



**Columbia City Council Meeting Recap**  
**Council Chamber, Columbia City Hall**  
**7:00 PM**  
**Tuesday, January 2, 2018**

---

Pledge of Allegiance  
Roll Call

**INTRODUCTORY ITEMS**

(Recited as indicated.)

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

Absent: Ruffin, Thomas.)

Approval of Minutes  
Adjustment of Agenda

(Minutes from December 4, 2017 approved.)

**(R1-18 moved from Consent Agenda to New Business by Skala.**

**Trapp requested to abstain from R5-18. Both changes approved unanimously.)**

**SPECIAL ITEMS**

(None.)

**APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS**

(None.)

**SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

(None.)

**PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**PH1-18** Voluntary annexation of property located on the northwest and southwest corners of the Brushwood Lake Road and Scott Boulevard intersection (Case No. 17-238).

[See B2-18 under Intro & 1st Read/Mayor Memo]

(Action: Staff presented a report on this aspect of the application. The applicant, Smith Lewis, LLP (agent), on behalf of NGT, Inc. (owners), seek to annex 10.36 acres into the City of Columbia and apply M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood District) zoning as the site's permanent zoning. Annexation is sought to allow the parcel to connect to the City's sewer and utility services. The subject acreage is contiguous to the City along its north boundary and to the east across Scott Boulevard. The subject site would be located entirely within the City's FP-O (Floodplain Overlay District) if already annexed into the corporate limits. Approximately two-thirds of the northwestern portion of the site lie within the "floodway" with the remaining area of the site, the northwest corner at Scott Boulevard and Brushwood Lake Road, located within the "flood fringe". The development of the site, as desired by the applicant, will be

further determined by submission of development plans following Council's determination if annexation is appropriate.

The Planning and Zoning Commission considered this proposal at their December 7, 2017 meeting. Following significant discussion regarding the environmental limitations impacting the site and limited information on the outcome of a pending Letter of Map Revision (LOMR) from FEMA, the Commission voted (4-4) on the proposed permanent M-N zoning. According to the Commission's Rules of Procedure, a tie vote means no Commission recommendation is being presented to Council on the requested permanent zoning.

Skala asked about the location of this property within the floodplain and staff explained the differences between flood plain, flood fringe and flood way.

Pitzer asked about distinctions between M-N and M-C zoning designations. Staff explained that M-N was less intrusive, and M-C allowed a broader scope of uses including vehicular traffic etc.

Public hearing was opened.

First speaker appeared on behalf of the applicant as an attorney and indicated that some elements of the application were not quite complete and asked for **tabling or continuation of this item until the first meeting in February**. Also, asked that all related items be heard on the same night.

No further speakers appeared.

**Motion to continue the public hearing until the first meeting in February was approved unanimously.** A further procedural question regarding zoning and votes on all related issues ensued. **A final vote on all related items will occur at the second City Council meeting in February.)**

#### **OLD BUSINESS**

**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.

(Action: MO Network Utility Transport, LLC is seeking an agreement with the City to install and maintain communications facilities, distributed antenna systems and associated wireless equipment, on City poles to provide wireless communication services. Poles will include those that are used for the distribution of electricity, lighting and/or communications service and are capable of supporting attachments. Before making any attachments to any poles, MO Network Utility Transport will submit an application and receive a permit from the City with respect to each pole. The application will include detailed plans for the proposed attachments, including a description of any necessary improvements to accommodate the attachments.

Staff believes that an agreement with MO Network Utility Transport is mutually beneficial, as the terms and conditions regarding the pole attachments have been developed jointly and described in the agreement. The compensation level, permitting process and turnaround times as proposed in this agreement are more favorable to the City than previously proposed state legislation. The proposed annual fee for each pole attachment is five hundred and forty dollars (\$540.00) for the first five (5) year

term. The annual fee will increase by twenty percent (20%) upon the commencement of each five (5) year renewal term.

Mayor asked about minimum terms of the proposed contracts and it was indicated that five years was the minimum term. Mayor also asked about the right of the city to reject individual pole locations. Staff indicated that they did have that ability.

Skala asked if this was a public utility or if it only served customers of that private service. Staff indicated that the use was a wholesale distribution use and that it served more than their direct customers. Staff also indicated that there is no expected interference from the devices installed on city poles.

Peters asked if other providers would be allowed to pursue similar contracts. Staff indicated that other providers could pursue this type of agreement; this would serve as a model agreement; and that if other providers came later then they may be precluded from some locations due to space limitations but could be accommodated.

Pitzer asked about how many units would be installed. Staff indicated that the initial number was 26 and that that number could go up. Pitzer further asked how the price of \$540 was determined. Staff indicated that it was negotiated and based on some other city charges both in Missouri and nationally. Increases in pricing at the end of each contract term was negotiated. Pitzer asked if the city needs to remove a pole when a device is installed on that pole, is that possible? Staff indicated that the city maintains control of the poles and reserves capacity on the poles.

No public comment was presented.

**Motion to approve passed unanimously.)**

**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.

(Action: The Parks and Recreation Department is requesting Council approval to acquire a parcel of land at the corner of Towne Drive and Whitegate Drive and for the City Manager to execute the Contract for Sale of Real Estate. The parcel is owned by Columbia Insurance Group and is located in a primary priority park acquisition service area in the 2013 Neighborhood Parks Plan. Staff negotiated a selling price of \$250,000 for the 2.24 acres of land identified as Lot Three of White Gate community, Plat Two. Acquisition of land for the purpose of a neighborhood park in this area of Columbia has been a priority for the Department since the approval of the City's 1994 Parks, Recreation and Open Space Master Plan. Pending neighborhood input, park staff anticipates the park to include standard neighborhood park amenities, such as a playground, walking trail, basketball court and shelter. The acquisition of the parcel is funded by the Parks Sales Tax park acquisition account.

The property was appraised by Cannon, Blaylock & Wise on September 20, 2017 and was valued at \$490,000. The parcel is undeveloped at this time; and pending input from the neighborhood residents, the park property could provide neighborhood park amenities, such as a playground, basketball court, walking trail, fitness equipment and a shelter. If desired, funding for amenities would likely come from a future Park Sales Tax ballot issue and is not included as part of this Council action.

Skala indicated that he likes this project, but indicated acquiring right of way in this area has been difficult. Asked if a bus shelter could be included. Staff indicated that that was possible.

No public comment.

Trapp indicated that he supports this project and believes that it fits in with the Strategic Plan intent, even if it was not originally designated as such. Thanked Columbia Insurance Group for making this land available. Skala echoed those comments and indicated that the price was right. This area has had crime issues, and this is an important improvement. Parks are a good way to start neighborhood improvements.

Mayor asked about future improvements. Staff indicated that there was no money for actual improvements yet, but that by 2019, after public input sessions, they will try to propose a plan of definite improvement. It is a relatively small parcel and will need some thought. Peters asked if this would attract more drug traffic or unsavory users. Staff indicated that it would not be worse than the existing neighborhood and that good uses tend to repel bad uses.

**Motion to approve passed unanimously.**

#### **CONSENT AGENDA**

**(All items remaining on Consent Agenda approved unanimously.)**

**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.

**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.

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

**R1-18** Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of the Keene Street and I-70 Drive Southeast intersection improvement project.  
(Removed from Consent Agenda to New Business.)

**R2-18** Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of the FY 2018 sanitary sewer main and manhole rehabilitation project.

**R3-18** Authorizing a lease agreement with Wabash Arms of Columbia, L.L.C. for the placement and maintenance of a trash compactor in the Downtown Community Improvement District.

**R4-18** Determining that the Police Precinct/Municipal Service Center North facility qualifies for funding under the Percent for Art program; authorizing the Commission on Cultural Affairs Standing Committee on Public Art to begin developing the public art component for such facility.

#### **NEW BUSINESS**

**R5-18** Authorizing the installation of a pilot street lighting project along Broadway, between Hitt Street and Waugh Street.

(Trapp abstained from voting on this issue.)

(Action: Staff has prepared for Council consideration a resolution authorizing a pilot lighting project consisting of six streetlights installed on Broadway between Hitt and Waugh. The estimated cost for this pilot is \$24,000 and would be charged to Capital Improvement Project E0180.

In 2001 a demonstration project was started to replace the existing streetlights in the Downtown Community Improvement District (The District) with acorn style lights as shown in Exhibit A. As a result of this 2001 lighting demonstration project, the remaining lights in the downtown area were replaced with acorn style streetlights in a partnership with The District. Many of the acorn lights fixtures have failed over the years and have been replaced with the standard streetlight that was available at the time. This has created a diverse mix of streetlights in the downtown area. Many of the poles that were painted black, especially those that were initially galvanized, are showing deterioration of the black

finish. Beginning in FY 2016 a CIP project to address lighting in The District was created (E0180). This project had three primary goals:

1. Underground the overhead electric streetlight circuits.
2. Installation of additional lighting for under lit areas including the alley ways.
3. Replace the streetlight infrastructure that was painted black.

This project would consist of the strategic replacement of poles and luminaires with new black powder coated poles and arms with Cooper Navion luminaires. The District has again offered to partner with the City to add features to the lighting to enhance public safety at night. The enhanced safety features would include an advanced photocell controller attached to the luminaire on the lower sidewalk arm. This luminaire would have the ability to be dimmed and brightened on a separate schedule from the upper street side luminaire. The upper street side luminaire would consist of a 3000K Cooper Navion luminaire operated from dusk till dawn. The lower sidewalk arm luminaire would consist of a 6000K Cooper Navion luminaire. The lower sidewalk arm luminaire would be operated on the proposed schedule: • Come on at dusk at a dimmed level. • Full power at bar closing to enhance safety and discourage loitering in the downtown area. • Return to dimmed level after ~30-45 minutes • Off at dawn

The District has offered to cover the cost associated with the advanced photocell controllers for the project, up to a maximum of \$30,000. Should the project move forward, the department would bid the materials as a package to obtain the best available pricing. It is estimated that the costs would range between \$3,500 - \$4,500 per light. The goal would be to replace as many lights as funding levels allow, approximately \$295,000 currently available in E0180 plus \$30,000 from The District.

The pilot project would consist of replacing six streetlights on Broadway between Hitt and Waugh. The estimated cost for this pilot is \$24,000 and would be charged to Capital Improvement Project E0180. No further changes would be implemented until this pilot project is evaluated.

The Director of the Downtown CID appeared on behalf of that group to reiterate information in the staff report and show exhibits of what the CID role is and how future improvements might look. Another board member from CID appeared to discuss the mish-mash of lighting options available in the downtown area. She noted that older lights have failed over time, and older poles that had been painted peel every time people put tape on them. Mayor asked who owned the poles. Staff indicated that they are city-owned. Speaker indicated that these would not be unique in style to downtown, but that they would be similar to other poles and lights in the rest of the city. Mayor asked about losing the acorn lights. Speaker indicated that they tried to retrofit these types of fixtures, and that it did not work well. Also, indicated that the current configuration was a ratty mix. These new lights are more modern, but right now we old lights have been installed on new poles and this is a reasonable way to approach lighting. Some ornamental light fixtures are not always the best solution. This is not inconsistent with historic preservation goals since the existing lighting scheme is really not historic.

Skala asked about other lighting projects from the past and referred to a project around the Tribune building. Speaker indicated that that project was going to put acorn lights on the wrong poles and it never happened. Speaker indicated that these lights were better targeted and could be dimmed on a timer basis or by motion sensors.

A police officer appeared to discuss how these lights would affect policing. They have investigated downtown lighting and their conclusion was that lighting helps disperse crowds during late night gatherings and it is effective. They tried this before with firetruck spotlights and even that worked. This

area was chosen because it appears on the monthly hot spot map. This is not the reinvention of the wheel. Speaker indicated that they are doing something that relates to public safety. Another police officer indicated that he has seen this model work in another city at a national conference. Pitzer asked about the relative intensity of these lights. Speaker indicated he could not give technical specs, but that the brightness would help disperse crowds at bar closing times. Did not know who would control the lighting schedules.

Skala thought this was an important step, but wondered if any downtown residents had weighed in on this. CID speaker indicated that there had not been a lot of discussion, but that once the pilot project lights were installed then they would convene an interested parties meeting.

No further public comment.

Mayor asked about cost per pole. Staff indicated that it should be about \$3,500 per pole light set. If this works, we would move to do another 100 poles. CIS will contribute about \$30,000. The city will be responsible for future construction. Skala asked if there had been an inventory conducted. Staff indicated that the city did buy extra acorn lights earlier, but those have already been used. Supporting parts, like ballasts, etc. are more expensive than the LED technology being discussed here.

**Motion to approve passed unanimously.**

**R1-18** Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of the Keene Street and I-70 Drive Southeast intersection improvement project.

(Removed from Consent Agenda to New Business.)

(Action: Staff provided a brief report indicating that an earlier public information meeting was well received. This would set the hearing for February 5. Skala mentioned that this has been a long-standing project and had been negotiated. He pulled this from Consent to make sure that the cooperative nature of this project was noted.

No public input was received.

**A motion to set a hearing for February 5 passed unanimously.)**

#### **INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING**

**(All items introduced as indicated.)**

**B1-18\*** Calling the municipal election to be held on Tuesday, April 3, 2018 to elect council members for Wards 2 and 6.

**B2-18** Voluntary annexation of property located on the northwest and southwest corners of the Brushwood Lake Road and Scott Boulevard intersection; establishing permanent M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood District) zoning (Case No. 17-238).

**B3-18** Approving the Preliminary Plat of Bluff Creek Estates Plat 9, a Revision to part of Bluff Creek Estates Phase 1, located on the east side of Bluff Creek Drive and north of Grindstone Parkway; granting a design adjustment to allow more than thirty (30) lots to be platted without a secondary point of access; granting a design adjustment to allow residential drives on a collector street (Case No. 18-29).

(Will require approval by 2/3 of Council when vote occurs at a future meeting.)

**B4-18** Approving the Final Plat of Bluff Creek Estates Plat 9 located on the east side of Bluff Creek Drive and north of Grindstone Parkway; authorizing a

performance contract (Case No. 18-7).

**B5-18\*** Approving the Final Plat of Lenoir Subdivision Plat 2, a Replat of Lots 1 and 2 of Lenoir Subdivision, located on the southeast corner of the New Haven Road and Lenoir Street intersection (3300 New Haven Road); authorizing a performance contract; granting a design adjustment to allow sensitive lands to be incorporated into lots intended for development; accepting a tree preservation easement (Case No. 18-6).

**B6-18\*** Vacating a sewer easement on Lot C2 and Lots 345-348 within The Vineyards Plat 3 located on the south side of Stone Mountain Parkway and east of Fair Oaks Court (Case No. 18-2).

**B7-18\*** Authorizing a right of use permit with The Curators of the University of Missouri to allow construction and maintenance of a hot water distribution pipe, chilled water distribution pipe, storm sewer, control conduit, domestic water pipe, electric duct bank and electric manhole in portions of the University Avenue and Hitt Street rights-of-way.

**B8-18\*** Accepting conveyances for utility, drainage and water, street, pedestrian and sidewalk purposes.

**B9-18\*** Authorizing construction of a storm water management basin project for the area bounded by Garth Avenue, Sexton Road, Oak Street and Lynn Street; authorizing the Purchasing Division to call for bids and/or issue a contract for the project.

**B10-18\*** Authorizing construction of the College Avenue sewer replacement project, between Rollins Street and Bouchelle Avenue; authorizing the Purchasing Division to issue a contract for the project.

**B11-18\*** Authorizing the filing of electronic reports and the execution of agreements with the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency in compliance with the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Electronic Reporting Rule.

**B12-18\*** Accepting a donation from Walt's Bike Shop for the CoMo Bike Co-op program operated by the Parks and Recreation Department; appropriating funds.

**B13-18\*** Authorizing a memorandum of agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for access to the Missouri State Public Health Laboratory (SPHL) OpenELIS Web Portal.

**B14-18\*** Accepting grant funds from the United States Food and Drug Administration for employee training for conformance with the FDA Retail Food Program Standards; appropriating funds.

**B15-18\*** Adopting The City of Columbia, Missouri, Money Purchase Plan; authorizing the City Manager to execute the plan; authorizing the Director of Finance to administer the plan.

**B16-18\*** Authorizing an amendment to the agreement with Tyler Technologies, Inc. relating to the Columbia Financial Enterprise Resource System (COFERS) project and the purchase of transparency software; appropriating funds.

**B17-18\*** Amending the FY 2018 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Police Department.

**B18-18\*** Appropriating federal forfeiture funds for the purchase of a replacement K-9 officer and canine kennel for the Police Department.

**B19-18\*** Approving the Final Plat of University Centre Subdivision located on the west side of Providence Road and south of Locust Street; granting a design



adjustment relating to street right-of-way width; providing for conveyance of a temporary construction easement for reconstruction of the sidewalk along Providence Road (Case No. 17-199).

**(A separate motion to table item B2-18 until February was made by the Mayor and passed unanimously in accordance with earlier council action.)**

## REPORTS

**REP1-18** Integrated Electric Resources & Master Planning.

[Council Memo](#)

[Load Forecast](#)

[IERMP Purpose and Scope](#)

(Action: This is a complicated report. CityWatch has provided the above links to the original documents presented by staff at this hearing. Basically, the city is indicating that earlier forecasts regarding power usage associated with new construction have not materialized and that the system and its future capabilities needs to be re-evaluated within a long-term planning format. One suggestion is that a new working group be created that would consist of the members of the Water & Light Advisory Board, electric customers of varying sizes, the University and schools, and other community representatives. The IERMP Purpose and Scope document outlines the scope of what that new working group would discuss. Recommendations from this group, staff and consultants could replace earlier forecasts and plans for electric grid configuration.

**What follows is a recap of the ensuing discussion.**

Staff indicated that there are two types of planning efforts that occur. One is a master planning effort. One is a more localized effort. Staff is recommending combining the two efforts. **If we do this, this will take Option A off the table and will reset the entire discussion.** The supply side effects of electricity have changed over time. Storage has changed and is evolving. Photovoltaic cells are improving. Electric cars are on the horizon. We want to include all data sources when we set our transmission and master planning process in motion. We propose the creation of a new working group and ensure that the public input process is robust. Questions were invited by staff.

Mayor thanked the staff for taking another look at the whole transmission system and process and believes that this is different than what had been discussed before. Mayor is asking if this means we do not need Option A or a substation in south Columbia. Staff would not go that far, but did indicate that conditions have changed and that pressing the restart button would be helpful and could result in a different outcome. Mayor asked if the charts presented by staff actually showed projections vs. use. Staff indicated that they do have that comparative information for some current years, but they cannot have that for years in the future.

Mayor asked about money that has already been spent on the Option A project. Staff indicated that funding for this project could be split and allocated across two ballot issues, so there could be reallocations of funds based on this planning and that losses that may be perceived from the first project would actually be moved to the second issue and accurate planning could improve the cost savings. The city has the ability to engage in load shedding, cost reallocation and mitigation in the short run.

Mayor asked about the status of Option E. Staff indicated that the consultants were about one month behind schedule and that some report should be forthcoming in February. Staff indicated that the information from the Option E process could be used in this new process. Mayor asked what was the process for establishing the old projections in the first place? Staff indicated that the consultants who are hired do their best based on historical information. Staff cannot guarantee that projections will be any more accurate in the future, but that with more data they usually get better results, particularly when they can identify new technology in advance. According to staff, future forecasts are always wrong – it's just by how much.

Skala addressed the whole issue of Option A vs. Option E. Skala wants to know where this leaves the whole process. Staff indicated that they will continue to get the information from Ameren about Option E. Skala asked if we have needs for additional 69 kV and how LED lighting will affect projections. Are you reassuring us that there are no deadlines for us that will result in fines? Staff indicated that because loads were reduced, we are not under the same constraints. If staff discovers short term needs in the interim, we will bring them to you. Skala asked about University needs. Staff indicated that they will be included in the new working group.

Trapp asked about load shedding and believed it was not a desirable practice. Staff indicated that that is a true statement but that federal guidelines allow us to shed load due to priority. Trapp asked if this would result in brown outs. Staff indicated that usually these events are short-lived, but these options do exist and are always there.

Pitzer asked if we will continue studies about tying into a 345Kv line. Staff indicated that that information would still be forthcoming. We do need to make a decision about the very high-voltage tie-in capabilities, but we do have time to look at all the options. If you find something in the short term, will you bring that to us? Staff indicated that probably not, because connecting to 345 kV is a giant step and would require significant design changes. More likely, you would see a different configuration or location of substations and distribution. Changes to existing substations are very possible. Pitzer asked if we have made changes before? Staff indicated that they have, and this is more complicated, but we can identify the resources we need to meet the demand. When was the last time we did this master planning? Staff indicated that they actually do some of this annually, but that the current proposal is broader in scope.

Pitzer asked about moving proceeds from the first bond issue to the next bond issue proceeds. Staff indicated that they are not actually changing funding sources right now, but that the two can be combined in terms of total funding. There is no certain effect on rates, but indicated that rates will go up in the future. Staff believed that this new review process could take 1 to 2 years. Staff believed that the cost of embarking on this new study protocol would cost approximately 1.2 million. That money is not currently budgeted. Could this come from reserves in the short term? Staff indicated that it could and that it could also be allocated in the next budget cycle.

Staff indicated that timing on this sort of change could be difficult in terms of implementation of a climate action plan. Pitzer indicated that if the climate action plan was adopted, and if we did not incorporate those goals into the configuration of this new electric system, that could pose a problem. Staff indicated that it would be difficult, and that the two programs do not always look at the same goals.

Peters asked why the schools and board of health were both named to this new working group. Staff indicated that they just went down the list and picked what seemed appropriate. Peters indicated that there was no representative from a renewable energy group on the working group. Staff indicated that they do anticipate that but did not know if you pick one from the supplier side, the consumer side, electric vs. gas etc.

Mayor asked to elevate this from a working group to a Task Force and wants input from industry groups, battery technology groups, neighborhood representatives, etc. City Manager indicated that that could work. Mayor thought it was more about who appoints the members and also, wants to make sure that there is the ability to integrate all the various studies into a single portal. Don't add another layer of consulting into this just to evaluate the work of other consultants. Mayor wants to go back to the Integrated Resource Study and believes that is a great study that protects ratepayers. Mayor indicated that he wants this to be a part of that discussion as well. He wants the task force in place before we determine what the scope of service will be. Mayor wants task force input first, and wants to know if there are any consultants who currently work for us who are doing something similar where we could expand their scope of work. Staff thought it would need to be a new proposal.

Skala thought this group was a good idea. Believes that there should be some level of expertise on this group, but does not want to expand it to such a size that it become unwieldy. Many members indicated that they wanted broad representation. Trapp indicated that he wanted to make sure this was a council appointment and not a staff suggestion, per se. Mayor then asked if we could cap rate increases on electric until this group completes its work. Wants a report back from legal, finance and staff. Pitzer asked to refer to earlier studies and incorporate that information. Skala thought that was interesting and that sometimes consultants give you what they think you want.

**No final action was taken on this item, but multiple reports will be forthcoming on different topics. The general consensus seemed to be that some sort of working group or task force would be established and that current electric grid proposals would be re-evaluated.)**

#### **REP2-18 Sports Fieldhouse Project History and Status.**

(Action: This report discusses the history of the sports fieldhouse project; what steps have been taken so far; and outlines possible outcomes, including a potential three-way partnership with the City of Columbia, Boone County, and a non-profit organization called Mid-Missouri Sports Park. Parks and Recreation staff recommends putting the sport fieldhouse development at Philips Park on hold until partnership options are explored and evaluated. Once the partnership options have been worked through, staff will return to Council with agreements to proceed with a partnership option or a recommendation to proceed with the project at Philips.

The Parks & Recreation Department's capital improvement plan (CIP) included an unfunded sports fieldhouse for many years. During this time, there were several semi-public and private attempts to develop a facility, so the department kept deferring the fieldhouse project until the attempts by other agencies played out. Recent attempts included a proposed fieldhouse at the Central Missouri Events Center and again at Clary-Shy Park. A multipurpose indoor sports complex was included in the master plan for the southeast regional park, which was approved by City Council May 3, 2010. The master plan showed the multipurpose indoor sports complex on the north end of Philips Park, and remained unfunded along with several other major amenities planned for the park.

The fieldhouse project resurfaced as a highlight in the 2014 “Columbia Sports Community Assessment” report. At the April 7, 2014 meeting, Council approved an agreement with Victus Advisors to assess Columbia’s sports market potential. The Columbia Convention and Visitors Bureau, in cooperation with the Parks & Recreation Department, commissioned this study to analyze Columbia’s unique market characteristics and existing facilities; compare Columbia’s sports market to similar cities; solicit feedback from sports event and tournament organizers; and recommend which sports facilities would generate economic benefits for the community by attracting competitive regional events. The final report recommended three primary development options:

1. City-County Competitive Sports Complex
2. Multi-Sport Indoor Fieldhouse
3. Aquatic Center for Swimming/Diving.

The report stated that “In conjunction with Boone County, redevelop the current Central Missouri Events Center (CMEC) to become a joint Columbia-Boone County Competitive Sports Complex” and that the sports “fieldhouse could be considered as an additional of the proposed City-County Competitive Sports Complex, or built on other available land with the City of Columbia.” In August 2014 Boone County voters defeated a 1/8-cent sales tax that would have provided funding for recreational and sports amenities in the County, with the bulk of the money being used for the Central Missouri Events Center. This unfortunately meant the eventual closing of the event center and the end of any potential partnership negotiations between the City and County.

The demand for a sports fieldhouse for Columbia’s recreational and competitive basketball and volleyball teams continued; and with the support of the Columbia Youth Basketball Association, P&R included \$2.7 million of the 2015 Park Sales Tax funds as a proposed project to be funded by the 2015 Park Sales Tax. On November 3, 2015, 71% of voters supported the renewal of the Park Sales Tax. Following the election, on December 7, 2015 council approved the implementation plan which established an annual schedule for the completion of all proposed projects associated with the ballot issue. Funding for the sports fieldhouse was included over two years starting in FY2017 with \$1,130,000 of Park Sales Tax funds and \$1,000,000 from the Convention and Visitors Bureau’s Tourism Development Funds and another \$1,570,000 scheduled in FY-2018. Since preliminary discussions had begun regarding making the portion of Clary-Shy Park that could have hosted the sports fieldhouse into an agricultural park and finding that the Central Missouri Events Center had been closed, staff proceeded with a recommendation to Council to construct the fieldhouse at Philips Park. On December 5, 2016, Council approved a not-to-exceed agreement in the amount of \$428,000 with SFS Architecture for the sports fieldhouse planning and design at Philips Park.

Prior to being purchased by the City, A. Perry Philips Park was parceled into different zoning areas ranging from planned office, commercial, and various PUD’s. With the new code, it is currently zoned as Planned Development (PD). The initial sports fieldhouse parcel site was reviewed and approved by Council at the August 7, 2017 meeting. During the PD process, it was determined that the future extension of Philips Farm Road needs to be designed and shown on the Philips Park plat. Since there are other 2015 Park Sales Tax ballot projects (tennis court complex, park shelters, playgrounds, trails, etc.) planned for the park, the decision was made to proceed with the design even though initial discussions had occurred regarding the potential project with Boone County. Since Allstate Engineering is a sub-contractor with SFS Architecture and had done all of the civil work for the sports fieldhouse, the SFS Architecture contract was increased by a not-to-exceed amount of \$20,000. This was approved at the December 4, 2017 council meeting. This design and eventual construction project is required regardless of the location of the sports fieldhouse.

In late August 2017, park staff was approached about the possibility of joining the County and non-profit organization called Mid-Missouri Sports Park (MMSP) in order to develop a premiere sports fieldhouse and future sports park at the CMEC. After an initial discussion was held to determine the scope of the project, city management was briefed. Staff discussed several options for the city to pursue, with each having their own advantages and disadvantages.

1. Proceed with plans to construct sports fieldhouse at Philips Park regardless of what happens at the CMEC.
2. Hold plans to construct the sports fieldhouse at Philips Park and do not partner with the County and MMSP.
3. Investigate the option to construct the sports fieldhouse at Philips Park and partner with MMSP.
4. Investigate the option to partner with Boone County and MMSP to build the indoor sports fieldhouse at the Central Missouri Events Center.

Parks and Recreation staff believes that proceeding with building a smaller sports fieldhouse would not be financially viable if a larger, premiere indoor sports facility was also built in Columbia. Staff believes that the best course of action is to delay the fieldhouse project at Philips Park in order to investigate the potential partnership options. After the partnership options are worked out and evaluated, staff will return to Council with agreements to proceed with a partnership option or a recommendation to proceed with the project at Philips.

The City Manager indicated that this request was not really ready for prime time because it is essentially a real estate deal and not all options are currently on the table. The staff proposal is asking for the ability to forestall this, so we can investigate this, and then come back with more information. The Mayor indicated that he was aware of these plans, and wanted to make sure the public had some input on how this should proceed.

Skala indicated that he was not aware of the full nature of the current discussions, but that taking a breath may be OK, but that we had made some promises to voters on bond issues on using the Philips tract for a new sports facility. Regardless of what happens here, Skala wanted to make sure that we do not abandon development of that park and that he would like to explore this and see what we could do in conjunction with others rather than by ourselves.

Peters indicated that she only heard from one person and that person supported this. Skala indicated that he had heard from one advocate who wanted this new sports complex to be located in Philips Park.

Pitzer indicated that there have been a lot of projects proposed for the Fairgrounds, and none worked out. Let's take some time, take a breath, and see where this goes. We are not at a position to decide this yet. Mayor asked about current timeframe for Philips Park plans. Staff indicated that this will push the construction of Phillips off by 40 or 50 days off the current schedule, depending on what the council ultimately decides.

Public conversation ensued.

First speaker indicated that he represented the Marriott complex near Philips Park. He indicated that the decision to build a sports complex at Philips Park had been passed by a public vote, it received a high percentage, and that the largest project on that list was this sports field house. This is how the bond was passed, and we need to honor our promise. If you delay this or don't build it, this is a broken promise.

The bigger problem here, is if you try to do the fairgrounds project, it will result in a tax increase. This is a bait and switch. This project has already been through public comment. Now, there is a backroom deal. We ask that the council follow the plan that voters approved. It will be a great deal for the city. We have the funding. Let's do it.

Mayor asked if city staff always said that the Philips project was the only option. Staff indicated that in short presentations, they did point to Philips Park, but they also indicated that Clary Shy or other places could be considered. Speaker indicated that nobody ever said the biggest part of this project would be built outside the city limits.

Skala said he still thought it was worth looking at this new opportunity and not forget about the Philips project. Speaker indicated that we already decided this in 2014 when the fairgrounds tax was defeated. That's why it wasn't talked about anymore. Why not follow through with what the voters approved?

Skala countered that he would not get into a comparative argument about where things should go in this town, but that he thought a short-term solution was to provide additional time to consider an alternative proposal.

Speaker countered that this was about a tax increase to voters, that we should call it that, and we should not ignore that fact.

Mayor asked if we could put this on the next council worksession since there were elements of this deal that not everyone knows, and we can come back with some better answer. Speaker indicated that the secrecy of the county was not a good indicator on this deal. Mayor indicated that he would be honest and transparent. Pitzer asked if this could be done as an open session. City manager indicated that this proposal had elements of a real estate deal and you have to be careful. The speaker indicated that this is a real estate deal between two public entities, so why not make it an open meeting? Mayor asked for this to be done in a public setting. The county itself would not have to have representatives at such a discussion. Mayor asked if there was an objection to having a worksession. Trapp indicated he would simply like to take a time out and that he does not want to endanger any potential project, including the original one. Let staff do their work and we don't need a worksession was his original point of view.

Additional public comment was received. One speaker indicated that there was nothing in the agenda indicating that this would be the subject of public discussion. That violates the sunshine law. I support the pause, but don't vote on anything other than an agreement to study this a little longer. If you are not really going to make this a public discussion, don't do too much tonight.

Next speaker indicated that he has been a sports physician for many years and believes that this new proposal is a good one. That does not diminish the benefits of the Philips proposal. This bigger project really helps make this an economically viable facility with benefits to the city and kids. I have commitments for funding and we can make this work on an amazing level. Let's talk about this more. Mayor asked if this speaker would be willing to testify at a work session. Speaker indicated he would.

Next speaker indicated that at the last hearing on this issue it became a discussion about poor vs. rich. Philips has a problem with transportation. The fairground site also has ground source heat pump capacity.

City manager indicated that scheduling-wise, the February 5<sup>th</sup> worksession would be better for a worksession on this topic than January 16 since some other people had already been scheduled for January 16. Skala took issue with a previous speaker who thought the council was doing something wrong by voting on an issue that was listed as a report. "If we don't like what the mayor is doing, we can overrule him." Mayor agreed and believed that this decision received more transparency by this discussion.

**Consensus seemed to be that there will be a worksession in the next thirty days (presumably on February 5) and that a decision on how to proceed would follow that meeting.**

REP3-18 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.  
**(Action: No action required. Report accepted.)**

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

#### **Public**

Speaker indicated he though the council has voted on many things during the Reports section of the agenda that they shouldn't and that Skala's comments were not complete. He thought an earlier speaker had made some good points regarding transparency. He further thought that if they adopt the new electric Task Force, they should follow the template of the Integrated Water Resource group. That group included knowledgeable professionals and citizens. One of the issues there was projecting demand. Let this group look like that one, but get rid of staff interference. Go with the Water & Light Board and five to seven additional people. Also, remember that rates are part of the way we encourage conservation. Glad to see that Water & Light is embracing this more robust discussion of electricity.

Next speaker asked about net metering. Wanted to know if it is true that they will no longer count half of solar energy use in reports? I can't find that in the records. Has council discussed the idea of not counting energy units from customer generated solar – or not? Staff has indicated that it was mentioned in a staff report, but he cannot find any council action in this regard. Mayor indicated that he is open on this issue, but does not understand what doesn't run through a meter. Speaker indicated that consumer generated energy that is consumed in a household does not run through a meter but that excess energy produced goes back into the system. Speaker believed that any discussion of this only occurred during a worksession, but the council never voted on it. Speaker indicated that he will advise the Water and Light Advisory Board of that fact. Same speaker also indicated that he thought the Water & Light Advisory Board should be members of the new electric planning task force.

Next speaker thanked the council for providing \$36,000 in funding for Room at the Inn. This really helps. Switched to another topic. Because of our new situation, some trailer park residents don't have to pay directly for trash service, but that means we also don't receive individual trash bags and news letters and our rates went up. Would like some remedy to this situation.

#### **Council**

Trapp indicated that he wants more information on what happened with trash pick up in trailer courts so the council can address the issue. Indicated that he had met with some dog owner professionals. Has some recommendations for dog tethering and wants a report from staff. Also, mentioned medical cannabis issue and wants to hear again from the Board of Health and other interested parties.

Skala indicated \$712,000 was raised in the COMO Gives campaign and thought that was a great outcome.

**Staff**  
**(No comments.)**

**ADJOURNMENT**  
**(Time: 9:36 PM)**

©2018 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