



Columbia City Council Meeting Recap
Council Chamber, Columbia City Hall
7:00 PM
Monday, March 5, 2018

INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

Pledge of Allegiance
Roll Call

(Recited as indicated.)

(Present: Treece, Trapp, Pitzer, Skala, Peters, Ruffin, Thomas)
(Absent: None.)

Approval of Minutes
Adjustment of Agenda

(Minutes from February 5, 2018 approved.)

(R29-18 was removed from the Consent Agenda by Treece and moved to New Business for consideration.)

SPECIAL ITEMS

SI3-18 Patrick McKenna, MoDOT Director - Recognize the City of Columbia for its highway safety efforts, most notably its Vision Zero program; and promote MoDOT's Buckle Up/Phone Down initiative.
(Action: The director applauded the City of Columbia for its commitment to highway safety through various enumerated initiatives and presented a commemorative plaque to the city made from a recycled highway sign. The award was accepted by Mayor Treece.)

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

(None.)

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC11-18 Brian Johnstone - Shepard Blvd/Rollins Trail in regard to the lack of mode shift possibility & 2006-2016 research safety issues along Old 63 between Broadway & Stadium & along Stadium between Old 63 & Ashland Road.

(Action: The speaker indicated that he lived on Bluffdale and challenged the rationale for locating a new trail serving that part of the community in the area that was chosen at an earlier meeting. According to the speaker's analysis of safety statistics, the current location of the trail along old Highway 63 and Stadium was not as dangerous as had been suggested during earlier debates and did not need to be changed. Specifically, he indicated that of 362 pedestrian injury accidents that occurred in the city last year, only 2 occurred on this section of the existing trail. Both of those occurred in the area where new crosswalks have now been installed and therefore that problem has been addressed. No bicycle accidents were reported in this area. The speaker further indicated that mode change from vehicles to bicycles among students was low, and that according to his own surveys, students would prefer to use apartment shuttles rather than bicycles to get to and from school, particularly from outlying apartment complexes. He indicated that mode change in this group was negligible.)

SPC12-18 Kim Dude-Lammy - Drink specials ordinance.

(Action: The speaker cited the fact that Columbia, MO was recently named the “drunkest city in America”, and noted that we should not be proud of that fact. She indicated that nationally, 1,800 students die as a result of drinking each year and that 600,000 are injured. The problem is not unique to Columbia, but binge drinking on and off campus are harmful to the well-being of this community. She suggested that low-priced drink specials at local bars are partially to blame for this phenomenon and has proposed an ordinance that would limit such drink specials, particularly those that offer underpriced drinks. She cited statistics that indicate college students prefer to drink at bars and that students would drink less if the drinks cost more. She advocated for responsible drinking and a responsible response to the problem by local bar owners.)

SPC13-18 Pat Fowler - Workforce housing down payment assistance as a recruitment tool for firefighters and police officers.

(Action: The speaker commented on a recent proposal by Councilman Pitzer that would dedicate up to \$500,000 in one-time funds to police retention and recruitment efforts through home rent and down payment assistance. She thought the proposal, while well-intended, could be better implemented if the use of those funds was more focused on the neighborhoods that surround the Columbia downtown area. She indicated that there is some good housing stock that could be utilized or improved in this area, and that when police live in such areas, they are better equipped to engage in community policing and neighborhood outreach efforts. She thought that by focusing housing options in the central city neighborhoods and strategic plan areas rather than just any house in the city, that the dollars could be maximized since housing stock can be cheaper in these areas.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

(None.)

OLD BUSINESS

B47-18 Rezoning property located on the east side of Paris Road, north of Brown Station Road, from District PD (Planned District) to District IG (Industrial District) (Case No. 18-14).

(Action: Staff presented a report on this item. The applicant is seeking to rezone the properties located to the north and south of the Orscheln Farm and Home on the east side of Paris Road, from PD (Planned District) to IG (Industrial District). The purpose of the request is to remove the planned district requirements from the properties in order to better address market demands and accommodate artisan industry and mechanical and construction contractor office uses. The property is approximately 6 acres in size combined. Columbia Imagined identifies the property as lying within a Commercial District which is intended to provide for a variety of citywide and regional retail uses as well as offices, businesses, personal services, and high-density multi-family dwellings that would support other uses within the district.

Uses adjacent to the subject sites include the existing Orscheln business, a small tract to the north zoned A (Agriculture) and a number of R-1 (One-Family Dwelling) lots to the east, along Hill Haven Lane. To the south, IG zoned (Industrial) property exists along the Paris Road corridor, and R-2 zoning (Two-family Dwelling) lies to the southeast along Alpine Drive. Photos of the site were shown. Industrially-zoned parcels adjacent to residential districts present a number of concerns and obstacles. One aspect is the existence of a shared drive with Orschelns that would mix industrial and commercial traffic. However, the UDC does provide a set of Neighborhood Protection Standards, in Section 29-4.7 that are designed

to limit the negative impacts of such land use conflicts. Many of these same standards are included on the existing PD plan for the subject property.

This request proposes to add land uses that were previously only permitted in either an industrial district or an industrial “planned” district. Following the adoption of the UDC in March 2017, the ability to add the primarily desired uses (i.e. artisan industry and mechanical and construction contractor office) could be accommodated by amending the existing PD Statement of Intent - not a rezoning to an industrial classification. The 2007 PD district and the associated plan have afforded neighboring property owners a specific indication as to what uses would be allowed on the subject property, and their arrangement on the site. While the plan has undergone a number of revisions and redesigns, the overall intent and proposed commercial uses remained unchanged.

The Planning and Zoning Commission considered this case at their January 18, 2018 meeting. The applicant and his engineers spoke in favor of the request, sharing concerns that the PD zoning has caused the property to remain undeveloped due to the costs and time required to comply with the PD site plan requirements. The applicant also provided testimony that the UDC neighborhood protection standards were more restrictive than similar standards contained in the current PD Statement of Intent/Design Parameters. Additionally, the applicant indicated that the individual parcel’s size would restrict the potential industrial uses.

Adjacent property owners, Betty and Larry Schuster both spoke in opposition to the rezoning, citing impacts of existing and potential future uses. They both shared concerns that the proposed rezoning would create a chain reaction of up-zoning adjacent properties. Following discussion, the Commissioners voted 6-3 in favor of the rezoning. Although city staff had earlier recommended denial of this application, the recommendation has now changed to one of approval based on the action of the P&Z Commission.

Discussion among council members ensued. Skala indicated that this was similar to an earlier case and asked what the uses for the property would be under the old plan. Staff indicated that the list was long, but identified many uses that would be added with a new zoning classification. Funeral home, car washes, landscaping business, artisan industries, heavy commercial, light industry, machine shops, bus barns, freight terminal, storage and wholesale distribution, contractor and mechanical shops were all included in the list. He noted that a 30% open space rule would be invoked, and a 35-foot building height would be enforced. The small size of the lots would limit development.

Pitzer asked if there was one PD plan covering the two parcels. Staff indicated that that was true, but that each subdivided parcel could have separate restrictions and not all would have to be built out at the same time. He also asked if the new restrictions in the new code were stronger than those in the PD plan. Staff indicated that there were new setback and neighborhood protections built into the new code and that this would come under the Level 3 standards.

Thomas noted that he thought a lot of the uses that would be granted under the new zoning could actually be granted under the existing plan, but that to achieve those uses under the planned scenario could cost \$25,000 and additional time. Thomas asked if that was a fair characterization. Staff replied that an amendment of a planned district is always possible, and that it is easier to add and subtract uses from a plan than before in terms of the breadth of uses that could be considered. Staff could not estimate an exact cost for going through the PD process and indicated that is the applicant’s cost estimate. He asked if the use that is being suggested for this property could be achieved under the

existing plan. Staff indicated that no formal review of a specific plan has been undertaken by the staff so would prefer to withhold comment on that. In general, a cabinet maker may be allowed under either, but it depends on how intensive the actual use would be. That would need to be determined in the future to be sure.

Public comment was opened.

An engineer representing the applicant appeared and provided a short history of the zoning on this property. The Mayor asked the engineer to consolidate remarks in terms of time. The engineer indicated that a mistake was made when an earlier plan was adopted back in 2007 and that changes have been made over time. He showed a map that illustrated how much industrial property was in this area and characterized the overall area as "Contractor's Alley". In the interest of time, he yielded to another engineer who would discuss potential uses and protections.

The next engineer referred to a few handouts that identify the various protections that exist in the new code if this land were to be rezoned. The new protections are stronger today than what were originally included in the old planned district. He also noted that this property used to be zoned MC (controlled industrial) and most of the property was zoned that way when one of the nearby neighbors bought that property. That zoning did change to planned over time, but that was back when the zoning code did not include the same level of protections that are embedded in the actual code now and the council relied on planned zoning more heavily. Screening, lighting, noise and general standards are all tougher now. It is the city's right to enforce these. Some of the enforcements available under the old planned district have been criticized, but for these two small properties, rezoning seems to be the logical way to go. We can only use 60% of this property. The north tract is only about an acre in terms of usable space. The southern lot only has about 3 acres of space available. He showed a map that illustrated how much other industrial property is located in this area.

Skala asked about how much industrial zoning really exists. He believed that in the shift to the new code, some items were taken from a planned or industrial zoning and put into a holding classification. The speaker clarified the question and indicated that the industrially-zoned properties shown on the map are all truly industrial properties and are not remnant planned zones. Why not just add some new uses to this existing planned development? The speaker indicated that this property has been zoned planned since 2006 and that it did not work well. The cost is probably \$25,000 and every time the plan changes at all you have to do it all over again. That situation has resulted in underutilized property where there could be employment and revenue opportunities. Columbia Imagined may say that this is a commercial area, but in reality, it is an employment district zoned for industrial use. The commercial and residential is an anomaly, not the industrial zoning. It has been industrial since the 1960's.

The next speaker indicated that there is an entire new set of standards that apply directly to light industrial properties that never existed in the old code, and that these new rules are very specific in terms of control of various problems like noise, pollution, odors, etc. He also cited the operational standards section of the code which offers specific remedies and procedures for addressing problems ranging from noise to odors to lighting to nuclear radiation. In discussions with concerned neighbors, each of the problems cited were either included in this new code and are enforceable by the city or were requests that were either self-enforcing or not realistic to be incorporated into an agreement. So, who should enforce these rules? Should we make a side agreement with a property owner? The new code says it should be in the hands of the city and that they have the responsibility to do so. There are some people who don't think the city is good at enforcement and that they don't trust us to do it

ourselves. We understand that. That's why these protections are built into the code and should not be at the whim of a side agreement. It should be surer than that and so we are willing to follow those rules.

The next speaker appeared as an attorney on behalf of the applicant. He addressed the issue of whether or not an applicant should ask for an amendment to an existing plan or if he should ask for new zoning altogether. Based on reports from the consultant who put this new code together, it is clear that the intent and suggestion at the time this was adopted was for applicants with old plans to come in and request a change to a more specific zoning designation. He showed several instances where the consultant made such recommendations. Planned zoning is inefficient, confusing and expensive in terms of administration. The consultant also indicated that planned zoning promotes a culture of negotiation and a NIMBY type approach to what should be sound land use policy. Under the new plan, planned zoning districts now expire after 3 years. The consultant suggested that if no construction has begun by then, then it would be reasonable for the applicant to come back and request a permanent zoning classification. This property has been idle for more than 6 years. The consultant believes this would be a good case for requesting a stable, specific zoning classification, and an industrial zoning classification is entirely appropriate for this particular area. Finally, during the UDC hearings the public asked many questions that the consultant provided answers to. One of the questions was, "Will there be an opportunity to change existing planned zoning designations to more stable classifications." The answer from the consultant was that under the new code an applicant could ask for a "legacy" planned district to be changed to a standard district through the regular zoning process.

The next speaker appeared in opposition to the application. He indicated that he lives in this immediate area and provided a handout to the council. He indicated that he was a former P&Z commissioner and council member and that he knows the history of the area well. He indicated that the staff report to P&Z indicated that many odious problems could arise from this proposal and that the staff initially opposed this idea since it removed neighbors from the discussion about what should happen in this area. Zoning follows the land, not the person and personalities should not influence this land use decision. He claimed that enforcement only occurs on a complaint basis and that means that it is up to neighbors to complain before anything gets done. That is not fair. The applicant has not addressed issues such as noise, odors, hours of operation and traffic. We did meet about this with the applicant, but they failed to offer any solutions to the problems other than to say "trust the code". He indicated that notice requirements are not good and that most neighbors were not aware of this action. He asked for denial of the request. IG zoning in this area is not good.

The Mayor asked when the speaker first heard about this proposal. He indicated that it was in August of 2017. If that is true, then this rezoning has already taken as long to achieve as a change to the statement of intent so how is that harmful? Seems like they chose one strategy over another and it has not worked any better. The speaker added that this has become a merry-go-round and that every time something doesn't quite work then the applicant tries to change the rules and just throw something at the wall to see what sticks. I work in development in several states. Do not let the applicant use this as a land bank. Using planned zoning forces the applicant to sit down with the neighbors. The Mayor asked if the council votes this down will they be accused of being anti-development. The speaker indicated that that is always possible but that this should be about good planning.

Skala is still not satisfied about the zoning classification. He wants to know if the IG that exists now was simply a bunch of MC that got pushed into this category or if all of the IG was really M1. Staff explained that there was an old category called MC that is different than the current M-C zoning designation and that that causes some concern, but because only one Industrial category was created in the new code,

and it was called IG, all old industrial designations were put into that single category. However, “controlled” industrial in the new code was not considered to be a planned zoning district so the characterization that planned districts were folded into IG is not correct. What was the difference between MC and M1. Staff indicated that it had a few more standards. Skala asked about other properties in the area. The speaker indicated that one was Landmark Bank and one was Dollar General. The A frames are on Alpine Drive.

The next speaker indicated that he was a commercial real estate broker. He indicated that he has had three clients in the last several months and believes that there is a shortage of small tract industrial. He thinks this proposal makes sense and consolidates the industrial area rather than creating pockets of industrial throughout town. Large industrial tracts don’t fit the needs of small users and the cost is high. We need tracts with zoning ready to go rather than have to go through a plan after a proposal is made.

The president of the Mexico Gravel Road neighborhood association appeared to oppose the plan. We did not receive adequate notification. We also believe that there is plenty of industrial property already zoned appropriately that could be used. We believe that no one would want industrial in their back yard.

The next speaker was the cabinet maker who was interested in purchasing this property. He described how his business has grown and how he needs more space, but that the city told him he would have to be in an industrial location. He has been looking for two years for a property that would suit him. He has had difficulty finding a good fit. He has lost clients due to a lack of space. He needs warehouse space, design space, building space and a showroom. This parcel seems like a good spot. We have continued to look for a new place, but he needs the space now and he wants to keep it local. The Mayor asked which lot he wanted? He indicated the southern lot seemed best. Ruffin asked about size of the building. He indicated that the building would be between 10 – 12,000 square feet. He indicated that his hours of operation were 8 to 5 on weekdays. He indicated that there are no real lacquer smells coming from the building and that he used to have an office in the finish room and that demonstrates how little odor comes from the process. We may not hire a lot of new people, but we need more room for the people we have now in addition to storage space.

The last speaker was the applicant and discussed the fact that small industrial land is hard to find. There is a lot of land, but some people do not want to split up tracts and some are not currently willing to sell. This is an infill site and due to its size and location it is self-limiting in terms of uses. We have had conversations with the neighbors, and we believe that the new zoning code addresses their concerns. We have to trust in that. Don’t create a bunch of little pockets of industrial. If you do, you will have more problems in the future with industrial next to residential uses. There is already a lot of residential abutting industrial, so this is nothing new.

The last speaker indicated that he was an attorney and an accountant. He believes that notification of neighbors is a problem. This is something the council needs to address. I believe this is a UDC glitch. We created a one-size fits all kind of category that does not allow Planned Zoning restrictions to migrate across. To solve this, I think you could just redo the plan. I think people took a wait and see plan and apologize later rather than ask for permission up front. We should send a message that this type of strategic land use will not be rewarded. The council can’t implement this new plan. The staff does. Let’s do it now.

Public comment was closed.

Peters asked if the staff recommendation was against this, what were the reasons? Staff indicated that it was mostly about continuity, but that there are some overlapping components in some zoning classifications. There is also a problem of cross access between commercial and light industrial traffic. We try to separate that when we can. Also, there is some R-1 that abuts this site. I don't know about the odious outputs.

Ruffin said it seems like there are sufficient protections in the code. Can you tell me how you will enforce the code? Staff indicated that it occurs at the time of permitting and that after operations begin then it becomes complaint driven.

Skala seemed to think that the conversion from the old code to the new has created problems. I think we should have created better districts. He indicated that P&Z records indicated that the vote there was actually a little closer. There is a problem with grandfathering sometimes. Moving forward, I think we may need to look at some changes to the UDC. Maybe we need to split the IG category into heavy and light. Although there is some residential next to industrial, most of that is R-2. I think they could have done this with a change to the statement of intent. I think that would have been passed easily by this group. I would encourage that kind of approach. I plan to vote no until we get some of these kinks worked out.

Trapp supported the proposal. He believes there is a shortage of small lot property available and that that limits job creation. This used to be industrial property, I think it is OK to make it that again. He indicated that most problems in the 2nd Ward is not between industrial and residential, it is between commercial and residential. He wants more development on the north side. He believes it has to do with land prices. We need more employment opportunities. I don't think the old plan worked. This is the industrial corridor and I think this is appropriate. There are lots of protections in the new code. This is appropriate.

The Mayor indicated that the one use of being a cabinet maker may be OK, but there is another parcel that gets opened up without protections to neighbors. I do not want to jeopardize the homeowners' rights. The applicant went for a change to the zoning, not a change to the plan. I will oppose this.

Pitzer thought that the reason the applicant chose to go with a zoning change is because the council asked people to go that direction. There are a number of legacy parcels that are going to confront this situation. They made their decision based on what they were told to do. Also, this is an industrial corridor. There are more protections now than ever before. It is a question of enforcement and that is really our problem and should not be put on the developer.

The vote was called. Motion to approve passed 4 to 3 with Skala, Thomas and Treece voting no.)

CONSENT AGENDA

(All items remaining on the Consent Agenda were approved unanimously.)

PR25-18 Establishing a revised policy for intergovernmental relations; adopting legislative tracking priorities for the 2018 federal and state legislative sessions.

B48-18 Approving the Final Plat of Red Oak South Plat No. 2, a Resubdivision of Lot 2 of "Red Oak South, Plat No. 1," located southwest of the Grindstone Parkway and Norfleet Drive intersection; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 18-21).

B49-18 Authorizing a right of use license permit with Spring Creek Homes

Association of Boone County for installation and maintenance of a private neighborhood identification sign within portions of the Vawter School Road and Foxcreek Way rights-of-way.

B50-18 Authorizing construction of the FY 2018 sanitary sewer main and manhole rehabilitation project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B51-18 Accepting conveyances for sewer, drainage and utility, and temporary construction purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.

B52-18 Accepting conveyances for utility, water utility, electric utility and underground electric utility purposes.

B53-18 Accepting a donation from Central Bank of Boone County, Missouri for the 2018 Fair Housing and Lending Seminar; appropriating funds.

B54-18 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for animal control services.

B55-18 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for public health services.

B56-18 Appropriating funds to offset expenses for Columbia Values Diversity Celebration activities.

R26-18 Setting a public hearing: declaring the necessity for the proposed installation of active warning devices at the Columbia Terminal Railroad's (COLT) intersection with Mount Zion Church Road in Hallsville, Missouri.

R27-18 Setting a public hearing: declaring the necessity for proposed construction of Phase I of the Sports Fieldhouse project located in A. Perry Philips Park to include a 41,000 square foot sports fieldhouse with four hardwood basketball/volleyball courts, office space, restroom facilities, multipurpose rooms, concession area, parking lot, extension of the entry road from Ponderosa Street and the installation of walkways, landscaping and exterior lights.

R28-18 Setting a public hearing: consider the FY 2017 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER).

R29-18 Authorizing an agreement with Columbia STEM Alliance, Inc. to provide financial support to build a collaborative network of educators, business partners and organizations to inspire interest in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) careers and generate a robust workforce for the community in support of the City of Columbia's Strategic Plan.

(Action: Item removed from Consent Agenda and moved to New Business.)

R30-18 Transferring funds for the purchase of a service van for the Fire Department.

R31-18 Transferring funds from the Department of Public Health and Human Services' FY 2016 General Fund savings to the City Manager's Office for the Vision Zero project.

R32-18 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with Community Foundation of Central Missouri for administrative and office support services.

R33-18 Authorizing an annual agreement with Columbia Access Television (CAT) for operation of a public access channel in FY 2018.

R34-18 Authorizing an agreement with Columbia Missouri Community Housing

Development Organization for HOME funds for construction of an affordable home to be located at 700 Oak Street.

NEW BUSINESS

R35-18 Expressing support for a comprehensive, independent performance audit of the City by the Missouri State Auditor; directing the City Manager to obtain estimated costs for conducting such audit.

(Action: At the February 19, 2018 City Council meeting, Mayor Treece requested a resolution be prepared that would authorize the Missouri State Auditor to conduct a comprehensive audit of all offices, departments and divisions of the City.

Because the City would be required to pay the actual cost of the audit, an appropriation of funds is required prior to authorizing a request. As a result, the attached resolution expresses City Council support for such an audit and requires the City Manager to obtain an estimate from the State Auditor to perform the audit. Once an estimate is received from the State Auditor, staff will provide the information to the City Council and, if Council desires to proceed, an appropriation of funds will be brought forward for additional Council action at that time.

Discussion ensued. The Mayor indicated that he was the maker of the resolution and that it was like one made by the City of St. Louis. He believes it will strengthen confidence in the city and ensure good government performance. He indicated that the State Auditor may or may not choose to accept this case and that if she does, the city would then need to negotiate scope and price of such an audit.

Public comment was opened.

The first speaker serves on the city's audit committee and asked for a clarification regarding the difference between a regular audit and a performance audit. She indicated that the regular annual audit was performed according to generally accepted accounting processes. It is a review of the financial operation and standing of the city. What that audit does not express the operational and policy side of governance including efficiency and the overall economy. Performance audits in the public sector examine whether the city achieves optimum results at reasonable costs and do they achieve policy goals. They are very different in their objectives. I would suggest that we are a complex city that has to follow many rules. I think we should keep in mind that just because something has always been done one way, does not mean that it is correct or that it cannot be changes, and sometimes we do things that are self-imposed. Other times we do things by mandate. Peters asked if the speaker thought the call for an audit was a good idea. She indicated she thought that it was.

The Mayor asked about a recent audit report and noted its limitations. He asked if the finance and audit committee has received full copies of the audit. She indicated that they receive summaries. The Mayor further indicated that there are limitations in the conclusions drawn by the annual audit. The speaker indicated that that is typical in many cities. She also believed that the annual audit is not entirely comprehensive and that unless there is a problem that rises to a certain level of concern it is not thoroughly reviewed. It also does not evaluate performance and operational excellence. She went on to explain that some things are small, like the same person from the accounting firm always presents the city's report – and she thought it should have other eyes on the report. She believes it is too routine and that it should be more than that. Trapp asked what a reasonable cost should be? The speaker could not provide an estimate. Peters suggested that we pay \$100,000 for our current audit and that a performance audit would be much more expensive than that. Pitzer asked if there was ever any

information that was requested that was not provided. The speaker indicated that they don't ask for specific information, they review general accounting procedures.

The next speaker indicated that he was an attorney and CPA. He indicated that the audit committee did receive full reports, but that the current audit only represents the financial position of the city and that there are some federal and state rules that govern those documents. It is a sampling exercise, but it is not comprehensive. The speaker suggested that the council should become the audit committee and that it is permissible for individuals to examine the methodology and ask questions. The speaker was not sure exactly what we would get out of a performance audit, but he thought it was probably a good idea. He suggested having a workshop on this process first, so we can ask the right questions if this does come to fruition.

The next speaker indicated that he thought Mike Trapp was not a good steward of our money. He wants to make safety a priority in our community and he wants to make sure we have the money to do it. He is in favor of this new audit. He wants to find out how much it costs before we go forward and encouraged support. It may be the cheapest way for us to buy confidence in the council and in our government.

The next speaker indicated that he did not know exactly what this would entail, but he knows that there are some problems with some parts of the city not being transparent in their activities. He cited the Water and Light department and believes that their operations should be examined. We have no way of knowing where the money comes from and where it goes. I think this would inform the decision-making process. The speaker supports the concept of a performance audit.

The next speaker represented the Columbia Board of Realtors. They sent a letter of support earlier and the speaker reiterated that support.

The next speaker appeared on behalf of the Columbia Police Officers Association. He indicated that they had requested the audit and they believe it could help restore confidence in city governance and financial management. We support the resolution. It is appropriate to use the state Auditor for this purpose.

The next speaker appeared on behalf of Columbia's Professional Firefighters. They support the call for an audit.

Public hearing was closed.

Skala indicated that he did not anticipate much opposition, but he wondered if the state Auditor would accept this task and how much would it cost. He supports the resolution. Mr. Pitzer asked if the auditor is REQUIRED to perform such an audit. The Mayor indicated that the Auditor has discretion. He also asked about cost. The city attorney indicated that they have to have an estimate up front and that they would have to appropriate money before any such audit could occur. This resolution reflects that requirement. Pitzer wants the answers to time and cost first, but reiterated support and indicated that he does not believe we can ask the public for money until we can regain the confidence of the community.

The vote was called. The motion to adopt the resolution passed unanimously.)

R36-18 Establishing an Integrated Electric Resource and Master Plan Task Force.

(Action: Staff provided a brief report. Columbia's Electric Utility is scheduled to conduct another Integrated Resource Plan in 2018. Based on revised electric load forecasts, staff is recommending that a new electric transmission and distribution system planning process be incorporated with the Integrated Electric Resource Plan. This proposed Integrated Electric Resource & Master Planning process will replace all previous planning efforts regarding serving anticipated loads and meeting federal transmission planning requirements. It is proposed that a Task Force be created and appointed by council to interface with this planning process.

City Staff proposes creating the Integrated Electric Resource & Master Plan Task Force consisting of a broad stakeholder group for the following purposes:

- Assist City staff in the planning process associated with the preparation of an updated Integrated Electric Resource and Master Plan in 2018.
- Ensure public participation throughout the process
- Forecast capital needs based on:
 - Capacity requirements
 - System reliability
 - Economic viability
 - Customer satisfaction
 - Stakeholder needs.
- Review the plan for continued compliance with established Electric System Planning criteria.
- Assist staff in developing demand side and capital programs which implement strategic goals and initiatives.
- Assist staff in identifying specific generation, transmission, substation, and distribution system improvement projects, budgets and schedules.
- Assist staff in identifying long range property and right-of-way acquisition requirements.
- Any other matters referred to the Task Force by the City Council.

To support the goal of public participation throughout the process, staff is proposing that the first step would be for an Integrated Electric Resource & Master Plan Task Force to be created. The intent is for this Task Force to be involved in the planning throughout the entire process starting with developing a scope of services for selection of a consultant to support this planning process. Upon completion of the Integrated Electric Resource & Master Plan the Task Force would be dissolved.

City Staff proposes the following stakeholder groups be considered to serve on a City Council appointed Integrated Electric Resource & Master Plan Task Force:

- Five (5) members from the Water and Light Advisory Board
- One (1) member from the Board of Health, appointed by the chair of such Board.
- One (1) member representative of the University of Missouri, appointed by the University of Missouri administration.
- One (1) member representative of the Columbia Public School District, appointed by the Columbia Public School District administration
- Five (5) members representing a diverse cross-section of individuals and service providers, appointed by the City Council from the following groups:
 - Residential Customer
 - Commercial Customer

- Industrial Customer
- Columbia Board of Health
- Environmental Stakeholder
- Neighboring Utilities
- Two (2) ad hoc non-voting members from the Office of Sustainability and the Department of Community Development, appointed by the City Manager.

It was indicated that the resolution was drafted by the law department. Thomas asked if there were any significant changes between the initial draft of the report and the final version supported by the Water and Light Commission. Staff indicated that there was a difference of opinion regarding size of the Task Force and that that would need to be determined by the Council.

Skala noted that there were multiple members appointed to this task force by the Board of Health and that there were competing versions of this resolution in play. Staff explained that a single person could represent more than 1 constituency group, but that that would be hard to advertise. We can work that out if needed. Pitzer asked why the public schools were included on this board. Staff indicated that they were a large user and major player in the community. The Mayor asked for a rate study that examines the rates for large users and small users. The rate study is scheduled to take place after this Task Force has finished its work. The Mayor wants that to happen while this public input group is assembled. Staff indicated that the task force will solicit input along the way.

Thomas asked to amend the resolution to include examination of a line extension policy and rates as it relates to expansion of the system. He wants that included in the scope of work. Skala thought these items were included in the general language but would support the changes if necessary. The Mayor asked if the task force would design the RFP for rate studies. Staff indicated that that could be included in the scope of work.

The public hearing was opened.

The first speaker indicated general support for the proposal. He believed that earlier work by the city staff was not sufficient and thought this would be an improvement. The Integrated Water Resource group was a good example of citizen input, but sometimes these items are complex and misunderstandings can occur. On this, the biggest question was how many ad hoc members should be appointed and how many total people would serve. He believed that regular citizen representatives should be appointed more so than institutional representatives. The speaker also questioned why we have the rates we do and what that money pays for? The Mayor asked if the commission recommended a specific number of people to serve on this new task force. The speaker was not clear on the specifics, but believed that there should be 5 members from the Water and Light Commission and 6 citizen members with additional ad hoc members if necessary. This is supposed to be a task force working with both city staff and a consultant. The speaker further suggested that the task force should consider changing the various rate groups. Please let the task force know that the council would like to hear from them as their work goes forward.

No further public discussion.

Trapp asked for the status of the load study. Those should be forthcoming soon. Staff indicated that these will come forward at the same time. The Mayor expressed his displeasure at the fact that they were not available now and indicated that he has asked for these many times in the past. Pitzer

suggested an amendment to remove members of the group from the board of health and the Columbia Public Schools. The Mayor countered with a suggestion to appoint 11 members, with 5 from the Water and Light Commission and 6 completely at-large appointed by the council. Skala suggested that if that happened it should be put into a matrix and reduce the applicant pool so the council can deal with the appointments on a reasonable level. Thomas indicated that he liked the general approach being discussed. He agreed with the idea that the public schools and department of health do not need specific representation, but he did think that the University should be represented somehow and that the Energy and Environment Commission should have some voice on this. Pitzer indicated that on the Climate Action Commission there were some positions that were defined, but general discussion indicated that there was some desire to try and include different group representation rather than requiring it.

Skala thought maybe this should be tabled and that he does not know what the status of the various power options is at the current time. The Mayor asked how much a consultant would cost to help guide this process. Staff indicated that depending on the scope of work, it could cost a million dollars or less. Pitzer suggested that because we are not starting from scratch, we could do this more economically. Thomas thought that the resolution should include developing an RFP. Due to confusion and debate, the Mayor moved to table this item until the next meeting and have staff refine the proposal during the interim.

Motion to table passed unanimously.)

R29-18 Authorizing an agreement with Columbia STEM Alliance, Inc. to provide financial support to build a collaborative network of educators, business partners and organizations to inspire interest in Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) careers and generate a robust workforce for the community in support of the City of Columbia's Strategic Plan.

(Item removed from Consent Agenda and moved to New Business.)

(Action: Staff is requesting Council authorization to provide financial support in the amount of \$35,000 from the FY2016 general fund savings to Columbia STEM Alliance, Inc., to promote and support education in the fields of Science, Technology, Engineering and Mathematics (STEM) within our community, in accordance with the City's Strategic Plan.

STEM Alliance, Inc. is a non-profit corporation formally established to promote and support Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics education in mid-Missouri. The Columbia STEM Alliance grew out of a CPS STEM World Café event with a goal to build a network of educators, business partners and volunteers that will work together to catalyze business and individual efforts to create a workforce that will drive job growth and improve the quality of life in Columbia and mid-Missouri.

The Columbia STEM Alliance has recently launched two programs that are making an impact on STEM education in Mid-Missouri. The two categories are community-wide coding and a robotics initiative.

The Mayor indicated that he thought this was a great cause, but he was not sure that this was an appropriate use of city money. I think this does not meet the test of transparency since the division director serves on the board. I think we can encourage participation without giving large grants of taxpayer money. Skala thought this was a public schools issue and that it linked into the city's realm

through the strategic planning initiative. Staff indicated that this is a job crating and training initiative and that it is measurable. He believed that the school system has some limitations in terms of funding and that this would be an enhancement. A representative of the applicant group thought this could expand awareness and involvement in the program. Ruffin asked how kids were recruited to participate. The applicant indicated that it is open application and that as kids continue in the program they are moved into specific areas of the program. They do try to recruit underrepresented populations and some recruitment occurs through the school system.

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING **(All items introduced as indicated.)**

B57-18* Appropriating funds to conduct condition assessments, asset inventory bar coding and Level I energy audits on 23 City-owned and occupied facilities.

B58-18 Authorizing the installation of active warning devices at the Columbia Terminal Railroad's (COLT) intersection with Mount Zion Church Road in Hallsville, Missouri; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; authorizing a supplemental agreement for highway/rail crossing improvements with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission; appropriating funds.

B59-18 Authorizing construction of Phase I of the Sports Fieldhouse project located in A. Perry Philips Park to include a 41,000 square foot sports fieldhouse with four hardwood basketball/volleyball courts, office space, restroom facilities, multipurpose rooms, concession area, parking lot, extension of the entry road from Ponderosa Street and the installation of walkways, landscaping and exterior lights; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.

B60-18* Appropriating funds for the replacement of a water utility truck.

REPORTS

REP18-18 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

(Action: No action required.)

GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Council

Thomas – Believed that feather flags should be regulated. Staff indicated that there will be a resolution coming forward from the staff. Also wants to follow up on regulation of downtown bar drink specials.

Skala - Indicated that Mr. Clark's earlier remarks about his experience were out of bounds. He then mentioned the fact that P&Z should look at a two-tiered level of zoning for industrial properties. He also asked about items regarding CenturyTel and settlements.

Pitzer - Discussed his efforts to recruit and retain police officers. He believes that there has been high turnover in the department and wanted to address that need with his ideas announced earlier last week. I think we need to figure out how to retain more people and that it will save money over time. These are tested ideas and have been adopted in other cities. I also wish we could figure out a way to reward police officers with long-standing service. I would like the city manager to think about this going forward. The Mayor clarified that Pitzer was suggesting using one-time savings and he concurred. He

believed that the cost could be up to \$500,000, but this is a test and we would have to see how successful it was. If that money gets used up, we can look for other sources of funding. Skala thought the general idea was good and that it is important to get police to live in the areas where they work. He would like to make sure that people who are already here have a chance to take advantage of some of these programs. He reminded the council that when they get these new hires, we are going to have to have a way to pay for this if it is successful in the long term. Pitzer indicated that these funds would be available for already budgeted positions. Thomas agreed that he liked the concept and believes that the program needs to be worked out in terms of specifics. He does want to encourage cops to live in town and in areas where a police presence would be important. The Mayor believed that the numbers regarding police turnover are alarming. He wants to stop that turnover, but also wants to reward long-term police veterans. At some point, we have to address police pay. We need more resources.

One member of the public jumped back up to explain that she was not trying to get police to live in high-crime areas, she wants police to live among us. I know people who I have helped in the neighborhood and I remember them. Knowing each other has a ripple effect that is positive. Focus the money exclusively in strategic plan areas. Let's be targeted about our program.

Pitzer - Resumed his discussion and asked for this proposal to be considered in new budgets going forward. Pitzer then changed the discussion to the city's treatment of icy roads during the winter. He thought it was good. Wants to know if we have a formal ice policy that is different than the snow policy. Wants to know about pre-positioning of trucks or partnerships with private vendors who would serve areas where the city can't get to. Skala did not want to disagree, but reminded the council that there are liability issues with private vendors working on public roads.

Peters – Indicated that in at least two cases neighbors have claimed that they did not know about potential rezonings. She wants to make sure that this gets addressed and if we need to revise the UDC we need to do it. The city manager will bring back a report.

ADJOURNMENT
(Time: 10:58 PM)

©2018 CityWatch-Columbia

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