



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, October 21, 2019
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, October 21, 2019, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS, and TREECE were present. Council Members RUFFIN and PITZER were absent. The Interim City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of September 16, 2019 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Ms. Peters.

The minutes of the regular meeting of October 7, 2019 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Trapp.

Mayor Treece asked that B314-19 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

Mr. Skala asked that B302-19 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

Mr. Thomas stated he planned to recuse himself from the discussion on REP91-19 due to an appearance of a conflict of interest.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B302-19 and B314-19 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Trapp.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC12-19 Board and Commission Applicants.

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

CITIZENS POLICE REVIEW BOARD

Hill, Billie Jo, 702 Wilkes Boulevard, Suite 301, Ward 1, Term to expire November 1, 2022

Williams, Cornelia, 1632 Kathy Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire November 1, 2022

COLUMBIA VISION COMMISSION

Gubbels, Chris, 22 Aldeah Avenue, Ward 1, Term to expire December 15, 2020

COMMISSION ON CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Bilal, Kamau, 1913 Arlene Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire October 31, 2022

Rippeto, Ellen, 806 West Boulevard South, Ward 4, Term to expire October 31, 2022

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Kasmann, Ross, 108 Dene Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire November 1, 2022
Ritter, Mitchell, 805 Sandy Court, Ward 2, Term to expire November 1, 2022
Whatley, Paul, 1900 Potomac Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire November 1, 2022

HUMAN SERVICES COMMISSION

Slayton, Valerie, 4110 Compton Road, Ward 4, Term to expire December 31, 2020

Mayor Treece asked that the Marijuana Facility License Review Board appointment be readvertised to allow for more candidates and a full complement of the Council. No one objected to his request.

SUBSTANCE ABUSE ADVISORY COMMISSION

Mondloch, Danielle, 3909 Gallant Fox Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire October 31, 2022
Smith, Gary, 204 Park De Ville Place, Ward 1, Term to expire October 31, 2022

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC66-19 Lori Henderson, Resident of 4th Ward - Support for Councilman Thomas and Affordable Housing Issue.

Ms. Henderson, 704 Glenwood Court, commented that over the 28 years she had lived in the Fourth Ward, the population of Columbia had grown from 70,000 to 123,000, and with that was the demand for residential and commercial development along with City services. Despite growth and prosperity in most areas, one-third of Columbia's residents struggled to find affordable housing, paying more than 30 percent of their gross monthly income for housing costs and utilities. She explained she had voted for Mr. Thomas the past three elections due to his platform, which included planning for growth, the cost of infrastructure, public transportation, and community oriented policing. She noted Mr. Thomas' 2018 reelection policy platform outlined a strategy of inclusionary zoning that had been used in other rapidly growing communities and required new subdivisions or apartment developments to make a small number of units permanently affordable. When asked to support the Oakland Crossing project, Mr. Thomas had taken the opportunity to advocate for affordable housing units, but instead the developers had offered to make a \$40,000 payment to the Columbia Community Land Trust. She pointed Mr. Thomas had included City staff in email communications with the developers, and when the City Counselor had raised a concern about the legality of the proposed contribution to the Land Trust, the agreement was immediately terminated. On November 19, 2018, Mr. Thomas had sent a letter to the Missouri Ethics Commission reporting the incident. She noted everyone made mistakes, and commended Mr. Thomas for the timely and direct way in which he dealt with his error in judgement. She stated she was satisfied that Mr. Thomas had acted with best intentions and not for personal or financial gain. She pointed out he had been straightforward with his constituents providing them updates via his newsletters, and had worked to fulfill the requirements of the elected office despite the media attention and some calls for his resignation. She understood two complaints had been filed in February of 2019 with the Attorney General that had resulted in an investigation and the appointment of a special prosecutor. She commented that she supported Mr. Thomas' decision to plead not guilty to the misdemeanor charge filed against him, and hoped he would prevail in the matter. She acknowledged the service of all City employees and elected officials gathered this evening to the community as she understood it was not an easy job. She provided a handout of her comments.

SPC67-19 Brian Johnstone - Random sampling of Columbia residents oppose use of eminent domain and support the preservation of "The Columbia Wilderness Sanctuary and Natural School."

Mr. Johnstone, 711 Bluff Dale Drive, stated It's Our Wild Nature and Columbia residents had lost through the City's use of eminent domain the opportunity to share and preserve a wilderness area primarily free of concrete and metal structures. He understood the City routinely took control of privately owned property without regard to a property owner's love and vision for that property. He commented that eminent domain destroyed the property owner's expectation of fairness and control over what they owned. He stated the City took value and physical property as it deemed necessary. The necessity in his experience was the picturesque stream beside a concrete trail to be built for bicycle enthusiasts. He suggested everyone be aware that their property might also appeal to the City's aspirations for tax revenues and support of special interests. He commented that It's Our Wild Nature had tried endlessly to minimize the damage to their precious property known as the Columbia Wilderness Sanctuary and Natural School, but the City's effort to preserve this beautiful green area was minimal to non-existent. He explained they had asked the City to implement its own tree preservation ordinance, but that had not been done. He noted they had also asked that the pathway of the trail be altered to save 44 identified native trees they felt qualified for protection per ordinance applications, but the City had indicated they would not change their plans. He understood the City planned to cut down most if not all of the 44 trees. Numerous less mature trees would also be felled. In a further attempt to work with City officials, they had conducted what they felt was a fair and unbiased petitioning campaign. They had not appealed to clubs or special interest groups associated with conservation and other nature-related objectives, and all respondents were Columbia residents whose interest level was unknown to the collection volunteers. He believed this random sampling of Columbia residents was representative of the larger population, and noted this method was in clear contrast to the City's open meetings procedures where persuasive City staff would identify options to be discussed and special interest groups invited to the meetings would dominate the proceedings in a manner that fulfilled the City's agenda. He commented that they felt there were a large number of Columbia residents that did not favor the City's use of eminent domain that allowed the City to destroy native trees, plants, and grasses without consequence to the City. He stated they had collected 1,157 signatures and read the petition language which asked for ballot vote for April 2020 with regard to the Shepard to Rollins trail. He provided the petition to the Council.

SPC68-19 Mary Hussmann - Shepard Rollins Trail.

Ms. Hussmann, 210 Ridgeway Avenue, commented that over the past few weeks she had been one of the volunteers gathering signatures from every City ward opposing the Council's project planned for Bluff Dale Drive, which was a narrow street. She stated all of the volunteers had reported that when Columbia residents were asked to sign the petition that almost every person signed it. She noted she had been engaged in petitioning off and on for over 50 years on a variety of issues, and she had not experienced this high a percentage of signage response. She pointed out the 1,157 signatures had been collected over a three week period, and suspected it was because the project destroyed the forest and the wildlife environment and violated Columbia's deep sense of fairness. The forestland was owned by Columbians that had formed a non-profit group called It's Our Wild Nature. Their members had committed time, energy, and financial resources to preserve 37 acres of unique and undeveloped habitat for thousands of living animals, insects, and plants for anyone to enjoy. She understood the City planned to install a 10-foot wide, 6-inch deep concrete path, and a three-part pre-fabricated steel bridge path for bikers and hikers. Concrete and steel were not natural, and It's Our Wild Nature opposed this invasive plan. She stated the City had not

called for a public meeting or tried to resolve many of the problems and issues of the proposal. Instead, since It's Our Wild Nature would not sell out, the City had taken the owners to court using eminent domain, which had robbed them of any say as to their property. She believed this went against the heart of a democratic society and a community that might not always agree, but one in which anyone could weigh in and have an equal chance to have their objections given strong consideration. She recommended the Council halt this current destructive plan and consider nature-friendly options that had been typical within the City. She asked those in support of her request to stand, approximately 17 people stood. She provided a handout of her comments.

SPC69-19

Pat Fowler on behalf of Transparency Matters - Performance Audit.

Ms. Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, stated Transparency Matters applauded the decision of Council to proceed with a performance audit. By this consensus, they had given the new City Manager, Police Chief, and Finance Director their best chance to succeed as change agents for the City. They had also given the ratepayers, citizens, and voters their best chance to understand how the City operated and why the City was asking for additional funding along with where the City wanted to assign those monies. A month before beginning the FY 2020 budget hearings, Steve Sapp had approached Maria Oropallo of their group asking for suggestions on how to present the budget in an understandable format. It was a project of many months of which they wanted to be a part. She explained they were present tonight to suggest an understandable format for the performance audit. She commented that a performance audit did more than identified where the money was invested and how it moved from ledger account to ledger account and under what conditions a payment was received or given. Instead, it got into the weeds in terms of whether there were sufficient policies, ordinances, or procedures in place. It sought to find those places where it said "x," but it was really used for "y." It also sought to quantify the outputs of action that started as a policy goal of the Council was legislated into ordinance, and then implemented by the processes undertaken by staff. By their perspective, the central organizing tool for understanding the findings of the performance audit was to provide the information tied to the budget specifically by section. She asked the Council to imagine the performance audit, while in process on the transparency portal to enable the residents, ratepayers, and City staff to follow along and answer certain questions as each section was completed, and also provided some examples. She noted it would be understandable language attuned to the ratepayers and citizens, which would then allow them to become the model for others to emulate. She suggested those involved in the process go to others to inform them, ask for opinions different from theirs, and carry those opinions back. As a member of a City commission, she saw staff operating from a place of concern and control, discouraging them from using their abilities and networks to be the eyes and ears for Council. If commission members did not reach out, they would only bring back their own individual experiences and would not harness the power of the community to better inform actions. She provided a copy of her presentation as a handout.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH41-19

Proposed construction of the Grace Ellen Drive PCCE #27 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project.

PH41-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp stated he was happy to see this moving forward as it had been a long time coming. It took time to accumulate the donated easements even as people struggled with the problems of a failing sewer system. He understood many on Grace Ellen Drive would be glad to see it was moving forward.

Mr. Trapp made a motion directing staff to proceed with the PCCE #27 - Grace Ellen Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH42-19 Voluntary annexation of property located on the southwest corner of Clark Lane and St. Charles Road (5406 Clark Lane) (Case No. 227-2019).

PH42-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked for clarification as to the location of the city limits. Mr. Teddy described it utilizing a diagram on the overhead.

Mayor Treece understood the property in green had been annexed by the property owner, but not the rest of it. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct and explained he did not know of the circumstances involved. He thought it involved a different trust, but had the same signatory on the petition.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Robert Hollis, an attorney with offices at 1103 E. Broadway, stated he was available to answer questions. He noted they would have a presentation and full complement of applicant representatives available at the next meeting.

Bob Gerau explained he was the owner of Bob's Fireworks and had been in the fireworks business for 54 years. He noted he a fireworks stand had been relocated on the Armstrong property for over 40 years and wished to continue that operation with the new owner. He understood there had been a fireworks stand on 763 just north of McDonalds that had been annexed and the company had been under contract with the owner for seven years. As a result, the City had annexed it in with the agreement that the fireworks stand could continue for seven years even though it was within the City limits, and they had been required to pay City taxes. Something similar had also occurred with a fireworks stand south of this location across I-70 near Lake of the Woods Road. He wanted this to be continued where he had locations now, but understood there was a problem since a prior Council had passed an ordinance making it illegal to possess fireworks within the City. If he was allowed to continue to have a fireworks stand on the property and it was annexed into the City, the issue would need to be resolved. He understood it could not be decided tonight, but wanted to bring it to the attention of Council. He reiterated there had been two prior instances by which a company had been allowed to sell fireworks for seven years after annexation and wished for that to continue at this location.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Gerau if he had a lease now with the current property owner. Mr. Gerau replied no, and explained the prior lease had been a year by year agreement.

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

PH43-19 Proposed construction of a right turn lane and sidewalk on the southeast corner of the intersection of Providence Road and Broadway, as part of the Flat Branch Park Expansion Master Plan.

Discussion shown with B316-19.

B316-19 Authorizing construction of a right turn lane and sidewalk on the southeast corner of the intersection of Providence Road and Broadway, as part of the Flat Branch Park Expansion Master Plan; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

PH43-19 was read by the Clerk, and B316-19 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked for the reason for this improvement. She noted she turned right there frequently and felt it worked fine. Mr. Nichols replied it would provide a longer queue to

allow right turns to be out of the through movement and improve traffic flow along Providence Road. It would also allow for better visibility of the crosswalk for those turning right. He reiterated it would help traffic flow considerable, through this intersection. Ms. Peters asked if there had been trouble with traffic flows there. Mr. Nichols replied yes. He explained those turning right created a queue on the through lane at times on Providence Road. Mr. Glascock understood it was primarily during peak hour traffic times. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. Ms. Peters commented that she must not travel through there during the peak hour as she had not experienced a problem.

Mayor Treece asked staff if they would say this was also forward-looking in that they did not want to make big improvements to the City-owned property there only to extend the lane in the future. Mr. Nichols replied yes. He commented that this allowed them to get ahead of that.

Mr. Trapp thought it was an F-rated road. Mr. Nichols stated he believed that was correct. Ms. Peters asked what that meant. Mr. Nichols replied it was related to the level of service. Ms. Peters understood F was bad. Mr. Trapp thought it was as low as the grading went.

Mayor Treece understood they were only approving the lane, and the other notes had only been included for context. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala asked if this fit in with some of the projected plans of that corner. Mr. Nichols replied yes. He noted they had been working with the Parks and Recreation Department staff in developing these plans.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

James McNutt explained he was the President and an owner of Midwest Petroleum and noted they had been unaware of the park expansion until they had received notice regarding the right turn lane. He stated they were supportive of the park, but had concerns with regard to the three properties they had recently purchased. One included 9Rounds Fitness which was a leased space, another had parking, and the third was their C-store. He noted they had been operating that store for the last 20 years or so via a long-term lease and had purchased the property about 1.5 years ago. The reason for purchasing the property was so they could rebuild as it was a small and inefficient C-store, and the only place to do that was via that second lot. He explained the proposed plan would render the 9Rounds Fitness lot unusable because its only entrance was from Cherry Street.

Ms. Peters stated she thought people accessed 9Rounds from Providence Road. Mr. McNutt commented that 9Rounds ended where the building ended and where the turn from old Cherry Street had been. He understood the City owned it, but pointed out they had to have access to their other two properties, which would be cut off by this proposal. There was no entrance to either property, and one would have to go to the third property to get back into the other two properties.

Mayor Treece understood what Mr. McNutt was calling the entrance to 9Rounds was actually the curb cut for what would have been Cherry Street had it connected across the creek to downtown Cherry Street. Mr. McNutt stated that was correct. Mayor Treece asked Mr. McNutt if he had a proposed alternative if that went away. Mr. McNutt replied yes. He explained they would eventually bring forth a proposal for a new building and C-store, and would like a placeholder or an agreement so they could add a cut-in elsewhere. He thought they could do a 30-foot curb cut or whatever was the standard to the left of the 9Rounds building. It would allow the C-store to be placed in front of it while still having access to 9Rounds. They would otherwise have a condemned property if there was not any access. Mayor Treece understood there was 60-foot wide curb cut where Cherry Street would be and Mr. McNutt was suggesting a 30-foot wide cut further down. Mr. McNutt replied he was agreeable to whatever the standard was as he was not sure if it was 30 feet, 45 feet, or something different as every municipality was different.

Mayor Treece understood this was a MoDOT road and asked if they would be amenable to this request. Mr. Glascock understood Mr. Nichols had talked to the area engineer

who had indicated they were amenable. Mr. McNutt pointed out this was not being request now. It would be requested when they brought forward their proposal for a new building, which they did not have a time frame on at this time. Mayor Treece thought it should be done while this was all torn up and asked Mr. McNutt if he was okay with that. Mr. McNutt replied yes. He explained he had been unaware of this until October 15 so it would take some time to design something. He understood this project would not begin until next spring and thought something could be worked out by then.

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

Mr. Trapp stated he thought the sidewalk would be much appreciated. He noted he had ridden his bike through there today, and it was tough to be on the road there.

B316-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: RUFFIN, PITZER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mayor Treece assumed staff would incorporate the change needed for the Midwest Petroleum properties. Ms. Peters asked if an amendment was needed. Mr. Nichols stated staff would work with Mr. McNutt. Mayor Treece thanked staff.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B302-19

Authorizing construction of a sidewalk along the east side of Sinclair Road, between Nifong Boulevard and Southampton Drive; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked what was typical in terms of undeveloped property. He wondered why the City and School District were doing this. Mr. Nichols replied he thought there had been some concerns with regard to the platting of the property and connectivity, and understood the need for a sidewalk had been mentioned. As a result, Columbia Public Schools (CPS) had come up with the money for the sidewalk. The City would build it and CPS would reimburse the City.

Mayor Treece asked why this was being done now and why the City was constructing it. He wondered if it had to do with the widening of Sinclair Road or the addition of the ditches. Mr. Nichols replied the City was used to building sidewalks so CPS had decided to just reimburse the City for the cost of the sidewalk.

Mr. Skala understood this had come to the forefront because of a new school and there had been negotiations between the City and CPS in terms of the School District paying for this in exchange for an agreement with the City to buy some parkland. He commented that Battle High School predated this school property and sidewalks were needed along St. Charles Road to Battle High School. Although there were some sidewalks on the south side, there were not any on the north side. This project appeared to have been driven by the development of new school and tended to ignore other issues, such as safety on St. Charles Road. He understood Mr. Glascock was working with the School District in terms of St. Charles Road, but wanted to bring up the issue due to the limited amount of sidewalk funding. Mr. Glascock replied he, the Superintendent of CPS, and a County Commissioner had participated in discussions about that sidewalk and had agreed in concept to bring it forward to try to get something built between Battle High School to the sidewalk on the south side. He hoped an agreement would come forward.

Ms. Peters asked if the expectation was for that to be built next summer. Mr. Glascock replied he was not sure it would be done by next summer, but that was what they were hoping to do. He noted three entities needed to come to an agreement first.

Mayor Treece asked about the City's policy. He wondered when they compelled the property owner to construct the sidewalk versus doing it for them. Mayor Treece

commented that he was thinking back to the uncomfortable scenario involving Victory Church. Mr. Nichols noted the Victory Church plan had required that sidewalk. Mayor Treece understood there had not been a development on this site yet so there was not an expectation for them to construct a sidewalk. Mr. Nichols stated there was not any mechanism other than a tax bill for the construction of a sidewalk there.

Mr. Skala understood some of the areas on St. Charles Road had predated the rules they had about sidewalks, which was the reason for some of the gaps. He noted the current sidewalk was across from the golf course. Mr. Glascock agreed and noted they would look at installing a crosswalk there to connect the two sides for a continuous sidewalk.

Ms. Peters understood CPS would contribute up to \$300,000 toward construction of the project contingent upon the City's purchase of land as authorized by a contract that had been passed in July of last year and asked for clarification. Mr. Griggs replied the City had applied for a land and water conservation fund grant that would have provided 50 percent of the funding, but they did not receive that grant. As a result, they were negotiating with the School District for a smaller portion of land. Instead of purchasing 10-15 acres as had been initially desired, they would likely look at about 5 acres. He explained that any time the School District built an elementary or middle school, they tried to partner with them for a neighborhood park. He noted it had worked well and was a benefit to the taxpayers. Ms. Peters asked if that would change the amount of money CPS would be able to put toward the sidewalk. Mr. Griggs replied he thought they would likely parcel out enough acreage to provide enough funding to cover the cost of the sidewalk.

Ms. Peters asked if the City could recoup some money if there was development of the land where the sidewalk was being constructed via a development agreement. Mr. Nichols replied he thought this had come up due to the issues near Battle High School. He understood there had been reluctance to move forward with the plat until pedestrian access was addressed, and believed it was a win to get this done prior to the school being opened. Mr. Glascock understood the sidewalk was not in the right spot and would be torn out if developed. Mr. Nichols commented that if the road was widened or if the property developed, the sidewalk would not stay in that location. He believed this would provide service for many years, but it would ultimately be taken out. Mayor Treece stated that was his recollection of the situation.

Mr. Skala stated he intended to support this, but believed it was a win-win situation for the southwest side of the community and a win-lose situation for the northeast side of the community. He understood negotiations were ongoing and hoped to see a sidewalk on St. Charles Road too.

B302-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: RUFFIN, PITZER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B314-19 Authorizing a school resource officer agreement with the Columbia Public School District.

Chief Jones provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece referred to item 3.4 of the agreement, which indicated CPS was responsible for all off-duty costs associated with DHS coverage and school events, such as football games and graduations, and assumed DHS meant Douglass High School. He asked if those costs were exempt from the 55 percent cost share. Chief Jones replied yes, and explained those costs were paid 100 percent by the school as an off-duty or extra duty assignment. Mayor Treece asked about the other football games, graduations, and school events. He wondered if those costs were subject to the 55 percent as well. Chief Jones replied anything outside of regular school activities, i.e. football games, would be paid as an off-duty or extra duty assignment to police officers and it would not necessarily involve a school resource officer (SRO). Mayor Treece understood this applied to the other schools even though they had not been specifically

exempted, such as Rock Bridge High School, Battle High School, and Hickman High School. If one of those schools had a police officer at a Friday night football game, the officer was off-duty. Chief Jones stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece commented that he had spoken with people in Jefferson City about their SRO agreement with Jefferson City Public Schools and they had eight school resource officers for a town of about 35,000 people. It was a 50-50 cost share except that all of the off-duty was paid by the Jefferson City School District. He struggled with whether Columbia's SROs were spread too thin or if the one's they had were too complacent in the schools to which they were assigned. He thought they ultimately wanted more SROs, but was not sure how they could get there yet.

Mayor Treece referred to item 2.9 of the agreement, which indicated CPS would provide the City with an annual report, and noted that was new language he had asked be included. He commented that ideally it would mirror what the School District reported to the federal government, but that data was 2-3 years old. He stated he wanted to see it in real time so they could evaluate whether they were reducing School District referrals. He also wondered what the numbers would look like if they did not have SROs and the schools called 911 every time there was an incident versus the effect and impact the SROs were making in the schools. Chief Jones explained they had left item 2.9.3 open so they could define issues as it related to the City.

Mr. Skala understood Chief Jones had been involved in the negotiations with the School District and asked if the City Manager had been involved as well. Mr. Glascock replied Chief Jones had negotiated the contract. Mr. Skala understood the 55 percent was an incremental step in terms of the School District being responsible for some of the cost burden, and asked if there had been discussion as to where it might go. He noted the Council had not defined any particular goal and wondered if a final cost share had been discussed. Chief Jones replied it had not been discussed. He commented that there were many issues at play. One was that the City had just implemented a new pay package so the pay for those four officers had increased. As a result, CPS was absorbing an increased cost there as well. In addition, they had agreed to fund up to 10 interns from CPS, which he thought was in line with community policing. Thus, other hard and in-kind costs that had been taken into account, such as use of facilities for the explorer program. It was not a matter of trying to reach a goal. He explained he wanted to see how this benefited the City before focusing too much on the money. Mr. Skala understood and thought this was fair. He had only wondered if there had been discussions as to what this had been incremental to and understood that was open-ended at this time.

Susan Renee Carter, 2105 Hillsboro Drive, commented that the research showed increasing the number of SROs in schools was a bad idea. During 2013-2014, 40 percent of all schools had an assigned police officer and 69 percent were engaged in school discipline enforcement rather than security and law enforcement. The students at the schools that had SROs were five times more likely to be arrested than those without. She thought they needed to discuss as a community whether that was the answer to the issues within schools along with the issues of safety. She stated she had learned more children were actually arrested and ended up in the school to prison pipeline with SROs when she had attended the National Disability Rights Network Annual Conference this year. As they formulated ways to help the community and reach more vulnerable students, SROs did not appear to be the answer. She noted black students and student with disabilities were major victims of the zero tolerance policies in place. The use of SROs grew out of the feeling that schools would be inundated by super-predators and that police officers were needed in order to control that situation. This combined with the fact Columbine had occurred created a fear of what was happening in the schools. In addition, the push for improved test scores had increased the number of arrests and suspensions. She believed it was better to address these issues through more active restorative justice practices, increasing the number of counselors within schools, and

better coordination between police, schools, and juvenile officers. She felt they needed to try to improve outcomes for students in ways that did not involve suspensions and arrests. She asked the Council to not look toward increasing police officers but to instead find better ways to address the issues facing students.

Mr. Thomas asked if anyone had drilled down into the statistics in terms of what those numbers looked like in communities that had a solid community oriented policing philosophy versus those that did not. Ms. Carter replied she could provide those numbers for him. Mr. Thomas stated he would really like to see them. Ms. Carter commented that police in schools only increased the number of arrests from everything she had read regardless of whether the community had a community oriented policing philosophy or not.

Mr. Thomas explained that when he had participated in a community visit to Gainesville, Florida, which practiced community oriented policing, some of the officers had presented a few of the programs they were doing within the schools and immediately after school and it really seemed to create a positive interaction, particularly between high school aged children and police officers. Ms. Carter said she would find the information and send it to Mr. Thomas.

Traci Wilson-Kleekamp stated she was with Race Matters, Friends, and thanked Chief Jones for working with the School District in revising the MOU. She commented that one of the reasons Race Matters, Friends had gotten into an entanglement with the School District was because they wanted them to apply equity and restorative practices to how they managed students, and they had not received any proof that it was an institutional practice. She noted Race Matters, Friends had asked the School District for data that showed the trainings, etc. that were being conducted were effective because they had a problem with suspensions and arrests of black children. At Smithton Middle School, it was almost a five to one ratio. She reiterated they had not been able to get good answers regarding the effectiveness of what CPS was doing. She noted the data showed that not having officers at schools was a good thing, and recommended the book entitled *The Condemnation of Blackness* by Khalil Gibran Muhammad as it discussed data and the fact black children were more at risk when there were officers at school. She commented that her main concern was that they practice restorative justice and equity in a real way. In terms of the MOU, she believed item 1.1, which indicated a goal was to foster educational programs and activities that would increase students' knowledge of and respect for the law and the function of law enforcement agencies, should be removed and replaced with item 1.6, which was a goal to build relationships with students, families, and staff that enhanced communication and the partnership between CPS, the Columbia Police Department, and the community. She explained the reason was because restorative justice was an integrated, interdisciplinary practice of everyone working together. It was not about one entity being the authority. If item 1.1 remained, they were not actually practicing restorative justice. She asked the City to hold the School District accountable and pointed out that it appeared as though CPD was doing a lot more than CPS in this MOU. She stated they were concerned because the School District did not have an audit trail to be able to track what they were doing with their suspensions and data. If they really believed in practicing restorative justice and equity, she felt it should be the primary focus and should be memorialized in their documentation and policy.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp if she had seen the language in the MOU regarding the SROs participating in the restorative justice practices on the back end. He commented that he believed one of the things that frustrated SROs now was that they were only engaged on the front end when that student was referred to suspension, detention, etc., but not when they reentered the classroom. Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp explained they were concerned that there was not good documentation even before they were called. She noted she had attended a discipline hearing and there was not even an audit trail for it. She asked if Dr. Stiepleman had ever responded to the Council. Mayor Treece replied no. He stated a letter had been sent in July asking for dialogue on the

issue. Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp commented that she thought it would be great if they would show up in dialogue with regard to this conversation because it was their job. In addition, she did not like the idea of spending money with them when there were three lawsuits against them for what appeared to be incompetence on their end. She pointed out that was all related to whether they practiced what they preached, which they did not have evidence regarding. She reiterated she thought they needed to show the Council and public their curriculum, how the equity teams worked if they had them, etc.

Mayor Treece referred to item 2.9.3, which involved a request for data, and offered Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp to share with him or Chief Jones any good indicators between now and when the contract expired so they could at least establish a baseline. Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp commented that the United States Civil Rights Data Collection had what she thought was the best website with data except that it was behind. She noted ProPublica had a website that also looked at data and comparisons. She thought those were actually better websites than what the School District offered. She explained that if the School District did not provide baseline data, they would not have anything to compare. They wanted to know what defined an offense to be arrested, suspended, etc., what practices were happening before the police were called, whether they were communicating, whether they were filing incident reports, etc. She stated she was worried the police were deferring to the School District employees and not obtaining answers to all of their questions. Mayor Treece asked Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp if she had seen the Southern Poverty Law Center study where they had requested data from 19 school districts in Louisiana and the data did not match what they had submitted to the federal government even for the same fiscal year. Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp replied the data was a problem, and noted they had been working with Tracy Greever-Rice in looking at some School District data, and it was concerning as the charts and data were wrong. She understood their thinking was that they were making it easy to read, but it was misleading and pathologized black students when they only said the data was black and all. Other ethnicities attended CPS, but it only said black and all. She felt they needed to disaggregate their data to be more specific about what they were watching and that they should not make it appear as though black students were the only problem they had.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp if she thought there was more good than bad in the MOU. Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp replied she did not know. She stated she liked the fact Chief Jones had taken interest in restorative justice practice. She pointed out that tomorrow at the University of Missouri at 11:00 a.m., Dr. Francis Huang would talk about the school to prison pipeline, racial disparities in suspension, etc. It would be online so those that could not attend could still watch. She thought it was important to understand when policing was effective and when it was not effective when it came to kids and how they could do a better job with students in terms of counselors and resources other than policing. She stated her preference would be to not arrest kids at all.

Peggy Placier, 209 S. Greenwood Avenue, commented that she had attended the last School Board meeting where they had voted to approve the MOU, but prior to the vote, there had been extensive parent comment and the vote had been taken under the impression that it had to be taken because the current contract with the City would run out on November 1. She explained the parent comments had been very serious, and several parents had commented on a clause in the MOU regarding the questioning of students without their students being present if the SRO deemed it necessary. She stated the questioning of minors without parents and/or attorneys present was a huge red flag. She referred to the documentary *When They See Us* which discussed what could happen with the questioning of minors without parents being present. She understood that parents had little faith it could be done fairly and without violations, and had told their children to not say anything if being questioned by an officer without them there. She reiterated she believed that was a legal red flag that needed to be clarified and parent trust needed to be built around that point.

Mayor Treece referred to items 10.1.2 and 10.1.3 and asked if that was new language in the contract. He did not recall it being in the prior agreement and asked if it had been added this year. Chief Jones replied yes. Mayor Treece understood it enhanced protection. Chief Jones explained it said that if the person was a juvenile, a parent needed to be present, and if the person was not a juvenile, a parent did not need to be present. He commented that notifying the parent when taking a student into custody was at the discretion of the SRO, and it had been included to protect the student. He noted they sometimes ran into circumstances where the parent was involved in the activity with the student or using the student to carry out the activity, and if the SRO was required to contact the parent, it could place the juvenile in jeopardy. He reiterated that was a protection for the student.

Ms. Peters asked if there was any way they could obtain reports more often than only at the end of the year in terms of what was happening with the SROs. She suggested every 2 or 3 months to get a better idea to determine how this was working. Chief Jones replied he thought there would be a way to get that information more often. He stated CPD would have control over police detentions at school. He thought they might be able to get the referrals to juvenile authorities more often, but was not sure how often it was compiled. He noted he could ask. Ms. Peters thanked Chief Jones as she felt it would be useful to have the information more often than once a year.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought this MOU was an improvement over prior MOUs. He appreciated Chief Jones' negotiations and noted he was excited to see them involved in more restorative justice practices and attending those trainings. He looked forward to continued cooperation with CPS.

Mr. Skala commented that he agreed with the notion that this was an improvement over the last MOU. He stated he was somewhat dismayed about the ability of CPS to deliver data and the proper kind of information, and understood those would be ongoing discussions that would need to occur. He reiterated he believed this was a step in the right direction and would support it.

Mayor Treece stated he was prepared to extend SRO services until June 30, 2020 in hopes they would have more ongoing conversation about it.

B314-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: RUFFIN, PITZER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B296-19 Approving a major revision to the "Columbia Mall" PD Development Plan located on the southwest corner of Stadium Boulevard and Bernadette Drive; approving a statement of intent; setting forth conditions for approval; granting a design adjustment to allow a lot line to bisect an existing parking lot (Case No. 176-2019).
- B297-19 Approving the Final Plat of "Columbia Mall - Plat 3" located on the southwest corner of Stadium Boulevard and Bernadette Drive (Case No. 174-2019).
- B298-19 Approving a major amendment to the "Sidra Subdivision" PD Plan located on the east side of Rashid Court and west of Stadium Boulevard; approving a revised statement of intent (Case No. 199-2019).
- B299-19 Approving the Final Plat of "Woodsong" located on the north side of St. Charles Road and east of Tower Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 106-2019).

- B300-19 Accepting a donation from Central Bank of Boone County for the 2019 Contractor Recruitment and Open House event; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B301-19 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the City of Jefferson, Missouri relating to emergency assistance in reviewing building and site development plans.
- B303-19 Authorizing a right of use license permit with North Village Gateway, LLC and Rice Investments, LLC for the installation and maintenance of a concrete retaining wall with footing and an ADA ramp with handrail within a portion of the right-of-way on the east side of Tenth Street, south of Walnut Street.
- B304-19 Authorizing a professional services agreement with Telvent USA, LLC for extended support and maintenance services for the ArcFM solution components software relating to an electric and water outage management system; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B305-19 Accepting conveyances for drainage, sewer, and temporary construction purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B306-19 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating grant funds received from the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for certain projects at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B307-19 Authorizing a sponsorship agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri, on behalf of University of Missouri Health Care, for the use of its logo and signage in Court 3 within the Columbia Sports Fieldhouse located in A. Perry Philips Park.
- B308-19 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for WIC local agency nutrition services.
- B309-19 Authorizing a tuberculosis diagnostic services participation agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services.
- B310-19 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with Columbia School District No. 93 for the distribution of emergency vaccines and medications.
- B311-19 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with Columbia School District No. 93 for the use of alternate facilities for the provision of mass medical treatments.
- B312-19 Accepting an ELSA Live Scan Station from the Missouri Police Chiefs Charitable Foundation; authorizing execution of the Missouri Law Enforcement LiveScan Project Award Letter.
- B313-19 Authorizing an intergovernmental agreement with the County of Boone, Missouri relating to the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program FY 2019 Local Solicitation.
- B315-19 Amending the FY 2020 Classification and Pay Plan to correct a clerical error.
- R149-19 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of a new terminal building at the Columbia Regional Airport; providing for construction of the

- proposed improvement using a design/build contract.
- R150-19 Granting a temporary waiver from the requirements of Section 16-185 of the City Code to allow possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages for the area along a portion of Park Avenue between Tenth Street and St. James Street, and a portion of Orr Street between Park Avenue and Ash Street, for the 2019 Joe Machens Family Picnic event.
- R151-19 Authorizing agreements with American Junior Golf Association, Inc. and National Middle School Basketball Association, LLC for sports development funding under the Tourism Development Program.
- R152-19 Authorizing staff to proceed with the preliminary design and expenditure of funds associated with the proposed construction of the Stanford Drive Private Common Collector Elimination Project (PCCE #21); directing that a public hearing be held upon completion of the preliminary plans.
- R153-19 Authorizing an amendment to the community housing development organization (CHDO) agreement with Columbia Missouri Community Housing Development Organization, d/b/a Job Point, to provide additional funding to facilitate the construction of two (2) owner-occupied affordable and energy efficient housing units located at 7 Third Avenue and 9 Third Avenue.
- R154-19 Authorizing a lease and agreement for ground site with CenturyLink Communications LLC for the construction of housing for telecommunication equipment and a driveway for access to the structure at the Columbia Regional Airport.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: RUFFIN, TRAPP (Mr. Trapp stepped out during this vote), PITZER. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

None.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B317-19 Voluntary annexation of property located on the southwest corner of Clark Lane and St. Charles Road (5406 Clark Lane); establishing permanent District M-C (Mixed-use Corridor) and District M-N (Mixed-use Neighborhood) zoning (Case No. 195-2019).
- B318-19 Rezoning property located on the south side of Clark Lane and approximately 1,200 feet west of St. Charles Road (5320 Clark Lane) from District A (Agricultural) to District M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood) (Case #194-2019).
- B319-19 Rezoning property located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Green Meadows Road and Gray Oak Drive from District PD (Planned

- Development) to District MC (Mixed-use Corridor) (Case #200-2019).
- B320-19 Approving the Final Plat of "Cullimore Cottages" located on the west side of Eighth Street and north of Fairview Avenue (Case #165-2019).
- B321-19 Vacating a portion of a sanitary sewer easement within Lot 1 of Rockbridge Subdivision Block V located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Nifong Boulevard and Providence Road (203-205 E. Nifong Boulevard) (Case No. 172-2019).
- B322-19 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to the annual permit rate for unmetered off-street parking facilities.
- B323-19 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds received from Jeffrey E. Smith Investment Co. L.C. per the terms of a developer agreement for the Nifong Boulevard corridor improvement project.
- B324-19 Authorizing construction of the Shannon Place PCCE #22 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division or authorizing a contract for the work using a term and supply contractor.
- B325-19 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B326-19 Accepting conveyances for temporary construction and sewer purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B327-19 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for maternal child health services.
- B328-19 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code to establish the Columbia Sports Commission.
- B329-19 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code relating to the impoundment and immobilization of vehicles issued a warrant for failure to appear for unpaid parking citations.

X. REPORTS

- REP90-19 Appointment of members to the Columbia Arts Fund Advisory Committee.

Ms. Dresser provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked why this was being done here versus under the appointments to boards and commissions. Ms. Dresser replied this was the Advisory Committee, which was recently reestablished per the establishing documents of the endowment fund with the Community Foundation. As a result it was separate from the appointments made by Council during the appointments of regular board and commission members. Mayor Treece asked about its organizational status. He wondered if it was a 501(c)(3). Ms. Dresser replied the fund associated with the Community Foundation was a 501(c)(3). Mayor Treece asked if they were a legal entity. Ms. Thompson replied it was not a separate legal entity. It was an advisory board to the Community Foundation, which ultimately had decision-making capabilities. The Community Foundation however deferred to this Advisory Committee with regard to expenditures out of the Arts Fund.

Mayor Treece made a motion to appoint the members suggested, i.e., James Melton, Natalie Thomas, and Lili Vianello. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas stepped out of the meeting room.

REP91-19 Columbia Community Land Trust Board Appointment, Bylaws, Authorizing Ordinance and Council Liaison Position.

Mr. Cole provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece commented that he was sensitive to the thought of the Land Trust Board that a homeowner might have more at stake than an occupant, however, to the extent the Land Trust was a creature of the City Council, he did not believe they needed to bend their ordinance to meet the bylaws of the not-for-profit. He stated if he had his way, the City would be out of the Land Trust business completely, but he was not sure, the Land Trust had the level of maturity to survive on its own at this point. He was not sure what to do.

Mr. Skala understood half of these types of organizations used one term and the other half used another term. Mr. Cole explained there had been a request by the Board to look at how others across the country handled this, and it was essentially split. Some required them to be legal owners of record, but others allowed it to be an occupant. He noted there were successful examples of community land trusts either way. As a result, it was more of matter of personal preference.

Mr. Skala commented that he tended to align with the comments of Mayor Treece and would be reluctant to defer the decision since this Board was a creature of the Council.

Mr. Trapp stated he would be more comfortable with going with the majority of the Land Trust Board if three owners had applied. Having only one owner put them at risk of not being able to have a quorum and created an uncomfortable situation. He pointed out the resident that had applied looked tremendously qualified and had written them a compelling email. He noted he would prefer the Council stand their ground with regard to the resident requirement and encourage the Board to align its bylaws with the City's ordinance. When they were at the point of full occupancy, they could review that requirement. As the one's that appointed the Board, they could also decide to give preference to homeowners. They had two open slots, and holding them open for hypothetical future homeowners that might want to serve while they had a qualified resident that met the requirement of the ordinance struck him as an injustice.

Mayor Treece commented that the prevailing document for the operation and governance of the Land Trust was its bylaws, and the Council could not appoint an occupant when their bylaws said homeowner. He felt the Council should be the one determining who was on the Board since the City was funding it.

Mr. Skala asked Ms. Thompson for an opinion as to the hierarchy of the two documents. Ms. Thompson replied the challenge was that by ordinance, the Council could appoint someone that was an occupant, but per the bylaws, that person could not serve if appointed. As a result, if the Board wanted to take advantage of the support of the City, they should comply with the ordinance. She stated she believed the Council could require the Board to comply with City ordinances.

Mr. Skala suggested they refer the issue back to the Land Trust Board based on the circumstances. Ms. Thompson noted the ordinance allowed the Council to appoint an occupant, and the bylaws of the Board should conform to City ordinances. She pointed out they could speak to things that the Council had not designated by City ordinance, but they needed to conform to the City ordinances. The other option was to change the City ordinance if that was the desire of Council. Mr. Skala felt this was similar to the relationship of the City and the State of Missouri in terms of the City not being able to conflict with the prevailing State Law.

Mayor Treece suggested this be referred back to the Land Trust. Mr. Skala agreed.

Mayor Treece stated Mr. Trapp had asked to step back from the Council liaison position associated with this Board, and asked if it was the desire of Council to have a Council liaison position for this Board. Mr. Trapp replied he thought it would be beneficial. He commented that he thought it might have been helpful in this situation with this discrepancy. It was a once a month meeting so it was not a huge commitment. He

explained that in addition to providing funding, the City provided the staffing, and it was the primary generator of new affordable housing, which was a Council priority. He stated he would happily take on another responsibility if someone wanted to trade. If they did not have anyone willing to do it, they might want to consider not having it because it was likely better not to do it if they did not have the ability to do it well.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought it was always a good idea to have a Council liaison, but it was additional work. It was also a way to determine or clarify the message that came back to the Council. They received citizen input, which tended to be different than the staff input. He felt it was often useful to have a Council liaison to sort through everything and provide the entire message to the Council.

Mayor Treece asked when the annual meeting of the Land Trust Board would be held. Mr. Cole replied the second Tuesday of December. Mayor Treece understood they had time to decide on the Council liaison issue.

Mayor Treece asked if there was any objection to refer the occupant versus owner issue back to the Land Trust Board for further discussion. No one objected. Mayor Treece noted that was the direction of Council then.

REP92-19 Youth Advisory Council letter in support of recent City Council action on conversion therapy.

Mayor Treece understood this had been provided for informational purposes and noted it was nice to have their perspective.

REP93-19 Amendment to the FY 2019 Annual Budget - Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds.

Mayor Treece explained this had been provided for informational purposes.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Mr. Thomas returned to the meeting room.

Dee Dokken, 804 Again Street, explained there were 661 acres of land along the Gillespie Bridge Road and Coats Lane corridor poised for development with the falling of the first domino, if there was a final approval of the 34-home Overton subdivision. She understood the decision would be made when the Boone County Commission voted on the final development item of the Overton plat on October 29, 2020. She commented that citizens were requesting the Boone County Commission table final approval and suspend all further approvals of development in the Gillespie Bridge Road/Coats Lane corridor pending the creation of a joint City-County west area plan. The creation of a west area plan was the solution as it would allow the time and citizen input required to make sound decisions on how development across the Perche Creek floodplain should progress. It would allow the City and County to plan together for their common future as they should. She stated they were urging the Council to support the County Commission as they made this difficult decision by expressing agreement tonight that the most sensible course of action was to put a hold on development in the area until the west area plan was finalized.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that there were always lots of cars by the third property going east on the south side of Holly Avenue near the corner of Parker Street and Holly Avenue. He felt there were 30-50 cars and there were not any business signs. He wondered if someone would check to determine if that type of activity could be located in a residential section of the City.

Mr. Elkin noted his recycling had not been picked up this past Thursday, and today had called 874-7380, which was the billing number. He was told he could not be transferred to 874-2489, which was the number for trash services. He asked if the phone system could be updated to accommodate a transfer of that nature and for the ability to leave a

voicemail if he did not want to hold for a representative to get to him.

Mr. Elkin noted a lady who was a senior citizen and on dialysis lived across from him, and she was a heavy user of cardboard. He understood the City did not make enough on recycling based on a news report he had recently seen, and wondered if someone could invent something curbside for gathering cardboard so it was not so difficult to gather and tape together in order to set on the curb for pickup. He suggested a plastic container in which the person could place cardboard. He did not feel the person recycling the cardboard cared for all of the tape.

Mr. Thomas asked for update on the status of conversations with Boone County with regard to the west area planning process. Mr. Teddy replied he thought there might have been some misunderstanding in that some felt the Council might do a more official initiation of the City's involvement in the plan. He noted he had sent a letter to the Boone County Director of Resource Management indicating the City was on board with doing the project and that their view of it was that it would be a planning effort coordinated between both planning and zoning commissions. He thought it would take about 18 months and would work in a similar fashion as the East Area Plan and the Northeast Area Plan. He commented that he did not have a schedule to present at this time, but felt the next step based on the initial conversation would be a presentation with the steps of the process. He stated he had not received any questions back on the letter so he assumed it was good. He explained they had not moved much on it, but were quietly collecting data as that was the first step.

Mr. Thomas stated he would have supported a more formal official letter of invitation if anyone had suggested it. He had not realized that was the normal form. He commented that he planned to personally communicate with the Boone County Commission before their meeting on October 29 to express his opinion that it would be better if they could place the moratorium mentioned while the planning process took place. He noted they had been discussing this planning process for at least three years. He understood it might have been possible to have started it earlier had City staff not been working on the Unified Development Code (UDC) and other things. He believed the development that was up for approval on October 29 would set the tone for how things developed on the west side of the Perche Creek, and they had the opportunity to have a really open and transparent engagement process before that occurred. It would include landowners and developers with interests in that area along with citizens of that area and citizens of the City of Columbia. He asked the Council if they would support a joint letter of some form.

Mr. Skala stated he was glad to hear the proposed west area plan was moving along the lines of the East Area Plan and the Northeast Area Plan, and noted he concurred with Mr. Thomas as he had been in the minority in terms of the City's role in the connection of that particular piece of property. He commented that he thought they had set the tone for the direction they were headed when they had voted against the Henderson Branch sewer extension. He reiterated he would personally advocate for that position.

Mayor Treece commented that he had voted in the minority on that issue as well and noted he regretted not making a more forceful presentation. He recalled the applicant indicating he could build his own sewer treatment plant and do what he was proposing to do, and although that was true, he would have had to invest \$450,000 up front in order to get a building permit and occupancy permit for each lot proposed. If the developer connected to the City sewer, it was extended at the developer's cost, which he understood was significantly less, and the developer could bill each homeowner for those connection fees. The connection had accelerated the development and created this situation. He noted he would be willing to sign a letter as well. He pointed out he was not trying to revisit or reconsider that issue, but felt they needed thoughtful engagement with the County due to that vote.

Mr. Trapp stated he was of two minds on this. It was not his preferred development style for that area, which was a reason he had been pushing for a west area planning process.

He was also chastened by the Missouriian articles indicating the average price of a home sold in Boone County had gone up \$45,000 from 2015 to 2018, and understood these houses would be below the average price. In addition, permits were down and they were increasingly moving toward an affordable housing crisis. Their only tool for the owner-occupied piece was the Land Trust, which did not create a lot of units. He noted there were a lot of forces at work against both housing affordability and affordable housing.

Ms. Peters explained she had voted to allow the sewer connection as she would rather have the development hooked up to the Regional Sewer District rather than a separate sewer. She noted they had a Regional Sewer District and did not feel they should hold developers hostage to it all of the time. She believed developments should be connected to the sewer versus a lagoon or other sewer system. She pointed out she was also fine with the development proposed there. She understood it might be the beginning of dominoes falling, but felt it would take a long time for that to happen. She noted she also believed more affordable houses were needed. In addition, at the same time, she did not have an objection to developing a west area plan and felt they should move it along.

Mr. Skala understood they were not all in favor of the joint letter and thought it might be worthwhile to forward a letter signed by whoever wanted. Mr. Thomas asked who would draft the letter. Mayor Treece suggested they each individually convey their opinion since there was not a consensus. Everyone was in agreement to that suggestion.

Mr. Trapp asked for staff to follow up with the request of Mr. Elkin with regard to the third house from Parker Street on Holly Avenue on the south.

Mr. Skala noted he had been contacted by constituents in the Benton Stephens neighborhood and asked how long one could keep a vehicle in front of a property and whether or not it could idle. He understood a 20-wheeler driver preferred to stay in his cab overnight with the engine idling. He wondered if anything could be done for that situation.

Mr. Teddy asked if the truck was parked in the driveway or the street. Mr. Skala replied he thought it was on the street. Mr. Teddy stated staff would need to look at the code. He explained the 24-hour restriction was the normal parking limit for any kind of vehicle. Mr. Glascock asked if his constituents had filed a complaint or were willing to file a complaint. Mr. Skala replied he thought they would be willing to file a complaint, and noted he would relay the message.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 9:01 p.m.