff to move forward with final plans and specifications for the staff recommended roundabout for the Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road intersection. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Skala commented that it was not a secret that roundabouts had worked fairly well in Columbia. In terms of landscaping for roundabouts, he noted there were some good examples on his side of town. They were smaller, but had been landscaped and were

being taken care of through the Adopt-a-Spot program. He believed there were some issues in terms of speeds once people had become familiar with the roundabout, especially for those without perpendicular intersections, but as far as he knew there had not been any accidents at most of the roundabouts. He felt the proposed roundabout would serve this neighborhood well once it was installed and landscaped, and noted he would support it.

Mr. Trapp explained he had asked that the roundabout be included again when the Council had decided to seek more input for an improvement at this intersection and was glad the facts and a lot of the public comment were in support of the roundabout approach. He noted he had hoped Vision Zero would be more than lip service. It was the idea that no traffic fatalities were acceptable and that it should be a part of their decision-making. He explained safety weighed heavy in his mind and stated he was pleased to support this.

Mayor Treece commented that he appreciated staff for their exhaustive look at this, and explained he would vote no based on competing budget priorities and an abundance of fiscal conservatism. The underlying concern to him was that this would change the complexion and character of the neighborhood in a way that encouraged traffic through there when they did not yet know the impact of widening Nifong Boulevard. He agreed it would push more traffic through Forum Boulevard during construction, but wondered if it would alleviate some of this congestion once the work on Nifong Boulevard was complete. He pointed out he was not in a dissimilar neighborhood when it came to traffic congestion and trying to get out of the neighborhood, which had also informed his decision on this.

The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Mr. Trapp directing staff to move forward with final plans and specifications for the staff recommended roundabout for the Forum Boulevard and Green Meadows Road intersection was approved by roll call vote with Mr. Pitzer, Ms. Peters, Mr. Ruffin, Mr. Trapp, Mr. Skala, and Mr. Thomas voting yes, and Mayor Treece voting no.

PH33-17 Proposed construction of a six-foot wide sidewalk along the west side of Oakland Gravel Road, between Blue Ridge Road and Edris Drive.

PH33-17 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Marie Pourooshab, 3307 N. Oakland Gravel Road, asked the Council to reconsider this idea as the building of this sidewalk would destroy trees and create a major inconvenience to those in the area for only about 150 feet of redundant sidewalk. She pointed out there was already a built sidewalk across the street. She stated two of her neighbors had been unable to attend, but had asked her to convey their objections. She understood the impact to the last corner house would be to its garage and fence, and they would no longer be able to park in the driveway. They could only park in the garage. She believed this would create a danger to the community and public. In addition, the landscape of their homes would change. She explained her father had planted \$2,000 worth of plants, which bloomed every spring bringing a beautiful scent to the area and were dear to her. She noted the sidewalks that were already built were being enjoyed by the public. She pointed out there was also a historic landmark if one went forward past the park, and asked the Council to not install the sidewalk there out of respect for the community and the historic landmark. She noted runners and walkers tended to use the other sidewalk due to this anyway. She explained there were times the sidewalk would not be able to be used because of the creeks causing people to walk in the streets or on the sidewalk across the street. She thought it would be best to use this money in locations where there were not other options as it was needed more in those locations.

Mayor Treece asked for clarification regarding the impact to a garage at one of the

houses. Ms. Pourooshasb clarified it would not be removed, but the vehicle would have come out of the garage directly on to the street, which was a danger.

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

Mr. Trapp asked for staff to comment on the garage situation. Ms. Anderson displayed a photo of the corner property being discussed and explained the garage would not be affected. They were rebuilding a part of the driveway and the fence would be moved back a little.

Mr. Trapp commented that this was technically in the Second Ward although the Second and Third Wards shared Oakland Gravel Road. He agreed there was a sidewalk on the other side, but noted very few people would cross the street to walk on the sidewalk. He believed this sidewalk was necessary and noted it had been on the plans since he was first elected to the Council. He pointed out several grant applications had been submitted to try to get the sidewalk built as well. He explained he had run for office on livable streets and the idea of a livable street was that streets should accommodate pedestrians, bicyclists, and motorists. For too long and especially in the Second Ward, there had been too many neighborhoods built without sidewalks, which made it difficult for homeowners. He noted it was better to design them ahead of time, but neighborhoods constructed prior to 2005 and some even older neighborhoods needed to be retrofitted to include sidewalks. He understood this sometimes did not win the support of those on the street that would be primarily impacted, but it was built for the future and made it safer. He pointed out the Vision Zero plan, which had been adopted by the Council, suggested the move toward safety whenever possible. He apologized to Ms. Pourooshasb, who was not supportive, but noted he felt it was an important and necessary project.

Mr. Skala stated he was conflicted on this issue and would normally defer to Mr. Trapp since this was in his ward, but he was also thinking along the lines of the budget. He pointed out he had already suggested placing any remaining savings in an infrastructure fund for sidewalks and street lights, particularly in underserved areas and areas where sidewalks were not completed and were wanted. He understood some people wanted them here, but others did not. He explained he was a bit troubled by this proposal due to the need to construct a retaining wall on to a six-foot sidewalk adjacent to a curb to provide a parallel path across the street from another sidewalk. He commented that agreed with the concept of complete streets, but was conflicted with regard to this issue.

Mr. Nichols explained it would be a 12-18 inch wall at the sidewalk. Mr. Skala felt there was already a problem when a retaining wall had to be constructed. Ms. Anderson explained it was an integral wall with the sidewalk, and would not be very tall. Mr. Nichols explained it would be constructed so they did not get into tree roots. Mayor Treece asked if that skewed the costs as the calculation was about \$75 per square foot. Mr. Nichols replied the sidewalk would be wider because it was at the back of the curb. They had been paying \$90 in some places. Sidewalks were not cheap as they dealt with property acquisitions and the rebuilding and changing the slopes of driveways in this instance. Mr. Skala understood the total project cost was \$300,000. Mayor Treece noted the cost was only \$40,000 at Old Hawthorne. Ms. Anderson pointed out the City had to pay prevailing wage, which meant it was more than what a developer would pay.

Mr. Trapp made a motion directing staff to move forward with final plans and specifications for the construction of the Oakland Gravel Road sidewalk project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and approved by roll call vote with Mr. Pitzer, Ms. Peters, Mayor Treece, Mr. Ruffin, Mr. Trapp, and Mr. Thomas voting yes, and Mr. Skala voting no.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B244-17

Rezoning property located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Providence Road and Forest Avenue from R-2 (Two-family Residential District) and M-OF (Mixed-Use Office District) to PD (Planned District);

approving the statement of intent; approving the Bisk LLC Coffee Shop PD Plan (Case No. 17-166).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked how a drive-through would be accommodated. Mr. Teddy replied it would be against the building, and the drive aisle would be used for it. It was not a segregated drive-through lane like one would see at a fast food restaurant. Mayor Treece understood pedestrians would cross the proposed drive-through lane to access the front door. Mr. Teddy stated there would be some crossover movements as people would use the parking lot to access the building.

Mayor Treece asked if there would be any exterior finish requirements in terms of appropriate materials specified. Mr. Teddy replied no. He commented that he did not know if that had been discussed with the neighborhood, but it was not part of the planned district. Mayor Treece understood it could be. Mr. Teddy replied it could if proposed or accepted by the applicant.

Mr. Skala asked if the restricted turning movements were sufficient to remediate any issue with the drive-through. Mr. Teddy replied the concern at the staff level was to discourage drive-through uses along the Providence Road corridor as they wanted to avoid a proliferation of drive-through facilities, but pointed out there was a fast food restaurant at the corner. He explained there were a lot stop and go movements with high and fast turnover type operations. Mr. Skala understood Kilgore's also had a drive-through. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct, and explained they were more tolerant of a pharmacy drive-through because there did not appear to be much stacking with it. He noted this had been debated by the Planning and Zoning Commission and they were torn between the positives of a neighborhood serving business and the negatives of traffic management on Providence Road. The vote had been four in favor and three against.

Ms. Peters understood this was a MoDOT road and asked if they had requirements or recommendations regarding drive-through traffic. Mr. Teddy replied MoDOT was typically involved with design standards, but did not offer opinions on land use. Land use decisions would be left to local jurisdictions, but standards had to be met when it came to access permits, such as driveway widths, driveway spacing, etc. The positive in this case was that they would be consolidating driveways at the alley.

Keenan Simon, 210 Park Avenue, explained he was an engineer with Simon and Struempff Engineering and noted the owners of Bisk, LLC, Mohammad Jarbou and Yousef Darkhalil, were already business owners within the Ridgeway neighborhood as they had recently renovated the old George's Steakhouse building into Columbia Laundry. He displayed photos of the building prior to and after the renovations. He stated Columbia Laundry had opened in 2016, and included a library for the exchange of books and a community bulletin board. In terms of the Forest Avenue and Providence Road property, he explained Mr. Darkhalil had not been sure about what to do so he had discussed it with people from neighboring properties and about 60-70 percent of the people had wanted a coffee shop. He commented that they had then met with the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association to discuss the design, and had also made changes to the design based on City staff comments. The reason they chose to request PD zoning was to protect the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association because they had indicated they were in favor of the project but wanted to impose restrictions on the property so it could not be developed into a convenience store in the future, and the PD zoning allowed for the imposition of the restrictions. It also allowed them to show the intent of the project through the plan. He explained the main reason they would reduce the number of parking stalls on site was because they felt the majority of traffic would utilize the drive-through or be due to foot traffic from Hickman High School. The drive-through was needed as it would allow the business to be sustainable. The PD process also allowed them to integrate the drive-through without requiring a conditional use permit. He noted the owner of Carlito's, which was a nearby business, had indicated

he relied on his drive-through to provide for 50 percent of business. He understood there had been confusion at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting as to how the drive-through would fit on the site, and described it. He pointed out the minimum standards for stacking lanes at a drive-through window were three spaces for stacking and to be 15 feet from the right-of-way or exit. This site could accommodate seven stacking stalls and the minimum distance to an exit or right-of-way was about 24 feet. He explained the business did not plan to serve hot food. It would only serve pre-made pastries and coffee. They felt this would reduce stacking time and traffic congestion. He noted the owners were constructing a building that was substantially larger than was needed to sustain a typical coffee shop as coffee shops were generally 1,200 feet, and the reason was to provide an area for community gatherings and the neighborhood association to meet. It would be a local coffee shop, not a chain. They also planned to expand their library and would try to recycle the grind by providing it to local gardeners or by teaming up with Kilgore's to recycle grounds at their community garden. In addition, they intended to partner with Cedar Creek Coffee, which was an organization that provided disabled adults with employment, by employing at least two individuals from that organization. He displayed a video showing how those at Cedar Creek Coffee roasted, packaged, and sold coffee, and explained the owners of the proposed coffee shop would brew and sell that coffee at this location. He asked the Council to support this infill development project as it would not require additional infrastructure and because it would provide job opportunities and sales tax from commerce.

Mayor Treece asked for the type of exterior finish that was contemplated. Mr. Simon replied it would involve a lot of glass as they wanted to create an inviting environment. He displayed what had been done at Columbia Laundry as an example. The owners were willing to put money into the project to create a sustainable business. Mayor Treece understood this would be new construction and explained he wanted something that complimented the neighborhood and would look good on Providence Road. The metal building to the south did not meet that expectation. He wondered if the owners would be willing to incorporate some exterior finish characteristics or acceptable materials as part of the project. Mr. Simon noted there was a lot brick on Hickman High School so including a brick band was something they wanted to incorporate. The roof would be gabled with architectural shingles so it blended with the neighborhood.

Mr. Ruffin asked if the drive-through would be accessed from Providence Road. Mr. Simon replied the entry into the site was only at one location, Providence Road. Mr. Ruffin asked if the drive-through would be accessed from the alley. Mr. Simon replied the alley would be converted to a two-way drive for traffic that entered and exited the site. It was currently used as an exit from the AQ Beauty Supply building. They would add paving to the proposed site to widen it to the standard 24-foot wide drive.

Ms. Peters asked if a person traveling north on Providence Road would turn across traffic to enter the drive-through while a person traveling south on Providence Road would just turn right. Mr. Simon replied one would have to cross traffic if traveling northbound on Providence Road as a left turn would need to be made into the area where the alley was now located. Ms. Peters understood there was not a median there. Mr. Simon stated that was correct. Ms. Peters asked if traffic would be required to turn right on to Providence Road from Forest Avenue when leaving the coffee shop. Mr. Simon replied they were trying to impose a right turn only by including a directional sign and a wishbone curb to the prevent people from making a left hand turn. Ms. Peters understood that the wishbone curb could be ignored since there was not a median there right now. Mr. Simon stated that was correct, but thought those people would risk getting in trouble.

Mr. Skala asked for clarification as he thought one could turn left or right off of Forest Avenue on to Providence Road. Mr. Simon explained they would try to get customers to exit right only on to Forest Avenue to get to Providence Road. He pointed out a pedestrian way project would happen at about the same time, and it would prevent traffic from turning left off of Forest Avenue. He noted Forest Avenue would turn into a right-in

and right-out only in about a year due to the pedestrian way and an island on Providence Road. Mayor Treece asked if that project had been approved. Mr. Simon replied he thought it had as it was a GetAbout project. Mr. Trapp stated it had been approved a while ago. Mr. Thomas explained it was known as the bike boulevard. Mr. Simon stated he was being told the project was out to bid.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding the bike boulevard. Mr. Thomas replied it was a bicycle emphasized connection that went from the Stewart Road neighborhood to the Business Loop and across Forest Avenue. It involved restrictions where Forest Avenue met Providence Road.

Mr. Pitzer asked how many jobs would be created. Mr. Simon replied that was a question for one of the owners.

Frank Ette, 1222 Maple Street, Boonville, explained he was present because he was supportive of Mr. Darkhalil as his wife had worked with him for many years on a part time basis. He noted Mr. Darkhalil did not do anything that was not aesthetically pleasing for the neighborhood, and pointed out he remodeled a laundry in Boonville, Missouri, which was liked by everyone. He stated he was also supportive because the project would supply jobs to people with disabilities. The jobs created would involve more than who actually worked at the building because the coffee would be roasted at Cedar Creek Coffee, which involved 5-6 individuals. He believed this would be a positive development for the First Ward as it was not a liquor store or pawn shop.

Linda Ordway stated she was with Cedar Creek Resort, which included Cedar Creek Coffee, and explained they were having a hard time finding employers that understood the need for those that might work a little slower and not have a demeanor with which they were familiar. They were ecstatic because Mr. Darkhalil would put them to work as he had worked with them in the past. She noted it would allow some of the people that worked with them to be in the community, and they were some of the best huggers and smilers.

Leon Wibberg explained he washed the dishes at Fresh Ideas and wanted to see if he could sell coffee at the coffee shop being proposed.

Alonzo Ray Clay noted he was from St. Louis, but was living in Columbia now, and was happy about the job he would get at the coffee shop. He stated he worked at Fresh Ideas as well and liked it, but thought he might like the coffee shop job too. He commented that he was happy the Council would help them find another job.

Roger Fowler, Jr. stated he lived in Columbia, but was from Kirksville, and noted he liked Cedar Creek Coffee.

Ms. Ordway commented that she hoped the Council approved this project as it would provide these men another job.

Mr. Thomas asked if Cedar Creek Coffee sold coffee to the general public or just businesses. Ms. Ordway replied they would sell coffee to anyone. She explained they had two locations with one being in Branson and the other being in Columbia. They had an 8,000 square foot building in Branson with more traffic and festivals. This was another way to bring those kinds of jobs to Columbia. She stated Cedar Creek Coffee was roasted at Cedar Creek Resort and placed in those cabins now.

Pat Kelley, 1007 Grand Avenue, explained the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association had held several meetings to discuss this proposal. They were thrilled this would not be another payday lender business and liked the idea of a community coffee shop, but did not like the drive-through proposal and the use of Forest Avenue as they were afraid it would be used for cut-through traffic off of Providence Road. They were also afraid people would turn left out of the coffee shop on to Forest Avenue even though there would be a sign telling them not to turn in that direction. She stated a lot kids were in the area, especially near Optimist Park, and there was already a lot of cut-through traffic from the Business Loop on Sexton Road and Grand Avenue. She noted Grand Avenue was the get-a-way street when there were shootings in the neighborhood. She asked that a block of Forest Avenue be turned into a one-way street so people drove to Providence Road and

did not drive through the neighborhood. While there was support for the coffee shop, there was concern about the volume of people that would impact the intersection of Forest Avenue and Grand Avenue, which was already problematic. She asked the Council to take those concerns into consideration prior to approving this plan, and if they were to approve it, she requested a way to reroute traffic while the proposed building was being constructed.

Mayor Treece asked how discussions had been with regard to the look of the building in terms of whether it would fit with the neighborhood. He also wondered how comfortable they were with the representations made. Ms. Kelley replied the neighborhood had discussed the use of the alley with the developer and that had been incorporated. They had not discussed the look of the building much. They had only talked about not having a lot of parking in the front and incorporating landscaping, greenspace, and a sidewalk for pedestrians. She understood those items had been included in the plan.

Mr. Skala asked Ms. Kelley if the request for a one-way street was something they wanted as a condition of approval as they did not know if there would be a problem at this time. He understood it could be made into a one-way street at a later time. Ms. Kelley replied she understood the bicycle boulevard would be completed after the coffee shop was constructed and wondered if they could move up the completion of the features of the bicycle boulevard in this area so it would address the traffic issues from the beginning. They felt a one-way street was a good solution, but would be agreeable to any traffic calming at the time the coffee shop opened so there were ways to divert traffic on to Providence Road.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was anything to stop traffic traveling south on Providence Road from turning right on to Forest Avenue and going through the neighborhood now. Ms. Kelley replied no, but pointed out there was not much of an incentive to do so at this time. There would be more of an incentive if one could pick up a cup of coffee along the way. Mr. Thomas understood Ms. Kelley felt people would be more likely to cut through the neighborhood if a coffee shop was located there. Ms. Kelley stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas commented that he was not sure a coffee shop there would make much of a difference in terms of whether people used Forest Avenue as a cut-through to the neighborhood. Ms. Kelley explained they would come in off of Providence Road to the drive-through, which went along the front of the building and would then exit on to Forest Avenue. Only those wanting to go right on Providence Road would travel that direction due to the median. She was afraid people wanting to turn left on to Providence Road would cut through the neighborhood.

Carolyn Matthews stated she was with the Native American Support Group and People's Visioning and noted they supported this proposal, Pat Kelley, and the neighborhood. She explained she had not researched this herself, but knew Ms. Kelley had researched it thoroughly and trusted her judgement. They supported anything that would help neighborhoods and minorities.

Eric Williams, 1001 Madison Street, commented that he had been a resident of the Ridgeway Neighborhood for 17 years and his main concern was the ability of traffic to turn left on to Forest Avenue from the drive-through as there was a neighborhood park right down the street. He believed people wanting to go northbound on Providence would turn left. He noted Hickman students parked along Forest Avenue and walked down the road to get to school. In addition, there would be a bike lane in the future creating more bicycle and pedestrian traffic in the area. He was concerned about a kid chasing a ball kicked into the road and getting hit by someone leaving this business because there would be more traffic as a result of the business. At this time, people were not tempted to turn on to Forest Avenue because it was a residential street. He did not feel the wishbone was sufficient to stop people from turning left.

Joan Wilcox, 1000 Madison Street, stated she lived in the Ridgeway neighborhood and was supportive of a coffee shop that had a neighborhood feel and was not a chain. She noted she was a patron of the laundry mat and noted it had a neighborhood feel to it.

She was encouraged about having a coffee shop like this that neighbors could utilize and visit with one another. These functional, family businesses were needed in the neighborhood. She stated she was a big proponent of the coffee shop.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he had been President of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association for years in the past, and in conjunction with the Ridgeway and Douglass Park neighborhoods, they had gotten the Council to adopt a policy resolution which included a set of guidelines for development of the Providence Road corridor from Stewart Road to Business Loop 70. He stated he was supportive of the original recommendation of staff to the Planning and Zoning Commission, which was to deny this request because it did not fit with the Unified Development Code, the Providence Road corridor guidelines, etc. They did not want drive-through facilities on this corridor, but did want multi-story buildings. They also did not want parking lots in the front of the lot. It was different than the Business Loop. He stated he was there to stand up to the long-term planning goal for the corridor. He commented that he would have been supportive if it had been a three-story mixed use building with a coffee shop on the first floor even if it had parking in the front as it would meet the long-term goal of how the corridor should develop and provide a local economic neighborhood feel. He was concerned about the approval of this setting a precedent for future developments. He pointed out they had overlooked the drive-through and parking in the front for Kilgore's Pharmacy because it was such a valuable neighborhood service, but it had been used as a precedent for violating some of the principles. In terms of this development, he understood the developer would pay attention to all four sides of the building. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Clark how he knew this. Mr. Clark replied he thought he had heard it during discussions regarding the back of the building and the location of certain facilities. He understood attention had been paid to it, but agreed he could be wrong.

Mr. Pitzer stated he heard the concerns with regard to the drive-through, but felt this was the type of local employer, local jobs, and neighborhood establishment they wanted to encourage. If they voted this down, there likely would be another payday loan or fast food restaurant there as they would be the only ones that could afford to develop there.

Ms. Peters asked what would happen if the coffee shop failed. She wondered what else could be placed on this site. Mr. Teddy replied the statement of intent included general retail, business, office, or restaurant so they had some options in reoccupying the building. It was limited by scale and a 2,400 square foot restaurant was not a particularly large restaurant, but it could be a fast food restaurant with a drive-through lane. There was also a 24-foot maximum height.

Mr. Ruffin stated he believed this was a great asset to the First Ward and it was the kind of business they hoped for in their neighborhoods. He agreed with Mayor Treece in that the exterior design should benefit the neighborhood by reflecting the architectural styles that were surrounding it. He pointed out he was familiar with Cedar Creek Coffee as it was a wonderful program that did very important work for an important part of the community they sometimes forgot. They provided employment, training, and love for their residents. He believed this was a great partnership and noted he would fully endorse it.

Mayor Treece commented that he did not think the drive-through was ideal and found retrofits of drive-through facilities in other parts of town frustrating as pedestrians were forced to walk across the drive-through lane to get to the front door. He stated he also preferred to have some of the exterior finish and four-sided architecture reflected in the PD plan. He noted they had a mixed-use neighborhood designation and was disappointed they were reverting to a PD plan instead of trying to meet the requirements of that designation. He pointed out this was the first project in front of them after adopting the Unified Development Code and they were falling back to old ways as this would allow the developer to not obtain a conditional use permit, etc.

Mr. Skala stated he was a bit disappointed as well as it would have been nice to have another story, but felt this was similar to Kilgore's in that this development was important to the neighborhood in terms of a place people could go. He was not happy with the

logistical problems of the drive-through, and thought they needed to be mindful of it if it became a problem by providing some remediation. He did not feel the perfect should be the enemy of the good. The idea of a coffee shop, the opportunities for employment, and its friendliness to the neighborhood was worth approving the project. He stated he would vote in favor of it.

Mr. Thomas noted he agreed with the comments made. He was not a fan of drive-through facilities, but most of them did not have any of the positive elements this project had. He believed the positives greatly outweighed the negatives of this project so he planned to support it.

B244-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: PETERS, TREECE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B245-17 Granting a waiver and a design modification relating to the construction of a sidewalk along a portion of the north side of Primrose Drive, approximately 500 feet east of Gardner Drive (2301 Primrose Drive); setting forth a condition for payment in lieu of sidewalk construction (Case No. 17-157).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report, and clarified it should be Garden Drive instead of Gardner Drive.

Ms. Peters asked if there was a sidewalk on the other side. Mr. Teddy replied no. Ms. Peters asked if there was an unfunded capital improvement project for Primrose Drive. Mr. Teddy replied it was on the 6-10 year CIP list as a need. Ms. Peters asked if there was a need to widen the street or to construct a sidewalk. Mr. Teddy replied he thought it was likely reconstruction and sidewalks. Mr. Trapp stated it was only to construct sidewalks because he had asked that it be added to the CIP list. Ms. Peters asked if that was just on Primrose Drive. Mr. Trapp replied yes, and explained it was estimated at \$600,000 so he did not see it happening. In addition, 6-10 years was optimistic. Mr. Thomas asked if that was the cost for the entire length from Stadium Boulevard. Mr. Trapp replied yes, and pointed out it was an old estimate so it was likely \$1 million now.

Mayor Treece asked how the estimated cost for the payment in lieu was \$5.50 per square foot when it cost the City \$75 per square foot. Mr. Teddy replied that was a good question. Mayor Treece noted that was more than the disparity of prevailing wage. Mr. Trapp pointed out they were constructing the sidewalk except for the last 60 feet so the \$10,000 was for 60 feet of sidewalk. Mayor Treece stated their cost estimate was \$5.50 per square foot. Mr. Teddy noted that was a little under \$20 per lineal foot.

Mr. Pitzer asked what triggered the sidewalk requirement. Mr. Teddy replied it was required by ordinance as a condition of additional multi-family construction for a collector class of street if it did not already exist, and Primrose Drive was classified as a collector street. Mr. Pitzer understood an additional building would be constructed. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mr. Trapp commented that he had met with Jay Gebhardt, the engineer for this project, and had visited the site to view the tree and the crumbling street on the other side. He noted there was an intermittent stream and some decay into the roadbed on the other side of the street he felt would need to be addressed at some point. There was also a possibility of traffic calming as they were only starting to look into that as the speeds on that street were high. He noted the applicant had offered to do a fee in lieu and recommended they take them up on that offer. He also suggested this be tabled in order to formulate how it would work. He thought there would be a couple of opportunities as there was a possibility of roadbed improvements and traffic calming. He did not want to offer up the tree for 60 feet of sidewalk as it provided some traffic calming now. He appreciated the Planning and Zoning Commission and tried to follow their

recommendations, but in reading the minutes, it did not appear as if anyone was familiar with the area. He thought they should grant the variance and look at an alternative that would save the tree as it added value to the neighborhood.

Mr. Trapp asked if they would be able to accept the fee in lieu of the 60 feet of sidewalk. Ms. Thompson suggested it be tabled to provide her the opportunity to draft the language and to provide the engineers an opportunity to double check the estimated amount.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to table B245-17 to the November 6, 2017 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Thomas displayed images of a design he wanted staff to consider as it would allow the tree to remain while also creating a sidewalk. He understood the road was 31 feet wide and was striped so one side was 12 feet and the other side was 19 feet, and when he visited the site, there was a speed trailer occupying about seven feet on the eastbound lane, leaving about 12 feet for each lane, and the traffic continued to move. He thought they could do something better than what he was showing at much less of an expense than removing the tree, rebuilding the culvert, and constructing a sidewalk. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Thomas if he was suggesting the City or the applicant would do this. Mr. Thomas replied he was not sure how much it would cost, and was only providing what he felt was an economical and satisfactory outcome. He wondered if they should negotiate more from the applicant and pointed out he was in favor of at least taking what the applicant had already offered in return for not sacrificing the tree.

Mayor Treece stated he was opposed to tabling this and pointed out the applicant was offering \$5 a foot when they approved another project where it would cost them \$75 a foot. It would not be any cheaper if they did it next year or five years from now, and it would not compensate the City near enough for their lost obligation. Mr. Thomas suggested the go ahead and table it as they could then begin to have conversations about the payment in the meantime.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Mr. Thomas to table B245-17 to the November 6, 2017 Council Meeting was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B254-17 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code relating to mutual aid emergency pay.

Discussion shown with B255-17

B255-17 Appropriating funds for compensation to Water and Light Department employees sent to Florida to assist with restoration efforts associated with damage caused by Hurricane Matthew in October 2016.

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if this always happened. Mr. Johnsen replied every time City of Columbia crews responded to another utility that utility was sent a bill to pay for the crews. It was the same when people came to help them with the City of Columbia system. Mayor Treece asked if Florida had sent crews to Columbia if those employees would be paid Florida's prevailing wage or the local prevailing wage. Mr. Johnsen replied they would typically be working and paid according to City of Columbia ordinances and other agreements in place. Mayor Treece understood the City of Columbia would only pay them the wage which prevailed in this geography. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece understood the City of Columbia was always reimbursed in these situations. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct.

B254-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B255-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B246-17 Approving the Final Plat of Kelly Farms located on the east side of Cinnamon Hill Lane and approximately 1,200 feet north of Stadium Boulevard; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-134).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters noted the council memo had indicated this was in substantial conformance with the initial plat, and although she could not see any changes, she wanted to ensure the final plat was the same. Mr. Teddy stated there was only very minor lot shape differences within the single-family lots as there was a V-notch in a couple of those lots that had not been present on the preliminary plat. He thought they might be accommodating a drainage structure or something similar. The number of lots remained the same as there were still ten single-family lots and a conservation/greenspace easement across the northerly 200 feet of the property. He pointed out there was a different lot numbering scheme, and explained that was what referred to when saying it was substantially in compliance. Ms. Peters understood the plat was essentially the same. Mr. Teddy stated it had the same development scheme. When looking at them side by side, they would look different because a preliminary PUD plan was much busier as it had more information on it.

Ms. Peters understood there was commercial land to the northwest of this and there was not a road to it. She asked if that was the responsibility of the developers of that commercial property. Mr. Teddy replied they would be responsible for their own access, but the existing section of Cinnamon Hill Lane continued to run to that site.

B246-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B247-17 Authorizing a contract for exchange of real estate with the Paul Alan Branham Revocable Trust relating to City-owned property located adjacent to the northwest corner of the Stadium Boulevard and West Boulevard intersection and property located adjacent to the southeast corner of the Stadium Boulevard and Planter Road intersection.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas commented that he had asked for this to be removed from the consent agenda and now had the answers to his questions. He explained he was mainly interested in what would happen to the lot on Planter Road with respect to the Miles Manor neighborhood residents. He understood the City would acquire it and would essentially merge it with a park area that was near the MKT trail.

B247-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B256-17 Authorizing a professional services agreement with Stifel Nicolaus & Company, Incorporated for financial advisory services for The Broadway Phase II tax increment financing application; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. St. Romaine provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters understood the maximum payment amount per this agreement could be \$15,000 and that the applicant had provided \$10,000 to the City. She asked who would pay the \$5,000 difference. Mr. St. Romaine stated they had more than sufficient funds from the applicant to pay and execute this contract. There was a pre-funding agreement with Broadway Lodging II, which indicated they had to pay all of the costs the City incurred in evaluating the proposal. At the time they had submitted their application in April, they had provided a \$10,000 application fee, which had been appropriated by Council, and this \$10,000 would be added to that so they would have \$20,000. In addition, there was a bill the Council would consider at the next meeting, which would appropriate another \$20,000 so they would then have a total of \$40,000 dedicated to the cost of evaluating the project.

Mayor Treece asked how the process was going. Mr. St. Romaine replied there had been four TIF Commission meetings thus far and a public hearing would be held sometime during the first week of October. They would have another TIF Commission meeting this Thursday at 6:00 p.m. He thought the process was moving along fairly well at this time.

Mayor Treece asked if they were premature in hiring a financial advisory company or if it was necessary to review the information. Mr. St. Romaine replied it was necessary because the applicant had to convince the TIF Commission and the City Council that the project was financially feasible. This company would look at the cost-benefit analysis, ensure all of the proposed tax rates were correct, and determine if the internal rate of return the applicant was expected to receive based upon a designated set of revenues was accurate. All of that information would be provided to the TIF Commission to help them come to a decision. Mayor Treece asked if they would make any analysis as to the "but for" clause and whether conventional financing would be available to support a project without tax increment financing. Mr. St. Romaine replied the "but for" test had to do with the concept that but for the approval of tax increment financing for the project, the project would not be built, and the developer had already signed an affidavit to that effect. The developer also had to prove the project was financially feasible and meet about fourteen stipulations that had been set in place by Council in 2008.

Mr. Pitzer understood Stifel Nicolaus & Company was essentially verifying the information. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked if the City had worked with Stifel Nicolaus & Company before on TIF projects. Mr. St. Romaine replied yes, and explained they had worked on both of the existing TIF projects. The City decided to hire them again for their expertise.

Mr. Skala asked if the TIF Commission was still short a member. Mr. St. Romaine replied yes, and noted applications were currently being sought with a deadline of this Friday. The Council would be able to appoint a new member at its next meeting.

B256-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. 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.

B248-17 Vacating the right-of-way for an alley located on the north side of Anthony Street, approximately 200 feet east of College Avenue (Case No. 17-185).

- B249-17 Authorizing a consolidated grant agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for FY 2018 transportation planning services (Case No. 17-214).
- B250-17 Authorizing a joint funding agreement for water resources investigations with the U.S. Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior for groundwater monitoring of well sites in the vicinity of the wetland treatment units and the Eagle Bluffs Conservation Area.
- B251-17 Accepting conveyances for sewer, temporary construction, drainage and utility purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B252-17 Accepting conveyances for water and electric utility purposes; accepting a declaration of restrictive covenants for a water main extension exemption.
- B253-17 Appropriating funds to upgrade aging network infrastructure and to purchase cyber security software in the Information Technology Department.
- R124-17 Transferring funds for payment of legal fees associated with ongoing litigation relating to construction of the Short Street parking facility.
- R125-17 Authorizing an agreement with Oak Towers Housing Development Group, LP, formerly the Housing Authority of the City of Columbia, for HOME funding for renovations to Oak Towers located at 700 N. Garth Avenue.
- R126-17 Authorizing Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) agreements with Central Missouri Community Action, Columbia Missouri Community Housing Development Organization and Show-Me Central Habitat for Humanity.
- R127-17 Authorizing a first amendment to the operations agreement with Thumper Productions, L.L.C. for the 2017 Roots N Blues N BBQ Festival at Stephens Lake Park; authorizing an agreement with Adventure Tree, LLC for the adventure tree activity at the 2017 Roots N Blues BBQ Festival.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R123-17 Consenting to the issuance of a state license for the sale of intoxicating liquor to Parks Amusements, LLC, d/b/a Silverball, located at 122 S. Ninth Street.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Peters understood there were two churches near this location and wondered if they had any opinion. Ms. Nix explained the City sent certified letters to everyone within 100 feet of the business. She thought twelve certified letters had been sent and they had not heard back from anyone. She pointed out this was in the same location as Tonic, a previous business of the same nature. It was also next to Fuzzy Taco, which also sold liquor.

The vote on R123-17 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. 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.

- B257-17 Rezoning property located on the northwest corner of Stadium Boulevard and Primrose Drive from R-2 (Two-family Residential District) to PD (Planned District); approving the Sidra Subdivision PD Plan (Case No. 17-170).
- B258-17 Approving the Clary-Shy Agriculture Park - PD Plan located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Ash Street and Clinkscapes Road; approving a statement of intent (Case No. 17-188).
- B259-17 Approving the Final Plat of Clary-Shy Agriculture Park, a Replat of Lots 1 & 2 of Columbia Recreation Center Plat, located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Ash Street and Clinkscapes Road (Case No. 17-192).
- B260-17 Approving the Final Plat of Northern Heights Subdivision Plat 2, a Replat of Lot 7 of Northern Heights Addition No. 1, located on the southeast side of Flora Drive (2906 and 2908 Flora Drive); granting a waiver and a design modification relating to the construction of a sidewalk along a portion of Flora Drive; granting a design modification relating to street right-of-way width (Case No. 17-178).
- B261-17 Approving the Final Plat of Columbia College North Subdivision located on the west side of Range Line Street and on the north side of Wilkes Boulevard; granting a design modification relating to street right-of-way width (Case No. 17-183).

- B262-17 Approving the Final Plat of Campus Lutheran, a Replat of Lots 1-7 and an Alley of Amended Plat of J.H. Guitar's Subdivision, located on the northeast corner of the intersection of College Avenue and Anthony Street (304 S. College Avenue); authorizing a performance contract; granting a design modification relating to street right-of-way width (Case No. 17-187).
- B263-17 Approving the Final Plat of Breaktime Vandiver Route B, a Replat of Tract 1 of Mid-Missouri Industrial Park & A Tract of Land Located in the NW ¼ of Section 5, Township 48 North, Range 12 West, located on the northeast corner of Vandiver Drive and Route B (Paris Road); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-193).
- B264-17 Approving the Final Plat of Copperstone Plat 7A, a Replat of Lots 102A and 217A of Copperstone Plat 7, located northwest of the Silver Valley Drive and Copperstone Creek Drive intersection (Case No. 17-195).
- B265-17 Authorizing a license agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission relating to the construction of a sidewalk and trail connection as part of the Clark Lane West Sidewalk and Hinkson Creek Trail Connection Project.
- B266-17 Appropriating funds to finalize and close out the Avenue of the Columns streetscape project.
- B267-17 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Burns & McDonnell for an evaluation and feasibility study for construction of the Option "E" 161 kV transmission line to the Perche Creek substation.
- B268-17 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Quanta Technology, LLC for a reliability study of the City's electric distribution system.
- B269-17 Appropriating Demonstration of Energy & Efficiency Developments (DEED) scholarship funds to be received from the American Public Power Association for assistance in the planning and development of the 2018 Advancing Renewable Energy in the Midwest conference.
- B270-17 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of

Health and Human Services for the Show Me Healthy Women program.

- B271-17 Authorizing an intergovernmental agreement with the County of Boone, Missouri relating to the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program and the allocation of FY 2017 funding.
- B272-17 Appropriating tax increment financing (TIF) application fees received from Broadway Lodging Two, LLC.
- B273-17 Appropriating FY 2016 General Fund savings to General Fund departments as part of the Incentive Based Budgeting Initiative.
- B274-17 Appropriating FY 2016 General Fund savings for projects identified by the City Council as part of the Incentive Based Budgeting Initiative.
- B275-17 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to personnel policies, procedures, rules and regulations.
- B276-17 Adopting the FY 2018 Classification and Pay Plan; providing for FY 2018 salary adjustments relating to the Classification and Pay Plan.
- B277-17 Establishing plan year 2018 active employee medical premium rates and retiree non-Medicare medical rates for the City of Columbia; providing for payroll withholdings.
- B278-17 Authorizing a collective bargaining agreement with Laborers' International Union of North America, Local 773.
- B279-17 Authorizing a collective bargaining agreement with Columbia Police Officers Association, Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #26.
- B280-17 Authorizing a collective bargaining agreement with Columbia Professional Firefighters I.A.F.F. Local 1055.
- B281-17 Appropriating funds for payment of legal fees associated with litigation relating to the CoMo Connect branding of the transit system.

X. REPORTS

REP72-17 Correspondence from the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council regarding a permanent Parking and Transportation Management Commission.

Mr. Trapp thought this was informational, but felt it provided a good opportunity for Council to express its will to staff to create a parking and transportation commission. He pointed out at least five of them thought they should move forward.

Mr. Thomas asked if a motion and vote was needed. Mr. Trapp replied he thought staff just needed to know the will of Council. Mr. Glascock stated this was sufficient.

REP73-17 Correspondence from the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council regarding delivery trucks downtown.

Mr. Glascock asked if they wanted staff to develop anything based upon this report. Ms. Peters replied yes. Mr. Pitzer asked if that was included with the parking and transportation management commission. Mr. Skala replied he thought it should fall under the purview of any parking and transportation management commission.

REP74-17 Proposed resolution on clean energy, clean water, and human rights.

Mr. Ruffin explained there had been a request for this resolution in January in support of the protest that was happening in North Dakota. Since that time circumstances had changed tremendously, and this was a draft based upon input from People's Visioning and the City of Columbia, which he hoped would be considered timeless in addressing their basic values.

Mr. Trapp understood this would be brought back as a resolution. Mr. Ruffin stated that was correct. Mr. Skala commented that he thought that should be done. Mr. Thomas stated he was agreeable.

Monta Welch noted she appreciated the remarks of this being a timeless consideration on the issues of clean water, clean energy, and human rights. She hoped there would be unanimous support at the next council meeting when this came forward as a resolution. She felt this was an important understanding to have in the community in terms of their values and as guidance to follow. She stated water was vital to all life.

Perry Big Soldier commented that this was a critical time in all of their lives and for the future of the seventh generation down the line, which was a Native American philosophy of thinking about the seventh generation down the line when making decisions. This resolution would help make that possible as it indicated the Council believed in life and the seventh generation down the line. He noted there was much to explore, such as fracking, coal extraction, etc. He explained he would travel back to Standing Rock on September 18 as people were gathering there for prayer. He thanked the Council for its support.

REP75-17 Intra-departmental transfer of funds request.

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

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Mr. Skala asked for a resolution in support of the Mayor's Initiative with respect to Charlottesville, Virginia.

Mr. Skala commented that nothing had happened with the sidewalk on Clark Lane between Highway 63 and Paris Road, and asked for a status as he thought that had been ready to move forward.

Mr. Skala understood a citizen commission had been envisioned to review

fiber/broadband, the consultant report, and other issues related to fiber infrastructure, and asked that they start the process for a resolution to establish a commission.

Mr. Glascock pointed out this was a responsibility of the Utilities Department and asked if he wanted something separate from the Water and Light Advisory Board or if it could be that Board or a subcommittee of that Board. Mr. Skala replied he would prefer a separate task force.

Mr. Pitzer understood the Utilities Department was working on a broadband business plan proposal as that had been indicated when the last report had been brought forward to Council. Mr. Skala thought that should be looked into first as they did not want to duplicate work. Mr. Pitzer suggested they be provided an update on the timeline of the business plan.

Bruce Alspaugh, 2815 Skyview Road, commented that he had been quite frustrated with the quality of the broadband service available in Columbia for many years. He noted he had served on the Google Fiber initiative task force that had submitted an application for fiber, which ultimately went to Kansas City. During this process, they had learned the City of Columbia already owned an existing fiber optic network that connected the substations around town, and there had been discussion as to whether they could better utilize this asset to make high speed broadband more widely available throughout the community. As a result, a consultant was hired and the reports had suggested a committee or commission to look into how to better utilize those resources. He stated he would volunteer to serve on any related group to offer his input. He noted he had worked in IT for many years and was an electrical engineer. He asked that the Council move forward with the consultant's recommendation.

Mr. Thomas noted he, Ms. Peters, and Mr. Trapp had attended a workshop last week that had been organized by Don Love of Empower Missouri with regard to an analysis of the vehicle stops data illustrating some examples of racial disparities in officer behavior and actions. There had also been discussion about methodology in terms of how to handle the data and use it the way it was supposed to be used. He commented that a member of the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB) had been in attendance, and thought the CPRB would be a great body to work extensively with Mr. Love and Empower Missouri in developing a methodology with the Police Chief and senior officers to analyze, understand, and respond to disparities in the data. He understood there were three approaches, and those were training, supervision, and policy within the Police Department. He suggested they ask the CPRB to take on this project and to make recommendations.

Mayor Treece stated he would prefer not to take action on that suggestion tonight. He wanted to review the ordinance to see if that was within the duties of the CPRB. Mr. Thomas commented that he thought it was as their duties were much broader than simply reviewing complaints against the police. He understood it included community engagement and education related to police issues.

Mayor Treece stated he wanted to also process what they might be analyzing and what they might recommend as they needed to maintain the confidence of the public in their neutrality. He did not want their analysis or recommendations to create a framework for which they might evaluate complaints that might come before them. Mr. Thomas explained he thought their role would only be to make recommendations to the Council. He did not anticipate them taking any action on their own. They were an expert body in this area and had been appointed to provide this type of advice. Mayor Treece commented that he was concerned their extraneous discussion would color their analyses of a set of facts they were presented on a case. He stated he could be wrong and wanted time to think about it. Mr. Thomas noted he was not suggesting an analysis of individual cases. Mayor Treece understood, but explained they would eventually get a case about racial profiling or something else, and this process might better inform their opinion or color their opinion in a way that was not fair to the complainant or police officer.

Mr. Skala thought this could be a good idea, but wanted to look at the mission statement of the CPRB first.

Ms. Thompson understood this might appear to be a perfect fit at first glance, but believed they needed to take a look at the role of the CPRB. She stated she felt this group had to stay neutral as it related to both the officer and the citizens. They had to have an element of fairness, almost like a quasi-judicial body, because they were reviewing appeals on complaints of alleged officer misconduct, which was the primary function. The only way this worked well was if there was trust from both sides. To the extent it did not interfere with the impartiality of the group, she thought the Council could assign them additional duties, but asked that they be cautious of creating impartiality. She suggested they think about what the scope would be as their strength was in the trust they built in all segments of the community and with the officers as an impartial body.

Mr. Skala thought it might benefit the CPRB to have contact with Mr. Love to talk about some of these issues as it could be a learning experience.

Mr. Thomas explained he felt a best practice in doing this was that the police would be involved with community representatives in going through the process. He wanted the police officers to be at the table with the CPRB. He noted some City staff members had been at the workshop held by Mr. Love, but there had not been anyone from the Police Department, and he thought it would have been good for someone from the Police Department to have attended as well.

Ms. Thompson stated she thought the educational opportunities were great, but felt they needed to fall short of asking them to weigh in and chose sides on what was still a community debate about what that data was, what it meant, and how it was analyzed. She did not think they would want to alienate any segment of the population because they were also trying to learn. She suggested they not be asked to weigh in on which tools were the most appropriate.

Mr. Thomas commented that he thought the community as well as the city government would need to have this conversation, and believed this was an appropriate place to have it.

Mayor Treece asked if they could take this up at another time when it was not so late. Mr. Thomas replied yes.

Ms. Peters wondered if the City had thought about what they would do if hate groups wanted to march in Columbia, and asked for a report. Mayor Treece pointed out a hate group had been here in 2007 and it had been successfully handled in that everyone went home safely. The Westboro Baptist Church had protested a funeral here and 3,000 people stood up and blocked their views while the police had protected their rights to say mean and hateful things. He was confident there was a plan in place to address it and did not want the plan to be in writing as report. Ms. Peters understood and stated she did not need a report.

Ms. Peters commented that there had been discussion about the ongoing education police officers received at the NAACP meeting recently, and asked for a report providing information on what that ongoing education involved. She wondered if it was 12 hours every six months, 24 hours in a year, etc. She wanted to know the type of ongoing education they received and how much of it had to do with racial profiling or implicit bias.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 1:13 a.m.