



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Tuesday, September 8, 2020
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 8, 2020, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS (left the meeting at approximately 9:00 p.m.), and TREECE were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of August 3, 2020 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mayor Treece. Mayor Treece explained the minutes of the regular meeting of August 17, 2020 were not yet complete.

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

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI12-20

COVID-19 Update.

Discussion shown with R109-20.

R109-20

Ratifying Order 2020-10 issued by the Health Director and authorizing the Health Director to extend the effective date of Order 2020-10 for a period of time greater than twenty-one (21) days.

The special item and resolution were read by the Clerk.

Ms. Browning provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if staff had looked at just ages 18-19 within the 10-19 age bracket. Ms. Browning replied they were seeing an increase in school aged kids, and they were a large part of the population. She explained they were working on providing more information behind the dashboard so those that wanted to see the numbers for specific ages could do so.

Ms. Browning continued with the staff report.

Mayor Treece asked who determined that a doctor's order was required. He wondered if it was protocol of the state or local health director or Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) guidance. Ms. Browning replied it was hospital protocol. Mayor Treece asked Ms. Browning if she could change that. Ms. Browning replied no. Mayor Treece asked how they could increase "no barrier, no questions asked" testing opportunities. Ms. Browning replied by increasing funding to pay for the tests. Mayor Treece asked Ms. Browning if her opinion on surveillance testing had changed given the widespread community transmission they had been seeing. Ms. Browning replied the goal was to get as many people tested as possible, and for those people that test positive to isolate

and quarantine in order to slow the spread.

Ms. Browning continued with the staff report.

Mr. Skala asked if the free testing events mentioned would require a doctor's order along with registration. Ms. Browning replied doctor's order would not be required and the person being tested could be asymptomatic. Ms. Peters asked how one could register. Ms. Browning replied one could register at the State Health Department website or with the Family Health Center for the other event. Mayor Treece asked Ms. Browning whether the Family Health Center event involved drive-through testing. Ms. Browning replied yes.

Ms. Browning continued with the staff report.

Ms. Peters asked if the University of Missouri was able to trace in 24-48 hours or if they were also at the 5-7 day capacity. Ms. Browning replied they were also behind. Ms. Peters asked if there was an opportunity for more volunteers to step forward to help with contact tracing. She noted the 5-7 days was not timely and wondered how that could be improved. Ms. Browning stated they would reallocate some of the CARES funding received to hire additional contact tracers. She understood the University was looking at how they could make changes to bring on additional staff as well. Ms. Peters asked if that meant they could reduce the time frame to 48 hours within about a week's worth of time, or if it would still take longer. Ms. Browning replied she thought it would take at least 2-3 weeks. If they could slow things down in terms of the number of cases, ramp up staffing levels, and make changes to REDCap in terms of how they were reaching out, she thought they could get there. Ms. Peters asked Ms. Browning if she had any other recommendations as to how to decrease the number of cases. Ms. Browning replied they needed to continue efforts to keep people apart, limit gatherings, and ask people to wear masks. Ms. Peters asked if people were trying to do the right thing or if people were continuing to gather in large groups without wearing a mask. She wondered if they needed to ramp up enforcement. She also wondered why it seemed as though they were backsliding. Ms. Browning replied she believed they were making improvements. She explained they had been out several weekends, to include the last two weekends, in an attempt to conduct compliance checks at bars and restaurants with regard to the new order. She understood the University of Missouri Police Department (MUPD) and the Columbia Police Department (CPD) were working together to limit gatherings in neighborhoods. She commented that with regard to students, a student that had COVID-19 likely lived with 4-8 other people so they tended to have multiple people impacted within one location. Ms. Peters understood students were not being moved to any COVID residence hall or other place for isolation. Ms. Browning stated students on campus had opportunities for isolation and quarantining in University provided spaces, but students off campus did not. She noted it would be beneficial to have a place they could isolate or quarantine safely.

Ms. Browning continued the staff report.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the hospitalization rate among Boone County residents. He thought she had indicated 13 out of the 50, and wondered if that number was going up. Ms. Browning replied it was up. She thought there had been about 70 to date over time, and explained the exact number per day tended to fluctuate. She noted they might have eight at one time with a couple more added on one day and then a couple others leaving the hospital and coming off that same day or soon after. It seemed to be relatively steady. Mr. Pitzer understood it was not increasing at the same rate as the absolute number of cases. Ms. Browning stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked if that was due to a larger concentration of cases being among younger people. Ms. Browning replied yes. She noted Boone County had a younger population and most of their cases involved that younger population that tended to require less hospitalization. She pointed out the risk would increase as there was more and more spread into the community.

Mr. Pitzer asked if there was any change in the seriousness of hospitalized cases over the last 6-7 months. Ms. Browning replied it varied. She stated there had been people that had been hospitalized for almost two months before being released. Others had

shorter stays. She pointed out they did not know about any long-term consequences afterwards either.

Mr. Trapp asked about the positivity rate. Ms. Browning replied they had not calculated the positivity rate from the last week because they had learned about some reporting errors from one of the labs to the State. She noted they were waiting for that to be resolved before reporting on the numbers.

Ms. Fowler stated she was stunned to hear the University only offered a quarantine facility to students that were in their residence halls and asked for the capacity of their quarantine ability. Ms. Browning replied she thought it was about 120. Ms. Fowler asked Ms. Browning if she knew if those spaces were currently full. Ms. Browning replied she thought they were near capacity if not full. Ms. Fowler asked Ms. Browning if she thought it was the responsibility of the University to offer quarantine capacity for their students that lived in housing adjacent to campus, but not on campus. Ms. Browning replied, in an ideal world, yes. She explained that without quarantine and isolation opportunities, they risked sending students home throughout the State or to other states, which increased the caseloads in those communities. The student would drop off of the numbers for Boone County and become one of theirs, and the exposure risk would increase there. Ms. Fowler asked Ms. Browning if she or the City Manager had any tools to leverage the University to accept responsibility for quarantining those additional students. Ms. Browning replied no. She noted the University had developed a plan, which included a plan for on-campus students. She pointed out it had been difficult for her to find isolation and quarantine facilities for people within the City so she believed it would be a challenge for the University as well.

Ms. Fowler asked who could help a person register for testing that might not have a smart phone or a computer. She commented that the last time there had been a no doctor's order testing opportunity, she had gone online to see how easy or difficult it was to register. She stated it had not been particularly easy on her home computer so she felt it would likely have been more difficult utilizing her smart phone. She asked where they were in providing assistance so they would not leave a lot of people behind on testing. Ms. Browning replied people could drive up or walk up with a doctor's order, and noted she understood the order was a barrier. She commented that Dr. Allemann had indicated she would write an order for anyone that needed one. If someone was uninsured, they had CARES Act funding and could work with the Family Health Center for a referral to obtain a test if the person met the criteria. Ms. Fowler asked about someone in a high deductible insurance plan. She wondered if they could go to the Family Health Center. She also wondered about City employees that might be concerned about exposure. Ms. Browning replied she would defer to Ms. Buckler regarding City employees, but did not think there was a cost for COVID-19 testing under the City's insurance plans. She also did not think a cost for an office visit would be required either. Ms. Fowler asked about someone that was not a City employee, but in a high deductible plan. She wondered if that person could go to the Family Health Center for a test. Ms. Browning replied perhaps, and noted she would have to check. Ms. Fowler commented that she was pointing out gaps she was afraid people were falling into in hopes that they could continue to provide information showing those gaps really did not exist as there were ways around them. Ms. Browning stated her staff was busy, but they would always take a phone call and try to figure out how to help someone.

Ms. Peters asked about plans moving forward since they were seeing the number of cases increase. She wondered if there was any thought to having restaurants go back to 50 percent capacity versus 75 percent capacity, closing the bars, asking the University to not allow people to attend football games, etc., if things became worse. Ms. Browning replied she thought they had to get past whatever happened during the Labor Day weekend. She stated they needed to determine if the current order was working, and they had not had enough time yet to decide. She commented that she thought it was working as they were not seeing as many people out late at night or as many house

parties, but they would also have the effects of Labor Day weekend. They would have to wait for 5-14 days after the two week period involving Labor Day weekend, and based on the number of cases then, they could determine what might be needed. She pointed out they, themselves, were their best hope if they would alter their own behavior. She stated she would hate to have to step back further and hoped they would all be able to do the right thing. She felt they currently needed to stay the course, at least through this order and potentially another couple of weeks. Ms. Peters asked when this order had started. Mayor Treece replied this Friday would mark two weeks. Ms. Peters asked Ms. Browning if she had a feel for what they would do if the numbers continued to increase. Ms. Browning replied it was dependent on many factors. It would have to be manageable. She explained this was happening across the State of Missouri. Boone County was not unique, and absent a statewide plan, it would be hard to take any action to step backwards.

Mr. Pitzer commented that a list had been published today showing the cities across the country with the largest increases over the past two weeks, and Columbia had been sixth. He noted the top ten cities had all been university communities. He asked where Columbia was relative to some of those communities in terms of restrictions or health orders. Ms. Browning replied some had closed bars down in their entirety while others had restrictions. In addition, some communities were aggressively enforcing the guidelines in terms of students. She noted she understood the University of Missouri was trying to do some enforcement in terms of violations of the rules on campus. She explained some schools had opted to repeat testing, such as every few days or twice a week. Many of them were doing similar things. She understood a number of universities in the SEC would not allow tailgating.

Mr. Skala stated he understood Duke University was testing everyone regardless of symptoms and their rates were low, but the University of Missouri was in a different predicament.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Browning if she had any authority to compel mass testing. Ms. Browning replied she did not believe she did. Mayor Treece understood they would have the ability to increase "no barriers, no questions asked" testing. Ms. Browning stated she thought they could if they could bring together a group to work on a strategy for the community. She felt it would take more than an order. It would take a real commitment by a lot of people.

Mayor Treece commented that two weeks ago it seemed prudent to reduce the risk of exposure by reducing the number of hours in the bars, and asked Ms. Browning if she had any data as to the rates of community transmission that they could trace back to a bar or a restaurant as the potential exposure site. Ms. Browning replied when reviewing the case notes, she could see there were patrons and employees in many of those facilities that had reported to have had been in that facility. There numbers were so large that it was taking too long to get to them. She commented that with a hepatitis outbreak or the mumps, they would have been able to take the case information to really make those epidemiology links, but the numbers were so large with COVID that they were unable to do that. She said they were seeing many positive cases in those businesses where people were gathering and not always wearing a mask.

Mayor Treece noted the first slide seemed to show it was increasing in the general population at about the same rate as the student cohort, and the next slide seemed to show the 60-64, 65-69, 70-74, and 75-79 age brackets increasing exponentially but not at the same rate as the 18-24 range. He stated he doubted the 60-79 year old was going to bars at 10 p.m. at night so they were not being exposed there, and asked Ms. Browning if she knew if they were being exposed to students. Ms. Browning replied they were seeing more cases in congregate living spaces when it came to those in the older age groups. She pointed out testing was being done in those venues and they were finding workers that might be positive as well as people that lived there.

Mayor Treece understood aggressive actions had been taken on bars violating the mask

ordinance or other health orders, and that due process had to occur so those bars were able to reopen. He asked if there was an interim step of shutting them down or pulling their license. He wondered if they could be more surgical rather than continuing to ratchet down on everyone. Ms. Thompson replied the City had the capacity for individuals, but it took some due process. They would not pull a license, but they could enter a closure order based upon an outbreak of a contagious nature of a communicable disease at a particular establishment. Mayor Treece asked for clarification regarding the capacity limits of the current order. Ms. Browning replied the current order just required social distancing to be accommodated. She explained capacity limits were based on the fire code, which involved very large numbers. As a result, saying they had to allow for social distancing was the best strategy. Mayor Treece understood they could not take action against the establishment based solely upon a violation of the mask ordinance or the social distancing requirement without a positive exposure that might be determined five days later, and asked if that was correct. Ms. Thompson replied it was very fact specific as to the nature of the violation and the risk involved. Theoretically, it might be possible, but it would really have to be a significant violation. The business had to be totally ignoring the health order. A situation with a small group of patrons that were not abiding or one person who wandered to the bathroom without a mask likely would not be sufficient to shut it down. If the establishment was not enforcing the order at all, it might provide for enough ammunition for a health order against a specific entity after repeated warnings and guidance, especially if they could combine it with a small outbreak or transmission of disease at that particular establishment.

Ms. Fowler stated she had met with the Board of the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) today, and they felt the Band-Aid was on the wrong wound in terms of trying to address the behavior of the students or young people. Two Saturdays ago, before the first day of classes, she noted she had come downtown late at night to observe the situation and she had seen a lot of inappropriate behavior in terms of the mask ordinance and the health order. She asked Ms. Browning if she had a willingness to meet with the downtown bar owners and others that were economically adversely affected by this order to give them a chance to help formulate a response that might better address what they saw. Ms. Browning replied absolutely. Ms. Fowler asked if that was something that could happen in the near future. Ms. Browning replied yes. Ms. Fowler asked if that was already on the schedule to occur. Mr. Glascock replied a couple of them had reached out to him for a meeting so that was in process. Ms. Fowler asked if that would be open to all of the bars by Zoom or some other hybrid meeting. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know as he was not setting it up. Ms. Fowler asked who was setting it up. Mr. Glascock replied Matt McCormick.

Ms. Fowler understood the portal was open at Boone County and asked if the City had a plan to ask for funds with regard to some of the unmet needs for COVID, including testing, tracing, and other enforcement needs they had. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Ms. Fowler asked if that would be discussed tonight. Mr. Glascock replied he had not planned on it, but noted they could. Ms. Fowler asked if the portal was open. Mr. Glascock replied he had seen a press release indicating it was so he assumed it was. Ms. Fowler understood the City had a plan to submit requests for funding through it. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas understood the position of sixth in terms of the most new cases per capita over the last two weeks had also put them into the red zone for the White House Coronavirus Task Force. He stated he was happy they were making specific recommendations based upon data, and listed some of those recommendations, which included closing bars and gyms, creating outdoor dining opportunities with pedestrian areas, limiting social gatherings to ten people or fewer, and instituting routine weekly testing of all workers in assisted living and long-term care facilities. He asked Ms. Browning if she agreed with those recommendations. Ms. Browning replied she looked at where the cases were coming from. She understood they had included gyms, but to her

knowledge, there had not been a positive case in Boone County due to a gym. She understood there could be a situation whereby a person had not listed it as a place they had been, but she had not observed that situation. She commented that she agreed with testing at nursing home facilities, and noted many already did it on a regular basis, and the State of Missouri was working with them through their licensure department. She pointed out people came to Boone County from surrounding counties and if no one else in the State was going to do these things, it would be hard. Mr. Thomas felt someone needed to be first. He noted these were official recommendations from a White House that was not a White House that over-exaggerated the situation or recommended excessive restrictions, and Boone County was not meeting those recommendations. Ms. Browning pointed out they were meeting them in some areas. Mr. Thomas felt it was deficient. Ms. Browning stated she felt a larger community conversation was needed.

Mr. Thomas wondered if they should have that conversation at the Council level, and asked his colleagues if they felt the recommendations of the White House Coronavirus Task Force should at least be followed. Mayor Treece replied he thought they should follow the commitment of following the data and science. He explained he had been given the opportunity to meet Dr. Birx when she had been in Missouri two weeks ago and noted he had asked what advice she had for a mayor of a college town. He understood part of it was to increase testing and quarantine opportunities. It was not to remove them from the community. He thought there was likely a divide as to whether students were a part of the community or guest of the community, and believed they were likely a bit of both. They were not just students on campus as they worked in the stores, restaurants, bars, daycares, and nursing homes, and shopped in the City's economy. He stated he would prefer the imprimatur of the Council to again reach out to the three universities and colleges with Ms. Browning and Ms. Thompson. He noted the goal was to reduce the number of rapidly rising increase in cases, and they could do that by improving the ability of the Public Health and Human Services Department to do contract tracing.

Mayor Treece asked if the University was doing its own contact tracing. Ms. Browning replied it was. Mayor Treece asked if that was fairly well coordinated. Ms. Browning replied she could see what was happening on their end, but they too did not have enough people to manage the numbers. Mayor Treece commented that if they were not going to do surveillance testing, he thought they needed to increase opportunities for "no questions asked, no doctor's order, no barrier" testing as often as someone wanted it. He felt that was a mark of good behavior. It did not make someone that tested negative invincible, but showed what that person had been doing all of this time worked. He also felt better enforcement was needed. Depending on whether the mask policy was extended when it expired on October 10, he believed they should either increase the \$15 penalty or not place a cap on it and provide for some strategic enforcement of it.

Mr. Thomas stated he supported following the recommendations regarding bars and gyms. They wanted systematic, data driven guidance, and it may not be perfect, but if all counties followed it, they could learn whether it was working or not. He felt Columbia and Boone County should do its part. He commented that he missed being able to go to bars, but thought that following these recommendations was the best way to get as close as possible to the kind of life they had previously. He stated he would argue that they had shut down the schools since they had kept the bars open, and that the rising cases that had pushed the schools online as of today might not have happened had they been stricter in terms of interactions within the community.

Mr. Skala stated they had achieved tremendous success early on by establishing the emergency declaration, etc. At that time, they had also brought everyone together in search of a community conversation. He did not believe that had been done lately, and they seemed to be siloed again. He commented that in a perfect world, it would be great to set the example, but the other counties were not doing this nor was the State. As a result, they were left scrambling to do the best they could under the circumstances. He thought it would be a great next step to get some of the groups together.

Mr. Trapp stated he would encourage Mayor Treece to have the conversations mentioned. He felt they needed to come together as a community and bring resources together. As a Council, he believed they should provide Mayor Treece with the imprimatur to convene to determine if they could raise a higher level of community support to take more aggressive actions. He also believed it should be based on the science and what they were seeing in the data. He stated he had an extreme amount of trust in Ms. Browning's decisions as she attended all of the meetings, had the professional background, etc. He noted he would provide her the political support and cover to make those tough decisions when they needed to be made. He pointed out Columbia was located within Missouri, and the statewide response had not been robust, which would always hinder them. In addition, their enforcement abilities were limited. He commented that they governed with the consent of the governed so it was important to get their messaging out to make things better. He appreciated the work of Ms. Browning and her staff as it was difficult.

The vote on R109-20 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC50-20 Adrienne Mann - Racism in Columbia.

Adrienne Mann commented that they had spent a lot of time over the last few months, in and out of council meetings, discussing the needs for reforms to address racial inequalities in the criminal justice system. While reforms to the criminal justice system were important, she also wanted to talk about the systems of oppression that existed across society, to include Columbia. She explained she was passionate about these issues due to their intersection with poverty, race, and health. She appreciated Mr. Thomas' commitment to looking at the data and following the bare minimum guidelines from the White House, and noted she also supported the Health Director in terms of her statement of needing community buy-in to make stricter recommendations, which started with the Council. She stated the case numbers, hospitalizations, and deaths had disproportionately impacted people of color, and felt they could be dismantling systems of oppression by taking stricter measures. She quoted a philosophy professor, Marilyn Fry, who described systems of oppression by saying, "Consider a bird cage. If you look very closely at just one wire in the cage, you cannot see the other wires. If your conception of what is before you is determined by this myopic focus, you could look at that one wire, up and down the length of it, and be unable to see why a bird would not just fly around the wire anytime it wanted to go somewhere. Furthermore, even if one day at a time, you myopically inspected each wire, you still could not see why a bird would have trouble going past the wires to get anywhere. There is no physical property of any one wire, nothing that the closest scrutiny could discover, that will reveal how a bird could be inhibited or harmed by it except in the most accidental way. It is only when you step back, stop looking at the wires one by one, microscopically, and take a macroscopic view of the whole cage, that you can see why the bird does not go anywhere; and then you will see it in a moment. It will require no great subtlety of mental powers. It is perfectly obvious that the bird is surrounded by a network of systematically related barriers, no one of which would be the least hindrance to its flight, but which, by their relations to each other, are as confining as the solid walls of a dungeon." She commented that today her goal was to illuminate just a few of those wires as the criminal justice system impacted a lot of other factors. Nationally, in April and May, Black Americans were hit the hardest by the economic recession with a 16.8 percent unemployment rate compared to a 12.4 percent unemployment rate for White Americans. In addition to increased involvement by the criminal justice system, plain old racism

impacted employment as well. She stated one Harvard study had found that when Black Americans used American or white sounding names, they received 150 percent more callbacks than they did when they used names that sounded black. In 2018, the average black worker earned just 62 percent of what the average white worker made, and this was happening in the diversity of the City's own workforce. She explained she had analyzed the payroll data recently added to the City's website, and in the most generous terms, the City's workforce was 22 percent people of color and 33 percent women. While this seemed like progress, when taking a closer look, of the 10 percent highest paid jobs within City government, only 16 percent were held by people of color and only five percent were held by women. In contrast, the jobs that fell to the lowest 10 percent by pay involved 51 percent of people of color and 47 percent women. She pointed out business ownership in Columbia also lacked representation. Nationally, only 8.7 percent of the Fortune 500 and S&P 500 companies had CEOs of color. In Columbia, there were 12,901 businesses with licenses, but only 209 were listed as women or minority owned, which was two percent. She commented that all of these factors impacted poverty in the black community, and poverty impacted all of the factors. It was a vicious cycle. In Columbia, 19.5 percent of white residents lived below the poverty line, while 32.7 percent of black residents lived below the poverty line. She stated that education was one of the best ways to make it out of poverty. In Columbia, the high school graduation rate for white children was 96 percent and 57 percent of that number had later attained a Bachelor's degree. In contrast only 89 percent of black children finished high school, and of that number, only 19 percent had later attained a Bachelor's degree. She paraphrased scholar Ibram Kendi as saying the facts could lead them to one of two conclusions; either black people were somehow inferior to their white counterparts, or a self-sustaining system of oppression had been built throughout history through intentional discrimination, detrimental color blindness, and indifference to human suffering. She commented that those within City leadership who believed the first needed to look for a new job, and those who believed the second needed to get to work. While they might not have been the ones that had created these systems of oppression, they were responsible for the choice to either maintain them or dismantle them, and wondered which they would choose.

SPC51-20 Kimber Summers - Shifting the responsibility of drug use and addiction from the criminal to the social justice system.

Kimber Summers did not speak as she was not in attendance.

SPC52-20 Roy Lovelady - Community policing.

Roy Lovelady stated he was the President of People's Defense and explained he was not okay because the system was broken, but understood it was, however, working as it was designed. He quoted Carter G. Woodson as saying "...to handicap a student by teaching him his black face is a curse and that his struggle to change his condition is hopeless is the worse sort of lynching." He commented that as a black person in America, he could be killed on the streets for no reason, shot in park for playing with a toy, choked to death just because, murdered for being black in a white neighborhood, shot in his car while rushing home to get medicine for his child, killed in the street with his hands up, or killed if he complied, and most definitely killed if he resisted. This was because he had been labeled as less than human and his skin was seen as a crime. He stated he was black, his music was too loud, his hair was too nappy, too kinky, too braided, or too dreaded, his pants were too saggy, he wore a hoodie, he walked too fast, etc. He noted he could not win. He commented that he could not get a job or a raise, he was a threat, he could not get respect, he could not make ends meet, and he could not breathe. He explained that he stood up and fought back when he could not breathe and was under attack. He pointed out the People's Defense would like to see changes, to include a change to the chokehold policy, community policing, and a true understanding of what that meant. He wanted the gun violence in Columbia to end, increasing police education requirements,

and true prison reforms. He thought they needed a definition what the police might feel was a threat and a fear for life as that tended to lead to excessive force. He commented that the school to prison pipeline needed to end, and that equal economics and wealth for all was needed instead of systematic oppression. A real understanding of pretextual stops was needed. He stated Columbia was not exempt to any of these issues because Columbia's black population was only 11 percent while black people were involved in 31 percent of vehicle stops. In addition, they were 16 percent more likely to be searched, involved in 53 percent of the use of force incidents, 57 percent more likely to be accused of resisting arrest, 63 percent more likely to be accused of having a weapon and/or drugs, and six times more likely to die at the hands of police officers. He understood 781 people had died at the hands of police in 2020 alone. He felt it was safe to say they had a policing issue, and the problem was at the foundation. He believed it should be dismantled and rebuilt. He asked the Council to rethink policing so officers were held accountable. Education, trustworthiness, and doing their jobs without racial bias were a necessity. He reiterated systematic changes were needed now. They did not need empty gestures or random lip service. Real change was needed. He commented that they put their hope in political parties to right the injustices, but which political party and process represented them so they would no longer have to protest or march. He stated the People's Defense was demanding true equal rights, anti-racism, and a non-biased system for all.

SPC53-20

Brent Haden - Police reform.

Brent Haden commented that he represented Nick Daniels, who had gone to the Fieldhouse for his birthday in October of 2013. While there, four officers had entered to conduct routine liquor checks, and three of them were identified in the lawsuit they had. They were Officers Terranova, Sinclair, and Corcoran. He explained a bouncer had told Officer Corcoran that his client was following him, and as a result, Officer Corcoran warned his client to stay back. The bouncer then grabbed his client and started wrestling with him, which resulted in the three officers jumping in and punching and kicking his client to put him on the ground. During that fray, his client had put his hands in the air, which could be seen from the bodycam. While his client's hands were in the air, Officer Terranova attempted to punch his client, but had instead punched Officer Sinclair in the face. Officer Sinclair then tased his client in the kidney and arrested him. Mr. Haden commented that it was bad enough that his client had been tased as a result of this while he had stood defenseless, but they had also charged his client with trespass, resisting arrest, and assault on a law enforcement officer for the alleged punch. When his client had been criminally charged, he had met with the prosecutor to watch the video and his client's charge had been dismissed as it should have been. He explained they had then sued the officers and the City, and his complaint for malicious prosecution had survived thus far through the court systems. He noted the elements of malicious prosecution included a false accusation that led to one being prosecuted and being damaged from it. He stated the City had made legal arguments that this case should be kicked on two grounds. One was that one had to be a prevailing party to bring the claim. In this situation, the case had been dismissed before going to trial, but the City did not feel that was good enough for them to be considered a prevailing party. The second argument involved having probable cause for one count or claim within a case, which then allowed for probable cause for any other claim. He stated he had concerns with regard to this doctrine. He reiterated the City was advocating that even if an officer, a prosecutor, or citizen knowingly lied about a second element, that the person or entity should be immune from a malicious prosecution claim because the first element was correct. He noted the City was attempting to move this case to the Missouri Supreme Court to make the doctrines he had just mentioned the law statewide. He believed they were manifestly unjust doctrines, and asked the Council, as the directing body, to reconsider and investigate the case.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH30-20 FY 2021 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.

Discussion shown with B211-20.

B210-20 Adopting the FY 2021 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.

Discussion shown with B211-10.

B211-20 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to eliminate transportation fares in FY 2021 for users of the GoCOMO Public Transit System.

PH30-20 was read by the Clerk, and B210-20 and B211-20 were given third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock and Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked if she would be charged \$72.13 if unlawful items were placed on the curb for pickup, or if it would be that cost in addition to the tonnage, time, etc. Mr. Sorrell replied it would be the three added together. The \$72.13 was the container, the \$55 per ton was the landfill rate for the tonnage, and the \$1.15 per minute was for a senior refuse collector and a refuse collector to throw all of that material in the container. Ms. Peters understood they would only pick up the bulky items. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. Ms. Peters understood they would then weigh it. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. He explained it was the same as if one ordered a dumpster to dispose of it oneself. This would allow the regular crews to not be impacted with their normal day.

Mr. Sorrell continued with the staff report.

Mr. Skala understood the \$5 add-pay for those lifting the bags was designed to get rid of the need for temporary workers. Mr. Sorrell stated they hoped the add-pay would make the positions more attractive so they had better success with recruiting and retention and would not need as many temporary agency staff. He commented that, ideally, they would have all permanent full-time City staff.

Mr. Skala asked if staff had considered reducing the weight limit of 50 pounds. Mr. Sorrell replied they had discussed that quite a while back. If he recalled correctly, they preferred one bag versus three bags. The preference was for one heavier bag than three lighter bags. He commented that if they took all of the residential tonnage and divided it evenly amongst the homes, most homes were not placing 50 pound bags of trash at the curb.

Mr. Skala noted there had been many complaints about animals getting into bags, and asked if there had been any consideration with regard to moving the time at which one could put trash out to help with that issue. Mr. Sorrell replied that had not been discussed, but it was something they could look into and provide a proposal for in the future. He commented that he saw enough wildlife in his front yard in the early morning hours that he was hesitant to put his trash out the night before.

Ms. Peters asked how the cost of bags was not increasing when they would go from 52 bags per year to 104. Mr. Sorrell replied that cost would increase and the increase would be about \$586,000. Ms. Peters asked if that would result in an increase in the cost to the customer. Mr. Sorrell replied that would not be passed on to the customer. He explained their vendor, Waste Zero, had provided information indicating bag sales and the bulky item collection charges should offset those costs. He pointed out they were in the process of awarding a contract for a cost of service study for solid waste, sewer, and stormwater, and recommended they not increase the cost now. He thought they should evaluate what it actually needed to be and increase it as necessary in the future.

Ms. Peters understood CDL drivers that were also tossing trash would be paid the extra \$5 per hour. It would not go to the temporary employees or people they hired from the outside. She asked if that extra \$5 per hour driving would be for the entire day or just for the time they were picking up trash and not driving. Mr. Sorrell replied the way it was

envisioned was that if they were fully staffed and had two people on each truck who were switching every 30-45 minutes, they would be paid the added \$5 for the entire day. Ms. Peters stated she thought that was what should be done. Mr. Sorrell commented that if someone had to be out due to a doctor's appointment, and someone else filled in for that time frame, that person would receive the \$5 for the time worked picking up the trash. He noted they would not get it if using sick leave, vacation, etc. He also pointed out that if they had a driver operating a truck with two temporary agency staff collecting the material in the back, that driver would not receive the \$5 because that driver was not actually physically loading the material in the truck.

Ms. Fowler commented that some of which had been discussed tonight had already been in the ordinance per her reading of it, such as calling for special trash pickup. She was surprised that those things were not already done, and it appeared as though they lacked the will for enforcement. Mr. Sorrell stated he was not sure of the history, but he believed they provided a lot of services they probably should not have provided. It was the reason he spoke about the issues at the work session in February. He read from the ordinance regarding special pickup which indicated "a special pickup for residential customers will be provided on a continuous basis at no additional charge" and that it was "intended for disposal of quantities or items which are too large for regular pickup." He understood the restriction was for items such as building materials, felled trees, large automobile parts, and hazardous materials. Essentially everything could be placed for pickup other than appliances, which had its own special section. He agreed some of it was likely due them picking up everything that had been put out at the curb over time regardless of whether it had been bundled. The goal in February was to discuss whether they could start enforcing the ordinance and make improvements for staff. He pointed out this had come from staff saying they did not feel they were being treated fairly. Ms. Fowler stated she believed the citizens did not feel they had been treated fairly by the lack of enforcement for several years.

Ms. Fowler asked if the cost of service study Mr. Sorrell had mentioned was a rate study or a cost of service study. Mr. Sorrell replied the idea was to determine what it actually cost to provide the service based on historical expenses and whether rate adjustments were needed for positive or neutral cash reserves. It would also determine if a certain classification of customers was not paying adequately for what they were receiving or paying too much. In addition, it would include predictions for future rates based on changes. He stated it was a combination of a cost and rate study.

Ms. Fowler asked if they were seeking a single consultant to provide this. Mr. Sorrell replied it had been bid with the option of bidding on one piece or all three pieces. Ms. Fowler felt those were very separate industries as far as being a subject matter expert. Mr. Sorrell replied they were separate industries, but the overall philosophy was likely similar. Ms. Fowler commented that given how much time they spent talking about trash, she wondered whether the lumping of those together was in their best interest. Mr. Sorrell noted the bids could be awarded separately. The company with the best response to each individual study would be chosen as they would be analyzed individually.

Ms. Fowler commented that while she was appreciative of the City agreeing to pay additional money to their trash collectors, she did not believe what had been proposed went far enough. She wondered how anyone would receive add-pay if they were still utilizing temporary workers. The plan, while helpful, did not appear to be designed to get them off of the path from using temporary workers and luring more people to work for the City as full-time benefited eligible employees. She thought it might be better to say they would increase everyone's pay by \$5 as long as they had the current system of residential trash pickup, and that they would work hard to convert the number of temporary employees to zero by bringing them in as full-time employees. Mr. Sorrell stated that was an option. He agreed that if they only had drivers, no one would be eligible for the \$5 add-pay. Ms. Fowler stated that did not seem fair to her given the

difficulties as it was not up to the driver as to whether he had two temporary employees on the back of the truck or one permanent employee. She did not understand why they had an obstacle to employment in the Solid Waste Division of being a CDL driver when at any given time at least half of the people on truck were on the back of the truck. She asked if staff had looked at lifting that requirement and using it as an upward promotional path for those that wanted to be CDL drivers in the interest of having regular full-time employees working there. Mr. Sorrell replied the idea was to staff each truck with two permanent City employees that would alternate between driving and collecting. He noted collecting all day was physically challenging. If they only utilized a driver with non-driver employees on the back, they would need to have three employees per truck. Ms. Fowler stated that was done with two temporary employees now that were making far less money without any benefits. She felt that was an inequity tied to some of the bigger concerns in the community. Mr. Sorrell commented that they could look at the possibility of creating positions that would not require a CDL to allow people that could not obtain a CDL to do the work if they wanted that opportunity.

Ms. Fowler urged staff to look at how to move toward better pay and regular full-time employees until such time the City was able to move to an automated trash collection service. Mr. Sorrell explained the temporary employees hired by the City as temporary employees of the City were trainees going through the process of obtaining a CDL so they could then become a permanent benefitted full-time employee of the City. Ms. Fowler understood the City was paying an outside service \$22 per hour and the person on the truck one-third less than that. In addition, the temporary employee was going through the process of doing this substantially hard work all day without benefits. Mayor Treece pointed out part of the incentive was to get them to become a City employee and to qualify for that additional \$5. Ms. Fowler suggested they offer everyone \$22 to work in residential trash collection regardless of the role so they could bring more people into regular City employment as they figured out the bigger issue of how they would automate the trash collection system. She believed now was the time to talk about it while they were reviewing the budget and dealing with the crisis they had. Mr. Glascock pointed out that what Ms. Fowler was asking them to do would create an inequity in the pay philosophy that had been adopted by the Council. The add-pay allowed them to not create the inequity since they would allow this only for those that picked up the trash. If they did it for everyone, they would need to review the pay philosophy for the entire City. Ms. Fowler suggested it be done as an add-pay for the trash collection system in the interim. Mr. Glascock stated that would still create inequities throughout the City because the CDL drivers in the trash service would be paid more than the CDL drivers in electric, water, etc. Ms. Fowler thought they could transfer to the Solid Waste Division if they wanted that level of pay.

Mr. Trapp stated he liked these changes. He thought pay-as-you-throw was long overdue as an interim measure until they looked at automation. He asked if a pay-as-you-throw system without branded bags had been reviewed. Mr. Sorrell replied they had originally considered a bag limit in February, but discussion at the last council meeting involved the heavier refuse bags the City provided. As a result, they thought about a combination, i.e. providing a good bag and only picking those up. It was then a self-imposed limit because each customer could choose how many bags they would purchase above the two-bag per week number the City provided.

Mr. Trapp commented that he believed adding the branded bag created some complications for people in terms of compliance. He thought they could still limit the amount of trash, which he was supportive of, with a bag limit. He stated he wanted to see an amendment that would allow for not having to require branded bags as it made it overly complicated. He noted he only used 50 bags per year, and wondered what he should do with his extra 50 bags. In addition, not everyone used the vouchers they received now. He reiterated he thought it overly complicated the issue without gaining much in exchange. He reiterated he was supportive of a bag limit, but was not sure he

was supportive of the branded bag concept.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked the proposal as he believed it had been thought through. He understood the \$2 per additional bag included the cost of collection and the cost of landfill space. Mr. Sorrell explained it had a tonnage fee of \$1.37, a collection time charge of \$0.32, and the remainder was the cost of the bag at somewhere between \$0.25 and \$0.30.

Mr. Thomas felt it would be easier to implement with branded bags as it would be easier for the workers to know whether to take the bag or leave it. In addition, they would not have to count bags. Mr. Sorrell agreed it made it simple for staff. They would throw the bag in the truck if it had a City of Columbia emblem on it, otherwise they would not. They would not be required to take pictures, count bags, etc.

Mr. Thomas stated he thought the strategy on pay was good as well. He noted it was messy, but it was inevitably messy.

Mr. Thomas asked how much of the worker's compensation claims were specific to refuse collectors. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not have that information, and understood Mr. Lue was in the process of compiling that information and would respond to his request once he had it.

Mr. Skala asked if placing emblems on the bags was a very expensive measure. He noted the heavy bags typically had yellow ties so they were distinguishable. Mr. Sorrell replied he would need to check on the cost, but stated he did not anticipate it would significantly change the price per bag. He noted the recycling bags already had the emblem.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the City had the capacity to collect and process an additional 2,000 tons of recyclable material. Mr. Sorrell replied if all of this worked and they were able to increase staffing levels sufficiently, they would have that capacity. Mr. Pitzer asked if that would require additional bags. Mr. Sorrell replied it could. He stated, currently, they were only receiving a 60 percent voucher submittal rate on the blue bags. Mr. Pitzer thought those people that were doing it might do it more. Mr. Sorrell noted they would have to modify the program to provide additional bags if that situation arose.

Mr. Pitzer understood staff was working hard to empty the recycling dumpsters they had now, and asked what an additional 2,000 tons in those dumpsters might look like. Mr. Sorrell replied he was not sure how much volume that would be off the top of his head, but pointed out it would be spread out during the course of a year.

Mr. Sorrell continued with the staff report.

Mayor Treece suggested staff briefly walk them through each of the amendments and for any inquiries regarding amendments be addressed now. He explained they could also ask staff to have other amendments prepared as well. He thought they could then allow for council follow-up and public comment, and make any amendments at the next council meeting. Mr. Thomas understood they had voted on amendments at this meeting in the past, and that Mayor Treece was recommending that be delayed until next time. Mayor Treece stated they could vote on them tonight if that was desired. Mr. Thomas commented that he did not necessarily want to do that, and explained he had only noticed that was a slightly different procedure than what they had done previously. Mayor Treece stated his only concern was for new amendments the public had not seen. Mr. Thomas commented that if they were all going to be at the September 21, 2020 Council Meeting, it made sense to vote on the amendments then. Mr. Skala stated that made sense to him as well as it allowed the public the opportunity to ruminate on some of the amendments and potentially obtain information the questions the Council might ask of staff.

Mr. Lue listed the items on the amendment sheet.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the \$672,000 associated with Amendment #1 was the number they had discussed at the last meeting. Mr. Lue replied he thought it had been.

Ms. Fowler commented that while she appreciated the amendment to restore the contribution, she had a lot of concerns about a high deductible plan even with the health savings account (HAS) contributions for modestly paid staff. She thought a high

deductible plan was a fine idea for well-paid people, but felt it was leaving modestly paid staff without regular routine preventative health care. Even when the deductible dropped to \$1,500, it was still outside of the reach of modestly paid staff in terms of accessing regular preventative health care. She explained she was bringing it up because she did not want this to be the end of the conversation about health insurance for employees.

Mayor Treece understood the City utilized advisors in constructing the health plans. He indicated he was not sure of the right answer, but pointed out there would be a cost. Ms. Fowler stated she understood, but noted they were talking about social determinants of health and the inequities that had been exposed during the COVID epidemic. She explained she had done the math on how she would be able to fund regular, routine, preventative health care at \$17 per hour given expenses associated with a place to live and other expenses, and she was not sure how it could be done even with the City contributing \$120 per month since the deductible was \$2,800. It would take two years of continuous employment to accrue enough money meet the deductible. She understood a consultant had helped the City manage it and that there was a cost component to it. She stated she was also aware of the philosophy that she did not agree with of people making better and less costly decisions if easy access to healthcare was taken away, and believed there needed to be a different standard when talking about modestly paid employees, particularly employees using their physical bodies to lift heavy objects. She explained she wanted to use this budget to talk about how they got back to providing real accessible healthcare to their modestly paid employees.

Mayor Treece asked staff to respond as to the types of preventative care the current plan had. Ms. Buckler replied all of the City's plans included preventative care at zero cost to the employee. Ms. Fowler asked what preventative care included. Ms. Buckler replied it included inoculations, the office visit for a physical annually, etc. She noted she could provide the list to Ms. Fowler, but she did not have it with her right now. Ms. Fowler asked about a situation of having to go to the doctor for poison ivy. Ms. Buckler replied that was not preventative care. Ms. Fowler asked how it would be handled if she had gotten poison ivy by picking up trash. Ms. Buckler replied that was then a worker's compensation issue. Ms. Fowler understood the worker's compensation system was then becoming the health care system for some. She stated she was looking forward to seeing the breakdown of claims that had been requested multiple times. She understood that if she had a sprained ankle and did not want to file a worker's compensation claim, she would have to go into her deductible. Ms. Buckler stated that was correct. Ms. Fowler understood her only choice would be to file a worker's compensation claim to have health care coverage for it.

Ms. Fowler asked how the City had gotten to a place where some employees were entitled to a \$750 deductible plan while others were not. Ms. Buckler replied the \$750 plan had closed several years ago because of the cost of the plan as they were at a point in their budgeting whereby they could no longer afford it. As a result it was closed, but those that had been in it had been able to stay in it. They just did not allow for any new enrollments.

Ms. Fowler asked Ms. Buckler what efforts she had made to make the lower deductible plan available to the more modestly paid employees who could then access healthcare more easily. Ms. Buckler asked for clarification. Ms. Fowler stated \$750 was different from \$1,500 and \$2,800 even with a contribution to the health savings account that could be accrued over time, and asked what effort or consideration Ms. Buckler had made to allow modestly paid employees to have access to a lower deductible. Ms. Buckler replied there were issues of offering health plans and not discriminating, i.e., offering something one group could receive that others could not. The only option they would have would be to open that plan back up or change all of their plans to something different. She noted they went through a process every year for actuarial results. She pointed out the City's plans were fairly generous compared to other public entities. It was just a matter of affordability for the City and how much the City was willing to spend. It

came down to how much they were willing to spend to pay claims and how much of the risk the City would take. There had to be a willingness to pay for it. Ms. Fowler stated she was trying to create that willingness by bringing together everything they had learned the last six months, which included the disproportionate impact of COVID on African-Americans and people of color, the fact they had more people of color in lower paying jobs within the City, and the other facts that were listed on the Department of Health and Human Services website. Ms. Buckler noted she understood and reiterated that it came down to how much they wanted to spend for it.

Mayor Treece thought this might be a good time to remind everyone that if they wanted an amendment to adjust anything that there needed to be a corresponding amendment of what they would cut in order to pay for it. This was the only way they would be able to maintain a balanced budget.

Ms. Fowler asked for the cost of opening back up the \$750 deductible plan.

Mr. Skala asked if all of the amendments were standalone and budget neutral, and whether some of the amendments were dependent on other amendments. Mr. Glascock replied those that had a dependency were grouped together. He noted he was not sure they were budget neutral, but pointed out the costs were shown. Mr. Lue explained the ones that were zero were revenue neutral.

Mr. Lue continued listing the items on the amendment sheet.

Mr. Thomas asked for the total cost of the Discover Parkway extension project. Mr. Lue replied he thought it was a little over \$5 million. Mr. Thomas asked if it was the \$5.2 million number shown as part of Amendment #8. Mr. Lue replied no. He stated he thought it was the combined total. Mr. Thomas asked if the entire cost of this project was planned for the FY 2021 budget. Mr. Lue replied yes. He noted the cost was at \$6.5 million. Mr. Thomas asked why canceling the project would not generate a savings of \$6.5 million if all of the costs were tied to the FY 2021 budget. Ms. Peveler replied \$735,000 involved Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission funds and that money would need to be returned if it was not used. In addition, \$540,000 had been appropriated in FY 2016. She believed most of that had been spent. She noted they would only have \$5,297,490 in FY 2021 that could be saved if the project was not done.

Ms. Fowler asked if this issue had arisen due to losing a grant or a share of revenue. Mayor Treece replied the City had budgeted the full cost of this extension. When the legislature had passed a cost-share program of up to \$50 million, the City had submitted a request for match funds to this already budgeted shovel-ready project. He pointed out the match money had been awarded, but when the Governor did his withholds, the Missouri Department of Transportation withheld that 50 percent match. As a result, the City was back to owning 100 percent of the cost. He understood there was a possibility that they might still receive it because other projects might not have the money in place, but pointed out the savings from this project to the City via the match was to go toward airport construction under that same capital improvement account.

Ms. Fowler asked if the airport project was still on track even though this money was being pulled back for the Discovery Parkway extension project, or if it was an either/or situation. She asked if there were pieces on either side with the extension project being the connecting piece. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Ms. Fowler wondered if pulling this project rendered work they had already done and money they had already spent as less useful or ineffective. Mayor Treece stated they had invested significant money into the intersection with land that had been donated by the University of Missouri for this purpose. The extension would go north routing traffic away from the I-70/Hwy 63 corridor, and they would have a connection from Gans Road to New Haven Road. He was not sure they should take this off of the table at this late date.

Mr. Thomas commented that he had proposed this amendment, and explained it was more about interrupting the very wrong systematic approach to growth in the community of forever building wider, larger four-lane highways at greater concentric distances from the center and filling it in with a lot of low density suburban sprawl via subdivisions without

affordable housing along with out-of-town owned, franchised, commercial centers that sucked the wealth out of the community while expanding the city limits. He stated there was not a highway section at either end of this extension. There was a short section of wide highway going across Highway 63, and then it was just Gans Road, which was a country road. At the other end, there did not appear to be anything at all. It would only connect to Grindstone Parkway or New Haven Road. He noted there was a plan in the CATSO Long Range Transportation Plan to continue building four-lane highways at \$6.5 million per mile all of the way around the City, which he believed was a poorly planned approach to growth. It did not help the poorest people in the community. It also did not do anything for having a healthy community or for transportation options. It made them very car dependent. He stated he was putting a stake in the ground by proposing they pull this off the project list, and felt they should also rethink their long range transportation approach.

Mr. Skala commented that when this had previously been discussed and voted on, a suggestion had been made by a former employee for a capital cost recovery charge that would apply to the properties on both sides of the new road. The suggestion was for the charge to be equal to the cost of new residential street and collected when adjacent parcels were developed. He thought that approach would be useful for improvements of this sort as they would receive something in return. He asked the Council to consider that when they discussed this particular amendment at the next meeting.

Mayor Treece asked if the suggestion of Mr. Skala would be a budget amendment or if that would be discussed during the public hearing for the project prior to proceeding with design and construction. Mr. Glascock replied he thought the public hearing had already been held on this project and that Council had authorized staff to go to bid as well. He noted it should have been addressed then. He pointed out it was also mostly University property and not likely to develop.

Mr. Skala asked for that to be considered in the future for other projects. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it should be done when the issue came up for public hearing. Mayor Treece felt it would be timely to consider this when they did the commercial build out the other way.

Mr. Skala stated he regretted not pursuing it at the time of the public hearing. Mr. Pitzer recalled Mr. Skala mentioning it. He noted the public hearing had only been held a couple of months ago, and they had approved the project by an overwhelming vote allowing staff to move forward.

Mr. Lue continued listing the items on the amendment sheet.

Mr. Thomas commented that a new contractor had taken over the function of Columbia Access Television (CAT) a year ago with a plan and vision to create a media resource center on the Business Loop with some partnerships to help accomplish that, and the Council had approved providing \$35,000, as that had been the amount provided to the prior entity, along with the equipment. He understood there had been a discussion between Mr. Glascock and a representative of Vidwest with regard to this year, but due to a timing glitch, the proposal had not been submitted in time to make it into the proposed budget. He also understood from the information provided by Vidwest that there was a fund balance left over from this year's budget. He stated he was proposing providing \$15,000 as that was one of the budget options Vidwest had offered. He asked from where that \$15,000 would come. Mr. Glascock replied general fund balance. Mr. Thomas pointed out he would advocate for this budget amendment at the next meeting when they voted on the amendments and only wanted to ensure everyone was clear about the background at this time.

Ms. Fowler stated she preferred they restore the funding to \$35,000. She explained she had been an alumnus of CAT-TV as she had been in their first production class in 2005, and she had learned to be a citizen that paid more attention, cared about media literacy, and took her responsibilities as a community member more seriously. She understood people went to CAT-TV for different reasons, but felt the value it had was in allowing

people to use it as a form of expression and to teach that to others. She believed it was invaluable and came at a very modest price. She stated she wanted to amend the motion of Mr. Thomas so funding was restored to \$35,000, and noted she intended to do this every year. Mr. Thomas noted he would accept the amendment.

Mr. Lue continued listing the items on the amendment sheet.

Mayor Treece asked for clarification regarding Amendment #17. Mr. Glascock replied it was related to the Taj Mahal restaurant. Ms. Fowler asked if they were leaving. Mayor Treece replied he understood they had not been paying their bills.

Mr. Lue continued listing the items on the amendment sheet.

Ms. Fowler asked for clarification regarding Amendment #19. Mr. Lue replied it was related to self-insurance. Ms. Fowler thought the City was likely self-insured for lots of things. Mr. Glascock stated it was for excess liability insurance. Ms. Fowler asked if it was excess liability overall for the City. Mr. Lue replied it involved risk management. Ms. Fowler asked if it was an errors and omissions related insurance. Ms. Thompson replied it involved property damage, personal liability, etc. The City was self-insured up to the first \$500,000. Ms. Fowler understood it was what she would call commercial general liability. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. She pointed out the City was also self-insured for worker's compensation, health costs, etc., but this amendment involved risk management. Ms. Fowler stated she understood which was why she asked.

Mr. Lue continued listing the items on the amendment sheet.

Mr. Skala understood the Boone County portal was up and they were accepting applications for CARES funding. Mr. Lue stated that was correct. Mr. Skala understood the City would submit an application and asked how much they would be requesting. Mr. Lue replied they still did not know the total amount, but noted the City had just under \$5 million in expenses.

Mayor Treece asked who was authorized on behalf of the City to submit a request. Mr. Glascock replied he had indicated to the County that Mr. Lue was authorized for those submissions. Mayor Treece asked if they needed an appropriation line item so that when the City received those funds, they could apply it back. Mr. Glascock understood the County wanted a blanket authorization. Mayor Treece asked about how the City received the money as it would be for prior fiscal year expenses when the funds were received. He wondered if they would see that included in the intergovernmental transfer of funds report. Mr. Glascock replied it would likely come to Council for approval as an appropriation.

Ms. Fowler asked what the City would be seeking in the application to the County. Mr. Glascock replied there would be multiple applications to the County. The first would be for reimbursement of expenses that were related to COVID from March until now. He noted his priority would involve the Public Health and Human Services Department to ensure they had what they needed in terms of contact tracing, etc. since the number of cases was increasing. He thought utility assistance also needed to be a high priority because people were unable to pay their utility bills due to COVID and job losses. He understood the Community Development Department was looking at needed assistance as well.

Ms. Fowler understood this was money that needed to be spent by December 31 from the point of view of the federal government. Mr. Glascock thought the date was actually December 30. He understood everything needed to be submitted by November 16.

Ms. Fowler asked if the County was taking the position that the CARES money was reimbursement looking backwards rather than funding new or pressing needs. Mr. Glascock replied he thought the first priority was for expenditures related to COVID to date. Any programmatic funding requests would be a second submittal.

Ms. Fowler referred to the presentation on August 13 of COVID related expenses and understood some of the cost to the City was the 80 hours of COVID leave during the time they had been discouraging employees to go into work, and asked if those costs would be broken out. She also wondered if the County had established standards for how they would allocate the money. Mr. Lue replied they had a spreadsheet for employee

expenses and it had separate tab for the types of expenses Ms. Fowler had mentioned. Ms. Fowler understood the requests would be submitted in such a way that if the County decided not to give the City anything for the COVID leave, the City could still potentially receive funds for other expenses. Mr. Glascock replied the \$5 million in expenses was broken down and the documentation had to be submitted with the application. The County would then tell them what they would reimburse and what they would not reimburse. Ms. Fowler asked if it was a system where they would say yes or no on the component pieces as opposed to no on the entire application. Mr. Glascock replied he thought decisions would be made on component pieces. He noted they were asking for a lot of documentation.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mayor Treece if he felt the County would be interested in funding its own Health Department to increase the no questions asked testing capacity. Mayor Treece thought it would be great if they did. He commented that he was curious as to how the City's share of the jointly managed City-County Health Department would be reconciled when almost all of it had fallen to them. He understood it was usually reconciled at the end of the calendar year, but wondered what they would do moving forward, especially as they were seeing a spike in cases. He knew they had an extraordinary disbursement for contact tracing, but wondered if Mr. Pitzer might be on to something with regard to testing. Mr. Pitzer stated he thought it would be a logical expenditure as time was going to be high if it needed to be spent this calendar year. He suggested they give the City Manager some direction to urge the Health Department to flush it out as soon as possible. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Pitzer if he was referring to a more aggressive and increased testing program. Mr. Pitzer replied yes.

Ms. Fowler asked if they were eliminating the CARE program and if that was the job training program for young people in the summer. Mr. Glascock replied they were not eliminating it, but were eliminating portions of it. Ms. Fowler understood it would involve 32 positions and asked if that was a substantial portion. Mr. Griggs replied they were reducing the number of applicants by about 37. This past summer, they roughly had the same number they always had. They had only shortened the weeks. He thought they would likely do the same thing this coming summer. Ms. Fowler asked how many young people the program would serve with the reduction. Mr. Griggs replied they would be right around 100 again. Ms. Fowler understood it would have been 132 or 137, and they would now be down to 100.

Ms. Fowler commented that a lot of people thought highly of that experience and wondered if there was a way to keep it going. She wondered if this was a function Mr. Whitt could take on as part of his duties in partnership with REDI. She felt providing young people an opportunity to learn job training skills, particularly young people of color and those residing in areas that were under-resourced, seemed like a very important project and program to continue. She was looking for ways to maintain its level, and REDI was the first thing that had come to mind for likely being a home for a job training/mentoring program for young people.

Mayor Treece explained one of the benefits about having it in the Parks and Recreation Department was that they were already used to working with the youth, and noted he was not sure REDI would be a good home for it. He stated it was a great program, especially for employers at this time. He wondered if there was a way they could be more assertive with employers as they were receiving free help. He thought they should be supplementing it.

Ms. Fowler wondered if they could ask employers, particularly those that had charitable foundations associated with them, to help fund positions. She stated she had concerns about losing spaces for young people. Mr. Griggs explained the cuts were only to the general fund. They had funding from Boone County Family Resources and some funds from the Utilities Department to place young people there. He noted Veterans United has also provided some funding. He commented that the CARE supervisor had been reaching out to businesses to determine if they would be willing to pick up any portion so they

were able to stretch every dollar.

Ms. Fowler questioned whether the City had the luxury of choosing when they placed items on the ballot rather than using the one election they paid for annually, which was the April municipal election, and wondered if there was a budget line that could be cut back to free up money for other City functions. Ms. Amin explained there was funding in the City Clerk's Office budget of \$118,660. Ms. Fowler asked if that was what the municipal election cost. Ms. Amin replied the cost fluctuated depending upon the number of other entities that participated and what the County Clerk thought was needed to staff it so she could not provide a particular cost. She noted the City's share was also dependent on whether it was a citywide election or if it only involved a couple of wards. In April of 2019, the cost had been \$79,336. She stated she could not say that was what it would cost the next time. She pointed out the last mayoral election was in April of 2016 and the cost had been \$61,741. In only three years, the cost had increased by about \$18,000.

Ms. Fowler understood every precinct would need to be opened up if it was a citywide election, and if there was a school board election on top of it, the costs would be shared. She noted they were headed for a ballot question in April if the signature collectors were successful in putting the automation of trash collection on the ballot. This would open up all precincts within the City and they could add an issue like the use tax or the extension of the parks and recreation sales tax. Regardless of where the money came from, it was citywide, all precincts election. She suggested they end the practice of picking and choosing when they placed items on the ballot by putting municipal questions on the municipal ballot only.

Mr. Skala commented that scheduling elections for various purposes was a political kabuki dance in terms of turnout and taking turns with the Columbia Public Schools. He stated it was logical to suggest all municipal elections be placed on the April ballot, but it might be too restrictive in some cases in terms of maximizing the potential for success with any particular cause.

Ms. Fowler stated she understood that argument, but noted they were in a time of constrained revenues. Allowing themselves the flexibility for political reasons seemed like an expensive exercise when real money could be utilized for other purposes.

Mr. Skala noted they were talking about a lot of worthwhile and legitimate causes, i.e., salaries, concern for modest workers, etc., but what they had not discussed was what they would identify to get there. He suspected they would have to have the conversation in terms of revenues and would also need to really balance and prioritize concerns because there were lots of priorities. He commented that one of his priorities had to do with racial equity and taking a racial equity view of all of the City's ordinances, which had been put on hold due to COVID. He thought they would carefully balance which programs they felt were necessary and which they felt were not for the next couple of years. Ms. Fowler stated she agreed which was why she felt the extra election next year was a luxury.

Ms. Fowler asked if it was a budget issue or staffing issue with regard to going to a hybrid system for boards and commissions during COVID. She noted there were people that could not leave the house due to their own health or the health of family members, and that they could be current members of boards and commissions or interested members of the public that paid attention and regularly and followed their work. She asked whether they needed to budget for an extra position so a staff person could be present to ensure the hybrid system was operational. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it would take more money for staffing, and felt it would take more than one person since there were 43 boards and commissions. He also pointed out some of the boards and commissions had different requirements that would create the need for different technologies than other boards and commissions. He stated they could identify which ones had a "see and be seen" requirement, but noted he also thought they needed to be equitable in terms of which ones could participate in a certain manner. If a hybrid system

was allowed, it would take more staff and he was uncertain of that cost at this time. Ms. Fowler asked how they could plan for that in the context of next year's budget. Mr. Glascock replied he felt Council needed to set a policy. Ms. Fowler asked staff to price out what would move them to a hybrid system in terms of staffing, software, and technology.

Mr. Skala suggested a report with the numbers so they could make a policy decision based upon what they thought the cost might be. He reiterated he believed it was appropriate to request a report to look into it so the Council could be informed, and they could then take up the discussion of policy.

Ms. Fowler asked if she would have to request a report or if she could request an ordinance be drafted. Mr. Skala replied he believed a report would inform an ordinance change, and felt that was the proper way to go about it in terms of allowing the public to understand the information of the report and how the ordinance was generated. Ms. Fowler commented that she was trying to determine how that might work when they had members of boards and commissions that were unable to attend now. She understood one board that had met a week ago had two members whose adult children had tested positive for COVID so they had been unable to attend because it had not been prudent given their exposure to their kids. Mr. Skala understood and noted there was a hierarchy of boards and commissions in terms of responsibility. Ms. Fowler stated she would ask for that report at the end of the meeting tonight.

Ms. Fowler asked if there was an alternative to citizens calling 911 to report concerns that might be an inappropriate use of police resources, such as the trenching situation on Ridgeway Avenue or any issues in the evenings of football weekends if they enabled short-term rentals. She asked if that would result in the need for more staff, a policy, or something else. Mr. Glascock replied there was a non-emergency number that could be called. Ms. Fowler asked if that would go to someone that could respond to an out of control noisy party. Mr. Glascock replied he thought so. Ms. Fowler asked if it was a number that was widely available now. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Ms. Fowler asked if it was the after-hours sewer number. Mr. Glascock replied he did not recall the number. Ms. Fowler asked if it was staffed all of the time to include evenings and weekends. Mr. Glascock replied he thought so. Ms. Fowler asked if the number could be shared with the Council. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Ms. Fowler felt this would allow them to lift a burden off of police in terms of overpolicing and expecting the police to do more than policing. Mr. Glascock understood it would be a department that worked 24 hours, such as the power plant or sewer plant. He noted they had staff on hand 24 hours, 7 days a week in certain places. Ms. Fowler understood they could call other staff if there was an issue. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala understood they had a non-emergency number, but did not know it was staffed for 24 hours. He knew they had the online option, but pointed out that did not help anyone that did not have access to it.

Mayor Pro Tem Skala opened the public hearing.

Brian Page stated he was present to speak for the solid waste workers who ran beside the truck collecting trash as they had the hardest job of all City staff. He suggested those that did not believe him try keeping up with them through a week's work. He commented that they did a thankless job for the citizens of Columbia with extraordinary grace. He believed decent pay that was a livable wage and insurance with an appropriate deductible had to be written into the next budget. He suggested a deductible of no more than a \$250 along with a living wage as being fair for the service they rendered. As an aside, he felt everyone suffered some form of oppression, and confronting one's own oppression allowed them to be compassionate for others who were suffering. He stated the solid waste workers suffered poverty wages and horrid insurance deductibles. He felt they needed to be generous with those workers as they had been generous with the rest of them. He asked the Council to do the right thing and to not privatize the service. He also questioned whether they needed to spend money when it was not necessary. He

thought if Mr. Pitzer would ask that question a few times, the Council would become conditioned to the question. He commented that by privatizing they would lose the now provided accountability, have ever increasing hauling fees, would create a tragic blight on the environment, and cause new reactionary dumpsites to become the norm. He stated he would never advocate harming a neighbor's property and/or serenity, but felt some that suffered resentment might. He asked Ms. Fowler to request of staff the cost per household in terms of a rate increase to cover it all, i.e., livable wages for the trash collectors, a reasonable deductible, etc. He understood the comment of Mr. Sorrell in terms of charging by item in terms of fairness, but also saw it as an onerous burden on staff to have to stop and a count as they worked.

Judy Schermer stated she resided on Royal Lytham Drive and noted she was present in support of the supplement to the budget that would fund the police mental health collaboration. She noted those with untreated mental illness were sixteen times more likely to be killed by law enforcement. In addition, it was estimated that \$918 million had been spent by law enforcement in 2017 on simply transporting people with serious mental illness for evaluation and care. She noted she had spoken with Steve Hollis who worked with the Department of Public Health and Human Services who had indicated they had a lot of situations whereby officers would not only transport patients but would sit and wait with them for hours only to be turned away. She believed a human crisis response system was needed with well-trained, compassionate, and unarmed professionals as the first point of contact and at capacity so they were immediately available at all times. She referred to a June 15 *Washington Post* article and noted Ron Bruno who lead CIT International and trained police on how to better interact with individuals in a mental health crisis said "we have to challenge the belief that mental health crisis services must come in a police car." She commented that mobile crisis response teams could include a mental health professional and a peer, someone that had recovered from a mental wellness crisis and was skilled at diffusing emergencies. She explained that when she had watched the murder of Daniel Prude in Rochester, she had known that had it not been for the mobile crisis unit in the city in which her loved one lived, her loved one could have experienced that same outcome. She felt there had been grace involved in that interaction and he loved one had been able to go to the hospital for treatment. She believed most law enforcement officers would welcome an opportunity to stop being the first responder when someone was in a mental health crisis. She did not feel it was even fair to ask a police officer to switch from the frame of mind of protecting the public from harm to a compassionate, caring role for which they were not trained. She hoped the Council would support the funding for this mental health collaboration team. Although it was not enough, she pointed out it was at least a start.

Dick Parker, 215 W. Sexton Road, noted black lives mattered, and that policing problems were not the only thing with an impact on African-American people. A disproportionate number of them were housing cost stressed and Columbia's utility rates tended to add to the problem. The most obvious example was the summer water rates. Columbia's utility rates differentially impacted individuals with low incomes making them pay more than their fair share. In January of 2019, a summer tier 3 rate was added as had been recommended by the Integrated Water Resource Plan to address the issue of irrigation and other summer discretionary water use, but the rate had been set much lower than the recommended rate. Customers that were housing cost stressed did not irrigate large lawns, yet all customers contributed to support the expenses caused by lawn watering customers. He felt tier 3 needed to recover a substantial amount of money, i.e. one-third of the cost of the water treatment plant and well field. He pointed out that only two-thirds as much water was used during the non-summer months, and without the summer high use, they would not need such a large system. He understood the Council would not address FY 2021 water rates until January, and explained he was making a statement now in order to bring the issue to their attention. He believed the Council should raise the tier 3 water rate to the recommended level of \$9.08 per ccf in January. He noted budget

plans did not call for an increase in water utility expenses for FY 2021, and this rate change could be done in a revenue neutral fashion by reducing the rates for all other water by about \$0.37 per ccf. He did not feel the Council should continue the subsidizing of expenses caused by customers that could afford irrigated lawns by a third of the citizens that were housing cost stressed as had been done for many years. He asked the Council to set the tier 3 level rate at the level the consultant had recommended.

Robert Carter stated he was speaking on behalf of the LIUNA Local 955 Solid Waste workers employed by the City of Columbia regarding the proposed solid waste reforms involving bulky item pickup, add-pay, and new bags, and explained the LIUNA Local 955 members approved the majority of the reforms. Making residents request bulky item pickups instead of having to pick up everything left on the curb would make their routes more efficient and would decrease the amount of unexpected strain on the workers. It could also result in less costs for the City because if people took their bulky items to the landfill themselves, the City would not be forced to hire additional labor during high volume times. He pointed out that introducing city bag requirement had been shown to decrease refuse and increase recycling measures in similar sized cities, and noted it would also help workers to stay on-time while lessening the workload on each route, allowing them to get more area covered in less time. If the additional pay proposal was implemented as had been written and discussed with them at 3:00 p.m. on August 31, the additional pay would only go into effect when the driver was lucky enough to be working with another full-time employee. They would otherwise not receive that pay. He explained most full-time workers were driving with two temporary employees on the back of the truck so the drivers were not handling the refuse collection. This meant no one on the truck would receive the additional pay, and that the proposed reform would not have any impact on workers. As a result, they were asking that the add-pay be applied to the drivers as well as the refuse collectors. This would help with turnover and allow them to continue transitioning temporary workers to full-time workers. The add-pay policy along with the other proposed reforms was meant to help get away from the dependence on temporary workers. He reiterated correcting the add-pay to include the drivers would keep workers in the job, which in turn would prevent turnover. He commented that it might not be roll carts, but it was a good step in the right direction of rewarding essential workers for their loyalty and hard work in keeping the City safe and clean. He noted they also stood with others in rejecting the budget proposal that would cut HSA contributions by 50 percent, in increasing the tool allowance for mechanics, and in working toward hazard pay for all workers, even if it involved back-pay from the CARES Act funds.

Robert Smith stated he had been a mechanic for the City of Columbia for the past 9-plus years and noted he was speaking on behalf of all of the mechanics at the Grissum Building, the Landfill, and in Parks and Recreation. He explained they were requesting three things. One was to leave the HSA as it was now without any changes. He believed it was ludicrous to make a change now with COVID and the way this year had gone. Another request was for the mechanics to also receive hazard pay. He commented that they were essential workers that could not work from home and had to put up with issues similar to those in the Solid Waste Division. He pointed out they actually had to go into the back of the trucks to work. They did not just throw trash in it as they had to work inside of it with the needles, broken glass, etc. He noted they had a similar situation with the City buses as not the cleanest people rode on City buses. They were touching things that had not been sanitized and were taking a chance everyday with the virus. The third request was for an addition to the tool allowance. He explained it had not been increased in years, even with the changes in technology, and they needed to be able to keep up with the technology, which meant more tools. He noted they were asking for a \$200 per year additional allowance. It was currently \$800 per year, and they were suggesting it be \$1,000 per year.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Smith if they purchased their own tools. Mr. Smith replied yes. Mayor Treece understood the City did not provide their tools. Mr. Smith explained the

City provided certain equipment such as a laptop, an air conditioning machine, etc., but any hand tool or digital meter was purchased by the mechanic. They each had a tool box and roll cart because they were not always in the same bay.

Mayor Treece asked if any of these issues had been brought up during the collective bargaining sessions. Mr. Smith replied the union member might have mentioned it, but he had not.

Ms. Fowler asked why the mechanics were supplying the tools instead of the City. Mr. Glascock replied it was because they had a hard time keeping tools that were not personally owned. He noted the City supplied the specialty tools needed as had been mentioned, but the basic tools were brought to work by each mechanic as part of his/her trade.

Ms. Fowler asked for the last time everything had been priced out so they knew if the \$800 was sufficient. Mr. Glascock replied it had likely been done about 10 years ago when it had been raised to \$800.

Mr. Smith commented that like computers and monitors, the tools needed to be replaced every so often. Their ratchets wore out and their wrenches broke.

Ms. Fowler thanked Mr. Smith for bringing this issue to the attention of Council.

Alex Bergman explained she was representing the steering committee of Mid-Missouri Jobs with Justice, which was a coalition of labor, student, faith, and community organizations, to include individual members. She noted she was present in solidarity with the Mid-Missouri John Brown Gun Club, the Mid-Missouri DSA, Our Revolution Mid-Missouri, IUE-CWA Local 86821, Transparency Matters, the Columbia Missouri National Education Association, and the Coalition of Graduate Workers to have their voices heard in support of City workers. She commented that anyone that had a great day off yesterday could thank a labor union. She suggested anyone not having the day off to join a union. Regardless of one's feelings about yesterday, she asked everyone to join her in support of Local 955 and their continued fight to secure better working conditions for Columbia's most essential workers, particularly their solid waste workers and mechanics. The City was not only failing to appropriately compensate its essential workers for dangerous jobs, but was also moving to remove and restrict the current benefits that City workers relied upon to keep themselves and their families safe and healthy. At a recent meeting, solid waste workers had provided a signed petition of demands that had included hazard pay of at least two dollars per hour, the implementation of roll carts, and a household waste bag limit during the transition to roll carts, and Mr. Sorrell had suggested a few items in response. One was a bulky pickup requirement to limit the number of large items on the curb, another involved regulations that functioned as a bag limit, and a third item was the additional pay of \$5 per hour for some solid waste workers. She understood the additional pay would only count if one threw away garbage on the back of the truck, and that most City workers were currently drivers because of the CDL requirement. The rest of the workforce was day-to-day with roughly 70 percent being temporary workers without CDLs. Current practice was to put two temporary workers on the back of a truck while a City worker drove. This meant few, if any workers, would actually receive the raise. The full-time workers in the Solid Waste Division would not receive additional pay because they would be driving and the temporary workers who worked for an agency would also not receive the additional pay because they were not City employees. While the proposal might be acceptable on the surface, the majority of workers would continue to feel the burden of working in dangerous conditions with insufficient pay, and that made the proposal insufficient. She pointed out that employing non-City workers did not save the City money. It actually cost the City approximately \$24 to employ one temporary worker. Since the City put two temporary workers on the back of the truck, it meant employing temporary workers tended to cost significantly more than just hiring more full-time workers. CDL workers were hired by the City at \$17 per hour. If a \$5 raise was given to all City workers in the Solid Waste Division, it would still be more cost-effective than hiring through a temporary agency. She

noted CDL workers could also make significantly more money in the private sector at other CDL classified jobs. She believed it was time for the City to compensate their workers at a rate that reflected their skill level and the work place risks. She stated the union supported the City hiring more employees at full-time rates and shifting from exploitative temporary worker contracting as quickly as possible. In addition, they felt all workers should be rewarded with additional pay for their loyalty as these reforms transpired, especially during the pandemic and its rough working conditions. She commented that they also opposed the City's proposal to slash HSA contributions by 50 percent during a worldwide pandemic. She believed it was outrageous for the City to choose to take money away from their workers' expected health savings contributions at a time when the health of the people should be the first priority. If the Council chose to cut HSA contributions, it would be another demonstration of failed leadership. She asked the Council to support the workers by protecting their HSA contributions and raising wages to more accurately reflect skills and risks in the workplace.

Sterling Brown commented that perception was reality and it was tricky to be sitting where the Council sat. It required one to be humble and to acknowledge or recognize the struggle, joy, etc. of someone else. He noted the President of the People's Defense, Mr. Lovelady, had spoken earlier, and the issues he had brought to the floor were not lost as they had been echoing throughout the community for at least 101 days. He stated the perception of Mayor Treece leaving the dais while Ms. Mann was speaking, not returning for Mr. Lovelady, and then returning to tell the next person that his time was up was not positive. It made him wonder if he and others would be heard and if they would feel compelled to act. He noted it extremely disheartening. He understood it was hard to want to continue to listen and to be a part of the process, but promised their voices would continue and that they would persevere.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, understood the City was paying \$1 million in life insurance for each police officer. He commented that he had spoken to some people regarding trash collection and was told no one wanted to get dirty anymore. He suggested they review the needs of the airport to determine if that funding was necessary as it could help address other City issues. He also suggested they look at a health and safety individual for trash collection as that could provide a potential savings in the long run.

Mayor Treece noted written comments had been received from John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, indicating that ratepayers would be paying for the expansion of the water treatment plant from 24 million gallons per day to 32 million gallons per day for a second time now. He had also suggested \$20 million be pushed to the FY 2022 budget and felt that they were setting the Utilities Department up for failure. The written comments received would be filed with this agenda item.

There being no further comment, Mayor Treece continued the public hearing to the September 21, 2020 Council Meeting.

Mayor Treece stated they would vote the amendments up or down at the next meeting following discussion if there was a motion and second. He asked if Council wanted to allow public comment prior to disposing of the amendments or if they wanted to allow it afterwards on the final product. Mr. Skala replied if the point was to allow people to ruminate on the information associated with the amendments, it might be appropriate to take comments prior to determining which amendments might be appropriate and which might not be appropriate.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B213-20

Authorizing the issuance of Sewerage System Refunding Revenue Bonds, Series 2020.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Lue provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B213-20 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pitzer, and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece commented that this was a great rate and asked Mr. Lue if he had ever seen it that low. Mr. Lue replied the last rate the City had received had been lower. He noted there had only been about \$8 million outstanding on the bonds of which \$6 million was principal. As a result, they would save about \$1.2 million in interest payments.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Lue if he had figured out a way to show the Council how the money was saved and whether it would result in a rate decrease for ratepayers or an avoidance of a future rate increase for ratepayers. He asked if \$1.2 million worth of sewer improvements could be done. Mr. Lue replied he was not sure that could be done. He pointed out the savings would result over the years as this bond would go to 2032. If they saved it as the years went by, it would be real money at the end.

Mr. Skala commented that just keeping track of it in terms of ongoing savings would go a long way in terms of communication with the community. Mr. Lue understood. He explained they would provide information related to bond savings in the financial report at the next council meeting.

Mr. Pitzer asked if staff was working on any other refundings. Mr. Lue replied yes, and noted it was related to parking. Mr. Pitzer understood it was under introduction and first reading on this agenda. Mr. Lue stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked if there was anything else for this year. Mr. Lue replied no. He thought that would be it for the year. Mr. Pitzer understood they had likely refinanced everything over the last few years. Mr. Lue commented that he thought there might be 1-2 for next year, and noted they should be in good shape after those.

**B213-20, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE.
ABSENT: FOWLER (Ms. Fowler stepped out during the vote on this item), PETERS.
Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B214-20 Approving the Final Plat of "The Vineyards, Plat No. 8" located west of Dumas Drive and at the western terminus of Stone Mountain Parkway; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 33-2020).
- B215-20 Authorizing a right of use license permit with P1316, LLC for the construction, installation and maintenance of private trees and tree grates within portions of the future extension of Endeavor Avenue rights-of-way.
- B216-20 Accepting conveyances for sidewalk and street purposes.
- B217-20 Authorizing construction of the Stanford Drive PCCE #21 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division or authorizing a contract for the work using a term and supply contract.
- B218-20 Authorizing construction of the Quail Drive storm water improvement project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B219-20 Authorizing a joint funding agreement for water resource investigations with the U.S. Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior for groundwater monitoring of well sites in the vicinity of the McBaine wetland treatment units and the Eagle Bluffs Conservation Area.

- B220-20 Authorizing a professional engineering services agreement with Black & Veatch Corporation for the design of a new southeast pump station.
- B221-20 Authorizing a professional engineering services agreement with HDR Engineering, Inc. for design upgrades to the West Ash Pump Station.
- B222-20 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the issuance of birth and death certificates and associated information technology activities.
- B223-20 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Healthy Families Missouri Home Visiting program.
- B224-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for the purchase of a uniform for an honor guard member and testing materials for the Fire Department's new recruit hiring process.
- B225-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating grant funds received from the National League of Cities for climate action activities.
- B226-20 Authorizing Amendment No. 3 to the 2017 Master Services Agreement with N. Harris Computer Corporation, on behalf of its division Advanced Utility Systems, to implement changes to the budget billing payment plan calculation as part of the utility billing software.
- B227-20 Authorizing acceptance of a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice - Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance to provide funding to the Police Department and Fire Department relating to the City of Columbia COVID-19 response; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B228-20 Authorizing an amendment to the memorandum of understanding with The Curators of the University of Missouri relating to primary response areas by law enforcement officers for property owned or leased by the University of Missouri together with certain roadways and intersections within and bordering the University of Missouri Campus.
- B229-20 Authorizing an amendment to the memorandum of understanding with The Curators of the University of Missouri relating to primary response by law enforcement officers for off-campus apartment buildings leased by the University of Missouri and staffed by University's Residential Life Program.
- R101-20 Setting a public hearing: proposed Phase I construction of the Perche Creek Trail, from the MKT Trail to Gillespie Bridge Road, to include construction of a 10-foot wide concrete trail, a bridge over the Perche Creek and a small trailhead on the south side of Gillespie Bridge Road.
- R102-20 Setting a public hearing: proposed installation of backup cooling equipment on the roof of the City Hall Building for the Information Technology data center.
- R103-20 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the south side of Bradbury Drive and east of Kipling Way (Case No. 161-2020).

- R104-20 Authorizing an agreement for professional services with Jim Whitt, LLC for development of a comprehensive program to assist disadvantaged business enterprises.
- R105-20 Authorizing an artist's contract with Chris Morrey Studio LLC for the Columbia Regional Airport terminal building Percent for Art project.
- R106-20 Authorizing an artist's contract with David Griggs LLC for the Columbia Regional Airport terminal building Percent for Art project.
- R107-20 Authorizing Supplemental Agreement No. 1 to the aviation project consultant agreement with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. for construction services relating to the design and construction of a new airport terminal at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- R108-20 Authorizing the public sale of Taxable Special Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2020C.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B230-20 Authorizing the issuance of Taxable Special Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2020C.
- B231-20 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to eliminate the safety helmet or headgear requirement for motorcycle operators or passengers as required by state law and modifying the agency responsible for establishing minimum protective standard specifications.
- B232-20 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to personnel policies, procedures, rules and regulations.
- B233-20 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to residential curbside refuse and recycling collection.
- B234-20 Adopting FY 2021 Classification and Pay Plans; establishing implementation dates of September 20, 2020 and October 1, 2020; providing for salary adjustments for eligible employees.
- B235-20 Establishing plan year 2021 active employee medical premium rates, active employee and retiree dental premium rates, and non-Medicare medical rates for the City of Columbia; providing for payroll withholdings.
- B236-20 Rezoning property located on the northwest corner of the Green Meadows Road and Green Meadows Circle intersection from District R-1 (One-family Dwelling) to District PD (Planned Development); approving a statement of intent; approving "The Godfrey PD Plan"; granting a design adjustment relating to front entrance placement (Case No. 127-2020).

- B237-20 Rezoning property located on the north side of Texas Avenue and approximately 650 feet west of Providence Road (13, 103, 105 and 107 E. Texas Avenue) from District R-1 (One-family Dwelling) and District R-2 (Two-family Dwelling) to District M-OF (Mixed-use Office) (Case No. 142-2020).
- B238-20 Granting design adjustments relating to the proposed Final Plat of Boone Electric Plat 2 located on the west side of Range Line Street and north of Business Loop 70 (1413 Range Line Street) to allow an alternative location for utility easement dedication and a lot line to bisect an existing structure (i.e., parking lot) (Case No. 135-2020).
- B239-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Boone Electric Plat 2" located on the west side of Range Line Street and north of Business Loop 70 (1413 Range Line Street); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 135-2020).
- B240-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Fyfer Place Plat 1" located on the southwest corner of the Broadway and Fyfer Place intersection; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 144-2020).
- B241-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Deerfield Ridge Plat 2-A" located on the northwest corner of the Scott Boulevard and Route K intersection; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 148-2020).
- B242-20 Authorizing a consolidated grant agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for FY 2021 transportation planning purposes (Case No. CATSO-000181-2020).
- B243-20 Authorizing an operating agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri and Bird Rides, Inc. for implementation of a shared active transportation operation for small dockless electric vehicles.
- B244-20 Authorizing a contract with Consolidated Public Water Supply District No. 1 of Boone County, Missouri relating to the relocation of a waterline along the north side of Route K as part of the Sinclair Road/Route K/Old Plank Road roundabout improvement project.
- B245-20 Authorizing an agreement with Regional Economic Development Incorporated (REDI) for the lease of office space at 500 E. Walnut Street located in the Fifth Street and Walnut Street municipal parking facility.
- B246-20 Authorizing an economic development agreement with the Columbia Chamber of Commerce, Boone County, Missouri, The Curators of the University of Missouri and Regional Economic Development Incorporated (REDI).
- B247-20 Authorizing Phase I construction of the Perche Creek Trail, from the MKT Trail to Gillespie Bridge Road, to include construction of a 10-foot wide concrete trail, a bridge over the Perche Creek and a small trailhead on the south side of Gillespie Bridge Road; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division for a portion of the project; authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Crocket Engineering Consultants, LLC for design of the trail project.

- B248-20 Authorizing installation of backup cooling equipment on the roof of the City Hall Building for the Information Technology data center; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B249-20 Authorizing a non-federal reimbursable agreement with the Federal Aviation Administration for a commissioned flight inspection of the Runway End Identifier Lights System (REILS) on Runway 2-20 at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B250-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for airport operations and annual transit projects back to transportation sales tax fund balance for future allocation for transportation projects; appropriating capital project funds identified for the Battle Park Phase I project and Chapel Hill Connector - Perche Creek Trail project back to parks sales tax fund balance for future allocation for parks projects.
- B251-20 Accepting conveyances for drainage and sewer purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B252-20 Accepting conveyances for utility and temporary construction purposes.

X. REPORTS

- REP49-20 Amendment to the FY 2020 Annual Budget - Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds.

Mayor Treece understood this had been provided for informational purposes.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that he understood there might be a parallel between injections one had chosen freely and the chance of having COVID-19. He had been told the flu could impact the immune system, which in turn made one more vulnerable to COVID-19. He noted he was concerned because he felt flu shots had likely been given to the elderly in nursing homes. He felt that was important when making decisions related to COVID-19.

Mayor Treece noted written comment had been received from Sara Eber asking the City to not tear down anything that reminded them of their history. She understood some of their history was good while other parts of their history were dark and evil. Eradicating monument or icons, whether it reminded one of the good or bad times, would ignore the good people that gave of themselves and their memories. This written comment would be filed with other items related to this meeting.

Mr. Thomas asked for an ordinance to be drafted prohibiting Columbia Police Department employees from using neck restraints, which included chokeholds. He noted this was something the People's Defense had been asking for over the past 100 days. He thought the least they could do was to draft an ordinance, allow for public comment, and have an open and honest discussion about the issue prior to voting on it as a City Council. He commented that a few meetings ago, Kirubel Mesfin had made a powerful case that it was a lethal tactic that was misused against people of color and that there were many other tools and tactics available to police officers to accomplish de-escalation. Dozens of police department across the country including Minneapolis, Houston, Charlotte, and Denver had implemented this policy within the last few months. He reiterated his request for an ordinance to be prepared for consideration at a future council meeting.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Glascock when he anticipated wrapping up the series of

listening tours that were being held. Mr. Glascock replied they had wrapped them up, but since then, one more had been requested which they were trying to accommodate. He thought the contract indicated a report would be provided to the Council by the second meeting in October.

Mayor Treece stated he was not opposed to the recommendation of Mr. Thomas, and only wondered if they should do it in the context of all the input they had received as there might be a series of reforms that might come out of it, which they could then review together.

Mr. Thomas commented that he did not want it to be put off for too long and pointed out they had heard frustration tonight. He asked if a specific time frame and process could be defined. He wondered if it was certain that a report would be presented with all of the outcomes or recommendations from the meetings at the second meeting in October. Mr. Glascock stated he would have the City Counselor draft the ordinance, and noted he would need to check with the consultant and Mr. Seewood to ensure they could meet that October schedule. If they were unable to meet that date, he would check with them as to when they wanted the ordinance on the agenda. Mr. Thomas stated he was agreeable to that.

Ms. Fowler asked where they were with regard to the creation of a revenue tax force. In reviewing the City budget, she was reminded that they needed to look at revenue streams for the City moving forward, particularly in light of the fact they could not tax online sales. She asked if the Council had already enabled that task force or group for a defined period of time.

Mayor Treece asked for the recollection of Council. He noted he thought the Council had discussed the issue and that there had been some general consensus, but could not remember for certain.

Mr. Skala recalled a discussion with regard to a task force but also thought Mr. Glascock was going to bring forward various tax initiatives and fees at a future work session, but understood those could have been independent processes.

Mr. Glascock stated he had planned to utilize the second pre-council meeting in October to discuss potential tax issues for the following year, such as a gas tax or online sales tax. He thought the discussion regarding whether a task force was necessary along with its responsibilities could happen then as well.

Ms. Fowler asked Mayor Treece if that was sufficient in terms of a time line. Mayor Treece replied yes. He noted he was sure they had likely discussed it in January before COVID had become an issue.

Ms. Fowler felt that would provide time to ask citizens what they felt was an equitable way to go about raising more revenue to meet their needs.

Ms. Fowler asked for a report with the cost of moving to a hybrid system for boards and commissions, given the health constraints they were experiencing during COVID. She wanted this to be allowed for the public as well as board and commission members who were confining themselves at various times due to COVID.

Mr. Glascock replied staff would provide a report indicating which boards and commissions could be addressed via a hybrid system and which had the "see and be seen" requirement.

Mayor Treece asked if it could also include a preamble with regard to the Sunshine Law. He commented that he was not insensitive to the concerns of Ms. Fowler, but thought there was value in in-person meetings. It allowed for the disparity of thought to occur more authentically than could be achieved online. He noted he balanced that in his professional career as there were a lot of legislative committees they could watch online. People could not submit comments or testify online, but it allowed the public a way to observe without having to go to Washington D.C. or Jefferson City.

Mr. Skala thought a hybrid approach might have some merit in terms of obtaining

information and listening to meetings. It was different than interacting with the group. He stated he was not saying they should not allow that, but felt it might be a way to balance the issue as it provided access, but not necessarily the ability to vote.

Mayor Treece understood the Attorney General had provided some guidance, which indicated that if they could not get members together due to the pandemic, the discussions should maybe be postponed until after the pandemic. He noted there might be some like the Board of Adjustment and the Planning and Zoning Commission that had statutory requirements that required them to meet. He wondered how much of the other boards and commissions needed to meet if the public health environment made it difficult for the members to participate.

Ms. Fowler stated she understood the concern and that she was asking something that would be burdensome under their current constraints, but noted what she saw happening was a further reduction in a robust public input process. She did not feel that was good for them as a City, particularly as they struggled with issues of social equity and racial equity injustice. If they allowed COVID to make the conversations smaller, they were not serving the best interest of the community.

Mr. Skala thought the report could include the extent to which these boards and commissions had requirements necessitating the need to be in person. He agreed a robust conversation was best, but also felt there was value in interacting with people in person. He noted it was a balancing act.

Mr. Skala commented that he was warm to the idea of being able to compensate solid waste drivers a little bit more, but not necessarily the \$5 which would be provided to those throwing 50 pound bags all day long, and suggested maybe half of that amount. He understood Mr. Glascock felt all CDL drivers should receive the same throughout the organization, and asked if there could be the potential for a hybrid approach for an add-on for only the drivers. Mr. Glascock replied they could do whatever the Council wanted, but for him, it would be an inequity to provide it to a CDL driver solely because they drove a solid waste truck. He referenced a CDL driver of a dump truck, and noted the only difference was the vehicle. He did not feel that was equitable, but indicated they could cost it out. Mr. Skala stated he would like to know the cost and for it to be included on the amendment sheet so they could consider it next time. He suggested half of the \$5 amount.

Mr. Skala commented that he was bothered by some of the statements made about flu vaccinations. He noted he had obtained flu vaccinations for a dozen years and would likely obtain them for another dozen if he lived that long. He stated he would rather rely on a medical professional to tell him whether it was safe or not. He believed comments of the opposite nature were a potential catastrophe waiting to happen for not only the flu, but for COVID as well. He commented that he had some background in medical science, but he was a politician on the dais, and was making decisions based on the recommendations of experts. Those were usually medical experts, such as those with the Department of Health and the others that informed their expertise. He noted he was willing to lend support from a political point of view, but did not feel he should make medical decisions for the City. He also did not feel the anti-vaccination discussion would get them anywhere except behind.

Mayor Treece noted the written comments from John Conway had also included comments regarding B213-20. Mr. Conway wondered how much debt service coverage for sewer bonds would increase as a result of the \$65,000 annual savings in the refunding. He also understood some of the existing sewer bonds had been financed through the State Revolving Loan Program and wondered if any administrative written approval was needed to issue the new refunding bonds. He noted the Preliminary Official Statement mentioned a depreciation replacement account and wondered how that

account would work and what the current balance of fund might be. Mayor Treece pointed out all written comments had been distributed to Council and would be filed with the items associated with this council meeting.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

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