



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, April 17, 2017
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, April 17, 2017, 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 THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, and TRAPP were present. Council Member SKALA was absent. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the special meeting of February 25, 2017 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Trapp and a second by Mr. Ruffin.

The agenda, including the consent agenda, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Trapp and a second by Mr. Thomas.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI4-17

The Future City Team competition results: "Power of Public Spaces".

John Conway explained The Future City program was supported by the National Society of Professional Engineers, and as a retired professional engineer, he helped to organize Future City teams in the Columbia middle schools. Tonight, the Lange Middle School team would describe its project associated with the Future City Team competition. He noted each team had an educator and mentors, and those were Robert Ndessokia, Mike Heimos, and himself, and the team members were chosen by the school and could be sixth, seventh, or eighth graders. He listed the five components of the competition, which included developing a project plan, designing a virtual city, writing an essay, constructing a scale model of a portion of their future city, and presenting their future city at the regional competition, and pointed out the process had begun in September and had ended in late January.

The team members, Braden Ambra, Mya White, Addison Gish, Landon Viers, Sean Keene, Lane Story, and Ethan McGee, provided a handout and described their project utilizing the scale model of their future city, which involved old Wabash bus station and Ameren sites in the downtown. The focus was on year-round uses for these public spaces. They wanted to keep the Wabash station alive due to its historic nature by turning it in to a museum, and suggested the rest of the area include a water park that could be turned into an ice skating rink in the winter, a dog park, a bike trail, a community garden for those living downtown, a farmers market under a pavilion, art sculptures, a large amphitheater with seating on the hill that could also be used for sledding in the winter, a pond for fishing, and a playground for children. They were also sensitive to the environment so the light posts would have solar panels so they could charge during the day and shine at night, and the roofs of the amphitheater and pavilion would have slanted roofs so the water runoff could go into an underground irrigation system and stored under the pond so it could be used as drip irrigation system for the trees and plants. The goal of the project was to create a public space that incorporated a

year-round, nutritional, economical, recreational, and cultural power, and they felt their model represented that goal.

Mayor Treece congratulated the Lange Middle School team for their work on this project and for winning an award, and stated he could not wait to see what challenges they would tackle in the future.

The team explained they had won the Kansas State University award as one of the favorite models in the engineering process. Mayor Treece thanked them for representing Columbia well in the State of Kansas, and congratulated Columbia Public Schools for having a Architecture and Engineering program in the sixth, seventh, and eighth grades.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC4-17 Board and Commission Applicants.

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

AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD

Cosner, Renee, 3624 N. Creasy Springs Road, Ward 2, Term ending December 1, 2019

CITIZENS POLICE REVIEW BOARD

Towne, Katelynn, 1001 University Avenue, Apt. 303, Ward 1, Term ending November 1, 2017

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Jones, Brian, 2305 Longwood Drive, Ward 5, Term ending March 1, 2018

DOWNTOWN COLUMBIA LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

Clark, John, 403 N. Ninth Street, Ward 1, Term ending May 1, 2020

Mayor Treece commented that Mr. Skala was unable to attend tonight's meeting and had asked that they hold off on making appointments to the Board of Adjustment and the Planning and Zoning Commission. He suggested they make those appointments at the second meeting in May since Mr. Thomas would miss the first meeting in May as he felt they would benefit from having a full contingent of council members. Unless there was an objection, he also suggested the City Clerk readvertise the vacancies for those two groups so they had as many applicants as possible. No one objected.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC26-17 Howard Hutton - The urgency of racial justice and social equity in our navigation to a sustainable future.

Mr. Hutton, 804 Cambridge Drive, explained he was speaking on behalf of Race Matters, Friends, but was also a board member of the Center Project, which was Missouri's only LGBTQ safe space and resource center and was located at 515 Hickman Avenue. He commented that with the help of the community, they helped to save lives. They helped physicists that worked in biochemistry develop cures to save them from the next pandemic, criminologists that worked with police departments change the way they engaged with the community, and parents from having their lives destroyed due to the loss of a child. They felt collaborative community policing could also help save lives, which in turn would save the community. The Center Project saw their value as being inextricably tied to the success of queer and transgender people of color and their families, which included all people of color. They were able to serve the community of color best when they provided the space to lead, and were enlisting trainers and looking for board members and program leaders of color to help them be more effective. They felt there was urgency to this work, and hoped Columbia would keep moving with them in that

direction. He noted Columbia was the second fastest growing metropolitan area in the Midwest, and its unemployment was around three percent even though people of color experienced unemployment of 15 percent. The United States had five percent of the world's population and 25 percent of the world's prison population of which nearly half bore brown skin. Since they had refused to deal with their Jim Crow superpredator past, they kept throwing brown people in jail and crushing more potential solutions the society needed to compete and survive. He felt Columbia needed to change its model to avoid environmental and social collapse and unrest. He suggested they get themselves out of prison and become educated and engaged in creating solutions for the future. He recommended truth commissions requiring people to learn about the damage done by racially biased systems in order to tackle persistent stereotypes, and for memorials of the great struggle to be commissioned for city and courthouse avenues. He commented that leaders of color needed to be in key positions of the enforcement structure and process in order to make the journey to racial justice and social equity more judiciously. He thought it was unlikely they could survive their future while so many people remained disenfranchised, and the LGBTQ center wanted to help along with many others.

SPC27-17 **Sutu Forte - Advocating for Columbia's urban wilderness.**

Ms. Forte welcomed Mr. Pitzer to the City Council and provided a handout. She noted Thoreau had said the best things were wild, and one did not go to a circus or show for something that was tame. She commented that they were so conditioned to act polite and grown up, and suggested they get to know, honor, and embrace the wild spaces in Columbia. She explained the handout provided described May 1-May 6 as a week to honor the urban wild spaces throughout the U.S. She noted Jane Goodall had indicated the single best thing they could do for Columbia was to maintain wildlife corridors when she was recently here. She believed everyone cared about the health of Columbia along with the people and creatures living here. She commented that as a child she loved to be outdoors in the country with her horse, and those areas were now covered in asphalt and houses. She asked that urban wildlife week be celebrated in Columbia, and thanked Mayor Treece for joining the Mayor's for Monarchs group, which she felt was a great program to bring back monarch butterflies. She read a paragraph from a book by a local author which suggested they be more observant of nature.

SPC28-17 **Ginger Owen - Advocating for Columbia's urban wilderness.**

Ms. Owen, 5775 E. Heller Road, commented that she co-chaired It's Our Wild Nature, a community organization, with Sutu Forte, and explained as a child she had grown up on a farm with creeks, wetlands, toads, wildflowers, etc. She stated her concern was for the 36 acres east of the University of Missouri campus on the Hinkson Creek along with the Hinkson Creek and the plans for a bicycle trail along the Hinkson Creek, which she referred to as Option 3. She commented that she thought Option 3, which involved more bridges and a cement trail along the Hinkson Creek, had been separate from Option 1, and understood \$6,000 had been approved for a survey. She did not feel that should have been done as there were still too many loose ends. She asked the Council to consider maintaining the 36 acres as a wildlife area with natural paths instead of any concrete.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH7-17 **Proposed reconstruction of Taxiway C at the Columbia Regional Airport.**

Discussion shown with B101-17.

B101-17 **Authorizing the reconstruction of Taxiway C at the Columbia Regional Airport; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.**

PH7-17 was read by the Clerk, and B101-17 was given second reading by the Clerk. Mr. Nichols provided a staff report. Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Thomas asked for the cost of the project and the funding source. Mr. Nichols replied the construction cost was \$2,832,630 and 90 percent would be funding by the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA). Mr. Thomas asked for the funding source of the \$280,000 the City would pay. Mr. Nichols replied the transportation sales tax. Mr. Thomas asked if a fund balance was maintained in the transportation sales tax fund. He understood the fund was utilized for the airport, the bus system, and road maintenance, and asked if each maintained an independent or individual fund balance or if there was a fund balance for the fund in general. Mr. Nichols replied the necessary match money was set aside in conjunction with the airport improvement plan, which was updated every year. Mr. Thomas understood the airport had taken its portion of transportation sales tax funds over the years and had placed them in a reserve account. Mr. Nichols stated the funds had been set aside as part of the capital improvement program. He noted they tried to anticipate needs, so some years they had more funding than in other years when the money was spent down on projects.

Mr. Pitzer understood construction would begin next year and asked how long it would take before it was completed. He also asked how this fit into the scheduling for the improvements to the runway. Mr. Nichols replied the runway was under construction now. Mr. Parks stated he thought Runway 13-31 should be completed this fall. Mr. Pitzer asked about the taxiway. Mr. Nichols replied it would likely next spring. He explained there would be a turnaround bulb with the completion of Runway 13-31 since the taxiway did not exist at this time. The bulb would be used until the connection with Taxiway C was completed. He pointed out the FAA had a funding stream and the issuing of the grants had to coincide with their budget cycles, and they also tended to package projects in a way the City could provide match funds. He noted they had been able to combine two grants with Runway 13-31 and Taxiway B because they had received great bids, and this in turn helped streamline the process.

Mayor Treece asked how the plans were coming for United Airways to begin service in August. Ms. Button replied it was going well.

B101-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH8-17

Proposed demolition of structures located on City-owned property at 1104 Worley Street and 1105 Again Street to correct storm water and sanitary sewer issues.

PH8-17 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided as staff report.

Mr. Ruffin asked for a timeline for completion of the project. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought the demolition could be completed within six months. Mr. Ruffin asked for a timeline for the work beyond demolition. Mr. Sorrell replied the stormwater improvements were in the CIP Plan for the year 2023 at a cost of \$450,000. Mr. Ruffin asked if there was any reason it could not be completed sooner than 2023. Mr. Sorrell replied it was a matter of funding and the prioritization of projects, and noted Council could ask staff to look into moving it up on the list. Mr. Ruffin explained he would like for this to be done as residents in the area wanted the problem fixed as soon as possible.

Mayor Treece asked how soon the bus shelter would be operational. Mr. Nichols replied it could be installed once the grading was done, and the concrete pad would be poured first.

Mr. Thomas asked if these two lots would be developed as a pocket park. Mr. Sorrell replied they would likely be used to help with stormwater quality treatment once they were able to do the stormwater work. Mr. Thomas asked if it would be possible to create

a public access trail through it. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought that was possible. Ms. Peters asked for details regarding the project beyond the demolition of the homes. Mr. Sorrell displayed a diagram showing a concept of what might be done. He commented that the sewer was located under the house on Again Street, so he thought they could install a cast in place liner there once the house was demolished. He noted they would look at it to determine if they could help reduce the incidents of backup in buildings during rain events as well. The project would also include storm drainage to help alleviate flooding. Ms. Peters asked about the blue on the diagram. Mr. Sorrell replied it was the existing storm drainage. The sanitary sewer was not shown on the diagram.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Michael McMann, 606 Independence Street, echoed the desire of Mr. Ruffin to move this project up from the year 2023 as he believed this neighborhood had been dealing with these problems since 1955. He thought a trail could be placed on part of the property, but noted it might not be safe because of the current stormwater flow and flooding so it would likely depend on the dirt work.

Katrina Boles, 1109 Again Street, stated she was concerned about the stormwater treatment facility because it would be next to her house and more and more stormwater continued to enter her basement. She noted she had spoken with City staff regarding the grading and had expressed an interest in extending the creek line from Worley Street. She thought a trail would be wonderful as well instead of the buried pipe there now.

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

Mr. Thomas noted he liked the idea of a crosswalk and bus shelter being included as part of this project. He thought they should adopt a policy of placing crosswalks at major bus stops, which would likely be at the same place bus shelters would be located. He stated he also liked the fact several different departments were combining efforts on the project.

Mayor Treece made a motion to directing staff to proceed with the project to include integrating some of the ideas mentioned along with accelerating the time frame. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH9-17 Proposed construction of the More's Lake remediation and site restoration project at the Municipal Power Plant.

Discussion shown with B106-17.

B106-17 Appropriating funds for excavation, hauling and disposal of coal combustion residuals as part of the More's Lake remediation and site restoration project at the Municipal Power Plant.

PH9-17 was read by the Clerk, and B106-17 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if the fly ash or coal ash was the by-product of burning coal. Mr. Johnsen replied yes. Mayor Treece asked how they had captured it in the power plant and if they had settled it in the pond. Mr. Johnsen replied the power plant had a wet ash handling system so there was both bottom ash and fly ash. The wet system extracted the hoppers in the bag house, which was the fly ash. In addition, the ash at the bottom grade of the boiler went into a hopper. The water system transferred the ash from the plant to the pond. In the future, if they were able to do a biomass project in the plant, they would have to change the ash handling system to a dry ash system.

Mayor Treece asked if the ash that had been settled in More's Lake had ever been removed or if it had just accumulated. Mr. Johnsen replied it had been dredged out on a regular basis over the years, and had been used for construction fill, road traction, etc. He noted there was more out there now than could be utilized. He pointed out that as they contracted for the ash to go somewhere, they needed documentation of where it was

going and who was responsible as part of the remediation. This was why they were proposing it go to the landfill.

Mayor Treece asked if they had utilized dredging equipment in the past or if they had cut the dam. Mr. Johnsen replied it had just been scooped out and piled up. Mayor Treece asked about the remediation process for this lake. He wondered if they would cut the dam and drain the water. Mr. Johnsen replied no. He explained the water would be pumped out. They would then stack it up and dewater it to the best of their ability so they did not have to pay water costs. It would then be shipped to the landfill. Mayor Treece asked if it would go to the City's landfill or another approved landfill. Mr. Johnsen replied it would go to the City's landfill. Mayor Treece asked if it was hazardous. Mr. Johnsen replied it was not hazardous waste.

Mayor Treece asked for a sense of what 90,000 cubic yards represented, and for the number of yards in a dump truck. Mr. Johnsen replied he thought there were seven yards in a dump truck. He explained they anticipated this taking three years and noted they would utilize City crews to mitigate expenses for hauling it, but they would still be responsible for landfill fees. Mayor Treece understood they would pay landfill fees to themselves. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood this would involve almost 13,000 dump truck loads. Mr. Johnsen pointed out they would also be required to install a groundwater monitoring system around it as they had to assess and report any impacts for a period of time.

Mr. Ruffin asked how the lake would be used in the future. Mr. Johnsen replied that was a decision they planned to make in the future. At this time, they only intended to clean it out and restore the site. He thought they needed to know the final remediation costs in order to determine what resources they had to do something with it, and they were a few years out from that decision. He understood some would like it to be a recreational lake with other recreational resources, but those decisions would need to be made in the future. Mr. Ruffin asked if they were looking at ten years. Mr. Johnsen replied no. He explained they needed to have the Lake remediated by 2020, which was only three years from now. He stated that was the reason for the mid-year appropriation, and noted future appropriations would be needed to get it done.

Ms. Peters asked if this was a recreational lake now. Mr. Johnsen replied no. Ms. Peters asked if there was a reason it had to be kept as a lake. She wondered why they would not just drain it and treat the ash that was there. Mr. Johnsen explained there were worse future liabilities and obligations if they left the ash there. The review by the engineers had determined it was best to get the ash to a permitted solid waste disposal facility that already had everything in place to track and report it. In terms of whether they could fill in the lake afterward so it was a piece of ground, the answer was yes, but that was a discussion for a future date.

Mr. Pitzer understood some the ash had previously been used for fill, traction, etc. and asked how much could be used for projects such as those now. He wondered if it was close to 90,000 cubic yards. Mr. Johnsen replied no. He recalled it being used for a structural fill for a construction site about 15 years ago, and thought that involved about 30,000 cubic yards. Mr. Pitzer asked if there was potential for that over the next couple of years to lessen the amount that would be placed in the landfill. Mr. Johnsen replied they would look for other uses, but pointed out they would have to document where it went and be accountable for its final resting place. Mr. Pitzer understood the \$7.8 million did not include restoration of the site to a recreational use. It was only for cleaning up the site. Mr. Johnsen replied it was the estimate to get it back to a point they could use it recreationally if they wanted.

Mayor Treece asked how often the power plant operated. Mr. Johnsen replied it operated most of the year. It was a 4-unit plant and two units were burning coal. He noted they were looking at a biomass conversion for one of the units as well. In the foreseeable future, two natural gas units would be running, and they were in the process of determining if a third unit would be converted.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Wayne Hawks, 3212 Westcreek Circle, commented that it bothered him that they were doing all of this and would pay themselves, and suggested they find someone that could utilize the fly ash. He thought it could be mixed with limestone slurry and bentonite for a good surface for development. This would solve the problem and save the City money. He stated he was concerned about the City's fiscal situation moving forward, and suggested looking at other options so taxpayers were not ultimately responsible.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a market for this material as indicated by Mr. Hawks. Mr. Johnsen replied the consultant had investigated options, and as of right now they had not determined a better option. He noted they had to accommodate a regulatory time frame, so they at least needed to start working on it until a better option became available. He stated this was a three-year project, and they were open to saving money at any time in the project.

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

Mr. Trapp stated he felt staff had a reasonable plan in terms of the City's obligation to restore the Lake within the regulatory time frame. He thought they were open to entrepreneurial opportunities should they present themselves. He pointed out this would be paid for through electric rates to the solid waste utility, which was a separate operation. He stated he planned to support this and looked forward to More's Lake becoming some type of community asset.

Mr. Thomas commented that he believed this was a good example of externalizing a cost in the past as they thought they were saving money, but in the end they had to pay for it. Now, current and future ratepayers would be responsible. He stated the economic analysis that had been done years ago had not taken this into account. He noted there were lots of other examples in Columbia and the world where costs were externalized. He encouraged everyone to think about the future costs of not conducting a complete economic analysis of operations, and believed any form of fossil fuel burning was a great example.

Mayor Treece stated More's Lake existed on one of the earliest hand drawn plat maps of the City of Columbia dating back to the late 1880s so the Lake had been there well before the 1904 power plant had been built, and thought it would be good stewardship to remediate it back to its original condition. He noted he was shocked by the cost, but putting the 90,000 cubic yards into perspective ameliorated that to some extent. He understood it might have been appropriate in the 1950s or 1960s to use it as a settling pond, but did not believe that same model would be used if a power plant was constructed today. He suggested they start with this initial appropriation and ask staff to continue to keep the Council informed of any opportunities to dispose of this material in a meaningful way, even outside of the regular budget process.

Mr. Pitzer agreed with the comments of Mayor Treece and Mr. Trapp as there was obviously a need to handle this in an appropriate fashion within a certain time frame. He asked staff to continue to look for other uses as it seemed wasteful and was costly to send it to the landfill.

Mr. Johnsen pointed out they would try to use staff resources and find other alternatives to help manage the costs, but noted they had to get started.

Mayor Treece made a motion to proceed with excavation, hauling, and disposal of coal combustion residuals as part of the More's Lake remediation and site restoration project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

B106-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH10-17 Consider the Water and Light 2017 Renewable Energy Report.

PH10-17 was read by the Mr. Johnsen.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer asked how big the solar farm would be for which they were soliciting RFPs. Mr. Johnsen replied they were looking at a five megawatt plant if they could make it work. He noted they liked photovoltaics because they matched the load profile better, and the capital costs for them were coming down. He stated they were open to a power purchase agreement, an ownership arrangement, or a combination. He explained they had provided for a range of megawatt hours, but thought they were likely looking at a five megawatt facility.

Mr. Pitzer asked if they had made rate projections based on the wind energy coming into the system. Mr. Johnsen replied they had looked at projections, and believed the next wind contract they would bring forward would have a very small impact on rates. He also thought the costs of photovoltaics would not have a big impact on rates, but provided the disclaimer that he only had preliminary projections.

Mayor Treece asked how they were doing in terms of meeting the 15 percent standard in 2018. Mr. Johnsen replied they were running above 15 percent for the first quarter of this year. Mayor Treece asked if they expected that to continue. Mr. Johnsen replied it would go down because wind would drop off a bit when it became hot. In addition, the loads increased when it was hot. Since it was a percentage of load, both parts of the fraction would change.

Mayor Treece understood the Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission (MJMEUC) recently entered into an agreement with the Clean Line Project at two cents a kilowatt or something similar. Mr. Johnsen stated that was the wind contract the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) had just approved to bring forward to the Council. He noted they still had to finalize the contract to commercially represent it to the Council, but they were working on it. Mayor Treece understood that was the Clean Line Project and not an extension of what they currently had. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. It was a new contract that would be pooled through the Missouri Public Utility Alliance.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Zachary Wyatt-Gomez, 2515 Oak Meadows Drive, stated he was the Missouri Solar Energy Industries Association (MOSEIA) Executive Director, and explained MOSEIA worked with state and local officials to make sure everyone was promoting a pro-business and pro-solar agenda. He commented that the measure of energy used to calculate the net metering cost should be the actual metered energy the utility received from the customer, and not the engineered estimate of all of the energy produced by the solar panels. The utility was ignoring the fact a substantial portion of the energy was used onsite. This method for accounting for net metering artificially inflated the cost from the resource making it appear to be one of the most expensive sources in the renewable energy portfolio. If the accounting was corrected, net metered solar energy could become one of the cheapest forms of developed renewable energy available for compliance purposes. He noted solar was one of the fastest growing industries in the U.S. and Missouri, and solar jobs in Missouri had increased by 28 percent last year. He pointed out Columbia's pro-solar and pro-small business policies had contributed to the growth. He believed fixing this small problem would do a lot to expand solar in Columbia as solar was affordable.

Mayor Treece asked for clarification. Mr. Wyatt-Gomez displayed a diagram and explained the solar process. Any unused kilowatts of energy would go to the utility. Mayor Treece understood no cash was exchanged, and the customer was only credited for it on the bill. Mr. Wyatt-Gomez stated that was correct. Ms. Peters understood in his example it was a 5 kilowatt credit instead of a 10 kilowatt credit even though 10 kilowatts had been produced because the customer had used 5 kilowatts. Mr. Wyatt-Gomez stated that was correct. The customer only received credit for what the utility took. He pointed out the methodology used by the City showed the utility taking 10 kilowatts instead of 5 kilowatts because 10 kilowatts were produced. Mayor Treece asked what the incentive would be to calculate it in that manner. Mr. Wyatt-Gomez replied it made net metering pricey. Mayor Treece asked why they would not want to

encourage solar among individual homeowners if photovoltaic panels were a good fit for the system and matched the voltage well. Mr. Wyatt-Gomez replied he thought they should be encouraging it, but noted there were underlying politics. Mayor Treece commented that credit given for 5 megawatts would reduce the \$38 per kilowatt hour to \$19, which would be less than what they would pay for community solar. Mr. Wyatt-Gomez agreed. He thought community solar costs could be less if an RFP process was utilized locally.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Wyatt-Gomez if he knew the Council had adopted a green energy building code about six months ago that would require solar ready roof framing. Mr. Wyatt-Gomez replied he did not as he moved back to the community in September.

Mayor Treece asked if the rebate for the net 5 kilowatts was dollar for dollar what would have been paid if one did not have solar. Mr. Wyatt-Gomez replied it was a one-for-one credit on the bill.

Wayne Hawks, 3212 Westcreek Circle, commented that he had just received the utility bills for a number of apartment units they had, and it had been up 15-20 percent across the board. He noted they were also building single-family homes in the north, and his electrician had suggested he look at solar. He understood it was expensive on the front end, but thought that would be okay if they could sell it back to the City and was told the City did not want to purchase it. He did not feel it was cost effective to spend \$30,000 for solar on a \$200,000 house as the house would only be valued at \$170,000. He did not feel it was cost effective to do solar at this time.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the increased utility bills were due to rate increases. Mr. Hawks replied yes. He noted solar was expensive as well because utilities did not want solar because they did not want the consumer to be self-sufficient as it was competition for the utility.

Mr. Thomas stated he did not understand why the City was not supporting the installation of solar by Mr. Hawks as he had solar panels on his house, and they supplied his energy needed. If he produced excess solar energy, he received a credit. He asked if this was not available to him. Mr. Hawks replied it was available, but the problem was the cost. He wondered why he could not build a system to generate power for the City. Mr. Thomas pointed out the City had an RFP out to do that, but they also had a system where a building could have its own solar panels to supply energy to the building and obtain a credit for excess energy produced to be offset against energy drawn from the City utility. Mayor Treece understood, from the perspective of the landlord, the payback was only there if the landlord held the property and payed the utility bill. Mr. Hawks stated that was correct.

Andrew Linhares, 1216 Subella Drive, explained he was with Renew Missouri, which was a state policy advocate for energy efficiency policy and renewable energy. He commented that Columbia's renewable energy standard was limited to no more than three percent higher than the electric rate would be otherwise with 100 percent non-renewable energy, which was similar to what they had at the state level, except at one percent. He noted most of the large utilities were not hitting that one percent even though they had thousands of net metered customers. He understood Columbia had .04 percent distributed solar, but thought that number would grow quickly within the next five years. He commented that the language was asking them to compare against the rates as if there were not renewables, and any savings to the utility from renewables needed to be reflected because they would have made the rates lower where they otherwise would not have been lower. He stated there was a big difference between net metering and the renewable energy standards as net metering could exist without the renewable energy standards, so net metering costs could not be considered as renewable energy standard compliance costs. He commented that there was a narrow way in which a customer's solar energy system could result in a renewable energy standard compliance cost. At the state level, if solar rebates were offered, the company could claim those renewable energy credits for compliance toward the target. He understood Columbia offered solar

rebates, and noted energy purchased from onsite renewable energy systems could be included as a cost as well. He did not think any other part of net metering could be considered a renewable energy standard compliance cost as they were different systems. He displayed a diagram showing the KCPL renewable energy standard compliance reports, and stated they had indicated the impact was less than one percent for 2016 when looking at a 10-year average and were receiving a net of 25,000 megawatt hours annually. If KCPL were to use the same methodology as the City, they would have millions of dollars of renewable energy standard compliance costs associated with their net metered customers. He pointed out there was a disconnect between the State and the City, and encouraged the Council to consider it.

Mayor Treece asked how specific Columbia's ordinance was with respect to the calculation of the net metering levels. He wondered if the rate at which it was calculated was written in the City's ordinance, and if the City did not have an ordinance, if the State statute would reflect how it should be calculated. Mr. Linhares replied if Columbia did not have a renewable energy standard ordinance, they would not be having this conversation. He commented that they were only discussing the tracking of how much it cost to comply with the ordinance. Mr. Thomas understood the State law would not apply because it was a City-owned utility. Mr. Linhares stated that was correct as it only applied to the major utilities, such as Ameren. He pointed out net metering, however, applied to every utility in the State, to include the City utility, so if the City had not passed its own renewable energy standard, they would still offer net metering and incur the administrative costs of offering net metering as a service. As a result, he believed those costs could not be seen as a renewable energy standard cost.

Jay Hasheider, 1812 Cliff Drive, stated he was on the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) and was a solar energy owner as he had a solar energy system at his house. He commented that the cost of solar was decreasing and the need for clean power was greater. The way the City calculated net metering costs made it the second highest of the seven renewable energy forms, and almost double any other solar cost. He pointed out the customer paid for the system and granted the utility the renewable energy credits, but the utility was saying this was costing the ratepayer the equivalent of \$38 per megawatt hour. Every kilowatt hour produced by the photovoltaic system was a cost the utility had to bear, but about half of those kilowatt hours were actually used in the home so the utility did not see it. He agreed there might be an argument with regard to cost for the kilowatt hours that made it to the utility, but did not feel the entire production could be attributed, and that was what the utility was doing. He commented that he had discussed this with staff during WLAB meetings, and tonight was the first time he had heard anyone say they were willing to work with the WLAB on this matter. He stated he found this very disheartening as he felt a publicly-owned utility would be more responsive to the public and especially the WLAB. As a solar owner, he was satisfied with the system and felt he was doing some good in the community. He also felt the renewable energy costs from net metered solar could be one of the least costly forms of renewable energy if calculated properly. The two local renewable energy sources that he believed could be developed in Columbia were ground source geothermal contact with heat pumps and solar.

Mayor Treece understood individual homeowners paid to put panels on the roof. Mr. Hasheider stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood the City was taking 100 percent of that investment and calculating it as their cost for two times the amount of kilowatt hours the owner was producing on behalf of the City. Mr. Hasheider clarified they did not include the cost spent on the system. They were acting as though they were buying everything he produced whether it went back to the utility or not. They discounted the cost of coal-fired generated power. He explained they started at \$80 per megawatt hour and discount it to get to \$38 per megawatt hour. The system the City built on the west side of town was calculated at \$20 per megawatt hour. It did not make sense that the one he paid for and provided the City credit for would cost \$38 per megawatt hour. He

stated he was encouraged that staff was interested in working with the WLAB to iron this out, but would come back to Council if he was not satisfied it was being handled correctly. Mayor Treece commented that as an advisory commission to Council he would encourage Mr. Hasheider to come to the Council immediately if he received that response again.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Hasheider if he disagreed with the rate per megawatt hour used in the calculation, the amount of energy used in the calculation, or both. Mr. Hasheider replied he thought they all disagreed with the amount. He agreed there might be an argument about the cost after they determined the amount. He noted the rate would come down proportionately to how much would be going into it. Mr. Pitzer asked if there was a narrow band in the disagreement in terms of the amount per megawatt hour they were including in the calculation. Mr. Hasheider replied Mr. Linhares had indicated there should not be any cost, but others agreed there was some cost. He suggested the Utility Department conduct a value of solar study that looked at all of the values contributed by a solar project so they had a better idea.

Mr. Thomas stated he shared the concerns raised by the WLAB and the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) on the calculation issue. He understood the big picture concern was that the City might not be able to increase its renewable energy quota as much as they should because they would hit the three percent ceiling. He also understood Mr. Hasheider was concerned about a communications consequence whereby people believed solar was more expensive than it really was. He asked if that was accurate and if he had any other concerns. Mr. Hasheider replied his other concern was the City would assume net metering was the highest cost and cut back on some of the incentives currently offered.

Jeffrey Owens, 1791 West Way Court, explained he worked for Missouri Solar Applications, which had recently opened an office in Columbia, and noted about five local businesses employed about 50 people like him who contributed to the local economy. In addition to supporting the tax base and creating jobs, they employed contractors in allied areas, such as roofing and electrical work, and purchased material and equipment from supply houses. He stated Columbia was the first bright spot in terms of solar energy in the State of Missouri, and he hoped it continued. He believed net metering would be a key to meeting the renewable energy mandate because it was really the only unconfined and unconstrained growth in renewable energy sources.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that a home had been built by Habitat for Humanity in partnership with the City and People's Visioning about 2-3 years ago, and thought it would be valuable to obtain statistics on the home in terms of utilities as it was built with solar energy. He understood the City had placed solar panels north of the City and on Ash Street, and suggested the use of water turbines for wind. He stated he understood Germany had gone all solar, and felt the United States needed to catch up. He suggested more grant money to incentivize renewable energy, and believed there could be an improvement in health costs by removing nuclear waste from the atmosphere.

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

Mr. Thomas stated he had always found it confusing to determine whether they were satisfying the three percent cost limit, and although he had not spent time looking into it, he understood various commissions felt it was flawed. He noted he would like to see a clear justification for the way it was currently being calculated or for a change to be made in how it was calculated. The renewable energy ordinance existed because the people of Columbia had a vision of a reduced carbon footprint as part of a global effort to improve the lives of people in the future as well as now. It was interesting that this was being discussed after the More's Lake mitigation project because in that situation the City had externalized the cost of the ash, and they were now having to pay \$8 million in cleanup costs. He believed a real analysis of the cost of renewable energy needed to include the future costs of mitigating for climate change to the current costs of the fossil fuel system.

He suspected if they did this, it would show they needed to move to 100 percent renewable energy as quickly as possible. He commented that he liked the points made about moving to a higher ratio of solar energy as it was good for the local economy by supporting small, local businesses and keeping the money local. When purchasing coal, gas, and oil, a couple million dollars per year left the local economy.

Mr. Trapp asked Mr. Johnsen to clarify the rate increases from last year as he thought it had been 2-3 percent. Mr. Johnsen replied the total had been less than \$5 per month for the average customer. He thought it had been two percent on the electric side. Mr. Trapp understood it would not have been a 15 percent increase. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct, and noted they would need to see the bill to determine the issue if it was higher as it would not have been that high from the rate increase alone.

Mr. Trapp stated he was pleased with the renewable energy results from the first quarter of 2017, and was excited they would be near 15 percent in 2018. He explained he had been on the Council when they had raised the standards, and thought staff had responded well to moving boldly forward with renewable energy. He noted he believed they were supporting solar and that there were issues with the formula. Like Mr. Thomas, he had struggled with trying to understand the formula. He felt obtaining outside help in bringing lucidity to the practice made sense. He commented that he believed they needed to move into renewable sources in general, and with solar in particular, with their eyes open as there were difficulties with intermittent power sources, which affected load balancing. He did not believe anyone was 100 percent solar. In order to run on intermittent sources, they needed to be on a smart grid to have a better control on demand or be able to address storage, or both. He understood the last time it had been looked into Columbia was not a large enough community for smart grid issues. He commented that he would be cheerleading for 100 percent renewable energy if he felt it was possible, but it was not with present day technology. He noted he had been a net metered customer for five years, and understood it created some equity issues. He explained he had contributed the initial investment with a City rebate and paid very little to the utility now as he used very little. He was always in the first tier so his rates were low and the City had a low base charge. If needed, he could turn on every light in the house as the utility was on the hook for all of them to be able to turn on everything all at once. This was capacity, and solar did not add much to it. The utility had to make capacity purchases to compensate for their increasing reliance on intermittent sources that did not provide that capacity. He thought they needed to be careful to protect everyone. They currently had low income people in non-energy efficient houses subsidizing middle class people like he and Mr. Thomas with their solar array when they were really not financially participating with the utility. There were still billing costs, capacity costs, etc. Although they did not use a lot of energy, it was convenient to be a part of the grid. He still wanted his refrigerator to run if it was cloudy many days in a row. He did not feel anyone was against solar, and the issues were load balancing, equity between people that were participating, and how they would pay. No matter how electricity was generated, there was a cost to billing, metering, capacity, regulatory framework, etc. He commented that he appreciated the hard work of the utility and noted they were working toward addressing the issues they had. He stated he believed they should do things in the best possible way for the environment and everyone when they could, and absent those choices, they needed to move forward in the least worst way. In this situation, they needed to maintain their primary purpose of providing reliable electricity. He agreed there were issues with fossil fuels in terms of health, but there were also issues with high utility bills as those also cost lives as indicated by the health impact assessment on transit. They had to be mindful of the people's dollars as there were a lot of people that struggled to pay their utility bills. He thought they needed to be equitable for the users, prudent in their decisions, and build the best power system they could afford. He pointed out the University of Missouri reactor was a medical reactor, and did not generate power.

Mayor Treece stated he wanted to hold off on approving this report. The ordinance

indicated it would be reviewed by the WLAB and the EEC prior to approval by the Council, and both commissions had substantive comments on it. He thought they would benefit from a work session on the issue. Mr. Thomas stated he agreed.

Mayor Treece understood the WLAB had been having trouble obtaining financial reports since September. Mr. Matthes explained that was due to COFERS and changing from the old system to the new system, and there was a delay in the reports. Mayor Treece asked if staff was receiving the reports. Mr. Matthes replied no. Mayor Treece asked how they were making adequate decisions without financial data. Mr. Matthes replied it was not that they did not have any financial data. The data from old reports was not ready. When the system was capable of producing the report, they could catch up. There were still some small issues keeping that from happening. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Matthes when he thought it would be fully operational. Mr. Matthes replied he checked on this weekly, and the long list had been reduced to a shorter list. He hoped it would be done by next month, but was unsure as they had to rely on others.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B108-17

Appropriating funds for replacement of wooden poles that support the overhead electric distribution system.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters understood 1,200 poles needed to be replaced and it would cost \$1 million to replace them. Mr. Johnsen stated that was not correct. Only about 170 would be replaced with the \$1 million. Ms. Peters understood it would cost \$1 million for 166 poles. Mr. Johnsen stated the estimate was about \$6,000 per pole. He noted a lot of the cost was due to labor. The pole itself did not cost that much. The cost was associated with the manpower to install it. He pointed out some poles were more expensive than others too if they had a lot of infrastructure on it as it could take a day to a day and one-half for a line crew to change out the pole.

Mr. Thomas commented that he thought the case could be made for fewer poles and wires if more customers installed solar, which could impact the cost.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a region or geographic distribution that the cost could justify the undergrounding of any of these lines. Mr. Johnsen replied they placed lines underground every year, and thought the budget was about \$800,000 to \$1 million, but it was an opportunity based budget whereby they coordinated with projects that would allow for a good cost, such as a water line, sewer line, or road project. If they had a real problem whereby it was cheaper to underground than to rebuild an overhead line, they would create a capital project to underground a particular line.

B108-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES:

THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE.

ABSENT: SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B112-17

Authorizing a master license and services agreement with Rave Wireless, Inc., d/b/a Rave Mobile Safety, for mass alert notifications of emergent and non-emergent issues.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes and Mr. Sapp provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece understood this was an opt-in system. Mr. Sapp stated that was correct, and it included several features whereby one could receive a phone call, voice mail, text, e-mail, etc. It allowed the individual to make that decision. Mayor Treece asked if there were different layers, such as police, fire, natural disasters, etc. Mr. Sapp replied yes.

Mr. Ruffin asked how they would notify the general public of this service. Mr. Sapp replied they would do a marketing campaign via social media, press release, etc. He noted there were a lot of different ways to market the service to the people.

B112-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SKALA. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B100-17 Vacating utility easements within Arbor Falls, Plat No. 3 located east of Ranger Drive and south of Euliss Drive (Case No. 17-83).
- B102-17 Authorizing a right of use permit with Missouri Network Alliance, LLC, d/b/a Bluebird Network, for the installation and maintenance of fiber optic cable within portions of the Route B and Brown Station Road rights-of-way.
- B103-17 Appropriating funds for the purchase and installation of a gate arm system in all City parking facilities and for parking meter upgrades.
- B104-17 Authorizing a financial assistance agreement with the Mid-Missouri Solid Waste Management District for the purchase of eight (8) commercial mini cardboard balers; appropriating funds.
- B105-17 Amending Ordinance No. 023001 to authorize permit holder and certifier registration designations and the electronic filing of discharge monitoring reports with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources Water Protection Program.
- B107-17 Appropriating funds to continue to facilitate the construction of upgrades to Boiler 8 at the Municipal Power Plant to reduce nitrogen oxide (NOx) emissions.
- B109-17 Accepting conveyances for utility, sewer and drainage purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B110-17 Appropriating funds from the Celebration for the Arts event.
- B111-17 Appropriating architectural salvage sale revenue to the New Century Fund for future use as a revolving loan fund for private historic preservation activities; transferring funds to offset a budgeting shortfall.
- B113-17 Authorizing an air service guarantee participation agreement with the County of Boone, Missouri, The Curators of the University of Missouri, the City of Jefferson, Missouri and Cole County, Missouri; authorizing air service guarantee participation agreements with various Chamber of Commerce members.
- B114-17 Amending the FY 2017 Annual Budget by adding a position in the City Utilities Department; amending the FY 2017 Classification and Pay Plan by adding a classification, making classification reassignments and changing a classification title.
- B115-17 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to unclassified service; amending the FY 2017 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Police Department; amending the FY 2017 Classification and Pay Plan by adding classifications and changing classification titles.
- B116-17 Authorizing a master services agreement and amendments to the master

software implementation services, master software license and master software support and maintenance agreements with N. Harris Computer Corporation for the licensing, implementation, support and maintenance of utility billing software.

- B117-17 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with the Greenbelt Land Trust of Mid-Missouri for the continued implementation of the "Our Natural Legacy: A Plan for Columbia and Boone County" open space/green infrastructure project.
- R49-17 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of improvements at the American Legion Park to include replacement of the existing playground and shelter, installation of lighting and a fire pit, and construction of ADA walkways within the park.
- R50-17 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of the FY 2017 sanitary sewer main and manhole rehabilitation project.
- R51-17 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of the Bingham Road and Ridgeley Road PCCE #16 sanitary sewer improvement project.
- R52-17 Setting a public hearing: proposed design and construction of sanitary sewers to serve the Henderson Branch Watershed.
- R53-17 Declaring the results of the April 4, 2017 municipal election.
- R54-17 Authorizing a Fourth Amendment to the software license and services agreement with Ramundsen Public Sector, LLC, as successor in interest to SunGard Public Sector, Inc., for a Records Management System (RMS) for the Police Department.
- R55-17 Authorizing Schedule B - Extension/Request for Additional Service(s) to the agreement with WebQA, Inc. for software services relating to open records requests.
- R56-17 Approving the Final Plat of Trade Winds Park, Plat No. 2B, a Replat of Lot 6-B of Trade Winds Park, Plat No. 2A, located on the northwest corner of Trade Winds Parkway and Richland Road in Boone County, Missouri, pursuant to the requirements of an annexation agreement between the City and the subdivider (Case No. 16-167).

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R57-17 Expressing support for the Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnerships (HOME) programs within the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD).

The resolution was read by Mayor Treece.
Mr. Cole provided a staff report.

The vote on R57-17 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: SKALA.

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.

- B118-17 Approving the Final Plat of Barcus Ridge, Plat No. 3, a Major Replat of Lot C2, Barcus Ridge Plat No. 1 and Lot 5, Barcus Ridge Plat No. 2, located on the north side of Old Plank Road and approximately 700 feet west of Abbotsbury Lane; authorizing a performance contract; granting a design adjustment relating to tier lots (Case No. 17-15).
- B119-17 Approving the Final Plat of C.E. Harr Plat 2, a Replat of Lot 1 of C.E. Harr Replat and part of Lots 7-10, 13 and 14, and all of Lots 15-18 of Wellington Gordon's Subdivision, located on the east side of Old 63, between McAlester Street and Gordon Street; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-73).
- B120-17 Approving the Final Plat of BMW Plat No. 1 located on the east side of Beverly Drive, between I-70 Drive SW and Bernadette Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-84).
- B121-17 Authorizing construction of improvements at the American Legion Park to include replacement of the existing playground and shelter, installation of lighting and a fire pit, and construction of ADA walkways within the park; calling for bids for a portion of the work through the Purchasing Division.
- B122-17 Authorizing an internship program agreement with the Society of Municipal Arborists to sponsor an urban/community forestry intern in the Parks and Recreation Department; appropriating funds.
- B123-17 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code relating to membership of the Substance Abuse Advisory Commission.
- B124-17 Authorizing Amendment No. 2 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services for tobacco control coalition services; appropriating funds.
- B125-17 Adopting a Missouri Property Assessed Clean Energy Show Me PACE Ordinance; authorizing the City of Columbia, Missouri to join Show Me Pace and stating the terms under which the City of Columbia will conduct activities as a member of such Board; authorizing the City Manager to execute the Show Me PACE Cooperative Agreement; directing the City Clerk to give notice to the Show Me PACE Clean Energy Development

Board; authorizing the City Manager, or designee, to serve as a member of the Advisory Council of Missouri Clean Energy District.

B126-17 Adopting a Missouri Property Assessed Clean Energy Missouri Clean Energy District Ordinance; authorizing the City of Columbia, Missouri to join the Missouri Clean Energy District and stating the terms under which the City will conduct activities as a member of such District; directing the City Clerk to give notice to the Missouri Clean Energy District; authorizing the City Manager, or designee, to serve as a member of the Advisory Council for Missouri Clean Energy District.

X. REPORTS

REP24-17 Correspondence from the Business Loop Community Improvement District (CID) regarding CID board membership.

Mayor Treece commented that he had an opportunity to speak with the applicants and recommended David Griggs, Gary Ennis, Lili Vianello, and James Gruender be appointed to the Business Loop CID Board of Directors. He noted this was an appointment of the mayor with the consent of the council, and asked if anyone had any objections. No one objected.

REP30-17 Correspondence from the Columbia Vision Commission.

Ms. Messina provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece stated he had a chance to visit with several of the members at the board and commission reception, and one of the thoughts he had was that this might be an effective group to look at the strategic plan and social equity milestones. They could help with measurements on the metrics and deliverables with respect to that plan. He commented that he was not inclined to disband them if they wanted to give them this task.

Mr. Thomas noted he liked that idea. He understood they had not had a strategic plan back when the visioning process was done so in many ways it had taken the place of the vision plan. He thought this group had a lot of energy and desire to continue working in the area and partnering with the Council on achieving its goals. He stated he would love to task them to look at the metrics staff was already tracking and measuring against the goals.

Mr. Trapp commented that he was not sure what an additional layer by a citizen commission would add as the strategic plan already had measurable objectives. He noted he had also considered the dashboard for the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence, but understood that had been handled by staff. He reiterated he was unsure of how a citizen board would add value to these processes.

Mr. Matthes noted he thought the letter represented what had been stated in that the mission had been accomplished. He commented that their might be a role in a future strategic plan, and suggested a work session whereby staff could present what other cities had done with these citizen groups. Mr. Thomas stated he was agreeable to that idea as it would give them time to figure out what they wanted to measure in the strategic plan and what they would regard as success. He asked Mr. Matthes if he was suggesting they did not want the Columbia Vision Commission to take on that role. Mr. Matthes replied the work had already happened as they had already received the first annual report on the current strategic plan. He noted they could critique it and there might be other elements of the plan where they could provide value. Mr. Thomas thought

they could start thinking about the next strategic plan. Mayor Treece suggested they visit about the issue at a future work session.

REP31-17 Report on Solar Eclipse Planned Events & Sponsorships.

Ms. Schneider and Ms. McConachie provided a staff report.

Mr. Ruffin understood they anticipated all events would be free and open to the public, including the distribution of the eclipse glasses. Ms. McConachie stated that was correct.

Mr. Trapp asked if they thought they might get 400,000 people. Ms. McConachie replied that number was based on a mathematical and geographical calculation of the number of people that could potentially drive into the area. It was the first day of classes at the University of Missouri and Columbia Public Schools would already be in session. They anticipated most of the traffic would be due to people in the region trying to get to Columbia. She explained part of the communication was to tell people to take their time in getting to Columbia. She was not sure there would be 400,000 people, and noted they would be able to provide a better estimate closer to the day. Ms. Schneider pointed out city-wide occupancy for the August Saturday, Sunday, and Monday was at 60 percent, which was unusual.

Mr. Thomas asked if hotel prices had gone up for that weekend. Ms. Schneider replied she only had the occupancy prices, and some were staying the same while others were closer to what it was for a football weekend. She thought it would depend upon how many more people called for reservations.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had reached out to the national media. Ms. McConachie replied yes, and explained there was actually an article in the L.A. Times highlighting Columbia as a great place to view the eclipse. She noted they had been in touch with different publications regionally and nationally. Mayor Treece suggested they reach out to producers of the national news in case they wanted to be here live in a City that had an organized effort around it. Ms. McConachie agreed Columbia was at an advantage in that it had the infrastructure to support a large event so it was something they were promoting. Ms. Schnieder pointed out they had in-kind sponsorships with print, television, and radio. Ms. McConachie stated three broadcast partners would promote locally leading up to the event.

REP32-17 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

Mayor Treece asked if the Public Works/Parking transfer involving the automated payment for the Plaza Garage involved the Short Street Garage or another garage. Mr. Matthes replied he thought it was for all of the garages.

Mayor Treece understood a lot of hotel guests used the one at the Short Street Garage and thought it might be convenient if they could also use their guest key to swipe for the parking garage. Mr. Matthes stated that would be the most complicated garage and they would work with the hotel to make it as convenient as possible.

Mr. Nichols agreed this was for all of the garages for standardization purposes, and they would have to work with the hotel in terms of the Short Street Garage. The company they planned to utilize had similar arrangements with hotels in other cities.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, asked if the Phoenix House provided assistance to working homeless people to obtain housing. Mr. Trapp replied he did not know as he had left the Phoenix Programs last summer. Mr. Elkin thought an entity was needed to reverse homelessness.

Caitlin Campbell, 307 St. Joseph Street, commented that she wanted to share a few concerns about transparency with Sunshine Law requests as someone who was more familiar with how the City handled records than the average person. She understood

R55-17 would extend the contract the City had for its new records request portal to add a module which collected and refunded fees, but what was approved also added two other features. One would allow custodians to draft cost estimates and invoice letters, and the other would automatically flag accounts that were submitting new requests, but had outstanding debt or invoices. In terms of the cost estimate letter, in the past she had noticed there was little consistency in how those were drafted and if departments would even give people breakdowns of the cost estimates. She hoped the new feature presented the opportunity to correct the issue and establish consistency city-wide as to if and when breakdowns were provided. In terms of the flagging feature, she understood it would track partial payments and notify staff when a requestor had outstanding invoices prior to staff beginning a new request. She stated debt or outstanding invoices should not have anything to do with new requests, and the Sunshine Law did not recognize those two things as related. She noted she had spoken with City staff on Friday, and her understanding was that the City intended to use the feature, but she hoped it was used in a way that outstanding invoices did not affect any action on a new request. In addition, if the feature was used to hold conversations between City staff and requestors, she hoped those conversations did not discourage requestors.

Mayor Treece commented that it was Ms. Campbell's audit of Sunshine Law practices of various entities that had triggered this transparency initiative, and one of the things she had found was the lack of consistency. He understood the City was better than some, but maybe not as good as the University of Missouri in terms of how they catalogued and fulfilled requests. He also understood she had beta tested this new system and had received a red flag indicating some of the information would not be available as it related to legal or personnel items even though that was not what she was requesting. Ms. Campbell stated that was correct. She explained certain words triggered flags as one typed into the new software, and she had been requesting items she knew were open. Mayor Treece understood her point was that someone that might not know any better might be discouraged by it and not take the next step. Ms. Campbell stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece stated he agreed with Ms. Campbell's comments in that Chapter 610 of the State statutes did not in any way prohibit someone who had not paid for a previous request from making a new request. He did not feel there should be an accumulation of grievances.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Campbell for clarification in terms of what she was asking for with regard to the invoice feature. Ms. Campbell replied some departments automatically provided an itemized breakdown of costs, such as a per page cost, a time cost, etc. It gave the requestor a good idea of the estimate. Other departments would not provide a breakdown until the request was paid for and fulfilled, so if the cost estimate was high, it was hard to determine why in order to negotiate it down. She also felt it was a transparency issue.

Mr. Sapp explained the parent company of GovQA, which was the software they were using for open records, utilized a standard invoicing module. The intent with this invoicing module was to address many of the concerns described by Ms. Campbell. It would allow for an invoice that provided a breakdown of materials versus research time, etc. They found the GovQA system had been very malleable through its implementation, and were cognizant of features that did not apply to the Sunshine Law. The flagging system in terms of outstanding invoices might be required by other customers, but it was something Columbia would not implement. Mayor Treece understood it was customizable.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a formal process for considering input such as the input that had been provided by Ms. Campbell. Mr. Sapp replied he was interested in hearing more about the issue Ms. Campbell had when typing in her request. He noted one of features of GovQA was to alert a person if the information could be found readily without having to file the request. If the word budget was typed, it should provide links to the website where the budget was housed.

Mr. Thomas asked if there were specific justifications to redact certain items and if there was any oversight mechanism to ensure the redaction was being done under valid conditions. Mr. Sapp replied the records custodians could freely reach out to the Law Department if they had a question concerning redactions. He noted with this new system they could put the Chapter 610 section and verse into the redaction document so the requestor knew the reason for the redaction.

Ms. Thompson pointed out there were times staff had identified information that might be sensitive, but was not necessarily a closed record, and in those situations they would look at whether it was information the requestor wanted or if it was something contained in a record that had been requested. She provided a birthdate as an example as it was not a closed record per the Sunshine Law, so if they redacted a birthdate, it was not because it was a closed record. It was because it was a sensitive record. If the requestor wanted the birthdate, it would be provided. She noted the requestor would not be charged for this type of redaction.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a specific list of the types of information that were closed records. Ms. Thompson replied the Sunshine Law contained a list. Mr. Thomas understood that included ongoing investigations in the Police Department. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas asked if a custodian redacted information due to it being a closed record if there was oversight that it was the correct decision by the custodian. Ms. Thompson replied a custodian would usually consult with someone in the Law Department if they planned to close a record. Mr. Thomas understood there was not a policy. Ms. Thompson stated it was not mandatory on every closed record and pointed out the custodian was trained to make those judgement calls.

Mr. Trapp commented that in response to Mr. Elkin, utility information was a public record so one could see if the user behavior met the net zero intent for which the building was designed.

Mr. Ruffin stated he had an announcement on behalf of Mr. Skala as the Choral Union, the University Singers, and the Concert Jazz Band would present the Abyssinian Mass by Wynton Marsalis on Thursday, April 20, 2017 at 7:00 p.m. in Jesse Hall. Special guests included Conductor Damien Sneed and Soloists Patrice Eaton, Martia Washington, Justin Michael Austin, and Djore Nance. It would also feature the golden voices of Karl and Mahree Skala.

Mr. Thomas explained they had received responses to a survey from 26 different organizations with an interest in having a community engagement process about policing. There was a lot of support for the process and good ideas in terms of how the process should evolve. He noted he, Mr. Trapp, Ms. Nauser, the former Fifth Ward Council Member, and Mr. Matthes had met last week, and were talking to the United Way and New Chapter Coaching as they had a lot of experience in convening and facilitation. He stated they would design a proposal for the City for a process leading to an event.

Mayor Treece asked if the proposal would come back to Council. Mr. Thomas replied yes.

Ms. Peters noted a citizen had contacted her about easement and right-of-way issues with Mediacom as they had placed flags in her yard months ago and tore up her yard a couple of weeks ago. The citizen did not realize her plants were in an easement, and since Mediacom had not communicated with her, she had not been provided the opportunity to move her plants. In addition, there were rocks where there used to be grass because Mediacom did not correct the problem they had created.

Ms. Peters understood there had been a report at the last council meeting with regard to right-of-way management, and could not recall if they had directed staff to bring forward an ordinance. Mayor Treece stated they had, but his sense was that it would only apply

to projects within the City's right-of-way, and the situation described was in someone's yard and not within City right-of-way. Ms. Peters agreed it was in a yard, but thought it had been in the City's easement. She asked staff how they could move forward. She felt if an entity was going to use the City's right-of-way or easement, the entity needed to notify those that owned the property of the work being done. Mr. Matthes replied they would follow up with a report, but pointed out the laws changed every year on who had rights to easements. He noted any report they provided with recommendations could be outdated after it was written.

Ms. Peters asked if Mediacom or any other cable company could just enter someone's yard. Mr. Matthes replied the answer was largely yes. He stated that certain industries had more eminent domain power than the government.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 10:01 p.m.