INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, June 4, 2012, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID and TRAPP were present. Council Member SCHMIDT was absent. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of May 21, 2012 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Dudley and a second by Mr. Kespohl.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor McDavid made a motion to add B147-12 to the introduction and first reading section of the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kespohl and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The agenda, as amended, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Kespohl and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

SPECIAL ITEMS

Recognition of Ms. Fan Yun, an artist from the region of our sister city, Laoshan District, Qingdao, Shandong Province, People's Republic of China.

Mayor McDavid commented that Fan Yun’s work had been displayed at Art in the Park over the weekend. He welcomed Fan Yun to Columbia and thanked her for her willingness to teach Columbia youth her art while she was in town. He presented her with an official welcome letter and a gift.

Fan Yun thanked Mayor McDavid and presented him with a piece of art work she had completed. Hsiao-Mei Wiedmeyer, a representative of Columbia Friends of China, explained this work had been done free-hand with scissors. The story behind this piece involved a boy using his body to melt ice in order to catch fish for his mother, who had been craving fish. She noted Fan Yun cuts leaves, paper cups, etc. in addition to paper, and that she would be at the Columbia Public Library on Wednesday at 7:00 p.m. to teach people her technique. She stated artwork of Fan Yun had been displayed at museums in other countries, and her first piece of artwork in the United States was here in Columbia, Missouri.

R87-12 Authorizing Artist’s Commission agreements for the design phase of the Short Street Parking Garage Percent for Art project.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Yolanda Ciolli, 156 Maple Grove Way, stated she was the Chair of the Standing Committee on Public Art and a member of the Commission on Cultural Affairs, and explained
the Short Street parking garage had been designated a percent for art project in October 2011. She explained the approach was to search for an artist as opposed to a specific work of art with the intent of involving the artist in the overall design process, so the artist could propose a work that was site and community specific. In the past, one artist was chosen, but three artists would be selected to prepare preliminary designs for review this year based on input provided by the Council in the past. The Standing Committee decided to limit the search for artists to those residing in Missouri. She described the application and review process, and stated Bede Clarke of Columbia, Beth Nybeck of Kansas City and the team of Robert Friedman and Marni Jaime of Columbia were recommended unanimously by the Commission on Cultural Affairs. If approved by Council, the three finalists would meet with the Standing Committee on Public Art and members of the community before creating their designs, and would be paid an honorarium of $2,000 each for their work. Once the artists submitted design concepts, public input would be sought on the three designs, and after the public comment period concluded, the Standing Committee on Public Art would initiate a review process and provide a recommendation to the Commission on Cultural Affairs, who would then provide a recommendation to Council. She asked the Council to adopt the resolution to enter into contracts with the artists so the design process could begin.

The vote on R87-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SCHMIDT. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

Sam Robinson - Report from the CoMET Team on its first four community conversations regarding transit.

Sam Robinson provided a handout to Council, and explained he was with the PedNet Coalition and wanted to report on the four community conversations regarding transit held to date. The goals of these events were to bring together a diverse group of stakeholders to discuss what they envisioned the transit system would look like in the next five years and beyond, and to determine the challenges and actions that could be taken in the short, intermediate and long term to realize the vision. He noted over 200 people had participated in the process and a diverse group of people analyzed the data to develop this report. Recommendations were to develop user friendly instructions on how to use the bus system, to identify multiple sources of funding for the transit system, and to create a planning committee involving the University of Missouri, the Columbia Public Schools, the Chamber of Commerce, the City of Columbia, etc. to look at transportation from local, county-wide and regional perspectives. He noted CoMET was supportive of the FastCAT proposal as it aligned with a goal of enhancing transit service. He also hoped to have an integrated approach to transit that would tie into the comprehensive planning process. He stated details were included in the handout provided.
PUBLIC HEARINGS

(A) Construction of the Northeast Pressure Zone 16-inch water main loop project.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen and Mr. Zajicek provided a staff report.

Ben Ross stated he was with Engineering Surveys and Services and described the process of choosing the recommended alignment. He explained they had started out with 23 separate alignments and had narrowed it down to three, which were presented to the public for feedback. The preferred route was the identified in red on the overhead.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

Ms. Hoppe asked to what extent this project would serve existing and new customers. Mr. Zajicek replied this would be in the City’s water service territory, and the customers along the alignment were already Columbia Water and Light customers. He thought there might be a few on the back roads that were not Columbia Water and Light customers. He explained this would allow for better fire protection in the area and better flow and pressure to the system. Ms. Hoppe understood the double flow protection was being provided for city-wide. Mr. Zajicek stated this allowed for a redundant feed at the Stephen’s Station Tower.

Mr. Dudley asked if this would provide for a possible connection as the City grew towards the new high school. Mr. Zajicek replied it would help the northeast pressure zone with more flow. He explained the Hillsdale Pump Station near J. Ousley Plaza on I-70 Drive SE was built to have four pumps running, and currently only two could be operated due to the way the water flowed to the northeast zone. He stated it would bolster the system in the northeast pressure zone to allow better service, but believed that area was within the Consolidated Water District territory.

Mr. Ross described the proposed alignment using the overhead due to a question from someone in the audience.

Mr. Kespohl made a motion directing staff to proceed with the preparation of final plans and specifications for the 16-inch water transmission main in the northeast pressure zone. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dudley and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B130-12 Authorizing design and construction of a system control center in Water and Light Department offices located on the fourth floor of the City Hall Building; providing for request for proposals through the Purchasing Division; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

B130-12 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SCHMIDT. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:
R88-12 Authorizing amendments to the FY 2012 Annual Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.
Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.
Ms. Anthony asked for an explanation regarding the increase in planning and administration costs for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) program. Mr. Teddy replied staff that ran the program was paid with CDBG funds. Ms. Anthony asked if the planning and administration costs were in keeping with what was allowed under the program. Mr. Teddy replied yes, and explained the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) allowed 20 percent, but Council, by resolution, capped administration costs at 16 percent.
Ms. Hoppe asked if there would be other resources in the community to make up for the loss in the owner occupied housing rehabilitation program. Mr. Teddy replied funding from earlier program years was left over and would be used. In addition, other agencies were involved with rehabilitation activities.
Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.
There being no comment, Mayor McDavid closed the public hearing.
Mr. Kespohl asked if funds were allocated to the different groups on an annual basis as a result of the applications submitted. Mr. Teddy replied yes, and explained they were currently in the evaluation phase for fiscal year 2013 applications. Everything Council saw on the budget page was represented by an application, whether from the City or outside agencies. Mr. Kespohl stated he was interested in the result based model the United Way was using this year and asked if something similar could be implemented for this program in the years to come. Mr. Teddy replied he thought that was something they should consider and pointed out they would start doing some of that with the International City/County Management Association (ICMA) performance measurement program as it would measure outcomes. They could then adjust the programs accordingly.

The vote on R88-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SCHMIDT.
Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

OLD BUSINESS

B109-12 Amending Chapter 12A of the City Code as it relates to stormwater management.

The bill was given third reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Matthes and Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.
Mr. Noce commented that the date under subsection (2) in the definition of development should be changed from May 21, 2012 to June 4, 2012 as it the intent was for it to be the date of passage of the ordinance.
Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend B109-12 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anthony and approved unanimously by voice vote.
Mr. Dudley made a motion to amend B109-12 by changing the date in Section 12A-5(a)(2) as part of the definition of redevelopment from May 21, 2012 to June 4, 2012. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kespohl and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor McDavid explained five amendments were being proposed by the Storm Water Advisory Commission, and read those proposed amendments. He explained Council would potentially act on those proposed amendments after public comment.

Ms. Anthony asked if the third amendment involving Section 12A-87(b) had already been resolved by the amendment sheet they had just approved. Mr. Noce replied it had.

Mr. Trapp asked staff to explain their concerns with regard to the Storm Water Advisory Commission recommendation involving Section 12A-87(f). Mr. Noce replied this had to do with vested rights, which involved showing money and effort had been put into a project and the ability to complete the project even though the law had changed. He noted they were now at a time period of five years later, and although there still might be facts indicating there was a vested right in a particular project, he believed this was lessening over time. This section was an expansion of that idea if vested rights was even an issue, and it might not be due to police powers. The recommendation of the Commission was far beyond what would be considered a vested rights issue.

Ms. Anthony asked if the change was incorporated as requested if it would be difficult to enforce. Mr. Noce replied he believed it would be hard to enforce because the different plans would be vested at different times.

Ms. Anthony thought it would be difficult due to having to determine if there was an adverse impact and asked if that would make it more difficult to enforce. Mr. Glascock replied they would determine whether there was an adverse impact by determining the significance of the change and the characteristic of the runoff.

Mr. Trapp asked if it would apply to plans approved after September 4, 2007. Mr. Noce replied the original language indicated conceptual storm water plans approved before September 4, 2007 in C-P, M-R, M-P, PUD and O-P zoning districts were acceptable, and staff was not recommending a change to that language. The Storm Water Advisory Commission language would expand this to include other types of sites since it indicated land in any other zoning districts. He felt this was a grandfathering provision that was beyond vested rights, and did not believe federal or state law supported this by exception or exemption.

Mr. Kespohl asked Mr. Noce if he was saying grandfathering should not have been allowed. Mr. Noce replied no, but he noted he was not aware of any exemption other than the vested rights concept. Mr. Kespohl understood the grandfathering had been allowed for seven years. Mr. Noce stated it was still being allowed as nothing had changed. The plans would expire in seven years, but there was not a limit in this provision.

Mr. Kespohl asked if a business or church wanted to enlarge its structure by replacing part of its existing impervious surface parking lot if it would be subject to the storm water ordinance or if it would be considered improving, renewing and restoring. Mr. Noce replied it depended on the size of the area. Mr. Kespohl explained it would be an overlay of the existing impervious surface. Mr. Glascock replied if this was done under the current storm water ordinance, some type of storm water improvement would be required. The proposed
storm water ordinance amendments would change the redevelopment section, and no storm water improvements would be required if the property was less than an acre.

Mr. Kespohl asked if a business or church replaced its shingle roof if it would be subject to the storm water ordinance or if it would be considered improving, renewing and restoring. Mr. Noce replied it would not be subject to the storm water ordinance because it was not a land disturbance.

Mr. Kespohl asked if a business or church wanted to replace its impervious asphalt driveway with a new asphalt or concrete driveway, which would be the same exact size, if it would trigger storm water improvements or if it would be considered maintenance since land would be disturbed. Mr. Glascock replied it would be considered maintenance if it was under an acre.

Mr. Kespohl stated he did not understand the difference between expanding the structure over an impervious surface and replacing impervious surface if it was the same size since land was being disturbed in both situations. Mr. Noce replied there was a difference between re-roofing the mall and milling up the same size area if it was over an acre. Mr. Kespohl stated he was talking about replacing a driveway and building a structure over a parking lot, and understood staff was saying one was maintenance and the other was not. He thought it would be difficult to apply the storm water ordinance due to these types of situations.

Mr. Kespohl asked if the storm water ordinance would be triggered if Boone Hospital needed to replace its roof since it was over an acre in size. Mr. Glascock replied it would not trigger the storm water ordinance since it involved a roof.

Ms. Hoppe asked how many changes had been considered and agreed upon since December 2011. Mr. Glascock replied changes were made after every meeting held. He was not sure of an exact number. Ms. Hoppe understood there was a list of ten in December, and staff had agreed to nine of those items, and two more items were brought forward in April. She believed staff had agreed to quite a few changes. Mr. Glascock explained most were wording changes, but some were larger changes. He noted site was mentioned in the ordinance over seventy times, and by changing the definition of site, the entire ordinance would change. Mr. Noce provided some examples of the changes made.

Albert Prouty, 3714 Santiago, commented that his church would soon be resurfacing a parking lot involving the same surface and size, and asked if they would have to comply with the storm water ordinance. Mr. Glascock asked if it was larger than an acre. Mr. Prouty replied it was three-quarters of an acre. Mr. Glascock replied he would not have to worry about the storm water ordinance.

Carrie Gartner, 11 S. Tenth Street, stated she represented the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) and explained they were concerned with changes to something that was an acre or more. Most of the parcels in the downtown were smaller than an acre, so most would be exempt, but there were a handful of parcels that were larger than an acre. They understood storm water needed to be taken care of in the downtown, and if someone bought an entire block, leveled it and built something new, storm water would need to be addressed. They were concerned for a church that had been around for 100 years on slightly over an acre of land and wanted to enlarge their rectory or extend their building onto a
surface parking lot. The CID encouraged development on surface parking lots as it would then be more active, but this would trigger new requirements if the proposed ordinance passed. She thought the ordinance should be based on the amount of land being disturbed instead of the size of the entire parcel.

Mr. Kespohl asked if she believed small areas of land disturbance should be exempt. Ms. Gartner replied yes, and explained a lot of earth would not be disturbed in most situations since the downtown was filled with impervious surfaces and areas.

Jay Gebhardt stated he was a civil engineer and a member of the Storm Water Advisory Commission and discussed the amendments proposed by the Commission. He felt the most important item involved the definition of site. Staff was determining if the storm water ordinance would be triggered by whether the lot owned was greater than an acre instead of whether the portion being disturbed was greater than an acre. He thought this was important because if someone had a lot greater than an acre and met the definition of redevelopment, they would not realize the same exemptions as someone who had a lot less than an acre even if both projects were disturbing the same amount of area. The goal of the Commission had been to provide some relief or incentive for redevelopment in areas such as the Business Loop or the downtown that needed to be redeveloped and had existing infrastructure. With regard to the definition of redevelopment, he noted the Storm Water Advisory Commission had unanimously agreed to an ordinance that did not include subsection (2), which he referred to as the subdivision clause. He believed the subdivision clause could be removed if the definition of site was changed so it meant the disturbed area. If Council decided to move ahead with the definition of site as proposed by staff, they would suggest a changed to subsection (2) as proposed by them so more redevelopment projects would be able to be realized. He agreed the single family issue had been resolved when Council amended the bill per the amendment sheet developed by staff. With regard to 12A-87(e), the Commission was concerned with the “maximum extent possible” language as it created a burden of proof and confusion for the person redeveloping property that was over an acre in size. The Commission had also tried to address revisions to plans because every planned district in the City that was not complete would be affected. He provided the Boone Hospital Plaza 1, 2, 3 and 4 as an example as the north side had not been completed, but plans had been approved. If the plans were revised, he understood more might be required in terms of storm water management than had originally been put in place. He wondered how much of a revision could be made, and this was not addressed. They also wanted to put an end to the approved plans with a sunset clause. He commented that these amendments affected the ability for a small business to expand, adapt and grow in the center of town. He felt the storm water ordinance approved in 2007 created a disincentive to do anything, and the Commission wanted to create an incentive for redevelopment. He asked those in the audience in support of the amendments proposed by the Storm Water Advisory Commission to stand, and approximately 40 people stood.

Mr. Kespohl understood plans filed by September 4, 2007 expired on September 4, 2014. Mr. Gebhardt explained if a PUD or C-P plan had not started, it might expire, but the plans for projects that had already started never expired. Mr. Kespohl was concerned with lengthening the time plans had to be acted on to 2019, which was another seven years, and
asked if that could be reduced. Mr. Gebhardt replied yes and noted there was nothing special about the seven years. Mr. Kespohl pointed out he would be offering the amendment with a shorter time.

Mr. Dudley asked for clarification regarding the definition of site and disturbance. If the mall wanted to install covered parking, he wondered if the disturbed area was where the footings would be to hold the poles for the covered parking or if it would be surface area of the cover. Mr. Gebhardt replied in his opinion it would be where the poles were located, but he would defer to Mr. Glascock. Mr. Glascock stated it would be where the ground was exposed.

Greg Ahrens, 1504 Sylvan Lane, commented that in Columbia due to the clay, the entire City was essentially an impervious surface after the first few drops of rain.

Anna Coulibaly, 902 Hope Place, stated she was a frequent pedestrian and was concerned with landscaping and redevelopments of any size as water was collected and dumped on sidewalks, which created a danger to those with difficulties walking. She suggested language be included in the ordinance to require storm water outlets to be placed so they did not create hazards for pedestrians or bicyclists.

Karl Skala, 5201 Gasconade Drive, stated he was the Chair of the Environment and Energy Commission and noted the Commission recommended supporting the definition of site as proposed by staff. In addition, they recommended not excluding the downtown exemption. He understood Mr. Gebhardt was speaking from the redevelopment perspective, but pointed out there was also a concern in the community regarding storm water runoff. As a result, he believed there had to be some responsibility for storm water management along with redevelopment.

Albert Prouty, 3714 Santiago, commented that the development he spoke of before was two miles north of City limits and asked if this ordinance would impact it. Mayor McDavid replied its jurisdiction would be within the City limits.

Larry Schuster, 3109 Hill Haven Lane, commented that he believed it was interesting to look at how perspectives changed, and noted in the 1960's and 1970's, there was a campaign to remove impervious surfaces, such as gravel streets and alleys, but now it appeared as though they were moving back to gravel. He understood impervious surface was a great tool for mitigating erosion and runoff. He pointed out that redevelopment was difficult because people were upset with design, the use of the property, storm water, etc., even though it was less expensive, and City ordinances made redevelopment even harder. He felt City staff should aid and assist instead of inhibiting and blocking development. If the concern was land disturbance, he believed land disturbance should be considered the site, especially in terms of redevelopment. He asked the Council to keep in mind the goal, who was served by it and how it could be accomplished.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, wondered how these rules would apply to annexations that were in process or those areas in which there were annexation agreements. He would hate for this to be developed, and later find out the ordinance did not apply due to agreements as those agreements impacted a significant amount of land. He noted the City had started sub-area planning, but thought that needed to continue to cover the entire
metropolitan planning organization area, which was the same as the CATSO area, because it would be a benefit.

Larry Moore commented that he had participated on the City/County joint storm water task force and was involved in development, and as a result, many people had come to him with issues. He noted the current CEO of Quaker Oats had expressed frustration because they had to build an expensive rain garden to expand their parking lot to add only a few spaces, and it did not make sense. He felt this affected job creation because it was too expensive to expand. He believed they needed to focus on the area being disturbed instead of the size of the entire tract.

Erin Daugherty stated she was the Chair of the Storm Water Advisory Commission and noted the Commission suggested seventeen revisions to the ordinance. Through meetings with attorneys and staff, only five changes were still being recommended, but they believed these were the most important. She pointed out the Commission spent over a year studying the issue and talking to engineers, professionals and attorneys. She asked Council to support the Commission recommendations.

Ms. Hoppe understood twelve items had been acted upon. Ms. Daugherty agreed there had been negotiations on the other twelve items. She noted a lot of concessions had been made by both parties.

Mayor McDavid understood the Commission wanted a change in the definition of site so it was defined as the area disturbed versus the size of the entire lot. He also understood there was an exemption for lots under an acre, but felt there were still situations where the language proposed by staff did not make sense, and provided an example. He agreed with the recommendation of the Storm Water Advisory Commission with regard to the definition of site in terms of storm water.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend B109-12 by changing the definition of site under Section 12A-5 so it read “the land or water area upon which development or land disturbance is physically located or conducted; being the extent of the area of land disturbed for the project.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Dudley.

Ms. Anthony asked how that would be enforced and wondered if each site would have to be measured. Mr. Glascock replied the disturbed area would have to be staked and measured in order for the City to be able to monitor it. If it was not staked, staff would have difficulty determining if it was more or less than an acre. Mr. Noce explained they were trying to address unintended consequences with the exemption of lots under an acre and a series of other exemptions that allowed for different situations staff had experienced over time.

Mr. Gebhardt explained another section required the disturbed area to be staked prior to any disturbance and it would be shown on the plan. He thought Mr. Glascock would have the authority to require it to be staked and fenced if it was a critical site. He felt it would be enforceable.

Mr. Kespohl asked if staking would be done by the contractor or City staff. Mr. Gebhardt replied it would be done by a design professional.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the property was over an acre and involved a small disturbance instead of a large disturbance if it would affect what was required in terms of storm water improvements. She wondered if they would have to pay the same regardless and if large
storm water improvements would be required for a small disturbance. Mr. Glascock replied they reviewed the amount of imperviousness that was being added. The storm water manual provided for three areas and provided an example in which ten square feet would be addressed if that was what was being added. Mayor McDavid commented that the ordinance did not indicate that. Mr. Glascock explained the ordinance allowed him to make changes to the manual on enforcement, and this was a proposed change. Mayor McDavid stated the unpredictability of regulation made it hard to do business and hard to plan. He wondered if someone would need to negotiate with staff to determine the cost of a project. Mr. Glascock replied it would be specified in the manual. The proposed manual changes would include three options, and he listed those options.

Mayor McDavid asked if the Storm Water Advisory Commission had access to the manual. Mr. Glascock replied the Commission had access to the manual, but not the changes because he did not have a final ordinance. Depending on the ordinance passed, some of the proposed changes might not be needed. If Council approved the ordinance as recommended by staff, these proposed changes would be needed. Mayor McDavid stated his frustration in reviewing the ordinance when Mr. Glascock had administrative actions that would modify the implementation of the ordinance substantially.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Mr. Dudley to amend B109-12 by changing the definition of site under Section 12A-5 so it read “the land or water area upon which development or land disturbance is physically located or conducted; being the extent of the area of land disturbed for the project” was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Kespohl, Mr. Dudley and Mayor McDavid voting in favor of it.

Mayor McDavid commented that another amendment proposed by the Storm Water Advisory Commission dealt with the definition of redevelopment. He understood a lot of the downtown had not been platted, and if a church or other development wanted to do something creating a minor disturbance, it would need to be replat the property, which would trigger the storm water ordinance. Mr. Noce stated he disagreed and explained it was not a subdivision if it was the exact same area and was not divided in any. Mayor McDavid provided an example of property at the corner of Locust and Hitt that had never been platted. Mr. Noce noted that was a different issue. Staff understood there were issues in the downtown, which was why the language had changed from platted to subdivided. Mayor McDavid understood replatting would not trigger the storm water ordinance. Mr. Noce stated that was correct as long as they did not subdivide.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend B109-12 by changing the definition of redevelopment under Section 12A-5 so it read “development that (1) expands or replaces any development; and (2) is not on a tract less than once acre that is shown on a final plat of a subdivision that created two or more lots submitted to the City for review after August 1, 2012; and (3) is on a site that is either: (a) one acre or more that has an impervious surface of more than twelve percent of the lot; or (b) less than one acre that has any impervious surface.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Kespohl and defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Kespohl, Mr. Dudley and Mayor McDavid voting in favor of it.

Mayor McDavid understood the issue of the single family residences had been resolved and asked if it included a situation of two detached homes with a lot line between
them. Mr. Noce read the change Council had previously made and stated he believed it had been resolved.

Mayor McDavid understood the Commission had an issue with the phrase “to the maximum extent practicable” in terms of Section 12A-87(e), and agreed it was vague. He asked if that was the intent of staff so there would be some subjectivity. Mr. Noce replied he viewed practicable as the same as reasonable, and believed what was practicable or reasonable on a 12 percent impervious site was different than what was practicable and reasonable on a 100 impervious site. Mr. Matthes pointed out the City was held to that vague standard by the federal government, so staff felt it should be passed along since they would be held to it. He noted they attempted to define it in the manual.

Mr. Kespohl made a motion to amend B109-12 by changing Section 12A-87 in terms of redevelopment so it read “redevelopment on a site of one acre or more is eligible for partial exemptions from the requirements of this article, as set out in the storm water manual, if the development does not have an adverse impact on any known mapped critical downstream location; and the director shall track, map, add and remove known critical downstream locations and make this information available to the public. The director shall set forth criteria in the storm water manual that details the partial exemptions under this sub section.” The motion was seconded by Mayor McDavid and defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Kespohl and Mr. Dudley voting in favor of it.

Mayor McDavid understood the last amendment proposed this was the sunset provision.

Mr. Kespohl made a motion to amend B109-12 by changing Section 12A-87 in terms of a sunset provision so it read “storm water management shall be provided in accordance with the approved conceptual storm water management plan in zoning districts, PUD, O-P, C-P, M-R, and M-P for which a conceptual storm water plan was approved before September 4, 2007, or land in any other zoning district for which a site plan was approved before September 4, 2007, unless a revision to the plan for the site is requested which adversely impacts the storm water discharge from the site. An “adverse impact” is one that significantly increases the volume of storm water discharge from the site, decreases the water quality of the storm water discharge and redirects the storm water discharge in a manner that results in downstream storm water drainage impacts that would not have occurred with the original plan. Approvals for storm water plans approved prior to June 4, 2012 shall expire on January 1, 2016 for sites on which the planned work has not commenced. Approval of all storm water plans approved after June 4, 2012 shall expire seven years after the date of approval if the planned work has not commenced.” The motion was seconded by Mayor McDavid.

Mayor McDavid stated he believed this change was reasonable due to the amount of work that had gone into the storm water plans for project that would soon start.

Mr. Trapp asked Mr. Glascock for his thoughts on this change. Mr. Glascock replied Boone Hospital was a bad example as the work there had started so their storm water plan was not impacted. This addressed projects that had not started. He noted he had never disallowed a plan unless it changed drastically, so he did not understand the need for this amendment.
Ms. Anthony asked if there was a project with an approved plan that had not started if it would be a problem to allow them to move forward with the original plan. Mr. Glascock replied he would not have a problem with it unless they made changes to the plan. Ms. Anthony asked if staff objected to this proposed amendment. Mr. Glascock replied his concern was the fact they included the phrase of “adverse impacts” and had other additions. He did not see the difference otherwise. He wondered if there was a concern regarding the decisions made by the person that replaced him in the future. He noted changes could be made that were not considered “adverse impacts”.

Mr. Kespoahl stated he had shortened the time for starting on a project. Mr. Noce pointed out the existing language did not have a sunset. Mr. Glascock noted the end date did not have to do with the fact the project had not started.

Ms. Anthony understood this change would allow for a revision as along as there was not an adverse impact and asked if it would be difficult to enforce and monitor. Mr. Glascock replied the developer would have to prove it was not an adverse impact.

Ms. Hoppe noted it stated “adverse impact was one that significantly increases the volume of stormwater” and asked if the “significantly” portion would create a problem. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it was similar to maximum extent practicable and that it was subjective.

The motion made by Mr. Kespoahl and seconded by Mayor McDavid to amend B109-12 by changing Section 12A-87 in terms of a sunset provision so it read “storm water management shall be provided in accordance with the approved conceptual storm water management plan in zoning districts, PUD, O-P, C-P, M-R, and M-P for which a conceptual storm water plan was approved before September 4, 2007, or land in any other zoning district for which a site plan was approved before September 4, 2007, unless a revision to the plan for the site is requested which adversely impacts the storm water discharge from the site. An “adverse impact” is one that significantly increases the volume of storm water discharge from the site, decreases the water quality of the storm water discharge and redirects the storm water discharge in a manner that results in downstream storm water drainage impacts that would not have occurred with the original plan. Approvals for storm water plans approved prior to June 4, 2012 shall expire on January 1, 2016 for sites on which the planned work has not commenced. Approval of all storm water plans approved after June 4, 2012 shall expire seven years after the date of approval if the planned work has not commenced” was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Matthes stated this was a culmination of about two years worth of work and it was impressive to see the changes. He commented that not every participant received all of the changes requested and believed that was a sign of good public policy. He felt City staff had addressed the concern regarding redevelopment as this would make redevelopment easier while aligning with the City’s smart growth ethic and recommended approval of it.

Mr. Trapp explained he voted against several of the amendments, not because he felt they were unreasonable, but because he wondered if they would result in less storm water amelioration if passed. He pointed out this did not just involve small businesses and church developments as it had a larger environmental impact, and the City had a responsibility to improve water quality, specifically with regard the Hinkson Creek. He was happy this would
be an on-going process and would continue to be reviewed. He agreed there had been a need to revise the existing storm water ordinance as he was also concerned with the stifling of redevelopment in the central and the Business Loop areas. He felt they needed to look beyond the scope of this particular argument and ordinance by looking at the bigger picture, such as regional planning, mitigation, fees, etc. He was open to those conversations and how they could continue to improve the ordinance. He believed the proposed ordinance would make things better.

Mayor McDavid commented that he could not accept the proposed definition of site and did not agree with the solution of issues being taken care of in the storm water manual. He agreed they had come a long way, but believed they could do better. He believed churches and other developments would be fundamentally treated in a way that did not make sense by this proposed ordinance, and stated he would not support this iteration of this ordinance.

Mr. Kespohl stated he was also having difficulty with the definition of site and believed it would stifle the improving, renewing and restoring of redevelopment of areas like Business Loop 70. He thought the City should make it as easy as possible for the redevelopment of those sites. He stated he planned to vote against this proposed ordinance.

Mr. Dudley agreed with the comments of Mayor McDavid and Mr. Kespohl with regard to the definition of site and stated he would not be able to support the proposed ordinance either.

Ms. Hoppe noted the initial storm water ordinance had been a five year process and involved a more balanced and diverse group than the recent process, and had been a result of a lot of give and take. She believed staff had made changes to accommodate the problems expressed by the development community. She explained there were a lot of different needs involved and felt the proposed ordinance was balanced.

Ms. Anthony commented that she believed they needed to move forward as an ordinance people could rely on was needed. These issues had been negotiated for a long time. She agreed the ordinance was not perfect when enacted in 2007 and agreed it likely stifled some redevelopment. She understood the proposed changes had been negotiated by staff and the development community, and involved attorneys. She also understood staff felt they had gone as far as they could with regard to the negotiations. She felt the proposed storm water ordinance changes needed to be enacted tonight and planned to support it.

Mr. Trapp understood the stricter and slower development process would continue if the proposed ordinance was not passed tonight.

Mr. Matthes asked if Council would prefer to table this bill again. Ms. Anthony replied she preferred not to table it. Mayor McDavid noted a new ordinance could come back to Council in the future in another form. Ms. Hoppe pointed out it could come back in the same form as well.

The vote on B109-12, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: ANTHONY, HOPPE, TRAPP. VOTING NO: KESPohl, DUDLEY, MCDAVID. ABSENT: SCHMIDT. Bill declared defeated.
B123-12  Rezoning property located on the south side of Walnut Street, approximately 350 feet west of College Avenue (1208 and 1210 East Walnut Street) from R-3 to C-2 zoning.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Boeckmann stated the staff recommendation was for Council to amend the bill per the amendment sheet, which involved the development agreement, and to hold it over to give the public an opportunity to comment.

Ms. Anthony suggested this be remanded to the Planning and Zoning Commission as a development agreement was a substantial change. It had been the practice of Council to refer things back to the Planning and Zoning Commission when there was a substantial change between the time they voted on it and the time it came to Council. She stated she wanted to hear what the Planning and Zoning Commission had to say about the development agreement.

Mr. Dudley made a motion to amend B123-12 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Anthony made a motion to remand this issue to the Planning and Zoning Commission. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kespoahl.

Mayor McDavid stated he would vote against remanding this to the Planning and Zoning Commission due to the time sensitivity of the transit portion of the development agreement. FastCAT needed to start by August 15 or it would be dead, and staff currently only had a short period of time to accommodate it.

Ms. Hoppe asked for the earliest time the Planning and Zoning Commission could hear this issue. Mr. Teddy replied it depended on whether notice was required. Mr. Teddy noted the Commission met this week, but the agenda had been finalized and he did not believe the Commission had enough time to review it, so the earliest would be two weeks from this Thursday. Mr. Boeckmann stated he did not believe there were any notice requirements for this since the hearing had already been held.

Mayor McDavid asked if Council could receive the recommendation of the Commission within two weeks if they heard it Thursday. Mr. Teddy replied yes. Mr. Dudley noted the Council sometimes has less time to look at things.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend Ms. Anthony’s motion to require the Planning and Zoning Commission to hear the issue at their meeting on Thursday, June 7, 2012, if remanded.

Ms. Anthony replied she did not have a problem with the motion to amend her motion. She noted she only wanted to provide the neighbors an opportunity to participate in the process, which they could do at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting unless the time frame was too tight for them. Mayor McDavid noted they could participate at the Council level on June 18, 2012 as well.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid to amend Ms. Anthony’s motion by requiring the Planning and Zoning Commission to hear the issue at their meeting on Thursday, June 7, 2012, if remanded, was seconded by Mr. Dudley and approved unanimously by voice vote.
The motion made by Ms. Anthony, seconded by Mr. Kespohl and amended by Mayor McDavid to remand this issue to the Planning and Zoning Commission and for the Planning and Zoning Commission to hear the issue at its June 7, 2012 meeting was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Pat Fowler stated she was the President of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association Board and noted she wanted to file a protest with regard to the speed in which the Council was moving on this initiative because the Association wanted an opportunity to be heard. She understood the document was 96 pages with attachments and amendments. She explained when she had heard there was a development agreement in the offering on Wednesday, May 23, 2012, she contacted her City Council Representative, and had yet to hear back. She contacted the City Manager’s Office the following morning and was informed Mr. Matthes would be in a press conference, which would make his day busy, and when she did not hear back from him by Friday, May 25, 2012, she e-mailed Mayor McDavid, Mr. Matthes and Mr. Teddy requesting more information. Mayor McDavid called her back and indicated he was waiting to hear from staff on the contents of the agreement. On Saturday, May 26, 2012, Mr. Teddy provided her a brief outline of the agreement, which she shared with the Association Board. The next morning the building at College and Walnut burned down, and as a result, she expected confusion and a delay in responding given the magnitude of the fire, so they were patient. After hearing nothing, the Association wrote an open letter to the City on May 30, 2012, which she provided as a handout. The Association asked to be included in the conversation with City staff about the contents of the development agreement, so it not only protected the City and the City’s interest, but the neighborhood as well. She asked the Council to include the neighborhood in the discussions of what was in the development agreement, so they knew whether they were being adequately protected before this came for a substantive hearing. She did not believe this Thursday was an adequate amount of time for them to be prepared to go before the Planning and Zoning Commission as they still wanted a discussion with staff prior to then. She pointed out the neighborhood spent hours preparing for the May 10, 2012 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, and the verbatim transcript of that meeting went into great detail in terms of what the neighborhood needed. Since the members of the Association had a pre-existing interest in the area, they believed the City should advocate on their behalf as well as the applicants. She encouraged the Council to read the minutes as it outlined their concerns and noted she wanted the opportunity to have a conversation with City staff so they knew whether they were protected. Waiting to be heard at the June 18, 2012 Council Meeting was too late.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to table B123-12, as amended, to the June 18, 2012 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kespohl.

Ms. Hoppe asked if staff could meet with the Neighborhood Association between now and the June 7, 2012 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Mr. Teddy replied they could.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Mr. Kespohl to table B123-12, as amended, to the June 18, 2012 Council Meeting was approved unanimously by voice vote with only Ms. Anthony voting against it.
B128-12  Authorizing a facilities and services agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the use of Peace Park for the Fourth of July Celebration and Fireworks Display.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Hood provided a staff report.

B128-12 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SCHMIDT. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B131-12  Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Lutz, Daily & Brain, L.L.C. for a comprehensive municipal power plant condition assessment.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.
Ms. Hoppe asked if this duplicated the study done previously. Mr. Johnsen replied most of the studies previously done involved looking at what was needed to make the plant compliant with the environmental rules in terms of cost and equipment. This was would take an in-depth look into how much money needed to be invested in the equipment that was currently there to ensure planning for new equipment and existing equipment matched up. Ms. Hoppe stated $500,000 was a lot of money for a study. Mr. Johnsen agreed and explained it was very time consuming as they had to review a lot of equipment in the plant. He noted the study would be a very important tool in the decision making process in terms of whether to invest in the plant.

B131-12 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SCHMIDT. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

CONSENT AGENDA

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

B122-12  Voluntary annexation of property located on the north side of Smiley Lane, just west of Derby Ridge Drive (1325 Smiley Lane); establishing permanent C-P zoning; rezoning property located on the north side of Smiley Lane, between Saddlebrook Place and Derby Ridge Drive, from District A-1 to District C-P.

B124-12  Amending the permitted uses on property in District C-P located on the east side of North Old Highway 63 and north of McAlester Street (900 North Old Highway 63); approving a revised statement of intent; approving the C-P Plan of Columbia Car Care.

B125-12  Approving the Final Plat of Begley Subdivision – Plat 2; accepting the dedication of rights-of-way and easements; authorizing a performance contract; vacating portions of Vanwood Way and Rangeline Street; setting forth a condition for approval.

B126-12  Authorizing an Air Traffic Control Tower Memorandum of Agreement with the Federal Aviation Administration for the lease of land at the Columbia Regional Airport; authorizing an Operation Agreement for Airport Traffic
Control Tower with the Federal Aviation Administration for operations at the Columbia Regional Airport.

B127-12 Authorizing a right of use permit with College and Walnut, LLC for the construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of a private storm sewer in the Walnut Street and College Avenue rights-of-way.

B129-12 Accepting easements for sewer and temporary construction purposes for the extension of sewer service to the Thomas E. "Country" Atkins Jr. Memorial Park Baseball Complex.

B132-12 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.

B133-12 Amending the FY 2012 Annual Budget and Classification Plan to reclassify positions in the Public Works Department; amending the FY 2012 Annual Budget to delete positions from the Public Safety Joint Communications/Emergency Management and Police Departments; amending the FY 2012 Annual Budget to add a position to the Police Department; amending the Classification Plan to close a classification in the Public Safety Joint Communications/Emergency Management Department.

R80-12 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the west side of North Highway 763, south of East Boone Industrial Boulevard (4515 North Highway 763).

R81-12 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the east side of South Old Mill Creek Road, south of West Mill Creek Court (4700 South Old Mill Creek Road).

R82-12 Setting a public hearing: consider the Neighborhood Stabilization Program (NSP) Program Income Reuse Plan.

R83-12 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for Maternal Child Health Services.

R84-12 Authorizing a second amendment to the airline airport agreement with Delta Air Lines, Inc. for commercial air service at the Columbia Regional Airport.

R85-12 Transferring funds for sewer and stormwater capital improvement projects.

R86-12 Approving the Preliminary Plat of Gentry Estates Plat 1 located on the southeast corner of Nifong Boulevard and Bethel Street; setting forth a condition for approval.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SCHMIDT. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

NEW BUSINESS

None.

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

The following bills were introduced by the Mayor unless otherwise indicated, and all were given first reading.
B134-12 Approving the C-P Plan of Bright Start Academy East located south of the Bearfield Road and South Old Highway 63 roundabout.

B135-12 Approving the Gentry Estates PUD-17 Development Plan located on the east side of Bethel Street, south of Nifong Boulevard; allowing a reduction in the required perimeter setback.

B136-12 Approving the Final Plat of Advance Auto Parts – Plat 1, a Replat of Part of Lots 141 and 142, Lot 131 and Lot 132 of Guitar’s Subdivision and Park Addition, located on the south side of Business Loop 70 and on the north side of Austin Avenue; authorizing a performance contract; granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations regarding the dedication of street right-of-way.

B137-12 Approving the Final Plat of Shields Eastern Addition Plat 1-A located on the north side of Bass Avenue and east of Dorsey Street.

B138-12 Approving the Final Plat of Village at Wyndham Ridge, Plat No. 3 located at the southwest corner of Abbington Terrace and Abbington Court, east of South Scott Boulevard.

B139-12 Authorizing application for FY 2013 transit planning, operating and capital assistance grants.

B140-12 Accepting conveyances for utility and sewer purposes.

B141-12 Authorizing a power exchange agreement with Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission relating to Iatan Unit 2.

B142-12 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with the Gudrun D. Parmentier Revocable Living Trust for the acquisition of property located adjacent to Clyde Wilson Park; appropriating funds.

B143-12 Appropriating fire equipment sale proceed funds for the purchase of fire safety and communication equipment for the Fire Department.

B144-12 Accepting a donation from State Farm Company Grants through the New Century Fund for the purchase of child passenger safety seats as part of the Fire Department’s car seat fitting station outreach efforts; appropriating funds.

B145-12 Amending the FY 2012 Annual Budget, the FY 2012 Pay Plan and Classification Plan to add a marketing specialist position to the Public Works Department; appropriating funds.

B146-12 Authorizing a Transportation Contract (FastCAT Express Bus Transit Agreement) with Walnut II LLC and College and Walnut, LLC.

B147-12 Appropriating funds for the construction of the Short Street parking garage.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP88-12 Stephens Lake Park Walkways.

Mr. Hood provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe liked this proposal as it related to Jack Estes Way since it would solve two problems. Pedestrians coming from the west across Old Hwy 63 would not have to merge with traffic. In addition, pedestrians would be able to get from the west side of the parking lot to Stephens Lake. She asked if any trees would be removed or if the walkway would wind
through the trees. Mr. Hood replied they did not anticipate removing any trees. They would route the trail in order to avoid removing any trees.

**REP89-12 Parks and Recreation Commission Recommendation regarding Heibel-March Building at Field Park.**

Mr. Hood provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe suggested they move forward with the recommendation of seeking proposals. She understood this had not been on the agenda and was only discussed at the end of the Parks and Recreation Commission meeting, so the public did not have a chance to provide input. She also understood the Historic Preservation Commission wanted to review this and provide input. If they did not move forward with the recommendation of seeking proposals, she would suggest a public hearing at the Parks and Recreation Commission level. Mr. Hood thought they should formally request proposals and then evaluate the proposals to determine if anyone was capable of restoring the building at the level desired by the City. If it was determined no one was capable, the Council could then make a decision regarding the future of the building.

Mayor McDavid made a motion directing staff to proceed with a request for proposals regarding the use and restoration of the Heibel-March building. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe.

Mr. Dudley suggested they include a sunset. Mayor McDavid thought all request for proposals had sunsets. Mr. Hood explained staff would seek proposals and require an estimate as part of the proposal in terms of when the project would be completed. If a proposal was accepted, Council could add time frames and deadlines on the project. Mayor McDavid understood the Parks and Recreation Commission could be involved in the review and recommendation. Mr. Hood agreed and noted they could also include the Historic Preservation Commission.

Mr. Kespohl stated he did not believe this could be done by August 1, 2012 and wondered if the date could be extended. Mr. Hood explained the Commission wanted to establish a time frame by which the Council would take action on the building and had suggested August 1, 2012. He stated it would be difficult to have the proposals evaluated by then August 1, 2012, and suggested the deadline be September 1, 2012.

Mayor McDavid suggested the Council leave it open-ended and staff could determine the time frame. Mr. Kespohl stated he disagreed and recommended they set a time as this had been going on for over six years. He suggested a deadline of October 1, 2012.

Mr. Kespohl made a motion to amend the motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Ms. Hoppe to require a decision to be made by October 1, 2012 if they proceeded with a request for proposals regarding the use and restoration of the Heibel-March building. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dudley and approved unanimously by voice vote. The motion made by Mayor McDavid, seconded by Ms. Hoppe and amended by Mr. Kespohl directing staff to proceed with a request for proposals regarding the use and restoration of the Heibel-March building and for a decision to be made by October 1, 2012 was approved unanimously by voice vote.
REP90-12  Storm Drain Mural Project 2012.

Ms. Rhodes provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid commented that he thought this was an interesting, intriguing and creative idea.

Ms. Hoppe stated the artists involved were professionals.

Ms. Rhodes noted there was a broad representation of local artists, including a student, and seven total storm drains would be painted. She pointed out the sites had not been finalized, and staff would follow up with the artists once they were finalized.

REP91-12  Customer Service Survey Results – Police Department.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid commented that this showed there was a disconnect between those interacting with officers in the Police Department and the citizen survey results, as it showed a lower satisfaction than the national average and low employee engagement numbers as well. It was important from a peer standpoint to identify those who were affecting the reputation of the officers that were dedicated, so those officers could be mentored in terms of how to be a customer service representative. He felt this was positive and reassuring information.

REP92-12  Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, provided the Council a handout, and noted it had been provided by e-mail as well. He stated he did not believe a large pile of wood with brick veneer in the center of the City was a good idea. They were lucky that no one was in the building when the fire occurred at the Odle’s Brookside development at the corner of Walnut and College. The fire was so intense that it damaged buildings across a five lane State highway. He wondered what would have happened if there had been another large building on the south side of Walnut. He thought this was a time to learn and correct the situation before there was a loss of life. He did not believe most cities that had densely populated center cities had the same building codes standards for the center of the city as they did for the edge of the city, but Columbia did. He believed a development such as this was a threat to health and safety, and was beyond zoning and the lack of sufficiency of resources for infrastructure, and suggested halting reconstruction and offering to buy land recently purchased by the Odle’s in the Walnut area for future use by the City. This would provide time to develop appropriate zoning ordinances, building codes, a sufficiency of resource test, etc., and would address the health and safety issue in the center of the City.

Kathleen Weinschenk, 1504 Sylvan Lane, stated she loved to go to Stephens Lake Park as it was her favorite place to be, but noted that when she got out of her car, she had to get in the line of cars in the parking lot in order to get to the sidewalk, which she did not feel was safe for her or anyone else.
Ms. Hoppe asked Ms. Weinschenk if she parked in the handicapped accessible parking area in the front. Ms. Weinschenk replied yes. Ms. Hoppe understood there was no way to get directly to the sidewalk from the car. Ms. Weinschenk stated that was correct.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Rangeline, understood the Council did not attend the presentation at the Library last Thursday regarding the Enhanced Enterprise Zone, and felt someone should have attended. He believed the Mayor had a conflict of interest by serving as the Mayor and as a member of the Regional Economic Development Inc. (REDI) Board. He did not feel the City should pursue blight, and commented on the recent fires and a recent murder. He asked the Council to step away from any conflict of interest.

Justin Thomas, 202 W. Sexton Road, stated he wanted an update on the redevelopment of Providence Road between the Douglass Park, Hickman High School and the Housing Authority property with regard to the pedestrian bridge. He understood public forums had been held and were informative, but wanted to be kept informed and involved in the process. He noted a few simple things could be done to make the area more aesthetically pleasing and user friendly, such as a new pavilion.

Greg Ahrens, 1504 Sylvan Lane, commented that the Code of Ordinances included a section involving parade permits, and anyone wanting to have a parade had to have a permit with two exceptions. The United States Army and United States Navy were not required to obtain a permit if they wanted to have a parade. As a veteran of the United States Air Force, he felt this was discrimination against the Air Force, Marines and Coast Guard. He suggested removing the exemptions or allowing other military services to hold a parade without a permit. He assumed this was an antiquated ordinance.

Karl Skala, 5201 Gasconade Drive, stated he was a member of Citizens Involved in and Invested in Columbia (CIVIC), but was speaking as an individual. CIVIC wanted to establish a dialogue with the leadership in the community regarding the Enhanced Enterprise Zone. He noted Keep Columbia Free was also a member of CIVIC, and they were interested in bringing forward recall petitions as allowed for by the Charter and explained he thought that was a big mistake. He wanted to ensure everyone knew he did not believe this was appropriate based on an individual issue.

Mr. Dudley commented that he had been told a family could not get into the Fifth and Walnut garage because it was closed during the Memorial Day parade, and asked if it had been blocked off during the parade. Mr. Matthes stated he would research the issue and get back to Mr. Dudley.

Ms. Hoppe stated there was no connection or link to the adaptive management website from the City’s website, and asked if a link could be added. She noted the website was www.helpthehinkson.org.
Ms. Hoppe asked staff to work with her and Ms. Anthony in drafting an ordinance involving a charter amendment to limit eminent domain in the event the Enhanced Enterprise Zone Board proposed a map to the Council.

Ms. Hoppe asked staff to follow up on Mr. Ahrens concern regarding the parade permit ordinance to determine if the exemption was needed and if other exemptions needed to be added. Mr. Matthes stated staff would review it.

Mr. Kespoahl understood the back-in parking on Ash Street still existed and noted he thought that was being removed and asked for clarification.

Mr. Kespoahl asked if Council would be provided information regarding the Retreat early this week so they would have a chance to look at it in advance. Mr. Matthes replied they would.

Mr. Kespoahl asked for clarification regarding the relationship between natural gas, trash trucks and the bins, as all three had been proposed as part of one project. He wanted to know of the cost savings involved with just purchasing natural gas trucks to pick up trash as the City currently collected trash, and the cost of purchasing the trucks so the City could utilize bins.

Ms. Anthony suggested staff review the City's building code standards to determine if they should be different for the central area of the City and asked that Council be provided a report.

Ms. Anthony commented that she had been a guest at a Grassland Neighborhood Association meeting and noted she was impressed with City staff. She listed those that attended and were involved, and pointed out the citizens of Columbia were well served by City staff as they had conducted themselves in a professional manner.

Mr. Trapp commented that it was in everyone's interest to take care of the storm water problem, and noted he did not think it was fair for the City to require only those developing properties to address the issue. He hoped they moved forward in identifying funding for projects as a community in an effort to do more sooner than later.

Mayor McDavid noted one of the panels of Sky Algorithm at the Fifth and Walnut parking garage was still backwards.

Mayor McDavid commented that Mr. Blattel had saved the City approximately $450,000 in credit card fees. In addition, he and Mr. Kespoahl saved $5 million on other fees. Since Mr. Blattel worked at the Missouri Department of Revenue, he knew people were not reporting their correct address when buying a new car. He initiated a search and found there were people in Columbia who owed the City of Columbia $149,624.00. He stated Mr. Blattel was his favorite administrator as a result of this at this time.

The meeting adjourned at 10:05 p.m.
Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk