



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure

Wednesday, August 24, 2016
7:00 PM

Regular

City Hall
Conference Room 1C
Columbia, MO

I. CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Ms. Tracy Greever-Rice called the meeting to order at 7:00 p.m.

Staff: Tad Johnsen, Columbia Utilities Director; John Glascock, Deputy City Manager; Ryan Williams, Assistant Columbia Utilities Director; John Ogan, Sr. Administrative Support Assistant

Present: 8 - Katrina Boles, Gregg Coffin, Cody Darr, Tony Grove, Jen Hedrick, Kim Kraus, Bill Weitkemper and Tracy Greever-Rice

Absent: 1 - John Conway

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

The August 24, 2016 Agenda was approved with a motion by Ms. Jen Hedrick and a second by Ms. Kim Kraus.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Ms. Kim Kraus made a motion to approve the August 9, 2016 meeting minutes with changes, and a second by Ms. Jen Hendrick.

The August 17, 2016 meeting minutes were approved with changes by Mr. Cody Darr and a second by Mr. Gregg Coffin.

IV. OLD BUSINESS

a) Review of Community Development Presentation by Tim Teddy - Mr.

Coffin stated that the scorecard concept should be pursued, as it brings value to the City and brings clarity to the viability of potential projects. Ms. Hedrick asked if the scorecard should be numerically based, or as Mr. Teddy advised, narrative based. Mr. Coffin encouraged it to be narrative based, or to come up with some kind of common score that would denote those projects that are approved, those for which some kind of caution is advised or that raise questions. Mr. Darr warned that numeric scoring presents the problem of comparing numbers that score unrelated factors.

Ms. Greever-Rice agreed with Mr. Teddy's point that it is a process to implement a scorecard, and Mr. Darr agreed that the scorecard process itself needs continual

review. Ms. Greever-Rice suggested some sort of regular trigger for a review of use of a scorecard. Mr. Bill Weitkemper suggested a satisfaction survey, and Ms. Greever-Rice suggested that this be done every other year. Mr. Darr suggested that it be either an annual review or initiated at the city staff's discretion. Mr. Coffin said annual review is not always needed. Mr. Darr suggested that the first review of the scorecard should be done by Council, and thereafter it would be an administrative duty, but if the scorecard is not going to be regulatory or actionable, it wouldn't need to go to Council. Mr. Coffin said that we need to frame the scorecard in terms of infrastructure, stating that from an infrastructure standpoint, review provides value to the community as well as to the developer on the feasibility of projects. Ms. Greever-Rice said that there are two sides to this: the administrative side of it, in terms of norming and standardizing what people and developers can anticipate when they go through the process, but the flipside of normalizing is that the community needs to be on the same page for knowing how the process works. There should be some kind of public vetting or education on how the scorecard works to make things less contentious. Ms. Boles asked if the scorecards would be transparent, and Ms. Greever-Rice replied that the scorecards would be part of public record, but that we shouldn't presume to know the answer to any transparency questions--though it would be useful to ask about that in our recommendations.

Mr. Coffin said at the end of Mr. Teddy's presentation, it seemed like communication and dialog was needed with the development community before zoning; that is, before a project becomes officially requested. There is a certain amount that needs to happen, and asked if it should be more formalized depending on the available level of staff. Mr. Coffin said that there needs to be more of a pre-application process to get a certain level of dialog started. Mr. Darr said that we do have a concept review but there is nothing set in stone. There is an informal meeting, and the developer will submit documents to the City. A meeting is scheduled for which they send out notices to people within a certain radius of the development site, and it is put in newspapers before the formal application process. However, this is only required for certain types of projects; annexations, rezones, planned district zones, and preliminarily plats. Things that don't require this process are commercial site plans on a straight zone site and also for final plats that have already been preliminarily plotted, as well as re-plats that have already been to the council and the zoning commission, unless it was a minor plat that was not looked at by the Planning and Zoning Commission. No development in the downtown area is currently required to have this review.

Mr. Coffin asked if we should recommend the requirement of review for those projects that would have an impact on infrastructure. Mr. Darr replied that he was not sure what service that would serve the City. Ms. Greever-Rice asked if concept reviews were public meetings. Mr. Darr replied no, but said that anyone can be invited, they are not public meetings, they are not posted, and the meeting is only announced after it has taken place.

Mr. Darr said that most developers, in the last five to seven years, are coming from outside the City and are not familiar with Columbia practices, and suggested that we have a development handbook because every municipality is different. Mr. John Glascock stated that a lot of time developers coming from out of state will hire a lawyer to work here.

Mr. Darr posed the question that if prior to formal submittal; would we want to require concept reviews, and asked if we would see value in a concept review of straight zoning sites or final plats. Mr. Glascock replied by talking about an example of requiring concept reviews on a 24-story building a developer recently wanted to put on the site of Bengal's. Without review restrictions, there would be no way to stop developments such as these. Because of the concept review, the issue went public because we had to bring it to Council, making the review process useful in that instance. He also stated that if the zone is going to be a change in use, we would need to have a concept review.

Ms. Greever-Rice asked if we would give discretion to staff to know whether or not to initiate a concept review on straight zoning matters. Mr. Glascock gave the example that if we went up from R-I to R-III, it would need a review, but down from R-III to R-I, we would not. Mr. Coffin highly encourages the review for any change of use in a straight zone and prefers this term 'change of use'. It was agreed that the City must define the term 'change of use' in the future, and in terms of infrastructure.

Methods of how mailings are used to notify people of review meetings were discussed. Recipients of these mailings can call Planning to get more information on the project. Ms. Greever-Rice brought up the public perception that a lot of decisions are already made before the public hears about it, and asked how we can counter that perception with more timely and better notification. Mr. Darr talked about the process and how generally the first time citizens hear of it is from postcards notifying them of the public information meetings, which we've been doing to his knowledge at least since 2007. He advised that affected communities have neighborhood meetings before those public hearings. Ms. Kraus advised that we inform more than just the people who live within a 185 foot radius from the development, and stated that the timing is too regimented and too fast for the general public.

Ms. Kraus and Mr. Darr next talked about the requirements pertaining to a proposed change of use form and the process of a formal change of use submission. Mr. Coffin advised that the change of use requirement not apply to the residential realm. Mr. Weitkemper advised that we consider safeguards for historical preservation.

Ms. Greever-Rice asked if sending notifications only to those living within a 185-foot radius from the development is sufficient; for example, in the case of a sewer change

or in the case of a large nearby development. Mr. Darr replied that these notifications were also in the newspapers. Ms. Kraus asked if even this was sufficient as it would only appear once and likely would not receive sufficient attention.

Differing kinds of developments and how different types of nearby developments would cause infrastructure effects in various ways were discussed--for example, the case of a newly-built data center increasing electrical demand on the surrounding community. Ms. Hedrick would like to have a trigger in the review process related to the intensity of impact on an area. Ms. Greever-Rice asked if we had the staff to accommodate this review process. Mr. Glascock stated that we would not need or have more staff, but perhaps we would have a longer time frame for the process.

Ms. Greever-Rice asked for the ratio of projects that are straight zoning verses those that trigger review. Mr. Darr guessed that if you include residential subdivisions, which are straight zoning projects, probably four out of five are straight zoning. Ms. Hedrick estimated that it was even higher than that, with around nine out of ten being straight zoning and not needing review.

Ms. Hedrick also stated her support for the term "change of use" and brought up an example at Chapel Hill. Mr. Darr stated that though he did not ask Tim Teddy specifically, he would like to know how the new development code addresses financial contributions for impacts to infrastructure. Ms. Greever-Rice advised that Mr. Darr send his question to Mr. Teddy via email.

b) Electric Utility Issues - Mr. John Conway's introduction and Mr. Bill Weitkemper's updates to his recommendations were discussed briefly. A discussion of meters and master meters began, and Mr. Darr advised a study related to having the criteria for obtaining a master meter be the number of units. A discussion occurred regarding who is responsible when a tenant of a property owner does not pay their water bills to the City, and having a usage charge was suggested as an acceptable solution. Smart metering technology was suggested for the future, as was the difference between automatic meter reading (ARM) and advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) meters. With AMIs, one can get more information, do demand-side billing, get real-time information, and alter rates depending on day part. This will aid people in reducing their consumption during peak hours, which will lower the demand to build more electrical facilities to meet peak demand.

The definition of the different types of residential facilities was brought up next. The specific types of meters that can be used at each were discussed. The entity responsible for paying for a switch or transformer was discussed, whether it was the utility or the project. Connection fees and how these are determined were discussed, and if Water and Light was planning to add one. Mr. Tad Johnsen said that the legal department was looking into this and the ramifications. He said that it's likely going to vary based on the project and anticipated use on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Darr said

that this seems reasonable and is also the same thing that this commission is trying to recommend. Ms. Greever-Rice added that we should balance the need to build near existing resources with the desire not to destroy anything historic.

Ms. Greever-Rice asked about the substation and rerouting issue. Mr. Johnsen talked about the options the Council was investigating and said it would take some time. Mr. Weitkemper said he saw it discussed in the Tribune chat forum and said the discussion there was interesting.

V. NEW BUSINESS

None.

VI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

Ms. Greever-Rice stated that the changes to the interim report were on her update sheet from the last discussion. She has added a staff list, focusing on people providing direct support to the Task Force, or those who have spoken. She filled out the presenter's piece and talked through some wording changes on the report outline that she added. The one thing that we left in the air was global recommendations. Mr. Coffin felt that these warrant being at the top to number one. Formatting issues with the document, and the topic of combining or not combining reports were discussed. Specifics related to the inclusion, wording, positioning, and length of the executive summary, recommendations, and public opinion within the document was discussed. Support staff from Water and Light must be addressed in regard to uniform formatting. It was agreed that we would also like to have the relevant departments review the recommendations before the final report is released.

It was noted that readings for more complete minutes can be found on the Google site.

VII. NEXT MEETING DATE

August 30, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1C
September 14, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1C
September 21, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1C
September 28, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1C
October 5, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in Conference Room 1C
October 11, 2016 at 5:00 p.m. in Council Chambers (May need to be changed)
October 18, 2016 at 7:00 p.m. in Council Chambers

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 8:56 p.m.

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-7214. In order to assist staff in making the appropriate arrangements for your accommodation, please make your request as far in advance of the posted meeting date as possible.

For the complete audio version, please go to the following website:

<http://sites.google.com/a/gocolumbiamo.com/mayor-s-task-force-on-infrastructure/>