



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, September 19, 2016
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, September 19, 2016, 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 SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN and TRAPP were present. Council Member THOMAS was absent. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of August 15, 2016 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Ms. Nauser.

Upon his request, Mayor Treece made a motion to allow Mr. Ruffin to abstain from voting on the amendment associated with B192-16 related to funding for the Boys and Girls Club. Mr. Ruffin noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that he was currently serving as co-chair of the capital campaign for the Boys and Girls Club. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Upon her request, Mayor Treece made a motion to allow Ms. Nauser to abstain from voting on R142-16. Ms. Nauser noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that the conflict was due to her family business as it involved alcohol sales. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece asked that B221-16 and B222-16 be moved from the consent agenda to old business, and that R136-16, R137-16, R138-16, and R143-16 be moved from the consent agenda to new business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B221-16 and B222-16 being moved to old business, and R136-16, R137-16, R138-16, and R143-16 being moved to new business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Ruffin.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI12-16

Introduction of new Airport Manager, Tamara M. Pitts.

Ms. Button, the Economic Development Department Director, introduced Tamara Pitts, the new Airport Manager for the Columbia Regional Airport. Ms. Button noted Ms. Pitts was born and raised in Chicago, Illinois, and had received a degree in civil engineering at Iowa State University. She had worked for MoDOT for the last ten years, most recently as the Aviation Project Manager. She oversaw 40 airports across central and northern Missouri, and this work included coordinating FAA compliance and delivering capital projects on time and on budget. She had a lot of energy and a strong focus on customer service. Ms. Button stated they were really pleased to have her on staff and as a part of the airport team.

Mayor Treece welcomed Ms. Pitts to the City of Columbia and noted they were excited to have her expertise at this important time at the airport.

Ms. Pitts stated she appreciated the opportunity and was glad to be here.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC10-16 Board and Commission Applicants.

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

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN COMMISSION

Gortmaker, Ann Marie, 1714 McAlester Street, Ward 3, Term to expire July 31, 2017

COLUMBIA HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD

Colyer, Catherine, 17 Bingham Road, Ward 5, Term to expire May 31, 2020

COLUMBIA VISION COMMISSION

Corbin, Megan, 3709 Prescott Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire December 15, 2016

Pass, Sasha, 2665 E. Alfalfa Drive, Boone County, Term to expire December 15, 2016

Wells, Jameson, 118 Oak Street, Ward 1, Term to expire December 15, 2016

CONVENTION AND VISITORS ADVISORY BOARD

Beard, Joan, 154 W. Green Meadows Road, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2018

Bell, Susan, 575 E. Sexton Street, Boone County, Term to expire September 30, 2018

Burgin, Barth, 7615 Black Walnut Drive, Boone County, Term to expire September 30, 2018

Jashnani, Leela, 900 Vandiver Drive (business), Ward 6, Term to expire September 30, 2018

Schultz, Thomas, 7100 Madison Creek Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2018

Trabue, Kimberly, 3530 S. Old Ridge Road, Boone County, Term to expire September 30, 2018

Weise, Teri, 3007 S. Rodeo Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire September 30, 2018

PERSONNEL ADVISORY BOARD

Jago, Arthur, 5303 E. Tayside Circle, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2019

Locklear, Jeanne, 4400 Thornbrook Ridge, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2019

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC49-16 Alan Mitchell, President, Columbia Police Officers Association - Sunshine request and agency transparency - Columbia Police Department.

Mayor Treece explained this scheduled public comment request had been withdrawn.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH28-16 FY 2017 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.

Discussion shown with B241-16.

PH29-16 Changes to the sanitary sewer utility rate, sanitary sewer utility connection fee and hauled liquid waste rate.

Discussion shown with B241-16.

B192-16 Adopting the FY 2017 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.

Discussion shown with B241-16.

- B193-16 Amending Chapter 12A of the City Code as it relates to stormwater utility charges.
Discussion shown with B241-16.
- B194-16 Amending Chapter 13 of the City Code as it relates to hauled liquid waste rates.
Discussion shown with B241-16.
- B195-16 Amending Chapter 17 of the City Code as it relates to Parks and Recreation fees.
Discussion shown with B241-16.
- B196-16 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to sanitary sewer utility rates and sanitary sewer utility connection fees.

Discussion shown with B241-16.
- B197-16 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to solid waste rates and services.
Discussion shown with B241-16.
- B198-16 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to water rates.
Discussion shown with B241-16.
- B199-16 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to electric rates.
Discussion shown with B241-16.
- B224-16 Amending Chapter 6 of the City Code to allocate appeals of administrative decisions on trade licenses to the Building Construction Codes Commission and dissolving the Board of Electrical Examiners, Board of Plumbing Examiners and Board of Mechanical Examiners.

Discussion shown with B241-16.
- B238-16 Amending Chapter 3 of the City Code to move the Airport Division from the Public Works Department to the Economic Development Department; amending Chapter 3 of the City Code to repeal Article II to eliminate the Airport Advisory Board; amending Chapter 3 of the City Code to enact a new Article II to establish an Airport Advisory Board.
Discussion shown with B241-16.
- B239-16 Adopting the FY 2017 Classification and Pay Plan for changes effective on September 25, 2016; adopting the FY 2017 Classification and Pay Plan for FLSA overtime assignment changes effective on November 20, 2016; providing for FY 2017 salary adjustments relating to the Classification and Pay Plans; providing for a salary increase for eligible employees.
Discussion shown with B241-16.

B240-16 Establishing plan year 2017 active employee medical and dental premium rates, non-Medicare medical rates, and retiree dental premium rates for the City of Columbia; providing for payroll withholdings.

Discussion shown with B241-16.

B241-16 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to unclassified service and general benefit provisions.

PH28-16 and PH29-16 were read by the Clerk, B192-16, B193-16, B194-16, B195-16, B196-16, B197-16, B198-16 and B199-16 were given fourth reading by the Clerk, and B224-16, B238-16, B239-16, B240-16, and B241-16 were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood the shortfall had been attributed to the water and light utilities, and asked if some of it had also been attributable to pensions. Mr. Matthes replied it was exclusively outside of the general fund. Pensions had been accommodated in the operating budget. Those costs had been increasing and had recently plateaued. He hoped to see those costs go down in the future due to the changes that had been made. The City still owed a lot of money, but was on a path to raise it over time. Mr. Skala understood the pension funds were reflected in the balance budget of the general fund. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala commented that the City was a bargain when it came to property taxes, and the reason people felt the pinch of property taxes was due to other taxing jurisdictions as some of those jurisdictions charged twelve times as much. Mr. Matthes stated that was an excellent point.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Rick Shanker, 1829 Cliff Drive, stated he noticed these documents had subjects relating to charges, payrolls, pensions, fees, and rates, and asked how B224-16 and B238-16 were related to the budget. Mr. Matthes replied B224-16 would dissolve three trade boards and replace them with an administrative function. As a result, it affected how they operated on a daily basis, and that was related to the operating budget. B238-16 involved the moving of the Airport Division from the Public Works Department to the Economic Development Department. It was an operational change reflected in the organizational chart in the budget and where it was funded in the budget. Mr. Shanker asked if these two items would save the City money. Mr. Matthes replied they were budget neutral, but would make them more efficient and more effective in some ways as well. Mr. Shanker stated he disputed this in terms of B224-16, and explained the Building Construction Codes Commission (BCCC) had rejected this idea in the past as they did not want the responsibility. He noted he had provided a letter to the Council that described why these three boards might or might not be important to the City of Columbia. He felt they helped to ensure there were not any improprieties in terms of granting licenses to people, and understood that function would be handled administratively now. Mr. Matthes explained it would be administrative so a staff member would make that determination. If the applicant did not like the decision, it could be appealed to the BCCC. Mr. Shanker commented that recently when one of the boards had asked that the City staff liaison be a voting member, they had been told that would not be appropriate, but in this situation, the City employee would take on that responsibility. He felt the current boards ensured everyone received a fair opportunity.

Sutu Forte thanked everyone for their hard work on the budget. She also thanked the Columbia Missourian for telling the citizens to express their needs and concerns and Ms. Nauser for saying it was important for citizens to show up. She asked that more indigenous trees be planted in Columbia for 2017 so they could nurture the air, water, and

humans. She commented that film was an important vehicle for transparency and noted Columbia Access Television (CAT) was a great teaching institution. She understood the Council had increased the CAT budget by \$10,000, and thought it would be nice if they could fund it a little more as they had a lot of students that needed up-to-date equipment. She understood Erin Brockovich had indicated Columbia's water was polluted and toxic with too many trihalomethanes, which was dangerous to pregnant women and people with respiratory diseases. She wanted the Water and Light Department to ensure what they were drinking was good for them. She asked that the Parks and Recreation Department add more urban wilderness areas. She also asked for better sidewalks for those that walked and those in wheelchairs.

Shelly Silvey, 3712 Godfrey Drive, explained she was the Board President of CAT and noted CAT was at a crossroads. They had endured major staffing cuts and the depletion of their reserves in order to give the public the voice to which they had been accustomed. CAT was changing and making major strides to serve the public and the community under major budget cuts. They had continued to pursue partnerships and opportunities in order to cut the operating budget while maintaining the level of professionalism Columbia deserved and expected. The Council had put CAT back in the budget at \$35,000 with discretionary funds, and had proposed \$50,000 in general funds in future years. This proposal would allow CAT the opportunity to continue its services. She thanked the Council for keeping CAT in the budget for this year and in years to come.

Louis Wilson, 404 W. Broadway, stated he was supportive of CAT and noted he had become a member last year. He explained he was also an entrepreneur so he was familiar with lean, mean operations. CAT met that bar for him as they worked hard with a microscopic budget. He asked the Council to do what they could for CAT.

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

Mayor Treece understood Amendment Sheet 3 associated with B192-16 was a compilation of Amendment Sheet 1 and Amendment Sheet 2. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Amendment Sheet 3 was the one they needed to use. He pointed out the amount associated with reallocating downtown camera funds to training in the Police Department budget should be \$16,000 instead of \$25,030. The Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) was spending more than \$16,000, but that was the amount of money that would offset the cost to operate those cameras.

Mr. Skala understood this settled the issue in terms of the responsibility of those cameras. Mr. Matthes explained this included the costs to store and retrieve data. He commented that the cameras were separate, and this only involved the hosting of the data.

Ms. Nauser understood this was for FY17 and asked about the process moving forward. She wondered if the CID would continue to fund this in the future. Mr. Matthes replied this was a one year deal. It had the potential to become a long term relationship, but it was a one year deal for now. The suggestion of moving the funds saved to training was excellent because it was still in the Police Department budget and would allow for an adjustment if the CID changed its mind next year. Ms. Nauser stated she hoped it would become a multi-year deal. Mayor Treece agreed he would like to see the relationship grow.

Mayor Treece thought they were all familiar with the national and statewide attention on heroin and opioid use, and asked if the police force and the firefighters had the medical direction to administer naloxone. He understood the Fire Department had the appropriate protocols as they already carried life support systems. He was not sure why this was being funded out of the council reserve fund when it was medically necessary. He thought it should come out of the existing medical budgets already provided. Mr. Matthes stated it had been a request by a council member and staff was surprised as the costs had come down quite a bit from the last time it had been researched years ago. In terms of implementation, they would start with the Fire Department since they were ready and because they already received medical calls. There could occasionally be a

scenario where a police officer might be the first on the scene so they wanted to roll it out for the Police Department, but it would take time as they would need to find a medical director to be involved and provide training. He suggested the Council authorize the expenditure with the understanding they would try to find this in the Fire Department budget as it would allow funding to be available if necessary. Mr. Trapp stated he would be okay with that.

Mr. Skala asked if they could look at this as a pilot project. Mr. Matthes replied he thought they should view this as a one year pilot program. If it worked, it would become a part of the Fire Department budget as they moved forward.

Mr. Skala commented that they felt it might be more appropriate for these types of expenses to come from the general budget, which would allow them to preserve money in the council reserve account for more weather dependent or emergency related items. He thought it would be nice if they could fund this type of expenditure from a departmental budget. Mr. Matthes stated they were willing to commit to that approach. He reiterated his suggestion of approving this tonight while being on record that they would prefer it be funded from the Fire Department budget. This money would be there only if they were unable to fund it within the Fire Department budget.

Mr. Matthes explained the total funding for CAT with this amendment sheet was \$35,000 as it stood tonight. It would all be funded from the council reserves for FY17, and there was nothing in future years. He understood Mr. Thomas wanted to establish a long term commitment with CAT, and Council could provide an indication as to what they wanted him to do in the long term, but reiterated, for FY17, CAT would be funded \$35,000 from the council reserve fund.

The Council, by voice vote, unanimously agreed to keep the suggested amendment involving funding CAT at \$35,000 through the council reserve fund on Amendment Sheet 3.

Mr. Skala asked if they needed to formally address the naloxone item. Mayor Treece understood the staff would try to absorb that through the budget. Mr. Trapp clarified he thought staff preferred the Council allow for it to come from the council reserve fund in case it was necessary. Mr. Matthes agreed it was a safety net, and would not be used if not needed.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought it was appropriate for the council reserve fund to be used for both naloxone and CAT because they both came up late in the budget process of a tight budget year and were Council priorities. He noted that often when they asked for items to be funded out of the council reserve fund more than once, it frequently ended up in the budget. He provided support for Neighborhood Watch as an example. He thought naloxone would be treated similarly. CAT had been removed from the budget during a tough budgetary year, and it was now funded out of council reserves. He explained he liked the capacity of council reserves for emerging issues and new innovation programs, and would like to see CAT taken out of the council reserve account. In absence of an alternative solution, he would not want to see any more than \$25,000 to come from council reserves for CAT next year. He commented that he was not opposed to it being funded as part of the budget, but noted they had obligations to city employees and core functions of government. He stated he would vote in favor of funding them this year, but explained he did not have a shared commitment to bring them into the budget. If they could bring them into the budget, it would be great, but if not, they needed to make the hard decision instead of asking staff to find \$50,000. He felt they needed to find a compensating income stream or cut something else if they wanted to add anything to the budget. He wanted the bulk of the council reserve fund to be able to be used for emerging issues.

Mayor Treece noted he wanted to avoid spending 90 percent of their discussion on a \$100,000 council discretionary fund when the entire budget was their discretionary fund. If they wanted to fund something, he thought they should be the ones identifying what needed to be cut in order to fund it.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed with many of the comments of Mr. Trapp, and noted he could justify the funding of naloxone or items that were weather dependent, such as homeless shelters. He thought CAT would have a strong application if they had a process of funding worthy goals out of the general fund.

Ms. Nauser commented that she thought they needed to make a final decision with regard to CAT. It was unfair to CAT to have to petition Council every year to obtain funding. She felt they needed to decide whether it would be funded, at what level it would be funded, and from where those funds would come. She did not believe they needed to have this conversation every year.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to keep the suggested amendment involving funding naloxone at \$11,880 through the council reserve fund on Amendment Sheet 3. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece made a motion to keep the suggested amendment involving the Fairview and Chapel Hill Intersection Improvement project on Amendment Sheet 3 as it would allow the use of the roundabout money for a broader street maintenance line item in the CIP while using the existing dedicated funding of \$351,000 in the operating budget to hire 3.5 additional police officers. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece made a motion to keep the suggested amendment involving the Discovery Parkway: Gans to New Haven project on Amendment Sheet 3. He explained it would allow it to be moved up from FY20 from FY21 and would allow them to get ahead of the construction anticipated there. He noted there would be some consequences which everyone might not be willing to accept.

The motion made by Mayor Treece to keep the suggested amendment involving the Discovery Parkway: Gans to New Haven project on Amendment Sheet 3 was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Ms. Nauser noted this change would impact the Fifth Ward. She understood the desire to get ahead of construction in terms of Gans and New Haven, but pointed out Providence and Nifong had been neglected for years. In addition, this road construction was a part of a larger corridor project, and listed some of those smaller associated projects. She stated she was advocating for leaving the Nifong-Providence to Forum 4 Lane project where it was in the CIP Plan so all of the projects could be addressed in a relatively cohesive time frame.

Ms. Peters stated she agreed with Ms. Nauser. She did not feel a movement of one year was worth it. She thought they should stick with the plan they already had.

Mr. Skala explained he was inclined to leave these projects the way they were currently in the CIP Plan as he believed discussions were still needed as to the type of improvements there would be on Forum Boulevard and the cost of the project.

Mr. Trapp commented that Roy Dudark had sent an e-mail suggesting they look at some cost sharing possibilities for Discovery Parkway since there would be significant private benefit to that expansion, and noted he wanted to provide the extra time for those types of negotiations. He pointed out he would also encourage that approach.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Skala to keep the suggested amendment involving the Discovery Parkway: Gans to New Haven project on Amendment Sheet 3 was defeated by voice vote with only Mayor Treece voting in favor of it.

Mayor Treece made a motion to keep the suggested amendment involving annual bus shelters on Amendment Sheet 3. He understood it would move the project up a year,

and felt they needed to provide them a safe place to sit and stand if they wanted to incentivize the use of the City's buses.

The motion made by Mayor Treece to keep the suggested amendment involving annual bus shelters on Amendment Sheet 3 was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Skala commented that he appreciated funding bus shelters sooner than later, and asked for clarification as to the cost of those bus shelters. He understood an award winning design was being considered in high profile areas that were significantly more expensive than the regular design, which he thought was attractive as well. He noted his inclination was to go with the more shelters versus the more expensive shelters.

Mayor Treece stated he thought the priority should be to construct more bus shelter. He felt this issue could be further discussed later and understood Mr. Thomas had some thoughts with regard to where the shelters would be placed. He commented that he could see those architectural bus shelters being placed in key areas to promote usage or in places where they had the land space to accommodate them.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Trapp to keep the suggested amendment involving annual bus shelters on Amendment Sheet 3 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece understood the next item involved the street and sidewalk closure fee, and noted in his mind this did not involve adopting the policy. This would only adopt a line item to receive those funds once the Council approved the policy. He explained they had received information with regard to the policy at the last meeting, and staff had suggested a linear foot per day charge for sidewalks and street lane closures. He understood a few issues needed to be worked out and that staff had met with a few stakeholders.

Ms. Nauser stated she thought it was inappropriate to put something in the budget for which a public hearing had not been held. She felt it was important for transparency purposes to allow the public to speak before this was placed in the budget. By placing it in the budget, they were indicating they had planned to pass it without public comment or testimony. She noted they had never had a place marker for funding previously. It would just be absorbed in the budget if and when it was approved.

Mayor Treece commented that this item had been on each amendment sheet, which had been subject to three public hearings. They would have another opportunity to allow comment on the actual policy when it was brought forward. He thought this was good protection to the taxpayers who had paid for the public asset. When it was being taken out of public use for private benefit, he felt there needed to be some compensation. He noted this was one way they could fund sidewalk improvements, which had been a suggestion of Ms. Forte earlier in the evening, or other pedestrian improvements.

Ms. Peters understood this was only to provide a placeholder in the budget and they were not passing anything or making any decision, and asked for clarification. Mayor Treece replied the way he viewed it was that they were not adopting that fee per day at this time. That would come later as a policy in the form of a bill. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. This would establish an endorsement of the concept, but the details would come later. Staff had captured it because it had been a conversation that had occurred as part of the budget process. They could do this now or they could wait and amend the budget when the policy decision was made. It was up to Council and had only been structured this way due to the timing of the conversation.

Ms. Peters stated she would feel more comfortable waiting to amend the budget until they had an ordinance since it would do the same thing.

Ms. Nauser stated her concern involved the fact there were specific amounts listed, which were subject to change. In addition, a lot of questions had been brought forward by the public so she felt it would be best to have the public speak first. They could then adopt whatever policy was agreed upon based on that public comment. She felt this was similar to how they had previously handled lighting in that they would restrict lighting

based upon the plat instead of a lighting policy. She did not feel they should make this decision without the policy. She suggested they address the policy first as it would allow public input.

Mr. Matthes reiterated it was up to Council as to how they wanted to proceed. He noted most of the budget was really establishing a concept, i.e. a spending limit for a program. Details were often worked out throughout the year through specific ordinances. They could address it now or amend the budget later.

Mr. Trapp explained the stakeholder comments he had received did not involve not moving forward with a policy. They involved how it would be done and what the process would be moving forward. He thought they would pass something in FY17, and felt it made sense to establish that budget category while they were dealing with the budget. He thought, as they moved through the policy, they should be slow and deliberate, and have at least one interested parties meeting. He believed they should be thoughtful in their decision. He reiterated he thought they would pass a policy during the upcoming fiscal year, and if they did not, they had a category with a zero in it at the end of the year.

Mr. Skala noted they had recently lost the opportunity to at least set up a temporary provision for a street closure due to a fairness and equity issue, and that was a reason for the sense of urgency with regard to this topic. He commented that he did not see any reason why this could not be a line item in the budget to indicate something was forthcoming. He explained he had been in discussions with representatives of the Chamber of Commerce and others who had indicated they needed more time for criticisms even though they had provided a three page list of criticisms. He thought the policy needed to be carefully thought out and worked out, but did not believe including this as a line item in the budget as a placeholder compromised any stakeholder or public discussion. As a result, he was inclined to support it.

Mr. Ruffin stated he tended to agree with Mr. Skala.

Mayor Treece made a motion to keep the suggested amendment involving a line item for the street and sidewalk closure fee on Amendment Sheet 3. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin and approved by voice vote with only Ms. Nauser voting against it.

Mayor Treece noted the next item was to add one full time police officer and reallocate street maintenance funding in order to pay for the position. He understood this involved the discussion as to whether to take the entire street maintenance budget from the dedicated payment in lieu of taxes, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. He explained the three positions in the proposed budget were to be paid for by a reduction in the street maintenance funding that was coming from the payment in lieu of taxes for the Columbia Energy Center. Mayor Treece understood they were making up for the lack of street maintenance funding on the operating side with capital improvement funds from the roundabout. He asked how much that involved. Mr. Matthes replied \$351,000. This amendment would increase the number of officers from three to four. There would be a reduction in the street maintenance fund to accommodate the fourth officer. Mayor Treece stated this would allow them to have four officers instead of 3 ½ officers, and noted he thought they needed all of the extra help they could receive in the Police Department, especially if they were going to readdress the schedule.

Mr. Trapp stated he supported adding more police officers, but felt they did not have a great funding source for it. They were replacing budgetary funds with one time funds. They were taking street maintenance funds and replacing those funds with a capital project they had delayed. It would only be funded for one year, and afterwards it would all be funded through the asphalt budget. He noted streets were a high priority as well. He thought they needed to add three officers per year to keep up with growth, but they had inherited a debt from previous councils that had not kept up with growth, and he did not feel they could get over that historic deficit with existing funds without horrendous cuts to

parcs, the elimination of the C.A.R.E program, and cuts to other items that were vital to who they were and what they did as a city. He thought they should continue to make hard decisions to keep up with growth while continuing to make the case to the community that they needed additional funds to correct the historic deficit. He commented that he did not plan to support the addition of this fourth officer as he felt adding three officers from the street maintenance budget was already a difficult decision with regard to the effects on street maintenance. If they had another source or if it was easier, he would support the fourth officer. He reiterated the money from the roundabout was a one-time funding source that they would not be able to duplicate every year. He reiterated he planned to oppose this amendment.

Mr. Ruffin asked how they would continue to fund this officer in years to come if they utilized one time funds to fund that particular officer. Mr. Matthes replied the street maintenance funding was a recurring funding source. They would use the one time funds to replace those for one year. The street maintenance budget would be whole for one year, but the reduction would occur on the following year. Mayor Treece noted that put pressure on them to replace the street maintenance funding next year.

Mr. Skala commented that Mr. Trapp was correct in much of what he had said in that they would have to continue this, but did not agree with his opposition to this amendment. He thought the outcome of the citizen survey was interesting as it used to be that streets were the priority with public safety coming in second, but that had been reversed in the last citizen survey. Public safety was the priority with streets coming in second. That reflected his priority in terms of how he viewed this amendment. He agreed it would put pressure on Council to provide funds for street maintenance since both were priorities, and that they would have to educate the public if they really wanted to increase funding for police officers. The cost was not just \$100,000 per year. It was really \$2 million because it involved a 20 year career. They would need a reasonable accommodation, maybe not as large of a request as in 2014, but they would likely need to go to the citizens with some ask to resolve the issue.

Mayor Treece made a motion to keep the suggested amendment involving the addition of one police officer by reallocating street maintenance funds on Amendment Sheet 3. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved by voice vote with only Mr. Trapp voting against it.

Mayor Treece noted the next item on the amendment sheet was the Boys and Girls Club Expansion project, which involved \$500,000 from general fund reserves. He thought this was a worthwhile investment that was consistent with the strategic and social equity plan. The Boys and Girls Club served 781 kids per year through its existing facility, and had the potential to do more with an expanded facility.

Mayor Treece made a motion to keep the suggested amendment involving funding Boys and Girls Club at \$500,000 through general fund reserves on Amendment Sheet 3. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Trapp stated \$500,000 was a lot of money, but noted this involved one-time funds, not budgetary funds. The City budgeted very conservatively, and this allowed them to weather downturns and absorb a lot of difficulties. He pointed out they kept 20 percent cash reserves to cover cash flows as they paid bills and for emergencies. During the last budget year, they used \$5 million to pay down the police and fire unfunded pension liabilities, which allowed them to hire additional officers because it had real world budgetary impacts year after year. He believed this was a catalytic investment in a key project. He understood some were critical of the City for funding an organization's capital campaign, but it would allow for a state of the art facility. He noted two major points of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence was community policing and more opportunities for positive activities for at-risk youth. He believed this was as important to public safety as funding more officers, and pointed out this was on the prevention side of

the equation. If the Boys and Girls Club was not able to increase its capacity and serve more children, the City would pay much more money in the future in less pleasant ways. He explained they were not giving this money away. They were only authorizing the City Manager to purchase services that would benefit the community. He noted they had done something similar to support Welcome Home for their part of the Veterans Campus, which was now under construction, and had been really important to that struggling group. It also matched what other community organizations, such as Veterans United, had done. He stated the City of Columbia was a large, powerful entity akin to a Fortune 500 company, and they had to do their part to support the endeavors of their partners, who were all working hard to improve the community. He explained this was an important priority of the City, and noted they had a process even though some felt they did not. It had been discussed at a pre-council meeting, and resonated with the formal processes of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence and the City's Strategic Plan. In addition, it came to the Council for them to decide whether or not to fund. If they did not want it to come to individual requests, they only needed to say no. He believed this request resonated with the strategic direction they wanted, and thought they could afford this one-time use of funds even in a tight budget year. He felt it was something they should do.

Mr. Skala commented that he was not going to argue against this as he believed it was positive, particularly as it related to the social equity theme they had with the Strategic Plan. He noted \$500,000 was a lot of money, and did not know why they had to settle on any particular amount. The \$500,000 was the number in front of them. The meeting at which this had been presented was excellent. It made sense to him in terms of social equity across the community. He stated he was prepared to support this, but was a little uncomfortable with the size of this decision. He noted he wanted to hear other comments before making a final decision.

Mayor Treece stated he thought they could improve the process going forward in terms of how they got to this point. He believed the Boys and Girls Club had made significant strides in community participation and community fundraising, and this would put them in a place where it would trigger matching funds from another foundation and result in a quality improvement for them and the entire community.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Trapp to keep the suggested amendment involving funding Boys and Girls Club at \$500,000 through general fund reserves on Amendment Sheet 3 was approved by voice vote with Mr. Ruffin abstaining.

Ms. Nauser understood the amount of money associated with the downtown cameras was \$16,000 instead of \$25,030. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. He pointed out the Downtown CID would also pay for two cameras, at that was in addition to the \$16,000.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to keep the suggested amendment involving the reallocation of downtown camera funds to the Police Department training budget on Amendment Sheet 3, but to change the amount to \$16,000. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece.

Mr. Skala stated his appreciation for the Downtown CID for partnering with the City on this issue. He had always thought City government should be in a position to assist private entities in terms of surveillance needs, but did not feel it was the position of the City government to provide surveillance on a public thoroughfare. He reiterated his appreciation for the Downtown CID spending its funds on a very worthy cause.

Ms. Nauser commented that she hoped this was not a one-time deal and that the Downtown CID would continue to fund this into the future.

Mr. Trapp thanked Ms. Nauser for identifying the opportunity to put these funds into training for the police as it was important and a strong community priority.

The motion made by Ms. Nauser and seconded by Mr. Trapp to keep the suggested

amendment involving the reallocation of downtown camera funds to the Police Department training budget on Amendment Sheet 3, but to change the amount to \$16,000, was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece made a motion to keep all of the staff requests on Amendment Sheet 3. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B192-16 per the Amendment Sheet 3, as amended. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on B192-16, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B193-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B194-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B195-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mayor Treece commented that he wanted to address the change from “served” to “individually metered” separately as he did not want to make the change if they were legislating through the budget. He would prefer to get the report from the Mayor’s Task Force on Infrastructure before proceeding with the change as he felt it was a loaded change. If staff was correct in that it did not change anything in terms of what they were doing, he did not feel a change was necessary in the ordinance at this time. He noted he was fine with the changes to the connection fees.

Mr. Matthes suggested the Council amend B196-16 so the original language to that section did not change.

Mr. Skala stated he was uncertain as to the distinctions between the definitions when this was last explained, and wondered if they would benefit from further explanation or if they should wait for the recommendations of the Mayor’s Task Force on Infrastructure. Mayor Treece noted he would prefer to have the Mayor’s Task Force on Infrastructure look into this as he was taking staff at its word that it did not matter since it did not represent a change. Mr. Skala was agreeable, but pointed out he would like an explanation at some point.

Mr. Matthes commented that staff felt this was a housekeeping issue, but others disagreed, and there was not a need to move forward with the change tonight.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend Section 1 of B196-16 so Section 22-262(a) (1) in Chapter 22 read “Residential. A residential user is a user of a dwelling unit that is connected to the city’s sanitary sewer system and served by one (1) water meter.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on B196-16, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B197-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B198-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Ms. Nauser asked what the average cost increase would be for commercial ratepayers. Mr. Windsor replied it was basically an across the board two percent rate increase even though they had some very small and very large commercial or industrial users.

Mr. Skala understood there had been a compromise recommendation from the Water and Light Advisory Board for a one percent increase instead of a two percent increase, but it had been a split decision. He understood the Water and Light Advisory Board Chair was planning on sending additional information to clarify some of the issues, but they had not received anything yet. As a result, he thought they should discuss the potential of a one percent increase instead of a two percent increase.

Ms. Thompson pointed out there might be an issue as the budget had already been adopted with the two percent included. Mayor Treece thought they could make a motion to reconsider B192-16, as amended, if necessary. Ms. Thompson agreed they would have to revisit B192-16 if they wanted to make a budget amendment.

Mr. Matthes suggested they keep the increase at two percent. He explained that each year they calculated all of the needs for the year, which included all of the capital projects and the operating expenses they were aware of. Last year, there had not been an increase in electric. In recent years, there had been a period of great weather so the utility had lost money to the point they were significantly below the goal in reserves. He noted water and electric utilities were different in that the reserve was 20 percent plus what was needed for capital improvements, and they were below that goal. He explained the two percent was really an operating increase. City staff had started the budget process by asking for three percent. During the internal review, they determined they could get by with two percent without losing ground. They felt very strongly at the staff level that the two percent was needed. He reiterated they had lost money in the past, and this was partly due to the rate structure as the rate structure was built to encourage conservation. It was a benefit to the community and the utility itself, but it also created a situation whereby they were very sensitive financially to weather. The return on investment philosophy for a for-profit utility was to obtain the return as quickly as possible, and as the customer used more energy, the price went down. The City's structure was reversed in that they waited to recapture costs so it would cost more as more energy was used. As a result, there was a lot of risk in a typical year. If the weather was beautiful whereby air conditioners were not used, it could result in the loss of millions of dollars in revenue. He commented that although he respected the Water and Light Advisory Board, he did not believe they had spent a lot of time looking at the budget. He reiterated his suggestion to keep the rate increase at two percent, and noted it could be further reviewed in detail with an amendment later if necessary. He stated he believed the two percent was the most conservative approach as they moved forward.

Mr. Skala commented that he was still conflicted on this issue, but noted he had been told that increasing utility rates was a good way to encourage conservation and renewable energy usage as it made those costs competitive. He stated he was not sure he completely agreed. He also was not sure he knew enough of the details to make a decision as to whether the two percent was necessary or with regard to the impact of going with the one percent increase in the future in terms of rates. He noted he was disappointed they had not received more information with regard to the internal struggle within the Water and Light Advisory Board as robust discussions had occurred.

Mayor Treece stated he was not inclined to provide any more support until he received

some closure on Option A versus Option E and clarification on the depreciation fund and the fund balance. He explained he was reluctant to raise rates to pad the reserve fund without more information.

Ms. Nauser understood the increase to residential customers was two percent as well, and asked if that was an average rate of \$3.59. Mr. Windsor replied that included all of the utilities. The electric portion was about \$1.60.

Mr. Trapp commented that as long as he had been following the City budget process, which was before he became a council member, the City had always budgeted conservatively. He thought that was very smart, and it had saved them from a lot of heartache. If they were not cautious, it could result in higher rate increases, which would be more difficult on family budgets. In general, when they talked about municipal inflation of operating utilities, it was about two percent a year. He noted they always talked about the negative side of growth, and there were some in the capital expenses of the utilities, but there was a benefit to growth on the operating side because they had more people joining their already built system and the costs would be spread amongst those people, thus reducing the operating expenses. He understood the municipal inflation rate ran at about one percent. Historically, rate increases were about two percent every other year, and they switched these increases around the utilities. They did not increase the rates for electric operating costs last year, so it made sense there was a two percent increase this year. If they did anything less, they would kick the can down the road and would take a dangerous risk if they had another cool summer. He commented that if they were really concerned about rates, he thought they should be looking at what might be the most affordable plan to deal with their electrical capacity issues by re-evaluating decisions they had made in the past. If they continued to delay processes, the costs would continue to increase resulting in rate increases. He pointed out he was very sensitive to utility rates because they had a profound effect on people's budget. Even a \$5 increase in utility bills could cause great difficulties for struggling families. He stated they needed to operate the utility in a responsible manner, and the rate structure required them to maintain large reserves. He thought it was important for them to approve the two percent rate increase tonight.

Mr. Matthes pointed out that if the Council approved the two percent increase, the electric utility would still be below the cash reserves target by \$1.6 million.

Ms. Nauser stated she would support the increase, but noted this was an annual conversation. While she felt the promotion of conservation was important, she thought they needed a more stable base for the electric utility, and hoped they would address that issue moving forward. She reiterated she would approve the two percent increase because she felt they needed to maintain the level of service expected by those in the community.

Mr. Skala commented that this was one of the more difficult decisions of this budget cycle for him because he had participated in meetings whereby he had heard they would be keeping pace with a one percent increase rather than a two percent increase. He understood the reason for the two percent request and did not want to make this budget cycle more difficult. He also understood they could always amend the rate increase. If they were to approve the two percent now, he would hope that would be considered a credit when they were considering another rate increase in the future. He stated he was disappointed more information had not been provided to assist them in this decision, but at this point he was prepared to move forward.

The vote on B199-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: TREECE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mayor Treece stated he thought Mr. Shanker had a good point in questioning why they were dealing with this as part of the budget when there was not a fiscal impact. Mr.

Matthes explained staff had included it with the budget so there would be more opportunity for public discussion. In addition, it involved administrative work. Currently, a staff member did all of the administrative work and then waited for the board to meet to make a decision. The industry standard was to have this be an administrative function, and this change would allow them to vastly improve service to the public as anyone could come in any day to obtain approval if they passed the test. They would not have to wait for the board met. This would allow them to accelerate the job creation and business creation pipeline, and there would still be input by a board in the appeals process. He pointed out there had also been difficulty in finding board members, and many vacancies had been readvertised for the last sixteen months. This created issues in obtaining quorums and those that suffered were those that were looking for a permit to work.

Ms. Nauser commented that there was a cost to each board and commission in terms of staff and the use of the building. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. He noted the work to get prepared for the meeting could be enormous and was in addition to providing the test and the administrative work. There was work before, after, and during each meeting that would no longer be required.

Ms. Nauser recalled the Council considering a reduction in the number of boards and commissions a few years ago, and asked if these had been included in those discussions. Mr. Matthes replied yes.

Ms. Peters understood a concern of Mr. Shanker included how the City would decide the qualifications of the applicants. She wondered if this would be capricious or if there was a standard. Mr. Matthes replied the requirements were laid out in ordinance. It was truly a decision as to whether the person had the qualifications or not, and whether they could prove they had taken and passed the appropriate test and put in the number of hours required. They had to prove specific measures, and the staff would be bound by the ordinance. Ms. Peters asked if other questions had come up at the board level. Mr. Matthes replied there was not much room for a staff person to inject any personal agenda.

Mr. Skala understood the efficiency aspect of this change and that the appeal process would fall to the Building Construction Codes Commission. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. He also understood the issues with the Board of Electrical Examiners, the Board of Plumbing Examiners, and the Board of Mechanical Examiners involved populating the boards. He explained he was touchy with regard to Council boards and commissions as they provided a different type of input than the professional staff. He assumed these boards did not require the same level of support as the Building Construction Codes Commission, and asked if it was a fair assumption. Mr. Matthes replied it could vary month to month, but in terms of overall workload, the Building Construction Codes Commission had a larger workload.

Mr. Skala asked about the possibility of combining the Board of Electrical Examiners, the Board of Plumbing Examiners, and the Board of Mechanical Examiners into one professional board. This would create efficiencies and would still allow appeals to be made to the Building Construction Codes Commission. Mr. Matthes noted he thought many on the trade boards also served on the Building Construction Codes Commission so many would continue to serve the City of Columbia. It was a matter of providing better service and the fact it was fundamentally an administrative task.

Ms. Nauser asked how changes in standards would be accommodated if they passed this ordinance. Mr. Matthes replied it would be handled the same way it was now, which meant an ordinance change would be brought forward. Ms. Nauser understood staff would be aware of industry changes and to bring those changes to the Council for consideration. Mr. Matthes replied yes. The tests they took were national, standardized tests.

Mr. Trapp commented that he thought streamlining the process would meet the strategic objective regarding living wage jobs as trade jobs tended to pay well. Requiring someone to wait for a meeting when there might not be a quorum delayed the process. He noted

they had perennial openings, and had not seen improvements in recruiting as citizen involvement was a great personal sacrifice. The interest was not there and this was an administrative function in almost every other community. As a result, he thought it made sense to make this change.

Ms. Amin explained there was an amendment sheet that made the date effective of the ordinance October 2, 2016 instead of today.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B224-16 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B224-16, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Matthes explained the idea here was to continue to implement the philosophy change with regard to the airport. Instead of it being a facility to operate, it would become an economic development asset to be used for that purpose. It was also a reflection of talent in the City in that Stacey Button, the Director of Economic Development, had a history of running an airport among other things. The other change was to the Board itself as they would delete the current board and reconstitute it.

Ms. Peters asked if this meant the current Airport Advisory Board would go away and a new Board would be appointed. She also wondered how that would be accomplished. Mr. Matthes replied the ordinance would create the structure, and Council would then determine who to appoint. There were some excellent members on the current Board, which the Council might choose to appoint to the new Board. The new structure tried to reflect some of the City's active partners in supporting the airport.

Ms. Nauser asked why they had included a representative from Jefferson City and not Ashland, as that was where the airport was actually located. She wondered why they would have a representative from a competing airport community. Mayor Treece replied he had actually asked for the representative from Jefferson City to be preserved. He noted about 20 percent of their enplanements came from Jefferson City. In addition, he thought there was a potential for the airport in Jefferson City to be a reliever runway for the Columbia Regional Airport. He had also asked them to participate financially in the operation of the airport. Mr. Matthes pointed out they had participated in the revenue guarantee previously.

Mayor Treece understood the City's Director of Economic Development was also a REDI employee. Mr. Matthes stated that was not correct. Technically, Ms. Button was only the employee of the City of Columbia. Mayor Treece understood her W-2 was from the City of Columbia. Mr. Matthes explained the staff was all employees of the City that fundamentally reported to him. They provided service to the REDI Board, on which he and Mayor Treece served. When the Council allocated money to the Department of Economic Development through the budget, it actually stayed in the City's budget. It did not go to REDI. REDI was a group that raised other money, which was used to accomplish things the City could not legally do. It was a unique partnership. The funds were really separately spent for a common purpose.

Mr. Skala noted there was a report later in the meeting regarding representation on the REDI Board, which he believed to be a reasonable request. He explained the City Council representation on REDI had decreased over time. A few years ago, it was only a 5 or 6 member board of which two were the Mayor of Columbia and the City Manager of Columbia. It was now at 19 or 20 members and the City still only had two positions on the Board.

Mayor Treece stated he was in favor of the proposed changes to the airport. He believed it was a good extension of the voters confidence at the August 2, 2016 election to increase the lodging tax rate for economic development purposes to help build a terminal.

He thought this change really converted the airport asset from a utility within the Public Works Department to a real tool within the Economic Development Department. He was confident the Director of Economic Development could use that tool to market Columbia in terms of new routes, new warehouse space, retaining existing employers, attracting new employers, etc.

B238-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS, PETERS (Ms. Peters stepped out during the vote). Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B239-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B240-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mayor Treece asked if the amendment sheet for B241-16 was still viable and asked for clarification. Ms. Buckler replied the proposal two years ago was to make lieutenants unclassified. They had now gone through a process with the Columbia Police Lieutenants Association (CPLA) whereby they had utilized a mediator with the Federal Mediation and Conciliation Service, and they had agreed that the people that were currently lieutenants would not be affected by that change. Only people that were promoted or newly hired after August 30, 2016 would be impacted. Current lieutenants would remain in classified service. Mayor Treece asked what that meant. Ms. Buckler replied it meant all of Chapter 19 would apply to them, including appeals for any kind of disciplinary action to the Personnel Advisory Board. Mayor Treece understood new hires would be at-will employees. Ms. Buckler stated that was the proposal. Mr. Matthes explained that was the agreed upon proposal. Mayor Treece pointed out that had been agreed upon by the incumbent seven lieutenants. Ms. Buckler explained it had been agreed upon by that organization and its representative. Mr. Matthes stated they had gone through the meet and confer process, and that had resulted in mediation. This was the compromise that had resulted from the process.

Ms. Nauser understood any new hire would consent or could choose to go somewhere else.

Ms. Buckler explained their argument was that they had not agreed to be unclassified when they were hired. Anyone hired or promoted into a lieutenant position would now know it was an unclassified position.

Ms. Nauser asked if it was typical for lieutenants to be unclassified in terms of the industry standard. Ms. Buckler replied there were a lot of different structures and different ranks for police departments. It was in some places, but it was not in other places. Mr. Matthes understood, in general, most law enforcement was unclassified. He noted sheriff department employees were at-will. He explained it tended to vary in cities, but it was very common. Mayor Treece stated he was not sure it was very common.

Mayor Treece explained he had a lot of concern about making any member of the Police Department at-will as that job was hard enough as they had their badge in one hand and their life in the other, not knowing which one they might lose at the end of the day. He was not sure they wanted seven lieutenants to be worried about losing their job for a split-second decision, especially when supervising patrol officers, and that was the scenario that would be created by this change. Mr. Matthes stated they wanted the lieutenants to make the right decision. Mayor Treece commented that the decision they would make would be one to help them keep their job because that was the decision the

City would be forcing them to make with this change.

Mr. Matthes explained this had been proposed due to insubordination. Mayor Treece asked if it was insubordination in challenging the decision of superiors as he thought that was sometimes healthy. Mr. Matthes clarified it was active miscommunication of policies, and there was a reason this had been proposed two years ago. It had only taken this long to come to this point. It was not about trying to fire lieutenants because by the time someone became a lieutenant, the City would have invested millions in that person in terms of training and as an employee. It was not about getting rid of someone. He reiterated it was about keeping the insubordination from occurring. He noted the bargaining unit had agreed to this mediation. Ms. Buckler pointed out they had asked for the mediation.

Mayor Treece stated he did not believe they had asked for this. He thought they had only asked for the mediation. Ms. Buckler stated they had asked for the mediation and this was the compromise that had been reached at the mediation. Mayor Treece noted they had not asked to be at-will. Ms. Buckler agreed they had not asked to be at-will.

Mr. Trapp understood this had gone through mediation and the CPLA had agreed to it. He also understood the Police Chief and City Manager felt this was necessary. Anyone going into the position in the future would know what the position entailed. He believed this compromise would alleviate the biggest issue of people becoming lieutenants prior to knowing about that particular risk. He thought this was a reasonable compromise.

Ms. Nauser made a motion to amend B241-16 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved with only Mayor Treece voting against it.

B241-16, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: TREECE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH33-16 Proposed HVAC improvements at the Activity and Recreation Center (ARC).

Discussion shown with B229-16.

B229-16 Authorizing construction of HVAC improvements at the Activity and Recreation Center (ARC); appropriating funds.

PH33-16 was read by the Clerk and B229-16 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

B229-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B137-16 Vacating a portion of an east-west alley located between 203 E. Walnut Street and 115 N. Providence Road (Case No. 16-93).

B137-16 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece stated he would like to separate the policy from the request, and not address the policy and this item at the same meeting. He suggested a 2-3 month tabling.

Mr. Teddy noted the applicant did not have a particular building plan, and their only plan at the moment involved the desire to close the curb cut at Providence Road. The vacation of the ally would allow for a simplified traffic pattern. He understood they were looking long range at some options for the properties they owned.

Ms. Nauser pointed out they would have the development code and some other issues to address soon.

Mayor Treece made a motion to table B137-16 to the February 6, 2017 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B243-16 Amending Chapter 26 of the City Code as it relates to tourism fees and the license tax on hotels and motels.

B243-16 was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

B243-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B221-16 Rezoning property located on the southwest corner of Madison Street and Orange Street from R-2 to O-P; approving the statement of intent; approving the True Properties O-P Plan (Case No. 16-141).

B221-16 was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Pat Kelley, 1007 Grand Avenue, commented that as a representative of the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association, she had presented their unanimous vote in favor of this rezoning at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Unfortunately, neighborhood organizing was never an exact science, and since the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting, they had met a neighbor who lived next door to the subject property and was a master plumber that had concerns with regard to stormwater. If the issue could not be resolved tonight and the Council wanted to table this item, she noted they would be happy to hold a neighborhood meeting soon in order to work on the issue.

Eric Williams, 1001 Madison Street, explained he had received a letter from the City about this project, but had not been contact by Jack Miller, the applicant, or the neighborhood association as Madison Street was on the edge of the neighborhood association boundaries. He understood this property belonged to True Media, but was concerned if they sold the property to another party as there would not be enough parking for the proposed building. He stated they were using the property to the north for parking, and if it was sold, that owner might not allow it to be used for parking in the future. This would create parking on a residential street. He understood they were counting this as an existing parking lot, and wanted to remove the parking lot and construct a building. He was concerned about the stormwater runoff as it would travel down Madison Street. There had been several occasions when there were hard rain storms that he had to go down the street and put the manhole cover back on the storm drain. He wanted to see a proper storm drain runoff plan as he did not want it to be just dumped into the street. He noted the building lot was at the crest of the hill on Madison Street, so the stormwater would run past his house and flood Sexton Road. He asked that this issue be tabled to address the stormwater issues. He thought the same codes that applied to new development should be applied here, especially since it was being turned into a new commercial property.

Mayor Treece understood this property was currently zoned R-2 and had a surface parking lot on it, which was the remnant of Commerce Bank when it was on the Business Loop and likely an overflow parking lot for staff. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Mayor Treece asked if they would have needed a variance for the surface parking lot on R-2. Mr. Teddy replied it would not be a variance. It would be a conditional use permit to allow commercial parking in a residential district. He noted it was an off-site arrangement even though it was across the street.

Mayor Treece asked if an applicant could propose what was being proposed here if there was separate ownership. Mr. Teddy replied it was a fairly small building, and the applicant had furnished a parking table. The spaces that would be provided exceeded the spaces required.

It was based square feet and the type of use.

Mayor Treece asked if a non-conforming use would be created if there was ever separate ownership in the future. Mr. Teddy replied he thought it could stand-alone. He also thought there had been testimony at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting that it was possible a part of the building could be utilized by a separate office user. They had not fully resolved the occupancy of the building.

Tim Crockett, 2606 N. Stadium Boulevard, explained he was the engineer for this project and noted this property was a redevelopment. It laid in what the City considered a critical downstream location. Property within a critical downstream location had a different set of criteria for stormwater standards. They either had to provide detention on the property or reduce the impervious surface on the property itself by a minimum of ten percent. Given that it was an existing commercial parking lot right now, the vast majority of the property was covered by pavement. The redevelopment of the site would add a substantial amount of pervious area to the site and greatly reduce the amount of runoff coming from the site now. He pointed out the old stormwater standards had not delineated a difference between new construction and redevelopment, and the issue encountered was that it was not cost-beneficial to redevelop in locations such as this. It was cheaper and easier to find a new piece of property on the outskirts of town than it was to reinvest in the inner portions of town. The City later changed those regulations to encourage redevelopment while still addressing stormwater issues. He reiterated this property was in a critical downstream location so they did not have free discharge from the property.

Ms. Nauser asked if they would have on-site detention. Mr. Crockett replied no, and explained they would reduce the impervious surface by more than ten percent. Ms. Nauser asked how that was being accomplished. Mr. Crockett replied by removing the pavement, constructing a building, reconstructing the parking lots, and adding greenspace.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he pleased he had been able to get Ms. Kelley in contact with Mayor Treece so Mr. Williams could come to the meeting to raise this issue for an explanation. It was how neighborhood associations worked.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Clark for his thoughts on rezoning from R-2 to O-P and then approving the statement of intent. He wondered if those should be separate motions or if he thought they should be handled together. Mr. Clark replied he did not have a clear answer. In general, he would suggest voting on land use designations and zoning separately from the plan due to 30 years of watching legal firms sell really bad land use designations by presenting a plan with neighborhood support. He tended to think they should be handled separately, but he was not prepared to say for certain.

Jack Miller, 500 Business Loop 70 W, stated he owned True Media and the property in question. He explained this rezoning request was based on the growth of his company, and noted they had just made Inc. Magazine's list of fastest growing companies for the seventh consecutive year so they needed to do some strategic planning for the future. He stated they had made big investments over the past several years in helping redevelop this section of town and the Business Loop, and wanted the opportunity to continue to grow the company in the area. The parking lot in question was left over from Commerce Bank. He noted they did not have customers that visited them on a day to day basis so he did not need the secondary parking lot. He wanted to see development in a campus-like atmosphere around their headquarters that allowed them to create future jobs and positions in Columbia. Keeping it as R-2 and redeveloping duplexes did not fit into his strategic plan. In addition, he was not sure it was the right type of development that encouraged growth and the type of investment the neighborhood even wanted. He thought what they had proposed in terms of landscaping and the type of building that would be constructed would harmonize with the great stuff they had done across the street at True Media and be a benefit to the neighborhood in comparison to leaving it a parking lot or building duplexes on it with the current zoning.

Ms. Peters asked Mr. Williams if Mr. Crockett's comments had addressed his concerns. Mr. Williams replied he felt they were trying to avoid some of the ordinance requirement through redevelopment. He understood that in terms of costs, but felt the lot would not have enough parking. He would prefer this lot be combined with the lot to the north so the parking was combined in what would then be considered one lot. If someone wanted to split it in the future, the City could prevent it from being subdivided.

Ms. Peters understood there was a street in between the two lots. Mr. Williams stated there

was a street. Ms. Peters noted that would involve getting rid of the street. Mr. Williams thought it could be one lot with the street in the middle.

Mr. Crockett agreed there was a public right-of-way between the two properties. If they could, they would plat them into one property, but they were physically not able to do it since there was a public right-of-way in between. In terms of the parking space concern, he noted they had drafted a parking arrangement or cross-share agreement, which was typical in a situation such as this. If Mr. Miller were ever to sell the south or the north property, the parking arrangement agreement would provide off-site parking on the adjacent property, so that issue had already been addressed. Mayor Treece asked if that agreement would convey to the successor in title. Mr. Crockett replied yes, and explained it went with the property.

Mr. Skala commented that in reference to Mayor Treece's question of Mr. Clark, both he and Mr. Wade, a former council member, were of the opinion that the land use issue and the planned development should be separated, but they had never prevailed in their thought process. He reiterated he felt they should be separate issues, and thought both sides could be argued.

Mr. Ruffin stated he planned to support this project. He noted True Media had done an amazing job of redeveloping in the area and he had every confidence this plan would enhance this part of that neighborhood. It would prove to be a real asset by providing more jobs and enhancing the overall aesthetics of the area. He reiterated he planned to support it as it was a good plan and was good for the Business Loop and the City.

B221-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B222-16 Approving the Final Plat of Mikel's Subdivision Plat 2 located on the southwest corner of Madison Street and Orange Street; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-140).

B222-16 was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

B222-16 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

B223-16 Approving the Final Plat of Hendren Hills Subdivision located on the north side of Proctor Drive and east of Creasy Springs Road; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-146).

B225-16 Authorizing a consolidated grant agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for transportation planning services.

B226-16 Authorizing a revision to the supplemental agreement for highway/rail crossing signal improvements with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission and the County of Boone relating to the Columbia Terminal Railroad's (COLT) intersection with O'Rear Road in Hallsville, Missouri.

- B227-16 Authorizing an amendment to the financial assistance agreement with the Mid-Missouri Solid Waste Management District for the purchase of front loading recycling containers.
- B228-16 Accepting conveyances for water and electric utility purposes.
- B230-16 Accepting a donation from the Columbia Cosmopolitan Luncheon Club for park improvements at the Frank G. Nifong Memorial Park; appropriating funds.
- B231-16 Authorizing an environmental child care sanitation inspections participation agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services.
- B232-16 Authorizing Amendment No. 3 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for WIC local agency nutrition services.
- B233-16 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for WIC local agency nutrition services.
- B234-16 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri, on behalf of its Office of Social and Economic Data Analysis, for data collection and analysis services relating to socio-economic, housing, health and education community indicators.
- B235-16 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Traffic and Highway Safety Division for a DWI enforcement unit.
- B236-16 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Traffic and Highway Safety Division for DWI enforcement relating to sobriety checkpoints and saturation patrols.
- B237-16 Appropriating funds to cover the costs of FY 2016 medical and prescription drug claims and contributions to employee health savings accounts.
- B242-16 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to increase the construction contract threshold relating to performance and payment bonds.

- B244-16 Continuing the application and collection of the local sales tax on the titling of motor vehicles, trailers, boats and outboard motors that were purchased from a source other than a licensed Missouri dealer; providing for such tax to be repealed, reduced or raised in the same amount as the local sales tax is repealed, reduced or raised.
- B245-16 Authorizing a school resource officer agreement with the Columbia School District.
- R128-16 Authorizing approval of the issuance of housing revenue bonds by the Columbia Housing Authority for the Oak Tower Apartments renovation project.
- R129-16 Authorizing an agreement with the Memorial Day Weekend - Salute to Veterans Corporation for an air show to be held at Columbia Regional Airport May 24-29, 2017; authorizing the City Manager to provide support services for the Memorial Day activities planned by that organization; and authorizing a parachute jump onto Broadway.
- R130-16 Authorizing an educational affiliation agreement with George Washington University, on behalf of its School of Nursing, to provide health clinical experience and instruction for nursing students.
- R131-16 Authorizing Amendment #1 to the service agreement with Application Software, Inc. for administration of the City's flexible benefits plan and trust.
- R132-16 Transferring funds to finalize and close out the Stadium Boulevard corridor transportation improvement project.
- R133-16 Transferring funds from the Columbia Financial Enterprise Resource System (COFERS) software capital project to the finance department operating budget.
- R134-16 Transferring funds from the Records Management System (RMS) software capital improvement project to the police department operating budget.
- R135-16 Transferring funds to cover accrual payouts associated with employee retirements.

- R139-16 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with Friends of the Farm, on behalf of Sustainable Farms & Communities Inc., Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture and Columbia Farmers Market, Inc., for fund-raising activities associated with the construction of a farmers market community center and a community agriculture garden at the Clary-Shy Park located on Ash Street.
- R140-16 Authorizing CDBG agreements with Independent Living Center of Mid-Missouri, Inc., d/b/a/ Services for Independent Living, Centro Latino De Salud, Educacion y Cultura and Job Point.
- R141-16 Authorizing an agreement with Central Missouri Community Action for administration of a microloan program.
- R142-16 Granting a temporary waiver from the requirements of Section 16-185 of the City Code to allow possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages associated with the Love Your Craft festival.
- The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER (except R142-16 on which she abstained), PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:**

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R144-16 Approving the Preliminary Plat for Kitty Hawk Manor, Plat No. 6 located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Northland Drive and Parker Street (Case No. 16-137).
- Mayor Treece explained there had been a request to table this to the October 17, 2016 Council Meeting.
- Mayor Treece made a motion to table R144-16 to the October 17, 2016 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.**
- R136-16 Transferring Council Reserve funds to the City Manager's Office to fund a Job Point program to provide scholarships to students referred to the Alternative Sentencing Courts from the Boone County Circuit Court.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece explained this had been discussed late during the last council meeting and he did not recall if they had come to a resolution. As a result, he thought it should be brought back up for discussion.

Mr. Matthes stated this funding was from the current fiscal year so the only sense of urgency was that the money would flow to the general fund reserves if a decision was not made tonight. If they wanted to fund the Job Point request, he thought this was the night to do it, and this action would make that possible.

Mr. Trapp stated he had asked for this resolution to be brought forward after Mr. Smith's

presentation. He understood this was Mr. Smith trying to be responsive to the initiative of Boone County to reduce the number of people in the Boone County Jail, most of who had been arrested in the City of Columbia. He noted Job Point would also receive County funds in an amount greater than this, and from a source separate from where they normally received for social services funding. He explained Job Point pursued regular social services funding for the vocational pieces of their programs. In general, social services funding had been flat or down by three percent since 2006. As they found additional funds from the council reserve fund, he thought they were kind of keeping up with the growth of the community's ongoing support for social services, which was somewhat unique for a city the size of Columbia. He noted this could be tied directly to the strategic plan in terms of job training for those most in needs. He stated he was supportive of this resolution and thought the process might get more complicated if the money flowed back into the fund reserves as they would have to find another way to allocate funding. He believed the request of Job Point had been crafted with the use of council reserves in mind. He pointed out that several years ago, they had provided one-time support to Job Point through the council reserve fund prior to Mr. Smith's tenure when they had lost their federal grant for the YouthBuild program during a sequester. Those funds had allowed them to maintain capacity at a reduced rate since they had not funded it at the level of the federal government. They had been able to maintain the program with critical gap funding and regain the federal funding in the following year. He thought their support for Job Point had been wise and judicious. He recommended they approve this request tonight.

Ms. Nauser pointed out a recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence had been to serve individuals with prior records. The courts would divert sentencing by allowing individuals to be directly referred to Job Point for job training and skills. She felt this funding would go a long way in assisting with the success of those individuals as good paying jobs were tended to prevent people committing crimes in the future. She stated she would support this based upon the Strategic Plan and the recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence.

Mr. Skala stated he thought this was a great cause, but had conflict with the process. He understood it would be cumbersome to retire these funds to the general fund and reallocate them. He noted he would like to see something in the future that would solve this problem so they did not continually raid the council reserve fund and so they accommodated these requests in the regular way they did business. He explained he was likely to agree with this tonight due to the circumstances of it being the end of the fiscal year, but did not feel this was the appropriate process. He thought the council reserve fund should be reserved for weather-related and emergency situations. He did not feel they should be used on a regular basis.

Mr. Matthes pointed out approval tonight would move the funds, but staff would still need to come back in the future with an agreement with Job Point for the use of those funds.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he agreed with the comments of Mr. Skala and noted he wanted to see a different and more coordinated process. He saw this as directly supporting one of the major recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence in terms of re-entry combined with active and adequate support services, which made sense, but felt this was a piecemealed process. He thought this should have been presented with the other aspects of the recommendations of the Task Force. He would prefer to have seen more coordination as part of the budget process. In general, he was quit supportive of this, but the way it had been done suboptimized the overall effect it could have had.

Eric Williams, 1001 Madison Street, commented that he worked in the construction trade and suggested this be open to all, and not just those referred to by the court as it could also be a good opportunity for someone that was poor. He thought this training should be open to the general public that met certain criteria.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that he had previously volunteered at Job Point and had thought it was a combination. He understood the participants had previously been incarcerated, but he also thought individuals could participate in the general setting. He enjoyed seeing the participants outside of the program as it showed the impact they could have on the future of individuals. He agreed this should not be limited to those referred to by the courts.

Mayor Treece asked if participation in the program would have to be limited to those with court referrals. Mr. Matthes replied he thought Job Point had programs that were open to everyone.

This particular request was for a specific program that was a referral program from the judicial system.

Mr. Trapp explained Job Point had other scholarship programs available for lower income people. He noted they also had a large footprint with people with developmental disabilities. They looked for people who had employment barriers so they had a number of different scholarship programs and grant funded programs, and they reached out to serve everyone in the community that wanted their services. This particular program was geared toward people that were in alternative sentencing courts, which allowed for intervention. He noted there was a mental health court, drug court, veterans court, and driving under the influence court. This was geared toward those coming through those courts. This allowed them to help a struggling individual while obtaining a public safety benefit. He pointed out the biggest determinate of whether someone would go back to prison or not was whether they had a full time job. The great thing about the Job Point training program was that it really opened up living wage jobs. It also covered the skills gap as there were high wage jobs for which people did not have the qualifications.

Ms. Nauser commented that Job Point also had the YouthBuild program whereby they assisted disadvantaged youth in the community by getting them into the construction trades and their GEDs.

The vote on R136-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS.

Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R137-16

Finding the structure located at 207 Fourth Avenue is a dangerous structure; authorizing an exception to Ordinance No. 022823 relating to the administrative delay on the demolition of structures in specified areas.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Pat Kelley, 1007 Grand Avenue, explained she had requested that this be taken off of the consent agenda because the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association had not been informed. They did not necessarily feel this building needed to continue to stand, but they wanted to know the plans for it in the future. They had previously heard the property associated with the next resolution, 804 King Avenue, would be turned into a parking lot, and had later learned an affordable house would be built at that location.

Mayor Treece understood there was typically a 30 day administrative delay on demolitions with a sign that indicated an application for demolition had been received, and asked if that had occurred in this situation. Mr. Teddy replied this had not yet been circulated to the Historic Preservation Commission. The normal means of notification would include a sign posted at the property for ten days. Mayor Treece asked if that had occurred on this property and 804 King Avenue. Mr. Teddy replied no, and explained they did not want to send the message that they had granted permission. Mayor Treece understood the sign was a notice of demolition, and part of the reason for the sign was to provide immediate neighbors appropriate notification that there could be construction dust, asbestos, etc. involved when the house was demolished. He thought it was important to have the yard sign in place.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that the Historic Preservation Commission and the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association should have received notice. These were core items that should go to the secretaries of the associations, and it was not difficult to know the area involved. He felt the issue of notice needed to be resolved so neighborhood associations were routinely notified even if notice was not required.

Ms. Peters understood this had been brought to Council due to the administrative delay, and asked if a sign would be posted once this was approved. Mr. Teddy replied they would post a sign that would say demolition was imminent so neighbors were alerted. Ms. Peters understood there would not be a public hearing later or a chance for people to come back with concerns. Mr. Teddy stated public hearings were not held on demolitions. He noted Chapter 6 of the City Code authorized him to override the 30 day delay in cases of dangerous buildings, such as a fire damaged building.

Mr. Skala understood the distinction was whether it was a 30 day notification or an imminent notification. Mr. Teddy explained a 30 day delay was required in the normal course of a demolition. A planner would take a photograph of the building and circulate the application to the Historic Preservation Commission. Mr. Skala asked if simultaneously there was also notification to the affected neighborhood association. Mr. Teddy replied they relied on the sign. He did not believe they had made it a practice of notifying neighborhood associations of demolitions other than the sign. He pointed out that if it was a problem property that was already on the neighborhood association's radar, there would be dialogue between the Office of Neighborhood Services and that association. Mr. Skala thought they might want to start notifying neighborhood associations. Mr. Teddy stated he was not objecting to that notification. He was only pointing out it had not been the practice.

Mayor Treece understood the property was zoned R-2 and asked if staff knew what the applicant had planned to do with the property. Mr. Teddy replied he did not, but pointed out it was a very narrow and deep lot. It currently had a bungalow style home on it. He noted it was adjacent to O-1 property.

The vote on R137-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R138-16 Finding the structure located at 804 King Avenue is a dangerous structure; authorizing an exception to Ordinance No. 022823 relating to the administrative delay on the demolition of structures in specified areas; authorizing a housing site demolition and re-use agreement of participation with Central Missouri Community Action relating to a structure located at 804 King Avenue.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters understood the Council had authorized allocating \$85,000 in CDBG funds and asked for clarification. Mr. Teddy replied that was the size of the demolition program so it was the pool of money they had available to assist applicants. Ms. Peters understood \$14,000 would go toward this demolition.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, understood the City had created a dashboard, but noted people did not know to go look at the dashboard. He also did not feel signs should be relied upon. He suggested notification be sent to the neighborhood associations because those associations could then go to the dashboard on the City's website and learn about that particular property along with other properties. This would ensure more people utilized the dashboard.

Mayor Treece stated he was old fashioned in that he preferred the yard sign. Mr. Clark commented that he did not think they should get rid of the yard sign. Mayor Treece noted the complaint they had received when he was on the Historic Preservation Commission was that people drove by a house every day and it was then gone all of a sudden. As a result, he thought the yard signs were effective. Also, not everyone had a smart phone or computer access. Mr. Skala agreed.

The vote on R138-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R143-16 Authorizing the Finance Director to write off certain uncollectible receivables.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Nix provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if the special tax assessments would have been sent to a collection agency as there was over \$50,000 in special tax assessments. Ms. Nix replied she had noticed there were a lot of special assessments, such as abutting street construction or sewer construction. She provided an example of a situation where the entity refused to pay it if there was not a state statute requiring payment. They had provided the ordinance language, but that had not been satisfactory to the entity.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, explained he was on the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee and noted he was pleased with the response of Ms. Nix. He stated he had asked for this to be taken off the consent agenda because he thought several things needed to be reviewed by the Finance Department staff and the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee, such as policies, amounts, length of time, etc. In terms of special assessments, liens could be placed on the property if the City was on top of it, and this was a very effective tool. He reiterated he was pleased by the response of Ms. Nix.

Ms. Nix stated she did not believe the special assessments had been sent to collections. Mayor Treece asked if a lien could be filed on those special assessments. Ms. Thompson understood many of those had a lien filed on them, but after ten years, the lien went away. She noted they had not been contacted individually on those that were less than ten years old. Mayor Treece stated some of these were still within that period. Ms. Thompson agreed, and pointed out the one listed for 2013 was a bankruptcy. She was not sure about the others.

Mayor Treece commented that he appreciated the diligence of staff in tracking these down, and noted he wanted to see what they might recommend to address the issue in the future. Ms. Nix thought they might have cut sewer service off to some customers. She hoped they could cross reference vendors and customers easier with the new system, and if not, they would have to come up with another way to mitigate it.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that there was a millionaire on Crescent Meadows that continually had violations, and he and others wondered why the City did not penalize and collect fines against assessments. He thought a new department or function of the City could be created. He was really concerned about this and its impact on the budget.

Ms. Peters asked if the recommendation was to write off \$174,000 in old debts. Ms. Nix replied yes. She commented that her recommendation was to write these off. She would work on others as there were more. She pointed out the list that had originally been presented to her involved \$600,000. She explained the Council would see more write offs in the future, but she hoped it would not be near as many as this time. She noted it would take a lot of staff time to try and track down some of the smaller amounts, and she was not sure it was worth it. Ms. Peters understood, but thought they would want to look into some of the larger amounts.

Ms. Peters asked about Cooper County Trash and Manufacturing. Ms. Nix replied she thought that company was in business in Boonville from her search on the internet, but she did not believe they did any business in Columbia any longer. Ms. Peters asked about the Boone County Corrections Facility. Ms. Nix replied she understood the Boone County Corrections Facility had only paid a partial amount of an invoice and had disputed the total charges. There was never any agreement with regard to how much should have been paid, and she was not sure City staff could go back now and determine how to come up with the difference.

Ms. Peters stated she was glad it was not \$600,000 anymore. Ms. Nix explained it was, but she would try to get the number down.

Mr. Skala noted there were some pretty well-known names on the list.

Eric Williams, 1001 Madison Avenue, suggested the City shame people into paying their bills, especially if they were prominent people, by posting the information on the website.

Ms. Peters suggested sending the bill again because there were a lot of limited liability companies on the list, and she thought many were still in business. The initial bill might not have gotten to them or had gotten buried in paperwork for a variety of reasons. They might pay it if they were aware of it.

Ms. Thompson stated she and Ms. Nix had talked and the Law Department was committed to help her get that list down, but there became a point where they could not accurately bill someone even though there was an account receivable, which was why the records needed to be cleaned up. She thought another list would come forward in the future, but they did not know exactly what that list would involve.

The vote on R143-16 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, NAUSER,

PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS.
Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B246-16 Approving the Final Plat of Stevens Ridge Subdivision, Plat 1 located on the west side of Route K, adjacent to William Smith Place; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 16-119).
- B247-16 Vacating a portion of an unused drainage easement on the south side of Lot 5 and Lot 7 within Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 2-B located at the terminus of Nocona Parkway and approximately 1,500 feet south of Ponderosa Street (Case No. 16-174).
- B248-16 Accepting conveyances for drainage and scenic conservation bikeway/walkway purposes.
- B249-16 Authorizing a joint funding agreement with the U.S. Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior for groundwater monitoring of well sites in the vicinity of the wetland treatment units and the Eagle Bluffs Conservation Area.
- B250-16 Accepting conveyances for utility, drainage and sewer purposes.
- B251-16 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the issuance of birth and death certificates and associated technology resources.
- B252-16 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Youth Leadership in Tobacco Prevention program; appropriating funds.
- B253-16 Authorizing Amendment No. 3 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Healthy Families America program.

X. REPORTS

- REP73-16 Council request for additional REDI board members.
Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala explained discussions related to this had existed for over a year, and what was eventually decided was that this was a genuine public/private partnership, but there was an issue in terms of representation. There were about five members when REDI was initially formed, and two were from the City of Columbia, the city manager and the mayor. This represented about a 40 percent investment. There were now about 19 members and the City still only had representation through the city manager and mayor. He thought representation should reflect a better proportion of the amount of money the City contributed this group. He understood there were a lot of contributions from the private sector, and there were ex-officio members from other communities since it was a regional group. He stated the City provided a tremendous amount of capital and time to help REDI do its work. He thought the Council had achieved some sort of consensus on this issue to at least make this request of REDI, and had assumed the letter would reach REDI before some of the budget discussions, but it had not. At Wednesday's meeting, he read the draft text of the letter to the REDI Board. He was pleased to see this report had essentially the same language as the letter. He hoped the Council saw this as a reasonable request, and that it was appropriate given the investment they were making on a yearly basis.

Mr. Skala asked if the letter would be signed by Mayor Treece and sent to the REDI Board. Mr. Matthes replied staff would suggest Council action in terms of how to improve the language or indicating their comfort level. If directed, they would put it on letterhead for Mayor Treece's signature and send it to the REDI Board.

Ms. Nauser stated she thought this was a reasonable request, and liked the idea they would alternate council members. She commented that she would support it.

Mr. Matthes pointed out Mr. Trapp and Mr. Ruffin would be participants of the REDI Board first if this change was made and asked if they were comfortable. Mr. Trapp replied he did not think this was necessary, but did not feel it was unreasonable either, and stated he could live with it. He noted he would be willing to serve for the first round.

Mr. Ruffin commented that he was not excited about having another meeting to attend, but would do so if necessary. Mr. Matthes noted he missed the meetings occasionally.

Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to provide Mayor Treece the draft letter for his signature, and to then forward it to the REDI Board. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP74-16 Alley Vacation Policy.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked staff to take a more thoughtful approach to this and to come back with something in the future unless anyone wanted something done more quickly. He noted the pending alley vacation had been tabled for a few months.

Ms. Nauser was agreeable to something coming forward in the future.

REP75-16 Bus Shelters Update.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought the Council needed to honor the process they had instigated by at least building some of the bus shelters and felt staff had made good choices to use the more expensive design for more prominent locations. He noted Mr. Skala had made an eloquent case in that more was better, and thought this was a nice compromise. They honored the public input and had chosen good locations.

Mayor Treece asked how staff had picked the locations. Mr. Nichols replied by reviewing visibility and high traffic areas.

Mr. Trapp noted 1500 Vandiver Drive had been a great location, but those tenants were moving out, and he was not certain the new tenants would have a lot of bus traffic. Mr. Nichols agreed, but there was a bus shelter on the north side, and this would complement it in terms of routing. They also thought the community area as a whole would benefit from it. Mr. Trapp agreed other people might use it as it was near the trailer park.

Mayor Treece asked if staff had looked at ridership or density. Mr. Nichols replied these were ones they thought would remain on the route after the consultant had completed its review. He noted a meeting was scheduled for October 11 at the ARC, which would start the public process in terms of the routes. Staff felt these would likely be viable locations even after the

results of the study. These had also been brought forward in the public hearing that had previously been held last October. He pointed out they would work with property owners to allow these to be constructed. They wanted direction on the number of types of structures from Council before bidding the project.

Mayor Treece understood the new design would be the one that was more architecturally oriented. Mr. Nichols replied yes. He noted they had one quote to provide them an estimated cost, but would need to get bids on the structure.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a program or mechanism in place whereby a business could assist if it wanted to locate a bus shelter on its property. Mr. Nichols replied he would have to work with the Law Department to determine what types of agreements would be needed. He explained the first step had been to get the locations finalized.

REP76-16

Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that in terms of the budget, he thought there were issues other than money, and noted a price tag could not be put on some items.

Mr. Elkin noted an earthquake had occurred in the central region recently, and explained he had two natural gas leaks at his front door. The leak was taken care of today, which meant it had been in disrepair for about a week. He also noted he had seen multiple water leaks throughout the City, and knew infrastructure was deteriorating. He wondered how much money it would take to get it under control, especially after an earthquake.

Mr. Elkin asked how many different outside entities had stopped contributing to the total budget, and wondered how much it would cost if they had natural gas and water leaking at the same time. It cost a lot of money to run a city, and they needed to get caught up.

Mr. Elkin noted construction was going on everywhere even though the Council had essentially shut it down, and wondered if citizens were being penalized due to commercial customers.

Mr. Elkin understood sales tax was paid based upon an honor system in Missouri, and asked if the City operated the same way. He wondered where the revenue was going.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that the Council had voted to allow the Finance Department to write off collectibles before the year end financials were completed and sent off for audit, but that did not mean they could not pursue collection efforts on those collectibles. He stated he was pleased to hear more than the use of a collection agency by the City.

Mr. Clark asked the Council to reconsider the electric utility rate increase at their October meeting since Mr. Hasheider arrived late and did not have the opportunity to present arguments for a one percent increase.

Mr. Clark commented that he agreed with Mayor Treece regarding problems with B241-16. He did not believe this was a way to run a police department even if there had been mediation. The problems and issues he heard being raised was the effect on lieutenants that were supervising the line forces. This was different than the role of captains. He did not feel they should have some lieutenants that were at-will while they had other lieutenants that were not at-will. He thought this would create a governance issue and cause problems in the future. He suggested they reconsider that decision.

Mr. Clark asked Council to rethink the airport as well in terms of its restructuring. He did not believe there had been collaboration with the Airport Advisory Board or others. He thought it could have resulted in a much better plan had it occurred.

Mr. Clark commented that keeping the plan with a rezoning prevented adequate deliberation with regard to whether something was too intense of a use separate from the plan, but separating them opened the door to speculative rezonings, etc. He thought a system of controls was needed, and suggested this issue be looked at very closely in terms of the unified development code. He noted he was very impressed with the intensity by which the staff was reviewing the public comments with the Planning and Zoning Commission.

Ms. Nauser explained she had recently wanted to dispose of some prescription medications and understood she could no longer take them to the Health Department for disposal due to a

state statute prohibiting police departments and others from taking those drugs. She was concerned because she did not believe they wanted to flush dangerous drugs down the toilets or throw them in a trash can as they could pollute the water. She asked that the City's lobbyist to work with state lawmakers to allow pharmacies, hospitals, and care facilities to take and destroy unused pharmaceuticals as she understood it was a statewide issue that needed to be addressed at the statewide level.

Ms. Nauser commented that she had constituents contact her regarding the speeding problem on Forum Boulevard near Green Meadows Road, and asked that traffic calming measures be incorporated with the traffic signal they were considering for this intersection. In addition, in the interim, she wanted to know if they could have some traffic enforcement in the area as she believed it would be beneficial.

Ms. Nauser stated the Chamber of Commerce had submitted a letter with regard to some of the concerns they had on the public inconvenience fee, and asked staff to address those concerns prior to this issue coming back before the Council.

Ms. Nauser commented that there was a very small sign on Scott Boulevard near the Beulah Ralph School at a pedestrian crossing on a hill, which was difficult to see. She asked that a larger sign be placed there and for an advance warning sign to be installed as well.

Ms. Nauser explained there was a lot of concrete debris from what appeared to be a curb falling apart at the south side of the Bethel Road and Nifong Boulevard intersection on the east side of the street. She asked staff to ensure that the debris and gravel be removed so it was not dangerous to pedestrians.

Ms. Peters stated she had received complaints from many people with regard to the new system for downtown parking whereby the only option to pay for parking was to have a smart phone and the app. She asked for a report on how that was supposed to work since it restricted parking for a number of people downtown. She also wondered why they did not have a parking meter along with the parking app.

Mr. Skala congratulated Mr. Matthes and thanked him and staff for the tremendous amount of work they had done in putting the budget together. He also thanked the Council and the members of the public that had participated in the process.

Mr. Ruffin expressed his appreciation to the Council for their historic support of the restoration of the Blind Boone Home. The grand opening was yesterday and a couple hundred people had participated in the celebration. It was a great time and a source of pride for the community, and would not have been possible without the collaboration of the City. He also thanked the people in the community that had given their time, energy, and support of the project. He noted the challenge now was to keep the house alive and active in the community, and thought they had the people in place to make that happen.

Mr. Trapp wished the United States Constitution a happy birthday as it had turned 229 years old on Saturday. He thanked Bryant College for letting him play Constitution Jeopardy.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 10:51 p.m.