



Columbia City Council Meeting Recap

Council Chamber, Columbia City Hall

7:00 PM

Monday, April 16, 2018

INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

Pledge of Allegiance

(Recited as indicated.)

Roll Call

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

(Absent: None.)

Approval of Minutes

(Minutes from April 2, 2018 were approved as presented.)

Adjustment of Agenda

(B69-18 was moved from Consent Agenda to Old Business at the request of Thomas. Peters asked that B71-18 be moved from the Consent Agenda to Old Business.)

SPECIAL ITEMS

SI5-18 Oath of Office of Newly Elected Second Ward Council Member Mike Trapp.

SI6-18 Oath of Office of Newly Elected Sixth Ward Council Member Betsy Peters.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC4-18 Board and Commission Applicants.

Board of Adjustment: Peter Norgard

Convention and Visitors Advisory Board: Tom Drury

Downtown Columbia Leadership Council: Neighborhood Rep – Cindy Neagle; General – Nick Peckham

Fair Housing Task Force: (Thomas asked for this appointment to be delayed for an additional 30 days or so. These positions were not appointed at this meeting and will be readvertised.)

Planning & Zoning Commission: Joy Rushing, Anthony Stanton

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

(None.)

PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH11-18 Proposed replacement of storm drainage and sanitary sewer infrastructure along a portion of Garth Avenue north of Lynn Street.

(Action: Staff presented a report on the status of this project. The 10-foot wide by 4-foot tall reinforced concrete box culvert (RCB), under the east side of Garth Avenue, was likely constructed in the 1930's and some of the steel reinforcement in the top of the box is rusted and is compromising the ability of the box lid to support the pavement above it. The storm drain system at Garth Avenue and Lynn Street is corrugated metal pipe construction which is rusted, and the failing pipe needs to be replaced.

Replacement of the RCB at this location was included on a list of projects presented to voters in 2015 ballot measure, which was approved to increase the Storm Water Utility rates. The project cost estimate is \$710,000 of which approximately \$610,000 will be for the storm drainage system replacement and \$100,000 will be for the sanitary sewer replacement.

No public comment was received.

Trapp complimented this project and indicated support. Peters asked about the time line for closure of Garth St. Staff indicated that they did not have a definite timeline. It was noted that pavement collapses had occurred in this area.

Motion to approve was supported unanimously.)

OLD BUSINESS

B68-18 Voluntary annexation of property located at the southwest corner of Highway KK and Scott Boulevard; establishing permanent M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood) zoning (Case No. 18-42). (Action: The applicant, Crockett Engineering Consultants, on behalf of J. Blaine and Ann A. Alberty (owners), requests annexation of 10.0 acres of Boone County A-1 (Agricultural) zoned land into the City of Columbia. The applicant is seeking M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood) as permanent City zoning. The property is Lot 1 of the River Hills Estates, a County subdivision that was approved in 1976. The site is currently located within unincorporated Boone County and is zoned A-1, which requires a ten-acre minimum lot size. The site is bordered on the east, west and south by property with the same County A-1 zoning. To the north, Beulah Ralph Elementary School is zoned City R-1. The site is currently improved with a residential structure and associated accessory structures. The subject site includes one existing body of water, with minimal tree coverage. The site is contiguous with the City's existing municipal boundary along its entire north property line. The site can be served by utilities, but an approximately 3,000-4,000-foot sewer extension will be required. Such extension will require the applicant or a future owner to construct a force main in order to connect into the City's gravity system to northeast. The Unified Development Code requires utility and other infrastructure plans for subdivisions and it requires a finding that adequate utility capacity exists before construction permits may be issued.

No specific user is defined at this time, but if someone does develop this property sufficient sewer capacity does not exist on the nearest line at this time and would need to be addressed. Road jurisdiction is split between the city the county and MoDOT.

The Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) considered this request at its meeting on February 22. Staff presented its report and the applicant and their representatives gave an overview of the request. No other member of the public spoke during the public hearing. Commissioners discussed the sewer capacity of the site, and also inquired on the availability of other utilities for the site. Other topics included the need for traffic studies in the future once development occurred to ensure that pedestrian safety is evaluated. Following the public hearing and additional discussion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted (8-0) to recommend approval of the permanent zoning pending annexation.

Long-Term Impact: Public infrastructure maintenance such as roads and sewers as well as public safety and solid waste service provision. Sewer maintenance costs may be greater due to the need for a sewer force main to serve the subject site. Future roadway improvements may be at the expense of the City; however, may be offset if improvements are required as part of a Traffic Impact Analysis for new development. Future impacts may or may not be offset by increased user fees and property tax collections.

Thomas asked about the location of the existing sewer plant and believed that it was at a low point. Why would this require a force main? Staff indicated that the natural flow of the area is toward Mill Creek, so no natural gravity line exists here and would need to be diverted to that area to access a significant gravity line. Pitzer asked if the new pump station would serve this property or others? Staff indicated that this pump station would only serve this development, but that in the future capacity could be reached at Mill Creek. Staff also confirmed that operational revenue would cover the costs of extension including the developer contribution.

Peters asked about service area and staff indicated that this was just across the line of the Urban Service Area, but that the earlier study did not know of general development specific plans at the time that map was drawn. In response to a question about fire service, staff indicated that this would be served by the city, and that although one county station was closer, that did not mean that responses would be less. Staff could not answer how quickly a response to a fire emergency would be answered. The City Manager indicated that the city's master plan includes future fire station construction. The funding for such a station was included in a previous bond issue. The Mayor asked if the property owner had offered new land for a fire station. Skala asked if they could negotiate for something that would allow for the placement of a fire station in this area. Has there been any discussion about other properties coming into this area at this time? Staff could not confirm that other properties were expressing interest at this time. Staff further explained that this area was not within a 4-minute response time from city fire protection. They next explained that a roundabout does appear on maps, but that it is a preliminary design. There would be no crosswalk to the south, but it would connect to the school.

Public discussion was opened.

An engineer appeared on behalf of the applicant and indicated that there is no specific plan for development of this property at this time. He indicated that 1,400 homes are in this immediate area and that this proposal is well-placed and well-spaced in terms of road networks. This proposal would allow for the placement of services at a node in a mixed-use manner and is well-justified under the current Columbia Imagined plan. The speaker indicated that electric and water is outside of the city service area. Sewer would ultimately come from the city but that negotiated fees will cover the true cost. We do not drain into the new school district area. We are just outside of the Urban Service Area, but we ARE included in the status area. We have not had enough time to work out all the fire service area problems at this time because the issue is new. That school is not served either. We can work this out. The speaker indicated that he believes this request is compliant and received 8-0 approval from P&Z. Skala asked about locations for a future fire station. The speaker indicated there are a lot of negotiations that would have to occur before any site could be established.

He suggested that this site might be suitable for a pharmacy or some living or an insurance agent, but nothing is set in stone. Pitzer asked how close any other services were. The speaker indicated that it would be at least 2 miles or cut across to the little general in south Columbia.

One additional speaker appeared and indicated that he believes that Route KK should be the limitation on the Urban Service Area and believed that this was speculative and beyond the limits of what we should allow. He did not care about the recommendation of P&Z and could not think of any good reason to expand the city in this area. Why take on some bigger responsibility? Why take on the need to build a new fire station? The fees paid by this development will not really cover true costs. This is wrong. We need a full-blown west/southwest area study and a west/southwest traffic plan.

No further comments were received.

Pitzer indicated that he believed that there were lots of positives included in this project. He thinks that sewer was the only major obstacle, and that services are needed in this area. He believes that this is appropriate, that it does provide needed services, and indicated that there are already developments further south of this, so he will support this proposal. The fire station is a separate issue and that is something this city will need to address. If we can build a new station here, great. If not, we will do something else. This provides no additional burden.

Skala indicated that he believes that he is a fiscal conservative in terms of annexation and that the USA is not inviolable. But, he thinks this is premature and wants to wait to approve this proposal. Peters asked why this was not on the Consent Agenda? The clerk indicated that Skala and Thomas both had concerns and the engineer indicated he would provide more information.

Trapp responded that if you want a walkable community you have to have a place to go. This will bring in more services, more sales taxes and will become a service node. Thomas indicated that he would support this as well, but he does not think this will lead to other major annexations and that this is a reasonable idea. He wants the city to refine how it draws the urban service area. This is a needed land use form and he believes it is an example of an urban village and will be of benefit. He would like to see urban pathways and crossings to day care and other services. Don't just give me boxes surrounded by parking lots. We should lower our parking thresholds. I will support this.

Motion to approve passed 6 to 1 with Skala voting No.)

B72-18 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with the Hallie Holland Living Trust for the acquisition of property located at 912 East Walnut Street to be used by the Solid Waste Division for a collection site for refuse, cardboard and container recycling in the Downtown CID; appropriating funds. (A related item listed on this agenda under New Business adopting a Downtown CID Master Plan (R60-18) was also considered at this time.)

(Action: Staff has prepared for Council consideration an ordinance authorizing a contract for sale of real estate to allow the City to acquire the property at 912 East Walnut Street to be used by the Solid Waste Division for a collection site for refuse, cardboard and container recycling in the Downtown CID. The acquisition is anticipated to cost approximately \$675,000. An additional \$15,000 is requested to be appropriated to cover closing costs and site improvements necessary to install the refuse and recycling collection facilities. Funding will be from Solid Waste Enterprise Revenue.

From approximately August 2004 until August 2017, solid waste services for the 800 and 900 blocks between Walnut and Broadway was provided by a trash compactor located behind 913 East Broadway. This compactor was located on private property via a property lease. At the request of the property owner, the property lease was terminated in August 2017 and the compactor was removed. Since that time, solid waste services for this portion of the CID have been provided with 2-yard dumpsters located in the public alley. There have been numerous complaints from businesses and property owners associated with the placement and usage of the dumpsters. The purchase of 912 East Walnut will provide a permanent solution for solid waste services for this area of the CID in a more efficient manner that encourages recycling and is more acceptable to the customers in the area.

The property currently has an existing structure on the north half and the south half is used for parking. The solid waste collection site can be located entirely on the south half of the property. The northern portion of the property could be leased or sold for use by a private owner. Upon approval to purchase this property and the development of the solid waste collection site, the potential to subdivide the property and sell the portion with the existing structure will be evaluated to reduce the financial impact of this acquisition to the Solid Waste Utility.

\$690,000 will need to be appropriated from the Solid Waste Utility to fund this acquisition and site improvements. It is estimated that the annual maintenance cost of the solid waste collection site that is planned for this property will be \$3,000 per year.

Thomas asked if all services would contribute to the cost of this new service or if it was just downtown users. Staff indicated that CID customers would be responsible for this service and no one else would pay into this, and it may be amortized over 30 years or so.

At this time the council asked to also consider the downtown CID trash plan.

Peters then asked how the sale price of the land was determined? Staff indicated that the seller agreed to sell this property at less than appraised value.

A presentation on the CID Trash Master Plan was then presented. Staff indicated that the downtown area was then divided into grids. The Mayor asked why the city would be purchasing property for private companies to have a place to dump trash. Staff indicated that in the past, downtown businesses were not required to have onsite collection facilities as they are today. We need to have some place for people to have a place to take trash downtown. Downtown was not well-planned a long time ago. The Mayor asked how the new downtown master trash plan was located on city owned vs. private owned sites.

Staff began a description of locations and articulated where trash collection sites existed or would be located. Some would be located in alleys, some were inside of new apartment buildings. Opus would be in the alley. Bengals would be in the building. Most inside facilities are dedicated to use by building residents only. Broadway Brewery has one location in the alley that had been removed but would be replaced and would block pedestrian and vehicle traffic. Further discussion ensued and council asked about general dimensions of trash compactors and recycling bins.

Mayor asked why we don't use parking garages to house dumpsters. Staff indicated that they do not have overhead clearance to load and unload. Staff also indicated that some compactors are located next to some parking garages. Ruffin indicated that he has received many complaints about grease, and junk in alleys now. He asked if the city would require use of the new compactors and would that alleviate the problem. Staff indicated that compactors would require less maintenance. Staff indicated that grease was always a problem. Staff further indicated that the city could just say we are not going to do this and downtown businesses would just have to take their stuff somewhere else.

Ruffin wanted more resolution to this and wanted some thing that would require downtown businesses to get in line on this.

The Mayor asked if the grease problem was an enforcement problem or what? Some restaurants have invested a lot of money in grease abatement. Staff indicated that they don't have an easy solution. Most

buildings were built to the property line and unless some buildings had an original place to collect grease, it may end up in the trash dumpster, even though that is not the preferred solution. There is no accountability of who dumps grease in dumpsters. Skala indicated that there is a private collector who picks up grease. He witnessed a collector who missed the truck pipeline and dumped more grease than usual in the alley. This also gives us headaches in terms of sewer and stormwater.

Thomas returned to the question at hand and asked if dumpsters will be phased out. Staff indicated that compactors will replace some dumpsters, but all of that information is not included in this report. We did not include all that information since some people would think that was all written in stone. Most of the existing dumpsters are in public rights of ways.

Public comment was solicited.

The first speaker indicated that she was a downtown business owner and showed pictures of dumpster juice, and since the dumpsters were removed, the problem has become worse. If you make downtown business conditions worse through rotten food grease and rodents, don't expect to collect more sales tax downtown. This affects our sewer system. We understand the cost issue, and that the city does not want to be a landlord, but think about selling off half of the property. The speaker indicated that she was not the actual property owner, but believed the property owner would agree to increased costs. She also indicated that trucks had run into their buildings.

The next speaker indicated that he has property downtown and that the stuff that is being distributed in the alley now stinks and it will get worse unless it is fixed. Please purchase this property and install new compactors. The slime and ooze that comes out of these dumpsters is dangerous, it stinks, and I can't think of anything worse to fall into. You can't close these dumpsters because they are full. When it rains, it gets wet and the stuff inside rots. There are good reasons to put people downtown, but we didn't plan for the trash.

The Mayor asked if these dumpsters would go away if we put the new compactors in place. Staff indicated that that was true. Thomas asked about grease. Staff indicated that this would not completely solve that problem.

A speaker for the CID appeared and suggested that the city purchase only the back parking lot instead of the whole property including the historic house. That would reduce cost. Part of it is currently occupied. So, if we didn't buy that, how would we provide parking for that unit? The owner indicated they would give up parking for that structure.

The next speaker indicated that the Historic Commission met the night after the CID met. They are uneasy about moving forward on this proposal because it may endanger the two buildings that face Locust. There are affordable housing options here as well as a business location. The speaker indicated that there are a lot of private parking spaces downtown and wondered why we don't ask downtown businesses to contribute \$50,000 to solve the grease problem. Please spend carefully. Increase enforcement first. I have been in these downtown buildings. They need help, but around the corner is an historic district. This roofline and building are important. Don't move too fast.

The next speaker indicated that she wants to speak to the master plan for trash. She believes that such a master plan is needed and appropriate. The North Village Arts District supports this plan. She believed it would encourage recycling and that their current dumpster is a place for illegal dumping all week long.

Decrease the opportunity for illegal dumping. Support this. Thomas asked how this would help increase recycling. The speaker indicated that their dumpster would be relocated to a place where recycling bins are available that are not currently available onsite. Orr street facilities would move to Wabash with dual capacities. The Mayor asked who owns the alley where Orr Street dumpsters are located? Staff indicated that it was city owned.

The final speaker indicted that he was familiar with the dumpsters behind KOPN studios. He thought the speakers did a good job, but thought this new plan falls far short and that it does not include grease, enforcement, collection and location. I think you should hold off on the purchase and delay implementation of this plan. This is about compacting garbage. I am not sure how all this works. It costs \$690,00 and I want to know how much the CID is really going to pay and we don't know. I am quite concerned about the rest of the bill that the city will get. I think we need more detail and what commitments will they give you and what will you do about the historic properties. Why not let the CID buy the building and let the city lease the space from them? We can do this in the next 45 days.

No further public comments were forthcoming.

Pitzer asked if this property was listed for public sale. Staff indicated that it was, but did not know the asking price. Staff indicated they will not ask for a rate increase for solid waste for the next two years, but that there could be an increase over 30 years of 5 %. Pitzer indicated that there is over a \$1 million excess in the solid waste budget. Did we already increase rates too much?

Peters asked if we have trash compactors ready to go in this area or if we would need to buy more. City staff indicated they already own the needed compactors.

Ruffin asked about the timeline for solving the problem. Staff indicated that they could get this done in 30 to 45 days and the only thing that might stand in the way is that there are some parking spaces in the area and they may have a right to occupy that area for some extended period of time. Ruffin asked about some people consolidating trash dumpster sites. Will local businesses comply? Staff believed that compliance would be good.

Skala thought there were a lot of issues, but there are two important ones. I think trash compactors are a good answer. I want to protect the integrity of the historic buildings. But, I want to fix the grease issue. Why not put cameras on the trash bins and find who is throwing grease in the dumpsters? We need enforcement. Get grease cameras. The Mayor asked about the north facing building. If we buy the back part can we make it work in terms of parking for the front part?

Peters asked to table the motion regarding the sale of the property and bring this back later but accept the compactor master plan. The mayor suggested tabling the first part and separate the issues. He further thought that they could buy both parts but immediately resell the first part. He is still not sure that it is the government's responsibility to provide trash collection sites.

Motion to table the purchase of the property was made and seconded. Thomas thought there were too many unknowns. This is a poorly thought through plan. I know we want to get this done, but I have some concerns. I also have concerns about the plan. The Mayor also indicated that he would support tabling. Thomas wants information about terms, condition of the building, etc. We need to do that. Are there alternate sites? There is a compactor on private property, but right now that is not operational.

Motion to table the purchase of the property passed unanimously.

The associated item (R-60) was then revisited and Thomas indicated that he thought there were a lot of questions remaining regarding grease, smell, plans. This is not a plan, it's just a map. It doesn't even talk about methodology. I want a better plan for solid waste before I vote on it. Staff said they thought they need to provide a map for planning purposes. Peters indicated that she trusts the city staff in terms of where it should go. Let's start here and then go forward. Most of these are in the private right-of way. Skala indicated he could start with approval of this then wants more information. Let's get more coding and information on this map. The mayor asked for a more in-depth look at this in terms of public health and neighborhood enforcement since we have downtown residential. Thomas also asked if we show this map, does it obligate us in any way. Staff indicated that the map was informational in nature.

Motion to approve the CID Master Plan passed unanimously.)

B82-18 Amending the FY 2018 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Utility Customer Services Fund, Community Relations Department and Information Technology Department; amending the FY 2018 Classification and Pay Plan by adding, closing and consolidating classifications and changing a classification title; transferring funds; appropriating funds.

(Action: This proposal moves several specific positions from the Utility department to the Community Relations office. The Mayor asked how this will improve the customer experience. Staff indicated that the integration of billing, explaining and implementing utility billing needs improvement and that this proposal integrates the input they have received from customers. By moving these team members to other lines of reporting, the customer experience can be enhanced in terms of oral, written and logical aspects. We want to establish a continuum of service from the time service is established to the time it is paid. The Mayor supported this approach. People need to have a good experience, and this can instill trust.

Pitzer asked how many people would be transferred. Staff indicated that 16 fulltime positions would be transferred along with 3 part-time positions. Moving and consolidation includes making similar jobs the same classification. In the move, a few things need to be reassigned, but the real changes are minimal. Pitzer asked about the additional \$38,000 of expenditure. Staff indicated that it was a lateral move of a current IT Position. Staff further indicated that current improvements like drive-through services, customer service levels and public outreach were pretty good right now, but that there was a lot of turnover and our staffing levels are god. The Mayor asked who handles complaints about utilities. Staff indicated that if this was approved it would come from the communications staff. We want our attitude to be right. The Mayor asked about people who visit City Hall directly. Staff indicated that people are directed to the right place for the right question. We are still working through other division of services questions between finance and public works, and we will get to that later.

Skala praised the operations of the Water and Light billing people and outreach. They were helpful and provided great customer service.

Public comment was opened.

The first speaker wanted to ask more about positions that have already been approved. This bill indicates that they are closing some positions. Are we really eliminating jobs? Or are we just switching cost centers for the same job. Staff indicated that they close one position and open another, so it is more about reorganization and we are managing a different way. The speaker likes the concept of

charging different divisions of the city different amounts to fund a new audit. I think you should have a well-funded audit committee under the finance department.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.)

B69-18 Rezoning thirty-eight (38) parcels in the West Ash and North Central Neighborhoods within an area bounded by Sexton Road on the north, West Boulevard on the west, West Broadway on the south, and Tenth Street on the east with thirty-three (33) of such parcels rezoned from R-2 (Two-Family Dwelling District) to R-1 (One-Family Dwelling District), four (4) parcels rezoned from R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to R-1 (One-Family Dwelling District), one (1) parcel rezoned from R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to R-2 (Two-Family Dwelling District) (Case No. 18-51).

(Moved from Consent Agenda to Old Business for consideration.)

(Action: Christine Gardner (applicant) is requesting on behalf of a group of homeowners for approval to downzone a total of 38 properties (originally 39). This request includes 33 parcels within the West Central Columbia Neighborhood Action Plan (WCC Plan) planning area that are currently zoned R-2 and are seeking downzoning to R-1. The 5 additional properties more generally located north of downtown (parcels #34-38) and are zoned R-MF and seeking to downzone to R-1 with the exception of parcel #37 which is seeking to downzone to R-2.

Downzoning, as used here, means a rezoning request that would place a property in a less intensive district, thereby reducing the range of uses and intensity of use that can legally occur on a site. The Planning and Zoning Commission considered this request at its meeting on March 8. Staff presented its report and the applicant gave an overview of the request. Commissioners shared concerns with decreasing the available density of the area, and how that may impact housing affordability. A suggestion to consider granting conditional use approval for accessory dwelling units (ADU) was discussed, as this would allow additional dwelling units on R-1 lots that meet the UDC requirements. The applicant noted that this was available for them to pursue in the future or an overlay district allowing ADUs in R-1 could be created without the need for conditional use approval. Following the public hearing and additional discussion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted (9-0) to recommend approval of the rezoning request.

Council discussion began and Pitzer asked if this concept could be applied city wide. In this case, city staff indicated that these homes were of similar use generally. Pitzer asked how the council can effectively handle this many parcels in a single action and about how downzonings would affect surrounding properties. Staff indicated that this would not affect neighboring R-2 properties, but that in some cases it would affect R-MF properties either in height or in setbacks if they were adjacent. Staff noted that there would be no direct effect unless those R-MF properties wanted to redevelop.

Thomas asked about the ADU discussion at P&Z. Staff explained that currently ADUs are not allowed in R-1 areas so the people applying to downzone to R-1 could not take advantage of ADUs automatically. Instead, anyone wanting to do this would have to apply for a conditional use permit. If that were to happen, the council would have to look at each property individually. That would not come in in a group application. Sometime aspects of such a request like corner lot placement, parking, etc. would have to be evaluated. Thomas asked about the redevelopment at Clinkscales and Broadway. Staff indicated that there is no specific use determined for that property at this time.

Skala followed up on the ADU discussion. He thought some areas wanted ADUs by right, and some other areas did NOT want ADUs due to parking, like in Benton Stephens. ADUs were specifically carved out in the Benton-Stephens overlay.

Public discussion was opened.

The first speaker appeared on behalf of the Historic Preservation Commission. She noted that the properties in question range in age from 1900 to 1954. These homes are representative of the largest inventory of workforce housing in this city representing bungalow and craftsman structures. We support this proposal and want to further protect this type of housing stock due to its affordability. There is unfinished work to be done after the adoption of the new UDC. We think these structures are at risk and we believe these property owners should be included in future discussions. We think neighborhood associations should be included and want these discussions to include all property owners, the Historic Preservation Commission, and the Energy and Environment commission. Don't make this a top-down decision. Do not allow an administrative delay tonight. We need to agree to this tonight with no further delay.

The next speaker indicated that he had no further objections to this particular proposal, but he thought that future downzonings should be individually considered and that blanket approval is not warranted.

The next speaker indicated that she is requesting downzoning. She has made a big investment. She believes this place is a diverse neighborhood and wants to maintain its unique character.

The next speaker was opposed to an administrative delay. She indicated that there was a lot of opposition to more development in the area and that this was an agreed to strategy. This process has been going on for a long time and there is no reason to end it at the last minute. We believe there are infrastructure problems in the area and bigger projects could make the problem worse. This is a very complicated process. We are doing the best we can.

The next speaker indicated that she was the one who submitted the application because the neighborhood association had created a neighborhood action plan. This has been a very long and complicated process. We are at a disadvantage. We have spent hundreds of hours on this along with city staff. We wanted to make sure that the only option we had was to downzone. This appeared to be the best option so the only way we can protect ourselves is to downzone to make sure we are not considered as R-2. If you go back in history, many portions of downtown were massively upzoned. Our particular neighborhood was ignored at first. Now we think we have a target on us and every week a new building is popping up without even having the opportunity to put an overlay in place. We have too many rentals, too many student rentals and we think we will lose our unique character if we don't do this. We have great diversity with immigrants and minorities living in the area. It is an eclectic neighborhood. We have challenges, but we love it and we are not shoving anyone out. We need to see actions on the part of the city to allow single family homes that anyone can move into, including single moms, low income, etc. This is a human dimension. Too many short-term rentals and too many parcels bought up by single owners don't contribute to this area as a neighborhood.

The next speaker indicated that she has lived in this neighborhood for 20 years and she wanted to remind the council that P&Z approved this unanimously. She indicated that she did not want some other zoning. She said it was simple of why they asked for individual downzonings in a big group even though they were scattered throughout the area. This whole area got rezoned to R-2 a long time ago. This

would destroy a neighborhood of single family homes. This is what is happening here now and some of us just don't like it. I have planted gardens and have big windows in my home. The leader of this movement should be congratulated. Don't let people buy historic properties and tear them down. I have heard that "my property is on the wrong side of the street. That is wrong.

The next speaker indicated his support for this proposal. This is an opportunity for neighborhoods to come together and meet other communities. We have met a lot of people in common cause. The development community fought tooth and nail to water down community protection standards. Those people will still make their money. This does not impact them. I am opposed to an administrative delay. The earlier administrative delay was to preempt developers. A delay here would serve no purpose.

The next speaker appeared on behalf of the West Central neighborhood and indicated that they have not endorsed widespread downzoning, but they do support this request.

The next speaker indicated that she appreciated the correction of a transcription error in the ordinance. The speaker indicated that your future should not be determined by your zip code. Home ownership is what is most important. Small homes are places where people can start that homeownership. Historically, that is how my house evolved. There are small homes, small apartments and townhomes in my area. Owner occupied is a good way to stabilize a neighborhood.

The final speaker indicated that on her block there are some homes that are ranch homes, and some are rental. We won't downzone the whole area. And a lot of people don't want to. There will always be a mix. We are all happy to be there. We like our neighborhood. We could probably have a little more density and we would still be OK. We could even do ADUs. This is walkable, even though there are not a lot of good sidewalks.

The final speaker indicated that he is downzoning from R-MF to R-2 instead of R-1. I don't like our city's motto. I think we need to do greater things. I want to address the cult of the highest and best use. I think that has to do with investment value, not use value. That is negative. The massive upzoning years ago forced people to go with the cult and it destroyed North Central. People west of Broadway are trying to prevent that from happening. We want some of these neighborhoods to have even more protections, but that is for another day. Protect these homes that are owned or rented. Neighborhoods are only a partial answer. Please do not allow a moratorium to be put in place. Don't just let someone come in from outside to make money.

The final speaker indicated that he thought the mayor made a good speech about climbing from the bottom to the top in terms of home ownership. Ownership instills pride. I have been in that area for years building homes and I think these are important protections.

The Mayor presented an amendment to make technical corrections to the proposal.

The motion to approve the amendment passed unanimously.

Ruffin applauded the work of the first ward residents who appeared this evening. He believed that the people who live in these homes value their properties and celebrate their diversity. I believe we have the responsibility to support these applications and help these neighborhoods.

Skala indicated that he supported the Benton Stephens downzonings and he will support these. He thought the passage of the UDC tried to strike a balance on neighborhood protections. He thought those

rules would help improve property values. Now, he believes that the worm has turned and that some owners have put sufficient pressure on people to move on so they could amass more properties. This would allow for more density but with more buffering and I don't see why that is wrong. In terms of the administrative delay, I agree with Mr. Norgard and will not support any administrative delay.

Pitzer indicated that group downzoning is not good public policy. He believes it is in contradiction to higher density goals, walkable communities, etc. He thought that there are some aspects that could be achieved, but this action would be antithetical to stated goals. The town homes referenced by one speaker were actually good moves in terms of housing. Doing this more often could be detrimental. I don't want to hint at any limitations, but I want all of these ideas to be considered before we take this course of action. Don't take step that make other ideas impractical. Thomas agreed with much of what Pitzer said, but thought it was important for neighbors to be allowed to determine their own fates. He will support this proposal and he thinks that small homes are often very dense, which is a good thing. He also doesn't like parking on the first floor for some apartments. On corners, let's create delightful density, but don't penalize all residents. Let's encourage multi-story apartments within neighborhoods and not worry about use all the time, but allow mixed use and have less reliance on cars.

Trapp indicated that all land use decisions get made with local land owners. There are other areas where we can do more development. I have supported downzoning in the past. Weighing it all, I think this will do more good than bad, so I will support this. Will we see more? I don't know how much more will come, but I will support this.

Skala indicated that he would like to speak again. He indicated that he used to be the president of the local Smart Growth group. One major Smart Growth idea is sense of place and in this case that idea trumps the concept of increasing density.

Motion to approve passed 6 to 1 with Pitzer voting NO.)

B71-18 Authorizing a right of use license permit with Columbia Restaurant Investor's #1 for construction, installation, maintenance and operation of a private railing and terminal posts with string lighting within a portion of the Locust Street right-of-way.

(Moved to Old Business for consideration.)

This proposal was required because the existing café already exists, but some restrictions conflicted with others. City policy actually encourages this kind of sidewalk use and the owners have submitted this to conform with all aspects of the code. This is adjacent to the Rise on 9th and the city retains the right to remove these improvements if there are problems. Some disabilities groups have indicated a problem with this area and it is being studied. A 60-inch space is required.

The Mayor asked about similar improvements to Room 38 and wondered if it was built according to representations made to the city. Staff indicated that they did not have full plans at the time of approval, but they are looking at some problems with parking and automobile overhangs. Room 38 is five feet wide on the walkway, but big truck bumper overhangs are being looked and some modifications may be made.

No further discussion was forthcoming.

The motion to approve passed 5 to 1, with Peters voting NO.)

CONSENT AGENDA

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

B69-18 Rezoning thirty-eight (38) parcels in the West Ash and North Central Neighborhoods within an area bounded by Sexton Road on the north, West Boulevard on the west, West Broadway on the south, and Tenth Street on the east with thirty-three (33) of such parcels rezoned from R-2 (Two-Family Dwelling District) to R-1 (One-Family Dwelling District), four (4) parcels rezoned from R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to R-1 (One-Family Dwelling District), one (1) parcel rezoned from R-MF (Multiple-Family Dwelling District) to R-2 (Two-Family Dwelling District) (Case No. 18-51).

(Moved from Consent Agenda to Old Business for consideration.)

B70-18 Approving the Final Plat of La Grange Place, Plat 4, a Replat of Lots 3 and 4 of the Plat of La Grange Place, located on the south side of Rollins Street and east of Providence Road (506 Rollins Street); granting a design adjustment relating to street right-of-way width (Case No. 18-41).

B71-18 Authorizing a right of use license permit with Columbia Restaurant Investor's #1 for construction, installation, maintenance and operation of a private railing and terminal posts with string lighting within a portion of the Locust Street right-of-way.

(Moved to Old Business for consideration.)

B73-18 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.

B74-18 Accepting conveyances and a temporary construction easement for sewer, drainage, and utility purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.

B75-18 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code to change the existing thermal storage rider to an energy storage rider.

B76-18 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services to facilitate the transfer of naloxone to trained local first responder agencies.

B77-18 Authorizing an agreement with Beacon of Hope Foundation and Columbia Community Land Trust, Inc. to provide residents of Lynn Street Cottages with fruit and vegetable vouchers to promote healthy eating; appropriating funds.

B78-18 Accepting a donation from United HealthCare for wellness promotion and programs for City employees; appropriating funds.

B79-18 Appropriating funds from the sale of a 2003 Sutphen SA75 fire truck for major fire station repairs.

B80-18 Amending the FY 2018 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Public Works Department - Custodial & Maintenance Services Division.

B81-18 Amending the FY 2018 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the City Utilities Department; amending the FY 2018 Classification and Pay Plan by reassigning classifications.

R49-18 Setting a public hearing: proposed installation of a suspended ceiling system in office areas at the Columbia/Boone County Public Health and Human Services facility.

R50-18 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of a replacement Central Missouri Aviation (CMA) Hangar 350 structure to be located directly south of Taxiway C and west of Hangar 40 and construction of a connecting apron and taxiway at the Columbia Regional Airport.

R51-18 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located generally southeast of the intersection of I-70 Drive SW and Strawn Road (840 N. Strawn Road) (Case No. 18-47).

R52-18 Declaring the results of the April 3, 2018 municipal election.

R53-18 Adopting the Title VI Program Plan for Columbia Transit.

R54-18 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri and the Missouri State High School Activities Association.

R55-18 Authorizing a professional engineering services agreement with Walker Consultants to prepare construction documents and provide construction phase services for repairs and maintenance of the 10th & Cherry parking structure.

R56-18 Transferring FY 2014 General Fund savings for a community workshop on climate action and outreach efforts for the climate action and adaptation plan.

R57-18 Providing contingent authorization of a state aviation trust fund project consultant agreement with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. to complete a Documented Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) checklist relating to the proposed new terminal site at the Columbia Regional Airport subject to receipt of funding authorization and approval of the consultant agreement from the Missouri Department of Transportation.

R58-18 Providing contingent authorization of a state aviation trust fund project consultant agreement with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. to complete a Supplemental Terminal Area Master Plan (STAMP) relating to the proposed new terminal site at the Columbia Regional Airport subject to receipt of funding authorization and approval of the consultant agreement from the Missouri Department of Transportation.

NEW BUSINESS

R59-18 Finding the structure located at 509 Clinkscales Road is a dangerous structure; authorizing a special tax bill against the property.

(Action: City staff have followed administrative procedures to take action on the structures located at 509 Clinkscales Road. Notice was sent to the owners and other interested parties regarding the violations with a deadline to come in compliance. No response was received. The home has been vacant for more than five years. With no action taken, an administrative hearing was held on January 26, 2018 with the Director of Community Development ordering the nuisance be abated by obtaining a permit for demolition of the structures within 30 days of the mailing of that document. The 30-day commencement deadline was April 9, 2018. No action was taken by that date. Staff are requesting that the City demolish this structure and place a tax bill against the property as needed.)

Staff have received a bid for demolition from SPE, Inc. in the amount of \$8,500. Staff is requesting to tax bill all costs to the property.

Questions about process ensued and staff indicated that this was only for demolition, not acquisition. That would require additional steps. Some language was also included that allowed the council to evaluate the structure in terms of historic significance, but that language is not needed now due to changes to the city code.

Motion to approve passed unanimously.)

R60-18 Adopting the Downtown CID Compactor Location Master Plan.

(Action: The purpose of this Downtown CID Compactor Location Master Plan is to formally establish trash compactor locations within the CID. The Solid Waste Utility provides trash and recycling collection services within the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) based upon the common use of trash containers, trash compactors and recycling containers, rather than individual account service.

In the early 1990s, the Solid Waste Utility began installing trash compactors in lieu of trash dumpsters in the CID because the compactors are a much more efficient method of trash collection. A trash compactor has the same volume as approximately thirty (30) trash dumpsters. Over the past 15 months, Solid Waste staff has been working with the Downtown CID to develop a Downtown CID Compactor Location Master Plan. The intent of the proposed Master Plan is to enhance solid waste services in the

CID by identifying the optimum location for trash compactors, throughout the CID, locating them in places convenient to the greatest number of customers, while minimizing cost to the City and CID customers.

Staff recommends approval of the plan.

Motion to approve passed unanimously. See Item B72-18 under Old Business for a full discussion of the issue.)

R61-18 Approving the City of Columbia Landfill Site Master Plan.

(Action: Landfill operations at the Columbia Landfill property began in 1986. The existing permitted landfill area is estimated to reach capacity between 2026 and 2031. The expansion of the landfill into the southern portion of the Columbia Landfill property is believed to be the best alternative for the Solid Waste Utility to continue providing solid waste disposal services. A new landfill disposal area in the southern portion of the Landfill property is estimated to add 40 to 80 years of disposal capacity.

Construction of the new southern landfill disposal area is designed to minimize environmental impacts while enhancing our natural resources in a cost-effective manner over time. The intent is to preserve, enhance and create sufficient high value wildlife habitat in and around the development to support the existing wildlife populations that occur in the area. A new landfill disposal area will also allow the Solid Waste Utility to continue providing landfill gas to the Electric Utility for electric power production. Utilization of landfill gas is an integral part of the City's Renewable Energy Portfolio. It is anticipated that the existing landfill and the proposed new landfill disposal area would produce sufficient volume of landfill gas to produce 5MW of electric production by the year 2040. Permitting and development of the proposed southern landfill disposal area will require significant time and effort to plan and design. For planning purposes, it is recommended that the first disposal cell be constructed and ready to receive waste prior to 2026. Upon Council's acceptance of the Landfill Master Plan, staff would begin work on the Landfill Expansion Permitting Project that is contained in the FY2018 Solid Waste Utility Capital Improvement Plan budget.

Upon Council approval of the Landfill Site Master Plan, staff will proceed with the Landfill Expansion Project as outlined in the FY18 CIP. This project is anticipated to take up to 5 years to complete and is estimated to cost up to \$1,200,000. Costs associated with the construction of future landfill disposal cells will be included in future Capital Improvement budgets for Council consideration.

Pitzer asked about user fees and staff indicated that this proposal would likely result in an increase in tonnage fees for users, regardless of their scale. Even with increased rates, they would still be lower than surrounding communities and Pitzer asked if that would draw more trash to this site. Staff indicated that there was a Hancock issue with raising fees too quickly, but that actual operational costs could be included in the future.

Public input was accepted.

One speaker indicated that this was generally a good proposal but that there could be more generation of fuels at this site. Using the enterprise fund to fund these improvements, this would result in residential users paying higher costs.

No further discussion ensued.

A motion to approve passed unanimously.)

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

(All items introduced as presented.)

B83-18** Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code to clarify land features that are considered sensitive and restricted from development.

B84-18** Changing the uses allowed within The Colonies Lot 101 & 102 O-P Plan located on the east side of Colony Drive and approximately 400 feet north of the Forum Boulevard and Katy Lane intersection; approving the statement of intent (Case No. 18-68).

B85-18* Approving the Final Plat of CPS Waugh - Locust Subdivision located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Waugh Street and Locust Street; granting design adjustments relating to street rights-of-way; granting a design adjustment relating to corner truncation (Case No. 18-59).

B86-18* Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with Paul A. Hinshaw and Michelle Hinshaw for the acquisition of property located at 1101 N. Eighth Street and 1103 N. Eighth Street.

B87-18 Approving a redevelopment agreement in connection with the Broadway Hotel Phase Two TIF Redevelopment Plan and Project.

B88-18* Authorizing a relinquishment of outer roadway agreement with Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for conveyance of a portion of Jacobs Place.

B89-18* Authorizing a right of use permit with Missouri Network Alliance, LLC dba Bluebird Network for installation and maintenance of fiber optic cable within the City rights-of-way.

B90-18* Authorizing an internship program agreement with the Society of Municipal Arborists to sponsor an urban/community forestry intern in the Parks and Recreation Department; appropriating funds.

B91-18* Appropriating funds for a new temporary employee.

B92-18 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code relating to the duties of the Columbia Vision Commission.

REPORTS

REP30-18 Administrative Public Improvement Project: Cosmo Skate Park Improvements.

(Action: Staff indicated that these improvements meet eligibility standards as determined by the City Manager. The cost of the project is \$35,000, which was budgeted in the FY2018 CIP and funded by the Park Sales Tax.

No further action was taken. Report accepted.)

REP31-18 Inclusionary Housing Report.

(Action: This report responds to a Council request for information on inclusionary zoning, alternatively known as inclusionary housing. What follows is an introduction to the concept and how it is put into practice. Density bonuses, the practice of increasing the maximum number of housing units allowed as an offset for delivery of public benefits such as affordable housing units, is described in brief as a component of some inclusionary housing programs.

There are two overlapping, often interchangeable terms. Inclusionary housing and inclusionary zoning. These terms refer to initiatives, programs, and policies that set aside a percentage of housing units for rent or sale to persons of low- and moderate- income. The various terms are described in literature as follows:

Inclusionary housing programs are local policies that tap the economic gains from rising real estate values to create affordable housing for lower income families. An inclusionary housing program might require developers to sell or rent 10 to 30 percent of new residential units to lower-income residents. (inclusionaryzoning.org, viewed March 2018)

Inclusionary zoning (IZ) is a land-use policy intended to enable some lower- and moderate-income households to live in middle- and upper-income communities. IZ policies either mandate or encourage real estate developers to incorporate into their market-rate developments a proportion of homes that are sold or rented at below-market prices in exchange for development rights or zoning variances. * (RAND Corporation, 2012)

Inclusionary zoning programs exist in approximately 400-500 jurisdictions across the United States. Typically they are found in highly active housing markets where the strength of the market exerts upward pressure on housing prices, leaving significant affordability gaps for wage earners and persons on fixed incomes. According to studies by the Lincoln Institute of Land Policy and the RAND Corporation, jurisdictions that have inclusionary housing programs include Davis, Irvine, San Francisco, San Mateo, and Santa Monica, California; Boulder and Denver, Colorado; Stamford, Connecticut; Washington, D.C.; Chicago, Illinois; Montgomery County, Maryland (the first and now longest-running inclusionary housing program); Cambridge, Massachusetts; the State of New Jersey; Santa Fe, New Mexico; Davidson and Chapel Hill, North Carolina; Park City, Utah; Burlington, Vermont; Fairfax County, Virginia; and Redmond, Washington.

An inclusionary zoning program has the following general characteristics:

- Mandatory, or voluntary-with incentives, set-aside of a specified percentage of affordable dwelling units in projects of specified sizes and locations. Typically, the set aside is 5 to 20 percent of the total units in a project. Chicago's Affordable Requirements Ordinance is an example of a mandatory program and New York City's R10 Program is an example of voluntary inclusionary zoning with incentives. (U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development, "Inclusionary Zoning and Mixed Income Communities," 2013)
- In return for the set-aside, developers often receive offsets or indirect subsidies in the form of residential density bonuses, fee waivers, or expedited permitting. In a voluntary program, participating developers obtain the bonuses while those that do not participate are limited to the housing densities permitted by the particular zoning district. (As an aside, note that density bonuses are a planning technique that can be used in other contexts, for example off-sets of increased density for developers that set-aside public open space or make extraordinary efforts to conserve sensitive landscape features)
- Some programs have developer "opt-outs" that may include building the affordable units at a location off-site; payment of a fee in-lieu to a housing fund, or donations of land on which housing development organizations may build dwelling units.
- Ordinances and policies designate "affordable housing units" as dwelling units that are priced or leased to be affordable to persons earning below a specified percentage of Area Median Income (AMI); for example, 80 percent of AMI defines low-income. Some jurisdictions may adopt a workforce housing strategy that aims to set-aside a percentage of new housing units at 100 to 120 percent maximum of the area median. The cost of constructing new houses and apartments combined with the capacity of households to pay without cost-burdening themselves (conventionally no more than 35 percent of gross household income should be spent on housing costs) will be used to help determine reasonable income targets.
- Jurisdictions designate areas where the inclusionary zoning requirements apply. For example, jurisdictions may designate mixed-use districts or employment centers as priorities. To promote equity or social inclusion, jurisdictions apply inclusionary zoning rules in residential districts having low poverty rates and high-performing schools so low and moderate-income households have access to good schools and valued community services, such as grocery stores selling healthy foods.

- Inclusionary housing/zoning requires an administrative process that qualifies households for the set-aside of dwelling units and provides stewardship to support home purchasers or renters and performs ongoing monitoring for compliance.

Skala asked if this was a topic currently being explored by P&Z. Staff indicated that this was along the same line, but that their examination was mostly about density bonuses. This is a more comprehensive approach to policy. Skala asked that P&Z expand their view of this topic.

Thomas asked about actual practice and wondered how new units were constructed. Staff indicated that in some places you can make units more modest or lesser in nature, but not everywhere. Thomas wondered if it became obvious or not. Staff indicated that it was intended to blend in and that most developers prefer to have units that blend in well. Some feature reductions are often allowed. Thomas asked how regulatory bodies oversee this process. Staff indicated that it did require inspection and oversight and that it could be the city, an agency or other group. It is a complex process. It should also take into account the overall need for such housing in a community and how the process progresses. Thomas asked that the Fair Housing Task Force take a look at this.

The Mayor indicated that he did not want to tinker with the UDC in terms of density bonuses or other changes. Thomas disagreed with the Mayor's suggestion.

No further discussion occurred.)

REP32-18 Missouri State Auditor response to R35-18.

(Action: The Mayor indicated that significant discussion occurred on this topic during the worksession and that the council could consider taking the next step of determining the scope of work. Skala worried about the sticker shock price of this proposal from the auditor and the time frame. The Mayor indicated he wanted to hear back from the public about this audit and would prefer to spend this money on other projects unless it came at the cost of public confidence. Peters indicated that she had heard only negative comments so far. Trapp said his comments had been mixed in nature.

The council informally agreed to revisit this proposal and get more information regarding scope of work and cost by working with the State Auditor's office.

No formal action was taken.)

REP33-18 Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) Sidewalk Transition Plan.

(Action: A report was presented regarding how the city evaluates and addresses city sidewalk and intersection needs. There is an inventory of existing sidewalks planned and then this information is entered into a main database. City owned properties will be evaluated first, and then areas of known concern will be evaluated. Next, areas with high pedestrian use will be added and they will inventory as much of the entire city as possible over time. We will evaluate for ADA compliance, other general standards and general usability. Rankings will determine how budget funds are expended.

Thomas thought the plan was logical and straightforward. Even though it did not create new funding streams, it was generally well-received. The Mayor asked about audible signals at different intersections and staff indicated most were located along the Providence Road corridor. The Mayor also asked about bus shelter sites and staff indicated that some progress had been made, but that it is a challenge where private right-of-way is required. Thomas encouraged continued investigation and asked if there will be an audit report on this project. Staff indicated that they will come back with updates on at least an annual basis.

The Mayor asked if there were any financial challenges in this regard. Staff indicated that there will be a dedicated stream for funding by 2020 and that other unused funds had been used in the interim. The Mayor asked if there was a dedicated contractor. Staff indicated that there were two preferred subcontractors and that they have been good in terms of pricing and response.

Pitzer asked about roundabout construction and that in some cases it is not accessible to some handicapped groups. Staff indicated that they had received information in that regard and that they would pursue this.

No further formal action was taken.)

REP34-18 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

(Action: No formal action or discussion transpired.)

GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Public

The first speaker indicated that they had met with Sgt. Fox of the Columbia Police Department, one of the persons charged with implementation of a new community policing initiative. She indicated that those discussions revealed that he was ill-prepared and not the best person for the job. We want to hold you to a higher standard. We want to first understand the direction, then figure out funding, then determine how we go forward. The officer in question was not prepared to discuss police-stop policy and we should reconsider how we approach this topic.

The next speaker indicated that there is a poor bus stop at Splashers and wanted to make that known. He next mentioned that 152 Habitat houses are now standing in this town after 30 years and wants to encourage affordability. Finally, he referenced Turning Point, and mentioned that the director of that group's wife has recently died. He mentioned that a job posting indicated that pay for director's job was \$60,000. The speaker stated that the current director does not get that kind of cash. I would like you to look into this and get that information.

The final speaker indicated that he was confused by the discussion about the recent audit request. He believed that we were looking for performance audits. He thinks there is some misunderstanding. He thinks the council is talking at cross purposes. On a different topic, he noted that in terms of levels of service at roundabouts we can actually find out useful information for experts. He indicated that Mr. Fox had dubious credentials to be in charge of the community policing initiative and that it is more important to impress us than just the city manager and the police chief. Finally, maybe we can have lunch and talk about this sometime, but most intersections will not support nodes. We need a central city plan that is wider ranging, but they are not appropriate on a half mile basis which is what the West Central plan is all about. We need to sort out where we can do all of this rather than just do broad statements.

Council

The Mayor congratulated Trapp and Peters on their re-election. He complimented Ruffin on his service as Mayor Pro Tem.

He appointed Skala as Mayor Pro Tem for the next year. The Mayor will continue to serve as the council representative to the New Century Fund.

Trapp indicated that he had information regarding work with disabilities regarding first responders, evacuation and public safety.

Thomas responded to an earlier speaker who disputed the location of usable bus hubs and commercial nodes every mile or half mile and that it works really well in many places. Further, he followed up on comments regarding Sgt. Fox and encouraged collaboration as this process goes forward.

Skala indicated that he wanted to delay the broadband task force but would like to consider the implementation of that group. He then mentioned that there are some budget issues that have to do with the agriculture park and wants to make sure that funding options help the group meet some funding and operational deadlines. The City Manager did indicate that they had met and that they wanted some assurance of funding by April 26. Finally, Skala indicated that a local street had been resurfaced and he appreciated that.

Pitzer indicated that he thought during this past election year, he heard many negative campaign comments and would like to consider how we could prevent such negative attacks in the future. The Mayor indicated that he tries to keep those comments focused on issues, but does not want to discourage public dissent. We can discuss that in the future. Skala said he thought it was the prerogative of the Mayor, but that if enough of us thought it was wrong we could do something. Trapp indicated that he felt he was attacked at 7:00 PM and couldn't respond until way later in the night, the story was already out. I would be interested in how other communities deal with this. Skala said he was more upset about attacks on staff. He admitted that sometimes candidate attacks did happen, and he hoped that he was not a part of that but maybe he was. He agreed to look at how other cities deal with the issue.

Staff
(No comments.)

ADJOURNMENT
(Time: 11:44 PM)

©2018 CityWatch-Columbia

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