



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### City Council

---

Monday, December 6, 2021  
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 approximately 7:00 p.m. on Monday, December 6, 2021, 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 Member MATT PITZER, Council Member BETSY PETERS, Mayor BRIAN TREECE, Council Member PAT FOWLER, Council Member ANDREA WANER, Council Member KARL SKALA, and Council Member IAN THOMAS were present. City Manager John Glascock, City Counselor Nancy Thompson, City Clerk Sheela Amin, and various Department Heads and Staff Members were also present.

The July 19, 2021 regular council meeting minutes were approved unanimously on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Council Member Skala.

Mayor Treece explained the minutes were not yet complete for the August 16, September 7, September 20, October 4, October 18, November 1, and the November 15 regular meetings.

The agenda, including the consent agenda, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Council Member Skala.

#### II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI19-21

Columbia Bicentennial Presentation.

David Lineberry spoke.

LINEBERRY: Well, thank you, Mr. Mayor, and Members of the Council. It's great to see you this evening. This is the final month of our bicentennial year, and I'd wanted to take just a few moments, brief moments, to try to put a little bow on this work. First of all, I'd like to express my thanks and the thanks of the entire Task Force to the Mayor and all the Members of the Council for the opportunity to serve on the Task Force and to help the City observe this bicentennial. And I'd like to thank my colleagues on the Task Force for the opportunity they gave me to serve a leadership role in that function. I joined the Task Force late as a member of the history sub-workgroup and a great deal of work had already been done. You had

already in fact reviewed and given tentative approval to a park master plan. Councilperson Fowler had been a key to the early work of the committee, and my predecessor as leader, Brent Gardner, had also done a great deal of work. And Brent, though he could not maintain his position as chairman, went on to the leader of the initiative behind the *You Don't Say* project with KBIA, which has brought regional and national recognition to the City and its progressive approach to discussing minority experiences in Columbia's history. And I also want to acknowledge the excellent work of Deb Shields, an early co-chair of the Task Force, who then went on to single handedly guide the CID's project on a Gateway Plaza, and that is a wonderful asset to the community. In addition to the Task Force, we worked hand in hand and in hand in glove with just really a few of your excellent City employees and I want you to know that and to know specifically whom. We were capably assisted in everything by Amy Schneider and Megan McConachie of Convention and Visitors Bureau, by Mike Griggs and Mike Snider of the Parks and Recreation Department, by the City Manager, and by Sarah Dresser and the Office of Cultural Affairs. We touched many, many offices and they helped us, but those were the ones who really helped us make things possible all year long. We had three organizing principles, Inclusion, Celebration, and Legacy, and we executed in all three of those areas. And I saw many of you enjoying some of the events that we put on, but more importantly, I saw many, many Columbians of all ages, and all backgrounds and all abilities in all kinds of activities throughout the year. And I say these things not to point out what the Task Force has done. I say these things to point out what you have made possible, and I just really appreciate that and I'm thankful for that on behalf of the Task Force and on behalf of the City. We only have one bicentennial. And it was burdened by external issues, and you really facilitated the Task Force efforts to do everything they could within those strictures. We are not quite finished. The park project continues. The fundraising for the park project continues. I would be remiss without reminding you of our -- the excellent service the City and Task Force have received from Mr. Chris Kelly, who joined our effort after the Task Force was full and brought his experience as a career foundations and development officer at MU and with a family foundation in the region to the fundraising task. When others would provide only bids for services, Chris came and provided his expertise for free, and he has garnered multiple six figures worth of in-kind and cash pledges and donations toward the park project. So that has been an extraordinary, extraordinary gift. That effort continues. You can see the progress in the park, but you can't see a bridge there yet, and so that continues, and those opportunities to give continue. We also continue until the end of the year to pursue of the 200Trees Project and the portal is open through Parks and Rec if you or a group of your friends would like to sponsor a tree or a group of trees. Those are placed on a public location maintained by city staff, and though I'd like to say that a lot of the legacies we created will last a long time, I'm not real confident there are going to be too many that last as long as those trees will last, so I urge people to participate in that. And finally to go to our website, again, [COMO200.com](http://COMO200.com), where we still maintain the *Tell Us Your Story* portal to collect the narratives of the histories of individuals, families, organizations, churches in the town, and the town's impact on them, and I see a dearth of accounts there so far from city council people. And I will tell you, as a historian, if I were looking back at the city's 50th anniversary or 100th anniversary or 150th anniversary

-- if I had a handful of accounts from council persons of that day talking about themselves -- why were they serving, what did they believe in, what had they seen the community become or change in their time -- that would have been a huge, huge asset to myself and to other citizens studying the history of the City so I urge you to go do there and do that. In appreciation for all these things that you've done and more for your service, we have made arrangements for some item to acknowledge that, and we've gotten these from a regional artist, who was at one time an employee the CVB. Her name is Ashley Fishback and she is an artist in stained glass. And, so we have one of these for the Mayor and also one for every one of you looks like exactly like this. That is the emblem of Bicentennial in stained glass for each of you to enjoy. Information about the artist is in the box. So with that, I'll just draw my comments to a close. Are there any questions or comments that I would -- I'd be glad to entertain from Members of the Council. All right then.

TREECE: Mr. Chairman, on behalf of the City Council and a grateful community, I just want to thank you and convey my appreciation to the great work of the Bicentennial Commission. You know, as a former chair of the Historic Preservation Commission -- you have another former chair of the Historic Preservation Commission -- it was quite an honor to preside over the City's Bicentennial. You helped it come alive and tell that story. I am grateful for your commitment to inclusion and sharing all of our history, and making sure we had events that were accessible to people that really told a story. I could not be more proud of the *You Don't Say* series on KBIA, a clever double entendre that reflects both things that people don't know about Columbia, you don't say, and things that we rarely talk about, you just don't say. And, I think the stories that were told through that series from trusted messengers, I think, is a legacy of the bicentennial that I think are going to be a great treasure trove, if you will, in the future. I'm grateful for your time. I tell all of our board and commission members, but, especially, I think it's true of yours, I want you to look back at your year on this and be proud of what you accomplished, and you should be very proud of everything you accomplished.

LINEBERRY: Thank you very much.

SKALA: I just want to express my appreciation, certainly in view of the difficulties that we have all experienced in terms of COVID and so on. It was a worthy celebration. The amount of work that you folks have done and the gratitude that you've given to some of the folks by name is well worth it. I will look up your website and maybe take up your offer of to contribute. This is something that -- it only comes around once every once in a while in a long time. So, very much appreciate all of your work and the work of the group that you were with. Thank you very much.

LINEBERRY: Thank you sir.

SI20-21

Update on the Recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence.

Public Health and Human Services Director Stephanie Browning provided a staff report, and the Council asked questions to which the staff responded.

BROWNING: Good evening, brief update. I thought it was kind of important to have some discussion, as we're thinking about the ARPA funding and how to move ahead

and using that funds for community violence, to just kind of go back and revisit where we've been -- some of the challenges, successes that we've had, so we can think ahead. So, just for background, the Task Force was established in August of 2013. They -- you can see their charge was to evaluate available resources and recommend ways that the City government and citizens themselves can cooperate to decrease violent crime. We had two council members that co-chaired it, and the list of Task Force members is there for you. The Task Force was established in response to concerns about, not only violence, but particularly in our youth, and so youth was a focus of that initial group. So, they needed to provide the recommendations back to Council by November 15, 2014. Their methods included researching evidence-based approaches to reducing violence. They had presentations and public testimony at their meetings. They held three public forums, capturing concerns of both parents, youth, and community, and as provided in the council resolution, the Task Force disbanded when the report was completed. So, in thinking about their work, I've had people ask me -- is it still relevant? Is it timely - it's seven years old. And so, one of the things in the report was they pointed out local conditions -- they had 12 consensus points -- so drugs and alcohol, major contributing factors, negative perception of the police by the community, lack of economic opportunity that contributes to lack of hope, a need for adult basic education, they noted that almost all perpetrators had no job skills, there was a lack of early childhood education, they recognized that gangs existed in Columbia, but were not sure how to know how much of a factor they were, they noted that most perpetrators are men in their twenties, they noted that most homicides are conflicts between people who know each other, they talked about antisocial attitudes around respect and justice as being a major factor, they also talked about instilling in our children pro-societal attitudes and values as well as an ability to obtain basic educational skills, and they also noted as their twelfth point that a majority of violent offenders have a previous and often extensive criminal history. So I think that's one of the things as we think ahead -- are those consensus points still accurate today? I think they probably still hold true seven years later. They found four pillars that they felt could reduce violence. The first pillar is prevention. The second was intervention. The third was enforcement. And the fourth was reentry. And in their report, they touched on all of those. So for prevention, the big thing that they talked about was that we have a lot of good programs around parenting skills, early childhood education, job training, but they felt that there needed to be greater coordination and awareness of the programs, and that thread continued throughout the report. Some of their recommendations included things like approaching violence as a public health issue. They wanted to see research on violence interruption programs, like Cure Violence, more support for parenting in early childhood programs, more focus on job training. They wanted to see more community connections and tools to help people connect to services. They wanted to establish -- they wanted to make sure that our processes for social services funding were fair and equitable. They focused on Columbia Public Schools and youth programming. They wanted to see support and an increase in neighborhood watch programs, and they wanted to have an annual forum each year that talked about crime, social issues, and discrimination in the community. So in looking at prevention -- okay, so before I go into this, every year -- so in 2014, the report came out, and 2015, 17, 19 and 20, City staff, our department included, was

asked what had we done to help contribute to this issue in the community. And last year Gina Pate, our City fellow, produced a document that I believe was shared with all of you that was probably 130-some pages long. So, I'm not going to go back and hit every single thing that's happened since 2014, but I want to hit a few highlights. So, in prevention, we have our CARES program. We still continue to have that. They have 100 trainees annually. That is down. We used to have 200. We also used to have the CARE Art Gallery, and budget cuts reduced that funding, but we still have 100 trainees each year. We have our Healthy Families America Home Visitation Program that's new since we got that funding -- or since the community violence report -- and that's a program that reaches families, high risk families, in the community through home visiting. It's an evidence-based program. We have our -- we just had a grant for Brighter Beginnings, also a home visiting collaboration. It is really working across all the local providers. So it's that coordination piece -- working with all the local providers that are doing these services to make sure people get in at the right time at the right place to the right agency. We've seen an increase in housing vouchers for chronically homeless. Municipal Court has made some changes. We have a new upward -- Boone County has an Upward Mobility Grant that is designed to reduce racial and ethnic inequities and support upward mobility from poverty. We're one of eight counties in the country to have this grant, and they should have an action plan by June. Also in prevention -- so positive youth engagement -- Columbia Police has the Explorers and they've created like a career path development, Boone County Community Services hosted a Youth Violence Prevention Summit, and the Children's Services Commission has put out a \$750,000 RFP for youth violence prevention work, which we should hear something soon. We also have Community Scholars in the community. We host interns in the summer, Parks and Rec sports, you know, sports and recreational opportunities. In terms of community engagement, we've had a lot of work with the Inclusive Impact Institute, and recently, just this last month, Source Summit was held. Dr. Lester Woods -- I haven't had a chance to talk to him, but it was really to focus on social and economic justice issues, and I know that there's a lot of interest in this topic with that group -- so more to learn. In intervention, they talked about need for youth facilities and to train people to provide safe places, trusted people to turn to, and engaging community building programs that appeal to youth. Some of the things that they called out -- create a youth community cultural center, family access center, implement a violence interrupters program, increase the number of available mentors in the community, increase CPS's work to identify and help at risk students, they wanted school resources officers in the middle and high schools, and they wanted CPS to focus on minimizing the impacts that happen when kids have to transfer from school to school because of, usually, unstable housing and other crises. So here's some of the progress since that time -- with the Children's Services Fund, we now have the Family Access Center for Excellence. Boys and Girls Club did a huge expansion with the teen center, a recording studio, and a gym. We have new City sports facilities. Some of that has freed up some of the programming at the Armory because we now have the Fieldhouse. The Police Chief, I believe, will be bringing to you a new school resource officer agreement sometime this month, I think. And we now have mental health screening for all children in Boone County schools two times a year, and that's important. We have our African American Heritage Trail, we have success grants for higher education and

community caretaking, and again Boone County Children's Services funding not only covered the Family Access Center and the mental health screening, but it has brought in millions of dollars for expanded programming for infants, early childhood in schools, youth family support and treatment. Enforcement -- so in this one, in this section or this pillar -- the Task Force talked a lot about trust between the community and local law enforcement. They thought that at the time, CPD was headed in the right direction, but they thought that more work was needed to be done. They wanted to not only see more community policing, but greater cultural competency training. So in the enforcement area, you can see the City Manager, the Chief of Police, and the NAACP consult on policing issues. A Vehicle Stops Committee has been formed to address disparities. There's been some independent disparity analysis by an MU research team. We now have a CPD staff member, I believe it's an officer, certified in inclusion and diversity. CPD officers have been going through cultural competency training. They made a trip with community members to the National Civil Rights Museum. Of course, they -- we've had lots of demonstrations and so they feel like they've been focusing on protecting people's rights to assemble. And we now have processes where there's public participation and policy development. In the area of community policing, we've had a leadership and organizational change. Their performance and promotions are now based on community policing goals. Officers are assigned and accountable to beats as the resources allow. They're more engaging with residents, businesses, and groups. We have the Boone County Stepping Up Initiative that's new since this time, and that is a nationwide initiative that Boone County governments have very involved in along with others from the City to reduce the number of individuals with behavioral health challenges in the justice system. In terms of CPD staffing, their officers -- they were at 163 in 2014. It's grown to 187 for this year, but they also now staff airport security, park rangers, and metered parking. They do use community policing as a factor for their promotions and succession planning. The CPD Foundation -- one of the things in the report was that there should be more community appreciation of our officers, so CPD Foundation sponsors some annual employee awards. And it is a profession that's experiencing recruitment and retention challenges. Reentry -- so one of the things I think the group is worried about is people returning to Columbia, offenders returning to Columbia, with violent history or at high risk for future problems, and so they wanted a higher level of accountability for our highest risk offenders. So, they wanted to identify high risk offenders, create a City level reentry supervision program, require high risk offenders to attend and complete the Pathway to Change program, and to engage City staff in the Boone County Offender Transition Network. So, in the progress here, the City does partner -- we now have the ROC, which we didn't have -- the Reentry Opportunity Center. We partnered with the ROC. It's a one-stop shop for people that have been recently released from jail or prison and those under supervision in the criminal justice system. The group, the Boone County Offender Transition Network, has transitioned -- is now called the Central Missouri Recovery Coalition, and the City does partner with that. It's a coordinated network of community based services and supports. The one thing that was called for in the report was a City level reentry supervision program, and that's something that the City does not have express authority to do. Finally, in the report -- I think this is really important -- since the Task Force recognizes that violence

reduction is not a one-time fix, and that the pursuit of the recommendations given in this report will require accountability from government leaders, educational institutions, local nonprofits, local businesses, and citizens. And so I think -- my point -- when I read that, I thought, it isn't just a City problem. It's a community problem, and we have to have solutions together. So when I was doing -- putting this together -- my working title was Stephanie's thoughts -- my thoughts entirely. One of the things I think that we really missed the ball on in 2014, after the report came out -- so we did not dedicate a person to coordinate across City departments with County government, with the educational institutions and the nonprofits. We just did not put the resources there, and so, I think that that's something moving ahead, that really needs to be considered. It has to have somebody that can really focus on that work. I believe it has to have a strong equity focus in anything we do with meaningful community engagement, continued emphasis on employment, affordable housing, and basic needs. We have to focus on reducing poverty. We have a lot of new grassroots organizations that are coming up, and it's hard to be a new organization coming up when you're in a community that has so many powerful nonprofits. We need capacity building for them. We need to continue to focus on safe spaces, places, and activities for youth. Of course, policy development is always important to address systems issues and that's an area where you have great impact, and again, to continue to local resource coordination. So, this is where I sort of need some input from you and I don't necessarily expect it tonight, but I sure would like to have some continuing conversations. When this Task Force was put together, the focus was youth. Many of our recent shootings, they're not youth. They're adults. So is our scope community violence in a big way? Do we want to consider things around it? Okay, if we talk about it as a public health issue, what that means is that we look closely at data, we say okay, what's happening -- you diagnose a problem. It's not just shootings. You look at where, you look at all that data, and then you figure out what are the strategies that are going to make the greatest impact. So, do we want to include things like domestic violence, child abuse, sexual violence, in addition, to gun violence. You have to consider the trauma that results from violence. And it's that trauma and those adverse effects that affect people's physical and behavioral health, often for life, and especially when it's trauma in children. And so, one, I think we need to define, what are we looking at when we do this -- what kind of violence? Community violence prevention is an allowable expense for ARPA. I need to know, are there specific program areas you would like to work on? There were four pillars. Do you want to work on prevention and intervention because that's really broad in that report? We know that there's many grassroots organizations committed to doing important work, and it's essential that we recognize that work that they want to do and that we find meaningful ways to partner, and so one of my questions -- how do we use this fund, this funding, to increase their capacity and meet the really strict requirements that come with ARPA? The accountability requirements -- I read the 32 page Treasury note today. It's strict. And finally, how do we leverage our available resources to have transformational change, and how do we sustain because this ARPA funding isn't forever? So those are thoughts and -- that I think merit future discussion. It doesn't necessarily have to be tonight, but it's something I really welcome because I don't know how we move forward without having some basic questions answered. So happy to take any questions.

TREECE: So, I'll -- thank you for the recap, and I think it's very informative. I was one of the people that were asking, well, is that 2014 report still relevant, and it's good to see some of the priorities that were identified and the steps that we've taken and the steps -- I think you're on the right track with your last two pages of Stephanie's thoughts. I'll add three more to that, if you will. And with respect to youth crime, you know, that was really part of the function on this. I appreciate the comment that you made about school resource officers. I understand the Chief's going to bring us back a proposed contract for four in the high schools, but, you know, from parents and teachers and school resource officers I talk to -- I mean, it's middle school where you choose, you know, whether you go the good way or the bad way. And I would suggest that, or I would recommend that Council consider jumpstarting that contract with the School District -- that we add maybe four more school resource officers at the middle school, maybe even floating into the elementary school one day a week, to help identify kids that have a parent picking them up at the end of the day or do they have a winter coat or not. I mean, all of those indicators of that -- this child, we just need to keep an eye on him or her as they grow into that system. And so I would suggest that. The other thing that you didn't mention there and was a direct outcome of this was Ban the Box. This Council, not this -- the previous Council adopted a Ban the Box that, you know, that employers, you know, may have otherwise automatically disqualified a justice involved individual from even getting past that next stage of the interview process. There's a program in St. Louis operated under St. Louis University called the Workforce Academy. They now have over 150 employers that participate in this program for justice involved individuals. They may be on probation and parole, they may have just had an arrest, they may have, you know, had a municipal -- whatever it may be. That helps job train those individuals, connect them with employers, and, frankly, in today's labor market with today's labor shortages, we should have a lot of participants from the employer side on this. But we just don't stop when we connect them with a job. We continue with some type of job coaches that work not just with that justice involved individual, but with the employer about how to motivate that person, what to say, and what not to say, how do we make sure that person has the means to get to the job on time, what do you wear to that job, how do you act, you know, what type of shift or work place is best for you with your skills. And then a third issue that I think that you briefly hit on there that we had a better job of is that Offender Reentry Program. The common denominator over the last three shootings have all been the individuals -- and you can Google this -- have had some type of prior arrest, if not incarceration. And, what, in addition to that job Workforce Academy, what peer counseling do we need from people, you know, at ROC, at other offender reentry programs, that we can, you know, keep them out of falling back into that situation or that environment or that home life or that gang life or whatever it may be that causing them to recidivate? So those are the three things that I would add.

SKALA: Just a few comments. You asked for some suggestions, perhaps. I look back on some of this and think about the Violence Task Force, which was ably represented on this body by Laura Nauser and Mike Trapp. Man, that occurred in 2014. It was also August of 2014 that Ferguson happened, and subsequent to that lots of -- there was a lots of introspection and looking back and so on. That that 2014 report, rightly highlighted, prevention, intervention, enforcement, and reentry,



and I think recently, very recently, I forwarded to you and the City Council some of the conversation that was occurring at the National League of Cities at the last summit that occurred very recently in November. There was a report that was generated by -- with the cooperation of the Race, Equity and Leadership Council and lots of other groups, primarily, the federal advocacy groups that NLC represents. It was called reimagining public safety, a toolkit for cities and towns. It reinforced a lot of the pillars that we had in this community on a parochial level, if you will, for some of our other -- the issues that were going on. And to address the Mayor's point about is this outdated or not, or should we update it. I think that document, which is really pretty extensive -- it's about a 40 page document -- reinforces some of those approaches, but modernizes it to some degree and addresses some of the issues that we are dealing with or have dealt with in this community, most recently, particularly in the downtown area, which is which is getting all the notoriety. That report emphasizes engagement, restructuring, and balance. That's the whole reimagining thing, not the defund the police, but to reimagine the whole idea. So, I guess what I'm -- the question I wanted to ask you was, you see this -- one of the failures that we have and I agree with you absolutely -- one of the failures was there was no single leader to coordinate some of this between the County and the City and the School District and so on. Do you see any or does the office -- in the last budget we appointed a diversity, equity, and inclusion officer and an assistant, a two person office -- do you see some of that responsibility falling to that group or is this totally separate -- that it requires another -- a different kind of leadership, not just specifically that particular office?

BROWNING: I mean, obviously, not knowing who's going to be in it and what their expectations are -- I think it's a really good place for it.

SKALA: Yeah.

BROWNING: Yeah. I mean, because this - these issues are around equity.

SKALA: Of course, and this will be the responsibility of the new city manager, when that city manager is appointed, and I think that's going to be a momentous appointment. So I was just wondering if you see that that's a reasonable home for some of that activity.

THOMAS: Yeah, thanks Stephanie for doing a deep dive on what the Task Force recommended and what has happened since then. And I certainly agree, it was a mistake, I mean, maybe we didn't -- just didn't have resources to put somebody in charge of implementing those recommendations and working across jurisdictions to do that. But now we have a lot of funds that we could do that with. There's the equity officer that's in the budget that will be appointed sometime early next year as well as other ARPA funds that could be used for several years for that position, so I think that given that this is such a critical issue that would be well warranted. What I recall from the presentation of the report and the kind of early discussion -- the Violence Interrupters Program -- a lot of people had a lot of hope for that. People really from the community being, you know, on the ground, in community, in contact with -- particularly in very underserved neighborhoods where violent situations sometimes erupt and being able to interrupt those situations. And we did do a small pilot program in about 2015-16 -- hired two part time staff who were community leaders, very engaged. I never saw any kind of report or summary of that program. I heard anecdotally it was going -- it was quite successful, but do you have any more information about that?

BROWNING: I don't. I mean, we worked -- our department worked with Glenn and Judy, when they would have some -- identify someone with resource needs -- we would try and connect them with some social service organizations. And I don't know how successful it was because a lot of the times when we'd get those referrals, when we would call people back, people would say that they were not -- that they didn't need them. So, you know, that was again -- they worked pretty closely with the city manager so, I don't, I don't know what the results of that were.

THOMAS: Based on sort of more recent research and reports and so on, is that a program that -- a type of program that you feel has promise, still?

BROWNING: I think -- Geoff's here, he can also speak to this, but I think that it has -- I think that there's some mixed results out there. Some things cite that there is evidence that it is good, and then there's some other things that I think are going to need some more study about, like some mixed results based on just on the study methodology. St. Louis has a program now -- they've got a Cure Violence Program. It is within an organization called Employment Connection. I met last week with the Moms Demand Action Group, and they're going to be very helpful in identifying programs, similar kinds of programs, whether it's Cure Violence or others, that are being implemented in communities more our size, because when you think of St. Louis City, and its size, and then you think of Columbia -- you know, like, is it scalable? It needs some research, but in the Employment Connections program -- it's a huge, huge nonprofit -- and the Cure Violence is one piece. They do all these wraparound different services and mental health and employment training, and -- so it's -- that is one piece of a very large organization, but Geoff may have --

JONES: [Police Chief Geoff Jones] So, I'm talking about programs that do that interruption and we've had these conversations for months, if not years, at this point. It has been very difficult to find anything that has shown consistent success. A lot of the more recent literature that has come out on those programs shows mixed results at best. What I will say is that most of those studies occur in larger metropolitan areas, and of course, Columbia is much smaller. So, I think there's an opportunity to work and find the thing what works for us. I would caution you in finding something that is canned and thinking that we can just implement a program based on someone else's success or failure because it could go either way. I think there needs to be more research. To that end, I did reach out this past week to our benchmark cities asking what types of programs are out there and if any of them are participating. I don't have responses back, but I can forward those when I get them. So, I'd be -- I'm curious as to what we might find with other jurisdictions that are similar in size and makeup.

THOMAS: Alright, thanks, Geoff.

PETERS: I would say, again, thank you Stephanie for the information, and I think we might want to consider whether we want, like a monthly report or every two months report, something that keeps this at the top of our of our thinking versus, you know, sort of falling back. I liked Karl's question about a coordinator for this program, and I think we probably need one, and I would not expect it to be one of or two equity officers. I would really think we'd need someone who -- that's their focus, that's what they do. It's not part of their job. It's their job to see what we need to do with the schools and are our school resource officers being as effective as we expect them to be, and do we, you know -- where are we with our offenders that are out of prison and getting them to jobs and getting them the support they

need so they don't end up in problems and that kind of stuff. So, you know, I think the two programs that you recommended and our coordinator are the first three things we should look at, but we also need to really keep looking at this and seeing what else we need to do and getting reports on what we have done. So those are my thoughts.

WANER: So, I have a question for Stephanie. So, in a lot of the recap that you provided, it seems like the County really understood the assignment. Like they showed up and they were doing these things, and -- how do we be more like the County? Is it the mental health tax, the children's stuff? Is it political fortitude? Like what's the -- where's the difference lie between what the County has been able to accomplish?

BROWNING: Well, definitely, the Children's Services Tax has helped a lot because it's brought an infusion of major resources. And it started -- it did not start till about 2015 or 2016, so -- and the Family Access Center opened. But, I mean, also with a lot of justice work that the County has been receiving grant funding on -- a lot of it is Commissioner Thompson, you know, and that's an area of interest for her and -- that she feels very passionate about and so she has been able to get on the National Association of Counties on some different committees and it's really helped to attract some funding into Boone County.

FOWLER: I have a couple of questions for Stephanie and perhaps the Chief. But, do school resource officers have to be officers? Could we not put caring adults with training into our schools who could be there as their liaison to do that work, to identify children that might be in danger of having a neglect issue or they're in a situation that needs to be remedied so they don't -- we don't start that ball rolling with lifelong trauma.

BROWNING: That part I'd have to ask Geoff about. But one thing with the Children's -- the mental health screening that's being done twice a year -- I mean, that's significant. Right? So that is -- so what we really need is to connect -- how do we connect the screening results and identifying kids who are at risk, and then what? And, you know, like I said, this is coming up pretty quick, so, I mean, I need to do a lot more discussion with Columbia Public Schools and all the other districts and how they're -- what they're doing with that, and Geoff may have --

JONES: I think it's really about defining roles. We've tried to do that with an MOU with CPS. When I first came, and we were having a discussion when we did have SRO in schools, we changed our MOU so that we were not being used as a discipline tool. You'd have to see that MOU and I can forward you a copy of that. You really have to define the role of the SRO and decide whether you want a police officer there, someone else that takes on the responsibility as you mentioned, or both. It just -- it really depends on how the role is defined.

FOWLER: I'm -- this might be another question for Stephanie too -- I know that you're both going to go back and forth, but I'm sort of struck by this idea that a school that has, I don't know, 1,200 kids can be appropriately resourced with a single individual. Now, I know that there's guidance counselors but there's no longer as many guidance counselors in a school as there was when I was in high school. So, this -- I'm troubled by the idea that -- I mean, not only do we have a problem to address at the youth level, but we also have an adult problem with community violence, which Stephanie identified. And when we're trying to solve, or get to the root of problems by just putting a single person who couldn't possibly

keep track of everything that's going on -- I mean, you probably hit the most noticeable cases you can see and try and do something about. And my other comment on that is -- when we're talking about grassroots organizations, there's a lot of people in this town and there's a lot of people of color in this town that had been working for free for years to try and improve the conditions in their community. And the funding processes that the City currently offers denies them funding because they have to have the resources up front to pay their staff and then be reimbursed later. And so it's an extension of the credit problem that communities of color are already experiencing. So what I want to stress to you as you go through this process, and I hope that you and I can have subsequent conversations about this, is that we find a different model. If we're going to ask members of the community, trusted members of the community, to help us in this work -- that we pay them fairly, that we make sure we pay them ahead of time so that they can do the work without having to put their own personal lives and their family lives under stress, and that we take a long look at how we currently fund not-for-profit services that are trying to address gaps in our community, whether it's between black people and brown people or regardless of who. The fact that we are denying the very trusted people who could probably do this work effectively and perhaps even more effectively because of the way we distribute funds.

BROWNING: I absolutely agree. That's why I said we need to focus on capacity building. The City's process for social service funding, the children's services process, United Way -- they all use a common application and form, and you know that that is born out of, really, the public demand for accountability with taxpayer funds, right? And so, these systems are set up whe

### III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

### IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC69-21 Steve Callis - Environmental concerns.

Steve Callis spoke.

CALLIS: Good evening. I'm Steve Callis and I live at 6304 West Normandy Lane. I'm the State Coordinator for International Compost Awareness Week. There's been a great deal of discussion lately about the environment in general, and methane emissions in particular. I wanted to offer some updated information on those topics tonight. Methane is a greenhouse gas that is up to 80 times as damaging as carbon dioxide when considered over a 20 year time frame. Organic waste, primarily food waste, generates methane as it decomposes in the landfill. The EPA has estimated for a number of years that 20 percent of the methane generated in landfills escapes to the atmosphere. More recently, research conducted in California by NASA and a private firm utilizing advanced technology indicates that some landfills about two to six times the EPA estimates. During the recent COP26 Conference, the Global Alliance of Organic Recycling Associations issued a call to increase recycling of organic waste back to the soil. Also, during that COP26, the United States signed on to the global methane pledge, which aims to reduce the overall amount of methane produced and released to the atmosphere. The Sierra Club and other organizations have long recommended diverting organic waste from landfills to

prevent methane being produced in the first place. Doing that would fall in line with global, national, and local priorities, such as the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan. Locally, the 2019 report from the City's consultant, Burns and McDonnell, reported that food waste makes up to -- makes up 17.8% of the total solid waste stream. Half that food waste comes from commercial sources, and the other half from residential sources. Ideally, each household would compost their own organic waste at home. The City provides composting workshops to encourage this, but annually over 15,000 tons of residential food waste still ends up in the landfill. Columbia landfill allows food waste to be dropped off at the landfill composting facility, but this isn't a convenient option for most. In 2019, Columbia passed an ordinance allowing private contractors to be licensed to collect commercial food waste to be composted. City Code still makes it illegal for anyone but the City to collect residential food waste, but the City isn't able to offer residential curbside food scrap collection due to ongoing staffing issues. The only remaining option is to allow private contractors to be licensed to provide that service. No tax dollars would be involved, but there would likely be a fee to the customers. Now there's been some discussion regarding the possibility that licensing private contractors to provide this service would cost jobs within the solid waste utility, but with those current staffing issues, I don't think that's likely to happen. Some have complained that trucks collecting residential food waste would cause additional wear and tear on residential streets. This type of service will be provided using smaller trucks, smaller than garbage trucks, with less wear and tear on the streets. Still others have suggested that these collections would require the infamous roll carts. Residential food scrap collection would be accomplished by providing five gallon pails to the individual customer with those being swapped out every week. Pick up an empty pail and leave a clean -- I'm sorry -- pick up a full pail and leave behind a clean empty pail. There's been some concern about the reduction in methane production, reducing the amount of electricity produced by burning landfill gas in the generators. It would take several years for this to become noticeable because there's already a great deal of organic waste decomposing in the landfill. By the time this does occur, the City should be able to make up for that shortfall, with other less polluting forms of renewable energy. Columbia needs to take a leadership role in reducing the global methane problem. Failure to do so will only exacerbate an already intolerable situation. The time to act is now so I strongly urge the Council to direct the City Manager to develop an ordinance with input from interested parties that will allow private contractors to be licensed to provide residential curbside food scrap collection. Thank you for your time.

SPC70-21 Rose Metro - Following through with commitments made by Council on 11/15 to implement a community violence intervention program.

Rose Metro spoke.

METRO: Rose Metro, 206 South Garth Ave., speaking on behalf of Moms Demand Action for Gun Sense in America, a nonpartisan grassroots organization dedicated to reducing gun violence in all forms. On November 15, many people including Traci Wilson-Kleekamp from Race Matters Friends, Rebecca Shaw from COMO for Progress, and Kristin Bowen for Moms Demand Action urged the City to use ARP funds to implement a community based violence Intervention Program. Council expressed support and planned to gather stakeholder input, yet no timeline was

laid out and the leader designated. It doesn't seem to have progressed. There absolutely should be community engagement on a range of issues, but the City seems unequipped to do so with current staffing. Moreover, as we heard, the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence already expressed support for a sustained fully funded intervention program in 2014, which was not implemented. Missouri has the highest rate of gun homicide among Black people in the entire nation, and Columbia is part of that. It is past time to act. I'll offer some ideas on how. I and other Moms leaders met with Public Health and Human Services staff last week and I'll share ideas that emerged. First, there are multiple evidence based programs with documented results, not only Cure Violence, but also Advanced Peace, and those mixed results that Chief Jones referred to come in when those programs are not fully funded and sustained. Nothing like them has ever been implemented in Columbia. Councilperson Thomas noted that Glenn and Judy did anti-violence outreach, and while acknowledging their important work, this would be a comprehensive program with an entire team of outreach workers and built in evaluation. Also, we have the money. Given that St. Louis spent \$7 million on Cure Violence over three years and Kansas City underfunded its Aim for Peace program at \$500,000, it's clear that our investment should be in the millions and last years. ARP funds could cover that substantial investment that would allow us to reap long term benefits while a one time under investment would only contribute to the false narrative that these programs don't work. It can be done in a city Columbia's size. Nina Hampton will discuss Kalamazoo, Michigan, which is smaller than Columbia. They just made a million dollar investment with ARP funds in gun violence prevention. These programs could be more successful in small cities because there can be greater coverage. So, the data and supportive of Cure Violence that Kristin shared previously is compelling, but to work as intended, a street outreach program needs to be supported by a broader social safety net. Job opportunities, access to mental health and substance abuse counseling. The City grip toolkit that Councilperson Waner mentioned last meeting provides complementary strategies tailored to a city of our size, including tracking gun violence, offering violence reduction fellowships, using multi-discipline homicide and shooting incident reviews, hospital based intervention etc. In other words, a violence intervention program could be the linchpin in a broader strategy of treating gun violence as a public health emergency. Instead of merely reacting to gun violence, through policing, we should be proactively preventing it by providing opportunities and diffusing conflicts. This could save money and reduce the burden on police in the long term. So, what happens next, the City put's out an RFP, an organization such as Power House or Love Columbia or FACE or CMAC could make a professional service agreement with the City. This organization would host the program, which would train outreach workers, our academic community, including Mizzou's Peace Studies program or MU Healthcare might support evaluation. Outreach workers would come from communities most impacted by gun violence, who understand its root causes and have the legitimacy to intervene. We have so many people with those skills, not just community leaders already known to us, but ordinary people whose names we may not know -- people who go to Vibe Lounge, people who have lost loved ones to gun violence. These people may be critical of Police or City leaders. They may have truths to share that would make people in this room uncomfortable, but they have so much wisdom. We just need to

empower them to use that wisdom to keep us all safer. And obviously that's not me. I'm a white woman, not a survivor of gun violence, and my organization started focused on mass shootings. For years, we did not respond effectively to the intersection of racism and gun violence, and while we're gradually diversifying, leaders like me are still learning from those most impacted and building partnerships. After Kristin spoke last time, City Council members and other speakers thanked Moms Demand Action. They did not thank Traci, Rebecca, Roy Lovelady, December Harmon, or the other people who have been advocating for similar initiatives for years. I don't think it was intentional, but it did cause pain, and I am sorry for that. So, although I'm speaking for a national organization, I do so as part of a coalition, including the people wearing orange here tonight. So, declare gun violence a public health emergency, commit to spending millions in ARP funds over several years on community violence intervention, put out an RFP to implement Cure Violence, Advance Peace, or a similar program as soon as the new city manager is in office, along with identifying other initiatives required to support it. Thanks so much.

SPC71-21 Susan Renee Carter - Action for taking responsibility and showing accountability.

Susan Carter spoke.

CARTER: Susan Renee Carter. I live at 2105 Hillsborough Drive. Comment I would like to start out with -- it doesn't really have to do with what I was going to speak about, although it does -- is that in the past, I've spoken to you about the research surrounding use of resource officers in schools, and if you read the research, you will find that there's no evidence supporting the fact that it helps situations. Some of the things that were suggested by Pat have a lot more clout when it comes to helping young people in the school system. If you put police officers in the school, all you do is end up with more children being incarcerated, and ending up in prison as adults. So, I'll start with that. And then, I'd also like to mention when you were going over how money had been spent for youth and jobs -- I want to point out the CARE program has been around for a long time. That program targets youth that are at risk. That's the primary concern of that program. Over the course of time, the dealings I've had with CARE is that 30 percent of those youth that were going through the CARE program to do a work experience ended up being hired by the employer that supported that person in that job. And if that doesn't affect your thoughts about how outcomes happen and that you should be fully funding that -- my understanding is that you now pay those youth's sub-minimum wage. Is that true? Is -- was that a change that you made because of your budget? That's my understanding. If you read the research about what happens to children at risk that are paid below minimum wage and what that does to their self-esteem and their view of themselves and their worth as workers, you will see that the outcomes are not good. So those are two things I'd like to advise you about on the discussion about where you're going with some of your programs because they're not going to reduce crime in your City if you don't do them right. And so, it brings me back to why I came up here to talk -- is about responsibility and accountability. After the November 14 downtown officer involved shooting, I was very concerned at the press briefing I went to and the council meeting I went to. Both of those instances disappointed me in how the City is handling these situations. At the briefing, it

ended up -- I felt like a lot of blame was placed on the Vibez owner and I've since seen that in the media. It continues to come up that the shootings occurred at the Vibez when in fact it didn't. There are a lot of other businesses around there, and I want to help you focus on the fact that if something like that happened at Walmart, and someone was in the parking lot and there was a shooting. Even though you can go in Walmart and you can get liquor any time of the day or night, you can go back out into the parking lot and you can drink it, and then you can re-enter the building of a shooting occurs in the parking lot. I don't think we would be saying we were going to be laser focused on them. So, we need careful not to be involved in what's known as dog whistle politics, where we create instances and views of certain people or certain races of people around incidents that happen in our community. I've felt like at the council meeting last time it was business as usual. We talked about sewers, we talked about traffic calming, we talked about land acquisition, but we didn't talk about the events that had occurred in the City even though we're saying we're a City in crisis until the members of the Council, you know -- the participants came to the podium and engaged the Council in a conversation. So I would like to see our Council be more accountable. I'd like to see them to be more engaged when there's really a problem with our City. Thank you.

SPC72-21

**Karen Sicheneder - Community input for Broadband Taskforce and future-proofing infrastructure.**

Karen Sicheneder spoke.

SICHENEDER: Hi, so, I'm here to piggyback on the discussion that we had in the work session today on broadband and the existing Task Force that is in place around this issue, and I wanted to bring up some of the things that I have been uncovering and discovering in the quest for this information. Now I represent Senate District 19 on the Missouri Democratic Party State Committee, and part of our platform is internet access as a public utility, and there's a reason for that. We had a lot of discussions today around gaining access to the maps that are held by the privately owned internet service providers in order to figure out where the City can lay infrastructure. I would challenge and I would argue we don't need those maps. What we need is for the City to invest in a citywide fiber infrastructure that the City can then lease out to private internet service providers, or further down the line, we can have a city owned ISP, and there's a couple of different reasons for this. We have several different equity points when it comes to this infrastructure. We have an equity point of neighborhoods that don't have internet access at all. There is no infrastructure getting it out into those neighborhoods. We also have neighborhoods that simply have aging infrastructure. These infrastructures in place are most often privately owned, and there's little to no incentive for these privately owned companies to go in and replace that infrastructure where we end up having situations like what Susan Maze has, where she has internet access but it's terrible because the infrastructure needs to be replaced. And then we also have the additional equity issue of the cost of internet, and quite frankly, there's not a whole heck of a lot that the City would be able to do about the cost if the City doesn't own the infrastructure. If the City owns the infrastructure and then they can actually put forward a City-owned internet service provider, the City would have the opportunity to be able to provide those services at a cost that would be much more equitable to communities that need that. Because of all of these issues,



trying to figure out what these privately held internet service providers already have doesn't matter. I don't care that they already have the infrastructure in place. They can sell that at whatever cost they need. We would still have the opportunity as the City to be able to have this for lease to new or existing internet service providers, thus creating some actual free market competition. Up until recently, a lot of the issues that people were seeing across the board were the internet service providers were working together to divvy up the city so that there wasn't really any competition and then they could fix rates at whatever they wanted them to be at. And this became an issue, as neighborhoods like mine, only had access to one internet service provider. We didn't have an option. Even though there's multiple companies in town, I only have access to one internet service provider. The infrastructure is there, but it's privately owned, and I can't shop around. I don't have that option. I want the option to be able to shop around. I want to be able to go to a different internet service provider if what they're giving me isn't working. I want to be able to get rates that are actually competitive. I really can't afford my internet access -- really can't afford it. It's too much for what I actually use. And in addition to that, I don't really have the option of rolling back my services because they don't build that into the plan because they don't have to -- because there's no competition. So, I want us to seriously consider looking at what the other cities around Missouri have done, and I gave you some packets today that goes over what has happened in Springfield, Missouri. They have actually taken out a loan for the \$120 million that was necessary for them to lay their own infrastructure, and then, in addition, they created a contract with CenturyLink where they are recouping those costs at about \$17 million a year, which means it will take them about 10 years to pay it off. So even if we can't get access to grants that are out there, which we would need a consultant in place in order to gain access to those grants, we could still pay for this on a loan and we could pay for this on a loan from our own utilities. We could get a lower interest loan from power and light to lay the infrastructure and then repay ourselves for what would essentially end up being a cash cow for the City that also creates equity in internet service. Thank you.

SPC73-21 Nina Hampton - Community gun violence, a public health issue.

Nina Hampton spoke.

HAMPTON: Good evening, Council. My name is Nina Hampton. I live at 202 Bay Pointe Lane in Columbia, Missouri. I'm delivering this comment written by my friend, Ruth Friar, who also lives in Columbia. It's titled Gun Violence a Public Health Issue. My friend Ruth lived in Columbia from 1975 to 1990. She move to Kalamazoo, Michigan, and returned to Columbia in 2018. She describes Kalamazoo downtown as a pedestrian mall much like Broadway. It stretches the entire length of downtown. Public safety officers patrol the downtown area on foot and bicycle and horseback. On the end, the mall is anchored by the bus train station and the Kalamazoo Gospel Mission, a temporary shelter that includes resources for the unhoused. A block from the Mission is a community health center. Across the street, a converted multi-story hotel that provides permanent subsidized housing. The mall itself is about six blocks long. At the opposite end is an accessible rapid mental health substance abuse treatment center. Around the corner from the treatment center, a bakery and chocolatier called Confections with Convictions, the parole office -- a block further Michigan employment and rehabilitation services.

Individuals in need can literally access all the services by walking in one end of the mall to another. The paper I gave you has data comparing Columbia and Kalamazoo that might be of interest. Kalamazoo is a little over half the size of Columbia, and funds more for public health than Columbia. On the surface, the City recognizes improving public health welfare is part of a community public health strategy. The other appears to fund police at the expense of public health. A few weeks ago, we had another traumatizing event in our community. Four people were injured and a man was killed. It was characterized as a mass casualty incident to accurately -- inaccurately characterize it as such caused additional trauma. To blame R'velle Fair for the violence that visited his club's door is completely unacceptable. Paraphrasing, Ibram X. Kendi, "to be Black is to be constantly rendered the problem. The problem is not black people. It is much more accurate to identify our unresponsive systems of government as the problematic perpetrators of our community's current and collective mass casualties." Kalamazoo has acknowledged that decreasing community violence requires a focus on inequity. They have embraced creating a vibrant community deeply invested in public health equity to ameliorate the root causes of violence to intentionally make services visible and accessible. For Kalamazoo, race is not a proxy for poverty, disadvantage, or disparity. Instead there are identifiable public health issues. All forms of violence are more frequent when access to health care and trauma informed public health resources are limited. When citizens see opportunity as limited, government unresponsive, police not as guardians -- when they live in areas for danger is concentrated, if the environment is routinely hostile, when owning and obtaining a weapon is seen as a logical way to stay safe, acting violently becomes a violent presentation strategy. These acts of violence represent a response to trauma, poverty, disadvantage, and disparity -- all public health issues. We are serious about community -- if we are serious about community violence, then it starts with conversations about public health, period. Local government systems must operate in openness and transparency, trust, and use the data available to make decisions to assign resources where they are most needed. This is why our City needs to work in collaboration with County to direct our public health department to provide the resources and to take action that coordinates expanded efforts to access community violence at its source. Our community has individuals and groups ready to step up and help. In 2014, the Mayor's Task Force on Violence set aside funds and made specific immediate recommendations to interpret community -- interrupt community violence. These recommendations have not been implemented. Rodney March of Rock the Community requested CARES funding to continue and expand known successful violence interruption strategies already being used within our community. The request was not funded until the second round. Shaunda Hamilton, mother of a victim of gun violence, started her own organization to interrupt community violence. Why aren't these two programs and others like them being elevated and fully funding as a functional interrupters of community violence that they are? We're serious about -- if we are serious about addressing gun violence in our community, we must name it as a public health emergency that it is -- as if our lives depend on it because they do. Thank you.

SPC74-21 Adam Saunders - Requesting surplus funds for community food security.

Adam Saunders spoke.

SAUNDERS: Good evening. I appreciate the opportunity to share with you all a little bit about the history, the last six years of this public-private partnership, and a view of what was a vacant Clary-Shy Community Park. I remember with Mike Griggs looking at this and getting the team together of what could be and how can we address food security, and we've created a big onion, a lot of layers to it that touch on food security, but well beyond that, I think, relevant to our discussion earlier today in the big picture. So a quick background, this is a public private partnership -- started back in 2015. It's come a long way. Columbia Parks and Rec has been the key interface that we've had with the City, been great to work with, to put together this open 10 acres into something very unique. It's more than a park. It has deep roots in service to the community. And we've been able to work through this timeline over the last few quick years. Looking at the numbers, to date, we've raised over \$5.9 million dollars. If you look at the numbers, about three-quarters of that is from private sources so big thank you to all the donors who've leaned into this and supported it, and thank you to the City and the federal and state and the County. Note that the City, to date, has made up about 14 percent of the investment in this park beyond the land itself and some staff time, and this is kind of the crux of the issue that we're proposing -- is there is surplus funds in the current fiscal year and a request for help to lean into this and help balance the load as we look forward at the last step of this project. Here's a quick view of what we have today -- the big MU Healthcare pavilion, the wings are funded, those are slated to be built next winter as well as a big urban farm, teaching facilities, schoolhouse facility, a barn and greenhouse, stormwater -- a lot has come together in the last few quick years. And what's miss -- the last piece that we're looking at -- the last big piece is the Welcome Center, right there on main plaza. It has three main functions, and the key anchor of it is the teaching kitchen, right there in the middle that'll really elevate the capacity to teach nutrition and farm literacy and food literacy and everybody eats, and so that's something that all people can relate to. Within this space -- also a resource center to help people engage in gardening and cooking in a flexible programming space that can function year round, no matter the weather -- so this building really adds significantly to the capacity of the organizations that use that, Columbia Center for Agriculture, Columbia's Farmers Market, but also creates capacity for broader collaborations that are in the works. So I'm going to dive through the layers of the onion real quick. Columbia Farmers market -- voted best market in the nation this year. It has a rural tie -- the 50 mile radius that reaches out to 80 vendors throughout mid-Missouri, so not just -- it provides access to food, but livelihoods to the region. We broke records this year -- the Farmers Market did at attendance and matching for SNAP and WIC resources -- it adds -- it improves the access and affordability of food. There's been a lot of innovation -- there's a produce prescription pilot program with Compass Health, just up the road. It's an interface between food and health care. Families with diarrheal related diseases can get prescribed fresh produce at the market. All the food that we grow at the site is donated to the Food Bank. We're on track to donate over 35,000 pounds this year. That number will increase as our gardens mature and expand. This site also is a launching pad of programming throughout the community. Opportunity Gardens is a home gardening mentoring program where we go into low income neighborhoods and garden with participants -- we start with what do you like to eat, let's grow that -- and we got about 100 families in that program any given year

for the last many, many years. We also take care of orchards and gardens around town, like the Kilgore's garden with Nora Stewart as a main beneficiary of that food. We had over 20,000 interactions with CPS schools for our Farm to School program, and are anticipated to expand now that we're in our new space and further -- the capacity there is grown. We've gotten more into therapy gardens, with the VA Hospital, Phoenix Rehab Center, Welcome Home Patriot Place -- gardening ties into therapy. And then finally -- last program is the Henry Kirkland Black Farmers Scholarship we started last year, which provides startup funding for black farmers to start a business or expand their business. So it's a lot there. I don't mean to dumptruck you with too much information, but all that, very modestly, is being programmed out of this one schoolhouse trailer that's temporary, capital T, temporary office on our site, and ultimately, we would like to expand that to -- the office space in this Welcome Center to provide a much better, more inviting public face to provide an on ramp for participates to get involved. As our capacity increases with this building that we'll be able -- we'll be able to serve more people in this big onion will continue to grow. So, I appreciate the opportunity to share an update and appreciate your help to get us this far.

## V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH48-21 Proposed construction of Fire Station #10 to be located north of and west of St. Charles Road, at the bend with the intersection of E. Richland Road.

PH48-21 was read by the City Clerk.

Acting Public Works Director Shane Creech and Fire Chief Andy Woody provided a staff report.

CREECH: Shane Creech, Interim Director of Public Works. The Fire Chief is with me tonight and will discuss in greater detail the need for an additional fire station in this area. I will concentrate my portion of the staff report specifically to this site itself. It is common for Public Works to assist the Fire Department with property acquisition, plan development, and the construction processes due to staff expertise in those areas. This site consists of two tracts, totaling 10.76 acres, at the intersection of St. Charles Road and Richland Road. Due to the topography of the site, both tracts are necessary to balance grading and construct the fire station. This additional area will have the added bonus of assisting with intersection improvements when traffic impacts require that. The fire station will be designed in such a way to ensure that it meets the needs of the Columbia Fire Department at the time of construction and into the future following intersection improvements. Please note that currently there is not an intersection improvement project funded. However, due to recent development proposal history in this area, it's anticipated to be under consideration with the next capital improvement sales tax set for renewal in 2025. An interested parties meeting was held on October 27. Five property owners in the area attended. One property owner was opposed to the fire station being located so close to their residence. While one of the property owners needed for acquisition was amenable to the acquisition, however, her contract deed purchasers were not. The ordinance to acquire the property is also on the agenda tonight which is not typical. Staff will obviously only move forward with that based on the results of this public hearing. This was done by request of the contract deed purchasers to accelerate the process where possible should council

decide to move forward. I will now turn it over to the Fire Chief to discuss the need for a fire station in this area of town and provide to some background on the property search.

WOODY: Thank you, and thank you for having me tonight. This is apparently going to be pretty difficult to see -- basically the area in east central Columbia falls outside of our benchmark response times. Some fall out of the radius of the fire station as well. As you know, the search for land began before I was here, in earnest years ago -- three or more, and there are very few places in the east side of the city of Columbia that we've not explored. We have to be careful, however, that the fire station is placed in a location that enhances the effectiveness of our department now and not only to help us in the future -- that it's not something that we are waiting to grow into. The fire crews that cover this area of the City now are among some of the busiest in the City including the downtown crews and the Fire Station 5 on Ballanger Lane. The first response area of a fire station is roughly 5, 6, 7 square miles. Some of ours are a little bit bigger than that. You all have addressed that, and we appreciate it. We're working through some of that now. But obviously, as we locate that station, that 5 or 6 miles -- you'll see on the map in just a minute -- it moves with the building so getting the -- finding the right piece of ground is important. So placing that facility in the proper location is critical because these are fifty year infrastructure pieces for the City. So what we did was we altered our land search -- rather than just driving and looking and -- to really include some good -- the use of technology. So, by placing essentially a mock firehouse in some of the different locations that we have been looking, we were able to then objectively look and review the information to help us find a location that's the most impactful for the community. We're able to be visible, available, and present in the locations that were needed. We want to make sure that our limited resources that you bless us with are properly placed and that delayed response times aren't limited by ensuring first the fire apparatus approximate to the customers. So you can see in some of this mapping -- I say you can -- we'll see if I can change the slides -- so some of the places where we've looked for -- at fire stations -- this is Stadium and 63- again, these are these are going to be difficult to see. I apologize for that. What we're -- the areas that we're looking at are the area of west of 63, south of the 70, north of Broadway. That kind of gives you a corridor there, so east of 63, south of 70, north of Broadway. We need that fire station to cover south of Interstate -- of I-70, and ideally, it comes even all the -- across the highway to cover Conley/Trimble corridor there as well, again to relieve those downtown crews. So, as we look at land, you can kind of see again -- I don't know what handouts you have there -- this is Stadium and 63. This doesn't cover to 70 and it doesn't cover east of the city limits. Although there is property there, again, this is something that just wasn't going to work I don't think for the City. We also looked at Elk Park Drive. We made some progress down Elk Park Drive, and that's actually how this ended up being fire station 10 and the other one that's already being built is Fire Station 11 is because of Elk Park Drive. This ended up falling through -- it ends up though that it, you know -- it is a little far south and east to cover what we really need this fire station cover to anyway. There was some land at Rolling Hills Road and WW Highway, Broadway. Again, too far south and east -- you can see we don't hit 70. We don't cover some of the subdivisions that out there now that are too far from the fire station now, which really led us again, technology-wise, back to the East St. Charles

Road location, which is where we have found this property now, and that's really what lead us to this -- was the information from joint communications to allow us to place these facilities in different areas in the east side of town. So really, it meets the needs of the City best now and moving into the future. A fire station in this location is estimated to respond to approximately 1,500 calls annually. It's needed now and will be needed later.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.  
Roy Myers and Natalie Kerkmann spoke.

MYERS: Roy Myers, I'm the owner of the land that you're wanting to acquire. Really didn't want to sell it. I haven't been offered anything, and I think there's other locations that would be better suited, preferably Rolling Hills and Richland -- there's a corner piece there that'd be perfect. The trees there are very old and they'll be really hard to replace. Yeah, I know you guys plant back new ones, but it's kind of hard to get trees that are already mature and already 200-400 years old. I haven't been offered anything for my land and would like to know what's, you know -- seems like a pretty violent act to eminent domain.

TREECE: I'm not going to negotiate with you up here. Are you willing to sell it at a price?

MYERS: Yes.

TREECE: Yeah, Okay. Of course, yeah, I'm sorry you got this point without being asked. Anything you'd like to add?

KERKMANN: Yes. My name is Natalie Kerkmann. I, just -- it was just a shock. That's a bad day when you wake up and you've made plans, you know -- we were going to build on the land and have tiny houses and possibly duplexes. I mean, we can build duplexes, or rent it out, you know, to people that come down for Mizzou games, that have people going to the hospitals right there on Keene Street -- it's, you know, five minutes away from downtown. We've lived here for over 20 years, both of us have, in Columbia, and we looked a long time to try and find, you know, the perfect land, and this just seemed like, you know, we finally had the whole plan coming into place, and it's like now, we don't have a backup plan and we didn't even know that this was something that was possible.

MYERS: And when I was trying to get electric on the property, I didn't know why they couldn't have told me then, you know, it's been a year that I've been denied a building permit or electric or a light pole. And it just seems like it was kind of stonewalled, you know, and denied my, you know, the use for which I'd brought the property, to be able to use it. I haven't been able to go and figure out what I'm going to do now, so.

TREECE: Alright, okay. Well thank you for coming tonight and visiting with us.

There being no further comment, Mayor Treece closed the public hearing.  
The Council asked questions and made comments.

PETERS: What is the plan for this land? Have we -- we've not negotiated a price with him? Are we looking into that?

GLASCOCK: The process is the public hearing first, and then you, as a Council, will tell us whether to proceed with plans and specifications, and then we will do a --

there's an ordinance to acquire, I believe, on this agenda as well, at which time we would then do an appraisal of the property and start negotiating with the property owner about the price.

PETERS: Okay, so.

GLASCOCK: It comes after the public hearing.

PETERS: Okay, so a public hearing, and then a discuss -- and then to see how much this land is worth and discuss selling, perhaps, buying it from the --

GLASCOCK: Yes.

PETERS: Okay, thank you.

SKALA: Yeah, the majority of this service area falls in the Third Ward. St. Charles Road -- there is a bit of a history for St. Charles being on the CIP plan, many, many years ago, about 10 or 12 years ago -- being improved and so on, This search for a fire station location has been going on for a good long period of time too. There was a more or less a prime location at Keene Street and St. Charles Road, or near St. Charles Road, but probably wasn't adequate, and the owner was not interested in selling it either, and we've heard a little bit about the history of the search for some of these areas that seem to fit the public safety nature of this fire station. This seems to be -- I mean, I -- a lot of this hinges on the negotiation for the sale of the property for someone who is -- has just been told that the City has found a viable sight for a fire station that serves the public interest, and I'll be interested to follow what that negotiation is. My inclination, because of the location and because of the long standing need, and the kind of the torturous search for this piece of property, is to support the City Council moving ahead with plans and specifications, but you know, the devil is always in the details, and I'm very sympathetic to the property owner as well, and I think they need to get their value out of this property, certainly. But seems to fit the bill for what is required for not only the developments that's happened at Old Hawthorne, but also this area -- the St. Charles and that Richland Road area in terms of the traffic flow, and the potential for a traffic circle here, I think, could straighten out some of the danger -- the dangerous traffic issues that exist right now. I don't know when we're ever going to get to the point where we can deal with some of the improvement issues in St. Charles Road. Some of those monies were taken many years ago to create the bridges that happened at the -- over the creek actually for the commercial area that happened a little bit south of there. At any rate, I'm prepared to support this, but I'll be closely following negotiations with regard to whether a fair price is offered for the property.

FOWLER: So, I would like an explanation. I don't see that the property -- they must be out in the hallway. I hope that they're still here. I can't see them, but I'd like an explanation as to how they come to a public meeting and when it was that they were notified that the City was interested in acquiring their property. I did not find comfort in anything that they said -- that they were now in a position where having tried to develop their own land, they now have the city wanting to purchase it. Can you help me understand that, somebody?

CREECH: Sure, they are the contract deed purchasers of the piece of property, so they don't -- the owner of record, and somebody, hopefully, Nancy or somebody could better explain contract deed purchaser -- but we reached out to the property owner. And, I believe, she reached out to the contract deed purchasers and invited them to the public hearing.

FOWLER: So, how long have they been the contract deed purchasers? They've had this as an option to purchase this land for some time?

THOMPSON: So, I would tell you that we have looked in the land records, and there is no record of a contract for deed. So, we're not entirely sure. This is kind of anecdotal coming from the property owner. That's something that will have to be sorted out as we go forward. At this point in time, we don't have clarity because we have not seen any paperwork on that particular issue. The actual property owner -- I don't have it in front of me -- but the property owner that's listed in the land records is different.

FOWLER: And you've had conversation with the property owner?

CREECH: Yes.

FOWLER: So, I see that -- I'm sorry I don't remember your name. Can you help us understand what the context is of this?

KERKMANN: I actually have copies of the contract for deed and all of the paperwork. I don't know why it didn't get filed. I've -- I notified them as I was supposed to -- it's in the contract that we were going to purchase the land and it was lease to own. We've been making the payments on the land to Melissa Furlow, that's who the owner is, and we're in close contact with her all the time. We've paid on it for an entire year. We also have paid the property taxes for the past two years -- it will be two years -- we just paid for this full year. So, I don't know why these copies didn't actually get put on file. I guess it's because once we make the balloon payment, the entire amount, then they would -- it would be in our name completely, if that makes sense.

FOWLER: It does. So, you have an expectation of purchasing this land, and then this transaction with the property owner of records is interfering with that. Where -- I guess now there's an even more complex issue there about how you're compensated for the fact that you've been putting money into paying for this land only to find out that there's an offer to sell it to somebody else.

KERKMANN: Correct.

FOWLER: Oh dear, I'm so sorry.

KERKMANN: Thank you. That's nice to hear

FOWLER: That sounds like a terrible set of circumstances.

KERKMANN: Yeah, it is. I mean, we understand that it's for the City's, you know, best interest and they need a fire station. It's just the way that it all went about -- wasn't quite right. I mean, we really didn't know anything about it that -- and so, then we got -- actually, Melissa got the letter and she texted it to me -- about the meeting, the informational meeting for the parties. So that was really kind of like, you know, wow, like we don't matter, they don't care. Like who knew about this, why didn't anybody say anything? And we even asked, do they want all of it or could we keep part of it at least, and they said they had phase one and two for all of it, and showed us the pictures and stuff, and it's just really hard. We've worked on that land for two years -- just me and my fiancé. Homeless people were living there. You could even see past the road. I mean, we've cut down the dead trees, we've spent thousands of dollars on renting equipment, like skid loaders and stuff to clean the whole area -- it looks like a park now. I mean, it's like -- it was completely overgrown with trees, there was mattresses, there was hypodermic needles. I mean, we had to pick up all that, and take loads of trash -- just as two by ourselves -- and everybody that lived around the area was so happy to see that, and



we've met them all and they all wanted to know our plans and they were all excited about it and they were so happy developments weren't going to be built there. And so we even kind of made friends with everybody in the neighborhood and they always stopped by to see how things were going. So it's just a lot of attachment, sentimental attachment, you know, our plans. And yeah, we want to help out, so we just to be compensated so that we can go purchase land somewhere else, I guess, and start over there.

THOMAS: Yeah, thanks. So, I want to just talk about another aspect of this and make another pitch for public infrastructure expansion fees for these types of projects. This is going to cost just over \$3 million. I assume that's the land acquisition and the building construction combined there, and it's clearly needed. Columbia is a growing city. This is fire station #10. We have about 50,000 households. So, it seems that serve about 5,000 households with each fire station, and we're going to have 5,000 households in a decade or two, and we're going to need to keep doing this. So, it would seem very logical and fair if we simply required a public infrastructure expansion fee from every new home that we permit construction of -- of about -- \$600 would do it -- because that would build up with the 5,000 households to create the funds for the next fire station. And then, we should also, I believe, apply that same principle to all of our other services and utilities that have a one-time infrastructure component as well as an ongoing an operations and service process. Thanks that's all.

Council Member Peters made a motion to proceed with the plans and specifications for proposed Fire Station #10. The motion was seconded by Council Member Skala.

SKALA: I just want to comment that -- once again, I just want to make sure that some of us will be following this closely in terms of compensation as this moves forward.

TREECE: This is inelegant at best, and I'm surprised it got to this level. And if we do move forward on it, I'm inclined to pull B378-21 off until there's some more fact finding. I don't feel -- there's clearly an issue between the lessor and the property owner. I don't know what it is. I'm not sure the City needs to be in the middle of it. I don't want to authorize eminent domain and interrupt that relationship.

FOWLER: I'm going to vote no on this for that same reason. I'm -- I don't -- I'm trying to sort out in my head all the circumstances here, and understanding that it's between the parties and it doesn't directly involve the City, but I'm really uncomfortable with this under these circumstances.

PETERS: Well, I guess I would have a question as to how we can move forward to delineate this and sort it out. I mean, rather than just -- I mean they've had this for a year. Why hasn't this paperwork been put in place? What compensation does the current property owner need to pay these folks if they need -- I mean, I'm not sure how to sort it out, but I don't know that I want to say let's abandon this piece of property, and I'm not how we can ask the City to go forward without having a motion -- you know, without some direction from the Council saying we need to move forward and look at how we acquire this property. So, I mean, I'm open to suggestions but I --

TREECE: My -- the only way -- look I can -- I'll support the motion to proceed with

the proposed construction at the location, but I'm not inclined to vote -- you know B378-21 is the actual authorizing the acquisition of property either by negotiation or eminent domain, and I'm not inclined to give staff the authority to do that at this point because I this was a surprise to me and I don't like surprises.

SKALA: That's not required, is it? I mean, that you're authorizing eminent domain to -- you are authorizing the plans to proceed with the negotiation.

TREECE: The lady's motion is to proceed with plans and construction. Inherent in that there's a separate agenda item and the Acting Director made a comment that it's unusual to have that authorization on the same agenda.

GLASCOCK: It is, but we were requested by the property owner to do that. I mean, that's why it's there.

PITZER: The same property owner? There are two property owners listed.

GLASCOCK: The original property owner, the one that's of record.

PETERS: The one that has leased this property out it sounds to someone else and has some other -- yeah, I can see that.

SKALA: Just a clarification -- point of order -- and that is what we're talking about right now -- the motion that was on the table and the second has to do with the proceed with plans and specifications, and there is a separate issue with respect to --

TREECE: On the consent agenda is B378-21, which authorizes the acquisition of property, and the ordinance is crafted by negotiation or eminent domain.

PETERS: You guys have any suggestions?

TREECE: -- and eminent domain is not a taking -- it still -- we still have to pay for it. It's just forced negotiation.

SKALA: Usually a last resort.

PETERS: And, I mean, I'm not in favor of that, but I think we -- I mean, I don't know really what to do I guess even though it's my motion.

PITZER: No, I agree. I mean something unusual is going on.

SKALA: That's the predicament I'm in as well.

TREECE: I'm happy to have staff take the next step on this, but I'm not inclined to -- you all vote how you want on B378-21, but I'm going to object to it on the consent agenda.

SKALA: I agree with you.

THOMAS: Yeah, I was just going to say, it seems like a lack of transparency at the very least by the property owner to have been negotiating with the City and allowing it to get to this stage, but not informing their -- I don't even understand the question of what a lease contract is -- go ahead John.

PETERS: Yeah, we could use some clarification.

GLASCOCK: Well, I can't negotiate with anybody except the property owner of record.

THOMAS: I realize that.

GLASCOCK: So there's no way for me to negotiate with the people that spoke tonight

PITZER: And if we're being -- I mean, the City is rarely the low bidder here right. So, once the property owner -- I'm totally speculating here -- once they knew the City was interested, you know, they knew there's -- maybe there's an opportunity for a larger check.

THOMAS: Right, but, they may have reneged on an agreement with the other

people, which isn't necessarily our business, but --

TREECE: Not our business.

THOMAS: I'm trying to figure out what happened.

PETERS: Yeah, except from an ethics standpoint or morality standpoint it seems like.

SKALA: But I think your position is probably the -- at least the temporary solution to this issue is that is -- we are interested in the property and there is some negotiation that can occur, but for anything serious happens in terms of any kind of eminent domain, then we need to take a deep breath.

PETERS: Yeah, so maybe we need to pull that the bill about the eminent domain off the consent agenda even though -- I don't know if that's --

TREECE: You can't do that, but when she calls the roll, Mr. Pitzer who votes first can say yes on all bills and resolutions except for B378-21, for which I vote no, if that's his -- I'm just saying -- if he's going to set the tone.

**The motion made by Council Member Peters and seconded by Council Member Skala to proceed with the plans and specifications for proposed Fire Station #10 was approved by voice vote with only Council Member Fowler voting no.**

## VI. OLD BUSINESS

B284-21

Approving the Final Plat of "Forest Hills, Plat No. 2" located on the south side of Geyser Boulevard and west of Lake of the Woods Road; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 125-2021).

The bill was given fourth reading by the City Clerk.

Community Development Director Tim Teddy provided a staff report.

TEDDY: This item has been tabled twice. It is going to have to be tabled again because you don't have a finished revised plat as yet. The reason for that is -- it was tabled November 1. If you recall, the applicants were not present on that date. We've since met with them and talked with them, and they lost their surveyor so that individual will need to be replaced so they need a little more time to redraw the plat but, I'll show you what is being done. And in terms of the construction plans, it was Council's direction that these two streets, Sugar Maple and North Waterford Drive, which is within the Edgewood Waters Edge communities -- that those not join. So the area that is encircled there -- you can see a line -- that's something I've put in there just to indicate that what they intended to do is take a lot known as Lot 179 -- that's common area that's used for drainage infrastructure purposes -- they will extend that across what is now shown as right-of-way. So they'll make approximately 60 feet or so of that street into a green space lot, and the street will dead end at that point. And this was shown last time -- these blocks. Those still exist. There's been a couple of what are called Type 3 barriers that have been added. Those are the construction fence sections that have the diagonal orange and white stripes - so those are present now. So as indicated here, the developer will change the plat to eliminate the right-of-away connection and the street connection, so Sugar Maple will be a dead end street within this subdivision. It won't be a long dead end so it'll still meet emergency turnaround standards in conjunction with the intersecting street called Royale Plum. And this is just a sketch plan that their design professional put together that shows the expansion of that Lot 179 so there'll be a drainage way across there. And then this shows in a

little more detail how they intend to grade that. You can see where the street dead ends. And, just to indicate with the cursor, it will dead end here. This is the property boundary down here, and then this would be a drainage way here across. Formerly, there was going to be a street and there was going to be underground piping, so drainage, you know -- pipe drainage replaced with overland drainage there within a swale. There will be a little bit of a berm also so there will be a physical barrier to movement, even if someone was of a mind to cross the grassed area. That's all I have to offer for you tonight. We put in our memo table to February. In talking to the applicant, they think they could have the plat prepared earlier. They are here tonight.

### Christina Luebbert and Karen Turner spoke.

LUEBBERT: My name is Christina Luebbert with Luebbert Engineering. I'm also -- we didn't-- Gene Basinger passed away a few weeks ago so he is not going to be able to sign the revision of this plat. Another surveyor in our office, Ron Lueck, has agreed to review all of Gene's work and help me make these changes to the plat so that we can go ahead and proceed with having it revised. Our plan would be to actually do that revision in the next couple of days. Ron goes south for the winter so I'm beating a time deadline with him. And we would want to see this put on the consent agenda assuming that you like this proposed compromise -- this -- we got guidance from Mr. Glascock on this. This was kind of the direction he suggested that we go -- it's the least amount of change to the plat. It's the least amount of change to the infrastructure plans and the least amount of effect to how this development would go forward while still compromising what the neighbors are looking for, which is no direct connection between the subdivisions. It does also allow, if we need to -- for instance, if the water department wants to make a back feed connection into the water system, you know, this allows the utility connection so that, you know, we're not preventing that from going through there if needed, and we'll have to -- we haven't had water plans drawn up because they won't draw them up until I have a -- at least an idea that this is how the plat's going to look when it's done. So, we've been moving ahead with construction -- west of the creek is nearly complete. So we are really trying to get this put to bed and know that we have taken everything that you've given us under advisement and made a sincere effort to appease everybody. So we would want to see this move forward as soon as possible. We would -- of course I'm sure the staff would need to go back through and recheck it when we do a resubmittal, but it should be pretty straightforward with this just one minor change. You have any additional questions about what we're proposing?

TREECE: I'm not sure it can be placed on the consent agenda if you are amending the plat. It may have to go back on old business so I'm not prepared to make that representation to you.

LUEBBERT: We would just want it as soon as possible on the next available agenda then.

TREECE: Very good.

SKALA: Yeah, that's the question I had. I just -- I wondered -- there was a recommendation that if there were a tabling motion to be considered it would be sometime in February, and you're suggesting --

LUEBBERT: We would be prefer it not be that late because we're going to try to get our revisions to staff this week, and we would like to see in on a sooner agenda because we want to keep this moving forward.

TREECE: I would too. I'd to get rid of this.

LUEBBERT: So would we.

LUEBBERT: And the owners are here and Ron Lueck is here if you have a specific question for either of them.

TREECE: Sounds good. Thank you for being here. It makes it easier.

TREECE: Are you good with this?

TURNER: [Karen Turner] I'm -- I think we're good with this, and we appreciate everybody's help, the engineers, the developers --

AMIN: Can you state your name, just for the record for the public.

TREECE: Karen Turner.

TREECE: I think this is a good solution. I know it's not ideal, but I think it's a great compromise.

**Mayor Treece made a motion to table B284-21 to the December 20, 2021 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Council Member Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.**

## VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B373-21 Reimposing a sales tax of one-eighth of one percent for the purpose of providing funding for local parks.
- B374-21 Voluntary annexation of property located on the east side of Bearfield Road and north of Woodhaven Road (4000 S. Bearfield Road); establishing permanent M-OF (Mixed-use Office) zoning (Case No. 304-2021).
- B375-21 Approving the PD Plan Major Revision for "Sonic of Columbia, Hyde Park" located on the east side of Buttonwood Drive and south of Nifong Boulevard (3700 Buttonwood Drive); approving a statement of intent (Case No. 214-2021).
- B376-21 Vacating a utility easement on Lot 1A within the Alpha Phi Subdivision Replat located on the east side of Providence Road (900 Providence Road) (Case No. 79-2021).
- B377-21 Vacating a utility easement on Lots 3 and 4 within Woodrail - Plat No. 6 located on the east side of Westcreek Circle (Case No. 297-2021).
- B378-21 Authorizing the acquisition of property for the proposed construction of Fire Station #10 to be located north of and west of St. Charles Road, at the bend with the intersection of E. Richland Road.
- B379-21 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the overdose data to action program.
- B380-21 Authorizing an equitable sharing agreement and certification with the U.S. Department of Justice and U.S. Department of the Treasury detailing FY 2021 receipts and expenditures of shared funds by the Police Department.
- B381-21 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with The Curators of the

- University of Missouri, on behalf of University of Missouri Healthcare, for medical support of law enforcement operations through the development of a Tactical EMS Program.
- B382-21 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Highway Safety and Traffic Division for acceptance of a grant for a DWI traffic enforcement unit.
- B383-21 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Highway Safety and Traffic Division for acceptance of a grant for DWI enforcement relating to sobriety checkpoints and saturation patrols.
- B384-21 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Highway Safety and Traffic Division for acceptance of a grant for dedicated enforcement of hazardous moving violations.
- B385-21 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Highway Safety and Traffic Division for acceptance of a grant to conduct special traffic enforcement of hazardous moving violations.
- B386-21 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Highway Safety and Traffic Division for acceptance of a youth alcohol enforcement grant to conduct compliance checks.
- B387-21 Authorizing a first amendment to PCS antenna agreement and memorandum of first amendment to PCS antenna agreement with T-Mobile USA Tower LLC for the lease of City-owned property located at 1400 Ballenger Lane (Fire Station No. 5).
- R185-21 Setting a public hearing: proposed installation of traffic calming devices on Bray Avenue between Fairview Road and Bray Court.
- R186-21 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of sanitary sewer rehabilitation project #9 in the Business Loop 70 and downtown areas.
- R187-21 Setting a public hearing: proposed design and construction of an automated debris removal system at the Wastewater Treatment Plant - Wetlands Treatment Unit #3; providing for construction of the proposed improvement using a design/build contract.
- R188-21 Authorizing a contract with the Central Missouri Humane Society for 2022 animal control and municipal shelter services.
- R189-21 Authorizing a first amendment to the agency receipt/agent authorization contract with GunBusters, LLC for the destruction of firearms seized by or surrendered to the Police Department.
- R190-21 Approving a project (within the meaning of Chapter 349, Revised Statutes of Missouri) of The Industrial Development Authority of Boone County, Missouri for Freedom House I Apartments, to be located in the City of Columbia, Missouri.

**The bills were given third reading and the resolutions read by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS (except for B378-21 on which she voted no), TREECE (except for B378-21 on which he voted no), FOWLER (except for B378-21 on which she voted no), WANER (except for B378-21 on which she voted no), SKALA (except for B378-21 on which he voted no),**

THOMAS (except for B378-21 on which he voted no). VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted, except for B378-21, which was defeated, 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.

- B388-21 Granting a waiver and design adjustment relating to the proposed Final Plat of Hardy Plat 1 for sidewalk construction on the north side of Highway KK (5971 S. Highway KK); setting forth a condition for payment in lieu of sidewalk construction (Case No. 318-2021).
- B389-21 Approving the Final Plat of "Hardy Plat 1" located on the north side of Highway KK and approximately 3,200 feet west of Scott Boulevard (5971 S. Highway KK) (Case No. 318-2021).
- B390-21 Authorizing reconstruction of the pavement, curb, gutter, sidewalk and driveway approaches along Walnut Street between College Avenue and Old Highway 63 North; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B391-21 Authorizing a right of use license permit with Missouri Alpha Chapter of Pi Beta Phi House Corporation for the installation, maintenance and operation of parking spaces and landscaping within a portion of the rights-of-way on the north side of Rollins Street and the alleyway behind 511 Rollins Street.
- B392-21 Authorizing application to the United States Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration and the Missouri Department of Transportation for airport capital assistance grants in 2022.
- B393-21 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for maternal child health services.
- B394-21 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for epidemiology and laboratory capacity enhancing detection expansion services for the provision or implementation of COVID-19 response activities; amending the FY 2022 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B395-21 Amending the FY 2022 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for expenses associated with the overdose data to action program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services.
- B396-21 Amending the FY 2022 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for the Fire Department's bay heater maintenance and replacement project.
- B397-21 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri, on behalf of its Office of Emergency Management, for the installation of an emergency siren and supporting infrastructure in Louisville Park.
- B398-21 Approving the Final Plat of "Concorde Office & Industrial Plaza Plat 12-A"

located on the east side of Maguire Boulevard and approximately 0.7 miles south of Stadium Boulevard; authorizing performance contracts (Case No. 302-2021).

## X. REPORTS

### REP91-21 RubinBrown LLC Utility Billing Audit Scope of Work.

Finance Director Matthew Lue introduced Rick Feldt of RubinBrown, and they were available for questions. Maria Oropallo, Chair of the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee spoke, and the Council asked questions and discussed the report.

LUE: Mayor, members of the City Council, Rick Feldt from RubinBrown is here tonight to discuss the proposed scope of the utility billing audit. And then if you have any questions after that, I'm here to answer whatever.

TREECE: I noticed -- I know you've been here all night, Mr. Feldt -- anything you want to add?

FELDT: No. I'm happy to answer any questions.

TREECE: Have you -- I also see Maria Oropallo here with Finance Audit and Advisory Committee. Have you had a chance to communicate -- do you like this? Do you want to say anything on this?

OROPALLO: Thank you, Chair of the Finance and Audit Committee. One of the features of what we expected from a performance audit -- management audit -- is whether the processes and procedures meet Council objectives. As Mr. Skala often states, the devil is in the details. While the areas look like -- we're looking at tasks - - what they are actually going to tell us is build a story, and the story is -- will speak clearly to the Council's stated objectives in the Strategic Plan about equity. The Finance and Audit Committee spent a lot of time during our discussions talking about how do these processes affect our residents, and Rick captured everything that we brought up with this list. So again, you're looking at something that says customer billing cycles . That's going to tell us something that we might or might not change, but it's going to tell us something, so I think the Committee -- we were really pleased with the -- this plan. Thank you.

FOWLER: I have a comment. I just want to make sure, and I think Maria is referring to the same issue, but we identified in conversation with the Finance and Audit Committee a hardship that we put on our residents regarding billing cycles, and I just want to make sure that this audit includes some assessment of that and to see whether or not we can find a path forward to alleviate that hardship on our residents.

FELDT: Yes, we did talk about that with the Finance and Audit Committee. Also, with the -- we also talked with the Water and Light Board also. But we are going to review the billing cycles and compare that to some of our other -- some other public sector clients that we have and make some recommendations, if, you know, possible

FOWLER: Thank you.

PITZER: What's the order when you bring this back? When you have findings, what's the order that you are going to go through -- come to us first or the committee first?

FELDT: Well, what I would do, or what we were thinking about doing, you know, talking with -- doing the audit, talking with management, getting the



recommendations to the Finance and Audit Committee and the Water and Light Board, get their feedback, and then when everybody is in agreement bring that to the City Council -- the report. So we'll vet all the recommendations with the appropriate parties before we bring it -- the draft report back to the City Council.

PITZER: Right, yeah, there was a questions last time, about like a working audit document is a closed document, but then once it's presented in an open meeting then -- there's there was some nuance to that. I don't think it was a big deal, but it was just the order in which things happened mattered.

FELDT: I mean, yeah, the order can be any order that you want. Generally, it's best -- that's within the ordinances and regulations but we're happy to do it whatever way the City wants to do it. You looked puzzled or have a question?

PITZER: I think we should see it or it should be available to us before it is available through a public records request. That makes sense?

FELDT: Yes, that makes sense, and I would agree with that, yeah.

TREECE: Alright, I think the scope is good, and I think the price is great. I think it -- let's proceed.

FELDT: Thank you.

TREECE: Thanks for being here, it's helpful.

REP92-21

### Request for Proposals for Public Access Channel and Community Access Center.

Cultural Affairs Manager Sarah Dresser provided a staff report, and the Council asked questions to which staff responded.

DRESSER: Sarah Dresser, Manager for the Office of Cultural Affairs. We are bringing a draft request for proposal for Council input for either nonprofit or other governmental agencies to operate a public access channel and community assess center. After your November 1 meeting and not renewing the contract with Vidwest, that put us back to going back to redraft an RFP. And I will just kind of hit some of the highlights of this draft document. The scope of services is substantially similar to the past. However, in our RFP that has been drafted, an organization could propose either doing a public access channel or another broadcast format that could be presented as an option. Some of the other some scope services would be similar, like operating a community access center, providing training, maintenance of equipment that has been provided by the City, as well as some additional services provided to other community organizations. In addition, a resulting contract award would be for \$35,000 and renewed for two additional years. And then the thought would be that every three years, we would reopen the RFP process. So, I also have Cale Turner with Purchasing here tonight if there's any specific questions about the RFP process, and I'm happy to take any questions as well.

TREECE: So I like the -- structuring the payment with the five or six deliverables,

DRESSER: Right. So that would be an additional adjustment to a future contract -- would be a more specific payment schedule based on different performance measures that are met throughout the term of each year's contract. So that would also be an update that we would plan to make.

TREECE: To me that helps reinforce that the City is buying services for a public access channel. We're not subsidizing wedding videos and other really nice things

that taxpayers don't pay for. This is a public access channel with clear public benefits, public service announcements, whatever it may be. So, I think that's a good addition.

PETERS: I really just have a question. You know, what Vidwest ran into problems with is that they cannot access the cable channel to have this on, and I don't understand -- maybe I just haven't read your RFP correctly -- but what is that we are asking a new company or Vidwest to be able to step up and do?

DRESSER: So, that would still be an option that could be presented, but we also kind of opened it up as well, if an alternative form of broadcast is something that could be maybe better achieved from a particular group -- that would be something that we in this draft are saying would consider in lieu of using the cable access channel - - some other broadcast format that they would propose.

PETERS: Do you have any examples?

DRESSER: I think there's various streaming services that are available, so again, that would be -- I know that's been talked about -- as kind of public media's transforming, that's been brought up in conversations, so, yeah, we would be open to considering that.

PETERS: Okay, thank you.

THOMAS: Yeah, thanks for bringing this back Sarah. First of all, just sort of an observation -- I thought really the terminology we were talking about was a public access channel and a community media center where people come in and use equipment to develop media. I've not heard the term community access center but, it's probably not a --

DRESSER: And that would be part of the scope of services is a community access center. So I might have failed to word how it was written in the RFP.

THOMAS: Okay, well never mind that. I do have a few questions. I also like the structured payment schedule upon delivery of, you know, pieces of a scope of work. Do just want to check and I think you kind of addressed this, the third installment requires three continual months of channel programming -- so that wouldn't have to be through fiber cable? It could be through internet streaming if whatever organization gets the contract is not able to get a fiber connection from the broadband provider?

DRESSER: Right, so that was just kind of a template example of how something would be structured so should, for example, the use of the cable access and PEG not be what we go forward with, that would maybe be altered to fit what, you know, vender we would go with -- if that makes sense.

THOMAS: Okay perfect, and then, under additional services for community organizations, the RFP asks for complimentary membership for the community organizations who are funded by the City, and is that the cultural arts program grant recipients?

DRESSER: Right, that's traditionally what it's been in the past -- is our 20-30 arts organizations that receive funding from our office have been given the complimentary memberships to us as well.

THOMAS: Yeah, just want to sort of do the math, and if there's 30 of those organizations and they all you know take up the maximum amount of their membership, that \$35,000 that's being awarded to the contractor will only go just over a \$1000 per organization, and not do any of the other things that we want the contract to do. So, you know, maybe -- I just think the expectation shouldn't be that

every organization can have live streamed events all the time and things like that. And then the final question -- in the sample agreement, it says that payment of funds are conditional upon certification that services and videos produced, broadcast, and streamed are done in a manner that complies with the Americans with Disabilities Act and 28 CFR Part 35, which I assume is some other federal legislation. If the contractor is using Mediacom cable or Youtube internet streaming, and their delivery is not compliant -- I mean does this mean, for example, that every program has to have a sign language interpreter?

DRESSLER: You might be able to answer better, Nancy, I think it --

THOMPSON: When it comes to programming that goes -- that we produce for cable access, it does have to be accessible, so it would have to have all the accessibilities feature whether or not -- it doesn't have to have a sign language interpreter, but it would need close captioning or something else that would that would allow that to happen. So, when your - and when your streaming, the same way -- because they're producing public comment that's being purchased with public funds.

THOMAS: And is the ability to comply with that all with the producer of the programming or does it also depend at least some extent on the platform that's used, such as Mediacom's cable channel.

THOMPSON: We wouldn't dictate to them how it has to be done. It's just when the final product gets done, that's what has to be done. So their providers don't necessarily, you know -- they can purchase -- the contractor can purchase from whomever they need to purchase from, but the end product has to be accessible, and their facilities have to be accessible if they're offering their facilities to the public and using the funds.

THOMAS: Yeah, great. Alright, that's all my questions. Thank you.

PITZER: Yeah, my question is about the two one-year renewals that you're proposing? So, how would those -- would those renewals be triggered if they met all of the metrics or what?

DRESSER: That was my understanding with just consulting with the Law Department -- is that that would the plan is that -- you know, they're fulfilling their contractual obligations, they would be set up for the next term.

PITZER: Right, okay. And then, some of those were like setting up the service the first year, so would they roll into, you know -- would they still apply for the following years?

DRESSER: Yeah, that's a good question. I think it would be assumed that they have met that if it was kind of carried over from like that first initial signing.

PITZER: Right, okay. Yeah, so I guess my comment would be that it probably is beneficial to everybody involved if this body wasn't deliberating the renewable of the contract every year at budget time.

TREECE: We would only deliberate the appropriation necessary to fund it.

REP93-21

Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Process.

Finance Director Lue provided a staff report, and the Council asked questions to which staff responded.

LUE: So staff would just like some guidance from Council to develop goals and outcomes for the meeting that we will have regarding the CIP. This will be like a workshop that we will have with Council, and we just needed a little bit of guidance to see what the outcomes are that you would all want.

FOWLER: Mr. Lue, I'm really excited about the idea that we could have a capital improvement project workshop and that it's -- I'm disappointed that it's only annual, but I understand staff has other things to do than constantly revisit for CIP with us. Is this something that would also be open to members of the public? Are they considered to be a target audience for that workshop or is it just Council.

LUE: I think this will be a Council -- this will be for Council, and then once we go through the CIP process, those would be the things that would involve the community.

FOWLER: So, and they'll get to attend though. It will be an open meeting.

LUE: Yes.

FOWLER: So, as far as how that would be put together, I have learned -- thank you -- not to get too excited when it assigns a location to something in one of your reports, rather than -- but I would like us to, when we're going through that workshop, identify which ward is benefitted by the project because there's some ambiguity in our understanding of that. And so, whether or not the workshop goes through ward by ward and says okay in the First Ward, there are these things, or in the Second Ward there are these things -- but it would be really helpful because we are faced with questions often about equity between the wards and I would like us to have as much conversation so that we can either shine a light that we're being equitable or shine a light that we're not being equitable.

THOMAS: Something I think would be very helpful going forward would be if every capital improvement project was identified as either a public infrastructure expansion project, meaning it's expanding the capacity of one of our systems to accommodate a larger number of customers than before versus a maintenance or replacement project, which is equally as much needed, but doesn't actually expand the capacity of the system because I think there's a logic to paying for those different types of projects in different ways. And if that was laid out, then it would be possible to do the analysis on how much we're spending on expansion projects versus maintenance and replacement.

LUE: So, theoretically, maintenance and replacement would not be in the CIP in this form. Those things are operating expenses that would happen through the operating budget. Some of the larger projects though could end up on CIP.

THOMAS: Yeah, I mean, there are definitely projects on the CIP that are maintenance and replacement and don't expand capacity, and there are some that combine both of those. And I believe they should be -- it should be estimated what percentage of the project cost is for expansion and what percentage is for maintenance and replacement.

SKALA: Just a question. I certainly want to endorse Mr. Fowler's suggestion that this be broken out in terms of wards. We do have this issue with ward equity. That's always a hot topic. I -- generally speaking, we do get the reports for some of the CIP improvements and so on, and they are, if I'm not mistaken, broken out generally along those lines, but I think a little bit more attention to detail for that would be very much appreciated.

PETERS: I would just like to know, sort of what is currently being done -- like what's been finished, what's currently being done, and then what's the future? You know, somehow or another, sort of split that up so we have some idea of where we've been what we've done with our current maybe CIP money, and that, you know, what we're in the middle of and then what we're hoping to do before this comes up

again.

PITZER: I guess I don't see this as a discussion of like individual projects and an update on where we are on specific projects. I was thinking of this more of like how the CIP process comes together -- you know, what you do with it, what -- how it relates with the budget, you know, that kind of more like -- overarching discussion about what it is and what we can glean from it. You know, all the other things -- some of them start to get pretty tricky and dicey. I mean, you can start talking about funding sources too and, you know, stuff that's voter approved, and, I mean, it's -- you can get down a rabbit hole pretty quick. So, I was looking at it more of like an overview on how it comes together, what you use it for, how it relates to our budget, things like that.

LUE: Okay, one thing, I think, to sort of keep in mind with this process, is this -- this will be a one time like an annual CIP workshop that we have with you all, but we will be presenting, like a -- it's in the plans to present some sort of quarterly report to you to kind of let -- update you on these things as well because that was one of the recommendations from the audit.

PETERS: So now, I guess I need some clarity. I was thinking we were looking at specific projects, but from what you're saying, you would -- could you elaborate on what you were anticipating with this?

PITZER: Well, I thought it came from, you know, not only the audit, but also we had some discussion at the last budget hearings about what exactly the CIP -- you know, how stuff got on there, how -- what it meant once was on there, how that translated to the budget because there would be things for like the 2022 CIP project that were not in the budget because they'd already been funded some other way or something like that. And there was -- I know we had questions kind of like -- what is the CIP really and what are we using it for and -- because there's stuff that isn't on the CIP that gets done, and why isn't it on the CIP and how does that get -- happen? So, that's where I thought this whole idea came from.

PETERS: And I don't object to that. I just didn't hadn't thought of or don't remember it.

LUE: What I'm hearing basically is that we need some sort of overarching discussion that would identify a few pieces of the CIP and then maybe for your part, Ms. Peters, that we would do that on the quarterly basis to kind of break down those pieces that you want to see.

PETERS: That would be fine and that does include the ward -- what ward we're talking about.

LUE: Yes.

PETERS: We can always do this a second time this year if we have to.

LUE: Yeah.

PETERS: I mean, you know, like if we -- the first one is overarching and then the second one we're still --

LUE: Yeah, that's fine as well.

TREECE: And the realty is Director Lue and his department do a great job, and everything they do is a continuous improvement.

LUE: I appreciate that.

PETERS: At least it continuously informs us of what's going on.

TREECE: Correct.

PETERS: So it much more helpful.

TREECE: Right.

PETERS: Yeah, I agree.

REP94-21

Closure of the Uncovered Floors of the Fifth and Walnut Street and the Short Street Municipal Parking Structures During the Winter Months.

Acting Public Works Director Shane Creech provided a staff report, and the Council asked questions to which staff responded.

TREECE: I get the sense this was done before you became Acting Director.

CREECH: Yes, this is a yearly report of practice since 2017. We just want to close the top floor of both the Short Street and Fifth and Walnut garage to help us prioritize snow removal during the winter months. Use of the garages are such that we don't anticipate any parking demand issues.

TREECE: But I heard during the downtown hotel discussion that our garages were 100 percent full, and we couldn't accommodate any more cars.

CREECH: Now there could be parking permits that would -- might not be somebody in the spot, but with the permits and the public parking they could have been full. That's possible, I suppose.

TREECE: But there's adequate capacity now to move all the demand below the uncovered portions without impacting --

CREECH: The Fifth and Walnut garage -- the top floor is currently closed while we wait to take care of some things there. On the Short Street garage, there's just a couple reserved places -- spots, and what parking staff tells me is that there's capacity to do this.

TREECE: And then what about the Tiger Hotel garage there? They lease the entire top floor.

CREECH: That one we don't do this.

TREECE: That's their problem.

CREECH: Yup.

FOWLER: Can I just ask the obvious question, may I ask? So, the reason why you close the top floors is because you don't want to be up there removing snow, and instead you want your equipment down on streets working on your priority routes? Is that correct?

CREECH: Correct.

FOWLER: Okay.

CREECH: Staffing issue.

FOWLER: Sure. Even though it's pretty exciting to watch the snow come over the edge of parking garage. I used to work right across the street from whatever the Hitt Street garage is at the University, and we watched them clear the top floor all the time. So, but I can understand why you'd rather not do that and have your equipment out on the road instead.

CREECH: And, we can always open it back up if we saw utilization such that we needed to. There's no reason why we couldn't do that.

TREECE: Thank you.

REP95-21

Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) Board of Directors - Annual Membership and Membership Change Due to a Resignation.

Mayor Treece commented.

TREECE: The Downtown CID Board of Directors has submitted two -- one proposed candidate for an unexpired term due to a vacancy and then a proposed slate of candidates for the new terms ending in 2025, and per their bylaws, I'm rejecting that slate, and returning it back to the Downtown CID so that they can submit an alternate slate, and so we have a choice of -- so that I have a choice of candidates to choose from.

REP96-21 Business Loop Community Improvement District - End of Fiscal Year Report.

Mayor Treece commented and asked if there were any questions.

TREECE: Business Loop CID has submitted their end of fiscal year report. Any questions, or comments? I don't see Dr. Gardner here.

REP97-21 Final Integrated Electric Resource and Master Plan and Task Force Reports.

Jay Hasheider, Chair of the Integrated Electric Resource and Master Plan Task Force, spoke, and the Council asked questions and discussed the report.

TREECE: This has been three years in the making. I see Jay Hashieder here, the Chair. I see Tom Jensen, the Chair of Water and Light Advisory Board, here. I see Kim Fallis. I see Robin Wenneker, Dick Parker. Who am I missing? Anybody else on the -- oh, thank you, sorry. Thank you all so much. I know you have waded through a lot of heavy data and information and managed a consultant. I like the way you portrayed the information. I like the reference to the minority report if there was one, and I don't know how much council wants to do at this point. I would suggest at a minimum we probably want to have a work session with staff to consider their implementation of this process in terms of demand load, load shedding. I've got some pet questions we can ask them now or later, but Jay, I don't know if there's anything you want to add, and then I know Tom and Kim and Robin and Dick and others are here as well. I want to be respectful of you being here.

HASHIEDER: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. I want to just address three things. First I'd like to talk about the Task Force. First of all, my name is Jay Hashieder. I'm Chair of the Integrated Electric Resource Master Plan Task Force. And I'd like to talk about our group and then I'd also like to explain just briefly the -- how the reports work together. And then I'd like to talk about the process that we're -- we've been in and are going forward with. First of all, the Task Force -- I just want to provide kudos. I think you hear a lot of great commendations about people and the work that they do, but I just want to underscore the work that this group has done. As you mentioned, three years in the making, we've had 16 different -- 16 or more different people volunteering to participate. Five of them, as you point out, are here tonight, besides myself, and it's just been a real experience to see the dedication that these people have brought to our meetings, the passion for the importance of the subject matter that we're dealing with, and also the willingness for everybody to listen to other people and have the conversations that help craft something that is representative of the group as a whole, and not just some single voices. So, it's been an honor to service as their Chair. And then secondly, I want to explain -- you have gotten three reports tonight. Two of them come from Siemens,

and they are addressing the Integrated Resource and then the Master Plan in two separate studies. And then along with that, you've gotten the IRP report -- the IERMP report -- and I just want to point out that our report is meant to just provide highlights of what we think are the highlights in these other two documents. Some observations, some findings, and then perspectives on some select topics that are germane to the issues that we have in front of us, and specifics -- the new generation sources, the value of solar, advanced metering infrastructure, the master planning, which of course deals with all the infrastructure of how we're delivering our electricity throughout the distribution system, the assessment of our transmission options, the capital projects that encompass all the financing that this going to take, and then the non-wires alternatives. So, those are the specific highlights and perspectives that we put into our report that we will hope that you can read along with the Siemens report, and then, hopefully, make some -- give you some guidance, advice on how to then direct the city in these endeavors. Lastly, I'd like to talk about the process. This has been a very unique process, from the standpoint that very few, if any other task force, have been so intimately involved in not only choosing the contractor for a study like this, and -- but also working with the contractor and the staff, and in the process that we've had to, I guess, invent and figure out how to accomplish certain things because trying to make a group, like a diverse group like ours, along with the staff in developing a report, both from the consultants and from us has been unique. So, we are feeling our way through this process. We're not sure where we're - we're not sure what's next. At the end of three years, we have spent something on the order of -- the City has spent something on the -- \$800,000 for the contractor. According to my calculations, it's roughly about \$100,000 worth of staff time and volunteer time in these meetings that I was talking about. And the study itself -- the work that we're looking at is going to end up spending in the neighborhood of a billion dollars over the next 20 years so it's pretty important. And then you might even add the importance that this is about climate change as well -- dealing very intimately with how much the City is going to produce in terms of greenhouse gases in these next 20 years. So it's a very important piece of work, and for it to be left to the end of a meeting as the final thing of a long agenda seems to be not exactly what we were expecting. And so, I'm not sure how the Council envisions going forward. But at this point, we feel that we have done the work that you've asked us to do in our mission statement, and we're going to move on to the third part of this which is the cost of service and rate design. And our next meeting is scheduled in late January to accomplish that. And so with all -- with that, I certainly would entertain any questions that you have, and we certainly have some experts here tonight -- some authors on the different subjects to answer.

FOWLER: So, thanks Jay and to the members of the Task Force. I counted how many meetings you had, and if add in the two meetings that you've appeared before us, that's at least 56 meetings that you've had over three years, and I'm very grateful for the amount of time you've each invested in that. So, I sort of a narrowed in on the time of use demand charges -- the future of time of use demand charges that are mentioned in your summary report, and I know that that's also a topic of other utilities because I pay the utility bills at my employer, which is -- uses a different provider, and they're sending us literature hoping we'll adopt that as well. So, what concerns me about that going forward is -- as you know, we have at least 14,000



households that are burdened by the cost of their housing -- low income families, and in lots of reasons, they end up in housing that is not energy efficient, and so a time of use demand charges may affect them disproportionately if we aren't successful in making energy efficiency improvements to those housing units. And while that's not our problem per se, it's a problem that we haven't had much success with in the past. Back when there was lots of federal money for weatherization, we didn't have a high number of landlords taking advantage of that in their rental property. So, I wonder if you have any guidance for us -- when I know there wasn't a component to this that talked about demand side management or energy efficiency, and that you recommend that we undertake and have a different study for that -- but do you have any guidance for us on how we might go about -- as we look at those new technologies and if we go into -- to the extent that I understand this automated metering system that you can read from afar, which would then enable us to go into a time of use demand rate structure -- do you have any suggestions for us on where we might go looking for better strategies for energy efficiency so we can try and get ahead of the fact that we -- at least I can see a disproportionate impact on our low-income families as we move along the technology line for the delivery of electric.

HASHEIDER: You've targeted a subject area that has some overlap between the work that we've done and what we're going to be doing. The time of use rates is something that's in our meetings up ahead. The other side of that is the gap that has occurred in this study, which was expected to see some reports about demand side management and energy efficiency programming that could be added, and it was not complete. It very much just wasn't -- was left undone. And so, it points out a deficiency in this study that we point out in our report. But I think the very central target of your question is how do we as a community make the rental units more efficient -- by what means do we do that and how do we prevent that from then leveraging higher rents to the people that are living in those housing -- those houses, and I honestly don't know that we will be able to answer that particular question. It is a conundrum and I think there are some things that you can do to nibble around the edges on it, but basically it's a combination of codes and incentives. And, so I think that codes are certainly outside the purview of our - but I think that the possibility of incentives and some other creative programs could potentially come out of an efficiency study, which could be done as a follow up to this one.

FOWLER: I don't want us to fall on the path of incorporating more technology in how we deliver and regulate electric services. I just see that that's going to be a big gap that's going to get wider, and I appreciate your reference to -- because it is about codes and incentives. Thank you.

THOMAS: So yes, thanks all of you for all of the work that you've done, and I agree, we can't just look at this report now and move on. So, I think I heard you say we should have a work session.

TREECE: Yeah, I'd like to have staff come back with their response, and frankly, implementation plan on this because it does have significant budget impacts. I think we need, as a Council, to discuss whether we're doing the AMI, you know, smart meters. I've got some transmission line questions that I want staff's --

THOMAS: And I think it would be good if we could do that quite soon, whilst this is hot and have the Task Force -- and could we get the consultant, Siemens, at least on

a video call so that we can ask them questions, and --

HASHEIDER: This is one of the process, I guess, difficulties -- is that as a Task Force, we are assisting staff with the consultant, and it was not in our domain to manage the contract with the consultant, and to be quite specific, we were told not to talk to the consultant. And, I can see why that was said -- because 16 different people calling a consultant is not a good idea. However, it does limit our ability to make sure that certain things get done, and from that standpoint, anything going forward, obviously, would have to be staff that would deal with the consultant.

THOMAS: And I was really directing that question to staff -- when we have this work session, in addition to the Task Force and the staff, that we could have the consultant participate.

TREECE: So, yeah, can we do that at some point?

GLASCOCK: Absolutely.

TREECE: The -- and I think we, as a Council, decided that the cost of service study would be spearheaded by the Water and Light Advisory Board.

THOMAS: It sounds to me like the Task Force still has momentum for that.

TREECE: This Task Force is dissolved when they submit this final report.

THOMAS: But that was a piece of their scope of work that --

TREECE: No, when they submitted their interim report to us, the cost of service study was always predicated upon the Electric Resource Master Plan Report, and so now we have to go price out, but before we can do that, we have to hear staff's response to how it gets implemented.

THOMAS: And I don't think we're talking about a cost of service study of the type that a professional industry consultant does. I thought we were asking them to look into the specific issue as to whether a public infrastructure expansion fee or a system equity fee --

TREECE: No that's something else. That may have been what you asking, but that's something else. No, this is -- those are two separate things. We have to price out what -- which --

HASHEIDER: I do want to point out, I mean, that those were mentioned in our mission statement with the Task Force, and we began this whole endeavor assuming that we were going to do all three of those things. I think that there is some confusion right now amongst the Task Force on whether -- which of these directions that we should be going. I know that there are the Water and Light Board members, who are there regardless, and then there are the ad hoc members who have voting rights, but are just there for the Task Force purposes. And I have asked, there is, I think, five different members that are not associated with the Water and Light Board -- I can't speak for all of them, but I know that there's significant number of them that chose to participate so that they could become part of this next -- complete this job with the rates and the cost of service. So I know they would have some interest to participate in the future, but of course, it is Council that makes that decision. We have submitted this report as the Integrated Master Plan Report, and so, I think that it would be very good from our standpoint obviously, to have direction from Council on how you would like for us to proceed. I don't know if you want to decide that tonight.

TREECE: I don't know that there's a decision to be made. I mean, the enabling legislation that created you says the Task Force shall be dissolved upon submission of its final report. So, I think you're going to -- you're going to lose members. I

mean, this has gone on for three years, and it seems reasonable that the Water and Light Advisory Board, of which you're -- you're on it and five -- that the Board has participated in this process -- do that cost of service study as the Board's appointed -- as the Council's appointed advisory board.

HASHEIDER: Okay, it is the Council's - we're at the Council's discretion.

THOMAS: Well, I'd like to hear if other members of Council feel that since the Task Force clearly wants to do this, is planning to do this, whether we should ask them to do it. I'd like to --

HASHEIDER: I do want to say that --

TREECE: I'd like to hear from other Task Force members, but maybe I want to hear from Council first.

PITZER: Yeah, I don't know that I want to hear -- I appreciate all the other Task Force members coming tonight, but I'm not sure that I want to hear from all of them either. And Mr. Hasheider, I appreciate your comments, and I appreciate everybody's work and I appreciate the 56 meetings, if not more meetings than that. And I attended a couple of them, and I know that they were for the most part, not very short meetings either, and so, yeah, I think, you know, in my reading of the legislation, I think it's clear that the Task Force, you know, is dissolved. And it's not like you're going away. I mean, the Water and Light Advisory Board is like half of the Task Force, and, you know, they would be the ones continuing on with work and so that continuity is right there. And we actually had trouble, if you'll remember when we had some resignations from the Task Force, replacing those positions, and you know, we were able to do it under the premise of -- well, we're so close to being done, let's just figure out a way to make sure we have those positions filled until this final report is completed. So, I think -- I'm certain that that's the way that we should go, and really this is a minor point. I mean, we're spending -- in terms of the amount of time that we're discussing this, we're spending way too much time talking about this specific point, and we really should be talking about what we're going to be doing next, which I agree is moving forward with a work session, and having some staff ideas upon implementation. I mean, I've got several ideas and there were a lot of good points that I've pulled out of your report that would be priorities of mine in terms of moving forward, and I assume that everybody else has their own priorities as well. So, I think that having that discussion would help us sort of coalesce around some of those key points from the report and really give the staff some priorities to work on in terms of moving ahead.

SKALA: Yeah, to kind of build on that framework that you're suggesting, I think that - - obviously, everyone here is very appreciative of all the work that went into the three years of study, the 56 meetings, and the countless hours, and the volunteer hours, and so on. I think it is -- we are -- should be looking forward to some input certainly from the staff in terms of the work session -- I would also like to see, not to broaden this out to too great a degree, but to include as well the Climate and Environment Commission with respect to some of the integration of some of the work that you've done and some of the conversations that I've had, even in terms of setting deadlines, perhaps changing some of our targets and so on and so forth. I think that would be important to the work of the work session as well along with staff input. So I'd just like to add that to that -- the body of work that we have with respect to the work session and encourage you to continue on in the vein that you

were suggesting -- that is to take on these other issues that you see going forward with respect to the work that needs to be done. But I tend to agree with the Mayor, as well, and that is that these reports were submitted and we ought to move on and try and integrate this information into the work session and move on.

TREECE: Thank you, thank you very much, and I know this isn't the last word. And I know -- I can't remember - Kim, are you still on Water and Light Advisory Board or you just cycled off? Robin, you're still on, among other things, right? And so, I appreciate the double duty that this has taken, the institutional memory that you now have afforded this, and I think that Water and Light Advisory Board can pick up the next phase of this as -- with the resources that they need.

REP98-21 Amendment to the FY22 Annual Budget - Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds.

Mayor Treece asked if there were any questions, and there were none.

## XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Dee Dokken, Adam Saunders, and Eugene Elkin spoke, and the Council discussed various topics.

DOKKEN: Hi, I'm Dee Dokken. I live at 804 Again Street, and October 4, Dr. Weaver presented a description of the sensitive area around Gans Creek Wild Area, and requested that there be a Task Force appointed that would work on a zoning overlay that would be applied to property as it's annexed into the Columbia in that area. She also presented petitions asking for a plan that was signed by over 2,000 people as well as 450 electronic signatures we had on an online petition. These were all collected just in a couple of months last summer. There seemed to be a consensus on the Council to consider a resolution to do this. Then October 18, the Council heard a request by the Canton Estates developer to waive the one year waiting period to resubmit his R-1 annexation proposal, which was denied. And then concerns were raised that the County should be -- had to be involved with this issue and a discussion that maybe that discussion could happen at an upcoming work session. While the work session occurred November 15, but of course there was no time for discussion for planning and there were only two commissioners present, I think. Since then, I think Justin Aldred, the Southern District Commissioner has said that the County doesn't need to be involved in this, and hopefully -- I hope that they will be doing a larger planning project in the coming year, but they aren't necessary for this issue of an overlay. It's only as something would come into the City that it would be - that the overlay would be used. So, what I'm wanting is -- has there been any developments or any change in what the Council thinks about this process? We're just waiting to hear -- waiting for this process to be started. Thank you.

SAUNDERS: Hello, again, Adam Saunders. Just wanted to say thank you again for the opportunity to speak earlier and today to use this forum to discuss this project, and over the last many months, I've had a chance to talk to all of you individually and through email and such, and it seems like there's a lot of interest in using surplus funds, and we are at a shovel-ready spot with this building, and so I guess it's like, you know -- is this something that we want to do? You know, if so, like,

what's our next step? And so we stand ready to support whatever -- if it's something you want to do, happy to continue to brainstorm and figure out how we can grow this big onion in our town. So, if there are any questions, we'll be here now or through the Council discussion.

TREECE: I have some questions for you and I'll ask you later, off-line.

SAUNDERS: Okay, thank you.

ELKIN: Eugene Elkin, 3406 Rangeline. Has the list of the \$25 million from the government -- has that been put out or communicated? You'll said over the next several weeks, we would all hear what organizations might have received part of the \$25 million.

TREECE: No one said that.

PETERS: No, and we haven't done it. No one has said that.

THOMAS: One RFP has been developed for part of it.

ELKIN: We will eventually have a list?

PETERS: No.

TREECE: We have not made any decisions.

ELKIN: Okay, just wondering where it was at. I heard the discussion about utilities, possibly the water, correct? Water is going up? Is that a yes?

TREECE: here's a state imposed fee that we're required to collect.

ELKIN: Okay, Boone Electric has -- now that's under electric rates. They've come up with something called EV. They have a system of three different rates throughout the 24 hours of usage. I don't know that that has any bearing on water side, but electricity -- I asked for them to do that years ago, and they finally are just now getting around to it. If you choose to abuse your usage of your utilities, you have to pay for it, and that's how some people become conscious of low-income persons. They will watch very closely if the TV and the radio and all these other instruments are playing at the same time -- there's a pretty good chance you're going to pay for all that extra utilities -- something to think about. The second day of November, at about 12 noon my trailer court was sold. Apparently the ownership of Colonial Village is also the same owner as ours. We will be seeing a \$30 per month increase January 1. This is not good news. This is some of the figures that's been talked about here tonight. Those that poor, on fixed income -- you take the \$30 and you take gas prices and you take food prices and we're all aware that things are going up, but are the poor going to choose to eat or freeze -- what is it they're going to choose? And, it's not a good thought. We do know that Medicare is going to up in the range of \$170 plus. Even though they say we're getting this huge increase in social security, it will be taken away from us by way of the increase being very large on the Medicare side. My point is, as we go about trying to solve issues in the City - - most recently, I was given a figure of \$600 -- something at the Public Health Department that worked with people of low income -- it was spoken by Mr. Hollis, possibly the last meeting, that persons would no longer just get \$200, they would be given \$600. Well, when checking into that, I am not eligible. So, I would like for you all to find out what makes one person get this and another one get that. And I thank you very much, because I am one of those on fixed income, and I don't want to use the \$600 if it's earmarked, but why not have it there for those that go slightly over. If it's only \$200 I get, it ought to at least be a fair shake on everybody. Thank you.

SKALA: I just have one issue. It goes to some of what Ms. Dokken was talking about. There obviously -- in some of the discussions, there was not a great deal of interest in the County dealing with some of the protective nature of the discussion. I, unfortunately, was gone. It was one of the few times, I missed meetings, but it was on the 18th when we had that discussion, and we kind of left that discussion with sensitive areas and forming a group to take a look at that and potential overlays and so on. So I'm not sure what the consensus of the Council entirely was about that, but without the cooperation of the County, I think it's up to the City to safe guard some of those areas that we have that are very sensitive. But I'm even more concerned about the west area plan, which has been kind of languishing for a great deal of time, and it's getting to be critical, now that we're eyeing Perche Creek and so on and so forth. And I don't know -- I guess I'll lean on the staff to the extent to find out where we may be in terms of finding out what we can do about a very vital plan that -- I mean we haven't had any plans since the last northeast area subplan, and I think it's a -- that's a very important one that we need to follow up on and find out what's going on.

PETERS: I have -- I spoke with Ms. Thompson this afternoon about what the potential would be to deal with sort of the Gans Creek area. You know, if it stays in the County, then it's zoned County. If it comes into the City then we need to address how it would be zoned and what would be appropriate to look at. So, we're investigating whether there are different zoning options or not, and if there are, what would be appropriate. And also, we need talk to -- or I guess since you're here, you know, what chances do you all have to getting funding to expand Rock Quarry Memorial State Park as opposed to relying upon City to do this. So those are just some of the thoughts we've had. I don't know about getting a group together to come up with an official overlay. I'm not sure what we could do or not do about that. So, we're sort of investing that at the moment. So, I just wanted to let you know where we were with that. And you're right, the County is not particularly interested in getting involved. They figure if it's County, it's County. If it's City, it's City so that's where we are.

FOWLER: So, even though we didn't have a chance to talk with the County representatives at our joint work session. We talked about the tax -- the ballot issue -- have they indicated they're not interested in discussing with us how to protect the wild area as part of -- when did they do that?

PETERS: The last time I saw the Southern Boone County Commissioner.

FOWLER: Was that -- I mean, have we -- they've formally told us they're not interested in collaborating with us on some kind of --

PETERS: I mean, we had a conversation about it. I didn't ask him to like -- I'm not sure how we -- I mean, I talked to him about doing it, and he was like -- what I already said.

FOWLER: So, while you're -- and I appreciate that you're looking into options there - - can we then bring this back next time and talk about it because, you know, eventually, that one year from whenever they first submitted their plans is going to come up again, and this is an incredibly valuable natural asset to protect. So, can we have some kind -- I don't know whether it's a report or in what capacity we discuss it again at the end of the next meeting to make sure we stay on top of this? And if we can move and form a group, and do an overlay that we can get underway?

PETERS: Sounds fine to me. I'm not quite sure how to go about that, Ms. Fowler, but I'm happy --

PITZER: What are we going to discuss at the next meeting that we can't discuss now?

PETERS: Well hopefully we'll have more information as to whether there's other zoning options.

TREECE: I mean, are we suggesting annexing and zoning property without the owner's consent.

PETERS: No, we're not, but that was one of the things to look at.

THOMPSON: I might be able to shed some light. There is the ability of cities in some circumstances to do -- take some zoning actions within one mile outside the city limits, kind of on that protect the border. I don't know if that exists in this particular situation. If it is an option, it's going to take additional research, but that would be the maximum that would be allowable under state law, if that option does in fact exist. It is not -- I'm not saying it does, I'm not saying it doesn't. It's a potential that we can investigate. Absent that, there's absolutely no authority for the City to take any zoning action outside of its city limits. That's the one exception that is a possibility under state law. So, past a mile, you absolutely have zero authority.

PETERS: And, I did not mean to throw you under the bus, and I feel like I did. I just talked to Nancy about this this afternoon, and she was like, well, let me see what I can find out. So, that's the extent of that. And I don't know what we can do for any overlay legally, as Mayor Treece points out, you known, to limit people's right to use their property.

THOMAS: And Nancy, it's not legal to create zoning restrictions on land outside the City which would only go into effect if and when it becomes annexed into the City. That's not a legal pathway.

THOMPSON: That's correct. You cannot do that. You're dealing with people's property rights outside of your city limits over which you have absolutely no authority.

THOMAS: But it would only come into effect when it comes into the City, so --

THOMPSON: But you're still determining property rights of property that's located outside your city limits. So, you can't make something go into effect prospectively and be binding upon either city councils or persons over which you have no jurisdiction. There is no jurisdiction over land outside of your city limits boundaries.

THOMAS: How is it different from the fact that when land is annexed into the City, the owners of that land have to start paying property taxes to the City? They know in advance, when they get annexed, they now start paying property taxes -- why would that be different.

THOMPSON: That happens by operation of law. That is -- that's just by operation of law. Once you come into the city limits, all of the rights and benefits and obligations of being a resident --

THOMAS: Well, if we were to pass an ordinance like this, wouldn't that be operation of law?

THOMPSON: No, you cannot determine people's property rights outside of your city limits. That is beyond your authority as a City Council to do that.

THOMAS: Okay, well I will take your word for that.

THOMPSON: It's a pretty - it's a very -- I'm very solid on that legal principal.

DOKKEN: Another option would be just to work on more zoning options in the UDC -

- a UDC amendment, so that when something came in, there would be that option that, oh, this is a conservation zoned area where there is, you know, not very much -- impervious surface limit and extreme buffering, etc.

THOMAS: I mean, we still have the option to, you know, decide on what zoning we would allow when property comes in

SKALA: That's right.

THOMAS: I mean that always exists at the time of annexation.

DOKKEN: And right now, there's just R-1 or open space. There's not -- nothing in between.

THOMAS: So your recommendation is we develop a new zoning category that could be applied in this situation.

PETERS: The other option would just be not to bring it into the City and leave it in the County.

THOMAS: Uh huh, which is what has happened so far.

THOMAS: So this is related -- I mean, addressing your call, Karl, for -- try to get some progress on the west area plan. this is part of a southeast area plan. And really, I think it would be an excellent planning practice if we could do these kind of plans all the way around Columbia at those margins, and include all of those stakeholders. As I understand it, the hold-up is planning staff capacity to be able to manage those processes, which are quite, you know, labor intensive. So, I would like to suggest that we invest some of our general funds surplus into doing sort of a comprehensive perimeter planning process or a series of area plans by hiring additional planning staff to manage those processes. If the County doesn't want to participate, I guess we can't force them to, but it would certainly be very helpful if we could. I hope we can develop a process for spending some of that general fund surplus, or planning how to spend it over a number of years. And I want to just, again, state my support for completing the welcome center at the Agriculture Park as Adam has talked to us a couple of times tonight. I think that is a really appropriate and beneficial use of these funds, but does anybody want to, you know, push for a work session or a process -- we have, I think, \$20 or \$30 million dollars in that general fund surplus. I think it makes sense to invest it in the community in some of the priorities. Shouldn't we be, you know, moving ahead with that?

TREECE: Thoughts?

SKALA: Just a thought, and that is that we have been talking about, on several occasions that one of the -- it was in the context of ARPA funding discussions that we also talked about the disposition of some of the surplus funds, and how to -- what to do with those and how to consider that, and I think that would be fair game for a work session to focus on just what those guidelines are, whether we've exceeded them and whether to use them for various purposes. I'm not necessarily pigeonholing it into any one particular purpose. I mean there are lots of good uses for these kinds of things, but I think that's a use, that would be a useful work session as well -- to take on the issue of the surplus funds to the exist to which --

THOMAS: Well, should we ask the City Manager to schedule a work session? I know we're kind of booked up through January and that the City Manager will be gone by February, but I think we could get it on the calendar anyway.

TREECE: I would prefer a less elastic discussion about the surplus funds until we



reach consensus for the first half of the American Rescue Plan funds. That's a higher priority, there -- everyone says we're wasting time on urgent needs, and I'm not going to buy the nice stuff until we buy the stuff we have to have.

PETERS: And I would agree. I would rather --

TREECE: You want spend some of that ARPA money tonight? We can talk about the surplus money next.

THOMAS: Well, we are waiting, I guess, it's a staff capacity issue because we're waiting --

TREECE: No, it's not. We're waiting on staff capacity for the second \$12.5 million. We have the first \$12.5 million dollars in hand. We can direct staff to proceed on that any day.

THOMAS: Well, it was my understanding we had asked staff to organize a kind of robust community engagement process that a lot of the other cities have done.

TREECE: We can spend it on community violence, we can spend it on mental health, we can spend it on the homeless, we can spend it on work force development -- lots of needs out there. We hear them every day. We get criticized in the paper every day, and every meeting we wait. I'm happy to make a motion right now.

THOMAS: What would your motion be?

TREECE: Let's proceed with a behavioral crisis center.

THOMAS: I think we have done that, Brian. That's what we did at a work session about a month or two ago, and since then, Steve Hollis, has produced an RFP for the homeless services center, and I don't know -- has that been issued yet? Is that on the street as they say, John?

GLASCOCK: There's one out. I don't know if that's the exact one.

FOWLER: That's the \$75,000 planning.

GLASCOCK: That's the planning one, I believe.

THOMAS: Oh, okay. Well, I thought we had directed the City Manager to develop RFPs for those very projects, so, whilst they're working on that, we can -- and then the other part, the second half, I thought we asked the staff to -- and particularly the Health and Human Services Department because they have the greatest aptitude for this work -- to design that kind of highly engaged community process working with the people most impacted by economic inequality, and we are waiting for that to happen. That's why I said, I think it's a staffing capacity issue. And whilst all this -- that is happening, I don't see why we can't start discussing the general fund surplus as well, and start identifying what those priorities should be.

TREECE: What does everyone else think?

SKALA: I was not suggesting that we disperse funds necessarily.

THOMAS: Well, I wasn't either.

SKALA: I was suggesting that we have a work -- because we've been taking about this for a good period of time -- that we ought to at least discuss what the guidelines are, how much the surplus funds are, and what the potential is, and we don't necessarily have to do any of that, before the disposition of the APRA fund, the first tranch of ARPA funding, which was kind of deferred to Stephanie Browning and the staff and so on, so I don't know exactly what you meant by elastic, but I don't think there has to be any knee jerk reaction to spending any of these monies, but I do think we need to have that conversation at least to reassure the public that we're mindful of it.

PITZER: Well, when Ms. Waner brought this up a couple of months ago, my

suggestion was to wait until we got the numbers for the end of fiscal year 21, which would probably be somewhere around now-ish so that's, you know, one starting point -- at least we know what the numbers are.

THOMAS: So do we have consensus to schedule a work session on the general fund surplus in February say?

PETERS: I guess I'd like to be a little clearer as to what we're doing with the \$12 million of the ARPA funds. I really -- I don't want to go backwards on this conversation today, but we have an RFP out for the opportunity campus or homeless shelter or whatever. I don't think we have an RFP out for mental health resources.

THOMAS: We don't.

FOWLER: So, my understanding, was -- and it was the first meeting in October -- during the work session, we talked about those four areas, and then Mr. Glascock said that Stephanie would reach back to us and talk with us in anticipation of her preparing a series of RFP's, so, she obviously is -- she has a full workload every day - - I get it -- but she is the person that has the widest depth of knowledge on engaging our community on these very issues. These are all public health issues, with the exception of work force development. So, I am -- and I think the last email correspondence we got from her was she would be reaching out to Council in January because she was tasked with the community violence update -- and they got the \$75,000 planning grant out, and that's what's out on the street now, which we hope that will get utilized for the opportunity center by the folks that have already been working on it so hard. But that was my understanding of where we are with that, and so, we are -- we're ready to go when Stephanie has the block of time to engage with us and then work -- move forward with those RFPs.

TREECE: My understanding is that we directed staff to move forward with the RFPs, and the Director of Health was working with us for the community engagement on the second round of funding.

FOWLER: No, that was not my understanding.

THOMAS: I think she's involved in both halves pretty heavily.

FOWLER: No, that was not my understanding.

PETERS: Maybe we should ask our City Manager what we are actually doing because it seems that we really ought to address using the first half of the ARPA funds and then we need to do --

TREECE: I recall having a work session where a majority of council reached consensus to direct the City Manager to move forward with the homeless RFP, a behavioral crisis RFP, a work force development RFP, and a --

THOMAS: Violence, community violence.

TREECE: Probably community violence.

THOMAS: And three of those four are Stephanie's domain, which is why --

GLASCOCK: And the Mayor's right.

TREECE: And then, we would move forward with a community engagement process for the second \$12.5 million.

THOMAS: Which is also Stephanie's domain.

GLASCOCK: Yep.

THOMAS: That's why it's a staff capacity issue, and I'm not sure what we can do about that. But the general funds, you know, it might be as simple as us agreeing as a Council -- if we have \$30 million dollars currently surplus that we decide to spend

that down, \$5 million a year for the next 6 years during the budget process, and then we can start thinking about how we want to spend the \$5 million for fiscal 23.

GLASCOCK: Well, you're going to start budget discussions sometime in January.

PETERS: And, one of the things we're also having to consider is staff salaries.

WANER: Right.

PETERS: I mean, there's supposed to be an entire --

THOMAS: Yeah, I mean, that can be on the table as well.

TREECE: Is there a consensus to have a work session in February? I think Mr. Pitzer makes a good point -- let's see where we end up.

FOWLER: Yes, February would be great

WANER: This was supposed to be a light agenda so I came with a list. I waited. Okay, so the first thing -- I'll go with my good thing first. I met with Adrian and Kim of the Gold Bar and Plush last week. I believe CPD met with them at one point, and I think Pat did as well. It was a really great meeting. I had -- it was a wonderful opportunity to get to know two business owners, but also, they are really trying to be more proactive in community building efforts, and so I just wanted to shout that out -- that I met with them. I think they're doing a really good job in trying to engage with the community more and kind of build up that community, you know, resilience.

WANER: The other things that I had -- I was going to mention the -- how do we move forward to support the CCUA because Adam needs a job as a lobbyist -- he's going to keep coming here every month until we do something, so I'm glad that we're going to continue to talk about that.

WANER: I don't know if you all are also getting all of these phone calls and emails, but it's been almost a year that we've had the trash program -- the pay-as-you-throw. I'm so sorry -- I know -- I'm going to keep bringing it up. The folks that I'm getting calls from are families that can't afford it and can't find the trash bags. That's the discussion right now. I don't if other folks are having the same issues, but they can't track down bags. I don't know if that has to do with the fact that it's December and we're going to have new vouchers and things in January, but it seems to be that we're having some supply and demand issues with those, which is creating a hardship on a lot of folks but specifically on low income families. We've got figure something out.

GLASCOCK: Can you tell me where they're going please?

WANER: Yeah, Moser's was one. Hyvee was one, and Gerbes was one. Those are the ones I've heard about this week.

GLASCOCK: Okay. Thank you.

WANER: I don't know if that's the same for other folks, but those are the phone calls that I'm getting. I mean, how do we address this. It can't be just one off solutions, can it?

PETERS: Well, there's a few things. Well --

WANER: I know, it's a gross conversation. Nobody wants to have it.

PETERS: No, you know, I live in the East Campus. It's a daily to weekly conversation in my neighborhood, just because of the scattered trash, but at one point we were hoping that we would get a citizens initiative to put the roll carts back on the ballot, and I have to say, I have not followed up with that group.

WANER: I have. I have info on that.

PETERS: Oh, excellent. Then, what's your info?

WANER: The info is that they have reached the number of signatures that they need, but they want to get extra so that if any of those are invalidated that they have, you know, a margin of error, but I think what makes it difficult is it's based off of a certain percentage of turnout at the last at-large election, which will change in April, so then the numbers potentially can change as to how many signatures they need. So relying on that as our fallback and are failsafe of we're going to do -- wait for that -- I have a problem with that.

PETERS: Well, the thing is that, I would say that it's the first part of December, and if they get it in by the end of January, then they are going off the last general election numbers that they needed. So then, they should hopefully have enough, and if they have enough, then we can put it back on the ballot, and that was just what the last Council had wanted to do. I mean we could always vote to put it back on the ballot or we could vote to bring -- I mean, we could bring it back for a discussion. I mean, roll carts are just another way of a pay-as-you-throw system. It depends how big your roll cart is, but it certainly takes care of a lot of the trash problems.

WANER: Yep, I agree with you.

PETERS: I don't know if we want to do that, or if we want to give them another month and see if by the end of January they've got enough signatures. I don't know. But that would be my current -- that's my current hope, I guess.

WANER: I'm comfortable with them being aware that there's a time line by which these same numbers are still accurate. Is that December 31st, Sheela -- that the percentage of turnout of the at-large election -- what they would need on -- the number of signatures they would need on a citizens petition?

AMIN: Based off my memory, all the Charter says is that it's based off the last mayoral, council member at-large election.

WANER: Not necessarily that calendar year.

AMIN: No, so, there -- that would be an interpretation issue depending on -- at this point they can't make the April election because of time to review -- submission, time to review, get on -- in front of you, notify the County Clerk -- so the earliest would be August.

PETERS: And, so if they got their signatures in, like, by the end of January, would that be enough time to review the signatures and get on the August ballot?

AMIN: We have thirty days to review them so potentially, but I tell you my concern is they've got stale signatures. They've been doing this for over a year.

WANER: Right.

PETERS: Well, that's why they need the extra signatures.

AMIN: They probably need a lot of extra.

WANER: And that's my concern -- is that continues to be the failsafe that we're talking about -- is waiting for the citizens petition. I commend them for their efforts, and I'm grateful for that. I'm concerned that it's going to continue to be the point.

PETERS: I mean, the other option would be to bring it back as a resolution or whatever for Council if we have four people that are agreeable to do that.

THOMAS: At the same time.

PETERS: Yeah, at the same time.

THOMAS: Because some people have jumped back and forth across the fence. We

could have done this a year ago.

PETERS: Yeah, well.

WANER: I wasn't here.

THOMAS: It was before your time.

SKALA: In addition to this, I mean -- talking trash here. My numbers were a little bit different. The numbers that I got is they were still a bit short, but that may or may not be the case, so may be right, but that means that it get -- if that in fact happens and they satisfy that requirement, and it gets put on the ballot, of course, then it has to pass, right? I mean, and that's not a -- I don't think that's a done deal, necessarily, because even though I think the issue is probably closer than it used to be. It was defeated by a significant margin in 2015 or 2016, whenever it was, and roll carts although solve -- they obviously solve some problems, create others, and we many have to have some sort of hybrid system, not the least of which is a \$12 million -- at last count -- \$12 million price tag to convert. So, I mean, we'll do what the folks want, but I'm just not sure what this deadline and when this is all going to happen. There are some issues -- I agree with you that I've heard as well -- about availability issues in particular in some stores, and yet when I talk to Mr. Sorrell, in some cases in following up on this, some of it is misinformation as to where to get these -- where to get the vouchers filled and so on -- that some folks don't understand that they have to go up to the admin desk to get some of these things, because they don't have them in the aisles. They're just not available in general, but I do think there are some supply issues, and I think that's a legitimate problem that we have to solve with Waste Zero.

PETERS: I guess the other option would just be to -- get a different trash service to do the trash versus the City.

WANER: So, privatize.

PETERS: Privatize it.

SKALA: [Inaudible] change the Charter -- that would require another referendum.

PETERS: It would change the Charter? In our Charter is says we do trash?

SKALA: Isn't there a proscription -- I thought there was -- you could not have a private.

PITZER: It's an ordinance. We could change it.

THOMPSON: That's electric. You're thinking electric.

SKALA: Oh, is that what I'm thinking?

PITZER: You'd need two readings to change the ordinance.

PETERS: So, is this something we could keep thinking about. I don't think we're going to solve it tonight.

WANER: Oh, no, and I didn't anticipate us solving it tonight. What I wanted to do was continue the conversation, especially because it's been a year, right? So I'm going to keep being that pain that says it's been six months, let's check in.

PETERS: That's okay, check in.

WANER: I would like us to keep having the conversation and trying to come up with some sort of creative solution. I know that's it -- roll carts are a hot topic and that may not be the answer, and that's fine, but we cannot keep going how we are.

WANER: And then my last thing, and then I'll let you all go home, I'm so sorry. I've received a lot of phone calls about -- concerns about panhandlers in the community. I know that Nancy, you tried so hard to give me the best definition of

the jurisdictional issues that take place with enforcing panhandling laws and things like that. I'm curious if we know other communities do to navigate the issues of panhandling in multijurisdictional areas. I know that -- for some folks it's a trash issue, for some folks it's the unhoused population might be aggressive with them, I don't know -- it hasn't happened to me specifically, so I wanted to bring that up as that's a continued theme of feedback that I receive from the Second Ward.

PITZER: Very briefly, because we're talking about scheduling a lot of things tonight. So I'm going to be gone the meeting of February 21. I'd very much like to participate in a discussion about the integrated resource plan and the discussion about surplus funds.

PETERS: Okay, so I guess we won't be doing that on February 21.

TREECE: Thanks.

PITZER: If that becomes a problem, let me know -- talking about scheduling

PETERS: You're done, you don't care.

GLASCOCK: I'll pass it along.

PETERS: Well you do that - but go ahead and schedule it not on that day.

TREECE: Anything you want to have discussed while you're gone?

GLASCOCK: Roll carts.

## **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 10:40 p.m.