



## Columbia City Council Meeting Recap

Council Chamber, Columbia City Hall

7:00 PM

Monday, December 18, 2017

---

Pledge of Allegiance  
Roll Call

### INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

(Recited as indicated.)

(Present: Treece, Trapp, Pitzer, Skala, Thomas, Peters, Ruffin)

Absent: None.)

Approval of Minutes  
Adjustment of Agenda

(Minutes from November 20, 2017 approved.)

(Ruffin asked to abstain from B376-17. Trapp also asked to abstain from this item as well as R102-17. Thomas asked to move R-183 to Old Business. Thomas asked to move B361-17, B363-17 and B375-17 to Old Business as well. R172-17 moved to New Business by Peters.)

### SPECIAL ITEMS

(None.)

### APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

**BC12-17** Board and Commission Applicants.

**City of Columbia New Century Fund Inc. Board** – Lynn Kleopfer

**Finance Advisory and Audit Committee** – Maria Oropallo, Tim Tunks

**Human Services Commission** – Nathan First, Lynn Kleopfer, Carlos Ortiz, Diane Suhler

**Mayor's Council on Physical Fitness and Health** – Jane Church, Jerry Dowell, Kara Truitt

**Personnel Advisory Board** – Secily Devese, Martha Dragich

**Police Retirement Board** – Michael Hackmann

**Public Transit Advisory Commission** – Dylan Cain

**Youth Advisory Council** – Yash Khanna

**Columbia and Boone County Library District Board** – Lisa Groshong, Philip Harrison, Lynn Hostetler, Kathleen Markie, Khaki Westerfield

(Additional appointments made to the Downtown CID Board under item **REP102-17** in the Reports Section of the agenda.)

### SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

**SPC68-17** Emily Cooke - Listen.

(Action: Speaker appeared as scheduled. What do we hear when we listen? What do we feel? We all need to do that to survive. Over time, we have forgotten how to do that effectively. I have listened to

the earth and believe that we should all give the earth respect as a voice. Believes that we are not listening effectively to the earth. I am grateful for the land and the forest around us. We need more quiet space and sustainable places.)

#### **PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**PH44-17** Proposed construction of the Ballenger Lane improvement project, from Ria Street to Mexico Gravel Road.

(Action: Staff presentation was provided. Ballenger Lane is classified as a Major Arterial in both the Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization (CATSO) 2030 Major Thoroughfare Plan and the City Major Roadway Plan. The proposed Ballenger Lane improvement project was identified in the 10-year plan for the 0.25% Capital Improvement Sales Tax ballot. The project includes constructing 6-ft. wide shoulders on each side of the road beginning near Ria Street to the south, and continuing north to the roundabout at Mexico Gravel Road; an approximate total length of 6,800 ft. (1.3 miles).

Ballenger Lane currently has two 11-ft. wide lanes with a stormwater ditch on each side of the road. Non-motorized use of Ballenger Lane prompts the construction of shoulders on both sides of the road. Existing subdivision sidewalks will tie into the proposed shoulders and 15 residential and three (3) commercial drive approaches will be reconstructed. The roadway will be slightly realigned, stormwater improvements will be made, and the road will be restriped. Staff had originally planned to construct a retaining wall near the northern end of the project; however, after discussing this option with a structural engineer and obtaining additional information about the box culvert it was determined that it would be more cost effective to extend the existing box culvert rather than constructing a retaining wall.

The total cost estimate for the project is \$2,200,000 which includes design, easement acquisition, utility relocation and construction. MoDOT will contribute \$1,800,000 towards the project cost. When the project is complete, the City of Columbia will acquire the road and assume maintenance responsibilities. Temporary construction easements, permanent utility easements, and permanent drainage easements may be necessary for the construction of the project. Construction is planned for the spring of 2019.

Public hearing was opened.

Speaker asked how her property would look after this project is constructed. Staff explained that a temporary construction easement would be required but that such a temporary easement would not extend after construction was complete.

Public testimony was closed.

Peters asked about city contribution. Skala closed with remarks indicating that this project was a long-time in coming and that over the years there has been multi-jurisdictional responsibility. This is a project that needs to be completed. Sidewalks could cost more than the road. This is a good compromise and is a step forward and may serve as a model for the Sinclair Road project. Take a look at this.

**Motion to approve agreed to unanimously.)**

**PH45-17** Proposed construction of the College Avenue sewer replacement project, between Rollins Street and Bouchelle Avenue.

(Action: This project will consist of constructing four manholes and the installation of trenchless lining for approximately 700 linear feet of gravity sanitary sewer located along College Avenue, within MoDOT right-of-way, from Rollins Street to the north. The sewer line currently serves four properties and is in a

deteriorated condition that, historically, has created large voids under the driving pavement of College Avenue. In addition, installation of the manhole at College and Rollins will allow for inspection and maintenance of a portion of the system that currently cannot be properly inspected and maintained, and will allow for the elimination of a redundant pipe that cannot be easily inspected or maintained. The original schedule for this project included design in FY2018 and construction in FY2019. However, staff is recommending this project be accelerated to complete the manhole replacement prior to the Missouri Department of Transportation Route 763 (College Avenue) ADA and Roadway Pavement Improvements project scheduled to begin March 2018. The manhole replacement prior to the MoDOT project will allow for future lining of the sewer mains without the requirement to excavate the new pavement MoDOT will be placing for this street.

This construction will be performed utilizing existing term and supply contracts or City staff. This project is estimated to cost \$125,000 which includes design and construction. This project will be funded with Sewer Utility Revenue funds and other such funds as may be lawfully appropriated.

No public comment.

**Motion to approve adopted unanimously.)**

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

**B362-17** Approving the Preliminary Plat of Mill Creek Meadows Subdivision located on the east side of Old Mill Creek Road, approximately 3,000 feet south of Nifong Boulevard (4700 S. Old Mill Creek Road); granting a design adjustment to allow a sensitive area to be incorporated into a residential lot (Case No. 17-119).

(Action: Staff presented an overview of the project. The applicant, Brush and Associates (agent) on behalf of Elias & Elias, LLC (owner), is seeking approval of a 31-lot preliminary plat on R-1 (One-family Dwelling District) zoned land, to be known as Mill Creek Meadows Subdivision Plat 1, and a design adjustment from 29-5.1(b.2.iii), which requires areas identified as sensitive land to not be included on lots intended for development. The 15.57-acre subject site is located on the east side of Old Mill Creek Road, approximately 3,000 feet south of Nifong Boulevard, and addressed as 4700 S Old Mill Creek Road. The requested preliminary plat includes the creation of 29 lots for single-family use, and two common lots. The common lots will contain the majority of the sensitive land areas located throughout the site, which includes Mill Creek. The preliminary plat also includes the future dedication of 33 feet of additional right of way for Old Mill Creek Road which is identified as a neighborhood collector on the Major Roadway Plan. The applicant is also requesting that approximately 300 square feet of flood fringe be permitted to be located on a developable lot, which is not consistent with UDC Section 29- 5.1(b) (Avoidance of Sensitive Areas). Flood fringe and other sensitive areas are not permitted to be included on new developable lots, except under certain conditions, which have not been met.

At its November 9, 2017 meeting, the Planning and Zoning Commission considered this request. Commissioners inquired why the 300-square-foot area of the flood fringe did not have an easement located on it, as had a previous similar request. Staff responded that the area was included within a utility easement and the front yard setback of the subject lot which were both non-developable areas. Furthermore, the 300-square foot area would be elevated out of the flood fringe if, in the future, the roadway was extended to the east. Given those circumstances, staff did not see the need for the additional easement as the intent of the UDC was being met by the other development constraints.

The Commission also questioned the need to extend Terzop Street (not shown on the CATSO MRP) to the east property line of the site, as it would impact a sensitive area (Mill Creek). Staff responded that the UDC requires the extension of streets to the edge of a property when it abuts undeveloped lands; however, acknowledged that that UDC contains provisions that would allow this provision to be waived to avoid sensitive features when an extension was not deemed necessary. The decision to include the extension of Terzop to the east property line was seen as a logical addition to the MRP as an east/west neighborhood collector that would ultimately provide an extension of Southampton Drive which currently terminates at Sinclair Road. Staff acknowledged that the extension of Terzop would require a bridge structure and impact Mill Creek; however, if connectivity in this area were deemed to be a priority this connection was not inappropriate since a there would need to be a bridge constructed over Mill Creek at some point.

Following additional discussion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted (5-3) to recommend approval of the preliminary plat and design adjustment.

Mayor noted that annexation had occurred long ago. Staff could not itemize all activity surrounding this property but did indicate some activity around this property. Neighbors indicated that they had attended meetings about this and that they were told this application would not be approved but if something came up they would be notified. Neighbors indicated that they had heard no updates since that time. Mayor asked about maximum length of cul de sacs and length of road. Staff indicated that this would be longer than 300 feet and would exceed the standard, but that there was no indication about how this project would specifically proceed. Staff explained that these were large lots. Skala questioned testimony regarding bringing in fill to raise the site. Believed that this was pushing the problem downhill. Asked about the new UDC and the statement that you could build in this area if requirements have been met, but that they were not. Staff explained that flood fringe was different than flood plain and floodway. Staff indicated that we should always do whatever we can to provide homes in the flood area on a reasonable basis. Skala asked if this was a 5 to 3 vote in favor. Staff indicated that was true but also indicated that this was the last point of connection possible. Pitzer asked exactly where the flood fringe existed. Wanted to clarify that no house could be built in one area due to setbacks and staff concurred. Staff indicated that a minimum lot size was 7,000 sq. ft. and that most of these were 8,000 or so sized lots. Staff also indicated that this was a long period of time between initial meetings and this project coming forward. Pitzer also asked about lots in the southwest part of this site. Indicated that it appeared that these specific lots were relatively flat. Asked if maps or lots had changed since the last discussions. Pitzer asked if any of these properties had a history of flooding. Staff did not know. Pitzer asked if it was incumbent on the council to take additional actions on this if there was a problem. Staff indicated that action could be tabled by the council.

Thomas asked about traffic on Old Mill Creek Road as a result of this development. Staff indicated that there did not seem to be a traffic problem of great significance. Thomas asked about schools in this area being required to make road improvements and asked if this project was subject to the same requirements. Staff indicated that they would have to build sidewalks and would build curb and guttered streets in this development. No turn land was required here. This will move through engineering before construction can occur. That's where we will find out about specific requirements. These are large lots. We will have to see how this unfolds. Thomas asked if in the future traffic volumes could increase? Staff indicated that sometimes lots of small projects do add up to a larger traffic need. Staff indicated that there will be a development charge of 50 cents per square foot for this purpose. Thomas asked staff if this will be enough money to cover costs. Staff indicated they had not done that calculation. Thomas indicated that he had done this and that he thought it was not near enough.

Public hearing was opened.

Engineer appeared on behalf of the applicant. Indicated that this plan is different than had been originally approved because the UDC changed during the interim period. Indicated that this entire area will not function as land in a flood plain because it will be raised out of that area. Also, stated that the original plan did have a cul de sac but that was amended. Skala asked if you build up in the floodplain, don't you shift the impact downstream? Engineer indicated that that was not really the case and that the FEMA estimates show some flooding propensities but that they are not exact. Pitzer asked about history of flooding in this area. Engineer indicated that he did not know exact flooding history but that there would be fill and that these homes would no longer be in the floodplain.

Next speaker indicated that he lived at the eastern part of this development and believed that notification was insufficient and had not received anything on this item since May. He is an architect. Believes that the density of this development is much higher than surrounding development and that this is a travesty. Did not know if there had been any studies about future flooding and how it would impact flooding in the existing flood area when significant storms occurred. If you dump that water in it will have an impact of some sort. Mayor asked if the speaker was an architect. He indicated that he was a contractor. Asked if this was in line with surrounding properties. Speaker indicated that it was not. Also indicated that the length of the cul de sac, if built, would be excessive.

Next speaker indicated that she lived in this area and that she had several issues with this project. Our homes are our biggest investment. Existing homes are on 3 acre lots. These are much smaller and do not match the surroundings. There has been flooding in this area many times. People who live there now have experienced flooding. We have seen so much flooding that we have lost trees and that we have had to clean out trees from under bridges. I have seen so many accidents on this roadway. It is not adequate for more people on this road. Where children play is right by this road. There is a lot to consider and I hope you will. I think you would have to widen this road before this goes forward.

Next speaker indicated that they live on the other side of the creek from this, so they won't be as directly affected, but that this will impact other homes in the area. If Columbia allows new homes to be built right next to other more valuable homes, then something is wrong. Magnolia Falls is going to build up, but that is not being taken into account. Mayor asked if they had received notice. Speaker indicated that they did but that then that meeting was canceled, and they received nothing after that. The only reason we are here is because someone called us about this. This is really about the density more than the project itself.

Next speaker indicated that she lived in the area. We built our house in 1984 and have a creek in our yard. It has backed up numerous times. If we could get assurance that this would not make the situation worse we could support this, but we have not heard anything. This has not been addressed. Don't know how this made this this far, but it does not seem right. Our flooding is much larger than what the applicant is leading you to believe.

Next speaker indicated that she lives in the flood plain and when she has asked questions she was told that the city is the only one that can develop in this area, but she cannot build a berm in her yard for protection. Why can the city do this? If another six-inch rise can bring flood waters closer to our house, then we need to be careful. When these regulations were written, they allowed the city to develop concrete trails in the area but no one else. Concrete trails cause more problems. Don't allow more development in this area.

Next speaker indicated that he believes that every meeting he goes to he hears about notification problems. I am proposing that the city should ask staff to provide a penalty to the applicants and engineers if proper notification was not given. This is a travesty. Please impose that new rule. Do you know that we have stormwater problems now because of inadequate planning? Don't just think about one project at a time. Think about it long-term. We have a lot of projects that need funding. They occur over time. It will get worse if we don't act now. Now is a good time to begin. This is not a good preliminary plat. Don't table it. Deny it.

No further public comment.

Pitzer asked about notification again. Asked if city followed the protocol. Staff indicated that original notification occurred in April, Public Information meeting was held in May and that information had been exchanged with staff over time. This piece of land already had the correct zoning, but that there were postings about this project online. Specific notifications may not have been sent at every stage. Pitzer asked if there were calculations performed about runoff due to new impervious surface conditions. Staff indicated that such calculations are required to show that runoff does not increase. Indicated that applicant has meet those requirements. If there are flooding problems now, then we need to address that problem as well.

Trapp indicated that the zoning has already been established for this land, and that roadway capacity issues should have been determined earlier. There is always pressure to create larger lots, but bigger lots are not always the best answer. There is a huge gap in the CATSO map and other connectivity issues. As we plan our city in the future, we need to consider what the impacts will be. They came forward with a good plan, and we blew it up. They made them adhere to new rules from the new UDC. I don't think we should reject this because we passed a new code that changed the rules on the applicants. There were no notification requirements that were missed. We should move forward on this.

Pitzer felt like the connectivity issue was still up in the air. This is a chicken and egg issue. If the connectivity does not occur in the future as expected, then what do you do? This is sticky. We want development to occur within the city – and it is. There will be more of these requests. There will be more transitions from rural to urban in the future. I don't think these issues are fully resolved. Should we go forward or defeat this and go back to the drawing board? Skala indicated that he is uncomfortable with this and that he does not agree completely with the staff's incremental approach to this problem. We used to talk about density and zoning. Before the new UDC, we talked about feathering density. Now we are abandoning Planned Zoning. Notification seems to be a problem here. Unless you know the ins and outs of this, it is difficult to follow this problem. I think we could table this due to CATSO questions, but right now I am inclined to vote no.

Mayor indicated that he will vote no on this proposal and that there are roads to nowhere and no funding mechanisms to pay for other connections.

**Motion to approve preliminary plat DEFEATED 4 to 3 with Trapp, Ruffin and Pitzer voting in the minority.)**

**B366-17** Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code to establish a parking advisory commission.

(Action: On June 6, 2016 Council adopted Resolution 76-16 establishing the Parking and Traffic Management Task Force to review and evaluate best practices related to parking and

traffic management in other cities as provided through examples in the Smart Growth America (SGA) report and presentation; evaluate SGA's recommended actions to address parking policies and strategies; review and evaluate parking requirements and options for parking requirement waivers within the M-DT District of the UDO; and recommend whether an ongoing Parking and Traffic Management Commission should be established.

The Parking and Traffic Management Task Force presented their final report to Council at the July 17, 2017 pre-council meeting, at which time staff was directed to establish a Parking Advisory Commission whose duties and responsibilities will include the following tasks:

- Evaluate the effectiveness of existing parking resources;
- Make recommendations on policies and procedures affecting parking resources;
- Study parking alternatives and make recommendations to most effectively manage existing parking supply and reduce parking demand;
- Monitor future demand trends for public parking structures;
- Examine neighborhood parking programs;
- Provide citizens with an adequate opportunity to participate in planning and assessing parking programs by holding public hearings to obtain views of citizens along with facilitation of other forms of community input to ensure transparency.

Staff recommends the commission consist of seven (7) members to include one (1) representative from the University of Missouri, one (1) representative from the Downtown Community Improvement District, one (1) representative from the Downtown Leadership Council and four (4) representatives to be appointment by Council. Public Works will provide one (1) staff liaison.

Public hearing was opened.

Speaker indicated that the subtext of this was really about the downtown area. Wants that to be noted. Believes that seven people on this commission are not enough. He wants nine people on the board. Thinks 15 would be too many. Appoint most people from the downtown and surrounding areas.

Thomas made an amendment to expand the size of the commission by two members and change the number of members appointed by the council from 4 to 6. Trapp felt like the original task force was too large. Wants to keep the membership smaller. Thomas spoke to the issue and indicated that smaller groups often have problems and that isolated opinions can prevail. Does not believe that 9 is too many to have on a board. Skala believes that he thinks in this instance the seven-member board is correct. Will support the seven-member size. Pitzer indicated that he thought downtown was well-represented already and did not see the need for a larger commission. The Mayor thought that maybe a few more members would be better. Asked for a roll call.

**Vote on the amendment by Thomas to increase the size of the board by two. Amendment passed 4 to 3 to increase the size of the new commission to a total of nine.**

Skala indicated that he wants this new group to be active in helping form policy about parking permit programs in Benton-Stephens. Thomas wants the commission to focus on enforcement, requirements for downtown parking requirements, the ability of downtown developers to buy-out of requirements and would like these to be early topics.

**Motion on the full bill as amended. Motion carried unanimously.)**

**B378-17** Authorizing a charitable contribution agreement with Mill Creek Manor, Inc. for the donation of property located adjacent to the Perche Creek near the terminus of Dolly Varden Drive, West Kingston Court and West Fort Sumter Court.

(Action: A brief report summarizing the elements of the proposal as stated in the title was presented.)

Public comment was opened.

Engineer indicated that he was clarifying that there was still the offer of a parkland from Mr. Overton on the table. Wanted to make sure the council was aware of that. Indicated that much of the property was not developable.

Next speaker indicated that he was not good at reading maps, but understood that this parcel was within the city limits. Thought this was OK.

Public hearing was closed.

Thomas asked if this piece of land was on the Parks master plan. Parks Department indicated that this land could help avoid the construction of additional bridges and that this would provide park and trail connectivity. Does this connect with the current trail plan? Not quite. It's on the west side of the creek and could require a different bridge, but we can't stay on this side of the creek because of terrain and ownership of other land. This would just be a natural area, but not an active park. Thomas thinks it is worth accepting. Trapp indicated support.

**Motion to accept passed unanimously.)**

**R183-17** Approving The Brooks Preliminary Plat #2 located on the north side of State Route WW, approximately 900 feet west of Rolling Hills Road (Case No.

17-77). (Item moved to Old Business by Thomas.)

(Action: Two items for annexation and preliminary plat being considered in tandem.)

Staff provided a short presentation and indicated that this proposal had received an 8 -0 approval by P&Z and that there were offsite road improvements contemplated. Thomas asked if this was within the East Area planning district and if it matched the plan? Thomas asked if there had been a financial contribution plan at the time. Staff indicated that there was no formal calculated cost of improvement plan in place. Thomas indicated that he is looking ahead to a West Area plan and wants it to be consistent with this plan. Staff indicated that maybe they could come up with something to help calculate future costs. Thomas indicated that this plan does provide contributions to part of this area, but not enough in his opinion.

Skala looked at the ward maps and wanted to know if this area would be in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Ward or Ward 6?

Staff indicated that this had been assigned to Ward 6. Brooks Plat 1 is in Ward 3. This would be in Ward 6. Wording in the ordinance defines the line as Broadway, generally, so that's why this was assigned that way.

Public hearing was opened.

Engineer appeared on behalf of the project. He indicated that road connectivity was defined and showed a map of the proposed subdivision. Many cul de sacs had been eliminated and replaced with loop streets. Have changed many major collector layouts in this entire area and have gone through an extensive public hearing and meeting process. We are well within the Urban Service Area. This area is surrounded by a multitude of zoning classifications, so we fit in to the general development pattern. Addressed a question about the potential Stadium extension. Showed a map that showed a potential future extension of that road, and although it is unfunded, this plan was modified to accommodate that future road. Indicated that offsite improvements would be provided, and that typical city policy would require the developer to construct all road improvements within the subdivision. Speaker indicated that they were building a road that would support the entire area, not just the immediate subdivision, even though most use of the new road would not be generated by this new population. We worked with the city traffic engineers to moderate traffic speed; are building this to a collector standard; and are improving signalization in the area. The Vineyards subdivision across from this in combination with this creates that improvement to be created. Also, indicated that pedway, sidewalk and road improvements are being provided at developer expense, including some turn lanes. We are also providing \$82,000 of shoulder widening on WW and will not require the city to have to acquire additional right-of-way. In all, we are adding about \$500,000 in road and safety improvements. This is compatible with all long-term plans and won an 8-0 endorsement from P&Z. There is no flood plain on this property.

Speaker discussed connectivity and parkland issues and indicated that had been worked out with the Parks Department. Mayor asked for a comparative size development example. Speaker indicated that Thornbrook has about 500 homes, but with a less well-developed road network. Speaker indicated that this tries to account for full, future build-out in terms of road network. This is under the old UDC rules, but we tried to make it work with the intent of the new rules. Skala asked if this was the equivalent of R-1? Speaker indicated that roughly that was correct.

Next speaker indicated that she was appearing on behalf of El Chaparral subdivision. Indicated that they have some concerns. Wants to make sure that traffic volume along WW is addressed. They asked for a MoDOT traffic study. MoDOT conducted a 12-hour study and 11,000 cars were counted. It took me 5 minutes to get out of El Chaparral and turn left on a Sunday afternoon. We asked for a roundabout. City, County and MoDOT indicated that there is no money for such a project. We ask that you seek solutions to this traffic situation.

Next speaker indicated that she lived at Sonora Drive. Indicated that it is difficult to turn left to come into the city. I don't understand why The Vineyards can get a traffic light and why El Chaparral cannot. I am not concerned about the new Brooks development. I am worried about our existing situation. I drive a Jeep. I can see. But, smaller cars cannot. We want traffic control at El Chaparral.

Next speaker indicated that he thought the neighbors spoke well and that he was not sure how well the CATSO plan had been conducted. Wants denial of this project until a transportation cost allocation plan is developed and implemented. Don't we have a bunch of small plans like this going on? Why can't this be consolidated into a single, bigger plan with a longer-term perspective. We need these kinds of plans. Don't do this until we get a grasp on this overall planning.

Next speaker indicated that there were some adjacent counties that need to be considered. WW runs to Fulton. This is an alternative route for some people. Maybe this is getting backed-up. The list goes on. If you put in a round about will it back up more traffic?

Peters indicated that she thinks this is a good development and we are going to have to look at some road infrastructure cost sharing plans in the future. She will support this plan. Trapp supports this and believes it is consistent with the East Columbia Area Plan. Pitzer indicated support for the project and that this one is closer to the city than some other and that it has good traffic circulation and pedestrian access. There may be issues with the road network, but this is a good application. Skala indicated that at least we don't have to deal with flood plain on this issue. We are going to have to have more cooperation between multiple jurisdictions in the future, but for now this is good. Thomas wants to look ahead to a west area plan. We need to look at land uses, utilities and road networks. We need to make sure we are charging enough in the future. This new project will put stress on this area. Maybe a round about here was a better idea than in some other places. Thank you for going through the additional road improvements in this area. My calculation is that you are spending about \$1,000 per new home and maybe we need to double that so we can get away from these negotiations.

**Motion to approve passed unanimously.)**

**B361-17** Voluntary annexation of property located on the north side of State Route WW, approximately 900 feet west of Rolling Hills Road; establishing permanent R-1 zoning; authorizing a development agreement with The Brooks at Columbia, LLC (Case No. 17-76). (Moved to New Business, then moved to Old Business to be considered in tandem with R183-17)

**Motion to approve passed unanimously.)**

**B363-17** Approving the Final Plat of The Vineyards, Plat No. 7 located on the south side of Elk Park Drive, approximately 150 feet east of Berkley Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-227). (Moved to Old Business.) (Action: Brief presentation by staff. Speaker indicated that this met earlier standards and that this was the completion of earlier agreements and was technically ministerial in nature. Thomas asked about connection with Elk Park. Speaker indicated that this is directly across from the earlier proposal. Cannot promise use of land that is not controlled by this developer. School in the area is ahead of schedule.

Public hearing was opened. No one appeared.

**Motion to approve passed unanimously.)**

**B375-17** Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to careful and prudent driving. (Moved to Old Business by Thomas.)

(Action: Police appeared to answer questions and indicated that this would not be a primary cause for action. This would not be a primary cause now, and most people won't admit to making mistakes, but it is a cause and needs to be related to another infraction. We can find out if people are using phones, but it is a long and involved process and it requires a warrant. It is not worth the effort and the ethical intrusion in every case. The judge may have more discretion in imposing a sentence, but we would prefer to go on what the officer can observe rather than trying to find out what is on a person's personal phone.

City counselor tried to explain additional nuances related to the enforcement of the law depending on what they can witness, and that prudent driving is currently a requirement for operating a motor vehicle. Thomas asked what else might pass at the state level. Staff could not hazard a guess.

Skala wanted to know how cops evaluate these situations. Police indicated that first they observe driving behavior. Second, they look at other underlying causes. Could be a distracted occurrence in the back seat or the use of a cell phone. Just depends on circumstances. Pitzer asked if this was primary or secondary. Prudent driving is primary, but the use of a phone is secondary to the primary infraction. The secondary doesn't really exist, it is more of an add on at sentencing.

Public hearing was opened.

Speaker indicated that she liked using her phone as a navigation device, particularly in other towns and it makes her feel safer. She doesn't want that to be illegal. Police indicated that that would not be illegal, but you couldn't program the device while you were driving.

Next speaker indicated that this is part of the Vision Zero strategy and that they fully support this bill and believe that distracted driving is simply unsafe, and that using a phone is not the only kind of distracted driving behavior that should be regulated.

No further comment.

**Motion to approve passed unanimously.)**

#### CONSENT AGENDA

(All items remaining on Consent Agenda passed unanimously except those items where a member may have abstained.)

**B361-17** Voluntary annexation of property located on the north side of State Route WW, approximately 900 feet west of Rolling Hills Road; establishing permanent R-1 zoning; authorizing a development agreement with The Brooks at Columbia, LLC (Case No. 17-76). (Moved to Old Business.)

**B363-17** Approving the Final Plat of The Vineyards, Plat No. 7 located on the south side of Elk Park Drive, approximately 150 feet east of Berkley Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-227). (Moved to Old Business.)

**B364-17** Repealing Ordinance No. 022850 which authorized a road relinquishment agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission; authorizing a revised road relinquishment agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission to expand the conveyance of a portion of Business Route 63 from Business Loop 70 southerly to Route 740/Stadium Boulevard and from Route 740/Stadium Boulevard southerly to Route AC.

**B365-17** Authorizing a road relinquishment agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the conveyance of a portion of Ballenger Lane between the Mexico Gravel Road roundabout and the Clark Lane roundabout, and a portion of Clark Lane between the Clark Lane roundabout and east of Woodland Springs Court, as part of the Ballenger Lane improvement project; appropriating funds.

**B367-17** Appropriating funds received from donations and miscellaneous revenue to the Parks and Recreation Department.

**B368-17** Accepting funds from the Community Foundation of Central Missouri to be used for FY 2018 annual arts agency funding; appropriating funds.

**B369-17** Appropriating funds from the 2017 Celebration for the Arts event.

**B370-17** Authorizing a software subscription agreement with Milsoft Utility Solutions,

Inc. for implementation and hosting services for an Interactive Voice Response (IVR) system to manage incoming electrical and outage reports via phone call.

**B371-17** Authorizing a special service agreement with Union Electric Company, d/b/a Ameren Missouri, for the transportation of natural gas to the Columbia Energy Center.

**B372-17** Accepting a conveyance; authorizing payment of differential costs for construction of a water main serving Discovery Park Plat 3A.

**B373-17** Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri, on behalf of its Veterinary Medical Teaching Hospital, for emergency veterinary services.

**B374-17** Authorizing an agreement with Columbia Housing Authority Low-Income Services, Inc. for Teen Outreach Program (TOP) activities in Boone County.

**B375-17** Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to careful and prudent driving. **(Moved to Old Business by Thomas.)**

**B376-17** Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Downtown Community Improvement District as it relates to the construction of a Gateway Plaza on the southeast corner of the Providence Road and Broadway intersection. **(Trapp and Ruffin Abstained.)**

**B377-17** Amending the FY 2018 Annual Budget by adding a position in the Law Department - Prosecution Division; appropriating funds.

**R172-17** Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of the Shepard to Rollins Trail Project (Trail Alignments 1 and 3). **(Moved to New Business by Peters.)**

**R173-17** Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of the Nifong Boulevard corridor improvement project between Providence Road and Forum Boulevard/Willowcreek Lane and proposed construction of the Forum Boulevard improvement project between Green Meadows Road and Nifong Boulevard.

**R174-17** Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the northwest and southwest corners of the Brushwood Lake Road and Scott Boulevard intersection (Case No. 17-238).

**R175-17** Transferring funds for meeting transcription fees for the Board of Adjustment.

**R176-17** Authorizing various Adopt-A-Spot agreements.

**R177-17** Authorizing a contract with the Central Missouri Humane Society for 2018 animal control and municipal shelter services.

**R178-17** Authorizing an agreement with Columbia Swim Club for sports development funding under the Tourism Development Program for the 2018 SPEEDO Sectionals Central Section Region VIII swim competition.

**R179-17** Authorizing the City Manager to execute agreements with various social service agencies.

**R180-17** Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the agreement for professional engineering services with Bartlett & West, Inc. relating to the Nifong Boulevard/Sinclair Road and the Vawter School Road/Old Mill Creek Road intersections improvement project.

**R181-17** Authorizing application to the Missouri Department of Transportation for cost share partnership funding for the proposed Sinclair Road/Route K/Old Plank Road intersection improvement project.

**R182-17** Appointing the City Manager, or the City Manager's designee, as an alternate voting member of the Hinkson Creek Collaborative Adaptive

Management Stakeholder Committee.

**R183-17** Approving The Brooks Preliminary Plat #2 located on the north side of State Route WW, approximately 900 feet west of Rolling Hills Road (Case No. 17-77). (Item moved to Old Business by Thomas.)

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

**R184-17** Establishing a Mayor's Task Force on Climate Action and Adaptation Planning.

(Action: Columbia City council passed Resolution 83-17A in June 2017, reaffirming Columbia's commitment for taking action on climate reduction and developing a Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP). The purposes of the Task Force include the following:

- Working with city staff and consultants on developing Climate Action and Adaptation
- Plan goals and objectives.
- Assist in the development of a public engagement plan.
- Engaging the community in planning community workshops and events.
- Reviewing interim and final project deliverables.
- Providing direction on prioritization of strategies and consideration of technical and community input.

Columbia City Council gave direction at the December 4, 2017 work session for the Task Force to be at least a fifteen (15) member task force. Members of the task force should reflect the diversity of the community, including students, and consist of representatives from City boards and commissions, the environmental community, the conservation community, the business community, the insurance community, major institutions, and subject matter experts.

The Mayor's Task Force on Climate Action and Adaptation Planning will convene during the period of the creation of the CAAP. The Task Force will dissolve after the CAAP is adopted by Columbia City council or by August 31, 2019, whichever occurs first, unless otherwise requested by City Council.

**After brief discussion, the motion to approve passed unanimously.)**

**R185-17** Expressing support for legislation providing legal access to cannabis as a medicine together with the cultivation of cannabis for medical purposes; endorsing the Missouri Medical Marijuana Initiative.

(Action: At the request of Council Member Trapp, Council Report 86-17 and a draft resolution expressing support for medical marijuana was submitted. The report and draft resolution was discussed at the Council meeting on November 6, 2017. Based on the feedback from Council, staff added a clause to the proposed resolution which states that legal access to marijuana as medicine reduces death from opioid overdose. Also, at the request of Council, Public Health and Human Services staff reviewed studies on Medical Marijuana Legalization. One of the more comprehensive studies, Medical Cannabis Laws and Opioid Analgesic Overdose Mortality in the United States, 1999-2010 published in the JAMA Internal Medicine-August 25, 2014, found that states with medical cannabis laws had a 24.8% lower mean annual opioid overdose mortality rate compared to states without medical cannabis laws. This study also states, "further investigation is required to determine how medical cannabis laws may interact with policies aimed at preventing opioid analgesic overdose." Another study showed inconclusive evidence as it related to the use of cannabis and changes in the rates of use of other legal and illegal substances. This

item was considered at the pre-council meeting as one part of the legislative agenda for the city for 2018.

Trapp explained that there have been other measures in the past to decriminalize aspects of marijuana possession and that some measures have been voted down in the past because on a local level we are prohibited from acting in contravention of other state or federal laws. What we CAN do is support other changes to state or federal law. Current studies are biased because of the limitations of studies of legal use. Trapp believes the research is clear and that this approach can be beneficial in reducing opioid addiction. Trapp cited an example and asked for support for an alternative approach. Believed that there were medical and ethical advantages to adopting support for such an approach.

Public hearing was opened.

First speaker indicated that she is a registered nurse and has other experience with cancer patients and that she is a cancer patient herself. Chemotherapy messes you up. It is poison. Marijuana helps cancer patients deal with a variety of issues related to cancer and its treatment, and marijuana can help with other diseases as well. Marijuana is illegal, but it shouldn't be. Marijuana can help with PTSD, cancer treatment, appetite, etc.

Next speaker indicated that he was with the VFW and that he believes that medical marijuana was important, useful and effective. He has lost relatives due to substance abuse and suicide. He wants help and believes that cannabis can help people in different ways. We need to be leaders in this issue and we need to educate ourselves about the positive benefits of cannabis. Marijuana can help prevent seizures, suicide and other pain and suffering. 28 states support this approach and both Missouri US Senators can support legislation like this. More doctors would support this if it were not illegal. Nixon was wrong about this years ago. Indicated that he had been able to cut out reliance on medications over time on a personal level.

Next speaker indicated that he favored this new proposal and that he represented NORML. Originally, marijuana laws were aimed at racial minorities. We need to reevaluate the impact of cannabis and how much more dangerous other drug abuse has been. Marijuana is not a gateway drug – it is an exit drug that provides better options than harder drugs.

Next speaker indicated that he collected more than 2,500 signatures in favor of medical marijuana. All sorts of people signed his petition.

Next speaker indicated that people who use medical marijuana have been treated as harshly as people who used marijuana for recreational purposes. We need to change that, and this can be a positive change. This resolution asks for state action, not local, so let's get behind this idea. Let's let doctors make the choice. Marijuana can reduce pain. This is one of the most effective steps we can take to reduce dependence on opioids.

Next speaker indicated that he was embarrassed that any council members had used marijuana and that we need to eliminate drugs in our lives and that this new proposal does not protect people from negative impacts.

Next speaker indicated that she is a medical professional and that there are many things we don't know. You may not know it, but Columbia has been identified as the drunkest city in Missouri. Teenagers use

marijuana all the time and legal drug companies promote the use of drugs all the time. Indicated that the use of marijuana does not lead to reduced use of opioids and makes it harder to quit opioid addiction. More use of marijuana in the workplace will be destructive. Do not support this idea.

Public hearing closed.

Mayor indicated that he did not believe this was a legislative priority and that he thought this was an issue between a patient and a doctor. He wants to focus on other priorities, even if he thinks it might be useful. Asked Trapp how he chose this issue over some other more pressing issues. Trapp indicated that he thought opioid addiction was important and that this addressed that. Mayor indicated he did not want to reference a campaign committee and that he thought this was not quite the appropriate way to pursue this.

Skala indicated that he had some training in this area and that was in favor of medical marijuana but that he did not believe there was a statistical correlation between medical marijuana use and the avoidance of opioids. He wants to refer the matter back to the Board of Health and find out where we all stand in terms of the many approaches that exist. Asked to table the issue for one month.

Peters indicated that she has seen problems with smoking marijuana and breast feeding. She will not support this because of problems with regulation. Thomas believes that there is no clear evidence that this will have specific benefits, even though he knows people on both sides of the issue. However, he supports the petition and the intent of the petition but will not support tabling. Skala made a motion to table to refer this to the Board of Health. Peters seconded that motion. Thomas questioned the amendment and asked about intent. Skala said he would present the information given to the council to the board and let them render an opinion. Trapp asked to move forward now on this issue and that there is plenty of information available. Ruffin indicated that he believes there are two issues involved here. He thinks it should only be available through doctors. This bill involves personal cultivation. Trapp indicated that it would allow people who can't get it through doctors to not be criminalized for use. Mayor indicated that he thought this was way too broad in scope and that it could be illegal.

Mayor asked which initiative petitions were being circulated and which number was which? Speaker for the group could not answer which version was which number. Skala said we are not in a time crunch. Next Board of Health meeting is on January 11. If that body were to evaluate this, they could have information back to the council by the first meeting in February. Skala changed his motion to table this until the first meeting in February. Trapp seconded the amendment.

**Motion to table until the first meeting in February passed unanimously.)**

**R186-17** Expressing support for the location of the new terminal building at the Columbia Regional Airport to be on the east side of Airport Road and south of the existing terminal building.

Airport Map

(Action: Approximately two and a half years ago the City of Columbia began the process of updating the Airport Layout Plan (ALP) and completing a new Terminal Area Master Plan (TAMP). At a City Council Work Session in May 2016, airport consultant Parsons-Brinckerhoff (WSP) presented six possible locations for the new terminal, and Council gave direction to proceed on evaluating "Preferred Site #2" which is located to the northwest of Runway 13- 31, adjacent to Route H. With that site in mind, as well as two others (the existing terminal location and a location further south near the end of Runway 2), the consultant concluded the necessary analysis and submitted the ALP and TAMP documents to the Federal

Aviation Administration (FAA) for review and comment this fall. These final documents have since been accepted and conditionally approved by the FAA.

Having received conditional approval from the FAA, City staff is prepared to make a site selection for the new terminal. Throughout the public process, there has been discussion with residents, community leaders and regional partners alike ensuring that the Airport terminal is built with the following key priorities in mind: Timing, Cost, and Practices --all the while meeting safety and security regulations and allowing for adequate future expansion. With all three priorities being of the utmost consideration, we ask that the City Council support a proposed new location, specifically the site just south of the current terminal.

Airport design standards prescribe the most efficient location for a terminal building to be at the midpoint of primary Runway 2-20 versus to the northwest of Runway 13. In addition, it is advantageous to utilize the existing infrastructure as a sustainable practice. The newly proposed location will allow use of existing utilities on-site and the re-use of the existing apron, ramp, and taxiway – all of which the FAA has invested in for nearly 50 years versus having to construct new ramps, aprons, service roads, parking lots, etc. and pull utilities to the northern greenfield site. Additionally, employing more sustainable practices and utilizing existing infrastructure will allow for substantial cost savings at the proposed new location. Preliminary estimates anticipate project savings to be in excess of \$10 million at the newly proposed location given the original project estimate of \$40 million for the northern Site #2. It should also be noted that the current terminal is not completely ADA accessible.

The newly proposed site will require a Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) which is an abbreviated environmental review that takes six months approximately versus the required full environmental review on the north site which will take up to 18 months before design can begin. Hence, staff anticipates being able to move more quickly on this new location just south of the existing terminal than on the greenfield site. With Council support of this new location, staff will begin due diligence on the site in partnership with the FAA and MoDOT to ensure proper procedures and regulations are followed, including the CATEX, Supplemental ALP, conceptual design, demolition and/or relocation of ancillary buildings, etc. Of important note, is that the current Airport terminal will remain operational until the completion of the new building. As noted in previous communications, funding for this project will be allocated from several sources: local, state, federal. On August 2, 2016, the voters overwhelmingly supported an increase to the hotel tax that will provide \$10 million over 23 years toward the new terminal project. In addition, the State of Missouri has also supported this project by providing \$2.5 million in June of 2017. It is the intent of the City of Columbia to pursue FAA grants to fund the project during the next federal grant cycle which begins in the spring of 2018. Federal support for this project is capped at \$20 million for terminal projects. The City of Columbia will dedicate Transportation Sales Tax for any amounts exceeding the allotted grants.

Council questions ensued. Skala asked about the future of the old terminal when this one gets built. Staff indicated that this terminal would remain operational during new construction and after that the old terminal could be used or leased by another operation, but the land would remain under the ownership of the city. This configuration would allow us to use existing runways and aprons. Peters asked about the separation of general aviation from passenger service. This would allow for that. Thomas asked why the staff came up with this configuration when for the last 2 and half years we had looked at another idea. Staff indicated that during a work session last year, this option was discussed again and so we took another look at this.

Thomas asked if this had been discussed with the Airport Advisory Board? Staff indicated that they were present at the announcement but that they had not signed off on this prior to that time. Mayor explained that this general concept had been approved and that this would save money and that it was an elegant solution.

Public hearing was opened.

Speaker asked about relative placement of the new buildings, size and spacing between the new terminal and the postal facility. Wants to avoid any explosive materials in the area.

Next speaker indicated that he represented the Chamber and that they endorse this concept and that it is a positive development to accelerate the timeframe on this project at a substantial cost savings.

No further public comment.

Skala indicated that he wished he would have known about this ahead of the announcement and would have appreciated notification. Pitzer supported this new concept. Glad too see that the concept has future expansion potential. Ruffin supports this concept and asked about parking. Staff indicated that one of the more recent parking lots would need to be reconfigured and that they will need 1190 spots. Current capacity is 900. They will need some enhancements to parking.

Skala asked about satellite lots and that has not been worked out yet. Mayor indicated that closing the funding gap should allow us to work out the parking situation.

**Motion to adopt the proposal passed unanimously.)**

**R172-17** Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of the Shepard to Rollins Trail Project (Trail Alignments 1 and 3). (Moved to New Business by Peters.)  
(Action: this is not an official public hearing, but public input was solicited.)

First speaker indicated that this option did not achieve all the goals enumerated in the original project; showed a short trail and a bridge; and that one part of the trail was to be determined later, but that that never happened and there was not public input meeting. Why is this costing so much and asked if the numbers were backwards because this now seems to be the most expensive? Asked for clarification. Also, believes that a lot of this trail was added to the project due to opposition from people who did not want this trail to go through Clyde Wilson Park and wants an explanation. If this is not going to benefit the handicapped population or walkers and only bikers, then I think we should reconsider this.

Mayor asked how the hearing process should be improved, if not the content. The speaker indicated that there are huge differences in the cost estimates and that this is wrong, so we should probably sit back down with city staff and get this worked out before it is adopted.

Next speaker indicated that the city council was an awesome group of people. Indicated she was told not to make this an emotional appeal. She indicated that was difficult because this was very important to her. She wants to have access to nature at this site. She believes that this needs to be a balance with nature. She thinks there needs to be more time to ask more questions.

No further comments from public.

Peters asked to amend the public hearing schedule to the first meeting in February. We have not done what we needed to do. We need another public information meeting. Let's see what we need to do. Thomas thinks this project has been decided and is ready to go. If we can't talk about it tonight, then I am not certainly not going to support delay if you won't talk about it. Skala indicated that he thought much of this would not change because it has been fought about earlier. But, he thinks there are some parts that could be clarified.

Pitzer indicated that he would not support any delay. We set the process and we have known this for months. Mayor indicated that would defer to the 6<sup>th</sup> ward council member. Peters asked to amend the date for the hearing to the first meeting in February.

**Amendment to the resolution passed 5 to 2.**

**Motion as amended passed 6 to 1 with Pitzer voting no.)**

### INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

**B379-17\*** Approving the Final Plat of Sidra Subdivision, Plat No. 3, a Replat of Lot 1, Sidra Subdivision - Plat 1, located on the northwest corner of the Stadium Boulevard and Primrose Drive intersection; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-236).

**B380-17\*** Vacating utility easements within the former rights-of-way of Locust Street and Second Street and an east-west alley on the east side of Second Street (Case No. 17-200).

**B381-17\*** Vacating a sanitary sewer easement located on the west side of Bernadette Drive and north of Worley Street (817 Bernadette Drive) (Case No. 17-202).

**B382-17\*** Vacating portions of the utility and drainage easements on Lot 3 within Rockbridge Subdivision Block IX located on the northwest corner of the Monterey Drive and Providence Road intersection (3901 S. Providence Road) (Case No. 18-16).

**B383-17\*** Vacating a portion of right-of-way platted for Eugenia Avenue located on the east side of College Avenue (Case No. 18-19).

**B384-17\*** Authorizing a cost share agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the proposed Keene Street and I-70 Drive Southeast intersection improvement project; appropriating funds.

**B385-17\*** Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking along both sides of Turner Avenue between Tiger Avenue and Providence Road.

**B386-17\*** Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code relating to energy efficiency loans for commercial properties.

**B387-17\*** Authorizing the City Manager to execute a grant of easement for water utility purposes to Consolidated Public Water Supply District No. 1 of Boone County, Missouri for the relocation of a water line along Route H near the Columbia Regional Airport.

**B388-17** Authorizing a pole attachment license agreement with MO Network Utility Transport, LLC for the installation and maintenance of communications facilities, distributed antenna systems and associated wireless equipment on City distribution poles.

**B389-17\*** Authorizing a contract of obligation with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources to satisfy financial assurance requirements for proper closure and post-closure care with respect to a permit for operation of a solid waste

disposal area.

**B390-17\*** Authorizing the City Manager to execute a temporary construction easement for highway purposes to the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for property located on the east side of Route 763 and adjacent to Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT) right-of-way.

**B391-17\*** Accepting conveyances for drainage and utility purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.

**B392-17\*** Authorizing application to the United States Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration and the Missouri Department of Transportation for airport capital assistance grants in 2018.

**B393-17\*** Authorizing a non-federal limited design and implementation reimbursable agreement with the Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration for the relocation of equipment in the AFSS building at the Columbia Regional Airport.

**B394-17\*** Appropriating funds for the work space expansion project in the Community Relations Department.

**B395-17\*** Appropriating funds from the sale of a 2001 Sutphen Quint fire truck for the purchase of fire apparatus equipment.

**B396-17** Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with Columbia Mutual Insurance Company for the purchase of property located on the northeast corner of the White Gate Drive and Towne Drive intersection.

**B397-17\*** Authorizing an agreement for the purchase of services with Boone County, Missouri for the Teen Outreach Program (TOP); appropriating funds.

## REPORTS

**REP102-17** Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) Board of Directors - Annual Membership. **(Trapp abstained.)**

(Action: A list of potential appointees to the Downtown CID was presented. Five board members were proposed by the CID along with seven alternate nominations.

**Jesse Garcia, Mike McClung, Dale Logan, Van Hawxby, and Lisa Klenke were appointed by the Mayor with the support of the council.)**

**REP103-17** Central Missouri Humane Society Relocation Proposal.

(Action: CMHS is requesting to swap city land at 616 Big Bear Blvd. (2.88 acres) on which the CMHS is currently located for 4.06 acres on Strawn Road where a future facility can be built. This land is part of the 47-acre tract donated to the City by Larry Potterfield. The CMHS has completed a needs assessment of its current facility, location, and anticipated growth. The CMHS has established a feasibility study committee to help develop a set of specific strategic priorities for a capital campaign and desires to enter into a memorandum of understanding with the City in order to move forward with the campaign.

A brief presentation was made by a board member of the CMHS. Skala asked how a memorandum of understanding works and how specific it needs to be. Legal staff indicated that this was a binding intent to try to work this out with the CMHS and that details of the negotiation could be worked out in furtherance of that end. It commits the city to a good faith effort to find out a way to get this done. You can make it as specific or ambiguous as you want in regard to the final details, but you are bound to try and work out some beneficial solution.

The Mayor indicated he is referring back to a plan that was presented earlier this year and wants to make sure that this land is platted and annexed. Thinks this may be premature since we don't know about water, utilities, annexation, etc. I think we have other potential uses for this before we commit to this deal. Thomas indicated that he did not see this as a give-away, he sees it as a swap. Asked the Mayor what else is being contemplated for this land? Mayor said he didn't know, but maybe it could be sold or given to someone else, But, until we look at all the options he thinks this is premature.

Ruffin asked a spokesperson from the CMHS about timeline. Speaker indicated that they would like to achieve this in the next 5 to 7 years so they could start a capital campaign. Can't wait too long. We have to identify a site. Trapp thought this was a great community partnership, so he suggested going forward with discussions and wants to explore fire station locations as well. Staff explained that they could bring forward platting and annexation information at the same time a memorandum of understanding was being created. Mayor asked to have the annexation and plat come first, then look at a Memorandum of Understanding. Peters indicated she would like to see this annexation and platting go first so they had the entire array of options out there first.

General consensus became that the annexation consideration should take place first then a Memorandum of Understanding could come forward that discussed a new humane society and a potential fire station on another site.

Motion to consider annexation and platting prior to the creation of a Memorandum of Understanding was made and seconded. Staff disclosed that at least one other group had inquired about the potential use of that parcel of land. Mayor indicated that was news to him.

**Motion carried unanimously.)**

**REP104-17 U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) Requirements.**

(Action: This Council Report provides a preview of the U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) requirements for the City of Columbia, the HUD Assessment of Fair Housing (AFH) Tool, recommended timeline, summary of how results of the AFH should inform the next Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Consolidated Plan, and recommended outline for a public engagement process. Affirmatively Furthering Fair Housing (AFFH) is a legal requirement that federal agencies and federal grantees further the purposes of the Fair Housing Act. The intent of this report to inform Council on these federal requirements and receive feedback and direction on the draft public engagement process.

City staff proposes creating a Fair Housing Task Force consisting of a broad stakeholder group for the following purposes:

1. Assist staff in refining the AFH public engagement process and conducting outreach.
2. Analyze required fair housing data presented by staff and local partners.
3. Review public input collected throughout the public engagement process.
4. Provide recommendations to Council for Fair Housing Goals and Priorities.

The two key deliverables of the Fair Housing Task Force would be as follows:

1. Provide recommendations for City policies that promote and further fair housing.
2. Provide recommendations on the use of CDBG, HOME, other HUD Sources and local funds in a manner that promotes and furthers fair housing and informs the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan.

**Council decided to pursue this course of action.)**

**REP105-17 Annual Report of Volunteer Service to the City of Columbia.**

(Action: In FY17, volunteers shared 42,251 hours of service supporting eleven departments. This reflects an increase of 20% over FY16. Parks & Recreation had the greatest support from volunteers, with 21,473 hours contributed to 60 different programs and activities. The Community Development Department logged 9,385 hours and City Utilities including Solid Waste and Stormwater had 6,268 hours of service. Specific areas of service included: Invasive plant removal; Litter pickup; Special events; Adopt-A-Spot; Recycling activities; Residential composting; CERT; and service by various individuals on city boards and commissions. Volunteer activities are valued at more than \$800,000 annually.

**Report accepted with kudos to volunteers from the council.)**

**REP106-17 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.**

(Action: Report accepted. **No formal action required.**)

**GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

**Public**

First speaker indicated that knows a homeless person who would like to volunteer and asked about the procedure. Speaker also asked about the workings of the Community Land Trust and who to contact. Wanted to know why mobile home owners don't get city newsletters with their trash service anymore? City Manager indicated he would look into that. Finally discussed explosions and natural disasters and wanted to know if the council is monitoring that.

**Council**

Mayor wants the council to establish taxpayer protections built into the TIF agreement that will be negotiated between the developer and the city. Wants a guarantee regarding investment by the developer or a cap on the number of years that the TIF extends. Would also like to guarantee the number of jobs created.

Skala indicated that he wondered about the financing gap on the new hotel and wanted to know if you can stack one CID on top of another CID in the downtown area. He thinks you should not do that. Mayor started proposing various gap financing alternatives including personal loans and paybacks, bonding, etc. Skala mentioned that there is no municipal risk in this, but it would be useful to look at this.

Mayor asked about the latest homicide and wants to know that we have a short-term crime strategy and if we need more detectives, we need to consider something because this is a serious problem.

Thomas asked staff about the transmission line project and wanted to know if we have received information that indicates we may not need to build out the power facilities in south Columbia and can use existing lines. City Manager indicated that there are some engineering aspects that need to be worked out on that. Thomas then asked about the Mill Creek substation and wanted to know if that would have to be built. City Manager indicated that there are other places to establish transformers and if we separate the two issues, we need to consider the load factor. We have never approved the substation. Mayor indicated that the director has told the Water and Light Advisory Board that they may not need the substation because expectations for load had not been met. Is this true? The City Manager indicated that it is not quite that simple but that there are options. We do not have a double fail prevention system in place currently, but there are no looming deadlines that will prevent us from looking at this program in a complete manner.

Trapp asked staff to explore the creation of a West Columbia Area Planning Initiative.

**Staff**  
**(None.)**

**ADJOURNMENT**  
**(Time: 12:34 AM, December 19, 2017)**

©2017 CityWatch-Columbia

*(This document may not be reproduced, redistributed or significantly cited in other works without the written permission of the author.)*

DO NOT COPY