INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, September 17, 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 (arrived at 7:23 p.m.), SCHMIDT and TRAPP were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Mayor Pro Tem Hoppe explained Mayor McDavid was expected to join the meeting within the half hour.

The minutes of the regular meeting of September 4, 2012 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Anthony and a second by Mr. Dudley.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Kespohl made a motion to move R158-12 from consent agenda to new business. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anthony and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Kespohl made a motion to add R163-12 to new business. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anthony and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Pro Tem Hoppe noted the Historic Preservation Commission had asked for R160-12 to be removed from the agenda.

Mr. Dudley made a motion to remove R160-12 from the agenda. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anthony and approved unanimously by voice vote.

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

SPECIAL ITEMS

Photo Voice Project: Seeing Columbia Through the Eyes of Our Youth.

Angela Hirsch commented that she was the Community Services Director for Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA) and explained middle school aged youth across Columbia were offered the Photo Voice project for eight weeks this summer. Eight young people participated in the program, and four completed all eight weeks of the project. She thanked Sarah Klaassen and Evan Melkersman, community organizers for the Central Missouri Community Action, Gary Beahan, a volunteer photographer who shared his expertise with the young participants, and Darin Preis, Executive Director of CMCA, for his support. She noted the project was funded through a Community Services Block Grant received through the Department of Social Services that allowed CMCA to work within the community to identify causes and conditions of poverty, and was focused on seeing the community through the eyes of young people. The participants were provided a camera and a weekly topic, such as basic needs, life long learning opportunities, relationships, and rules.
and influences, both positive and negative, in their lives and in their community. The photographs were on display at City Hall for one month, and they invited everyone to see what these young people had to say through their photographs.

Will Araiza stated he was 13 years old and in the eighth grade at West Junior High School, and noted he liked having the opportunity to meet new people and see the world from a different perspective. He pointed out this project taught him to notice more things when out in the community.

Shawn Hayden explained he liked the Photo Voice project because it provided him and the other kids an opportunity to look at something in a different perspective, and because it allowed everyone to see the world through their eyes. He stated he learned how to look at things from a different perspective and noted he enjoyed hanging out with and learning from his teachers and classmates.

Ms. Hirsch thanked the City for its support and encouragement, and for giving them the opportunity to display the photos.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Upon receiving the majority vote of the Council, the following individuals were appointed to the following Boards and Commissions.

Mayor McDavid arrived at 7:23 p.m., during the appointments of the board and commission members.

BOARD OF ELECTRICAL EXAMINERS
Sapp, Karen, 6601 County Road 333, Callaway County, Term to expire August 1, 2015

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION CODES COMMISSION
Copeland, Melvin, 10950 North Route B, Boone County, Term to expire August 1, 2015
Sapp, Karen, 6601 County Road 333, Callaway County, Term to expire August 1, 2015

COLUMBIA VISION COMMISSION
Osborn, Amy, 10 East Leslie Lane, Ward 2, Term to expire December 15, 2013

CONVENTION AND VISITORS ADVISORY BOARD
Bell, Susan, 575 East Sexton, Boone County, Term to expire September 30, 2014
Jashnani, Leela, 900 Vandiver Drive (business address), Ward 6, Term to expire September 30, 2014
Kelly, Michael, 1231 East Bluebird Drive, Boone County, Term to expire September 30, 2014
Schultz, Thomas, 7100 Madison Creek Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2014
Trabue, Kimberly, 3530 South Old Ridge Road, Boone County, Term to expire September 30, 2014
Turner, Spencer, 5701 East Mexico Gravel Road, Ward 3, Term to expire September 30, 2014
Weise, Teri, 3007 South Rodeo Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire September 30, 2014

DISABILITIES COMMISSION
Luebbert, Marcie, 1515 East Walnut, Apt. 103, Ward 3, Term to expire June 15, 2015
PERSONNEL ADVISORY BOARD
Kinkade, Kevin, 4512 Royal Lytham, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2015
Slade, Leslie, 2107 Carol Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire September 30, 2015

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

Carol and Chuck Headley – Trash Bags.

Chuck Headley, 5009 Cullen Court, commented that he represented a group that was in favor of the current trash collection system, and noted they were in possession of a large number of signatures in favor of the present trash system at this time and could likely gather many more if they were to go door to door or if they stood in front of the post office. He asked those in support of the present trash system to stand, and approximately ten people stood. He explained they were disappointed in the decision to consider a pilot program when surveys and public opinion clearly did not want a change. He noted he represented citizens from all of the wards that showed their dislike for roll carts. Many departments had greater workman compensation claims than Solid Waste, and they believed this issue needed to be looked into further. He urged the Council to contact his group for further discussion, especially since there did not appear to be a clear consensus on the issue. He did not think the economic realities had been exposed in terms of cost savings and reiterated that there were many questions that still needed to be answered prior to moving forward. He stated they wanted the workers to be safe and would encourage anything that could be done to make this activity as safe as possible, but noted the City also needed to provide effective services that were easy for the citizens to use. He did not believe the objective was always to find the least cost technology, and thought they needed to consider technology that was preferred by consumers because consumers did not always select the cheapest way to satisfy their needs. He asked Council to not move forward with a change to the roll cart system for trash services.

Karen Burger, Principal of Lee Expressive Arts Elementary School, and Amy Sarver, President of Lee Elementary PTA - Thank You for Traffic Safety and Parking Improvements at Lee Elementary.

Karen Burger told a story of an automotive shop teacher who returned a call from a lady five minutes before class started. This lady explained she had been on a dark street when her car stopped, and two young men pulled up behind her and motioned for her to lift the hood of the car. In about two seconds, they had the car running. She thanked them and offered them money, but they would not take it. She explained they had told her to call their teacher to thank him for what he taught them, which was why she was contacting him. Ms. Burger explained teachers and the City did not always understand the impact they had on students, and she wanted the City to know the wonderful impact the recent improvements had on the students of Lee Elementary in terms of the flashing speed sign, the bulb out, etc.

Amy Sarver thanked the City on behalf of the PTA, the parents and the children, and a few children from Lee Elementary presented the Council and staff with a handmade thank you card.
Benjamin Ross - Columbia Fire Department's Community Emergency Response Team.

Ben Ross explained he was a volunteer on the Columbia Fire Department’s Community Emergency Response Team (CERT), and thanked the Council for its support of the Fire Department and the CERT program. They were excited about the recent grants the Fire Department had applied for and received to improve training and equipment. The CERT had 30 members representing a diverse cross section of Columbia’s residents in terms of ages and backgrounds, who were trained in disaster and preparedness, fire safety, basic first aid, life, search and rescue, triage, radio communications and how the incident command system worked. Some members volunteered at events, such as MU football games, the Roots N’ Blues Festival, the Fourth of July fireworks display and the Memorial Day Air Show. Following a major disaster when professional first responders were overwhelmed, CERT members were trained to shut off utilities to damaged buildings, treat life threatening injuries, provide first aid, rescue lightly trapped victims and put out small fires. They were a force multiplier for the professional first responders. He pointed out that in the current fiscal year, CERT members had volunteered over 2,400 hours, and the newest grant the Council approved at its September 4, 2012 meeting would allow more equipment to be purchased for the CERT team to train with and to deploy at events and during disaster response. On behalf of his fellow CERT members, he thanked the Council for its continued support of this program.

Representative of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association - Neighborhood Impacts on St. Joseph, Ash, Hubbell and North Village Residents Since the August 18 Opening of the Student Housing Complex at College and Walnut.

Adam Saunders, 214 St. Joseph Street, commented that he was speaking on behalf of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association (NCCNA) and the residents of St. Joseph, Ash, Hubbell and St. James streets. He explained fewer than 80 students had moved into the Brookside building between Ash and Walnut streets to date, and the total capacity of the buildings under construction was 724. Cars now lined all available spots and there was a regular shuffle of cars up and down the street. On Thursday, Friday and Saturday nights, there was a migration to and from bars, and the outcome was litter, vandalism, fights in the streets, property damage, vomit, footprints in the garden and yelling during all hours of the night. The development currently only had 11 percent occupancy, and by the fall of 2013, it would be at full capacity. He pointed out the responsibility fell on many. The students had the responsibility to act sensibly, the land owners needed to set norms for behavior and create safe conditions within the buildings, the police needed to enforce the law, the City’s traffic department needed to design parking and traffic flow that minimized the safety risks, the Council needed to set reasonable policies that guided development, and the neighbors had the responsibility to be proactive and constructive in finding solutions. He hoped all of the parties mentioned could meet in the future to solve these complex problems. He explained they had five recommendations and asked Council to consider these recommendations for the 2013 budget. They wanted Columbia police officers to create a presence that would reduce vandalism and unlawful behavior as people walked past their homes on the way to the apartments on bar nights. They believed the interested parties
traffic study meeting involving local property owners and stakeholders on October 4, 2012 needed to be facilitated with a holistic approach to seek solutions for St. Joseph Street and adjacent streets in the entire North Village area. He believed items such as one way streets, half street closures, residential parking passes and other ideas needed to be explored and discussed. This stakeholder process needed to be piloted for this situation, and then replicated in other neighborhoods surrounding the University with similar parking and traffic problems. Neighborhood groups, the City and the University needed to develop long term strategies to create a transportation system that reduced the total number of cars used in the downtown area. The FastCAT program was an attempt at this goal, but a holistic planning approach was needed to successfully respond to the annual turnover of many thousands of students. Currently, by observation and by surveying people that parked on the street, he understood close to 100 percent of these new students had cars. They either parked on the street, at the $60 per month Brookside parking lot, the Greek houses or at other University lots. Reducing the number of cars in the downtown area was a long term goal that needed funding now and in the future for sustained progress. An area of immediate need involved improvements to bike routes that would limit the number of cars on the routes, improvements to wayfinding signage so people knew the location of the routes, and bike safety education for safe commuting practices. They felt Council needed to adopt the 2010 H3 Charrette commissioned by the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council as the recommendations in the report were key in ensuring future developments were to scale, included walkability in the design process, were mixed-used, had a mixed demographic, and had the long lasting functionality in the downtown landscape. His concern was that college towns would be left with huge hastily built structures with questionable long term business feasibility. He believed the Charrette would create a process that led to a diversified long term development with stability to be feasible for generations. One of the outcomes of the Charrette was for a form based code to be applied to areas prime for development or redevelopment, and noted the NCCNA wanted to volunteer to be the first pilot district for form based codes. He explained the NCCNA also wanted to meet with Council and staff leadership to share their vision for the neighborhood. He asked Council to balance the desire for more tax revenue with the desire for stable, livable communities as adjacent neighbors and tenants were paying the price for the imbalance. He noted the developers, neighbors, the City Traffic Division, the City’s Planning Division, and the Council needed to work together to make development better in the future.

Mr. Kesphol asked Mr. Saunders if he knew the number of parking spaces in the lot the developer had created on Walnut. Mr. Saunders replied he did not know. Mr. Kesphol stated it appeared to be full when he drove by.

Ms. Anthony understood a traffic study meeting would be held on October 4. Mr. Saunders stated that was correct, and noted it would include area stakeholders. This was requested earlier in the summer, and he was glad it was moving forward, but felt a more holistic approach was needed. Ms. Anthony asked what time the meeting would be held. Mr. Saunders stated he did not recall the exact time.
PUBLIC HEARINGS

B205-12A Adopting the FY 2013 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
B206-12 Amending Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to building permit fees.
B208-12 Amending Chapter 11 of the City Code relating to Public Health and Human Services Department fees.
B209-12 Amending Chapter 17 of the City Code relating to Parks and Recreation fees.
B210-12 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code relating to parking fees for unmetered off-street facilities.
B211-12 Amending Chapters 13 and 22 of the City Code relating to sewage service utility rates.
B212-12 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code relating to the Solid Waste District boundary, services and fees.
B213-12 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code relating to service fees, security deposits and water service line fees.
B214-12 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code relating to electric rates.
B215-12 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code relating to water rates.
B207-12 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code relating to the Rental Unit Conservation Law including fee increases.
B251-12 Amending the Classification Plan; adopting the FY 2013 Pay Plan; providing for implementation of the Pay Plan.
B252-12 Adopting the City of Columbia, Missouri, Money Purchase Plan; authorizing the City Manager to execute the Plan; authorizing the Director of Finance to administer the Plan.
B253-12 Amending Chapter 18 of the City Code as it relates to Police and Fire Pension Plans.
B254-12 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to personnel policies, procedures, rules and regulations.

B205-12A, B206-12, B208-12, B209-12, B210-12, B211-12, B212-12, B213-12, B214-12 and B215-12 were given fourth reading by the Clerk, B207-12 was given third reading by the Clerk, and B251-12, 252-12, 253-12 and 254-12 were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor McDavid explained amendment sheets associated with B205-12A, B213-12 and B251-12 needed to be considered by Council.

Mr. Dudley made a motion to amend the budget by providing $3,000 for the Neighborhood Watch program from the Council reserve fund. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kespohl.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend the budget by phasing out the healthcare subsidy to retirees under age 65 over three years instead of two years. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anthony.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing for all of the bills associated with the budget.

Matt Colgin, 4805 Prestwick Court, stated he represented the Columbia Apartment Association, and commented that with regard to B207-12, the Association understood the rental fees needed to be increased so the City was able to cover its costs. They were not opposed the City covering its costs, but were opposed to the 114 percent increase in the fees without any increase in the life of the certificate. They hoped the Council would consider increasing the life of the certificate of compliance in the future.

Pat Fowler, 606 North Sixth Street, stated she appreciated the City Manager’s kind words with regard to the cooperation of City employees in terms of the pension plan, but she was concerned with the ability of the Council to keep its promises in light of the fact the
Council had acted to circumvent the agreement made previously on the healthcare subsidy issue. She understood there was not a planned increase in the storm water fee and that there might be a ballot initiative on the issue. She asked Council to include the historic neighborhoods in the discussion of the ballot in terms of what it would look like and how it would meet their needs. She commented that solid waste employees earned an average of about $11.00 per hour, and asked the Council to consider its meaning. Most people she knew that were making $11.00 per hour had a second and third job. If this was the most dangerous job in the City of Columbia, she felt they should be paid a wage that allowed them to get sufficient rest and to take care of themselves and their families so they could do their job safely. If it had the same incidents and injury rates as a firefighter or a fleet mechanic, she thought they should be paid a similar wage. At $11.00 per hour, their out of pocket costs likely prevented them from taking advantage of the City’s subsidized healthcare. She reiterated she believed solid waste employees should be paid a wage comparable to what the firefighters and fleet mechanics, who were in similarly dangerous jobs, earned.

Janice Hagan, 1107 Sunset Lane, stated she was a retired City employee who had been given the opportunity to serve Columbia for over 29 years, and was now privileged to be an active City volunteer for the past 10 years. While she appreciated the amendment to spread out the elimination of the retiree health insurance subsidy over a two year period and now a possibly three year period, she encouraged the Council to consider spreading the elimination of the subsidy over a four year period. Most of the 2013 budget reductions regarding active employee benefits were to be implemented only with future employees. She felt it was unfortunate the elimination of this subsidy was not directed toward only future retirees, who would be adequately informed and could make appropriate choices. She pointed out present retirees had made healthcare decisions based on the cost and coverage of the existing plan. A 25 percent reduction of the retiree health insurance subsidy over a four year period would reduce the financial burden on the existing retirees, and in four years many of these retirees would be Medicare eligible.

Don Stamper, 2604 North Stadium Boulevard, stated he was a registered lobbyist in the State of Missouri and was speaking on behalf of the Columbia Home Builders Association and its President, Phil Clithero. He understood Mr. Clithero had communicated with the Council earlier today. He explained they were concerned with the proposed fee increases and the cost of home construction in the community. They were unsure whether Council understood the impact the increase would have on affordable housing and the ability to remain competitive in comparison to other communities. They urged the Council to look more carefully at the history of these increases and the impact they had on affordable housing. While the proposed increase to the base permit fee of $127.22 up to $500.00 for a residential building was not excessive, it was only one part of the cost of permitting a house for construction. There were significant fees in eight other areas, and those included electrical, mechanical, plumbing, development, storm water, sewer utility, water connection and water meter, for a total of nine different charges. A study completed by the Central Missouri Development Council had indicated these types of charges had increase an average of 34 percent per year resulting in a total building permit charge averaging $4,297.70 for a 2,000 square foot house. Total charges had increased by 77 percent for the period of 2006
to 2010, and the cost for a permit for a house had more than tripled in the past five years. Prior to the creation of the Community Development Department, many of the charges and services were based in the Public Works Department, and the base building permit fee had not increased for many years while other areas were increased and implemented through a phased-in process. The Association and others had participated in those discussions, and had fundamentally agreed to the phased-in approach in an effort to equalize the impact of new housing. He thought it could be argued that a change in structure had created an artificial need for an increase in fees in the Community Development Department. He commented that commercial building permit fees were their largest concern as the proposed increases ranged from +18 percent to +61 percent or an average of 32.4 percent. These rates put Columbia at a significant disadvantage compared to competing communities. They recommended future increases being tied to a cost of living increase, a comparison of other increases in City fees or another formula based on inflation. He pointed out these increases would be passed on to the consumer and wanted to ensure the Council understood this.

Leroy Sharp, 3103 Timberhill Trail, pointed out there were three homes on Timberhill Trail, and they currently took their trash to the corner, which was about 400 feet away, so the 60,000 pound trash truck did not have to come up their street and tear up the road. As a result, he did not think the trash bins would work as well. He explained he had called the Solid Waste Division and understood the use of the blue bags for recycling would continue. He had asked them to explain how the entire system would work, and they could not. He asked the Council to continue the present system for trash collection.

Stanley Diaz stated he was the owner of Diaz Rental Properties and noted they had properties all over Columbia. They primarily had low to moderate income tenants, and pointed out tenants were already having problems paying their rent and utility bills. He and others were concerned with the proposed inspection fee increases without another concession, as it would eventually force them to raise rents. They agreed if the city was losing money on inspections, something should be done, but felt it should be a give and take situation so landlords did not have to continue raising the rent on tenants. He pointed out there had recently been a tax increase, and there was now talk of tenant occupancy requirements. He noted these were difficult times and people’s incomes had not increased.

Kevin Ahlbrand stated he was the President of the Missouri Fraternal Order of Police and explained he was against the reclassification of the rank of captain to unclassified or at-will employees. If this was done, he believed it would foster “group think” which was detrimental to organizations. It would lead to poor choices, complacency and a lack of innovation. He noted civil service protections had been put in place to protect police officers from politics and to remove politics from policing. He understood Chief Burton had been quoted as saying this was not unusual in agencies, but he disagreed as he knew of no other police agency of a comparable size in the State of Missouri where the rank of captain was listed at-will. He commented that great leaders earned respect and loyalty, and did not dictate it. Columbia was a very progressive city, and implementation of this would be a huge step backwards for the City. He believed it would be detrimental to the command staff, the officers and the citizens of Columbia.
Janet Hammen, 1844 Cliff Drive, commented that she had resided in the East Campus neighborhood for 35 years and was the current President of the East Campus Neighborhood Association. She encouraged the Council to increase the fee for the inspection process. She believed these fees needed to cover the cost of inspections and did not think they had in the past. She also urged the Council to not increase the length of time for certificates of compliance. Three years and six years were a long time between inspections for certain properties. She did not believe it would benefit the quality of their neighborhood or the City to increase the length of time of the certificates of compliance. She asked the Council to keep the three year inspection rate and to consider a shorter period for aged properties.

Karl Skala, 5201 Gasconade Drive, thanked the City Manager and Council, assuming they voted favorably, for the rise in development fees, which he believed needed to cover the cost of service associated with new development. He assumed the increase in fees, based on the valuation of the property, was not the same thing as the development charge that was voted on in 2005. He noted he had been a member of the Infrastructure Task Force and they had struggled with these issues for some period of time prior to coming up with a majority report and minority report, which differed in the details associated with how to fund some items. They had not been able to address anything other than road infrastructure, which was important, but he felt they needed to address hard and soft infrastructure as well. A recommendation of the minority report was to fund road maintenance with transportation sales tax funds, which the City Manager had addressed. Another recommendation of the minority report was the utilization of a trip generation module based on the kind of traffic the project generated instead of valuation or square footage of a property. He thought it could be revenue neutral or as aggressive as Council wanted in terms of capturing hard and soft infrastructure costs.

There being no further comment, Mayor McDavid closed the public hearing for all of the bills associated with the budget.

Mayor McDavid understood B205-12A, which dealt with the budget, had an amendment sheet dealing with CNG land acquisition.

Mr. Matthes explained the amendment sheet would allow the City to fund the purchase of land for the CNG facility, if the preferred location was not acceptable.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend the budget per the amendment sheet, which involved funds for land acquisition for the CNG facility. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schmidt and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Anthony asked for an explanation as to the need for funding the neighborhood watch program. Mr. Kesphol replied he attended a neighborhood watch meeting last Wednesday and learned the program was unfunded. It had been funded in the past, but was no longer funded. He thought if they expected citizens to participate in neighborhood watch programs and to assist the Police Department, the City needed to help fund the program. He had asked for the budget requirements and understood they thought they could get by with less than $3,000, but he thought they should provide $3,000 in funding. Ms. Anthony asked if the money would be used primarily to hold training programs. Mr. Kesphol replied it would fund the training, signs and advertising costs.
The motion made by Mr. Dudley and seconded by Mr. Kespohl to amend the budget by providing $3,000 for the Neighborhood Watch program from the Council reserve fund was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor McDavid understood the Council amended the budget at its last meeting with regard to the retiree subsidy to allow 50 percent of the subsidy in FY 2013, and to eliminate it in the following budget year. He understood Ms. Hoppe had proposed to phase out the subsidy over three years and asked for the financial impact of the change. Mr. Blattel replied it would be about $160,000. Mr. Matthes stated they would have three $160,000 years versus two $215,000 years. Mr. Kespohl understood adding 50 percent back into the budget was an expense of $107,000. Mr. Blattel pointed out that was within the general fund. Mr. Matthes explained the savings was spread across the entire budget and that impact was only on the general fund. Mayor McDavid asked for the budget impact of the proposed amendment for this year. Ms. Hoppe replied she thought it would be about $55,000. Mr. Matthes explained it would increase the gap by about $40,000 this year and the subsidy would be kept one year longer. Mayor McDavid asked how much the impact would be next year. Mr. Blattel replied it would be roughly $200,000.

Mr. Schmidt stated he had voted for the 50 percent at the last meeting with the thought the City had no idea what healthcare costs would be next year. He understood the proposed amendment would be the difference between one-third and one half, which was one-sixth.

Mayor McDavid asked staff to provide an explanation regarding the agreement or expectation of employees in terms of the post-retirement health care subsidy. Mr. Matthes replied a Council budget decision had been made in 2007 to create the subsidy in response to a GASB change in how cities accounted for post employment benefits, and Council decided to phase out the subsidy at a steady level over five years so it would end in 2012.

Mayor McDavid understood the initial recommendation of staff was to eliminate the subsidy at the end of five years, which was now. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Ms. Hoppe commented that she did not believe this had been clearly communicated to employees. Mr. Matthes agreed the communication had been confusing. Mr. Schmidt stated that was the reason Council agreed to add 50 percent of the subsidy back into the budget. He explained they had an obligation to the taxpayer to close the budget and the 50 percent was middle ground.

Mr. Matthes understood the amendment would shrink the total of $431,000 by one-third next year and one-third the year after, so there was zero subsidy in the third year. Ms. Hoppe stated it would spread the total reduction over three years instead of two years. Mayor McDavid understood these retirees would be provided two-thirds of the subsidy this next fiscal year, one-third during the second year and none the third year. He asked if that was correct or if Ms. Hoppe meant to provide 75 percent of the subsidy this year, 50 percent in the second year, 25 percent in the third year and zero in the fourth year. Ms. Hoppe stated she preferred the option, which involved 75 percent this year, 50 percent in the second year, 25 percent in the third year and a zero subsidy in the fourth year. Mayor McDavid asked for the cost of that proposal. Mr. Matthes replied about $300,000 this year, $200,000 next year and $100,000 the following year. Ms. Hoppe pointed out most of the retirees would be
eligible for social security after four years, so she felt this was reasonable given the limited income of retirees and the lack of clear communication by the City and others.

Ms. Anthony stated she believed there had been miscommunication and the retirees had based their healthcare choices on that miscommunication. She felt the City had an obligation to make this right, so she was supporting of Ms. Hoppe’s proposal.

Mayor McDavid commented that he would vote against the proposed amendment. He explained they were dealing with a general fund that was not growing at the same pace as the population times the rate of inflation and median incomes were down. The addition of $300,000 in post retirement health benefits for retirees would be paid for by current employees because that money would not be available for them or for City services. He pointed out in the private sector there was no post retirement healthcare. COBRA could be purchased by an individual for eighteen months. He also noted a decision to extend the subsidy for which there was no contractual obligation was equivalent to two police officers and two firefighters, and on that basis he would vote against the proposed amendment.

Mr. Trapp explained he had offered the original amendment because he had shared concerns with regard to communication with the retirees, but he was uncomfortable with adding further budget holes that Mr. Matthes would need to close. They had some leeway because Mr. Kespoohl had identified budgetary savings through refinancing some bonds, but they still needed to close the deficit spending. He noted he would oppose the proposed amendment.

Mr. Kespoohl stated he had read the 2007 budget document and it appeared the intent of the document was to closeout the subsidy by 2012. It might not have been relayed to employees, but it was in the budget document. He believed the understanding amongst Council was that it would end in 2012.

Mr. Schmidt believed the subsidy was always intended to be phased out in 2012 although it might not have been communicated very well. He explained they had already taken a step to express their sadness with respect to the misunderstanding, but felt they also had an obligation to the taxpayer to balance the budget. He commented that they had offered to maintain half of the subsidy for one year, but did not believe they could extend it over three years as they did not have money in the general fund to make up for it.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Ms. Anthony to amend the budget by phasing out the healthcare subsidy to retirees under age 65 over three years instead of two years was defeated by voice vote with only Ms. Hoppe and Ms. Anthony voting in favor of it.

Chris Egbert, 2308 Deer Creek Court, commented that he retired as a police captain in 1993 at which time he was appointed the director of a regulatory agency in state government that oversaw the licensing and training of state, county and municipal police officers. He thought the City should reconsider making the position of police captain an unclassified position. He explained he had been a seventeen year veteran before he was promoted to captain, and if the captain position had been unclassified, he would not have taken the promotion since he was only three years away from retirement. It would have been too great of a risk. He felt less people would disagree with higher ups even if a particular decision was not in the best interest of the citizens because they were more concerned about
job security and paying their bills. He pointed out the City already had a process for terminating or demoting an employee and felt that process should be followed for police captains. He did not believe termination should be based on contempt of the supervisor. He felt leadership should promote an environment that welcomed positive interaction and that leaders should surround themselves with people smarter than themselves. He asked the Council to reconsider making the captain position an unclassified position.

Mr. Kespohl asked Mr. Egbert for an explanation of the process he had referenced. Mr. Egbert replied there was a complete personnel process with hearings and other many steps that needed to be followed to terminate or demote an employee. It was based on cause, and not just that the person’s services were no longer needed. Mr. Kespohl asked if that was for any police officer or just command staff. Mr. Egbert replied it was for any police officer or City employee.

John Clark, 403 North Ninth Street, stated he was generally supportive of this budget process. The strategy of focusing on a reduction of the burden on the general fund was a good idea. In addition, the move to internalize costs was positive as these subsidies should be paid by the consumer and not the public. He suggested doubling or tripling the property tax rate to help fund the general fund as he believed it was too low, and to reduce sales tax rates to offset that increase.

Ms. Anthony noted the amendments made at the last meeting were not reflected in the documents provided, so she was confused. Mr. Blattel pointed out they had been incorporated into the budget. Mr. Matthes stated they were decided at the last meeting so they were included in the budget. Mr. Schmidt thought it would be helpful to be provided the amendments from the previous meeting next year.

The vote on B205-12A, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B213-12 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anthony and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor McDavid understood the City Manager was recommending the reclassification of police captains. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct and explained this was a direct result of the consultant’s report involving the Police Department. He read the recommendation of the report and stated he agreed with the recommendation. He noted this was fairly common in Missouri and throughout the United States in law enforcement. He thought it was a tool that would help improve on the recommendation of the consultant.

Mr. Schmidt understood this was a personnel matter that needed an ordinance change and asked for clarification. Mr. Boeckmann replied it was proper for the Council to vote on this issue. It would be improper for them to tell the City Manager to fire or hire a particular captain.

Ms. Anthony stated she was not comfortable with the change and felt captains should be somewhat protected and be allowed due process. She did not understand why the City could not use the existing process if a police captain needed to be terminated or demoted.
She agreed it would discourage senior talented police officers from becoming captains due to the lack of security.

Mayor McDavid asked if there would still be due process for a captain who was an at-will employee. Mr. Boeckmann replied there was some due process under state statute, but it was minimal. The Police Chief would have to meet with the employee and explain why the person was being discharged. The employee had the opportunity to rebut, but was not entitled to a hearing or other items they were entitled to currently.

Ms. Anthony commented that although the Council had faith in Chief Burton, they might not have faith in a future police chief, so she did not agree with this policy change.

Mr. Schmidt asked if this would allow the Police Department to implement this change or if this would cause the Police Department to implement the change. Mr. Boeckmann replied this would implement the change. Mr. Schmidt understood a new ordinance would need to be passed in order to reverse the decision in the future, if they approved the change at this time. He commented that he was inclined to go with the staff recommendation and the consultant’s report.

Mayor McDavid stated he would support the City Manager in this decision. He explained he came from a culture of hierarchical organizations and was not accustomed to organizations in which the boss had no authority over the subordinates. The City Manager worked for the Council and the Police Chief worked for the City Manager, and it made sense for the captains to be responsible to the Police Chief.

Mr. Dudley agreed and noted everyone in the private sector was considered at-will employees.

Ms. Hoppe understood this could open the doors to similar changes in the Fire Department and other areas of City government. She noted she wanted to support the report of the consultant and Chief Burton, but it was not clear as to why changes could not occur within the present system. She asked if Council could have a closed meeting regarding the issue so they could make a better decision. Mr. Matthes explained the current system had helped to create the atmosphere of toxicity, which was identified in the report, and this would solve that problem. He asked if the Council could hold a closed session on the subject. Mr. Boeckmann replied it depended upon what they wanted to discuss. If they wanted to discuss individual police captains in terms of the current situation or the recent past, they might be able to hold a closed meeting, but they would be close to getting involved in personnel matters.

Mr. Kespohl read a portion of B254-12, which listed the offices and positions that were currently unclassified. He understood there were already several unclassified department heads and deputies, so they were not setting a precedent.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend B251-12 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved by voice vote with only Ms. Anthony and Ms. Hoppe voting against it.

B251-12, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:

VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: ANTHONY, HOPPE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:
Mr. Dudley made a motion to amend B206-12 by phasing in the increase to building permit fees over two years. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kespohl.

Ms. Hoppe asked what that meant financially. Mayor McDavid asked staff to show the fees in comparison to benchmark cities. He understood the proposal was to change it from $302.00 for a 2,000 square foot house to $685.00 for a 2,000 square foot house, and the amendment would increase it by half. Mr. Blattel explained that cost would be $217,000. Mayor McDavid understood it would cost the general fund $217,000. Mr. Blattel replied it would increase the gap or decrease general revenue by $217,000. Mayor McDavid understood that was equivalent to three police officers and three fire fighters. Mr. Schmidt agreed and noted they had not agreed to expand the healthcare subsidy either.

The motion made by Mr. Dudley and seconded by Mr. Kespohl to amend B206-12 by phasing in the increase to building permit fees over two years was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Dudley and Mr. Kespohl voting in favor of it.

B206-12 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDATAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B208-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDATAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Kespohl explained the budget included the percentage goals in terms of cost recovery for fees by the Parks and Recreation Department, and noted the target goals were not being met even with the changes in B209-12.

Mr. Schmidt commented that the City was only recovering 75 percent of the building fees. Mr. Kespohl understood, but noted these were goals set by the department.

Mayor McDavid thought Mr. Kespohl's point was well taken as he believed they should recover 100 percent of the costs associated with golf.

Mr. Kespohl stated he was not opposed to the target goals, but felt they needed to meet those goals next year. Mayor McDavid agreed.

Mr. Trapp understood the Parks and Recreation Department did not want to hit people with large increases during the down economy.

Mr. Schmidt commented that there were also public health arguments for encouraging certain types of behavior. He asked if this was coming out of the general fund or some other fund. Mr. Blattel replied it was a general fund subsidy.

Ms. Hoppe stated there were some public safety benefits of young people having the opportunity to be involved in constructive activities. Mr. Kespohl agreed, and thought they might want to reduce the goals. Mayor McDavid stated they could reduce the goal, but they still had to pay salaries.

The vote on B209-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDATAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:
The vote on B210-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B211-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B212-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B213-12, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B214-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B215-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B207-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Kespohl asked what GUST stood for on the first page of the Money Purchase Plan associated with B252-12. He noted all of the other acronyms were explained except for that one. Mr. Blattel replied it was an IRS regulation, but he did not know exactly what the acronym stood for. Mr. Matthes stated staff would research it and get back to Council. Mr. Kespohl asked if this was retroactive back to January 1, 2012. Mr. Blattel replied it was for the plan year beginning January 2012, but it was effective on October 1, 2012. He explained all of the money purchase plans were categorized based on the calendar year of the plan, but it was not retroactively effective for January 2012.

B252-12 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B253-12 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:
B254-12 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: ANTHONY, HOPPE.

Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

**Item A was read by the Clerk.**

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Schmidt understood the speed humps cost $2,500 each. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Trapp understood Mr. Glascock had indicated the sidewalks would be no closer to the houses and asked how they would go from three foot sidewalks to five foot sidewalks. Mr. Glascock replied they could do it due to the grass strip that currently existed. The sidewalks would be at the curb line and the street would be twenty feet wide. Mr. Schmidt stated he felt that would be appropriate once the traffic calming was completed.

Mr. Kespohl asked for the total cost of the project. Mr. Glascock replied about $400,000. Mr. Kespohl understood that included the street, curb, gutter, storm water, sewer, etc. Mr. Glascock pointed out it was not to the City’s street standards and only one side of the street would have curb and gutter. He noted the sidewalk would be a standard width. Mr. Kespohl understood the street was not a full street width. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Ms. Hoppe asked if easements already existed for the sewer. Mr. Glascock replied there were no easements for the private common collector. Ms. Hoppe understood the tie in from Sunset Lane would be on property on Broadway. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct and reiterated it was without an easement. Ms. Hoppe understood some were concerned with the sewer line being at the property lines due to the trees in those locations, and asked what could be done to minimize tree loss. Mr. Glascock replied they would try to bore the line in between the manholes, but each lateral had to have a tie in, so they would have to dig a pit at each lateral. They would try not to open cut the main line.

Mr. Schmidt understood each property owner could decide where they would connect to this. Mr. Glascock stated that was true to some extent and noted they would try to accommodate the property owner.

Mr. Dudley asked how many trees would be lost due to the sidewalk. Mr. Glascock replied five trees.

Mr. Schmidt assumed it was not good to for a tree to be within five feet of the street. Mr. Glascock stated it tended to cause problems. He pointed out half of the cost of this type of project had been tax billed to the property owner in the past, but they no longer did this.

Mr. Dudley asked if there was a contingency whereby staff could replace or provide replacement trees for the five trees to be affected by the sidewalk. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it could be part of the acquisition of the easement. He pointed out there was no way to purchase as large of a tree, but there could be some compensation. Mr. Dudley thought it would be helpful if some of the trees could be replaced.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.
Jim McGowin, 1121 Sunset Lane, commented that he had lived in this location for 27 years and there was not much grass growing in between the street and the existing sidewalk, so he was unsure as to how a five foot sidewalk would be installed without getting into the front yard of their properties. Mr. Glascock explained staff plotted the line on a map. The street was 20-22 feet, and the City would make it a constant twenty feet and the current edges of the sidewalk would remain in the same location they were now. Mr. McGowin asked if the sidewalk needed to be five feet and suggested it be three feet with passing points every 200 feet. He wanted something more in line with a 1940’s subdivision. Mr. Glascock replied Council would have to make that decision. Ms. Anthony asked if there was an ADA problem if it was smaller than five feet. Mr. Glascock replied the five foot was the City standard, and was not an ADA requirement. Mr. Matthes pointed out the five foot was informed by ADA requirements. Ms. Anthony understood the Council had the ability to change the width of the sidewalk without incurring any kind of ADA issue. Mr. Schmidt stated he was surprised the FHWA allowed this. Mr. Glascock explained the Council adopted the five foot standard in 2005 or 2006.

Mr. McGowin commented that most of the property owners wanted the sewer and street improvements, but they did not want the five foot sidewalks. He explained he was concerned with the storm drain between his house and the property next door to him because it would be the biggest, deepest ditch that would be dug since his property would house the collector for storm water. He stated his home was built in 1939 and had red brick basement block and anchors that went all of the way to the property line, and he was unsure as to how any contractor that bid the job could say it would not hurt the structural foundation of his home. He also wondered how any contractor could bid on the project without knowing what was involved. Mr. Glascock explained this was a public hearing, and after approval was received to proceed with the project, staff would acquire easements for all phases of the project, and at that point, staff would talk to the property owners about anchors, etc. to ensure the contractor was aware of them. He noted it would be in the form of a disclosure.

Mr. Glascock commented that they currently had a four foot sidewalk, so they could keep it at four feet if Council wanted. Mr. Kespohl understood there was a space between the curb and the street. Mr. Glascock stated there would not be space between the curb and street with the installation of the sidewalk.

Brown Bass, 1113 Sunset Lane, explained the sewer currently went between his house and the neighbor’s house to the east and toward the back of the property, so he believed all of his trees would have to be removed. He commented that if the City checked its early 1990’s records, they would find the street was screwed up. It had been designed to be low in the center since it was on a hillside, but that was not how it was constructed, so water ended up in the basements of the homes on the north side of the street instead of the center of the road. He noted his basement was almost useless and believed others had the same problem. He stated he did not believe there was a need for the five foot sidewalk as three feet was wide enough, and felt the installation of a five foot sidewalk would be a waste of money. He pointed out that when the street was lowered on his side of the street in the 1990’s, he had to replace the sidewalk on his side of the street to the house, and commented that if the contractor could not construct this project properly, the project should not be done.
as his house could not handle more rain. In addition, he understood the street would be constructed with a high center again. He did not believe it was fair for their homes to be washed away.

Mary Achor, 1007 Sunset Lane, stated she appreciated the fact they were getting a new sewer as her sewer backed up into her basement regularly and fecal matter in the basement was a problem. She noted she was also appreciative because she could not afford to pay for the work herself. She hoped something could be done to save her neighbors’ trees and to not take away her neighbors’ front yards. Anything the City could do to help them would be greatly appreciated.

Susan McGowin, 1121 Sunset Lane, explained she currently did not have a sidewalk in front of her house, so she was concerned with how far the City would go into her front yard to install a sidewalk. She also did not feel five foot sidewalks were needed. She commented that she had walked up and down the street for 27 years with a dog and without any problems. She stated there would be one block with five foot sidewalks and the rest of the area would not have any sidewalks.

Ms. Hoppe understood Ms. McGowin was on the corner and asked for the footage of her front yard. Ms. McGowin stated she was on the corner, and would therefore have a sidewalk on both sides of her yard. She noted there was 18 feet from her porch to the street.

Julie Barry, 1009 Sunset Lane, stated she very much appreciated the project and the dedication of the engineering staff as they had done a fantastic job of communicating with the neighbors, even though all of the neighbors were not in agreement.

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

Mr. Schmidt commented that he and others had fought for years for street standards, and pointed out no additional space would be taken from any property owner because the City was standardizing the width of the street. In addition, he did not believe one foot was a big deal. He stated the standards were for people with disabilities and for those that biked and walked, and noted the City was doing a lot of work on the street.

Ms. Hoppe stated she had served on the Street Design Standards Committee and explained the design standards were for new areas and new streets. They had discussed retrofitting existing streets, and the fact the new standards would have to work with the configuration of older streets in order for it to be applied. She understood the neighbors had concerns, but noted they were also appreciative of the sewer and street improvements so they would no longer flood. She commented that she had discussed this with staff and was pleased to know their yards would not be taken for the five foot sidewalk. She noted she would be fine with a four foot sidewalk as well. She stated she had been impressed with staff as they had tried to address the specific problems of the neighbors.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to install four foot sidewalks instead of five foot sidewalks when proceeding with this project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dudley.

Mr. Glascock commented that a four foot sidewalk would not save any trees and would not be detrimental to the project.

Mr. Trapp stated he was a big proponent of sidewalks and noted it was his main campaign issue. He believed sidewalks improved neighborhood life and generated spaces where people could communicate, and this already existed on Sunset Lane. In addition, he
believed four foot sidewalks were sufficient to meet the neighborhood needs in moving up and down the street. It would acknowledge the character of Sunset Lane and the needs of the people that lived there. He liked the fact this was a comprehensive project and thought they should move forward with the traffic calming in anticipation of needs and to be able to fix the problem while it was cheap. He reiterated he believed changing the sidewalks from five foot to four foot would be nicer aesthetically and would still meet the transportation needs of the people in the neighborhood.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Mr. Dudley directing staff to install four foot sidewalks instead of five foot sidewalks when proceeding with this project was approved by voice vote with only Mr. Schmidt voting against it.

Mayor McDavid asked if traffic calming was embedded in this project. Mr. Glascock suggested Council make a motion to proceed with the traffic calming.

Mr. Dudley made a motion directing staff to proceed with traffic calming. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Dudley made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans, specifications and the construction of PCCE # 19 Sunset Lane sewer improvement project. The motion was seconded by Ms. Hoppe and approved unanimously by voice vote.

(B) Construction of improvements at the Columbia Regional Airport to include a large passenger holding area, relocation of the baggage claims area, providing for a controlled access system to the ramp, and constructing an overflow parking lot with lighting on the west side of Airport Drive.

Item B was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked if a modular building was also known as a double wide. Mr. Glascock replied they were temporary structures.

Mr. Kespohl asked how many cars the new parking lot would hold. Mr. Glascock replied they hoped it would accommodate about 150 cars.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Rob Nix, 1503 Stone Street, explained his comments were not geared toward the temporary improvements to the airport, but rather the fact that the ultimate goal was to have a new $20 million terminal as he believed the goal was too lofty. He understood proponents had indicted the terminal’s lack of capacity was a crisis, and that it was bursting at the seams. He also understood a veterinary medicine company was looking at Columbia as a location to open a factory, but had gone to Ames, Iowa instead due to the airport. He commented that the airport was currently serving close to an all time low in terms of the number of passengers. There had been only 9,090 passengers in 2009, and there were currently only two flights per day. He understood it would soon increase to 2.3 flights per day. He felt the historic terminal was handsome and in excellent condition, and was built to handle a much higher volume than it had handled in recent years. In 1978, the passenger volume totaled over 66,000, mostly on DC9 jets with a capacity of over 100 passengers. In 1988, the terminal served three scheduled airlines with 22 daily arrivals and departures. This produced a yearly passenger volume of over 50,000. He agreed the facility could use a few updates and believed new security requirements and restroom deficiencies needed to be
addressed. He commented that plans on file from 1977 showed reasonable expansion possibilities that would fit well with current and future needs, and would cost a lot less than $20 million to build. The terminal concept design report of 2011 showed a design plan estimated at $4 million that addressed current and future needs without major disruption to the facility's use. He believed it was time to slow down and proceed with rational citizen planning.

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

Mayor McDavid commented that he believed things were different than they were in 1978. Mr. Glascock agreed and explained most of the planes that landed at the airport then were 19 seat prop planes, although there were also DC9 planes. In addition, the TSA was now in the middle of the lobby and they did not exist back then. He noted they were able to handle more traffic in the past due to those reasons. Currently 50 seat jets were landing at the airport, and in November, 138 seat airbus planes would be landing at the airport. He commented that while they did hit an all time low of 9,000, they were currently at about 36,000 passengers, and the holding area was not very large, so improvements were needed on a permanent basis.

Mr. Kespohl made a motion directing staff to proceed with the described airport improvements. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dudley and approved unanimously by voice vote.

R161-12 Authorizing the City Manager to apply to the Missouri Department of Transportation for Safe Routes to School and Transportation Enhancement funds under the SAFETEA-LU Act of 2005.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Schmidt understood an application already existed for the Garth Avenue Sidewalk and Median/Crosswalk project. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct and explained it had previously been a more extensive and costlier improvement. Mr. Schmidt understood there were some remaining GetAbout funds, and those could be used as the match. Mr. Teddy replied those funds could not be used as a match because federal funds could not be used to match federal funds.

Mr. Schmidt understood this was for 2005 money. Mr. Teddy explained this was money that had been carried forward and the two programs no longer existed in the latest transportation bill.

Mr. Schmidt understood there would plenty of time for people to review plans and for staff to hold information sessions after the applications were submitted. Mr. Teddy stated there could be a public improvement process involving interested parties for the design of any of these projects. He pointed out preliminary design plans would need to be submitted to MoDOT on October 1, 2013.

Mr. Schmidt asked for clarification regarding what the Connect Cosmo Park/Bear Creek Trail to I-70/Stadium Boulevard Intersection project would entail. Mr. Hood replied the portion identified by the dashed orange line on the plan shown on the overhead would be built. The portion identified by a solid orange line already existed. The oval shaped loop at the front of the park was an asphalt trail that had been in place for many years, and the dark
orange at the north end of the park was the existing Bear Creek Trail. Mr. Schmidt understood nothing was being done where the black dotted line was shown across the interstate and down Bernadette. Mr. Hood stated he understood that would be part of the bike lanes that were incorporated in the diverging diamond project. The idea was to connect the trail through the park to those bike lanes that would be put in as part of the diverging diamond. Mr. Schmidt understood the primary part of this project would be the dotted orange line. Mr. Hood stated that was correct.

Ms. Hoppe commented that she was interested in the College Avenue Median/Pedestrian Refugee project as it was desperately needed by students and those in the East Campus neighborhood crossing College Avenue. She asked staff to meet with the East Campus Neighborhood Association as soon as possible so the Association could provide input as they had a few ideas.

Mr. Kespohl understood that if the City received $1.8 million for these improvements, it would cost the City about $316,000. Mr. Hood stated that would be correct if all three grants were approved, but at this point they were just applications. Mr. Teddy stated he believed the City would be awarded a grant for only one of the projects at most.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Kate Akers, 1411 Anthony Street, stated she was pleased the City recognized the need for improvements along College Avenue. She explained she was a parent of a Lee Elementary child, lived in East Campus and worked at the University, and had been proactive in working with the City in terms of traffic safety issues at Lee Elementary. She thanked the City for its effort there. She believed crossing College was just as big of a problem and noted kids could not walk or ride a bus safely from East Campus. She also noticed college students playing chicken as they crossed College, and pointed out it was very dangerous. She applauded staff for applying for these grants and noted she hoped the City was awarded the grant or would look for money elsewhere to make the necessary improvements. She commented that a vehicle had rolled into her in the past, and was upset it had taken this long to improve the situation. She stated the people in East Campus had a lot of great ideas in terms of how they could improve the situation in an attractive manner, and noted they wanted College to become more of a community street and less of a highway.

Kathleen Weinschenk, 1504 Sylvan Lane, commented that she was a member of the PedNet Board and they had had prayed for this. She thought it was wonderful.

Janet Hammen, 1844 Cliff Drive, understood the grant proposal included College from University to Rollins, and suggested it go all of the way up to Bass Avenue as that was the area where the Lee Elementary children tried to cross College. She did not know if that could be incorporated now or by October 1 if the grant was awarded. She pointed out approximately 25 neighbors had met and had come up with ideas based on how they walked, biked and drove in the area, and she hoped their ideas could be incorporated into the plan.

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

Mr. Trapp commented that he really liked these proposals and noted the first two really highlighted huge transportation needs. He knew the Garth Avenue project area well as he walked his dog there every day. He pointed out a lot of kids lived on the far block of Newton Drive, which dead ended into the undeveloped Baxter Park. He explained the kids
walked up Newton to Phyllis, so if this proposal was not funded, he hoped the City would consider a crosswalk across Garth at Phyllis. The intersection of Leslie Lane and Garth at the four-way stop was treacherous. The sidewalk on both sides would be great, but if they could not construct that, he reiterated the need for a crosswalk at Phyllis. He noted a crosswalk at Parkade was needed as well due to sight issues caused by the terrain.

The vote on R161-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

OLD BUSINESS

B231-12  Rezoning property located at the western terminus of Southampton Drive, east of Sinclair Road and north of Muirfield Drive, from R-1 and PUD-8 to R-1 and PUD-10.5.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the City had asked Columbia Public Schools to review the rezoning and provide comments with regard to how this rezoning would affect the school. Mr. Teddy replied staff provided Columbia Public Schools notice of zoning applications. He thought they could be more aggressive by soliciting a response rather than just providing them an opportunity to respond. He noted the City had provided their consultant data in the past that included all areas of potential residential development when the Schools were conducting their boundary study.

Mr. Kespohl asked if the City or the developer would extend Southampton. Mr. Teddy replied it was a developer responsibility, but was part of the PUD portion of this tract with the exception of about 215 feet.

Ms. Anthony understood sidewalks would be installed on Sinclair as the properties were developed. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct as that was the typical arrangement for subdivisions. The performance contract for the final plats, which staff did not yet have, would indicate the subdividers had three years to install the sidewalks. He pointed out the first phase only included a sidewalk on the edge of one lot, but as the PUD was developed, there would be a sidewalk on Sinclair adjacent to the PUD.

Tim Crockett, an engineer with Crockett Engineering Consultants with offices at 2608 North Stadium Boulevard, commented that this was a split zoned tract of land off of Sinclair Road, but the current configuration was not conducive to an agreeable development at this time. This proposed development shifted the R-1 portion to the south in order to buffer the existing residential subdivision with more single family residential development. This would provide a natural progression from the existing subdivision to the denser corner of Southampton and Sinclair. He pointed out they were increasing the size of the R-1 area while reducing the number of units as they were only seeking 20 single family residential units per an agreement made with the Homeowners Association. He noted there would be 146 multi-family residential units, but they would not have access onto Muirfield Drive. This would protect the single family residences that were currently there. There would be 40 percent landscape and open space, and the total number of residential units would likely be
165. He pointed out the increase in the PUD designation did not allow for an increase in total number of units. He explained the project was consistent with the Metro 2020 Plan and would complete the Heritage Meadows development. He described the preliminary plat the Council would also consider, and noted they had contacted the three area homeowner associations. He showed the Council a timeline of the different meetings the developer had with the neighbors of the area and the three area homeowner associations, and noted they had a letter of support from the Heritage Meadows Homeowner Association, which was most impacted. He explained stormwater would be addressed, a traffic study would be done at the time the PUD was developed, and property values would remain stable since they would have more R-1 houses near the existing R-1 houses. He pointed out the developer would work with the City with regard to traffic and traffic calming.

Ms. Anthony asked if the proposed single family residences would become a part of the Heritage Meadows subdivision with similar covenants or if they would be their own homeowner association with separate covenants. Mr. Crockett replied they would like for them to be a part of the Heritage Meadows Homeowner Association, but they did have slightly different covenants.

Jackie Van Delden, 1912 Kingsbridge Drive, stated she was the President of the Heritage Woods Homeowner Association and noted the Homeowner Association was not opposed to this new development. They were concerned with the increase in PUD because it would allow for taller buildings, such as apartments, which could become student housing. They wanted this to remain a residential area and not become a student housing area. If it became student housing or was developed as a PUD 10.5, they were concerned about the effects on their property values and an increase in traffic on Sinclair Road. She understood a traffic study would be conducted, but it would not be done until the PUD portion was ready to be developed. She explained another concern was the effect it would have on Millcreek Elementary, and stated she believed the City needed to consider the impact developments had on schools. She reiterated they were not opposed to the development as it was nice to have the R-1 as a buffer, but they did have concerns with the increase in density on the PUD portion of the property.

Ms. Hoppe understood The Grove on Rock Quarry Road was zoned R-3 and there was a substantial amount of student housing at that location. She asked if student housing could be developed on the PUD-8 zoned property. Mr. Teddy replied there was no restriction on the type of unit constructed, so it could buildings with a fairly large number of units, two-family dwellings or townhouses. He pointed out not more than 10.5 units to an acre would be allowed in the two zoning tracts divided by Southampton, and The Grove was likely more since R-3 allowed up to 17 units per acre.

Ms. Anthony asked for clarification regarding the difference between PUD-8 and PUD-10.5 in terms of building type. Mr. Crockett replied there was no difference in the building type. He pointed out the difference in PUD-8 and PUD-10.5 was not significant in terms of additional units. The significance was in the calculation. They were asking for eleven more units on the PUD portion than what they could put on the PUD-8.
Ms. Hoppe asked if the height of the buildings would increase. Mr. Crockett replied it would remain the same. They had essentially taken the original written set of guidelines created in 1999 and incorporated it into the statement of intent.

B231-12 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

R162-12 Approving the Preliminary Plat of Heritage Village, Plat 1 located at the western terminus of Southampton Drive, east of Sinclair Road and north of Muirfield Drive; setting forth conditions for approval.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

The vote on R162-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

B236-12 Granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations regarding sidewalk construction along a portion of the east side of Russell Boulevard within Jaynes Subdivision Plat 2.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Anthony asked if there were any sidewalks on the east side of Russell. Mr. Teddy replied there were no sidewalks on the east side of Russell. He explained Russell Boulevard divided an older section from a newer section and the City had established rules that required sidewalks when the west side was subdivided. Ms. Anthony asked if the entire west side had sidewalks. Mr. Teddy replied yes.

Ms. Hoppe understood the School was concerned that if part of the east side of street had a sidewalk, kids would cross the street mid-block, and asked if money for the sidewalk could be collected now with construction of the sidewalk being done later when money was available for the entire east side. Mr. Teddy replied this request was to waive the requirement completely. He explained the three ways to request a variance included a sidewalk not being required without condition, an offering of cash in lieu of a sidewalk in anticipation a larger City project that involved the construction of sidewalks, and the construction of an alternative walkway. He pointed out the sidewalk variance procedure did not eliminate the Council’s ability to tax bill the property in the future, but this was not commonly done in terms of sidewalks.

Mr. Schmidt asked if Russell Boulevard was chip and seal. Mr. Teddy replied it was an asphalt road. Mr. Schmidt asked if it had curbs on the east side. Mr. Teddy replied yes.

Ms. Anthony understood the Jaynes Subdivision had been subdivided into three lots and asked what would happen at the end of the property to the north if it was required to install a sidewalk. Mr. Teddy replied it was a dilemma because it would be a dead end sidewalk, but it would be progress toward a sidewalk system some day in the future.

Mr. Dudley stated it would be nice if the Council could grant the variance with a contingency that when the area was fully developed, a sidewalk would be required.
Greg Ahrens, 1504 Sylvan Lane, understood there were other large lots along the road that could potentially be subdivided and would trigger the installation of sidewalks of that side of the street. He also noted that any street that intersected another street was a legitimate place to cross over to the other side. He agreed with the Planning and Zoning Commission in terms of recommending the Council not grant the requested variance.

Mr. Schmidt commented that if they granted this variance, they would be required to grant the next one. He felt it was appropriate to place a sidewalk there due to the nearby school. If they were concerned with requiring a sidewalk to nowhere, he suggested they tax bill the property or build a sidewalk up to Oak Court. They could also paint a crosswalk there since it was an asphalt road.

Mayor McDavid noted he would vote to deny this variance because it was next to a school and he did not believe it would be a hardship to construct the sidewalk. He understood it might dead end now, but believed there would be more development in the future.

Mr. Trapp stated he did not think they could concede that Russell Boulevard would never have a sidewalk on the east side. A sidewalk was coming down Broadway in that direction. He thought the City should become more assertive in terms of tax billing properties to fill in sidewalk gaps.

Mr. Dudley pointed out the crosswalk from the school went up the east side of Russell Boulevard.

B236-12 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NO ONE. VOTING NO: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDavid, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. Bill declared defeated.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

PR145-12 Establishing revised policies relating to appointments to City boards and commissions.

B232-12 Rezoning property located on the north side of East Prathersville Road, east of North Tower Drive (1775 East Prathersville Road) from C-1 to M-P.

B233-12 Vacating a drainage easement on Lots 6A and 6B within Tower Industrial Park Plat 2 located on the northeast corner of Prathersville Road and Tower Drive.

B234-12 Approving the East Locust II C-P Plan located on the south side of Locust Street, between Hitt Street and Waugh Street (1100-1108 Locust Street); approving a revised statement of intent.

B235-12 Approving the Final Plat of East Locust Plat 1 located on the southeast corner of Hitt Street and Locust Street (1100-1108 Locust Street); granting variances from the Subdivision Regulations.

B237-12 Approving the Final Plat of Oak Park Plat 1, a Replat of Williamson Place Plat 1 located southwest of the intersection of Route K and Highpoint Lane; authorizing a performance contract.
B238-12 Approving the Final Plat of Oak Park Plat 2, a Replat of Williamson Place Plat 2 located southwest of the intersection of Route K and Highpoint Lane; authorizing a performance contract.

B239-12 Approving the Final Plat of Oak Park Plat 3, a Replat of Williamson Place Plat 3 located southwest of the intersection of Route K and Highpoint Lane; authorizing a performance contract.

B240-12 Approving the Final Plat of Oak Park Plat 4, a Replat of Williamson Place Plat 4 located southwest of the intersection of Route K and Highpoint Lane; authorizing a performance contract.

B241-12 Authorizing a consolidated grant agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for transportation planning services.

B242-12 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to transportation fares on fixed route buses.

B243-12 Authorizing construction of traffic signal improvements at the intersection of College Avenue and Walnut Street; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B244-12 Authorizing construction of traffic signal and sidewalk improvements at the intersection of Fairview Road and Ash Street; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B245-12 Accepting conveyances for sidewalk, utility, sewer and temporary construction purposes.

B246-12 Authorizing a lease extension agreement with the Carolyn J. Adams Revocable Living Trust for property located at 2311 East Walnut Street.

B247-12 Appropriating funds received as reimbursement for the commercial structure fire at the Loop 70 Plaza strip mall located at the intersection of Business Loop 70 and Garth Avenue.

B248-12 Accepting and appropriating donated funds from the Boone Electric Community Trust for the free school-based influenza vaccinations program provided by the Department of Public Health and Human Services.

B249-12 Accepting and appropriating donated funds from the Boonslick Kiwanis for the free school-based influenza vaccinations program provided by the Department of Public Health and Human Services.

B250-12 Accepting and appropriating donated funds from the David B. Lichtenstein Foundation for the free school-based influenza vaccinations program provided by the Department of Public Health and Human Services.

R146-12 Setting a public hearing: authorizing replacement of the augur system at the Walter Leroy Anderson Salt Storage Facility located at 1101 Big Bear Boulevard.

R147-12 Setting a public hearing: construction of a new restroom building and connecting 6-foot and 12-foot walkways at Albert-Oakland Park.

R148-12 Setting a public hearing: construction of improvements to the baseball/softball fields at Albert-Oakland Park.

R149-12 Setting a public hearing: construction of improvements to the Little Mates Cove and the dog park at Twin Lakes Recreation Area.
R150-12 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for WIC Local Agency Nutrition Services.

R151-12 Authorizing an agreement with Mickey Schaefer & Associates LLC and Tourism Ambassador Institute, LLC for a Tourism Ambassador Certification Program.

R152-12 Modifying the Operations Agreement with Thumper Productions, LLC to allow beer hawkers in the open container area at the 2012 Roots ‘N Blues ‘N BBQ Festival.

R153-12 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. for the preliminary and final design of the Scott Boulevard bridge over Mill Creek as part of the Scott Boulevard Phase 3 Project.

R154-12 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Engineering Surveys and Services, LLC for construction inspection services for the Short Street parking garage project.

R155-12 Transferring funds for the ERP software project.

R156-12 Approving the by-laws of the Coventry Court Neighborhood Association.

R157-12 Authorizing agreements with UnitedHealthcare and Dearborn National for benefits administration and insurance coverages for City of Columbia employees.

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

NEW BUSINESS

R158-12 Supporting the affordable housing project on Lambeth Drive proposed by the Columbia Housing Authority and New Horizons Community Support Services, Inc.

R163-12 Authorizing agreement with the Columbia Housing Authority and New Horizons Community Support Services Inc. as it relates to the development of affordable housing apartments located at the south end of Lambeth Drive.

The resolutions were read by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Kespohl explained this was a joint venture between New Horizons and the Columbia Housing Authority. New Horizons would construct a building to house mentally disabled individuals and the Columbia Housing Authority would construct three buildings for low income residents of Columbia. He noted he attended a meeting at Sockel involving the White Gate Neighborhood Association and those on Lambeth Drive. The residents were initially opposed to this development, but changed their feelings as they learned more about the development. They had even asked everyone else to leave the room so they could discuss the potential agreement amongst themselves, and everything requested was in the agreement. He understood they voted to unanimously approve the project contingent upon the items requested being in an agreement. He believed the neighbors were satisfied.

Phil Steinhaus, 201 Switzler Street, stated he was the CEO of the Columbia Housing Authority and described the project. The Columbia Housing Authority would have 24 units in
three 8-plex buildings and New Horizons would have a single building that would hold 23 units with a single entrance. It was all one development as the Columbia Housing Authority and New Horizons were partnering on this project, and persons with disabilities could live in any of the units. New Horizons would provide on-site support services to the clients. He explained they had met with the neighbors and thought the meeting had been productive. There were a few changes to the agreement after the attorneys had reviewed it, but he believed the essence of what the neighbors wanted was still included. The only significant change was that the neighbors wanted fencing all along the western side of the property, but City staff did not feel that was appropriate due to it being in a watershed area and the area containing old growth trees. They would provide a barrier on the northern boundary as he understood the neighbors wanted to limit foot traffic into their neighborhood. The development would provide housing for people with incomes of 30-60 percent of the median family income.

Andrea Cheung, 1408 Hathman Place, explained New Horizons had been in business since 1976 and provided support services for mentally ill individuals. She noted New Horizons owned and operated residential care facilities in Columbia and Jefferson City, but Columbia was still in need of housing specifically for disabled individuals. Their hope was to provide safe, affordable and decent low income housing to their clients. The vast majority of their clients lived in poverty because they were too disabled to work or could only work part-time, but New Horizons tried to help them become as independent as possible and housing was a big step in that direction. She stated they were pleased with the outcome of the meeting with the Lambeth neighborhood and were willing to concede to their requests. She hoped this would help alleviate the stigma associated with mental illness as well.

Mr. Steinhaus pointed out the Columbia Housing Authority had worked closely with New Horizons for a number of years and believed this was a great partnership. A number of their clients lived in Paquin Towers and Oak Towers as well as Columbia Housing Authority family sites. He hoped the Council would support the authorization of a letter of support from the Mayor and the Third Ward Council Member to be submitted to the Missouri Housing Development Commission as part of an application that was due Friday.

Mary Hussmann, 5306 Rice Road, understood the Columbia Housing Authority and New Horizons were asking Council to sign off on a taxpayer funded plan the taxpayer knew very little about. She understood this might be a good project, but wondered when the Commission had met to vote on this particular land purchase and for approval of submission of the tax credit application. She knew it had not been discussed in July or August as she had attended those meetings. She also wondered why the public had not been informed of the 4 ½ hour meeting that had taken place with the neighbors as she believed everyone was a neighbor when public housing was involved. She understood the homes would serve individuals and families earning 40-60 percent of the Boone County median family income, which appeared to be housing for the middle class. The minimum wage was $7.25 per hour and most of those jobs were part time positions. She wondered if Columbia planned to raise the minimum wage to $9.00 per hour. She commented that rents would be $486 and $598 per month, which was not affordable to someone in poverty. She wondered how much the City would be obligated to pay in terms of infrastructure. If the project was funded, it would
be on C-3 property, and it would not be before the Planning and Zoning Commission or the City Council. She believed questions and concerns needed to be addressed prior to a letter of support being provided, and was not concerned the deadline might not be met since they had approached the Council at such a late date. She reiterated Council should ask for their questions and concerns to be addressed prior to endorsing it.

Greg Ahrens, 1504 Sylvan Lane, commented that he was the contact person for the White Gate Neighborhood Association and he had not received notification of the meeting that had been held. He noted the current bus route along Clark Lane dropped people off and required people to board at the south side of the street by I-70. In addition, there was a lack of good lighting at the corner of Lambeth and Clark Lane. The line of sight coming down on Clark Lane was not good and people tended to travel fast so it was not safe for pedestrians. He understood the unimproved street between the Socket building and a vacant lot that had been owned by the family of Dr. Lambeth was a private street that had been blocked off by Socket. He also understood a proposed flyover lane would exit off of Highway 63 to get on I-70 at this location. He stated he did not have a problem with mentally disabled people living in the neighborhood, but he was not sure this was a good location.

Mr. Schmidt understood there were no sidewalks on this part of Clark Lane. Mr. Ahrens stated that was correct, but noted the sidewalk plan included a sidewalk. Mr. Schmidt asked who owned the lake that was to the northwest of this property. Mr. Ahrens replied he thought Woodlake Apartments owned it.

Mr. Schmidt asked if the site would be staffed because there was not really a good way for residents to walk to the White Gate shopping center or other areas.

Jan Heumann with New Horizons explained staff would not be on-site on a full time basis, but staff would be in and out of the building. She pointed out staff might be there more often based on the needs of those living there.

Mr. Schmidt thought it would be a great service for those that were ambulatory to walk or wheel to White Gate. He wondered if there was a way to build a path connecting residents to roads that would get them to White Gate. Mr. Steinhaus stated they had discussed extending the Clark Lane sidewalk past Eastwood to this property as it was on the sidewalk plan. He pointed out it was hard to find affordable land in town and this area was near the New Horizons offices. It would not be a residential care facility. He commented that they had an option to purchase the property only if the project was funded.

Ms. Anthony asked for clarification regarding the low versus median income issue raised by Ms. Hussmann. Mr. Steinhaus replied there was a wide need for affordable housing in the community and work force housing was needed as well. There was also a shortage of one bedroom apartments in the community. He pointed out this issue had been discussed at a Housing Authority Board Meeting, and the Housing Authority Board had approved of moving forward in a partnership with New Horizons. This would serve low income working families. He agreed housing was needed for people at 0-30 percent of the median family income, and that was primarily handled through public housing and Section 8 housing, but they also needed housing for a slightly higher range with income still less than the median income. Ms. Heumann commented that those living in the New Horizons building
would have a considerably lower income other than those in the Columbia Housing Authority portion of the property.

Mr. Trapp stated he would speak strongly in favor of this proposal. He explained he had worked closely with New Horizons and the Columbia Housing Authority for a number of years, and had the utmost respect and trust that they would put together a great project that served the needs of those in the community needing the most help. New Horizons operated ethically and with safety in mind when serving the needs of disabled people. The same was true for the Columbia Housing Authority, and he believed both would be good neighbors. This project would be close to the offices of New Horizons so it would save money for those traveling back and forth. He stated he would like to see sidewalks on Clark Lane and for traffic to travel slower in the area. He also wanted Grass Roots Organizing (GRO) to provide full endorsement to the project, but he did not believe they could let the perfect be the enemy of good. Non-profits were being forced to become more entrepreneurial and nimble as they evolved and grew in order to prove what they were doing was bringing value for the dollars that were being spent. In addition, the City was only being asked to write a letter at this point. It was not the end of the process and he assumed there would be other accountability measures from both organizations and external forces. He encouraged the Council to vote in favor of this.

The vote on R158-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVIS, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

The vote on R163-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVIS, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R159-12 Adapting the City of Columbia, Missouri Strategic Plan - 2012-2015.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion to amend R159-12 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dudley and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on R159-12, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVIS, SCHMIDT, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

The following bills were introduced by the Mayor unless otherwise indicated, and all were given first reading.

B255-12 Rezoning property located on the southwest corner of Grindstone Parkway and Rock Quarry Road from A-1 to C-P; approving the Grindstone & Rock Quarry Break Time C-P Plan.

B256-12 Approving the Final Plat of Tower Industrial Park – Plat 3 located on the northeast corner of Prathersville Road and Tower Drive; authorizing a performance contract.
B257-12 Approving the Final Plat of The Village at Wyndham Ridge, Plat No. 3 located northeast of the intersection of Route KK and Scott Boulevard; authorizing a performance contract.

B258-12 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to nonconforming uses.

B259-12 Appropriating funds for construction of a 10-foot high wildlife deterrent fence at the Columbia Regional Airport.

B260-12 Authorizing replacement of the augur system at the Walter Leroy Anderson Salt Storage Facility located at 1101 Big Bear Boulevard; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B261-12 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.

B262-12 Authorizing construction of a new restroom building and connecting 6-foot and 12-foot walkways at Albert-Oakland Park; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B263-12 Authorizing construction of improvements to the baseball/softball fields at Albert-Oakland Park; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B264-12 Authorizing construction of improvements to the Little Mates Cove and the dog park at Twin Lakes Recreation Area; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B265-12 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri to allow use of University property for the annual Halloween event.

B266-12 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code to eliminate the Commission on Community Cooperation, the Career Awareness and Related Experience (C.A.R.E.) Advisory Board, the Internet Citizens Advisory Group, the Armory Board and the Special Business District Board; amending Chapter 10 of the City Code to eliminate the Public Communications Resource Advisory Committee; abolishing the GetAbout Columbia: Non-Motorized Transportation Pilot Project Advisory Committee.

B267-12 Amending Chapters 9 and 16 of the City Code as it relates to possession of fireworks.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP146-12 Cliff Drive and Ann Street Marketing and Signing.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe thanked staff for providing this report and noted people driving south on Ann Street tended to turn on Cliff Drive and drive the wrong way on the one way street. She thought this would make it clearer.

Mr. Glascock asked if she would recommend “Do Not Enter” signs pointing toward Ann Street. Ms. Hoppe replied that might help as well. Mr. Schmidt thought they might want to reconsider this as it sometimes caused more confusion and provided some examples.

Ms. Hoppe suggested trying what staff had recommended to first determine if it worked.

Mr. Schmidt asked for clarification regarding the bulb out. Mr. Glascock replied it would be painted. Mr. Schmidt understood the curb would be moved if it worked.
Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to make the changes and to prepare the appropriate ordinance changes. The motion was seconded by Mr. Schmidt.

Mr. Dudley asked if an arrow could be painted on the street coming off of Cliff Drive near the bulb. Mr. Glascock replied they could review it. Ms. Hoppe suggested staff obtain input from the East Campus Neighborhood Association.

The motion made by Ms. Hoppe and seconded by Mr. Schmidt directing staff to make the changes and to prepare the appropriate ordinance changes was approved unanimously by voice vote.

**REP147-12 Occupancy Disclosure Forms.**

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Ms. Anthony asked for more time to review the occupancy disclosure forms provided. She understood there was not an urgency with regard to this issue since it would be a new tool for the toolbox.

Mr. Schmidt asked if it was appropriate for them as a legislative body to discuss the details of the form. He thought it was more administrative. Mr. Boeckmann replied it was not illegal for Council to get to this level of scrutiny. Mr. Teddy pointed out the motion at the previous meeting was for staff to bring forward a form for Council review. In addition, he viewed it as something that would illustrate a future ordinance. Mr. Schmidt stated he was comfortable voting on a model, but not necessarily a specific form.

Mayor McDavid stated there was a lot of resistance from apartment owners, but the issue was that there was a problem with people abusing the rental regulations of the City of Columbia. His plea to the people that did not want the disclosure forms was to provide the Council a solution to the problem. Even though a specific apartment complex or landlord did not create the problem, it was a problem of the industry.

Mr. Kespohl commented that he was happy to see penalties on the form, but wondered if the fine would be assessed to the owner of the property or the management company. Mr. Teddy replied the fine would be assessed to the license holder. Mr. Kespohl noted the property owner might not be aware of the situation. He also wondered if the $500 fine would be assessed to the tenant if they were in the wrong, and questioned how that fine would be collected. He thought the issue would have to go to court. Mayor McDavid asked for his recommendation for change. Mr. Kespohl thought they needed time to determine how this would be administered.

Ms. Hoppe suggested the form include a statement indicating information would need to be provided in the future if there was a question regarding a familial relationship instead of requiring verification in advance. She also wondered how verification would work in terms of single sex partners and children.

Mr. Kespohl stated he had been asking for the names of tenants and their relationship on the rental applications for years because he wanted to know who was living there and what the relationship was amongst those people.

Mr. Kespohl suggested a meeting be held for further discussion. Ms. Anthony stated it needed to include homeowners and neighborhood associations in addition to landlords. Mr. Kespohl agreed it should be open to everyone. He also believed a representative of the legal
department needed to participate to help determine what could and could not be done. Mr. Matthes stated a meeting would be held similar to an interested parties meeting, and then the issue could also be discussed during a future pre-council meeting in order to get through some of the concerns.

REP148-12 Heibel-March Building Update.

Mr. Hood provided a staff report.

Mr. Kespohl understood this had been an on-going issue and they were at the same place they were ten years ago. He thought they would need to pull the plug on this at some point in time.

Ms. Hoppe stated she thought it was reasonable to extend it for a week if there was interest.

Mr. Schmidt agreed with Mr. Kespohl in that at some point this would need to end, but he pointed out that once the past was gone, it was gone, so he hoped they could hold on to the building a little longer.

Mr. Hood explained the building was not in good condition so at some point it became a concern for the City. Mr. Schmidt asked if the Parks and Recreation Department could use the land to build something new that had character. Mr. Hood replied they had many options. The original plan was to remove the building and install a nice landscaped area on the corner that mirrored what Columbia College had done on the opposite corner. He noted it had been twelve years, but they were optimistic a couple proposals would be received by September 21, 2012.


Mr. Hood provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe understood the Benton-Stephens Neighborhood Association was concerned because they had not been notified, and in this particular situation, there had been a two month period from the time the limb fell to the time it was determined the tree needed to be removed. She suggested neighbors be notified in terms of good customer service because people tended to be invested in parks and old trees. She thought the neighbors could have been notified that the tree was being studied and might need to be removed.

Mr. Schmidt thought the Benton-Stephens Neighborhood Association expected to hear about any tree removal due to a prior situation in terms of tree trimming by the Water and Light Department. He thought they would have been satisfied with being told the tree was being removed.

Mr. Hood stated they would try to recognize situations where there might be established neighborhood associations and people heavily involved in the park in order to notify the neighborhood association. He pointed out this was a situation where once he was notified the tree was a hazard, he felt the tree needed to be removed.

Mr. Kespohl pointed out a press release had been issued. Mr. Griggs noted the press release had been sent out the day the tree was removed, but it obviously did not get to the neighborhood association in time.
Ms. Hoppe thought staff would need to be extra vigilant in terms of tree damage due to the dry weather this summer, and understood more trees might need to be removed. Mr. Hood commented that a number of trees would not survive due to the summer drought. They were monitoring those that were highly stressed. He noted it was quite possible that they might not know the extent of the situation until next spring. He thought larger trees might survive another year or two depending on future weather conditions. The foresters had estimated that they could see up to a 10 percent loss, which would result in a large number of trees. He hoped it would not be that high.

**REP150-12 Administrative Public Improvement Process - Parkside Mulch Site.**

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report and explained this had been provided for informational purposes.

**REP151-12 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.**

Mr. Kespohl asked if miscellaneous contractual services included anyone hired to do work for the City. Mr. Matthes replied that was true most of the time. He pointed out they were combining 3-4 projects into one to reduce the overall cost.

Mr. Schmidt asked if these would involve professional services or temporary workers. Mr. Matthes replied these were construction projects.

Mr. Kespohl explained he became uneasy when he saw miscellaneous. Mr. Matthes stated that was the name of the account. Mr. Schmidt suggested a footnote with an explanation in the future.

**COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

Greg Ahrens, 1504 Sylvan Lane, stated he was glad to see the improvements at the corner of Eighth and Broadway to resolve the issue of not having a curb cut to cross at Eighth, and believed it would be a nice project when completed. Currently, the sidewalk was closed at the intersection, but there was not a sign at Ninth and Broadway indicating the sidewalk was closed at the other end, so those in wheelchairs had to turn around and go back to Ninth and Broadway and cross the street there to get to the same place. In addition, part of the sidewalk on the north side of Broadway was also closed, and there was a sign, but there was not a curb cut where it told people to cross. As a result, they had to turn around and go through the alley. He suggested better signage in the downtown to make people aware of sidewalk closings and alternate routes. He also stated the idea of not building sidewalks until the lots were built upon in subdivisions was foreign to him because when his parents purchased a home in Florissant, Missouri in 1964, all of the sidewalks had been installed even though all of the lots had not been developed. He noted contractors would lay boards over the sidewalks so the heavy equipment did not damage the existing sidewalk, and if they did damage the sidewalk, they had to rebuild it. He thought Columbia needed to reconsider its policy for the future.

Mr. Trapp commented that a lot of kids in the neighborhood where Newton Drive dead ended into Baxter Park played in the parking lot of the apartment complex and asked staff to...
consider adding playground equipment, a pavilion and barbecue grill to Baxter Park as it would add to the neighborhood life. He understood there was very little flat space at the Park, but thought it would be helpful to place something there. He noted he had stated the items in order of what the neighbors preferred.

Mr. Trapp understood a double gate was being installed at the Garth Avenue Nature Area and asked when it would be installed. Mr. Hood replied he did not have a specific time frame, but thought it would be done before next spring.

Mr. Trapp noted the citizens had asked for a light, even a solar light if the appropriate utilities were not available, at the gate to increase safety and make it more usable.

Mr. Trapp stated he had been contacted by BMX bikers who wanted access to the skate park, and did not want a dirt race track. He understood the skate park was well used by skaters, so the sharing of the facility might create safety issues, but suggested these types of activities be included in the long term plan for the parks or that the bikers be allowed to use the skate park for an hour a day or a weekend a month. Mr. Hood explained they were working on a new ten year master plan and he believed the plan would identify the need for some type of BMX facility. He noted the skate park had been designed specifically for skating, and not for bike riding, so there were some real liability issues in opening it up to bikes since it was not designed for bike use. He agreed the bikers needed a separate facility.

Ms. Anthony commented that she and Ms. Hoppe had been approached by several people that felt the City’s current sign ordinance was inadequate in terms of the proliferation of illuminated changing copy message signs. One that had been erected was at the corner of Stadium and Broadway on the beautiful law firm building that was recently built. It was large and was not attractive, and she believed it ran contrary to the intent of the sign ordinance. She felt the existing sign ordinance was fair and balanced, but it only regulated signs on the outside of buildings, and these signs were cleverly being placed on the inside of windows. In addition, they were popping up everywhere. She provided a handout of a proposed amendment to the sign ordinances. She suggested the Planning and Zoning Commission review it and provide input, but felt a moratorium was needed so these types of signs would not be put up while the issue was being reviewed. She asked staff to draft a moratorium ordinance, and for the issue to be referred to the Planning and Zoning Commission for its review and input.

Ms. Anthony understood the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association would be holding a meeting on October 4, 2012 and hoped City staff would participate. She commented that she would like to have a pilot project involving residential permits ready to go by October 4 as she felt a report should have already been received on the issue. Mr. Matthes replied they planned to have something by October 4 for that neighborhood, but noted each neighborhood was different, and they were trying to find the right balance. He pointed out the issue was complicated, but he believed they had some of the fundamentals figured out. He thought they would be prepared to present something to that specific neighborhood, and they hoped it would be applicable to others.
Ms. Anthony asked for the most current development agreement governing the park at the corner of Rock Quarry and Grindstone to be provided prior to the next meeting as they would be considering another development nearby at that meeting. She noted she had asked for it previously, but she had not yet received it.

Mr. Kespohl thanked Council for voting in favor of funding the Neighborhood Watch program. He had set a goal to try to visit every neighborhood association in his ward over the next several months and his hope was to have a watch person on every block in the ward. His wanted to drive crime out of the Third Ward.

Ms. Hoppe commented that there had been a lot of concern regarding the use of eminent domain for economic development when the Enhanced Enterprise Zone issue was initially discussed. This summer she had worked with the City Attorney to come up with language for a Charter amendment, with the approval of Council, for the public to vote on in April, 2013. She asked for the ordinance to move forward with the Charter amendment to be presented at the next Council Meeting for consideration. She noted she would provide Ms. Amin with a copy of the language for the record.

Mr. Dudley thanked staff for their work with regard to the Sunset Lane improvements.

Mr. Dudley noted he had received a lot of comments with regard to the upgrades at Twin Lakes and thanked staff for their work on it as well.

Mr. Schmidt noted Mr. Saunders from the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association had made three requests earlier in the meeting, which included adopting the Charrette formally like they did other reports, the consideration of form based zoning, and to allow him to make a presentation to Council at a work session, and he thought they needed to proceed with those requests.

The meeting adjourned at 11:42 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk