

PLANS AND POLICIES COMMITTEE MEETING

May 19, 2026

1:00 p.m.

Councilman Denny Whayne Conference Room (Busch Building, 4th Floor)
840 Boonville Avenue

MEMBERS

PRESENT: Abe McGull, Chair; Heather Hardinger; Callie Carroll; and Craig Hosmer*.

MEMBERS

ABSENT: None.

**COUNCIL/
STAFF**

PRESENT: Councilmember Bruce Adib-Yazdi; Maurice S. Jones, Deputy City Manager; Collin Quigley, Deputy City Manager; Jordan Paul, City Attorney; Amanda Ohlenselen, Director of Economic Vitality and Workforce Development; Tim Rosenbury, Director of Quality of Place Initiatives; Steve Childers, Director of Planning and Development; Eric Reece, Police Major; Anita Cotter, City Clerk; and Michelle Kaasa, Senior City Clerk Administrative Specialist.

GUEST: David Romano, citizen.

*Arrived at approximately 1:02 p.m.

Opening Remarks/Roll Call

Councilmember McGull, Chair, called the meeting to order at approximately 1:00 p.m. He welcomed everyone and noted the agenda for the meeting would be roll call, approval of minutes, continued discussion of the Citizens’ Advisory Board realignment, lane filtering discussion, and continued discussion of the fiscal impact of development projects.

Roll call was conducted. Present: Heather Hardinger, Callie Carroll, and Abe McGull. Absent: Craig Hosmer.

Consideration of March 17, 2026, and April 21, 2026, meeting minutes

Councilmember McGull expressed his belief the minutes accurately reflected the conversations and activities of the Committee. Mayor Pro Tem Hardinger moved to approve the minutes as presented. Councilmember Carroll seconded the motion, and the minutes were approved as presented by the following vote: Ayes: Hardinger, Carroll, Hosmer, and McGull. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None.

Continued Discussion of the Citizens Advisory Board Realignment

Councilmember McGull noted Jordan Paul, City Attorney, had prepared a draft resolution for review that had removed the portion allowing those residing outside the city limits to serve on the Citizens' Advisory Board.

Mr. Paul noted the direction given by the Committee at the previous meeting was to amend the resolution to no longer include non-resident sales tax stakeholders. He further noted the Committee had been provided with a copy of the revised draft resolution along with a copy of the previous resolution for their review.

Councilmember McGull expressed his belief the redraft should be sent to the full City Council.

Councilmember Carroll asked if the intent was to have advisory members. Councilmember McGull responded non-resident membership was removed from the draft. Councilmember Carroll expressed her belief the members that would be removed had invested time and effort into the board, and there was no fault with them.

Councilmember McGull noted Mr. Paul had covered this issue and agreed there was no fault with anyone, but there was a conflict with City Charter requirements. Councilmember Carroll asked if applications would be accepted to fill the vacancies. Anita Cotter, City Clerk, responded if the topic came out of Committee, it was anticipated the Public Information Office would send a news release relaying information about the application process. She added the resolution would come before City Council at its next meeting, and the Committee of the Whole would meet on June 15 to review applications and make recommendations. Councilmember Carroll asked if the applications would be reviewed to ensure they met the qualifications. Ms. Cotter responded affirmatively.

Councilmember Hosmer asked if the current properly appointed members would remain on the Board. Ms. Cotter responded affirmatively and noted appointments would be made for vacancies. Mr. Paul noted the Committee of the Whole would have authority until the end of June and expressed his belief it would be cleaner to make reappointments at that time.

Councilmember Hosmer moved to send the amended resolution to City Council. Mayor Pro Tem Hardinger seconded the motion, and it was approved by the following vote: Ayes: Hardinger, Carroll, Hosmer, and McGull. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None.

Lane Filtering Discussion

Councilmember McGull noted it would be illustrative to watch a video regarding lane filtering before the beginning of the discussion. He turned the meeting over to Maurice S. Jones, Deputy City Manager, and the video was played.

The video covered lane filtering in Colorado, noting it would be legal after August 7, 2024. It further noted there were five rules to be followed by the motorcycle driver to safely pass: the vehicle the rider wishes to pass must be at full stop, the lane must be wide enough to fit the vehicle and the motorcycle while passing, the motorcycle must go 15 miles per hour or less, the

rider must pass safely and control the motorcycle, and the rider must pass on the left and not enter the oncoming lane of traffic.

Mr. Jones noted Eric Reece, Police Major, from the Springfield Police Department would provide information on lane filtering.

Major Reece noted the stance of the Police Department was they would support the decision of the Committee and further noted they were not requesting lane filtering be allowed. He provided an update on the enforcement, stressing that there were significant enforcement issues regarding lane filtering. Major Reece further noted it would be difficult to use radar on motorcycles for the 15 mile-per-hour limit and catching them afterward would be problematic. He further expressed concern with the width of lanes for safe passage.

Councilmembers discussed the difference between lane splitting and lane filtering, noting lane splitting was still illegal in Colorado, and lane splitting would not be permitted.

Mayor Pro Tem Hardinger asked about the safety components of lane filtering. Major Reece responded educational campaigns would be needed regarding lane filtering to educate drivers on how motorcyclists would be allowed to move around them. Major Reece reinforced the difficulty of enforcement for lane filtering and agreed it was difficult to monitor, especially with unsafe motorcyclists. He added the best tool for enforcement had been the use of drones.

Mayor Pro Tem noted there would also be education needed for those who teach motorcycle awareness and education classes.

Councilmember Carroll asked for clarification on the importance of lane filtering. Major Reece responded his research showed lane filtering would allow traffic to move more quickly as the motorcycles could move ahead of cars since they were able to accelerate faster at the light.

Councilmember Adib-Yazdi noted his experience was that motorcycles would filter to the front of the line and take off more quickly than cars. He further noted David Romano, who had written the potential legislation, was in attendance and could answer questions if needed.

Councilmember McGull asked Mr. Romano to speak. Mr. Romano noted lane filtering specifically addressed safety issues for motorcyclists and further noted he had been rear-ended two times by a vehicle. He added going to the front of the line made motorcycles more visible to everyone. Mr. Romano expressed his belief lane filtering at 15 miles per hour or less had minimal risk.

Councilmember Carroll expressed her belief it appeared it was just as important for vehicle drivers to be educated.

Mr. Romano noted the Colorado law did not allow for going over the yellow line. He expressed his belief lane filtering was already occurring, and bicycles were practicing lane filtering as well.

Councilmember McGull acknowledged there were blind spots that would make it difficult for someone in a vehicle to see a motorcycle, and sometimes drivers were distracted. He asked Mr. Romano what his recommendation would be. Mr. Romano responded an amalgamation of the law City Council passed in March along with language from a proposed Missouri law which forbade lane splitting but made an infraction for drivers intentionally blocking a bicycle or motorcycle. He noted six states had joined California in legalizing lane filtering. He added research showed lane filtering was better for traffic flow and safer.

Councilmember Hosmer asked if vehicles were required to be at a complete stop. Mr. Romano responded most laws required vehicles to be travelling at 15 to 20 miles per hour. The current law in Missouri was discussed. Major Reece expressed his belief there was no law that allowed lane filtering. He further expressed his belief there would be little to no change in traffic numbers for accidents. He added his preference was that traffic be stopped before lane filtering occurred and that motorcyclists would pass to the middle.

Councilmember McGull noted he would like to hear from motorcycle officers and be provided information regarding any cities in Missouri that allowed lane filtering. Mr. Romano noted he could send studies endorsed by the American Motorcycle Association showing safety benefits. Major Reece expressed his belief there could also be noise complaints from motorcycles being close to vehicles.

Councilmember McGull asked that any new information be sent to the City Clerk. Mr. Jones noted they would have Motorcycle Patrol Officers attend the next meeting. Councilmember Hosmer noted he would like to know the number of motorcycle fatalities and accidents within the city. Major Reece noted most fatalities in the previous year were related to speed.

Mayor Pro Tem Hardinger expressed her belief there was a good case for lane filtering as motorcycles were more agile, and this was good conversation.

Continued Discussion of the Fiscal Impact of Development Projects

Mr. Jones noted Matt Schaefer, Assistant Director of Economic Vitality, would provide a continued overview of the fiscal impact of development projects.

Mr. Schaefer noted there was an earlier proposal that a requirement be made for all projects utilizing incentives to provide a fiscal analysis showing the impact on taxing districts. He added the current Economic Development Incentives Policy Manual had an overall general requirement that such projects have a but-for test showing the project would not occur if not for the incentive. He added discretionary incentives were to be granted only at the level necessary to make the project feasible. Mr. Schaefer further noted a fiscal analysis was not necessarily required to determine impact on City or other taxing districts, except for as required by statute or local ordinance.

Mr. Schaefer noted staff recommended pursuing a comprehensive economic development framework whereby staff would engage an outside consultant to assist with preparation of the document. He further noted the framework would allow projects to align with policies and be

viewed with a more comprehensive lens. He added the framework would align with ForwardSGF and be more intentional. Mr. Schaefer noted the framework would also be aligned with the Urban Service Area to ensure infrastructure investments were made wisely. He further noted staff would be available to present detailed information regarding the proposal, including what firms could provide such a framework and where this had been implemented.

Mr. Schaefer noted interim action could include amending the Economic Development Incentives Policy Manual to require fiscal analysis on all projects exceeding a certain investment threshold. He added the only projects that did not have such analysis would be multi-project redevelopment plans.

Councilmember McGull expressed his support for the action and noted it would show the average citizen the advantage of specific investments. Mr. Schaefer noted the information could be provided in a customizable form or spreadsheet showing the expected assessed valuation of improvements. He further noted the example did not account for the existing tax base but viewed what would temporarily be forgone with the incentive. He added it could not be viewed as a loss of revenue based on the premise that the investment would not occur without the incentives.

Mr. Schaefer noted another example could have a more detailed tax impact analysis with a more robust set of assumptions, also accounting for what would occur if the abatement or incentive were not provided. Councilmember McGull noted the positive assumptions were not currently reviewed. He expressed his belief he wanted citizens to see both sides even if it were only an assumption.

Mayor Pro Tem Hardinger agreed it was beneficial to review both sides and expressed her belief it was important for citizens to understand the impact.

Mr. Schaefer noted properties requesting incentives were often distressed properties with a very minimal assessed valuation. He added that property may decrease in assessed valuation and enforcement actions such as crime and code violations could be a cost to the taxpayer. He added a less than 100 percent abatement would have direct immediate benefits to the taxing district, and redevelopment would have economic activity associated that was not reflected in the analysis. Mr. Schaefer noted this type of analysis provided transparency and allowed tracking in real time. He further noted a tax abatement disclosure report was prepared annually and provided a full accounting of the actual tax impact all tax abated and Tax Increment Financing (TIF) projects had citywide. He added this report was for the prior fiscal year.

Councilmember Carroll asked if data could be shown using specific projects that had passed through City Council as an example, specifically regarding sites that were not previously active and how tax abatement could have been utilized for economic activity. Mr. Schaefer responded the GASB 77 disclosures report reviewed the actual abated taxes and not the other side of the equation. Councilmember Carroll asked how to see the other side of the equation. Mr. Schaefer cited examples such as the Heers Building and Moxie Hotel. Councilmember Carroll expressed her belief real time data and projections were helpful examples.

Mr. Schaefer noted the purpose of the programs was to encourage redevelopment and investments. He added many of the tax abatement programs were tied to blight remediation. He added they also stimulated economic activity and job creation.

Councilmember Carroll asked for one example to be presented and noted an activated space was a deterrent to crime and a benefit to surrounding businesses.

Mr. Jones asked if the instructions were for staff to provide a clear example, such as the Moxie Hotel, as a demonstration of the impact of projects. Councilmember McGull expressed his belief he would like to view the fiscal impact of all development projects prior to them coming before City Council.

Steve Childers, Director of Planning and Development, clarified what the Committee wanted to see was more background on the economic impact of development. He expressed his belief the definition of “project” would need to be narrowed down.

Councilmember Carroll suggested if the project was acceptable to the Planning Department and in compliance with City Code, then the fiscal impact could be shared to show the benefit of what would be generated. Mr. Childers responded it could be similar to the staff report in that it would be based on the Comprehensive Plan and being compliant with the Land Development Code. He added the fiscal analysis could then be a separate page coming from Economic Vitality. Mr. Schaefer noted there was data that could be used to provide a projection with heavy caveats that it would be a projection.

Councilmember McGull asked staff to produce ideas on how this could be quantified and expressed his belief it was important for citizens to see the information and important for those making the decisions. He added aesthetics could also be considered. Mr. Schaefer noted there was an equation created to efficiently maximize the return on investment. Mr. Jones noted the information would be put together to present at the next meeting.

Councilmember Hosmer noted approximately 50 percent of property in Greene County was tax abated and expressed his belief they had to be cognizant as homeowners were paying the majority of the property tax. He further expressed his belief the City should disincentivize the holding of vacant property and enforce the boarded building ordinance more strictly.

Councilmember Carroll expressed her belief there were good developers in the city, and it would be beneficial for them to have the ability to purchase the lots. Councilmember Hosmer noted he would support incentivization for developers to tear down existing buildings that were already zoned properly and had the infrastructure and bus lines in place. Mr. Childers noted the department would like to map out opportunity areas and identify properties that could be developed. He added this information could then go to Economic Vitality to determine the incentives.

Councilmember McGull noted the discussion would continue and asked staff to consider ideas regarding disincentivizing those holding onto neglected property and enforcement for the boarded building ordinance.

Adjournment

Mayor Pro Tem Hardinger moved to adjourn. Councilmember Carroll seconded the motion, and it was approved by the following vote: Ayes: Hosmer, Hardinger, Carroll, and McGull. Nays: None. Absent: None. Abstain: None.

The meeting adjourned at approximately 2:12 p.m.

Prepared by Michelle Kaasa

DRAFT