INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, May 21, 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 TRAPP, KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID and SCHMIDT were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk and various Department Heads were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of May 7, 2012 and the special meeting of May 9, 2012 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Dudley and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

The agenda was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Hoppe and a second by Mr. Dudley.

SPECIAL ITEMS

Recognition by the American Public Works Association for achieving a third re-accreditation award for leadership in the field of Public Works.

Ann Daniels, who was with the American Public Works Association (APWA), wished everyone a happy National Public Works Week and noted they were proud of the employees in the Columbia Public Works Department as they were true leaders. She stated Columbia’s Public Works Department was first accredited in 2001 and had recently been re-accredited for the third time, and explained a team of APWA peers from across the country participated in the review and all 150 practices were deemed to be in full compliance. In addition, the City’s Public Works Department had seven model practices that would be shared across the United States and Canada with organizations that were looking for ways to improve. She thanked the Council for supporting the program and presented Mr. Glascock with an accreditation plaque.

Mr. Glascock thanked his staff and stated the re-accreditation would not have happened without them.

Mr. Matthes pointed out there was no higher praise than this award for a Public Works Department and noted he was proud of them.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

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

AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD
Faber, Steven, 3004 Woodbine Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire May 16, 2013

**BOARD OF MECHANICAL EXAMINERS**

Dove, James, 407 Parkade Boulevard, Ward 2, Term to expire June 17, 2015
Oetker, Steve, 4108 West Rollins, Ward 4, Term to expire June 17, 2015

**BOARD OF PLUMBING EXAMINERS**

Arms, Bret, 2506 Oakfield Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire May 31, 2014
Schulz, Bill, 1716 Stirling Court, Ward 5, Term to expire May 31, 2014

**BOONE COUNTY COMMUNITY SERVICES ADVISORY COMMISSION**

Ferris, Linda, P.O. Box 3, Ward 2, Term to expire December 31, 2014

**COLUMBIA HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD**

Kinney, Marvin, 1623 Highridge Circle, Ward 4, Term to expire May 31, 2016
Lewis, Max, 1201 Paquin Street, Apt 609, Ward 1, Term to expire May 31, 2016

**COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS**

Mazick, Charles, 904 Virginia Avenue, Ward 1, Term to expire March 1, 2014

**DISABILITIES COMMISSION**

Brookins, Christy, 3210 Kohler Circle, Ward 4, Term to expire June 15, 2015
Henson, Lee, 3104 Greenbriar Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire June 15, 2015
Price, Cheryl, 511 Parkade Boulevard, Ward 2, Term to expire June 15, 2013
Turpin, William, 700 North Garth, Apt, 715, Ward 1, Term to expire June 15, 2015
Weinschenk, Kathleen, 1504 Sylvan Lane, Ward 3, Term to expire June 15, 2015

**ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY COMMISSION**

Tillema, Herbert, 306 Westridge Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire June 1, 2015
Turner, Alyce, 1204 Fieldcrest, Ward 4, Term to expire June 1, 2015

**FINANCE ADVISORY AND AUDIT COMMITTEE**

Sommer, Andrew, 209 St. Joseph Street, Apt. D, Ward 1, Term to expire December 31, 2014

**PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION**

Devine, Daniel, 710 Ridgeway Avenue, Ward 1, Term to expire May 31, 2015
Donaldson, Meredith, 1001 Pheasant Run Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire May 31, 2015
Kloeppel, Terry, 111 West Alhambra Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire May 31, 2015

**SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

Lisa and Taj of Hickman High School HOPE Club - Share results from a recent town hall event about underage drinking.

Lisa Simms stated she was a representative of the HOPE Club at Hickman High School and of the youth in Columbia, and noted underage drinking was a problem. She explained underage drinking had caused 190,000 emergency room visits in 2008, and there were situations in which young girls were dropped off on the steps of the emergency room by
her friends who were too drunk to take her to the door. These type of situations occurred every weekend across the United States and Columbia. She suggested solutions to stop underage drinking. She did not believe parents should have alcohol in the home, but if that was unrealistic, they should purchase very little and monitor their levels. She understood Columbia was a college football town, but believed it was unacceptable for adults to drink excessively in front of and/or with their children. She also believed parents needed to tell their children there were consequences to drinking. She understood doing these things might not keep kids from never drinking alcohol, but thought, if adults became what they expected from children, the children would work to make them proud. She thanked the Council for listening as it was a rare opportunity for the young to be given a voice in society.

Taj Thompson commented that cultural norms indicated it was okay to drink and noted parental drinking influenced drinking by children since parents had a strong role in their children’s lives. He suggested parents become more involved in order to lessen the number of deaths from alcohol. He thanked the Council for listening.


Ann Peters provided a handout and explained Maddie’s Fund was a mission to revolutionize the status and well being of companion animals. It was a pet rescue foundation established in 1999 to help fund the creation of a “no kill” nation, where all healthy and treatable shelter dogs and cats were guaranteed a loving home. Since its inception, Maddie’s Fund had awarded animal welfare organizations and universities more than $96 million to save animal lives. The foundation supported collaborative efforts in which cities and counties pooled talent and resources to build a safety net of care for the community dogs and cats and funded projects that produced a measurable increase in adoption and a reduction of shelter deaths to demonstrate progress toward the goals. She described the types of grants available through the foundation and explained she hoped the Council would support a community shelter data grant, which was a starter grant. She stated a coalition of animal groups operating in any county or region in the United States with a human population of 100,000 or greater was eligible to apply, and at a minimum the coalition had to include all animal control agencies and traditional shelters located within the target community. An opportunity also needed to be provided for adoption guarantee organizations located within the target community to participate. Each participating group had to agree to publish shelter statistics and an annual report or newsletter on its websites. She explained they needed the Central Missouri Humane Society and the City’s animal control agency to agree to participate.

Valerie Chaffin stated she was the Executive Director of Columbia Second Chance and noted adoption guarantee organizations were needed as well. Her organization and Dogs Deserve Better, which was run by Melody Whitworth, were those types of organizations, and they wanted to participate. They were passionate animal rights people, but were also business people. This grant would be funded in an amount between $10,000 and $40,000. She asked the Council to provide a letter indicating animal control would participate, and pointed out that letter needed to include the text on page 5 of the application,
which was part of the handout provided. She believed these statistics needed to be gathered and published, and funding could be distributed to the parties involved based upon the adoptions that had occurred and the number of live animals released to welfare organizations.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

R79-12  Authorizing a contract amendment with the State of Missouri Department of Economic Development – Division of Business and Community Services as it relates to the Neighborhood Stabilization Program budget; authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with Russell and Kathryn Diane Goodrich for the purchase of property located at 603 North Fourth Street.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe asked if this home needed to be demolished because the City did not have effective enforcement codes or because those codes were not enforced. Mr. Teddy replied the structure had been in enforcement for quite some time. He noted a review further back in time would be needed to determine when the neglect that led to the current condition began. Ms. Hoppe understood the City was better at enforcing the codes now and the deterioration had happened before then. Mr. Teddy stated the structure had been in a bad way for a long time.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

The vote on R79-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVI, SCHMIDT. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

OLD BUSINESS

B94-12  Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the installation of automated traffic signal enforcement equipment.

The bill was given third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. St. Romaine provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked if accidents had dropped by 20 percent throughout the City or just at these intersections. Mr. St. Romaine replied only these intersections had been reviewed. He referred to a spreadsheet that had been provided and noted there was a 71 percent decrease in the number of reports taken and a 60 percent decrease in the number of those cited for following too close.

Ms. Anthony asked how the change in the Police Department’s policy on accident reporting affected those statistics. Mr. St. Romaine replied it would likely have had a significant impact since an officer was not dispatched unless there was an injury or a vehicle was undrivable. Mr. Kespohl asked when the policy changed. Mr. St. Romaine replied he thought it changed in 2009.

Mr. Kespohl commented that it appeared as if the intersections at Stadium and Worley and Providence and Stadium had more calls in 2010 than in 2009, but the calls were significantly lower for the rest of the intersections. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was true and
noted it was very hard to gauge the reason. When looking at the total number of ticket violations issued, during 2009, which was the first year of operation, 773 tickets were issued at the Providence and Broadway intersection, but that number dropped to 301 in 2010, and he believed that was a result of public awareness. He also believed there was a spillover effect across the entire community.

Mayor McDavid asked if it was the opinion of staff that there was a public safety benefit to red light cameras. Mr. St. Romaine replied yes.

Mark Flakne, 2408 Basswood, stated he would like to believe those intersections were safer due to red light cameras, but there was not one shred of empirical evidence that supported the claim. He commented that he found it offensive that the City would install these cameras, and noted that regardless of whether they raised money for the City, they grew bureaucracy because much of the money was spent to support them. He encouraged the Council to not install anymore red light cameras and to remove the existing cameras.

Mayor McDavid understood this was a pilot project. He believed many cities had installed red light cameras as a revenue source, but it had not proved to provide a revenue benefit and there was only anecdotal evidence in terms of a public safety benefit since there was no control group. He noted he was willing to support this bill as long as staff understood this was something that needed to be reviewed because if there was no public safety benefit and no revenue, there was no reason to have red light cameras.

Ms. Anthony stated she agreed with Mayor McDavid, and felt if they were going to allow the program to continue as a pilot, she thought they needed to determine a time frame, such as six months or a year, for when another report would be received. Mr. St. Romaine pointed out the City had entered into a five year contract with Gatso, which included a 90 day termination clause for convenience. He explained the contract with Gatso originally called for red light cameras to be installed at a total of 16 intersections. These five were chosen based on traffic studies that had been conducted by Gatso confirming large numbers of observed red light violations during rush hour. Since the first five red light cameras were installed, Gatso had surveyed approximately 35 other intersections throughout Columbia and had not found a current need for cameras at any of those other intersections. He noted the cost to install cameras at each intersection was approximately $200,000. He suggested they continue to monitor these first five intersections for the next couple of years.

Mayor McDavid asked for the time remaining on the contract. Mr. St. Romaine replied two and one half years remained on the contract.

The vote on B94-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

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

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Ms. Anthony asked if all of the groups were in relative agreement. Mr. Glascock replied he thought they were all in agreement. Mayor McDavid stated he was not certain that
was true based upon information he had received. Mr. Dudley understood not everyone was in complete agreement and suggested the issue be tabled to allow for a work session.

Mr. Dudley made a motion to table B109-12 to the June 4, 2012 Council Meeting and to hold a work session involving staff, the City Council, the Chamber of Commerce and the Storm Water Advisory Commission on this topic for either Monday or Tuesday of next week. The motion was seconded by Mr. Kespohl.

Mayor McDavid stated he supported the motion to table this because he felt they were close to a resolution. He understood there were eight points of contention that were largely technical and legal in nature and did not believe it would take much effort to resolve those issues.

Ms. Anthony stated she was opposed to the motion to table and noted she had received many calls from people wondering why this had not moved quicker. She understood attorneys for the Central Missouri Development Council and the City, along with staff and the Storm Water Advisory Commission, had worked on this, and not everyone would be happy. She thought they needed to move forward and did not believe a work session was necessary at this point.

Ms. Hoppe commented that the Council had received a letter from the Environment and Energy Commission with three recommendations and asked if the ordinance was compliant with those recommendations. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Ms. Hoppe stated she agreed with Ms. Anthony in that the Council should move forward with the ordinance and not table it.

Mr. Trapp commented that he did not believe two weeks would make a difference in a many year process as he thought it might result in a better investment from the stakeholders.

The motion made by Mr. Dudley and seconded by Mr. Kespohl to table B109-12 to the June 4, 2012 Council Meeting and to hold a work session involving staff, the City Council, the Chamber of Commerce and the Storm Water Advisory Commission on this topic for either Monday or Tuesday of next week was approved unanimously by voice vote with only Ms. Anthony and Ms. Hoppe voting against it.

Mr. Matthes suggested the work session be held at 4:00 p.m. on Tuesday, May 29, 2012. The Council was in agreement with that date and time.

B111-12 Approving the Final Plat of Rock Bridge Christian Church Plat 2, a Replat of Lot 1 Rock Bridge Christian Church Plat 1, located north of Green Meadows Road and east of Bethel Street (301 West Green Meadows Road); authorizing a performance contract.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Shari Korthuis, 2987 S. Running Deer Court, stated she thought the Planning and Zoning Commission had recommended denial and understood the community was against this. Mayor McDavid explained this was not the request for rezoning. This would only allow the establishment of lot lines and did not authorize use of the land.

Jay Gebhardt stated he was an engineer with A Civil Group and noted they were creating a single R-1 lot.
B111-12 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B121-12  **Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code to establish an Enhanced Enterprise Zone Board.**

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor McDavid commented that an Enhanced Enterprise Zone (EEZ) Board would be created if this ordinance passed, and he would appoint Anthony Stanton, Jeremy Root, John Strotbeck, Louis Gatewood and Randy Morrow based on suggestions received. The County Commission and the Columbia Public Schools would make the other two appointments.

Mr. Brooks provided a staff report.

Linda Green, 206 Anderson Avenue, stated she was representing the Mid-MO Chapter of Women’s International League for Peace and Freedom and commented that she did not believe the public had been shown the facts indicating a need for an EEZ blight designation. She pointed out an article in the Columbia Missourian had indicated the Missouri State Auditor’s Office had analyzed data from all 58 EEZ’s in Missouri and had determined businesses receiving EEZ credits were not adequately monitored and little had been done to verify information from businesses applying for those EEZ credits. The audit stated the Missouri Department of Economic Development had given false economic benefit information regarding EEZ’s to the Missouri State Legislature, and the tax credit analysis had an error rate of 43 percent. She thought Columbia needed to be wary of the EEZ program. She referred to “The Great American Job Scam: Corporate Tax Dodging and the Myth of Job Creation” by Greg LeRoy, who was the Executive Director of Good Jobs First, and asked the Council to read it to learn the history of blighted enterprise zones in other cities across the United States. She noted Greg LeRoy would speak on this issue by webcam at the Friends Room at the Library on May 31, and invited everyone to attend. She suggested the Council take time to inform itself and to not appoint the EEZ Board or blight Columbia neighborhoods for an unproven program. She asked the Council to slow this process down.

Shari Korthuis, 2987 S. Running Deer Court, asked the Council to slow down the EEZ process as well. She listed situations in which eminent domain had been a result of blight and information indicating EEZ’s were not proven methods of job creation. She noted tax abatements impacted school districts, and these programs were rarely about blight removal and mainly about finding areas that produced little tax revenue and turning them into strip malls. She did not think Columbia needed to be blighted, and thought property taxes needed to be properly assessed as it would address the revenue situation for public services. She pointed out the City’s unemployment rate was 5.2 percent, so Columbia should not be considered blighted.

Don Laird, 1205 LaRail, stated he was the President of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce and noted the Chamber respected the Council’s recent decision to rescind the current EEZ resolution to allow for further discussion regarding the issue, but strongly encouraged the Council to remain steadfast in support of the EEZ as an important economic development tool for the community. He commented than nearly 23 percent of those in
Columbia lived below the poverty line as defined by the United States Census, and the highest concentrations of those living below the poverty line were in the first and second wards. The Chamber believed gainful employment was one of the most important things that could be offered to the unemployed, and tools such as the EEZ could help. He asked the Council to support and move forward with the EEZ.

Monta Welch, 2808 Greenbriar Drive, stated she was speaking on behalf of the Columbia Climate Change Coalition and felt environmental and sustainable development was an important part of how Columbia chose to develop, and that these tax credits diverted funds from everything else that was needed. She commented that the recent legislation in Jefferson City attempting to stop blight designations in an EEZ from being able to be used for eminent domain would likely, per Representative Chris Kelley, be determined to be unconstitutional under the Hammer-Schmidt law. She asked the Council not to lie and falsely blight large areas of the community. She understood some people planning to buy property within Columbia were waiting to see if the City would be declared blighted before investing. She noted the City Manager had stated Columbia was not blighted, and if that was the case, Columbia would not meet EEZ qualifications. She hoped the Council would attend the town hall meeting mentioned earlier by Ms. Green, and asked the Council to slow down and take the time to hear the data from that meeting. The EEZ tax incentives would favor larger, wealthier businessmen and corporations and would ultimately erode and transfer the tax burden to smaller businesses. Columbia needed more funds to repair infrastructure and she did not believe the tax base should be eroded any further while risking property blight and devaluation. By creating the EEZ, she believed the Council would hand over local control to the inept Department of Economic Development. She understood the company targeted for the EEZ was in discussions with the University of Missouri and was not a company that would bring lower skilled manufacturing jobs to Columbia. While she acknowledged the need for jobs for all demographics of the unemployed, she believed it was disingenuous to allow people to think the jobs would be for manufacturing and for 80 percent or more of the local unemployed. She suggested organizations, such as the Food Pantry and United Way, participate in a broader conversation on how to find jobs for the larger percentages of people they serve to determine if they, with others in the community, could creatively bring jobs to those demographics without which the City would not qualify for the EEZ program. She asked the Council to not establish an EEZ Board and provided a handout of her comments.

Dawn Zetterberg, 608 Hunt Avenue, stated she lived in Ward 1, which was within the blighted area on an earlier map and she did not want the value of her house to go down. She stated she did not want to move out of her house.

Jim Loveless, 2404 Topaz Drive, commented that he believed the two primary concerns expressed involving the EEZ were property devaluation due to a blighted designation and the fear of condemnation. He explained he was a homeowner, and his home was his family’s largest single investment after a lifetime of work, and like most others, he wanted to see his home value appreciate. He stated he was not overly concerned about the influence of an artificial designation, which was an artifact of legislation which enabled the formation of an EEZ. He thought it was unfortunate this terminology was a part of the legislation as another term could have just as easily been used. The businesses and
industries, which the City’s development staff would target, would not be influenced by the designation. They would be influenced by the attractions the City had for their people and the opportunity for some cost relief in deciding whether to create new jobs in the community. He believed business establishment or the expansion in jobs imported or created would drive the demand for property in Columbia, and that demand would drive the value of his home and other properties in the community since the most influential driver of property value was a strong, vibrant economy. The EEZ was a step toward providing another tool for Columbia to use to enhance its economic vitality. He understood the fear of condemnation on private property since the record of legislative bodies in this arena was not always enviable as the use of condemnation of private property and the transfer of that to other private hands for redevelopment had sometimes been abused. He believed the situation in Columbia was different as some limitations would be placed on it. In addition, the Council had pledged this would not be the case in Columbia. He felt, at some point, the citizens had to trust those elected to represent them to acknowledge their concerns and honor the commitments made to the citizens that elected them, and he had faith in this Council and those that followed would do just that. He believed the action before Council was a step in the right direction for Columbia.

Mary Hussmann stated she was speaking on behalf of Grass Roots Organizing (GRO) with offices at 611 N. Garth and noted blight was a negative term that would indicate an area in Columbia was unsanitary, unhealthy and unsafe. She did not believe Columbia neighborhoods were blighted and felt it was deceptive and dishonest to twist the truth and pretend an area met the blight criteria. The Regional Economic Development, Inc. (REDI) had indicated they needed blight to get manufacturing jobs to Columbia, but the State had no hard data showing if or how blight EEZ’s had helped any specific community bring jobs and income to their city. She noted the EEZ program did not require any community to use any potential job growth to stimulate low income and high unemployment areas where the jobs were needed most. She wondered how the Council could act to engage in a program when they had no idea what it could do, and when the effects could be permanently damaging. She understood any company that invested as little as $100,000 and gave at least two people a job would receive no less than 50 percent of their property taxes and tax credits from the State. She believed this was a tax avoidance scheme that would erode the already strapped tax base causing others to pay more taxes to address the loss of revenue to schools and others. She wondered what would keep a company that came to Columbia from asking for a bigger tax break or moving to another community. She also wondered how already established companies within Columbia would feel since they were not being provided tax breaks. She did not believe any more time should be wasted on blight or the EEZ as it was divisive, damaging to the reputation of Columbia, unproven, costly and unfair to the majority of Columbians. She asked the Council to not waste anymore efforts on this unpopular program.

Peggy Kirkpatrick stated she was the Executive Director of the Food Bank for Central and Northeast Missouri with offices at 2101 Vandiver and pointed out she was not in favor of or against the EEZ. She only wanted to get people to work. The pantry provided food to 19,945 people in 2009, 20,596 people in 2010 and 22,638 in 2011, and as of April 2012, the
pantry had served 10,295 people. Of the 10,295 people from this year, 2,350 were unemployed. She felt social service agencies were having trouble keeping up with the demand for basic needs services. She explained the two types of poverty were generational and situational, and situational poverty had increased in the last 3-4 years due to the recession. Those people had the life skills to be self-sufficient, but a situation, such as unemployment, a catastrophic illness or divorce, was the cause of the poverty. Once the situation was resolved, those people would no longer need basic services. She commented that the Food Bank did a very unofficial survey from May 11 to earlier today, May 21, asking Boone County residents if they would be interested in applying for a factory/manufacturing job if available in Columbia, and of the 2,936 people that visited the pantry on those days, 503 responded and 438 of those indicated they would be interested. She explained she asked five area manufacturing companies of the required entry level skill set, and only two required computer skills. All required a high school diploma or a GED and basic work habits all employers would desire. She stated she did not have the answer regarding how to get people back to work and hoped the Council could help get people back to work.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, stated she disagreed with Mr. Loveless’ statement indicating the definition under state statute was an artifact. She noted she lived in the North Central Columbia neighborhood and North Central was on a lot of development plans, whether private or City initiated or involving the EEZ program or a TIF district, and their homes were sacred to them. She felt by starting a program that included their demographics with regard to income, the Council would start the displacement of the neighborhood. She referred to the 1960’s and noted there was a history of displacement of low income residents in Columbia. She believed this program would have the effect of accelerating the acquisition of land under homes in the area as it provided incentives to people, and she was concerned they would be displaced. Although she had not met a Columbia resident that had been displaced in the 1960’s, she had met relatives, who had indicated it was a life changing event from which their elders had never recovered. She did not believe displacement was a way to bring about economic prosperity to Columbia, and felt this was a step backwards.

Jeff Stack, 7890 Turtle Creek Lane, commented that he was disturbed by the fact the process was continuing forward as it seemed to only benefit the very elite and a small group of business interests within and outside of the community. He felt this was a charade and that decisions had already been made. He was not sure how this would benefit the community or those that needed work. He believed the blight designation and the dismissal of a neighborhood was detestable. He challenged and encouraged the Council to vote no on this issue as there was enough resistance. He thought the Council should rethink this process if they believed in free enterprise as it could create more problems in the long run, and encouraged the Council to show a greater amount of vision by considering the interests and needs of all people in the community versus a small number of people.

Roy Hartley, 110 Russell Boulevard, stated he did not want the Council to establish this board and noted there had been no public announcement for the positions they were seeking to fill like with other City boards. Those appointed would be hand picked and would be making significant decisions that affected everyone in Columbia. He did not believe that was acceptable. He agreed jobs were needed, but felt there were a lot of ways to create
jobs. He commented that clean air, clean water and an aesthetically pleasing community with good services, schools, public transportation, bicycle lanes, etc. contributed to quality and raised property values. A large steel mill in the middle of Columbia that employed a lot of people would decrease property values because no one would want to live next to it. He asked the Council to not create the EEZ Board.

Dan Cullimore, 715 Lyons Street, stated he would support the appointment of two of the people mentioned by Mayor McDavid, but still felt the establishment of a Board was premature. He commented that there was an advance public announcement of nominees for most of the boards and commissions with this kind of power, which allowed for public input. He encouraged the Council to allow the public to vet these names and provide input. He asked the Council to not proceed with appointments to the Board tonight.

Tim Rich, 2516 Meadow Lark Lane, noted he was the Executive Director of the Heart of Missouri United Way and that he also served on the Board of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce. He provided a handout and explained financial independence and income was one of the keys to solving poverty in the community. He stated he had conducted a poll of the non-profit agencies the United Way funded and received a response from about ten percent of the agencies, and those that responded indicated they were in favor of the EEZ if it would bring jobs to the community. He explained he was the son of a factory worker and found it offensive when people stated they did not want those kinds of jobs in Columbia because those jobs allowed his parents to come out of poverty and to provide for three of his cousins in addition to him and his two siblings. He noted the data on page 9 of the handout came from the Truman School of Public Policy and indicated unemployment had doubled since 2005 to six percent. Per the best estimates in March, unemployment was now at about 4.9 percent. This meant 5,500 people in the community were currently unemployed. In addition, the poverty rate was 21.8-23 percent and was equivalent to 24,500 people in the community. He stated he could not imagine trying to raise a family of four with a household income of $22,500 or less, and provided some statistics and reasons the poverty level was worse. He commented that 3M had over 1,200 employees when he moved to Columbia, but it currently only had 100 employees. He understood they had to compete with other 3M plants to expand to get back to 1,200 or more employees, and due to this, he believed incentives were needed. In addition, many in the community felt jobs needed to be provided to teens in the summer. Those participating at the first meeting of the Silence the Violence movement believed jobs were the only way to stem the violence. Although there was a lot of retail in the community, retail did not pay a livable wage, and those that were underemployed were working in those jobs that normally high school and college students worked. He believed they needed to find a way to bring livable wage jobs into the community to address the issue of poverty. He also pointed out property values were impacted negatively when poverty rates increased to over 20 percent and moved toward 40-50 percent because people did not want to live in those types of communities, and he did not want that for Columbia.

Mitch Richards, 707 Washington Avenue, stated he was the Treasurer of Keep Columbia Free and explained the reasons Keep Columbia Free had publicly called for the recall of any Council Member that supported the establishment of the EEZ Board were not personal, but were political. Keep Columbia Free was a political action committee, was
partisan and had a specific agenda, which was to promote and defend life, liberty and property for everyone in the community. They advocated for free markets, property rights and civil liberties, and to spoke out against corporate subsidies of all kinds. They felt the EEZ process had been flawed from the start as it had not sought input from the community in an adequate manner. It appeared to be driven by the interests of the business community and REDI, Inc., which was a public-private entity with ties to all of the economic power centers of central Missouri. He did not believe Columbia was blighted and did not feel Columbia needed to provide taxpayer money to private business interests. Columbia was regularly cited as one of the most livable and prosperous towns of its size in America. The EEZ initiative, with the obligatory blight designation, would potentially trample on the property rights of every resident in Columbia. He noted Columbia’s had a history of eminent domain abuse, specifically in terms of the eradication of the Black business community in the Sharp End a few decades ago. He did not believe it was acceptable to seize a family’s home if it could be demonstrated that what would be put in its place would provide an increase in revenues to the government. He thought one of the problems was that people falsely believed the government should and could create jobs, but in his opinion, jobs were created when burdens, taxes and regulations were reduced and the rule of law was upheld. A policy of the needs of the many and of the rights of the few did not create wealth. It hurt and divided people among racial and socio-economic lines. Keep Columbia Free had long opposed this model for economic development and the EEZ would further entrench this model in central Missouri at the expense of the free market. He emphasized that if an EEZ Board was created, Keep Columbia Free would collect signatures for the removal of the ordinance and the dissolution of the board to be placed on the November ballot.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, explained he was a disabled factory worker and wanted people to have jobs, but also wanted good water, etc. He asked the Council to listen to the “little people” and referred to a financial disaster that had occurred in the stock market and had affected the economy because the “little people” were ignored.

Dean Andersen, 814 Timbers Court, commented that he believed the discussion regarding the EEZ was healthy, educational and would bring the community together in the long run. He explained he came from a working class family and in a small town and believed factory jobs were good jobs, but he also believed those factories should pay their fair share of taxes. He noted computers and automation had made industry much more productive with far less workers, and that profitability was often translated in higher wages for the CEO. It also meant these corporations could pay their fair share in taxes and to allow them to do less was unfair to everyone else, which was why he was not supportive of incentives of this type. In addition, the community was dependent on the tax base. He agreed something needed to be done to address poverty. One solution would be to reduce the interest rates businesses, such as payday loans, could charge those in need. He also agreed job creation was needed, but felt those locating in Columbia should pay their fair share.

Bruce Summers, 6231 N. Gregory, stated he was in opposition to the EEZ Board and REDI as he believed this program was a gateway to eminent domain. He felt anyone in support of REDI, the EEZ Board and the use of eminent domain to take personal property
was a tyrant. Governments tended to take wealth from people and redistribute that wealth, and in that redistribution process efficiency was lost. The best thing any government could do was to support the private property of the individual so they could do best with what they had.

Deanna Walkenbach, 407 Pyrenees Drive, understood Mr. Rich indicated the unemployment rate was 4.9 percent and 5,500 were unemployed in Columbia, but that equation took into account everyone that lived in Columbia, and noted Columbia did not have 5,500 unemployed people because that figure included children, students, etc.

Carol Greenspan, 505 Columbia Drive, Apt. H, stated she agreed with the comments made earlier by Linda Green. The cost versus benefit of the EEZ was unknown and no data had shown the benefit to the communities in which the EEZ had been established. She pointed out Columbia had the lowest unemployment rate in the State of Missouri. She agreed more people were unemployed now than in the past, but some of those that were unemployed needed more than the kinds of jobs this would provide. They needed an education. She explained she came from an impoverished family as well, and her father changed that by working during the day while going to school at night, which was why she felt education was important for the unemployed. She noted she was also concerned about the lack of local control in terms of the EEZ because monitoring was handled by the State. In addition, there would be a major loss of revenue due to the movement of taxes to small businesses and certain individuals.

Greg Ahrens, 1504 Sylvan Lane, recommended the Council table this bill and allow for a community-wide conversation on economic development in general through an economic development commission or task force that would investigate the facts. The proposed bill gave three duties to the commission, which were to develop the map and application for Council consideration, recommend companies for EEZ eligibility and provide an annual report to the Missouri Department of Economic Development. He felt a more broad-based group needed to be established to develop the map and application, and after that was done, another board could be appointed to recommend companies and provide an annual report to the State. He understood some of the land involved was currently outside of the city limits and he questioned the authority of the City to apply for an EEZ for an area outside of the city limits. He noted the definition that determined the eligibility for this was the same definition used in other legislation that led to eminent domain, and the legislature failed to enact a proper statute to eliminate that language for this. He stated he did not believe the community needed jobs and thought they needed incomes instead.

Nancy Harter, 201 S. Glenwood Avenue, understood REDI, Inc. had been organized in 1998 to promote positive economic expansion in Columbia and Boone County as a non-profit and public-private partnership that worked to provide increased economic opportunities for the area while maintaining a high quality of life. She did not believe the EEZ blight program was promoting a positive economic expansion or maintaining a high quality of life for all. She felt providing tax incentives was similar to bribing corporations and did not believe they should give away money as it was needed for schools, roads and other items necessary for a high quality of life. She felt REDI was taking the easy way and following the crowd, and believed there were more creative ways to bring jobs to Columbia with its major university
and two colleges. She suggested the City use the University of Michigan as an example. She believed the loss in tax revenue from the EEZ would cause great pain to this community and its people. She felt the Council was being deceived or deceiving themselves and were being beggars with regard to putting forth a blight designation. She believed the citizens of Columbia were upset, anxious and angry.

Jennifer Bukowsky, 2140 E. Bluebird Lane, commented that she had heard a lot of concerns of the need for money and jobs, but had not heard any ideas from the opponents to the EEZ in terms of bringing wealth to the community in a manner that was better than what was proposed. While she respected their concerns and views regarding property values, etc., she believed everyone would benefit from more wealth being in the community, and felt it was the responsibility of Council to consider tools such as the EEZ.

Shawn Reberry, Ashland Road, commented that if the City thought tax abatements would help the economy, he wondered why a board needed to be formed as he believed the City should just lower taxes for everyone.

Michael Redstock, 1118 West Broadway, agreed one of the best ways to get people out of poverty was to help them acquire gainful employment and that one of the best ways to build jobs and grow a community was to lower taxes. He wondered why taxes for everyone should not be lowered and suggested providing all local businesses these tax breaks as they employed people and were loyal to the community. He felt 3M might not be struggling if this tax break had been provided. In addition, the money would then not be funneled to outside corporations only.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he appreciated the Council reviewing the composition of a possible board, but felt that once the board was created, any discussion regarding economic development would stop. He believed a much broader public discussion was needed to reach consensus on the kind of economic development needed, the types of companies that would receive incentives and how economic development initiatives would be financed, and suggested a board be created to do this type of review. He was not in total agreement that a community had to grow or it would die, and noted the benefits of rapid growth were unevenly distributed. He was uncomfortable with an approach of more jobs at any costs and was concerned about the budgets of the School District and others that were helping to fight a variety of poverty conditions. He recommended not approving the establishment of this EEZ Board, but establishing another board that would lead to public discussion regarding the kind and pace of economic development in Columbia as he was uncertain the EEZ program was the best way to move forward with economic development.

Paul Land, 2005 Robin Terrace, commented that EEZ provided the City a tool to target specific industries and bring in jobs from outside of the community. The program would require a certain percentage of the business needing to be outside of the community and had lower thresholds that allowed smaller businesses to participate. It was an economic tool that had been proven throughout the State, and he believed Columbia should be able to utilize the same tool. He did not think there had been back room deals, and did not believe this program would result in displacement or eminent domain. This was about providing a tool developed by the Department of Economic Development to create jobs, which had been proven successful in 120 other municipalities. He stated he supported moving forward with
the EEZ as he believed communities outside of Boone County would continue to seize the opportunity for manufacturing jobs if Columbia could not compete.

Ben Jacob, Liberty Plaza, commented that he believed the EEZ program was a wedge in the door for land grabbing. He did not believe this was a tool. He believed it would be used by individuals with money to scheme to take parts of the community, and thought this idea should be eliminated. He asked the Council to take the lives of others more seriously.

Dan Hemmelgarn, 412 Thilly Avenue, understood those in support of the EEZ believed it would create jobs and noted he was supportive of creating jobs, to include manufacturing and factory jobs, if they continued with their clean industry model. He was concerned evidence did not support the fact jobs were created by the EEZ program. He reviewed the unemployment statistics of other communities with an EEZ program and did not believe the program narrowed the gap between those communities and Columbia. He felt tax abatements were a precarious approach to creating jobs as he believed companies would leave for a better tax incentive even if we provided a tax incentive. He did not think this was a good approach to economic development. He believed Columbia was already doing something right as it had the lowest unemployment rate in the State. In addition, the City had good infrastructure, which was dependent on a good tax revenue base, and he hope that was not undermined with the EEZ program.

John Nelson, 1294 Victoria Avenue, stated he was in agreement with the comments made by Mr. Hemmelgarn as he was supportive of job creation and of manufacturing jobs. He was not in favor of declaring Columbia blighted in order to be eligible for this program. He noted he obtained unemployment numbers from www.missourieconomy.org, which was a link on the Missouri Department of Economic Development website, and explained the unemployment rate for the State in 2011 was 8.55 percent, and for the past twelve months, it was 8.19 percent. The rate for Boone County for 2011 was 5.83 percent, and for the past twelve months, it was 5.5 percent. The rate for Columbia for 2011 was 5.43 percent, and for the past twelve months, it was 5.22 percent. The actual unemployment in terms of population for Columbia was 3,058 in March 2012, and not 5,500 as implied by Mr. Rich. The legislation establishing the EEZ indicated the level of unemployment according to the most recent data available needed to equal or exceed the rate for the State of Missouri or the county for the previous twelve months, and based on this he did not believe Columbia was eligible for the program if the community was looked at as a whole instead of through sections.

Karl Skala, 5201 Gasconade Drive, commented that he was opposed to the EEZ, but was happy with a couple of the potential appointees to the EEZ Board if Council decided to proceed. He stated he was concerned about jobs as well, especially those that would provide a better future for those on the lower end of the socioeconomic continuum, but he believed a real jobs discussion needed to emphasize work force development and transportation, and not just the pre-conditions for economic development incentives. He was concerned about the loss of local control with the EEZ program. He congratulated the Council on its decision to rescind R20-12A, and asked the Council to reject any manufacturing, industrial, commercial or retail tax abatement incentive proposal that required the definition of area blight as a pre-requisite for taxpayer subsidized initiatives, which would exclude the EEZ program and Tax Increment Financing based on blighted areas as local
tools. He suggested the Columbia Charter be amended to redefine blighted property to provide substantive protection to property owners and prohibit the use of a blight designation to benefit private development or redevelopment. He asked Council to initiate a public discussion regarding the specific need, financial cost and job creating effectiveness of all economic development incentives, and the memberships and relationships of all governmental and quasi-governmental public-private and private sector entities, groups, boards and commissions that provided the Council with economic development incentive advice.

Catherine Parke, 413 Thilly Avenue, commented that the Council must have seen compelling and substantial evidence and data in support of the establishment of an EEZ Board with all of its implications, which included the statutory designation of blight and the loss of local control, in order to create this ordinance being voted on tonight. For three months, many citizens of Columbia had asked to see the data and evidence supporting the EEZ and for a strong and full public discussion as this was a momentous issue in the history of Columbia. Since this discussion had not yet happened, she recommended the Council not pass this ordinance.

Thomas Weller, 603 Hunt Avenue, stated he believed the blight zone was a form of segregation as it created areas or zones that would be segregated from others. He explained there were segregated zones in the 1930’s and 1940’s in terms of people of different races and economic levels, and felt this blight zone would reestablish that type of segregation. He suggested they not repeat history by creating the blight zones. He thought they should provide education and opportunities in order to address poverty instead of creating blighted areas.

Justin Thomas, 202 W. Sexton Road, commented that instead of looking at this as a tool in the tool kit, he thought this could be viewed as a credit card in a wallet, and wondered why the City would want to use this particular credit card when the others were not maxed out. He thought they should look at other tools that would make Columbia attractive to businesses. Everyone wanted the EEZ blighted zones to be as small as possible, but it would then be isolated on the areas in which the poor people lived. He did not think they should take someone's property in order to provide them a job.

Mr. Trapp commented that he wrestled with the issue of local control with regard to the EEZ because the applications went to the State once the board, map and job classifications were established, but he also understood jobs did not happen by themselves. He thought the toolbox analogy was a good one and this would provide another tool in the toolbox and noted he had a great deal of faith in REDI. The City had an economic development department, which was phased into REDI to provide for a regional approach. This made sense for development and allowed for economic development in the form of a partnership. He believed there would be more public and private partnerships as finances became scarce in order to enact a positive agenda. He felt the fundamental issue was jobs. He recognized the fact Columbia’s unemployment rate was lower than a lot of other places within the State, but he did not believe the unemployment rate represented the true rate of people who did not have jobs. It only represented those that were still actively looking for employment. It was generally a fair rule of thumb to double the unemployment rate to obtain the actual rate of
people who actually wanted a job. He explained he spent time with people that struggled with that issue and this seemed to advance the cause. He noted that through this dialogue and conversation with the community, the Council had responded. The Council had rescinded the previous resolution and brought it back as an ordinance, which was a process point. The previous board had generated a smaller blight area map in an effort to address neighborhood concerns. In addition, Council planned to add neighborhood and opposition representation to the new EEZ Board at the cost of not reappointing some members that had served admirably on the previous Board. He noted the Council was trying to bring the community together as best as they could. At some point, he believed they might have to agree to disagree, but he appreciated the different perspectives from everyone involved.

Mayor McDavid stated one of the interesting duties in his position as mayor was to serve on the REDI Board as he had participated in discussions with IBM, Google and other companies. He noted they had lost some of those businesses because the incentives were not as much as other communities. He wished Columbia did not have to provide tax incentives, and pointed out he tried to communicate the culture, youth, energy, education, parks, trails, etc. when pitching Columbia, but that was not enough for some companies. He explained companies like Veterans United, which employed 900 people and was established by University of Missouri graduates that already liked Columbia, were not always hiring people with only GED’s or people with criminal records. He agreed there were a lot of great companies in Columbia, but many did not serve that population. In addition, there were many companies that would locate in Columbia regardless of the tax abatement, and these incentives did not necessarily need to be provided to them. He thought these incentives needed to go to companies that would not locate in Columbia without them, and for companies that might provide jobs that paid $35,000 per year with benefits to people without a college education, so people had an opportunity to get out of poverty and raise a family. If Columbia did not provide incentives to these types of companies, they might relocate to communities like Centralia, which might cause Columbians to drive to Centralia while utilizing the Columbia school system and infrastructure without paying for those services since the money would go to Centralia instead. There were a lot of people that did not have jobs and needed assistance. He believed this program could help. He understood the argument of not wanting to abate taxes and put a burden on the schools, but noted those taxes were not being eliminated. Only a portion was being abated for a certain period of time, so the company would still be responsible for paying some taxes, and if the company did not locate to Columbia, no taxes would be paid as they would not exist. He noted he would support moving forward with the establishment of the EEZ Board to assist in bringing businesses to Columbia to potentially provide needed jobs.

Mr. Schmidt commented that when he ran for City Council in 2011, he had a vision of a livable, walkable, vibrant Columbia centered in the First Ward with its thriving downtown and residential neighborhoods. Many believed these goals had already been achieved, but he did not believe they had. There was a lot of unemployment within the African-American community, the youth and people with criminal records, which needed to be addressed. He believed Columbia had suffered from the loss of manufacturing jobs, and there was finally discussion with regard to that problem. He noted he would continue to support the EEZ
program for those people. He recognized that many disagreed with his decision, and he respected and was grateful to those who were engaged in a productive and community minded manner discussion with him on the topic. He hoped that conversation would continue beyond tonight as they might differ on their approaches, but did not differ in wanting a healthy, thriving community where everyone could earn a living wage and enjoy the best of what Columbia had to offer. He noted this was one tool, and others tools, such as job training, would be discussed.

Mr. Dudley pointed out the EEZ Board would have people in support of and against the EEZ, which was good as the process moved forward. He suggested the citizens help develop other ideas for job creation while the EEZ process was being deliberated. He felt it would benefit the community if the same amount of effort was made for ideas for job creation as there had been with opposing the EEZ. He noted he planned to support the establishment of the EEZ Board.

Ms. Hoppe commented that this ordinance positively addressed the process problem in terms of the EEZ Board and would allow for the expansion of the composition of its board members so it was more representative of those who would be in the potential blighted census zones. She explained she had gone back and forth on this issue. She felt this could be a positive tool in the toolbox if it was used narrowly and cautiously and with proper controls, which would include a Charter amendment regarding eminent domain and the use of blight for pursuing eminent domain. If the EEZ board recommended a new map with blighted areas, she believed those protections needed to be in place. She thought some legitimate questions had been raised, such as the role of the Council with regard to economic development policy and job creation, the role of the economic development director in terms of being only the president of REDI or the director of economic development for the City, and how to address situations when REDI’s interest overlapped or diverged with the City’s interest. She noted another issue was the lack of data in terms of the number of jobs the EEZ really created and whether other types of tools would create more jobs. She believed green jobs, such as jobs involving energy efficiency, would create trades, employ a lot of people and remain in the community. She pointed out there was a concern manufacturing companies would only remain in Columbia for a certain period of time if offered abatement as they would wait for a better offer. She agreed the EEZ was one potential tool, specifically in terms of manufacturing, but reiterated that they needed to proceed carefully, cautiously and narrowly. She hoped the EEZ Board provided a map that was narrow in its designation. She noted she was in favor of the creation of the Board, but had many reservations and concerns.

Mr. Kespohl stated he had always believed the discussion involving the EEZ was about jobs. He was happy the unemployment rate in Columbia was the lowest in Missouri, but he was still concerned about unemployment and underemployment in Columbia. He commented that at his grandson’s confirmation service, one of the other 14 year olds being confirmed said, “Christians should put others before themselves and commit selfless acts for less fortunate people” in his address to the congregation, and he felt that was appropriate in this situation as well.
B121-12 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDAVID, SCHMIDT. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

CONSENT AGENDA

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

B110-12 Changing the uses allowed on C-P zoned property located on the west side of U.S. Highway 63 and approximately 700 feet south of Interstate 70; approving a revised statement of intent; approving the C-P Development Plan of Lot 1 of Konstantin Subdivision.

B112-12 Approving the Final Plat of Auburn Hills Plat 10-A1, a Minor Replat of Lot 1007, Auburn Hills Plat 10-A located on the northwest corner of Bodie Drive and Edenton Boulevard; authorizing a performance contract.

B113-12 Amending Chapter 6 of the City Code as it relates to chimney sweep license requirements and to establish fees for mechanical licenses.

B114-12 Authorizing a right of use permit with Stephens College for construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of a pedestrian bridge in the East Broadway right-of-way.

B115-12 Appropriating funds for the purchase of four Paratransit vans, two buses and miscellaneous equipment.

B116-12 Appropriating funds for the Hominy Branch Outfall Relief Sewer Project; transferring funds to the annual sewer improvement project.

B117-12 Appropriating special fuel tax rebate funds for the Fleet Operations Fuel and Facilities Upgrade project.

B118-12 Accepting conveyances for temporary construction, and sewer purposes.

B119-12 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.

B120-12 Amending the FY 2012 Annual Budget, the FY 2012 Pay Plan and Classification Plan to add, delete, reclassify, upgrade, change titles and close positions in the Law Department, Human Resources Department, Department of Public Health and Human Services and Finance Department; transferring funds; amending Chapter 19 of the City Code to include the deputy city counselor in the definition of unclassified service.

R68-12 Setting a public hearing: construction of the Northeast Pressure Zone 16-inch water main loop project.

R69-12 Setting a public hearing: design and construction of a system control center in Water and Light Department offices located on the fourth floor of the City Hall Building.

R70-12 Setting a public hearing: consider an amendment to the FY 2012 Annual Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds.

R71-12 Authorizing an inspections participation agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Summer Food Service Program for Children.

R72-12 Authorizing the City Manager to execute Amendment No. 1 to the agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services...
R73-12 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Show Me Healthy Women Program.

R74-12 Authorizing various Adopt a Spot agreements.

R75-12 Authorizing an agreement with Hockman’s ATA for sports development funding under the Tourism Development Program.

R76-12 Authorizing an amendment to the professional architectural services agreement with Peckham & Wright Architects, Inc. for planning, design and construction management of the infill space in the Fifth Street and Walnut Street parking structure.

R77-12 Authorizing the execution of a Continuing Disclosure Agreement in connection with the City of Sikeston, Missouri, Electric System Revenue Refunding Bonds, 2012 Series.

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

NEW BUSINESS

R78-12 Authorizing a neighborhood stabilization program development agreement with Job Point for the redevelopment of property located at 908 Madison Street.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

The vote on R78-12 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, KESPOHL, DUDLEY, ANTHONY, HOPPE, MCDavid, SCHMIDT. 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.

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

B123-12 Rezoning property located on the south side of Walnut Street, approximately 350 feet west of College Avenue (1208 and 1210 East Walnut Street) from R-3 to C-2 zoning.

B124-12 Amending the permitted uses on property in District C-P located on the east side of North Old Highway 63 and north of McAlester Street (900 North Old Highway 63); approving a revised statement of intent; approving the C-P Plan of Columbia Car Care.
B125-12 Approving the Final Plat of Begley Subdivision – Plat 2; accepting the dedication of rights-of-way and easements; authorizing a performance contract; vacating portions of Vanwood Way and Rangeline Street; setting forth a condition for approval.

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

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

B128-12 Authorizing a facilities and services agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the use of Peace Park for the Fourth of July Celebration and Fireworks Display.

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

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

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

B132-12 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.

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

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP81-12 Mexico Gravel Road Signage to Slow Speeds in Curve.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid made a motion directing staff to prepare an amendment to Section 14.223 of the Code of Ordinances to raise the speed limit on Mexico Gravel Road, between Vandiver Drive and Ballenger Lane, from 30 mph to 40 mph as currently posted, and to add chevron signs as shown in the diagram. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dudley.

Mr. Kespohl asked if it was being raised to 40 mph. Mr. Glascock replied they were including it in the ordinance as 40 mph. Mr. Kespohl thought that might make the problem worse. Mr. Glascock stated the speed limit sign indicated 40 mph. Mr. Kespohl understood there was a problem when coming around the curve when it was icy. Mr. Glascock stated the signs would allow for more depth to see the curve. He believed many did not see the curve until it was too late. Mr. Kespohl understood the issue could be revisited. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.
The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Mr. Dudley directing staff to prepare an amendment to Section 14.223 of the Code of Ordinances to raise the speed limit on Mexico Gravel Road, between Vandiver Drive and Ballenger Lane, from 30 mph to 40 mph as currently posted, and to add chevron signs as shown in the diagram was approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP82-12 Street Closure Request - Fire in the Sky.

Ms. Rhodes provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp asked for the difference between hard and soft closures. Ms. Rhodes replied a hard closure implied there was a stage or other permanent structure in the roadway and a soft closure only allowed for pedestrian traffic into and out of an area.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to approve the street closure as requested. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP83-12 Street Lighting along the Western Terminus of Smiley Lane.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe understood the operation cost for the four lights was $1,459 annually and this would be paid with general fund money to Boone Electric. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct.

Ms. Hoppe recalled a discussion regarding a reduction in lighting in areas in which there was too much lighting in an effort to reduce expenditures from the general fund. She asked if staff was looking into areas with too much lighting or in areas where businesses had been established and were now creating their own lighting. Mr. Johnsen replied no. He explained the only plan in place was for the use of LED’s in order to reduce electricity usage for the same amount of lighting.

Mayor McDavid noted there had been discussion in terms of the Water and Light Department budget paying for street lights and asked if that was being done. Mr. Johnsen replied the general fund was only paying for the operation of the street lights and the cost of the materials to maintain the street lights.

Mayor McDavid asked how this would be funded. Mr. Johnsen replied it would be funded through the general fund and the City would be paying Boone Electric for these lights.

Mayor McDavid made a motion directing staff to authorize Boone Electric Cooperative to install four additional street lights along the western terminus of Smiley Lane. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP84-12 Sidewalk Gaps in Subdivisions - Smithton Ridge.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Schmidt understood those that purchase adjacent lots did not have an obligation to build a sidewalk if the lot was never developed. He also understood the City required developers to construct streets, but that was not required for sidewalks. Mr. Teddy replied the requirement was deferred for single family homes. Technically, it was part of the subdivision infrastructure and subject to the performance contract, but older subdivisions were outside of the requirements of the performance contract. He explained they would
require the developer to install sidewalks as the subdivision was approaching completion, but they did not have the authority to require the gaps to be filled in older subdivisions.

Mayor McDavid commented that he would like to require the sidewalks to be constructed, but there were gaps all over town, so that would be difficult from a policy standpoint. He wondered if it was a workable policy to require every lot in Columbia to have a sidewalk. Mr. Teddy agreed and thought they might want to look at the significance of the gap, such as whether it was part of a route people took. He noted this particular situation was likely part of a school route. Mr. Matthes agreed it would be difficult to come up with a policy and recommended the Council address these gaps on a case by case basis instead. For this particular situation, it appeared the gap needed to be addressed and all remedies other than tax billing had been exhausted.

Ms. Anthony asked if the owner of the two lots was the original developer. Mr. Teddy replied both lots had been sold to others.

Mayor McDavid understood the staff recommendation was to tax bill the owner of these two lots. Mr. Matthes agreed.

Mayor McDavid made a motion directing staff to begin the process of tax billing for construction of sidewalks on the two lots discussed within Smithton Ridge. The motion was seconded by Ms. Anthony.

Mr. Schmidt suggested they only tax bill if the owners did not choose to construct the sidewalks themselves because it would likely cost less if they did it themselves. Mayor McDavid asked if he wanted to give them a time frame of 90 days to act. Mr. Schmidt stated he preferred 120 days.

Mr. Kespohl asked if an ordinance or mechanism was needed to require sidewalk installation for a lot that was redeveloped or rezoned or when a new subdivision was built. Mr. Matthes replied that was the current approach of the City, but in this case, they were beyond the time frame. Mr. Boeckmann explained that as part of the subdivision process, the developer was required to install sidewalks within three years, but if not done, there was a five year statute of limitation, so if the City did not do anything within those five years, the City’s claim under the contract was not effective.

Mr. Schmidt asked if the 90 or 120 days caused an issue then. Mr. Boeckmann suggested the property owner be contacted because there was no need to wait four months if the owner indicated he would not install the sidewalk.

Mr. Trapp thought there might be a larger policy issue in terms of subdivisions greater than three years and less than eight years. He liked the idea of requiring a bond so they did not continually have this problem and asked if that would require a separate motion.

Mayor McDavid thought they should require a time limit so someone did not say they would install the sidewalk without any action. He liked the 120 day suggestion.

Mr. Schmidt made a motion to amend the motion made by Mayor McDavid directing staff to provide the property owner 120 days to respond if the owner preferred to install the sidewalk himself instead of being tax billed. The motion was seconded by Mr. Dudley and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid, seconded by Ms. Anthony and amended by Mr. Schmidt directing staff to begin the process of tax billing for construction of sidewalks on the
two lots discussed within Smithton Ridge if the property owner did not respond within 120 days was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Trapp thought the City should hold active subdivisions within the time frame accountable to the performance contract, and asked if that needed to be addressed by a separate motion. Mr. Matthes stated staff intended to enforce the installation of sidewalk gaps in subdivisions still under the performance contract. Mr. Trapp understood Council did not need to take action. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct since they intended to address sidewalk gaps in this manner.

Ms. Hoppe understood sidewalk gaps might need to be prioritized in terms of which ones needed to be addressed. Mr. Matthes stated routes to schools were more important than others, and staff would look into each situation.

Mr. Schmidt hoped communication with the property owner would be done with a knock on the door or a friendly letter instead of a threatening letter initially because there could be situations where the property owner could not afford to install the sidewalk.

**REP85-12 No Street Parking during Snow Events - Pilot Program.**

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Ms. Hoppe asked if these three neighborhoods, which were on the perimeter of the City, would receive snow removal services before any other residential area. Mr. Glascock replied yes, if they could come to an agreement to remove cars off of the street quickly. Ms. Hoppe asked why these neighborhoods were chosen. Mr. Glascock replied eighteen neighborhoods applied and these three were chosen for the pilot because they were not heavily parked areas and would likely result in better compliance. In addition, since they were further out, it would allow staff to determine if the pilot worked in terms of time. Ms. Hoppe asked if the trucks would already be in those neighborhoods or if they would be in the central city area and would then have to go out to these neighborhoods. She wondered if this meant the central city would be last in terms of receiving snow removal services. Mr. Matthes stated the priority routes would be serviced first.

Mr. Schmidt suggested they include a crowded central area neighborhood in the pilot as well to determine how it would work. Mr. Glascock stated they were starting with neighborhoods in which they felt the pilot would be successful. If cars were not moved, they would be towed, and staff did not want to tow too many cars. Mayor McDavid stated the City did not have to tow the cars. They could just not plow those areas.

Mr. Kespohl asked for the remedy if cars were parked on the street. Mr. Glascock replied the street was either not plowed or the cars were towed. Mr. Kespohl asked how many times the crews would go out there before saying the neighborhood was off the list. Mr. Glascock replied there would need to be a lot of education because a notice would be sent via press release or another method indicating whether the pilot would be implemented with that particular snow storm.

Mayor McDavid stated he believed peer pressure was powerful, and the owner of the car that kept a priority neighborhood from being plowed would have to deal with that peer pressure. He thought that would be a sufficient compliance method.
Ms. Anthony commented that she thought there would be compliance due to the incentive of plowing service, especially on cul-de-sac streets and perimeter neighborhoods. She felt if this made plowing more efficient and if other neighborhoods signed up, it would help the entire City because it would take less time to plow.

Ms. Hoppe stated certain streets in the Sixth Ward were very steep and she was concerned they would not be addressed in a timely manner even though they were on the residential priority list. Mr. Glascock stated these neighborhoods would not be ahead of the priority streets.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought this was a great idea and believed Valley View was a good selection as it had an active neighborhood association and interesting topography. This pilot would also put some responsibility on neighborhoods. Mayor McDavid suggested pictures be taken in situations where cars were parked on the street.

REP86-12 Vegetation Management Program.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Kespohl commented that the specific complaint that caused Mr. Thornhill to ask for a report involved trees being trimmed to short. The person that had contacted Mr. Thornhill was not satisfied with how they were cut. In addition, scraps of wood, etc. were left on the sidewalk and street. He asked who should be contacted in those situations. Mr. Johnsen replied the Water and Light Administration Office could be contacted, and they would send people out to talk to the owner to determine how they could make it aesthetically better. He explained they talked to the customer prior to trimming most of the time in terms of what they were doing and what to expect. He noted they operated off of a three year species specific type cycle so certain species were trimmed back further than others.

Mr. Schmidt thought the City could advertise the fact they provided coupons for new trees when necessary. In addition, he noted property owners could contact staff as well in terms of how the trees would be trimmed and who was responsible for which trees, etc. He commented that one of the reasons the City had reliable power in the winter was a result of the tree trimming program, so there was a trade off in terms of power, aesthetics and vegetation. Mr. Johnsen agreed and noted the three year cycle was a fairly good compromise. He explained the trade a tree program was for situations in which they removed a tree and planted another tree that was more suitable for the location.

REP87-12 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Thomas Weller, 603 Hunt Avenue, stated he was on disability and did not have a lot of money for cabs, and could only afford to transport his pets to veterinary clinics through the public transit system. He had a pet carrier, but was told his pets were not allowed since they were not designated as service animals. During hot weather, it was difficult to walk to the veterinary clinic and back.
Mr. Weller explained on May 11 he had been bitten by two dogs when walking along Worley on his way home to Hunt Avenue. He understood the dogs had bitten someone after him as well.

Mayor McDavid asked about the public transit system policy regarding pets. Mr. Matthes stated he did not know and would get back to Council on that issue via a report. Mr. Schmidt felt a pet in a carrier should be okay.

Ms. Anthony asked Mr. Weller if he had reported the bites to animal control. Mr. Weller replied he had reported it to animal control and the police on May 11. Mayor McDavid asked if he had received a response. Mr. Weller replied yes and noted only one dog had been found to date.

Dick Emerson, 3810 Trefoil Drive, stated he was the person that was pressing the issue of sidewalk completion on Trefoil Drive. He understood the Council had taken action to get those sidewalks completed. Mayor McDavid stated that was correct. Mr. Emerson explained when he located in the Smithton Ridge subdivision in 2005, only three lots had been undeveloped, and within a year, the sidewalk was completed on one of those lots. He was told by that property owner that the City had installed and billed them for the sidewalk, which had upset him because he felt he could have done it more cheaply. He was not sure why the City did not install the sidewalk on the other two lots at that time, but he suspected those two lots would never be developed, which was why he felt it was important for those to be installed. He was glad this issue would finally be addressed and appreciated it.

Mr. Dudley stated he had forwarded an e-mail to staff regarding sidewalks on the south side of Broadway, between Garth and West, as he was told it would be less expensive to install sidewalks on the south side instead of the north side, and asked for a report regarding cost and the possibility of installing those sidewalks this summer. He wanted to know if that was the City’s responsibility or the property owner’s responsibility as well.

Ms. Hoppe stated she wanted to follow up on the request for a letter from animal control for the grant described by Ms. Peters and Ms. Chaffin.

Ms. Anthony commented that she would also like staff to invite the interested parties to meet to discuss the opportunity for collaboration. She hoped they would not only collaborate on this issue, but find other areas of collaboration as well. She understood it had been the intention of the Central Missouri Humane Society for their director to convene a meeting to discuss collaboration issues when that person came on board, but she was not sure this could wait until the new director was hired and preferred the City host the meeting. Mr. Kespohl understood a director had been hired. Ms. Anthony hoped the director would agree to participate.

Mr. Trapp understood the Maddie’s Fund grant was small, but those studies could lead to much larger awards, which would benefit the City.

Mr. Kespohl commented that a citizen had contacted him regarding the creation of a right turn lane on Keene Street to turn on to St. Charles Road to help with the traffic situation in the evenings, and asked staff to look into this possibility.
Mr. Kespohl asked for a schedule of connection fees for City utilities over the next five years in terms of whether they would increase and by how much. He wanted this for water, sewer, electric, solid waste, stormwater, etc. Mr. Matthes stated staff would provide that information to the Council.

Mayor McDavid noted he would propose a transit initiative called “FastCAT” on Thursday morning at 10:00 a.m. in Conference Room 1A. He stated there would be some controversial aspects, but believed it would be an initiative that would spur an increase in ridership. It also had the potential to make the revenue situation for transit more stable.

Mayor McDavid stated third party healthcare administration costs had been discussed in the past, and asked if a report regarding its status could be provided or if it would be discussed as part of the budget. Mr. Matthes replied he believed a RFP was on the street to implement the concept. He noted recent changes might push this back, but it was underway. Mayor McDavid understood the issue of mail order was included in this, and asked that Council be informed as the process progressed.

Ms. Anthony asked if the “FastCAT” initiative had anything to do with the Odle’s and a contribution from them to it as part of their rezoning request. Mayor McDavid replied he preferred not to say anything until the press conference.

Ms. Anthony asked for the status regarding the policy of the Police Department not providing accident reports. Mayor McDavid replied he thought the Council had asked for a report. Ms. Hoppe agreed. Mr. Matthes replied he thought it was on the Pre-Council Meeting list. Ms. Anthony thought this policy needed to be investigated further. Mr. Kespohl understood the report would also address the policy regarding responses to thefts of less than $30.

Mayor McDavid appointed John Strotbeck, Jeremy Root, Anthony Stanton, Randy Morrow and Louis Gatewood to the Enhanced Enterprise Zone Board. He noted Mr. Strotbeck and Mr. Stanton would have terms ending in 2016, Mr. Morrow and Mr. Root would have terms ending in 2015, and Mr. Gatewood would have a term ending in 2014.

The meeting adjourned at 10:49 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk