

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES  
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL  
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI  
MAY 19, 2014**

**INTRODUCTORY**

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, May 19, 2014, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members TRAPP, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID and CHADWICK, were present. Council Member SKALA was absent. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES**

Ms. Hoppe asked for a change to the minutes toward the end of the discussion of B103-14. She thought it should read “Ms. Hoppe recalled that the City Council had tried to...” instead of “Ms. Hoppe commented that recalled the City trying to...”

The minutes of the regular meeting of April 21, 2014 and the regular meeting of May 5, 2014 with the change requested by Ms. Hoppe were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Trapp and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

**APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA**

Mayor McDavid notified the public that B118-14 had been withdrawn by the applicant. Ms. Chadwick requested B126-14 be moved from the consent agenda to old business. Ms. Nauser requested B123-14 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B123-14 and B126-14 being moved to old business and B118-14 being withdrawn, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

None.

**APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

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

**BOARD OF PLUMBING EXAMINERS**

Arms, Bret, 7006 Montauk Court, Ward 5, Term to expire May 31, 2016  
Schulz, Bill, 1716 Stirling Court, Ward 5, Term to expire May 31, 2016

**COLUMBIA HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD**

Rogers, Genie, 1400 Business Loop 70 East, Ward 3, Term to expire May 31, 2018

**ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY COMMISSION**

Kirshner, David, 200 Wallaby Way, Ward 2, Term to expire June 1, 2017  
Parker, Dick, 215 W. Sexton Road, Ward 1, Term to expire June 1, 2017

**PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION**

Blevins, Marin, 508 Smoky Mountain Court, Ward 4, Term to expire May 31, 2017

Davis, Sue, 2209B Creasy Springs, Ward 2, Term to expire May 31, 2017

**PUBLIC TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMISSION**

Ms. Hoppe commented that there was only one applicant for the Public Transit Advisory Commission (PTAC), and that applicant resided in the same ward as many of the current PTAC members, so she suggested they allow time for more people to apply.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to readvertise the vacancy for the Public Transit Advisory Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**ROCK QUARRY ROAD SCENIC STAKEHOLDER GROUP**

Pritchard, Jan, 3505 Rock Quarry Road, Ward 6

Stephenson, Mariel, 2111 Rock Quarry Road, Ward 6

Wilson, Victoria, 3201 Blackberry Lane, Ward 6

Youmans, Julie, 2101 Rock Quarry Road, Ward 6

Davis, Tony, 4655 Rock Quarry Road, Boone County

Hammen, Janet, 1844 Cliff Drive, Ward 6

Peters, Elizabeth, 305 McNab Drive, Ward 6

Peterson, Bev, 1702 University Avenue, Ward 6

Donaldson, Meredith, Parks and Recreation Commission

Hoppe, Barbara, Ward 6 City Council Member

Stanton, Anthony, Planning and Zoning Commission

Harder, Dan, Bicycle/Pedestrian Commission

**SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

None.

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**B125-14 Accepting the work on the Sewer District No. 165 (Maple Bluff Drive) sewer construction project; approving the report of the Director of Public Works; levying and assessing special assessments.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Ms. Chadwick wondered if this was the best place to put the City's limited sewer funds given the current need for infrastructure in the First Ward, and asked why this was a higher priority. Mr. Glascock replied this project had already been completed and this ordinance would allow for the levying of tax bills. Mayor McDavid understood the City had the choice of either levying the tax bills or doing the work for free. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser asked if this project had been initiated by the neighborhood. Mr. Glascock replied these were all failing on-site sewers. Ms. Nauser understood the on-site systems were leaching into the streams so this was a public health and safety issue. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas understood each homeowner would be charged \$5,000 and asked about the remaining costs. Mr. Glascock replied \$463,941.10 would come from the sewer utility. He explained the City could have deferred the tax bills on these lots, but felt it was unlikely the deferred amounts would ever be paid since the odds of a one acre lot with a house on it being split or subdivided was slim. Mr. Thomas asked for the meaning of a deferred tax bill. Mr. Glascock replied the rest of the bill would be deferred into the future by placing a lien on the property, and that lien would have had to be paid when the lot was subdivided, rezoned or there was an increase in the number of water meters serving the lot. Mr. Thomas asked if these different options were considered when the decision was made to proceed with construction. Mr. Glascock replied yes. He pointed out bond proceeds were used, and the City could not be repaid when bond proceeds were used.

Mr. Thomas understood this was not an annexation. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. The on-site sewer systems were removed, and the public main was constructed. Mr. Thomas asked if this area was within Columbia City limits. Mr. Glascock replied it was within the City limits, and explained it had been annexed previously. Mr. Thomas understood this area had been annexed in the recent past to obtain City sewer. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas asked if this was consistent with the City's general policy for these kinds of situations. Mr. Glascock replied it was not consistent in that the Council decided to not defer tax bills for these properties. He explained there would normally be deferred tax bills, but staff had recommended not issuing the deferred tax bills since the lots were already one acre in size with a house. The only one that would be potentially split or subdivided was the six acre tract at the end. Mr. Matthes pointed out it was a process outlined in ordinance, and Council had the option to defer, but in this case the facts were such that the price was too high for the individual homeowners. He referred to the legislative history section in the council memo and noted this had been a nine year process. Mr. Thomas asked if the annexation had been included in the legislative history. Mr. Matthes replied he thought the history only included items related to the construction project. Mr. Thomas understood the City did not have a policy because they had not previously encountered a situation such as this in terms of really small lots. Mr. Glascock explained this large of a sewer district was uncommon. They normally had one or two properties at a time.

Mayor McDavid asked how many sewer districts like this were outstanding. Mr. Glascock replied he did not have an exact number. Mayor McDavid stated he was uncomfortable with the process as this was an affluent neighborhood with beautiful houses. If this was land that was undisturbed, the developer would have to install the sewer and the homeowners would have to pay for it, and those homeowners' user fees would pay for other projects, such as this. In addition, First Ward resident user fees were paying for projects such as this. He reiterated it did not seem right. He noted they were so far along with this project that there was no recourse, but suggested they consider the fairness of their constituents paying user fees that were funding this sewer improvement in an affluent neighborhood.

Ms. Chadwick understood Mr. Glascock had indicated other projects similar to this would come before the Council in the future. Mr. Glascock explained there were

developments just outside of the City limits that were constructed to Boone County standards with lagoons or septic tanks, and they tended to want sewer once they were surrounded by the City. He noted it was a way to get rid of on-site sewage, and would continue to be an issue as Columbia continued to grow. Mayor McDavid understood the theory behind these projects was that he benefited by living in a community with good sanitation even though he might not live near these areas. Mr. Glascock felt the question was whether they wanted sewage running through streams and across City property as a result of failing sewers. Mayor McDavid understood the City was responsible for the streams if they were contaminated. Mr. Glascock pointed out the City was not responsible for the streams. The City was responsible for the health of the community. Mayor McDavid understood the City could get fined by the Department of Natural Resources. Mr. Glascock stated they could if it was a City system.

Ms. Nauser commented that she believed everyone should have some form of buy-in regardless of income or neighborhood as everyone benefited in terms of health and safety. She thought they should look at fairness in terms of the proportion of the tax bill as she did not feel it was prudent to charge someone \$176,000 for a sewer line. She noted this subdivision had been built at least twenty years ago as this issue had been going on since 2005 so it was not a new subdivision. Mr. Glascock pointed out the rules had changed in terms of private common collectors as well in that the property owner was not tax billed as long as the necessary easement was provided to the City. Ms. Nauser understood that was a policy, and felt they should stick to the policy in order to be fair. Mr. Glascock explained this was done due to the cap on deferred tax bills, which had now been extended to \$2 million.

Ms. Nauser asked if the people in this neighborhood had been actively seeking this project. Mr. Glascock replied yes because some of them had failing sewers. Mr. Matthes noted a petition had been signed by the residents in 2005.

Mr. Thomas understood this was similar to private common collector elimination (PCCE) projects. He thought the only real difference was that PCCE was a piped sewer system rather than on-site detention. In both situations, the City was taking over the system and investing the funds needed to bring the system up to standard. In this situation, the City asked for \$5,000 from each home, but for PCCE projects, the City only asked for the easements. Mr. Glascock pointed out the City received easements in this situation as well. Mr. Matthes noted another difference was that the City treated the PCCE flow, but did not treat the flow when a septic system was involved. Mr. Thomas understood the City was treating the flow prior to the transfer for PCCE projects, so those people were also paying for that treatment. In this situation, they were not paying anything.

Ms. Chadwick thought the Council might need to revisit the policy. Mr. Glascock pointed out it was an ordinance, and not a policy. Ms. Hoppe suggested this be discussed at a future pre-council meeting. Mayor McDavid commented that ordinances reflected policy, and those ordinances could be changed. Mr. Matthes stated this topic would be added to the pre-council meeting list.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp stated he thought the City had an interest in taking septic systems offline and in protecting the water supply. He agreed it was expensive, but felt the current ordinance was the appropriate way to handle it in terms of using it as a way to bring people into the City. He pointed out those that were not in the City, but lived on the edge of the City limits, were still using City services while not paying for those services. He did not feel someone would pay \$150,000 for a sewer for a \$250,000 house, and this was the only way the City could get the water clean. He stated he would vote in favor of it.

Mayor McDavid stated the City was in the process of analyzing appropriate development fees, and noted they would have to make a joint decision with regard to what might be fair. He thought this pointed out what they could not let happen, which was making development outside their jurisdiction substantially less expensive as it would result in lower standards and bigger problems in the future.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she thought it would be good to look at the policy in terms of how it worked and priorities due to the limited funds they had for these types of projects.

B125-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B129-14 Authorizing the installation of a solar photovoltaic (PV) pilot project behind the West Ash Pump Station located at 1917 West Ash Street; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood a company in Centralia, Missouri made anchors for these and asked if any preference would be given to them. Mr. Johnsen replied staff had participated in a number of discussions with that company to try to get them in touch with past contractors. In the past, the City was only able to encourage the contractor to use that company, and he hoped they had a little more control this time in terms of where the parts came from, how they were purchased, their price, and how they would be installed.

Ms. Chadwick asked if there was anything the Council could do to help. Mr. Johnsen replied it primarily involved the purchasing arrangements. He explained they hoped to find a good design and supply, which would require separate contracts and the staff putting the project together. They would lose some control if it was determined one contract was best for the entire project.

Mr. Trapp asked if there was a cost estimate compared to other forms of energy the City purchased, such as solar on the roof of his house. Mr. Johnsen replied staff was aiming for \$2,000 to \$2,500 per kilowatt, which was probably substantially cheaper than what he had purchased for his house. He pointed out the capital costs tended to decrease with projects this size.

Ms. Hoppe understood this was something the City would own in perpetuity as long as it lasted, which was different than community solar where people leased solar. Mr. Johnsen explained the community solar approach could be used with this site. It would allow a more direct interface with the community, costs could be offset directly to the participating people, and those people would see credits on their bills. He noted staff did not have all of the details

to determine if this would be a good candidate or time to try community solar, and pointed out this site had been meant to be developed as suggested for a while. It faced the right direction, had a slope, etc.

Mr. Trapp asked if they had estimates of the cost of energy from that system. Mr. Johnsen replied he did not have a dollar per megawatt hour cost for him at this time since he did not know the number of megawatt hours that would be produced or how long the system would last. There were too many variables and assumptions that would need to be made.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Mayor McDavid stated he thought this was an interesting project because it monetized the cost of solar energy. He understood this was estimated to cost \$500,000, but felt 20 years for the life of the panels was optimistic as panels tended to degrade. In addition, solar panels were improving annually so he felt solar panels five years from now would be better than these panels. He understood today's AA municipal bonds were selling at 3.5 percent interest, and when this project was amortized at that percentage, the annual cost was about \$34,800. Assuming a midpoint of 275 for megawatt hours, the cost was about \$126.53 per megawatt hour. He referred to the Renewable Energy Report, which indicated Bluegrass Ridge wind was \$67, Crystal Lake wind was \$56, the landfill was \$47, and Free Power was \$54. He noted Free Power was a solar demonstration project and did not really provide any power. He believed the cost of this energy should be compared to the cost of energy the City did not have to purchase, and for Free Power, it was \$36.47. This project would produce solar energy at \$126 per megawatt hour when they could be buying it at \$36 per megawatt hour. He understood the City had a mandate to increase renewable energy, but would still vote against this project because they could purchase twice as much in wind energy with this money. If they were serious about reaching 15 percent in renewable energy in three years, he thought they would need to make some smart decisions. He did not believe solar was it in terms of efficiency and capturing it, and thought wind was a better choice for Columbia. He stated he would vote against this project.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she had recently attended the Renewable Energy Conference at the University of Missouri, and noted there were some excellent presentations with regard to community solar. In many communities, the solar projects were purchased or leased by residents prior to being built. She agreed Columbia Water and Light was not there yet in terms of the details involved with community solar, but felt this was a prime example of the City building solar with the possibility of the community leasing a part of it. She noted a person that leased or purchased community solar could move and transfer it to their new location, and renters could participate as well by transferring it if they left the community. She stated it was an investment to the community by the community, and would greatly lower the cost to the City. In addition, it was clean energy.

Mr. Thomas stated he agreed with Ms. Hoppe, and noted this was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan goals and something the community wanted. He believed moving ahead with this project would inspire more people to take an interest in solar. He agreed with Mayor McDavid in that the cost of infrastructure was what it was currently, but those costs were going down, and that was in part due to the interest in it. He commented that he was

not aware of any evidence indicating solar panels degraded after 20 years, and felt that was an arbitrary time line. He stated he would vote in favor of this project, and noted he was pleased to hear the City would build the missing sidewalk on the east side of Bernadette as part of this project in order to comply with the policy of addressing sidewalk gaps with the developments of lots.

Mr. Trapp agreed solar was expensive and felt this was more an exercise in values than in economics. He understood solar panels degraded at about half of a percent per year, which would allow for a good and productive life. He agreed the City would be committed to these panels for an ongoing period of time if the project was approved, and that it was an expensive way to generate electricity, but believed it was an important step. It was a tiny fraction of the City's generation capacity and allowed for diversification. He felt solar would have likely looked better had it not been for the natural gas boom, and the implications of that were uncertain. In addition, they did not know if the price of natural gas would continue at this lower price. He noted this project would lock the City into this for the long-term, and pointed out solar matched up better with the City's peak energy usage. He agreed these initial steps were a bit more expensive, but believed it was a small step and a step in the right direction.

Ms. Nausser stated she agreed with Mayor McDavid in that this was an expensive pilot project, and felt this \$500,000 could go toward more pressing infrastructure needs. She noted she would vote against this project.

Ms. Chadwick stated she would support this project as she felt it represented a value in the community as many were in support of renewable energy. She noted she and others of the First Ward were excited the project would be located in their ward, and pointed out it was a pilot project so they would be able to see the economics. She explained this also allowed the City to diversify the types of energy it had as well.

B129-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, THOMAS, HOPPE, CHADWICK. VOTING NO: NAUSER, MCDAVID. ABSENT: SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**(A) Installation of audible pedestrian signals and countdown timers at the intersection of College Avenue and Broadway.**

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Cheryl Price, 511 Parkade Boulevard, stated she was a member of the Disabilities Commission and thanked the City for allowing them to set priorities for the money that had been made available to them. She noted this project was high on the Commission's list of priorities, and would positively impact many people to include those who were blind or had low vision. She hoped the project would be completed in October as anticipated. She commented that she supported the City's efforts for safety improvements on College as she did not believe there was a street in Columbia that needed more attention than it.

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

Ms. Hoppe noted this intersection did not have any pedestrian safety features or signals and was very difficult to cross by bike or when walking due to having to avoid cars that were turning. She believed the audio portion of this project would assist everyone, and not only those that could not see. She stated she was happy to see this move forward as it was really needed.

Mr. Trapp commented that he had shared these plans at the annual meeting of the Missouri Chapter of the National Federation of the Blind in Columbia when he had provided welcoming remarks, and they were very pleased to know the City was trying to address these kinds of issues. He stated he planned to support the project.

Ms. Nauser stated she hoped this was not the only intersection addressed in this manner, and that they considered it for other dangerous intersections as well.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to proceed with plans and specifications for the construction of audible pedestrian signals at the intersection of College Avenue and Broadway. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**(B) Construction of roadway safety improvements on College Avenue between University Avenue and Rollins Street.**

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Benjamin Ross, 1113 Fay Street, explained he was an engineer with Engineering Surveys and Services and that the City had hired his firm to assist with the College Avenue Safety Enhancement project. He provided a history of the project, which began in 2009 when the University of Missouri hired a consultant to conduct a pedestrian study that had concluded the current pedestrian environment along College Avenue was unsafe. He noted the City had worked with MoDOT and the University of Missouri during 2012 and 2013 to acquire grant funding, and his firm was hired in August 2013 to begin this process, which included targeted outreach, two interested parties meetings and today's public hearing. He pointed out they were recommending Alternative A and believed the project would be built during the summer of 2015 when the students were out of session and there was less traffic along College Avenue. He stated over 19,000 vehicles per day traveled on College Avenue, and there were 2,500 vehicles per day during peak hours. In addition, the University of Missouri traffic study had indicated an average of 2,500 pedestrians per day crossed College Avenue at a mid-block. At the peak hour, about 460 pedestrians crossed at the mid-block. He described the process, and explained they had listened to the concerns of those contacted for the targeted outreach, which included the East Campus Neighborhood Association, the City Fire Department, the City and University Police Departments, and several University of Missouri campus planning committees, in order to develop alternatives. They then took the input received at the targeted outreach and the first interested parties meeting to develop the alternatives presented at the second interested parties meeting. He explained pedestrian and driver safety were the highest priorities of the project, and he described the results of the research conducted in terms of crosswalks, medians, HAWK signals, etc. He noted Alternatives A and B included HAWK signals, marked crosswalks with stamped pavement, a restriction on left turns, and a vertical element, such as a short wall or

fence, and the staff at the City and the University preferred Alternative A. Although it was more expensive, they felt the life cycle cost would be less. He described Alternative A in more detail, and noted the space between the column and the face of the curb was 1.5 feet, the distance between the wall and the face of curb was two feet, and the angle of the pavement was at a 30 percent slope. In addition, 140 left-hand turns going into and out of the East Campus Neighborhood would be displaced during the peak hour. A dedicated left-turn lane and a protected left turn could be added at Rollins Street to assist with the displaced left turns along with the potential for other alternatives.

Mayor McDavid asked if the HAWK signals would be pulsed. Mr. Ross replied they would be coordinated with the upstream and downstream traffic signals. Traffic would be stopped when the button was pressed, but if the button was immediately pressed again, it would force the pedestrians to wait. The goal was to try to stop traffic for pedestrians and those in wheelchairs, while still moving vehicle traffic. They were not trying to favor pedestrians completely over vehicles.

Ms. Hoppe understood some of the potential solutions for the displaced left turns into and out of the East Campus Neighborhood during peak hours would not be implemented immediately due to the cost. Mr. Ross stated that was correct. Ms. Hoppe asked for clarification regarding the peak hour or hours at which the 140 displaced left turns occurred. Mr. Ross replied the University of Missouri study included peak hour counts for the morning, at noon, and in the evening, and the highest count of those three was 140. Ms. Hoppe asked for the total displaced left turns during the entire day. Mr. Ross replied he would have to look up that information and get back to her.

Ms. Hoppe understood the study conducted by the University in 2009 had indicated most accidents occurred at the intersections with signals. Mr. Ross stated that was correct as most of the vehicle/pedestrian crashes had occurred at the University Avenue and College Avenue intersection. They thought that was due to the conflicting turning movements of vehicles turning left and right at the intersection while pedestrians were trying to cross the road. He pointed out the benefit of the proposed HAWK signals was that pedestrians could cross the road without any conflicting turning movements by vehicles.

Ms. Chadwick commented that they would be increasing the number of turns at the intersections, and asked what would be done to improve crossing at the intersections of Rollins Street and College Avenue and University Avenue and College Avenue. Mr. Ross replied most of the 140 displaced left-turns were headed south, and he believed most of those vehicles would go to the Rollins Street intersection to make the left at the stoplight. He noted they had identified a future improvement that could not be built with current grant funding. Ms. Chadwick asked for the cost of the future improvement. Mr. Ross replied \$270,000 would allow for a new traffic signal and the widening of pavement to the south.

Ms. Hoppe understood one rating factor involved whether the grant application description was met, and the grant application description was not to provide safe crossing for pedestrians. It was to provide a safe crossing with a median. This meant any alternative with a median barrier received five points, and if it did not include a median barrier, it did not receive those five points. Mr. Ross agreed the grant application included a full-length median barrier, but it was really a pedestrian safety grant, so those points were allocated as long as

the proposal improved pedestrian safety and met the spirit of the grant. He noted Alternative G included a landscaped median, but since it would not be completely blocked by landscaping, it scored a little lower.

Ms. Chadwick asked if pedestrians would be able to walk over the median if they added landscaping to the two-foot slanted wall. Mr. Ross replied the wall would block pedestrians. He explained many people had requested landscaping in the interested parties meetings, and the concern was maintenance and safety. The existing pavement width on College Avenue from curb to curb was only fifty feet, and the lanes were ten feet wide, so they only had ten feet of usable space. This would result in about two feet for landscaping once the median was constructed. He noted they did not feel it would be safe for City or University staff to maintain landscaping on a two-foot wide strip next to narrow ten-foot vehicle travel lanes. He pointed out MoDOT had concurred with their opinion that landscaping would not be the best for this location. Ms. Hoppe asked if they had considered zero landscaping plants, which would include heat-tolerant and low-maintenance plants. Mr. Ross replied Landworks Studios, which was the landscape architect, had listed several plant species they felt would work well at pedestrian crossings, and MoDOT was against the idea from a safety standpoint.

Ms. Hoppe commented that fences, barriers, concrete walls and landscape medians all received five points for the criteria of the appearance matching the corridor, and asked for clarification on how that was rated because many people did not agree. Mr. Ross replied the design team rated it based upon input received.

Mr. Thomas noted one of the slides had included a very attractive landscaped median option, and understood the argument was that it would be dangerous to maintain. Mr. Ross stated it scored lower due to maintenance and because they felt people would continue to jaywalk over the median. Mr. Thomas asked it was an actual photo or a photo creation as he believed there would be data if it was an actual photo. Mr. Ross replied he did not know, and explained the photo came from a Federal Highway Administration safety pamphlet. He pointed out they interpreted it to be a landscaped median that was not intended for people to walk across. He noted College Avenue was unique in terms of the number of pedestrians that crossed it, and they felt that although it would look nice, it would be hard to maintain and people would walk over the top of it, which would not result in much of a safety improvement. Mr. Thomas stated he had a different opinion, but neither of them had any data to support their opinions.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was data on how a median with a fence versus a median with attractive landscaping affected traffic speeds. Mr. Ross replied that College Avenue had about 460 pedestrians and 2,000 vehicles per day, so it was off of the chart in terms of volume, and he believed more improvements than just a median and crosswalk were needed. He stated he had not seen any data regarding traffic speeds, but understood pedestrian crashes would be reduced. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Ross if he had any intuition from his work as an engineer as to whether the impact of a hard vertical wall alongside a roadway would be different from something softer. Mr. Ross replied the landscape architect had indicated vertical elements could be used as a traffic calming device. People would slow down for

something that stuck up more than a flat median. He noted they also believed the stamped pavement to accentuate the crosswalks would slow down vehicles.

Mr. Thomas asked if Mr. Ross would consider the phasing of the traffic signals at the College Avenue and Rollins Street intersection and the College Avenue and University Avenue intersection where it was green for north/south traffic including turns, green for east/west traffic including turns, and then red for all directions so pedestrians could cross without any traffic movements.

Linda Moen, a traffic engineer with EFK Moen, LLC, stated they could look into it, but pointed out an all red would require everyone to stop and would likely result in significant delays in the corridor. She noted they rarely saw an all red in a high traffic corridor due to corridor progression issues. Mr. Thomas understood the concept of cars moving along in bubbles with consistent green lights was good from a traffic standpoint. Ms. Moen stated platoons were a good thing for traffic progression, especially on College Avenue as the progression was from Stadium Boulevard to Broadway. The HAWK signal as it was proposed would not do a lot of damage to that progression. She reiterated her perception was that an all red would create a problem in term of progression, but it could be reviewed further. Mr. Thomas stated he thought it would be good idea to look at it in an effort to reduce accidents since there were a lot of accidents at those two intersections. Ms. Moen explained it came up often, but she had not seen it done because it did too much damage to traffic flow.

Ms. Hoppe commented that there was a concern with regard to adding traffic to the College Avenue and University Avenue intersection in terms of those going south or turning left from the East Campus Neighborhood because pedestrians tended to cross even after the light changed for vehicle traffic from red to green causing the vehicles to wait and miss their opportunity to turn before the light changed again. She asked if that issue had been studied based on existing conditions and the fact traffic would be added there due to restricting left turns elsewhere. Mr. Ross replied many had expressed concern regarding the difficulty of making a westbound left off of University Avenue to College Avenue at the interested parties meeting, and they hoped that many of the pedestrians that crossed College Avenue would now cross at the HAWK signals, which were lined up with high traffic areas on campus.

Ms. Hoppe asked if compliance and changes in behavior with education had been considered in rating the alternative without medians and with the HAWK signals. She noted the University of Missouri had extensive off-campus facilities in terms of educators that educated on a variety of topics, and wondered if that type of education with regard to the HAWK signals had been considered in rating the change in behavior. Mr. Ross replied they had considered both education and enforcement in the overall review of the alternatives, and noted they were not optimistic that education would change behavior due to the high turnover of residents in the area and the demographics of the majority of pedestrians. Ms. Hoppe asked if data supporting that was available. Mr. Ross replied no.

Ms. Chadwick asked for the width of the median. Mr. Ross replied the width of the raised median would be five feet at the bottom and the columns would be two feet wide. In addition, the height from the pavement upward was about five feet. He displayed a depiction of the median with the measurements.

Mr. Thomas asked for the width of the lanes with the median. Mr. Ross replied the width would vary. He explained the lanes were currently ten feet wide, and they would be left at ten feet wide at the northern end, but the middle and southern end might be widened to about 10.5 or 11 feet. Mr. Thomas asked for the width of the center turn lane currently. Mr. Ross replied it was ten feet. Mr. Thomas asked what happened to the other five feet. Mr. Ross replied the vertical face of the curb would not be built on the lane line, so it would be offset. Mr. Thomas understood there would be a shoulder in middle next to the median. Mr. Ross stated that was correct.

Ms. Hoppe understood the median barrier would likely preclude any possibility of bike lanes on College Avenue since there would not be any additional space, and asked if bike lanes had been considered as a future option for the College Avenue corridor. Mr. Ross replied the road would need to be widened to accommodate bike lanes in the future, and it would be expensive.

Ms. Nauser asked for the timeframe for the grant. Mr. Ross replied the project needed to be under contract by December 1, 2014. Ms. Nauser asked when the project would need to be completed. Mr. Ross replied a completion date was not required.

Ms. Nauser understood the recommendation was for Alternative A, and asked if leftover grant funds could be used to assist with traffic flow if Alternative B was chosen. Mr. Ross replied it would have to be approved by MoDOT.

Ms. Nauser understood the letter from MoDOT dated March 5, 2014 indicated support for Alternatives A and B, and asked if that meant MoDOT was not supportive of the other options, such as those that included landscaped medians, which MoDOT would be responsible for since it was a MoDOT road. She wondered what would happen if they chose a different alternative. Mr. Ross replied he believed the letter from MoDOT indicated they felt left turns conflicted with pedestrians, which they did not want. He understood MoDOT did not want landscaping either as they had indicated they would not maintain it, and noted the other partners were hesitant as well. Ms. Hoppe pointed out there was a question as to the definition of maintenance in this regard.

Ms. Nauser commented that based upon the City's experience on a similar project, she believed they would have trouble obtaining MoDOT approval if something other than Alternative A or B was chosen by the Council, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Ross replied he thought that was correct. He noted it was a MoDOT road, so MoDOT would need to approve whatever was built there.

Ms. Hoppe asked if MoDOT would pay for a project with only the two HAWK signals to determine how those would work with education. Mr. Ross replied they would have to ask MoDOT as he did not know. Ms. Hoppe felt those were not really options if MoDOT would not pay for them, and it was strange to consider them as options if they were not options. Mr. Ross explained the grant specifically stated a raised median or a median, so he was unsure if MoDOT would approve HAWK signals by themselves. Ms. Hoppe stated that was disappointing because every time this issue had come before the Council, she had asked if other options would be considered since they did not want an end solution without input from all parties, to include the neighborhood and the community. She understood the idea of the medians had come forward in 2009 without community input, and she had been assured this

would be an open process whereby other options would fully considered. Ms. Chadwick commented that the City would be forced to choose an alternative that would create more problems on City streets and likely cost over \$200,000 in the future to correct if they were forced to only consider Alternatives A or B. Mr. Ross pointed out they had looked at a lot of different alternatives, and felt they would need to confirm with MoDOT what they would specifically allow and not allow in general and in terms of the grant. He explained they had started with the grant criteria in developing design alternatives. If all 140 displaced left turns went to Rollin Street, a left-turn lane would be needed and would cost about \$270,000 to \$280,000.

Ms. Hoppe commented that page 23 showed eight people preferred options with trees or landscaping, which was not Alternative A or B. Mr. Ross stated that was correct. Ms. Chadwick understood the majority of the people requested trees and landscaping. Mr. Ross explained there were about 20 people in attendance, and eight people asked for trees and landscaping. Ms. Chadwick understood it received the majority vote. Mr. Ross stated there were quite a few landscaping comments at both interested parties meetings.

Mr. Thomas asked how many accidents per month there were at this time. Mr. Ross replied there had been eleven reported pedestrian crashes from June 2005 to September 2009. Mayor McDavid understood there were nine from October 2009 to June 2010, which was a 29 percent increase. Mr. Thomas understood that was about one per month. Mr. Ross stated it was only 0.2 per month, and noted he needed to look up that information. Ms. Hoppe asked Mr. Ross if he could indicate whether those accidents were at the intersections or at mid-crossings as well. Ms. Nauser noted the study indicated most accidents occurred at the signalized intersections, suggesting high concentrations of pedestrians and turning vehicles at intersections was an unsafe condition.

Ms. Chadwick understood there would be an increase in the number of cars turning at the signalized intersections, but nothing was being done to better pedestrian crossings at the intersections. Mr. Ross stated they would be offering a safer place to cross away from the intersections, and noted the stoplights at University Avenue and Rollins Street would be connected to the HAWK lights.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Janet Hammen, 1844 Cliff Drive, explained she had been authorized by the officers of the East Campus Neighborhood Association to speak for the Association even though an official meeting had not been held, and noted they were uncomfortable with the process associated with this project. The entities had gotten together to develop plans, and had then come to the stakeholders that actually used the facilities for their thoughts. She pointed out the Neighborhood Association had indicated all along that they did not like this grant proposal and did not want a concrete barrier or fencing, and they had been told that proposal was only a starting place and did not mean it would be a part of the project, but that was not what they were hearing now, which she felt was misleading. Jaywalking on College Avenue had gone on for more than forty years, and although they had talked about safety for a number of those years, nothing had been done. She did not feel students that came from University Avenue or further north, or those that came from the dorms would go to the mid-block crossings as they would still use the University Avenue or the Rollins Street intersections. Those crossing

at the mid-block crossings would come from Rosemary Lane, Bouchelle Avenue and Wilson Avenue, and that would create the safety issue. She stated she was astounded with the attitude that the students and residents of the area would continue to jaywalk regardless of what was done. She noted there were a lot of students that crossed Broadway, but very few jaywalked on Broadway, and did not understand why people thought the jaywalking would continue if there were two mid-block pedestrian crossings with HAWK lights. She also thought education could be done at orientation and at other times, and suggested enforcement against jaywalking to encourage safe crossings. She thought a shift in thinking was needed. She pointed out that students were upset this issue had come up while school was not in session. She reiterated the Neighborhood Association was not happy with the process, and believed two mid-block crossings with HAWK lights would work with education and enforcement. She felt this could be done initially, and evaluated in a year. She commented that they also did not want left turns to be restricted as it would create problems within the neighborhood. She noted the lights at Rollins Street and University Avenue were horrible due to students crossing there and not allowing vehicles to turn even when they had the light. She asked Council to proceed with the two HAWK lights along with education and enforcement, and evaluate it in a year. If the Council was adamant about the medians, she thought Wilson Avenue should be left open. In addition, she did not believe the one-way streets should be changed. She pointed out there were two fraternities with 100 parking spaces each on College Avenue, and those vehicles would be forced to drive through the East Campus Neighborhood to get to their parking lots. She felt a traffic study of the impact to their neighborhood was needed, and understood that would only be done after approval, which she felt was backwards. She urged the Council to rethink this.

Lance Tamerius stated he was speaking on behalf of the Christian Campus House with properties at 704, 700 and 608 College Avenue, and noted their residents had been jaywalking across College Avenue for 45 years. He explained many people had spent a lot of time developing alternatives to barricades only to find out there would be barricades since the grant had been accepted, and he felt that had been a waste of time. He explained he was not opposed to some kind of barricade or a restriction on left-hand turns if it improved safety even though it would be a terrible inconvenience, but he was concerned because other alternatives had not been considered, and the problems that would be created with the barricades and restrictions had not been addressed. He thought answers needed to be provided prior to approval of the project. He understood there were no plans to expand the sidewalks where students would congregate while waiting for the HAWK lights. In addition, the traffic patterns in the East Campus Neighborhood would change. He explained there would be no way to access their property from the back if they came from East Campus with the proposed plan in terms of one-way streets, etc. He felt this showed a lot of consideration still needed to be given to what would happen to those that lived in the area, and that indecision and confusion would likely cause more accidents than it would prevent.

Bill Easley, 705 Cook, commented that he had been jaywalking for over fifty years and had not had any accidents. He asked the City to consider the changes to Park Avenue and Stadium Boulevard where people could no longer turn, and suggested turning restrictions not be put on College Avenue as he felt the barricades would be ugly. He stated people had to

use common sense when walking or driving, and explained he had a limp and still crossed Broadway, Providence Road and College Avenue. He asked the Council to consider the expense, how it would look, and the fact they would never be able to stop people from jaywalking.

Sarah Smith, 1619 University Avenue, commented that she had lived in the East Campus Neighborhood for 18 years and agreed there were a lot of safety issues on College Avenue, but felt the barrier would create a new realm of safety problems they could not even conceptualize. She understood anyone needing to turn left to go south on College Avenue would be pushed back on to William Street, Rollins Street, and University Avenue, and those areas already had heavy pedestrian, bicycle, etc. use. She believed reversing the traffic flow of the neighborhood would cause congestion and make it unsafe. In addition, turning left onto College Avenue from University Avenue or Rollins Street was already difficult during peak times as it required a person to turn on red while dodging pedestrians or wait through multiple stoplight cycles. She wondered what would happen when that flow increased, and did not believe enough thought had been put into what it would do to the East Campus Neighborhood in terms of pedestrian safety within the neighborhood and the intersections of University Avenue and Rollins Street.

Joyce Snow, 711 Morningside Drive, explained she had lived in her home for 47 years and that Morningside Drive was a fork off of Wilson Avenue. The proposed plan would force her to go to University Avenue or Broadway in order to get home as she did not feel trying to turn left at Rollins Street would do any good. She noted she was also concerned about those that lived in the East Campus Neighborhood as it would create more traffic problems within the neighborhood. She asked the Council to take that under consideration in their decision.

Debbie Strid, 606 S. College, commented that GPS systems tended to bring people to Columbia from I-70 to the Business Loop to College Avenue, and she did not believe people would go to Rollins and then come north again. They would go to University Avenue and then go to William Street. She noted the 140 vehicles making left turns would go to University Avenue if they were headed to Wilson Avenue or Rosemary Lane. She pointed out her property was dependent on access to College Avenue. She understood there was discussion regarding a U-turn, but that would not be done as part of this project, and she wondered what would happen in the meantime. In addition, if someone traveled to Rollins Street, they would use Bouchelle Avenue, and it was already in poor condition. She noted there were a lot of cyclists and pedestrians in the neighborhood who would be impacted. She stated she was in favor of the HAWK signals, but not the fence down the middle of College Avenue. Ms. Hoppe understood Ms. Strid was a business owner with a business in the East Campus Neighborhood. Ms. Strid stated that was correct.

Kathleen Weinschenk, 1504 Sylvan Lane, stated she believed more sidewalks were needed in town.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, commented that she believed the community was disappointed in the process, and wondered if a new grant that did not demand a median could be written. She thought the HAWK lights and crossings might cost the community less if that was an option, and felt they could at least try it. She noted the community favored trees if a median was required as it would cool the community, would look better, and tended

to slow traffic, and pointed out there were types and styles of trees that could minimize concerns and complaints. She stated Clarion Associates had indicated the City could use more trees in the downtown, and noted College Avenue was an extension of the City's only scenic roadway. She suggested they consider trees even if through the use of planter boxes, etc. as it would look nice, and thought they should attempt to ask MoDOT for approval for the use of trees. She noted trees located in other parts of the community were maintained, and she believed the maintenance could be scheduled at times there was less traffic.

Jonathan Hambacker stated he was a University Missouri student and a member of the Missouri Student Association. He commented that it appeared as though all of the issues had not been worked out, and noted he was concerned about safety on College Avenue based on his experiences with close encounters in terms of accidents. He hoped some safety improvements were implemented in an effort to help the situation regardless of decision made.

Syed Ejaz stated he was an affiliate of the Missouri Students Association (MSA) Campus and Community Relations Committee and a concerned Mizzou student. He explained College Avenue was busy, and crossing it hastily was dangerous and a problem. Although the concerns about left turns might be valid, he believed the proposed option provided safety, convenience and peace of mind from the perspective of students, and asked the Council to vote in favor of that proposal.

Rick Shanker, 1829 Cliff Drive, commented that he had lived east of College Avenue for many years, and suggested a crosswalk system, similar to the system that was used at Old 63 and Walnut Street, on Broadway near the new hotel, and on Walnut Street near Orr Street. He stated the proposed cost of this project was \$700,000-\$800,000 or more, and did not believe it was a wise way to spend federal, state or local taxpayer money. He pointed the people crossing College Avenue were residents and students that likely demonstrated adequate high school grade point averages, and given the opportunity would use crosswalks for safe travel. If the barricade was to be built, he suggested a displaced fencing system on the west side of College Avenue that could be integrated to the White Campus theme. The center barrier would impact residents and businesses along College Avenue and all Columbians that used the road. It would impair traffic flow throughout the neighborhood residential streets, create snow removal problems, provide a place for trash to accumulate and provide another palette for graffiti and vandal artists. He commented that he did not believe it would prevent jaywalking as people could jaywalk to the structure, and then walk along it to a crosswalk. He stated Columbia had rejected the idea of fences on major thoroughfares, and the rejection of this wall would be consistent. He hoped the Council would support safe crossings for all pedestrians by providing a crosswalk system and rejecting the expense, eyesore, and problems this proposed plan would bring to Columbia.

Chad Phillips stated he was the Chair of Missouri Students Association (MSA) Campus and Community Relations Committee, and believed this project, which was in close proximity to a high traffic portion of the University, would significantly impact all students. He commented that there was a frequently occurring problem of dangerous pedestrian situations on College Avenue, and did not believe education and the addition of sidewalks alone would resolve the safety issues on College Avenue. With the safety of present and future students

in mind, he stated he supported the addition of the median on College Avenue, and was thankful for any solutions enacted by the City with pedestrian safety in mind. He hoped the Council held the importance of pedestrian safety in a higher regard than the convenience of left turns and traffic in their decision.

Julie Nolfo stated she was the traffic engineer that had conducted the 2009 study for the University of the Missouri that precipitated this project. She explained the University had indicated that for many years students had expressed concern with regard to crossing College Avenue, and when she observed the situation, she found that over 460 students crossed at mid-block. She noted this did not include those that crossed at University Avenue or Rollins Street. In addition, these students tended to stand or walk in the center left-turn lane. She commented that the situation on College Avenue was one of the worst she had observed, and her study recommended improvements be pursued along College Avenue. She understood MoDOT, the University of Missouri, and the City had discussed the situation, and MoDOT and the City had decided to pursue safety enhancement project funds. She explained she had attended both interested parties meetings and had spoken to many residents, and understood the concerns with regard to landscaping versus fencing, but felt the real concern was pedestrian safety. She believed the pedestrians would cross wherever possible regardless of whether there were trees, so she felt a physical deterrent was needed to bring them to the crosswalks, and noted she thought that would provide for a much safer corridor. She stated the recommended alternative was the preferred proposal in her opinion, and one that would allow them to accomplish what they had set out to accomplish for years.

Annette Triplett explained she was the Executive Director of the PedNet Coalition and noted their organization was very concerned with pedestrian safety. She commented that she used to live in the East Campus Neighborhood and it was not only scary for pedestrians, but it was scary for drivers as well since so many people were crossing College Avenue. She stated people from her organization had attended the interested parties meetings and had been happy with how staff had responded to their suggestions and concerns. She pointed out this was a safety issue, and not a landscaping issue. She noted they were some of the people that had suggested landscaping in the center median, but reiterated this was ultimately a safety issue. If landscaping was not the best option, she did not believe that should hold up a project that provided a better safety solution. She understood it would be very expensive to solve this problem, and noted they had grant funds available now. She urged the Council to not let this opportunity lapse, and asked them to use the funds available to help solve this crisis and save lives.

Larry Hubbard stated he worked for University of Missouri Campus Facilities, and noted the University of Missouri supported this preferred design for improvements to College Avenue as it had been presented. He commented that the University had proactively pursued safety improvements along this corridor for at least 20 years, and believed the design presented tonight would provide students a safer means of crossing this very busy roadway.

Marc Strid, 606 S. College Avenue, commented that the speed of cars traveling on College Avenue was an issue as well, and every time that had been brought up, they had been told the City did not want to slow it down. He felt this was necessary if the City really

wanted to improve the safety of students. He also felt the City had failed to consider the fact the barricade would provide a false sense of security for drivers who would continue to travel fast and not be able to stop when a student crossed the barricade as the student would not be seen due to the barricade.

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

Ms. Hoppe commented that she thought it was clear the safety of crossing College Avenue needed to be improved, and had been needed for at least thirty years. She was also pleased the City was moving forward with an improvement for the situation as it was good for students and the residents of the East Campus Neighborhood. She noted they had heard a lot of testimony indicating there had not been a lot of data collected with regard to how the HAWK crossings would work with education, and thought it was insulting to say the students were uneducable. She believed the HAWK crossings would provide a huge benefit for students crossing College Avenue. For thirty years, students could only cross at University Avenue and Rollins Street, which created a huge gap causing students to cross at the mid-block. She reiterated she believed the HAWK crossings would greatly improve the situation as it would provide two additional safe ways to cross College Avenue. Given the lack of data with regard to the benefit of education, the two additional crossings, and the fact this solution with a median would create additional problems that had not been thoroughly studied or funded in terms of left turns, she thought it was reasonable to install the HAWK lights, educate the public and assess the situation in the future. She noted it might be the perfect solution, and it would leave open the option of bike lanes or something more in the future since the middle lane would not be taken up with medians. She noted there had been concern regarding College Avenue being an entrance to the City. She pointed out the installation of just the HAWK signals was the lowest cost alternative at \$280,000. She did not believe they needed to spend the money just because they had it when it had not been fully analyzed and created other problems.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for Alternative D, which included the two HAWK signals and mid-block crosswalks, and to add an education and enforcement component along with a data collection and analysis component to it.

Ms. Hoppe pointed out this might completely solve the problem, and if it did not solve the problem, they could then look for additional funding. She stated she was totally opposed to spending money only because it was available, and for a solution that caused another problem they could not solve and would be expensive to solve.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for Alternative D, which included the two HAWK signals and mid-block crosswalks, and to add an education and enforcement component along with a data collection and analysis component to it, died for the lack of a second.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for two HAWK signals and mid-block crossings with a landscaped median that involved zeroscaping and would allow for a lower cement median with higher vegetation that was drought tolerant and needed very little maintenance, and for left turns to be allowed at Wilson Avenue.

Ms. Hoppe felt that type of median would create the visual deterrent while complying with the interests of many of the respondents in terms of a better-looking median. In addition, the allowance of a left turn at Wilson Avenue would allow some of the existing traffic patterns in the neighborhood to remain.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for two HAWK signals and mid-block crossings with a landscaped median that involved zeroscaping and would allow for a lower cement median with higher vegetation that was drought tolerant and needed very little maintenance, and for left turns to be allowed at Wilson Avenue, was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mayor McDavid stated there was no certainty of any funding for Ms. Hoppe's proposal because it was not anything MoDOT had approved, and noted he would support Alternative A. He understood this would be an inconvenience for those in the East Campus Neighborhood, but pointed out this was a safety issue in his opinion, and not an inconvenience issue. He felt this was a dangerous road with a death waiting to happen. In addition, he believed students would take the shortest distance between two points when crossing regardless of the number of HAWK lights installed. The safety experts had provided their opinion, and he was relying on their opinion. He stated this was a very dangerous pedestrian situation that needed to be approached with Alternative A, and noted he would oppose any other option.

Mr. Thomas commented that he believed the overarching problem was an expectation to be able to get from point A to point B in a very short period of time while using the City's limited transportation resources in a very inefficient way. He felt the pulsing of traffic and desire to keep traffic flowing at 35-40 mph through a built-up area was really the problem, and that needed to be broken up in order to create the livable, walkable, and safe community they wanted. He understood that was ambitious in this culture. He believed the Council had to do something now in terms of College Avenue to not only prevent a death and reduce the number of accidents or injuries, but to also create a feeling of safety so more people would be willing to walk. He understood some residents of the East Campus Neighborhood drove to campus because they did not feel it was safe to walk there. He believed walking, bicycling, and bus journeys were encouraged with traffic calming, and when it was less convenient for traffic to get to a destination. He stated he would not support any left turns because he felt pedestrians would cross at those points, but agreed pedestrians would use the HAWK crossings even with landscaped medians. In addition, the landscaped medians would be more attractive and pedestrian-friendly.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to amend the motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Mr. Thomas to eliminate the left turn at Wilson Avenue. The motion was seconded by Ms. Chadwick.

Mr. Trapp stated he reviewed Chapter 9 of the Institute of Transportation Engineers Traveled Way Design Guidelines, and it indicated a six foot minimum was required for street trees and ten foot was preferred. In addition, frequent pruning was required for sight lines. He did not believe they could create a landscaped obstacle that would be sufficient and agreed this project was about safety. He noted they had heard from 2-3 traffic engineers and felt they needed to rely on their expertise. He commented that they had the opportunity to

pursue grants to cover the bulk of the cost and were partnering with the University for some of the other costs, and this opportunity could go away if they did not follow the associated time lines. He believed this was an opportunity to advance safety and fit within the design standards. He stated he would oppose the motion.

Ms. Nauser commented that she believed this was a public safety issue. She understood this would create an inconvenience, but felt it would only be an inconvenience until people became familiar with the new traffic patterns. She pointed out they had a similar situation about a year ago on Providence Road, and noted they had been forced to move forward as preferred by MoDOT. With regard to this project, the March 5, 2014 letter from MoDOT indicated support for Alternatives A and B. She stated there was no indication for support of a landscaped median, and she did not believe MoDOT would be supportive due to its financial situation. She noted Alternative A had the least maintenance costs per year, and she would support that option because this was a safety issue. She believed the students would cross where convenient unless there was a barrier and felt more than a landscaped median was needed. She reiterated she did not believe MoDOT would allow left turns regardless of the option chosen. If this alternative created other problems, she felt some of those problems could be addressed in the annual budget.

Ms. Hoppe pointed out zeroscaping did not mean trees. It meant native vegetation and drought-resistant plants that needed very little maintenance. It would allow for a very narrow median that created a visual plant barrier.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Ms. Chadwick to amend the motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Mr. Thomas to eliminate the left turn at Wilson Avenue was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Thomas, Ms. Hoppe, and Ms. Chadwick voting in favor of the motion.

Ms. Hoppe withdrew her previous motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for two HAWK signals and mid-block crossings with a landscaped median that involved zeroscaping and would allow for a lower cement median with higher vegetation that was drought tolerant and needed very little maintenance, and for left turns to be allowed at Wilson Avenue, and Mr. Thomas, who had seconded it, was agreeable.

Mayor McDavid made a motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for Alternative D. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Thomas understood based on previous comments it appeared this was the only alternative that would pass tonight, and he believed something needed to be done now, so he stated he would vote in favor of the motion.

Ms. Chadwick stated she agreed something needed to be done now, and felt this was the only option at this point.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she had only withdrawn her motion so she could make a new motion, and felt she had been denied that opportunity.

Mayor McDavid withdrew his motion, and Mr. Trapp, who seconded it, was agreeable.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for two HAWK signals and mid-block crossings with no left-turns and a landscaped median that involved zeroscaping and would allow for a lower cement median with higher vegetation that was drought tolerant and needed very little maintenance.

Mr. Thomas thought the Council had already voted on that motion. Ms. Hoppe stated the Council had voted on Mr. Thomas' amendment. Mr. Thomas agreed, but pointed out his amendment of the motion would have resulted in the same thing.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for two HAWK signals and mid-block crossings with no left-turns and a landscaped median that involved zeroscaping and would allow for a lower cement median with higher vegetation that was drought tolerant and needed very little maintenance was seconded by Ms. Chadwick.

Mayor McDavid stated they did not know whether MoDOT would accept the landscaped median, but that was the risk they took. Ms. Chadwick stated it was one of the options presented to the public, and it appeared to be disingenuous for MoDOT not to accept an option that had been presented to the public. She asked if a representative of MoDOT was present and could comment.

Jenni Jones stated she was a MoDOT Central District Senior Transportation Planner and noted she would have to get back to the Council with regard to whether MoDOT would accept a median with landscaping as she would have to consult with the engineers and design staff.

Ms. Chadwick made a motion to table Item B until the June 2, 2014 Council Meeting so MoDOT could provide input regarding the landscaped median. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe.

Mayor McDavid stated he would not support the motion to table as there was an alternative on the table that they knew MoDOT would support.

Ms. Nauser pointed out this was MoDOT road, and regardless of what the City wanted, MoDOT was final arbitrator. She noted they had been down this path before with Providence Road/Burnam Road, and felt tabling would only delay the inevitable decision of Alternative A or B.

Mr. Thomas stated he recalled MoDOT had changed its position on at least one aspect of the Providence Road/Burnam Road discussion regarding the turns in and out of one of the streets in the Grasslands. Ms. Nauser commented that they had allowed left turns at the last street closest to Stadium Boulevard. Left turns were limited elsewhere.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she did not believe MoDOT would be unwilling to allow another alternative that had been presented to the public even though it was not preferred, and tabling this would allow the City have a full Council as well. She noted the community would be stuck with this decision for a long time, so she thought it was worth thoughtful decision-making.

Mr. Trapp asked if tabling this issue for one meeting would affect the time line. Mr. Bitterman replied he thought it would. He explained that if MoDOT allowed the landscaping, they would likely require it be maintained by another entity, such as the City of Columbia, and staff would then need to come back to Council with associated costs. In addition, the City would likely also have to amend its agreement with the consultant to calculate a cost of designing the landscaped median a drainage system under the roadway to carry rainwater, snow, or whatever got into the storm drain. They would likely need more time to allow the

consultant time to determine the true construction costs and life cycle costs of a landscaped median.

Ms. Hoppe understood the project needed to be under contract by December 1, and under construction by May of 2015, so there appeared to be time to allow for a better decision.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Ms. Chadwick directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for two HAWK signals and mid-block crossings with no left-turns and a landscaped median that involved zeroscaping and would allow for a lower cement median with higher vegetation that was drought tolerant and needed very little maintenance was defeated by voice vote with only with only Mr. Thomas, Ms. Hoppe, and Ms. Chadwick voting in favor of the motion.

Mr. Trapp understood MoDOT would either say no, which meant they were back to choosing from Alternatives A or B, or say yes, which would create engineering changes that would push the City beyond the time frame of the grant requirements. Mr. Thomas stated he did not believe they knew that for certain. Ms. Nauser noted it could potentially add to the cost of the project, which they might not be able to fund. Mr. Thomas stated he thought the costs might be less if they did zeroscaping instead of the wall and fence.

The motion made by Ms. Chadwick and seconded by Ms. Hoppe to table Item B until the June 2, 2014 Council Meeting so MoDOT could provide input regarding the landscaped median was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Thomas, Ms. Hoppe, and Ms. Chadwick voting in favor of the motion.

Mayor McDavid made a motion directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for Alternative A. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Ms. Hoppe asked for clarification regarding procedure if the votes continued to be 3 in favor and 3 opposed. Ms. Thompson replied Council would move on to the next item on the agenda with no action on this particular item when it was done making motions on this item. She pointed out they would have to start this process over because the public hearing would have to be held again. Ms. Chadwick asked how long it took to hold another public hearing. Ms. Thompson replied she did not have the time frames with her, but understood Mr. Glascock had indicated it would be 30 days. Ms. Chadwick asked how that would work with the schedule. Mr. Nichols replied they were up against the time line to be under contract by December.

Mr. Trapp commented that he felt Alternative A was the only way to bring the votes together to move this project forward. He encouraged everyone to consider the safety of students trying to cross College Avenue and an improvement to the pedestrian-friendliness of Columbia, and noted politics was the art of compromise. Ms. Hoppe stated politics was also the art of thoughtful and full decision-making, and she did not believe a month delay was too long to ensure they had all of the information and a full Council for more representation. This was something the community would have for a long time. Ms. Chadwick asked if any Council Member would miss a meeting next month. Mr. Thomas replied he would be absent from the June 16, 2014 Council Meeting.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Mr. Trapp directing staff to proceed with the plans and specifications for Alternative A was approved by voice vote with only Ms. Hoppe and Ms. Chadwick voting against the motion.

**(C) Voluntary annexation of property located on the north side of Prathersville Road and east of State Highway 763 (1339 Prathersville Road).**

Item C was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Chadwick understood the applicant was requesting annexation so they could connect to the sewer as they were not connected to sewer now, and asked how much that connection would cost. Mr. Teddy replied he thought there was a sewer main to the rear of the property that had been built by the Boone County Regional Sewer District, and the cost would be covered by rates. He noted there was a ten year agreement between the Boone County Regional Sewer District and the City that indicated any new connections would annex into the City. Ms. Chadwick asked if there would be a cost to the City to build the sewer infrastructure. Mr. Teddy replied no new public infrastructure was required to accommodate this request. It would only involve private connections.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Jennifer Arnold stated she owned property that was located about one-quarter of a mile north of the proposed annexation. She explained much of the property owned in this area had been owned by the same families for generations, and in her case, it was six generations and soon to be seven generations. She noted they lived in the County and wanted to remain living in the County, and did not want to live in the City. She stated she was opposed to this annexation because she was concerned they would be annexed the closer they became to the City limits. She pointed out this annexation would increase costs to the City in terms of sewers, law enforcement, etc., and noted there was constant law enforcement issues on Prathersville Road and Wagon Trail Road now, which would likely increase with density. She asked the Council to not annex this property.

T.K. Livingston, 4034 Creasy Springs, stated he was the purchaser and developer of the subject property, and explained the only reason this property was being annexed into the City was due to the sewer system. It had an outdated lagoon and the County would not let them upgrade or do anything else with it. He noted the facility would continue to be used for storage. He stated they would connect to the sewer system pay for it themselves. He explained they had worked with the County and the City, and the only way to solve the problem was to remove the lagoon and bring the property up to code by connecting to the sewer, which required annexation.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, commented that she felt the City needed to be careful in terms of annexations due to the existing sewer and financial problems.

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

**OLD BUSINESS**

**B45-14 Rezoning property located on the northeast corner of Providence Road and Turner Avenue, and on the northwest corner of Turner Avenue and Fifth Street, from District R-3 to District PUD-52; approving the statement of intent; approving the**

**Preliminary Plat and PUD Plan of ACC OP Development LLC; setting forth conditions for approval; approving less stringent height, setback and landscaping requirements; granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations regarding dedication of street right-of-way; providing notice as it relates to the provision of utility service.**

**B63-14A Authorizing a development agreement with ACC OP Development LLC relating to property located on the northeast corner of Providence Road and Turner Avenue, and on the northwest corner of Turner Avenue and Fifth Street.**

Mayor McDavid commented that the applicant had requested B45-14 and B63-14A be tabled to the July 7, 2014 Council Meeting.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to table B45-14 and B63-14A to the July 7, 2014 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B118-14 Approving the Final Plat of University Centre Subdivision located on the west side of Providence Road and across from Locust Street (201 S. Providence Road); providing notice as it relates to the provision of utility service.**

Mayor McDavid understood B118-14 had been withdrawn. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

**B119-14 Approving the Minor Plat of Bristol Lake Plat 1-B, a Replat of Lots 36A and 38A Bristol Lake Plat 1-A, located on the north side of the western terminus of Rutherford Drive; authorizing a performance contract.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend B119-14 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B119-14, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B123-14 Vacating a water and electric easement near the southeast corner of Forum Boulevard and Forum Katy Parkway.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, asked if this easement was at Second Street and Locust Street in the Old Town area. Mr. Teddy replied no. Ms. Nauser understood that issue was associated with B122-14. Ms. Welch commented that she had mistakenly asked for the wrong item to be removed from the consent agenda. She wondered why the easements at Second Street and Locust Street were being vacated, and what those people that had requested the vacation had planned on doing at that location.

B123-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**B126-14 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to establish 10-hour parking zones on portions of Cherry Street, Sixth Street and Seventh Street.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked for the staff recommendation. Mr. Glascock replied his recommendation was to approve the replacement of the 2-hour meters to 10-hour meters.

Ms. Chadwick commented that she had asked for this to be removed from the consent agenda because downtown parking was an issue, and this would change parking meters in a prime location to long-term 10-hour meters. She asked what CenturyLink currently did with their vehicles. Mr. Glascock replied they parked anywhere they could and fed the meters every two hours. He explained they were trying to locate them in front of their own building so they would not take up spaces in front of other businesses. Ms. Chadwick asked if there was not an option for their vehicles to be in a parking garage. Mr. Glascock replied he understood the vehicles came from other communities for meetings and training. Ms. Nauser understood those parking spots would not always be filled by CenturyLink. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct, and noted the City could not save them just for CenturyLink as other cars could park there.

Ms. Chadwick asked if there were other 10-hour meters in prime locations such as this. Mr. Glascock replied there were 10-hour meters in the downtown, but he did not believe any were on this street.

Ms. Chadwick asked for clarification as to whether staff was also recommending a parking space on every block for the use of a utility vehicle performing network operations. Mr. Glascock replied no, and explained they would study that issue. He explained a lot of service vehicles, such as Water and Light, CenturyLink, Ameren, came downtown to service buildings and tended to have a difficult time finding parking. He pointed out they would pay a fee for this service. He noted CenturyLink currently had their own hoods and could park anywhere by hooding the meter, so staff was trying to determine a different way of conducting business with them.

Ms. Chadwick asked if there was a way to provide CenturyLink a revolving hangtag so they could share it with out-of-town guests. Mr. Glascock replied CenturyLink and the other utilities did not want to do that. He pointed out CenturyLink was the only company with its own hoods, and staff wanted to move away from that process because it was hard to quantify exactly how much they owed the City. Ms. Chadwick asked for clarification. Mr. Glascock replied that years ago an agreement had been entered into with GTE, which was now known as CenturyLink, allowing them to have their own hoods at a cost per year. This had worked well until the City had raised its hourly meter rates as CenturyLink did not want to pay the increased cost, so staff was trying to come up with a solution.

Ms. Chadwick stated she did not plan to support this since parking was in demand.

Ms. Nauser asked if their fees would be commensurate with what the City negotiated on other long-term leases on parking meters. Mr. Glascock replied this was no longer done with other utilities. He explained they had allowed this to continue because CenturyLink had paid for the service, but they were now saying they did not use as much as they were being asked to pay. He reiterated it was hard to quantify.

Mr. Trapp understood this measure would only change 2-hour meters to 10-hour meters, and the other issue would be looked into further by the City. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Ms. Nauser understood someone would have to plug those meters anyway. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas understood this meant the meters would be

plugged once for ten hours without having to go back and forth. Mr. Glascock pointed out the meters were open to anyone. They could be utilized on a first come, first served basis. They were not being held for CenturyLink. Ms. Chadwick stated the City would be creating 10-hour meters where students could park all day.

Mr. Thomas commented that there was a benefit to having short limits on meters. He asked if the same vehicle could plug two-hour meters on a continuous basis. Mr. Glascock replied no. Mr. Thomas asked if that was enforced. Mr. Glascock replied yes, if they were able to catch it. Mr. Thomas understood people were technically supposed to move their vehicles to a different meter. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct, and pointed out they were supposed to move the vehicle off of that block.

Ms. Chadwick felt this change would create long-term parking at meters by campus. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct, and noted it could always be changed again.

Ms. Hoppe understood the other option was to use the hoods they had. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct, and pointed out the issue was that they could not agree on the price. Ms. Nauser commented that she felt they needed to pay the market rate as was required for everyone else. She pointed out she paid the market rate for her utilities and did not get a discount, so they should pay the market rate as well.

Jeremy Root, 2417 Beachview Drive, commented that he thought parking was an important asset in the downtown. He understood these spots were along Cherry Street, between Sixth Street and Seventh Street, and that the Council would consider a bill later in the evening to place a new development on Seventh Street and Eighth Street with 200 fewer parking spaces than residents. He was not sure why the Council would convert three meters in the heart of downtown to 10-hour spaces for CenturyLink. He understood CenturyLink was not willing to pay for hoods, which would allow them to park anywhere. He did not feel it would be a wise policy decision to convert prime parking spots to 10-hour long-term spaces and wondered why staff was recommending it. If the hoods had value to CenturyLink, he thought they should pay that value to the City. If they did not have value to CenturyLink, they could be treated like everyone else who had to find a parking spot. He did not believe an accommodation with the potential to subvert, create, and diminish the number of available parking spaces for the public downtown should be made for them.

Michael Byrne, 305 Edgewood, stated he agreed with Mr. Root on this issue. He explained he worked downtown and used to work on Cherry Street, and understood his clients who needed to find parking spaces often had a hard time finding it. He felt this change would impact other business, and pointed out the parking garage on Fifth Street had spaces that could be used for longer than two hours. He understood CenturyLink had multiple parking spaces in that parking garage and there was no reason why someone visiting from out of town should not be able to park in that parking garage using one of the spaces assigned to CenturyLink. He reiterated that this did not make any sense and would impact downtown small business owners in a way that was not necessary.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, commented that he believed parking was an extremely valuable asset in Columbia. He understood the City had other arrangements for dealing with interim long-term parking, which included the rental of spaces and the provision

of City-owned hoods, and thought CenturyLink should abide by those policies. He felt it was reasonable to require CenturyLink to abide by the rules everyone else had to follow.

Mr. Thomas understood this was not related to the role of CenturyLink as a utility service provider in Columbia in terms of access to service telephone lines or internet cables. Mr. Glascock stated it was a request from CenturyLink for its out of town staff to be able to park next to the building where they were in training all day.

Mr. Thomas commented that there were a lot of other downtown businesses that had people coming in from out of town, and although it would be nice for each of them to be able to have longer term parking spaces, he was not sure that was good for the downtown parking policy.

Mayor McDavid stated he did not believe this was a good idea and would also vote against this bill.

B126-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NO ONE. VOTING NO: TRAPP, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK. ABSENT: SKALA. Bill declared defeated.

**B130-14 Authorizing an amended and restated agreement with Opus Development Company, L.L.C. as it relates to property located on the north side of Locust Street, between Seventh Street and Eighth Street; providing for the repeal of Ordinance No. 022010.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. St. Romaine and Ms. Thompson provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe understood if Council passed this ordinance and a valid referendum petition was filed, the previous ordinance would not be repealed. Ms. Thompson stated the previous ordinance would not be repealed by this Council action, but it could come to Council through the referendum process. Ms. Hoppe understood the previous approval would be in effect and the petition process that had already started would address it. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct, and explained this was an alternative method based upon the request of Ms. Chadwick.

Ms. Amin commented that she received information from the Boone County Clerk's Office late this afternoon, and based upon what had been provided, she thought there would be enough signatures with the amended petition. She pointed out she needed to double check everything, and noted the Council would receive a certification from her at the next meeting. Ms. Thompson pointed out that was a separate and distinct process.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to amend B130-14 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Chadwick and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Joe Downs, 7733 Forsyth Boulevard, St. Louis, Missouri, stated he was representing Opus Development Company and noted they were in support of this ordinance. He also reaffirmed their steadfast commitment to completing this project for the 2015 school year. He explained they had collaborated with various community members, which had provided conviction to the value of this project to the University of Missouri, the City of Columbia and the Historic Avenue of the Columns. He understood the University had experienced extraordinary growth over the last decade, and was planning for more growth, but would not provide the housing required to accommodate that growth, so they were depending on

private housing stock. He believed that private housing stock was at an extremely low vacancy rate of 3.5 percent, and based on those rates along with the growth the University was planning, he felt it was clear new product, such as the proposed Opus development was needed. He commented that he thought the location of that housing was paramount as students and their parents wanted them to live near campus. He noted downtown Columbia provided the University a comparative advantage over some of their competitors. He explained that safety and security was important, and pointed out the police officer at their development review meeting had indicated their security system was exactly what they wanted. He stated this development would create hundreds of construction jobs and would increase property tax. In addition, their residents would spend their money in The District. He pointed out that on top of the existing development fees, they would pay an additional \$450,000 to accommodate water and sewer infrastructure, which was significantly more than any other project in this town. In addition to that, they were relocating and upgrading a stormwater pipe that ran under the property. They were also committed to the bus transit system through the purchase of passes. He explained they had met with the Avenue of the Columns Committee and the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID), and understood the Downtown CID was pleased with their enhancements to street-level retail and how they had activated the streetscape with their architecture and common amenity areas. In addition, the Avenue of the Columns Committee had indicated the development was appropriate for their master plan in design and character.

Isa Dasho, 918 W. Stewart, commented that she had lived or worked in the downtown for the last seven years, and loved Columbia as it was a vibrant community. She agreed more developments was needed, and noted she was not opposed to development, but did not feel another student structure with 250 undergraduate beds was needed on Eighth Street. She noted these complexes were pricing out people that worked in the downtown, the graduate students, and the young professionals that also wanted to utilize and take advantage of the wonderful amenities in the downtown. She felt the undergraduate complexes changed the dynamic in a way that could not really be foreseen. She did not believe people of diverse ages and affluences wanted to skirt around vomit, and thought the City would need to consider street cleanup in the future. She commented that there had been a lot of organic revitalization in the past five years, and felt it was sad and borderline criminal to allow a fly-by-night out of town developer to decide the future of Columbia's soul. She noted the community-at-large was invested in the downtown, and thought development could continue to occur in an organic manner. She did not believe a 250-bed undergraduate complex was needed as those types of complexes already existed all over town. In addition, she thought they would be facing a student housing crisis bubble in the next five years. She asked the Council to consider those factors in their decision.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyon Street, noted the council memo for B130-14 had indicated the long-term fiscal impact was unknown, but it also indicated it was anticipated fees and charges to the customers of the utility services would be adequate to maintain the system and the economic activity generated from residents would be sufficient to maintain the other public services necessary to serve the project. He believed this anticipated result was patently false. He pointed out the City Manager had indicated in the State of the City report

that staffing in all departments was deficient by about 30 percent. He did not believe this result would occur unless development fees reflected the true cost of mitigating the additional burdens new development placed on overloaded and aging infrastructure. He commented that he thought that would only happen when the City was guided by development policy based on plans approved by citizen participation, which was backed up by appropriate mathematical modeling and algorithms that allowed the true anticipation of the impacts of various development options. He stated the real result of this agreement at this time would be an increase in petty and violent crime, increased traffic, an increased overburden in parking, the increased inflow and infiltration of stormwater and the consequent overflow of sewers, increased rates for service customers, more drunks on downtown streets, more vandalism, and more wear and tear on City streets and sidewalks. He did not believe there would be a significant increase in transit system participation because they would live close to everything needed. He felt the only unknowns at this time were whether the City would be subject to action from the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) or the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for adding load to a recognized deficient sewer system and how the City would pay for the promises made to provide the increase in services demanded by this and other downtown developers.

Holly Henry, 410 Hirth, explained she had attended a meeting last Wednesday in which Mr. Matthes had stated the infrastructure was fine and there was a lot of capacity if it did not rain. She pointed out it had rained, and her basement continued to flood. She stated she felt this development at this time without infrastructure improvements was wrong. She noted she did not object to density in the downtown as she felt density should be around the University of Missouri and the downtown, but wanted to see more mixed-use development versus this single-use of glorified private dorms. She stated the demographics showed the college-age population was on the wane, and these types of arrangements were not suitable for other types of families or young professionals that did not want roommates. In addition, they were extremely expensive and not necessarily well-constructed. She commented that she had read some articles regarding Opus' history with this sort of development, and it raised some questions in her mind. Although there were a series of problems associated with this development, she felt the main reason they should wait to approve it was the fact there was only enough capacity if it did not rain per Mr. Matthes.

Jeremy Root, 2417 Beachview Drive, stated he was representing Repeal 6214, and asked to be allowed five minutes to speak. Mayor McDavid stated he would allow three minutes. Mr. Thomas commented that he disagreed as Mr. Root represented an organized group that was equally as valid as Mr. Downs representing Opus.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to allow Mr. Root five minutes to speak as the representative of Repeal 6214. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved by voice vote with only Mayor McDavid voting against the motion.

Mr. Root commented that he was opposed to this project and believed the Council had an obligation to its constituents to reject it. He read Section 128 of the City Charter, which stated "The voters shall have power to approve or reject at the polls any ordinance passed by the Council, or submitted by the Council to the voters, excepting emergency ordinances as provided for in Section 15 of this Charter, ordinances for the levying of taxes, or for the

issuance of special tax bills, as provided in this Charter, such power being known as the referendum.” He understood initiative petitions had come before the Council in an effort to pass certain ordinances, but was not aware of this power of referendum ever being exercised in the history of Columbia whereby the citizens had felt the Council had gone too far. He noted the State of the City report had indicated about 80 percent of the citizens enjoyed a high quality of life, and he was one of them, but it also showed 66 percent of citizens were dissatisfied with economic growth planning, which was two-thirds of the community, and 4,100 of those people had signed a petition to repeal this project. Many resources had been committed to the downtown in terms of consultants and citizen engagement, and nothing had suggested the need for a student housing complex for undergraduates at the corner of Eighth Street and Locust Street. They all suggested the need for civic space and public use, and this project would take away a block for those uses in the downtown. He commented that regardless of the changes made to the site plan, there would be no public use of this property if the project was approved, and this was not what the citizens wanted. He did not believe this project added any benefit, and noted it would only add cost. He was grateful for the developer’s willingness to contribute to the sewer and stormwater, but those contributions would only allow for their impact to flow more fluidly into an already overburdened system, and he did not believe it made sense or was wise policy. He felt approving projects such as this was why 66 percent of the citizens of Columbia were not satisfied with economic growth planning. He commented that the Council was re-introducing and re-passing an identical development agreement as both had 31 numbered paragraphs. He understood the site plan was different, but noted it was not enforceable as the developer could still change the site plan. He stated these were precious blocks of the town, and those that assisted with the referendum petition loved them so much that they had spent more than three weeks gathering signatures. He commented that the referendum process was critical to democracy and urged the Council to respect it. He reiterated he was opposed to this project and believed the Council had an obligation to its constituents to reject it.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he believed TIF districts and these development agreements would set the community back for a generation. He pointed out Mr. Teddy had indicated in the past that residential development did not pay for the costs it created, and this was residential development, which meant it would not pay for itself. He noted there were at least five other projects behind the Opus project, and regardless of whether Opus moved forward or not, his goal was to stop other projects that would consume the City’s capital as the citizens would be forced to pay increased rates in subsidizing these developments. He suggested the Council repeal B62-14 and reject B130-14, and allow Opus to sue the City because he did not believe it would involve the amounts they feared and it would stop a really bad project. He thought they needed to pay for the mistake made, but did not have to compound it by doing it again. An alternative would be to settle with Opus on the basic terms of the agreement, but not on the basis of a development agreement others could use. It would be on the basis of a legal settlement for legal reasons to avoid the cost of litigation. That would create a barrier and send a message to the City Manager to not sign any further agreements.

Josh Wexler, 801 Martin Drive, commented that his biggest concern was the precedent the Council might set of accepting arbitrary amounts that developers were willing to pay for sewer projects. He understood The Lofts provided an extra \$50,000 and Opus would pay an extra \$450,000, and asked for the formula of these calculations. He also felt the formula should be the same for all participants. He noted he was also concerned with the potential for more college housing, and pointed out students were transient and did not have disposable income. He thought young families that would likely remain in Columbia for twenty years might be better served by having the option to live downtown, and the proposed development did not appear to be able to be converted for that purpose if needed due to economic forces.

Deanna Walkenbach, 407 Pyrenees Drive, commented that she was concerned about Section 3 of the ordinance, and asked if that meant the citizens did not have the right to do another referendum petition. Ms. Thompson replied no. She explained it meant that if there was a referendum petition filed on the amended and restated development agreement, the prior agreement would not be repealed. She noted the Council could not voluntarily repeal Ordinance No. 022010 under the terms of the existing development agreement without being in default. Ms. Walkenbach understood the City would fall back to the first development agreement if a petition was submitted on the second agreement. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. Ms. Walkenbach stated she felt that was a violation of the rights of the citizens to petition. Ms. Thompson pointed out the referendum petition on the first agreement was still pending, and noted the City Clerk had indicated earlier tonight that she believed there would be enough signatures and that the certification would be presented at the next Council Meeting. She stated that process would continue. Section 3 only prevented the voluntary repeal of the ordinance by the City. Ms. Walkenbach understood if they submitted another referendum petition with enough signatures, it would have to go on the ballot. Ms. Thompson stated there was the potential to have a referendum petition for both issues.

Frankie Minor, 403 S. Garth, stated he was relying upon the Council to do its due diligence in serving its citizens, and felt they needed to ensure they had good information. He pointed out the University of Missouri was currently constructing 331 beds, had another 576 beds in the design stage that had been approved, and another 400 beds would be submitted for approval next year. He commented that each of the companies would do due diligence to ensure they did not lose money, but noted studies from local developers had indicated 33,000 undergraduate-focused beds existed in the community, and there were only 27,000 undergraduates in the community. He understood one of the relatively new downtown facilities had opened with a 10 percent vacancy rate. He noted he was also concerned about parking because he believed students would bring their cars regardless of whether there was sufficient parking, and they would park in front of businesses and in the neighborhoods. He felt the developers needed to provide sufficient parking. He commented that the proximity to campus did not contribute to student success as that success was a result of the programs and services provided by the University. Proximity only allowed convenience and easier access to facilities. He stated he was also concerned about the price the facilities were charging as it only created greater debt for the students. He asked

the Council to ensure the developers were building housing needed by this community instead of what they thought was needed.

Ms. Chadwick explained she had attended a meeting recently that included the Chancellor, the President, and Gary Ward, and Mr. Ward had indicated there were currently 6,500 undergraduate student beds on campus and there were 7,400 freshmen this year. She asked if that was correct. Mr. Minor replied the original projections were for 6,400 freshmen for this year and it appeared there would likely be 6,600 freshmen this year. He noted 90 percent would live on campus while 10 percent would either live within commuting distance or in the Greek chapter houses, and were not counted in that number. Ms. Chadwick understood there would be 7,700 beds on campus once all anticipated University projects were completed, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Minor stated he thought that was approximately correct.

Linda Green, 206 Anderson, stated she and her husband had owned a business for over twenty years in the downtown so she felt she had some perspective. She noted she recently saw approximately 30 young people running and shouting at each other on Ninth Street when she was at Lakota, and believed this was the future of downtown. She thought this would chase away customers from downtown businesses because not many people wanted to deal with groups of young people running and shouting. She was also concerned about parking because there would not be any customers if there was no nearby parking. She noted the Opus development did not have a parking solution, and believed the development would create a lot of unpleasant changes in the downtown that would chase away customers of businesses in the downtown and change the complexion of the downtown. In addition, she felt this was overbuilding and should not be done.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, commented that she thought the community wanted the Council to take quick action on the issue of who paid and how much they paid. She felt the City was clearly in a financial mess because the fees charged were in the bottom third when compared to similar cities. Columbia was not even at the median average for developer fees nationwide. This was the reason the City was in this crisis in terms of infrastructure, which included not only hard infrastructure, but soft infrastructure such as police and fire. She also felt the Council needed to concentrate on ensuring development fit within the character of what the public wanted. She believed contentious developer requests would continue if those two issues were not addressed, and asked the Council to move quickly on those items.

Peter Yronwode, 203 Orchard Court, commented that at the recent Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DCLC) forum Mr. Matthes and Mr. Glascock had discussed downtown sewer infrastructure in great detail and had indicated a moderate rainfall greater than one inch had caused overflows at manholes in the sewer along the MKT Trail. He noted Mr. Matthes had also indicated it was impossible to predict the course of development and that the City would always be forced to play catch-up. In this case, he felt they knew exactly where the problem would occur, the extent of the damage it would cause, and had some idea of the cost to correct it. He explained Mr. Matthes had assured the public that the sewer infrastructure was adequate except when it rained, but noted it would continue to rain. He pointed out sewer overflows violated state and federal clean water regulations and occurred

now, even prior to the addition of 260 new residences. The Council had been cowed by the threat of a baseless lawsuit by Opus, but seemed unconcerned by the possibility of enforcement action by DNR and EPA. He noted Columbia was already on EPA's radar for its impairment of Hinkson Creek, so scrutiny of Flat Branch overflows was likely. He asked if the cost of settling these violations would also be charged to the ratepayers of Columbia despite their opposition to this project. He asked if the Council wanted another black mark on Columbia's environmental record to accommodate out-of-state profiteers who had come to Columbia to exploit its inadequate zoning regulations, violate downtown plans that reflected the work of many concerned citizens and businesses, stress inadequate infrastructure, and refuse to contribute more than a paltry percentage of the cost to repair and upgrade the system. He reminded the Council that they worked for the citizens of this community, and not the developers who sought to mine the community for greed. He stated he felt the Council should hold developers to a higher standard than merely complying with C-2 zoning, and making a few trivial concessions would not ameliorate the permanent damage of the project. He recommended the Council vote against this development agreement.

Pam Cooper, 403 West Boulevard South, understood the original proposal did not have first floor retail and the proposed compromise would create more active space. She stated she was confused because she thought Opus had indicated they did not do retail when they had previously come before Council, and had since learned Opus had student housing in other communities, such as Ann Arbor, that had first floor retail. She asked why first floor retail could not be incorporated in this development.

David Mitchell, 408 S. Glenwood, commented that he actually liked having students in the downtown and noted he would not have a job without students since he taught at the University. He did not feel the issue was students in the downtown as they were a part of the community and made it more vibrant. He felt the issue was how they wanted the downtown to look and who they wanted living in the downtown. If only student housing only existed in the downtown, they would miss mixed-families. In addition, they were pricing out families and single professionals who could be vibrant members of the downtown community. He did not feel 200 extra student beds would add much to the downtown. He stated he understood the City was scared of litigation in terms of a breach of contract, but felt the bigger issue was the breach of public trust. The community had placed its trust in the Council to make a decision regarding the impact of this development beyond the construction of the building and students residing there, and felt those who already lived and came to the downtown needed to be considered. He thought they needed to consider the damage and harm to the public space.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, stated she had spoken to the Council many times regarding the fragility of the infrastructure system, and that was one of the reasons citizens were so concerned about this development. She commented that what she found most troubling was that the City, as stewards of public resources, would enter into contractual agreements that left them vulnerable to default, especially since the City Charter contemplated as a condition precedent to a referendum petition that the Council would give serious consideration to repealing an ordinance that upon reflection and further information was unwise. She noted they were at a point where the City Counselor had indicated the City

was in default if the Council repealed the first ordinance as requested by the citizens. She asked the Council to not make this mistake a second time and to ensure language that violated the citizens' trust in protecting their assets was removed before approval of this development agreement so the City was not in default when the Council performed its duty under the City Charter.

Sid Sullivan, 2980 Maple Bluff Drive, explained he had circulated the referendum petition and noted there were many reasons people had signed the petition. Some had been concerned with the process in terms of passing a very controversial ordinance on a Wednesday instead of the usual Monday. Others were upset because City Administration had indicated the City did not have the infrastructure for the development, and they believed it. As a result, there was now a credibility gap. Some were concerned with the loss of the central business district for local residents as they did not believe the area was not big enough to maintain the level of commerce local citizens expected with the influx of students. Others were upset this did not fit within plans, such as the H2 Charrette and the Sasaki Plan. He noted Ms. Hoppe has raised the issue of a moratorium on development about a year ago, and the consultant hired to review the zoning codes had suggested development be withheld until a plan was in place. He pointed out the Council would soon go to the citizens to ask for a tax increase to pay for infrastructure, and lost credibility would affect approval of those tax increases.

Mayor McDavid stated his opinion had not changed as he did not like the disseminated, decentralized student housing that had occurred over the past 15 years and because he was an advocate for affordable, quality student housing adjacent to campus. This proposal was in conformance with the rules, ordinances, codes, and requirements of the City of Columbia, and the proposed project would put a quality housing project in a place where there was currently an asphalt parking lot and empty building. He felt this was a good project and that Columbia would be better for it, and stated he would support this ordinance.

Ms. Chadwick asked for clarification regarding the site plan not being enforceable. Ms. Thompson replied the purpose of this amendment was to amend the site plan, which she believed was absolutely enforceable. The project had to be built in substantial conformity with the site plan attached to the agreement, and that included the active living space on the first floor. The site plan was attached to the agreement so it was enforceable.

Ms. Chadwick asked how the amount contributed had been decided. Mr. St. Romaine replied it depended largely upon the project location. He explained the Columbia Properties II and ACC developments on Conley involved a defined project with a defined beginning and end. It was basically the sewer line that served those two developments that connected to the main trunk line. The total cost of that sewer project was \$450,000, and it would only serve those two projects, so a ratio of beds from those two developments was used to determine how much each of those developments would pay. He noted the Opus development was different, so Public Works provided the cost to upgrade a typical downtown block. He pointed out a block could have multiple uses depending on the number of parcels on the block, but in the situation, Opus was developing the entire block and was asked to contribute \$250,000. In terms of The Lofts, they took the total cost of a typical block, which

was \$250,000, and since they would utilize about 55 feet of a 250-foot block, they were asked to contribute about a fifth of the cost, which was about \$50,000.

Ms. Chadwick understood each Council Member as an individual could be financially liable if the City was sued due to a voluntarily repeal, and asked if that was correct. Ms. Thompson replied there was the potential, and explained a voluntary act raised the potential for a declaration of a voluntary enact in violation of an existing contractual agreement. Ms. Chadwick understood that would make the individual Council Member potentially liable. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct, and pointed out it would be for taking an intentional act they knew was in violation of an existing agreement of the City.

Ms. Chadwick asked if this development was exclusively for students. Mr. Downs stated their building would not be restricted to non-students.

Ms. Chadwick asked Mr. Downs to elaborate on retail versus an active space on the ground floor. Mr. Downs replied they developed a lot in the urban cores and embraced what the specific property would demand, and in many of their projects they had embraced retail. He explained they had looked for a site on Ninth Street, and if they had been on Ninth Street, where there was retail vitality, they would have embraced retail. They did not feel retail would be successful at their current location based on discussions with the retailers they knew of on Ninth Street and regional retailers that conducted business with them. He noted the Downtown CID and the Avenue of the Columns Committee had explained they were trying to create an active pedestrian experience, and they felt they could accomplish that goal in other ways, such as providing active spaces in the interior building, articulation in the architecture, and sidewalk enhancements, which was what they had done.

Ms. Hoppe understood Opus had retail at their developments at Marquette University and in Ann Arbor, and asked if those communities had required retail. Mr. Downs replied he did not believe so, but noted he was not certain.

Ms. Hoppe understood they would not prohibit non-students, and asked how many non-students resided in their other student complexes. Mr. Downs replied this development was very similar to their other projects in that over 80 percent of the units would be one-bedroom and two-bedroom units, which catered to young professionals and others who wanted to live downtown. He pointed out it was not a majority, but a number of non-students lived in their buildings. Ms. Hoppe felt that was pretty vague as there might only be one or two non-students. Mr. Downs stated there were more than one or two non-students, but it was not a significant number. He noted the developments were purpose-built student apartment buildings.

Ms. Chadwick asked how many one and two bedroom apartments were in this development. Mr. Downs replied he thought they had 23 one-bedroom units, 74 two-bedroom units, and 22 four-bedroom units. Mr. St. Romaine stated he understood there were 26 one-bedroom units, 69 two-bedroom units, and 23 four-bedroom units for a total of 256 beds.

Ms. Chadwick commented that she did not previously vote on the Opus project, and her concern was with regard to whether the City would breach a contract a previous Council had made with an organization. She explained a repeal petition was submitted due to the lack of due process, and she felt she was providing the people due process with this

ordinance. She stated she would vote in favor of the City not breaching a contract with an organization that met the current zoning codes based on location. She noted she had reached out to both sides the day she was elected in an effort to reach a solution to avoid the City breaching a contract and for the project to become something she would support. She stated she had spoken with Josh Oxenhandler, the legal representative of the people calling for the repeal of the previous ordinance involving Opus, and has asked what they wanted. She had also spoken with Opus to ask them to meet to discuss what she would need in order to support the project. She explained she asked Opus to go through due process as Josh Oxenhandler had indicated was wanted by the petitioners. Opus agreed to go through due process and include an active ground floor in their development. Now that due process had been followed, she understood the petitioners were not supportive of the project due to land use and infrastructure. She pointed out the land use was agreeable to the Avenue of the Columns Committee as had been indicated in the letter provided by Mary Wilkerson, and the Downtown CID. She also thought it was consistent with the Comprehensive Plan, met current C-2 zoning codes, and met the interim C-2 zoning recommendations, as that would require retail on Ninth Street and on Broadway, and this project was not on those streets. If they did not want to allow projects such as this, she thought they needed to change their zoning codes. She suggested they work as a community to discuss land use and establish policy, and not attack individual projects. She encouraged the public to provide Clarion, the zoning consultant, feedback in terms of what they wanted to see for C-2 zoning and in this area. She commented that if infrastructure was the issue, she was puzzled and concerned with why there was not a referendum petition on a 315-bed complex that was voted on the same day as the Opus project as it also taxed downtown infrastructure. In addition, the Council approved a 34-bed unit at its previous Council Meeting, and the petitioners clearly supported that project. She felt this project had been singled out based on likes and dislikes, instead of what the zoning codes and ordinances allowed. She pointed out the University of Missouri had reached out to the Council, and had indicated their student population was growing and would continue to grow. She had heard concerns indicating the student population would soon be stagnant and that this would turn into Section 8 housing, but she did not believe they would ever have Section 8 housing this close to campus. She understood the University felt students in close proximity to campus had a better outcome and retention. She noted the University of Missouri was the number one employer of Boone County as it employed 10 percent of the community, and she was sad that the community did not embrace the students. As the First Ward Council Member, she wanted to ensure the community welcomed students and did not make them feel isolated. She commented that they would not single out any other population and say they did not want any more of them living in the downtown, and wondered why they accepted those statements regarding students. She stated the Council was a policy-making group, and not a project manager, and if the public wanted change, she suggested they look at policy and help the Council change policy. She understood infrastructure was a huge issue and that the City needed to charge more, and asked that the community work together to change policies to increase development fees and to ensure development paid for infrastructure in the future.

Ms. Hoppe commented that page two of the development agreement indicated inadequate water, fire protection, electric, stormwater, and sanitary sewer facilities existed to serve the proposed increase in use of the developer tract which would result from the project construction, so the City was acknowledging there was presently inadequate water, fire protection, electric, stormwater, and sanitary sewer facilities. The agreement also indicated the development could obtain an occupancy permit even if the City did not have sufficient infrastructure to serve the project. She noted the City did not have a plan at this time. She agreed they were working on a plan, but reiterated there was no plan at this time to provide sewer by 2015, which was the completion date anticipated by Opus. She stated she was very concerned with making promises they could not keep, and with allowing Opus to operate and pollute the streams due to inadequate sewers. She was also concerned with the lack of a consistent policy and formula in terms of infrastructure. The Lofts contributed \$50,000 for a 36-bed unit, and Opus would contribute only \$200,000. By her calculation, they should contribute at least \$350,000 for the sewer. She commented that she had asked repeatedly how much new development was contributing to the \$6.7 million problem in the Flat Branch basin, and the amount of capacity that would be impacted by these developments and had not been provided that information. In response to Ms. Chadwick's comments, Collegiate Housing Partners (CHP) had been much further along in the process so it seemed fundamentally unfair to hold up that project, and The Lofts project was very small. In addition, it appeared they were paying a lot more for infrastructure. She noted the developer had indicated the students would spend lots of money in The District, and if that was the case, she felt it would be a natural fit for retail to be located on the bottom floor. Moving the general activity to the first floor level would not provide an active space for the community. The students would be gone during the summer, and it would be dead space as people would not go to that area. She commented that communities that required retail in their most central and prized areas received that retail. She pointed this development would be at this location for at least the next fifty years, and retail on the first floor would allow the community to get the most it could for the square footage in the downtown and would help maintain a vibrant downtown. She noted the City had required transit passes for five years for Brookside, and only two years for this development. They had discussed the need for parking, and one possibility was for commuter parking and tying it to transit, and that feature was not included. In terms of comprehensive planning, she understood all of the downtown plans had indicated the need for balanced growth, having a vibrant community, and having people of all incomes, ages, and professions living in the downtown. She was concerned about any unbalance and thought they needed to proceed carefully. She noted she planned to ask the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council to look at the kind of balance they wanted in terms of residential. She explained they had talked about affordable housing for students, and did not feel that was in the downtown. She commented that the City was working to have a vibrant transit system, and felt there could be off-site student housing that was more affordable than these expensive downtown units. She pointed out she was not saying there should not be any downtown units, but felt it needed to be carefully balanced. She noted she had voted against this proposal previously, and would vote against it again as she did not see any difference.

Ms. Nauser thanked Ms. Chadwick for her tenacity immediately after being elected in trying to come up with a solution even though it might not be the perfect solution. She believed the students would either live downtown, in the periphery, or in residential neighborhoods as parents and investors were turning homes into rental properties. She noted this was occurring more and more in the Fifth Ward. She commented that rent prices were high for a number of reasons. One factor was that there was not enough rental property in the community, so the limited supply caused prices to increase. Another reason was that some people could not afford to purchase a home, so they had to rent, which added to the demand for rental property. She stated she would rather have students living in the downtown than off of Grindstone. She believed Opus had gone above and beyond in terms of development fees as they were paying more than any other developer in the community. She understood they could argue whether it was enough, and noted the City was in the process of reviewing its development fees. She pointed out she did not believe everything should come to a halt in terms of development until that was addressed. She stated she would support this project.

Mr. Trapp thanked Ms. Chadwick for trying to craft a compromise in the spirit of trying to get people to work together and resolve their issues outside of the courts. He agreed the City had infrastructure issues and was working to address them. He also agreed that there were too many negotiated deals, a lack of uniformity, and a need to re-evaluate the zoning code, which was underway. He did not believe they could put a hold on growth, and felt artificially limiting the amount of rental housing would drive up rental prices, which would not help with affordability. This project was contributing to infrastructure above and beyond the basic fees. In addition, he felt a scattered, low-density site was least preferred. He believed they would compete with college students for parking spaces regardless of whether students drove 7, 10, or 20 miles, and noted the City's daytime population was 50,000 people higher than its bedroom population. He felt the students were the easy scapegoat for road congestion and parking issues, and thought this development was similar in that some had indicated if it was not for this development, there would not be an infrastructure crisis. He stated the infrastructure issue would remain regardless of this development. If there was a zero-growth state, which some people advocated, there would not be an increasing population of people to share the costs of repairing and replacing the City's aging infrastructure. He noted economic growth was needed to drive and create opportunity, and smart growth advocated for growth in a way that made sense. It did not make sense to the endlessly sprawl because that made it more difficult to serve developments on the fringes and edges of the City. He commented that even without downtown development, there would still be sewage in the Flat Branch when it rained. This project would add less than one percent to the sewer flows on days it did not rain. The issue with the sewers when it rained was due to water seeping into the aging infrastructure, which the City was trying to address with inflow and infiltration. He stated one of the things he liked about Columbia was its 3.5 percent unemployment rate and the vibrant downtown. He understood the community was wrestling with what it wanted Columbia to look like and how they wanted to pay for infrastructure, and felt they were making strides toward it. He stated he planned to support this project.

Mr. Thomas commended the Repeal 6214 group for incredible effort and inspired leadership as they had inspired the community with passion and hard work, and had created a level of engagement that was not often seen. As a policymaker trying to respond to community desires, it was great to have a community that cared and put in the time, effort, and hard work to let the Council know their thoughts. He commented that he had listened very carefully to all of the concerns expressed and had shared most of them. The process in which the original development agreements were passed had led to a loss of public trust, a patent of errors, and a dysfunctional government. He explained the infrastructure issue was the most important issue in his mind, but understood there were other issues of the building being located in a critical spot in the downtown, the ambience of the downtown, etc. He felt some of those issues had been addressed and that the City had a great opportunity to address infrastructure. As a result, he asked the Repeal 6214 group to pivot and get behind the effort to ensure the City recovered adequate funds from new development at the time of permitting to cover the expense of expanding the infrastructure systems to accommodate new development. He commented that the City added 10,000 people every 3-4 years due to its growth rate of about 2.5 percent per year, and the burden of expanding infrastructure to accommodate these new people was severe. He explained he was working with City staff to understand what part of the annual cost of expanding the system to accommodate growth was recovered by a series of permitting fees. He pointed out \$800 per dwelling unit went to the sewer utility, \$638 per dwelling unit went toward the water utility and \$0 per dwelling unit went toward the electric utility. In terms of the electric utility, he noted the ratepayer or general taxes paid for the cost of the wires and capacity needed to serve those people. This was not a sustainable way to fund infrastructure when they were growing at 2.5 percent per year. He hoped for vigorous conversations to understand the numbers in a fair, balanced, and transparent way, so they could decide as a community at what rate to set those charges. Road infrastructure also needed to be addressed as they expanded road capacity at about \$10 million per year, and only 50 cents per square foot, which totaled about \$1.5-\$2 million per year, was recovered from new development for that purpose. He believed these issues needed to be addressed if they wanted a sustainable future. He understood some people did not want any growth, but he did not agree as he liked bringing new people into the community and felt increasing diversity was good, but agreed it needed to be done in a sustainable and manageable way as he thought they were close to being out of control at this time. He commented that the City would need to balance the impact of increasing development fees with the need to cover costs. He stated a tremendous amount of energy had been spent on this one housing development, which he did not feel was entirely fair as they had also approved the Collegiate Housing Partners' project, and it was a similar project. He felt this was more about development fees than the Opus project, and noted he would support the new development agreement and devote his energy to reviewing the cost of infrastructure and how the City paid for that infrastructure.

B130-14, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, THOMAS, NAUSER, MCDAVID, CHADWICK. VOTING NO: HOPPE. ABSENT: SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**CONSENT AGENDA**

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

- B117-14 Changing the uses allowed on C-P zoned property located on the east side of Colony Drive and south of Chapel Hill Road; approving a revised statement of intent.
- B120-14 Approving the Final Plat of Academy Village Plat 2, a Replat of Lots 2 and 3 Academy Village Plat 1 and vacated right-of-way of Providence Road located on the southeast corner of Green Meadows Road and Carter Lane; authorizing a performance contract.
- B121-14 Approving the Final Plat of Old Hawthorne, Plat No. 13 located on the north side of Old Hawthorne Drive East; authorizing a performance contract.
- B122-14 Vacating utility easements in portions of the Second Street, Locust Street and public alley rights-of-way.
- B124-14 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with Robert E. Dunn and Laura Mae Dunn for property located at 802 Hirth Avenue.
- B127-14 Appropriating funds for improvements at the intersection of Route 740 (Stadium Boulevard) and Old Route 63.
- B128-14 Accepting conveyances for temporary construction and sewer purposes.
- B131-14 Authorizing a facilities and services agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the use of Peace Park for the Fourth of July Celebration and Fireworks Display.
- B132-14 Authorizing a memorandum of agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri, on behalf of Osher Lifelong Learning Program, for the use of the Hillcrest Community Center and Moss Building on the Waters-Moss property for Parks and Recreation Department activities.
- R92-14 Authorizing an agreement with Missouri Symphony Society for tourism development funds for the 2014 Hot Summer Nights festival.
- R93-14 Transferring funds for the purchase of a mapping grade GPS unit in the Public Works Department.
- R94-14 Authorizing City membership in the Welcoming Cities Program to promote mutual respect and cooperation between foreign-born and United States born Americans through local policies, services and practices.
- R95-14 Authorizing Amendment No. 5 to the Engineering Services Contract with HDR Engineering, Inc. relating to the design of Hominy Trail Phase II (East Section) from Woodridge Drive to I-70.
- R96-14 Authorizing an extension to the service agreement for marketing and advertising with Woodruff Sweitzer and True Media LLC for marketing and advertising agency services for the Convention and Visitors Bureau.
- R97-14 Approving the revised Preliminary Plat of The Gates located on the south side of Old Plank Road; approving less stringent stormwater standards than those set forth in Chapter 12A of the City Code.
- R98-14 Authorizing the temporary closure of a portion of Ninth Street between Walnut Street and Broadway; granting a temporary waiver from the

**requirements of Section 16-185 of the City Code to allow possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages for a Ninth Street Summerfest event.**

**R99-14 Approving a Tax-Advantaged Financing Compliance Policy and Procedure for the City of Columbia, Missouri.**

**R100-14 Authorizing the public sale of Water and Electric System Revenue Refunding Bonds, 2014 Series A.**

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

**NEW BUSINESS**

**R101-14 Repealing Resolution No. 70-10A that established procedures and guidelines for scheduled public comment at City Council meetings and adopting a new resolution on the same subject.**

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Thompson provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked for clarification. Ms. Amin replied scheduled public comment could only occur on items that were not under public hearing, old business, consent, or new business, and therefore it only applied to reports and introduction and first reading items. She noted it could apply to a special item every now and then as well.

Mr. Thomas understood this expanded the use of scheduled public comment to include items on introduction and first reading and reports. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

Ms. Chadwick understood this only allowed scheduled public comment, so people would still have to sign up by noon on the Wednesday prior to the meeting. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser asked why they would allow that for introduction and first reading items as those items would either go to the consent agenda at the next meeting, where they could be pulled off of the consent agenda, or be located under public hearings or old business at the next meeting where people were allowed to comment. Mr. Thomas replied he thought people might want to talk about the introduction and first reading item at the meeting when it was under introduction and first reading.

Mayor McDavid understood this would allow scheduled public comment for items under introduction and first reading and reports. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct, and explained the current rule was that no scheduled public comment was allowed on an item listed on the agenda.

Ms. Hoppe pointed out the existing restrictions would remain, so not more than six total people could speak, and only two people could speak on the same topic. In addition, a person could not speak more than once every two months.

Mayor McDavid asked what problem would be solved as he felt there would be several unintended consequences. Mr. Thomas replied there could be a report on which a vote might be taken, and he felt people should be able to provide public testimony on it if they had

concerns. Mayor McDavid commented that he did not believe legislation was allowed under reports. Ms. Hoppe stated the Council recommended action. Mayor McDavid agreed the Council might recommend an ordinance be brought forward, but they did not approve legislation. Mr. Thomas pointed out the Council often asked staff to proceed with a body of work that essentially committed them to a certain path, and he wanted to hear from the public if they had any concerns. Mayor McDavid asked if they wanted to allow public comment on every report. Mr. Thomas replied no, and explained this would only allow the opportunity for someone to speak under scheduled public comment on that report topic. Ms. Hoppe pointed out people had to sign up on Wednesday, and the agenda did not come out until Thursday, so the person who wanted to speak on a subject that was timely was told they could not speak since it was a report or under introduction and first reading. Mayor McDavid stated they could speak during the open comment portion of the meeting. Mr. Thomas explained that would be after Council had taken action in the case of reports. Mayor McDavid understood this was only for scheduled public comment. Mr. Thomas stated that was correct.

Mr. Trapp stated he planned to make a motion to remove introduction and first reading so scheduled public comment was expanded to only include report topics.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that the Council routinely conducted public business that had not received the required 24-hour notice in the report section and under general comments of Council, and believed it was a violation of several State laws. All of the report items could be placed under new business even if staff only needed feedback. If they did not plan to vote on an item under reports, he wondered why they would object to a scheduled public comment at the beginning of the meeting. He thought it was inappropriate to discuss and vote during reports, and noted he liked what he thought he had read the resolution to be, as presented by Ms. Hoppe.

Mayor McDavid understood the amendment suggested by Mr. Trapp would effectively allow scheduled public comment on an issue under the reports section. Mr. Trapp stated that was correct.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend R101-14 by adding introduction and first reading to item number five, so a scheduled public comment could not be made on an introduction and first reading item. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Mayor McDavid commented that he liked the amendment as he had been concerned with allowing scheduled public comment for introduction and first reading items because he felt proponents would know an item would be on introduction first reading and would sign up for scheduled public comment and lock up the two slots for that issue so no opponent was able to speak. In addition, he did not see a reason to allow it for introduction and first reading as public comment would be allowed at the next meeting. He agreed with the argument of allowing scheduled public comment for an item under reports as they might be able to influence the decision of Council. He stated he would support the amendment.

Mr. Thomas stated he would oppose amendment. He thought they needed to look at this in terms of forbidding scheduled public comment on items they already allowed public comment on, which included public hearing items, old business items, new business items, and consent agenda items as anyone could ask the Council to pull an item off of the consent agenda to allow for public comment. He did not believe they should disallow a scheduled

public comment if, by some fluke, someone scheduled a public comment on an item that happened to be on introduction and first reading. He thought they would not want someone signing up for scheduled public comment on an item that was under public hearings as they wanted to hear all of those comments at the same time for simplicity purposes.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she agreed with Mr. Thomas, but since they were in the position of a potential three to three vote, she would rather have the perceived success of allowing scheduled public comments for reports.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Ms. Nauser to amend R101-14 by adding introduction and first reading to item number five, so a scheduled public comment could not be made on an introduction and first reading item, was approved by voice vote with only Mr. Thomas voting against the motion.

The vote on R101-14, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID, CHADWICK. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SKALA. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

### **INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING**

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

- B133-14**     Authorizing the issuance and sale of Water and Electric System Revenue Refunding Bonds, 2014 Series A.
  
- B134-14**     Extending the corporate limits of the City of Columbia, Missouri, by annexing property located on the north side of Prathersville Road and east of State Highway 763 (1339 Prathersville Road); establishing permanent C-3 zoning.
  
- B135-14**     Rezoning property located at the western terminus of Smiley Lane (415 West Smiley Lane) from District R-1 to District A-1.
  
- B136-14**     Amending Chapter 20 of the City Code to change the terms of Planning and Zoning Commission members from five years to three years.
  
- B137-14**     Approving the Final Plat of Creeks Edge Clubhouse located on the north side of Sawgrass Drive and west of Scott Boulevard; authorizing a performance contract.
  
- B138-14**     Approving the Final Plat of The Gates Plat No. 1 – Rearrangement, a major Replat of The Gates, Plat No. 1, located on the south side of Old Plank Road and west of Sinclair Road; authorizing a performance contract.
  
- B139-14**     Approving the Final Plat of Rock Valley Plat 5, a Replat of Lot 401 of Rock Valley Plat 4, located on the north side of Chapel Hill Road and west of Madison Park Drive; authorizing a performance contract.
  
- B140-14**     Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for tuberculosis diagnostic screening services.
  
- B141-14**     Amending the FY 2014 Classification and Pay Plan by reassigning the assistant to the city manager position in the City Manager’s Office.
  
- B142-14**     Amending the FY 2014 Annual Budget by adding two energy technician positions in the Water and Light Department; appropriating funds.
  
- B143-14**     Authorizing a right of use permit with Kim and Steve Stonecipher-Fisher to allow construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of a

**retaining wall within a portion of the drainage easement on Lot 131 of Westcliff Plat 1 located on the north side of Surrey Court.**

**REPORTS AND PETITIONS**

**REP50-14 Demolition of Old Fire Station No. 7 to Create a Recycling Drop-Off Center.**

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid understood staff would come back with an ordinance or proposal. Mr. Glascock stated a public hearing would likely be held on the item. Mayor McDavid commented that they would want to know what it would look like because it was in a very visible area. Mr. Glascock agreed, and noted they would not want to install a chain link fence. They would likely use a split block wall or something similar.

Ms. Nauser commented that this was becoming an eyesore so she welcomed any movement forward.

**REP51-14 Vision Commission Implementation Status and Media Mention Reports.**

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

Ms. Hoppe thanked the Vision Commission for the report and information.

**REP52-14 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.**

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

**COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

Curtis Brown felt something needed to be done about the sewer system and other infrastructure as improvements were needed to accommodate the new buildings and more people. He commented that he had been turned down from the Harry S. Truman Memorial Veterans' Hospital, and many people were getting hurt by the doctors and nurses there. He believed something needed to be done and asked Mayor McDavid to talk to federal representatives and representatives of the hospital. He explained he won a settlement because the doctors made mistakes, and asked for the City to look out for the veterans.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, asked the Council to ask staff to provide information by the next council meeting with regard to what other cities did in terms of an adequate public facilities requirement prior to the issuance of building permits and occupancy permits. This would allow control over the pace of construction in order to protect the fiscal solvency of the City and to protect existing citizens from declining infrastructure services and rapidly rising debt service. This was routinely done in other cities and was not part of the zoning code. It was good fiscal management. He was hopeful the Council could adopt a similar policy by the first meeting in July. He also asked the Council to ask staff to appeal the decision of the Board of Adjustment (BOA) to the Boone County Circuit Court with regard to the appeal by CVS in support of itself since it previously rejected the CVS proposal and in support of staff. He thought it was time for the City to stand up for its staff and policies for final resolution. He also asked the Council to ask Ms. Thompson to provide a full legal briefing of her comments

regarding a potential civil liability for voting as he felt that was a wild overstatement because there were all kinds of protections for elected officials.

Kelly Pascucci, 1107 Merrill Court, explained some Columbia Water and Light customers did not want to participate in the smart meter program. They did not want microwave relay stations or microwave radio transmitters on their homes for various reasons, to include adverse health impacts, privacy, safety, and inflated billing. She noted there was currently no exit policy, and an item being considered was a \$75 one-time fee plus an additional \$5 per month recurring fee, which she felt was extortion. People on fixed incomes, the disabled, and individuals with metal implants, pacemakers, or cancer should not be exposed to radiofrequency radiation and/or dirty electricity put out by digital meters. She suggested an immediate exit policy for those who wanted their electromechanical analog meter returned because they no longer wanted to be exposed to a Class 2-B carcinogen, and demanded to be given a choice without extortion fees. She commented that she would have spoken in front of the City Council for approximately 11 minutes by the end of her comments today, and that was not near enough time to share the threats of digital and smart meters. She stated *Take Back Your Power*, a documentary about smart meters and the smart grid, had won three humanitarian film awards, and recommended the Council view it. She pointed out vulnerabilities would be created, and one example was unprotected customer usage information. Utilities would expose consumers to unnecessary risk by collecting massive amounts of data unnecessary for billing purposes. The smart meter program involved monitoring and inventorying energy, and had nothing to do with saving energy. She noted the cost of digital meters was five times more, and their lifespan was three times shorter. She thought customers should have the right to protect their families and homes against these devices without being charged additional fees.

Philip Rabbitt, 1415 Godas Drive, understood the College Avenue issue had already been discussed, but thought the crossings on Rogers Street, which was likely installed in conjunction with Columbia College and involved bright LED lights that notified drivers of pedestrians, would be appropriate for College Avenue. He stated he was not certain the College Avenue situation had been resolved as this did not address the area north of University Avenue, and suggested a HAWK signal in that area. He also asked the Council to consider reducing the speed limit by five miles per hour on the stretch of College Avenue from Stadium Boulevard to Broadway, or creating a slow zone with signage only. He commented that he did not believe the opinion of compression as an issue for trees in the median was valid because that had been accomplished with Locust Trees in larger communities, such as Chicago and New York.

Ms. Hoppe commented that there had long been concern and interest for a pedestrian crossing on College Avenue by Lee Elementary School, where a large number of students walked to school. She asked staff to look into the possibility of adding this crossing to the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Plan, which was north of the College Avenue median project.

Ms. Hoppe noted page 215 of the College Avenue Safety Enhancement Project study showed traffic changes that would be needed if left turns would be impeded by medians, and asked staff to determine how they could work with MoDOT to fund these improvements so they were completed simultaneously with the median project that would restrict left turns. She listed the improvements as widening the east leg of Rollins Street to the south for construction of a dedicated left-turn lane for westbound traffic and modifying the traffic signal to add a green arrow for westbound left turns to College Avenue; widening the southwest corner of the University Avenue intersection to the south and adding a dedicated right-turn lane; widening the northeast corner of the College Avenue and Ashland Road intersection to allow southbound motorists to make U-turns; and making the green highlighted traffic pattern changes that had been recommended for the East Campus Neighborhood.

Ms. Hoppe asked staff to contact the Rock Quarry Road Scenic Stakeholder Group members that were appointed so they could meet and move forward within the next month or so. She also wanted to know who on City staff would work with this group.

Ms. Hoppe understood the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council was looking at the City's infrastructure issues, and noted she also wanted them to review the Comprehensive Plan along with downtown plans in terms of the mix of retail and residential needed going forward for at least 20-30 years out so Columbia continued to have a vibrant downtown for students and other residents. She hoped they could provide recommendations for a good balance between residential and retail with diversity for the best use of downtown. She noted another component was affordability and the ability to have some affordable housing so the downtown was not only for the rich.

Ms. Chadwick asked staff to provide an update to the Parking Committee report with regard to what had been implemented and why suggestions of the Committee might not have been implemented. She understood the Committee had recommended meters on Ash Street by the Columbia Daily Tribune be converted to hangtag meters or longer-term meters, and that and few other suggestions had not been implemented. She commented that she was in the downtown frequently and was unsure of the meaning of the parking meter colors, and wondered how the City conveyed that information to the public. She understood there was a minimum charge for the use of a credit card, and asked for clarification regarding that process along with the signage and lighting recommended for the garage by the Committee.

Ms. Chadwick asked staff to collaborate with the University of Missouri with regard to a satellite parking lot on a major interchange outside of the downtown for shuttle service to the downtown and campus. She thought they should explore providing free parking for the purchase of a bus pass to encourage the use of public transportation.

Ms. Chadwick commented that she had used the bus a lot this week, and the app was continuously telling her no City buses were currently running. She believed customer service and the app for the bus system had to improve to promote ridership.

Ms. Chadwick asked for additional information regarding the online payment fee for utilities. She understood there was a \$4.70 charge and wanted to know if that fee covered the credit card charges or if the City was over-collecting. She thought credit card fees were typically billed as a percentage of payment, which was not being done in this situation.

Ms. Chadwick stated she would be interested in information regarding an ordinance for the sufficiency of resources, and asked staff to provide information regarding what that might look like or provide information regarding anything the City might have they could currently implement to determine if adequate resources were available for new development.

Ms. Chadwick noted she would follow up with staff on the issue of digital meters to fully understand how that worked.

Ms. Nauser commented that several people had contacted her regarding panhandling at the entrances of the community, primarily where people were exiting off of the highways, and asked staff to provide recommendations regarding how they might deter that behavior.

Ms. Nauser understood the City owned the vacant lot next to Fire Station No. 7, and asked for clarification regarding any future plans for that lot. She noted a sidewalk gap had existed there for at least eight years, and she wanted to see that sidewalk gap in front of Fire Station No. 7 on Green Meadows Circle addressed so it connected to the sidewalk in front of the church.

Ms. Nauser stated she had been contacted by a constituent indicating it was difficult for people with children to reach some of the amenities at Rock Bridge Park, which was a small neighborhood park, because they had to push strollers, etc. through the grass, and asked if the City could provide a pathway to provide easier access. She noted it did not necessarily have to be paved. In addition, there was playground equipment for younger children and older children, but there really was nothing for children in between those ages. She commented that the suggestion made was for a concrete slab so kids could play four-square, and asked if that was a possibility.

Ms. Nauser stated she wanted a report from staff listing the recommendations the Columbia Chamber of Commerce had suggested for the airport. She also wanted the report to describe the City's plans for moving forward with some of those recommendations along with a potential time line. She had read that the City had not contributed anything to the airport for 14 months since it was self-sufficient and growing, and she wanted to ensure it continued to grow. She noted she used the Columbia Regional Airport whenever possible, and it was becoming very crowded when people who recently arrived were waiting for their luggage at the same time others were waiting to depart.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Matthes to have the comparative report of the Ben Londeree study to the Council in time for the July 7, 2014 Council Meeting. Mr. Matthes replied he believed they would be able to provide it by then.

Mr. Thomas commented that he had received requests from constituents to allow public comment on B139-14, which was under the introduction and first reading section of the agenda tonight. Ms. Amin understood Mr. Thomas wanted B139-14 to be placed under old business instead of the consent agenda. Mr. Thomas stated that was correct.

Mayor McDavid asked if the City had received a GRS study regarding the pension valuation this year. Mr. Matthes replied he thought they had. Mayor McDavid asked that it be presented as a report. He explained it was a pension plan liability and asset analysis they received once a year.

Mayor McDavid commented that the citizens had rated public safety as the number one priority and even though the crime rate was at a 35 year low, it was still too high. He noted the City had a small police department at about 1.4 officers per thousand people as the average was about two officers per thousand people. He pointed out the City's portion of property tax was only six percent of the total, which was very low, and he stated he planned to ask staff to present an ordinance to put a property tax increase on the ballot. Since they could not assimilate 35 police officers next year, he planned to propose this increase occur over the next eleven years. He suggested a five cent increase in year one, year three, year seven, year nine and year 11 for a total increment of 30 cents. This would allow for a normal-size police department and a fully funded fire department. It would also allow for community policing.

Ms. Hoppe asked when he anticipated this being on the ballot. Mayor McDavid replied he understood it took time to get something on the ballot and did not know if this could be done before November. He commented that he was not certain the public would support this, but he wanted to make the case and allow Columbians to make the decision. If the community was not willing to pay for appropriate sized police department, the City would continue to do the best they could with what they had, but if they wanted an appropriate sized police department, they would have to pay for staffing, and he felt a property tax increase was the best way to accommodate it.

Mr. Matthes commented that given the amount of ballot needs the City had, he planned to appoint staff teams to work on each item in terms of preparing data, presentations, and fact sheets. He stated he also planned to invite a Council Member to sit on each of those staff teams.

Ms. Chadwick asked if the Council had to vote on the ordinance by a certain time in order to get it on the ballot. Mr. Matthes replied it had to be voted on by August.

Mayor McDavid understood there was not enough time to get anything on the August ballot. Ms. Amin stated that was correct.

Mr. Matthes stated Mr. Rehard had done some fantastic research on sales tax and property tax, which he would share with Council in writing as soon as he possible. He noted he had been challenged when saying Columbia was a low-tax city in a low-tax state. He explained Columbia's property tax rate was half of the average of the 27 cities they measured against in Missouri.

Mr. Matthes noted Mr. Rehard was well into the Ben Londeree study update as well.

Ms. Hoppe understood the Council would receive a report regarding taxes. Mr. Matthes replied stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser commented that Columbia relied very heavily on sales tax, and that caused the budget to fluctuate greatly, and she did not believe police and fire services were areas they wanted to worry about in terms of financial fluctuation. She pointed out police and fire protected property, so she thought those services could be tied to property taxes in order to provide some stability.

Ms. Chadwick noted Mayor McDavid had indicated Columbia was a low-crime city, but any crime was bad crime. She stated crime in the First Ward was obviously a big concern of her constituents so she supported putting a property tax increase on the ballot.

The meeting adjourned at 12:38 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin  
City Clerk