



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, April 15, 2019
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 15, 2019, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Boy Scout Troop 68, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, and TRAPP were present. The Interim City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

Minutes were not approved because the April 1, 2019 meeting minutes were not yet complete.

Ms. Peters asked that B89-19 and R59-19 be moved from the consent agenda to old business and new business respectively.

Upon his request, Mayor Treece made a motion to allow Mr. Trapp to abstain from voting on PH15-19. Mr. Trapp noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that his limited liability company had a contract to do outreach to individuals who were homeless or panhandling within the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) and the CID had pledged financial support for the project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B89-19 being moved to old business and R59-19 being moved to new business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Skala.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI3-19 Oath of Office of Newly Elected Mayor (Council Member At-Large) Brian Treece.

Discussion shown with SI5-19.

SI4-19 Oath of Office of Newly Elected Third Ward Council Member Karl Skala.

Discussion shown with SI5-19.

SI5-19 Oath of Office of Newly Elected Fourth Ward Council Member Ian Thomas.

Mr. Ruffin administered the Oath of Office to Mayor Treece, and the City Clerk presented him with a framed Commission for Office.

The City Clerk administered the Oath of Office to Council Member Karl Skala and Council Member Ian Thomas, and Mayor Treece presented each with a framed Commission of Office.

Mayor Treece thanked the public for its vote of confidence on Tuesday to continue the progress that had been made, which for him, was more open, honest, and transparent government. He stated he was grateful for the outpouring of support for this continued direction and for confidence in this Council. He commented that he was glad they were

all still there to continue the important work that had to be done.

Mr. Thomas thanked the Fourth Ward constituents for supporting him for a third term and noted he was looking forward to continuing to work on important policy issues, such as public transportation, development impact fees, and affordable housing. He stated he also wanted to take this opportunity to again apologize for his error in judgement with the Oakland Crossing development process last fall. He commented that his intentions were entirely honest and designed to address Columbia's serious shortage of affordable housing. When the developer had offered to make a donation to the Community Land Trust, he should have said nothing and should have left it to the entire City Council to decide whether that voluntary offer made a difference to the decision instead of agreeing to support the proposal. He noted he had immediately canceled the agreement and had committed to recusing himself when the City Counselor had pointed out that, if completed, such an agreement might be illegal. He explained he had learned his lesson and stated he would not engage in those types of negotiations in the future. He commented that he also planned to disclose full details of any and all ex-parte conversations at the start of agenda items just as members of the Planning and Zoning Commission routinely did.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC4-19 Board and Commission Applicants.

Mr. Skala commented that they had some very important decisions to make with regard to the Board of Adjustment (BOA) and the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). He noted the candidate for the BOA was an alternate, which made it a relatively easy choice, but noted he wanted to revert back to a system used during his first term, from 2007 to 2010, for those boards and commissions with rule-making authority, such as the PZC and the BOA. He suggested the Council interview the candidates prior to making a selection. He stated this would only take about 10-15 minutes per candidate, and thought it would only involve 4-5 candidates. He believed it would be a welcomed opportunity to obtain more information and make a comparison based on real time exposure to the candidates.

Mayor Treece understood that had been done in the past. Mr. Skala stated that was correct. He thought it had been suspended in 2010 and was not sure it had been revisited.

Ms. Peters stated that sounded reasonable to her. She thought it would be nice to actually meet those that were willing to serve on committees.

Mayor Treece asked if there was any objection to doing this, and no one objected.

Ms. Amin understood she was not readvertising either vacancy. Mayor Treece stated he did not believe it would hurt to readvertise. Mr. Skala commented that they could. Ms. Amin explained that at some point there needed to be a cutoff date in order to conduct the interviews. Mayor Treece suggested it be left open for a couple of more weeks until the interviews were scheduled. Ms. Amin explained they would advertise this week, and it would not close until May 3. She would then let the Council know of the outcome, and they could then decide how to proceed.

Mayor Treece noted a member of the Council was expected to serve on the City of Columbia New Century Fund Inc. Board and it had been him for the last three years. He stated he did not mind continuing to serve on it if the Council was agreeable. He explained this was typically decided at the meeting in which new council members were sworn in, and asked if there was any objection to him continuing to serve. No one objected.

Mayor Treece commented that there was one applicant for the one City of Columbia New Century Fund Inc. Board vacancy. While he respected that applicant, the person was an elected member of the Columbia Public School District Board and he worried that would be incompatible with the City's interest on the City of Columbia New Century Fund Inc.

Board. He asked if there was any objection to readvertising for that vacancy, and no one objected.

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

COLUMBIA VISION COMMISSION

Burrow, Danielle, 3904 Keystone Court, Ward 4, Term to expire December 15, 2019

DOWNTOWN COLUMBIA LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

Hutchinson, Andrew, 607 Washington Avenue, Ward 1, Term to expire May 1, 2022

LIQUOR LICENSE REVIEW BOARD

Gardner, Brian, 3707 Teakwood Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire May 1, 2022

Mayor Treece noted they would readvertise for the PZC as indicated previously.

Mr. Pitzer asked if they could go back to the discussion regarding interviews as he wondered when the interviews would occur. Mr. Skala replied that in the past they had been done as part of the pre-council meeting. Mr. Pitzer noted there were six candidates so the interviews would take an hour.

Ms. Amin commented that if they could not move things for the pre-council meeting, they would likely have to schedule another time. Mr. Pitzer pointed out they had difficulty scheduling a time for another meeting just before the regular meeting tonight. Ms. Amin noted it would ideally need to be scheduled prior to May 20 as they would make appointments then. She also noted they would not have a full council on May 20. She explained some terms were up on May 31 and stated she would need to check to see if the current members could continue to serve beyond their term ending date.

Ms. Peters asked if interviews could occur prior to the May 6 pre-council meeting. Ms. Amin replied that could potentially be done if the Council was able and willing. She pointed out they were not truly having a pre-council meeting that evening. She explained that in the past the Council had sometimes narrowed the applicant pool if there were a lot, but that was a process as well. Mr. Skala agreed and noted it had involved a matrix to narrow down the pool to a manageable number of 4-6.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the interview would be a requirement for the position. He wondered how it would be handled if an applicant could not make the interview date or time. Mr. Skala replied from his perspective it would provide more information and help in the decision-making process. He did not believe they could make it a stipulation that one had to appear.

TAX INCREMENT FINANCING COMMISSION

Hall, Caleb, 2004 Woodlea Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire September 1, 2020

Spellman, Steven, 2312 Katy Lane, Ward 4, Term to expire September 1, 2022

TOBACCO RETAILER LICENSE REVIEW BOARD

Maynard, David, 1918 Jackson Street, Ward 2, Term to expire March 31, 2022

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC23-19 Nina Hampton - Community Policing and Community Involvement.

Ms. Hampton, 202 Bay Pointe Lane, commented that the establishment of the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB) was very much in line with the philosophy of community policing in that it depended on the voices of citizens to direct it. She understood that when the CPRB had first been organized the attendance had either been so large or it had been anticipated to be so large that it had been moved to the Council Chamber. She also understood it had been created in response to the President's 21st Century Policing

Manual. She explained the Council Chamber had been fairly empty at the meetings she had attended about three months ago as only a couple of people, other than herself, had been in attendance. One had been a member of Race Matters, Friends, who had been filming the meeting due in part to Bill Davis, a former police officer that had served on the CPRB until he had recently moved. She noted Mr. Davis had expressed his frustration in the ability of the CPRB to do the job it had been designed to do, i.e., give citizens input and oversight with regard to the Police Department. She commented that Mr. Davis had indicated the Chair and the City's staff representative were not a driving force for the CPRB and were obstructionists. She stated the training she had attended a couple of Saturdays ago had involved an accreditation manager, Sergeant Dochler, and he had provided a rousing report of the CALEA accreditation process, which the Police Department was seeking. She thought it was great to see someone enthused about obtaining public input and the input of the CPRB, but the City staff representative then told them the reasons it could not be done, i.e., if it involved a quorum it would constitute a meeting, etc. She believed CPRB meetings could be a wonderful forum for eliciting people's opinions and input as part of the accreditation process. She hoped there was a way to try to obtain input through the CPRB. She commented that she did not believe the City staff representative or the Chair of the CPRB were trying to be obstructionist, but it was hard to listen to all of the reasons it could not be done when there was excitement for it. She suggested each Council Member try to attend a meeting. She understood Sergeant Dochler had indicated he could not wait for a monthly meeting as they needed input more quickly. She thought there should be a way for the CPRB to provide weekly input.

SPC24-19 Carol Brown - Community Bail Fund.

Ms. Brown stated she was an activist with Race Matters, Friends, and noted they were hoping to see real citywide community policing in Columbia. They wanted to see a new era of racial equity conversations coming from the government and real changes in institutions and policies. She explained she wanted to speak about the new Race Matters, Friends community bail fund and white fragility as it stifled conversations regarding racism in the community. She stated racism was a white-people problem and a big problem. She commented that the community bail fund was an attempt to address a small part of the problem, i.e., the criminalization of black and brown people. She noted Race Matters, Friends had been exploring social justice issues in the community for years now. They had received requests to begin specific court observations about two years ago, and it had been really eye opening. Spending time at the Court House would make one think Columbia was a majority black community and a community that was very poor, but the population of Columbia was only about 10 percent black and the community as a whole was not poor. She explained the community bail fund was a result of their court observation work. Judges, lawyers, public defenders, and the court administrator had really helped them figure out how the jail and bail system operated in Columbia and Boone County. It had taken a year to get the project off of the ground and they had finally been able to get the community bail fund on the list of bail bond companies posted at the jail at the beginning of March. She commented that Sheriff Dwayne Carey had not been helpful and had proved to be a huge obstacle in their efforts to get on the bails bond list that was posted at the jail for inmates to refer to when they needed to get out of jail. She stated they had persevered as they had found the court rules, which indicated he did not have anything to say about it. She explained Race Matters, Friends recently began bailing people out of jail with no fees, and thus far this month, seven people had been bailed out of jail at a cost of around \$4,500. The funds had been donated by the community and from people across the entire country. She noted they were in the process of joining the National Bail Network. She commented that they had seen how the poor, the marginalized, and, more often than not, their black neighbors, were charged money they did not have by the criminal justice system prior to being convicted of anything. It was sucking resources out of the community, and people

with resources could easily get out of jail while those without resources could not. What they had was a debtors' prison with a disproportionate impact on the black community. She stated Race Matters, Friends had been created to deal with racism within themselves and in their lives, and to disrupt the system and structural racism encountered in the community. She commented that they knew white people avoided their own discomfort by not talking about race and often the term "poverty" was substituted for race. This worked great for white people, but it did not move the community forward. She reiterated that racism was a white-people problem and that they needed to talk about race and the structural institutional racism in the community. The community bail fund could keep bailing people out of jail, but until white people addressed the problem, there would always be the need for a community bail fund and the continuation of criminalizing people of color. She stated they would continue to spend more and more of their scarce community resources on policing and jailing people as long as they refused to honestly and publicly address the topic of racism. It was expensive, ineffective, and uneconomical as the cost was about \$60 per day to keep one person in jail. She noted they could see racism in the community through unemployment rates, housing policy, school and health outcomes, etc. She commented that there was not enough affordable housing and there was push back to real inclusionary zoning, which would impact the disparate free and reduced lunch rates between schools. She explained the outcomes at schools were predictively bad for children of color, and the maternal health and infant mortality outcomes in Boone County were some of the worst in the country. She felt that was unacceptable and noted the fragility and discomfort of white people kept them from even talking about racism. She stated it was past time to do it anyway and believed the cost of not doing it was way too high. She pointed out no one had ever died from an uncomfortable conversation.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH12-19 Consider the installation of traffic calming devices on Primrose Drive between Stadium Boulevard and Sunflower Street.

PH12-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp understood this would be paid for from annual traffic calming funds and noted they had accepted some fee in lieu of funds for a sidewalk in order to save a Sycamore tree near the speed hump close to Rashid Court. He wondered if it would be appropriate for those developer funds to pay for that speed hump. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it would be. Mr. Trapp stated he thought it would be better to do that so they could save some traffic calming funds. He explained they had discussed doing a more elaborate project that would incorporate a sidewalk around the tree but it had not been cost-effective. If the City did not use the payment in lieu of funds, it would go back to the developer. He noted the sidewalk was on the CIP list, but it was about 30 years out at a cost of about \$600,000. He thought they would lose the \$10,000 if they did not spend it and believed it would be appropriate to spend it on this project.

Mr. Thomas stated that was a great idea. Mayor Treece agreed.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Sam Bledsoe, 2500 Primrose Drive, commented that he was very much in favor of this traffic calming. He explained he had small children and was afraid of them even being in the front yard due to the speeds people traveled. He stated he knew he was not the only one as others had children along Primrose Drive and noted they were very much in favor of this project.

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

Mr. Trapp commented that he believed this was a very important project. He explained he had run for Council on livable streets, and traffic calming and sidewalks were less about transportation policy than about the front yard experience. He felt that when they became back deck people instead of front yard people, they traded down their conviviality

and neighborliness. By slowing down traffic, he thought they might be able to lure people out of their back yards and into their front yards. It would create more eyes on the street, which would protect them from property crimes and enhance neighborhood life. He commented that this was the first street he had walked when he was a new candidate running for office, and was thankful he had survived.

Mr. Trapp made a motion directing staff to move forward with the installation of traffic calming devices on Primrose Drive between Stadium Boulevard and Sunflower Street and for the in lieu of fees they had accepted on the sidewalk waiver to be used to pay for it. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Ms. Peters understood the City had received \$10,000 and this was a \$30,000 project. Mr. Nichols stated the remainder would be paid for from the traffic calming fund.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Mr. Skala directing staff to move forward with the installation of traffic calming devices on Primrose Drive between Stadium Boulevard and Sunflower Street and for the in lieu of fees they had accepted on the sidewalk waiver to be used to pay for it was approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH13-19 Proposed replacement and installation of additional security cameras in City-owned parking garages.

PH13-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala commented that there had been a long history of surveillance cameras in the parking garages and this would be an upgrade. He asked if this would affect the volatility or capacity issues or create a limitation on how long these surveillance records were kept. Mr. Nichols replied it would be digitized. Currently, it was on tape so it was very archaic. He believed this would increase security and the assistance they could provide.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the \$43,000 per year long-term impact was a new \$43,000. Mr. Nichols replied it was for ongoing maintenance. He explained this company provided camera installation citywide through a blanket contract, and reiterated that was a maintenance fee.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to proceed with the replacement and installation of additional security cameras in city-owned parking garages. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH14-19 Proposed construction of the Cosmo-Bethel Park improvement project to include the renovation of eight (8) tennis courts, installation of a new park entry sign and renovations to the north parking lot.

Discussion shown with B90-19.

B90-19 Authorizing construction of the Cosmo-Bethel Park improvement project to include the renovation of eight (8) tennis courts, installation of a new park entry sign and renovations to the north parking lot; appropriating funds; authorizing an agreement with Columbia School District No. 93.

PH14-19 was read by the Clerk, and B90-19 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

B90-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH15-19 Proposed replacement of streetlights in the Downtown Community Improvement District.

Mr. Trapp stepped out of the meeting room.

PH15-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen and Mr. Williams provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if the arm halfway down the pole that hung over the sidewalk would be the new LED head or the acorn head. Mr. Williams replied they would both be LED heads. The upper or streetlight arm would be a 3000K and the lower arm would be a 6000K.

Mayor Treece asked Interim Chief Jones if he had any sense of how those new heads in the problem block had been performing with respect to disbursing the crowds after the bars had closed. Interim Chief Jones replied the lights had been tested for functionality, i.e., they had been raised and dimmed at a time they did not have bar crowds. In addition, the test period was at a time students were not in town or in the winter months when it was cold. It was not an ideal time to obtain comparison crime data. He commented that every study he had researched had indicated more lighting reduced crime.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a schedule of which lights would be changed out first. Mr. Williams replied staff had worked with the Downtown CID to identify about 100 that would mainly be along the Broadway thoroughfare to provide a consistent uniform look in the downtown area and in the areas closer to night time activity.

Mayor Treece commented that about a year ago when this had initially been discussed, he had concerns about the aesthetics of changing from the acorn head to the LED head, but after walking downtown with Deb Sheals, he realized they already had a hodgepodge of different heads. He thought the potential for uniformity depending on how they were rolled out was likely better with these new heads.

Mr. Skala understood from the comments that there was not any potential benefit for extending the pilot period to collect data during the summer and when the bars actually closed, and that staff was comfortable with the idea that these lights would provide added security. Interim Chief Jones explained it was not only a deterrent, but it also offered more light to better identify people in crowds, including police officers that were wading into the crowds. He felt there was a big benefit in terms of safety. Mr. Skala stated CPTED rules and regulations had suggested the temperature of the lights was important in terms of witness identification and asked if that had been considered. Mr. Williams replied the 3000K was closer to the yellow light they were used to seeing produced by a high pressure sodium light.

Mr. Ruffin asked for the timeline for completion if this was approved tonight. Mr. Williams replied if this was approved tonight, staff would work with the Downtown CID to bring forth an agreement to appropriate the \$30,000 they had discussed donating to the City for the advanced photocontrollers. They would then obtain permission to bid the project through the City's Purchasing Division for hopefully a summer installation.

Mayor Treece asked who would have control over those lights. He wondered if it would be the downtown unit or if they would be set up on a timer. Mr. Williams replied it could be set up in many different ways. Currently, they had a gateway that sat on top of City Hall and acted as a receiver for the network. He stated these had the ability to be timed in 15 minute intervals and there was also a webapp that would allow people with access to turn them on and off at will.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Debbie Sheals explained she was the current Chair of the Downtown CID and had been the Chair of the Downtown CID's Operations Committee when they had started talking about these lights years ago. She noted the safety aspect with the dimmable lights was something the Downtown CID would fund. She stated the EO180 project fund, which was replacing all of the lights and the fixtures, would include City funding that had been appropriated. She commented that she was very excited about this option and pointed

out \$30,000 was less than an officer's wage for one year. She believed this would provide a long term fix at a low cost and hoped the Council would approve it.

Jay Hasheider, 1812 Cliff Drive, stated he was on the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) and wanted to make sure the Council knew the WLAB had voted to not approve this project at this time. He explained they wanted more information about safety. He commented that he wanted to express his consternation about being on the WLAB and in a situation of trying to identify what might be good in terms of safety and aesthetics for the community. He stated they were there to pay attention to the water and electric utilities and their ratepayers. He explained an objection he had was that the Utilities Department was paying for this improvement to the downtown that benefited the City as a whole, and many people that would not have to pay for it even though they were Columbia citizens. He noted those were the Boone Electric Cooperative ratepayers. He felt the water and electric ratepayers were taking on the financial burden of the entire streetlight budget, and noted he intended to follow up on that issue as a member of the WLAB. He reiterated they had been asked to look at safety issues but they were not safety people. The feedback from the interested parties meeting was close in terms of whether the project was favored or not, and many of the objections were aesthetic. He stated he was comforted by the fact Mayor Treece had looked at the light fixtures with Ms. Sheals, but felt it was inappropriate for the WLAB to make a judgement on aesthetics. He also did not feel this was in the best interest of water and electric ratepayers because it was a City issue and there were more than water and electric ratepayers within the City.

Mayor Treece stated he appreciated Mr. Hasheider's thoughts on safety versus rates, and asked if the utility had always paid for the streetlights. Mr. Johnsen replied the utility had been paying for the streetlights for about the last five years. Mayor Treece asked if that included residential neighborhoods. Mr. Johnsen replied yes.

Jim Windsor, 200 Manor Drive, wondered if City crews would have been able to do this work instead of contracting for it and paying substantially more if the electric utility paid competitive rates and was fully staffed.

Bob Hohenstein explained he was the Executive Director of the Downtown CID and noted they had worked very closely with the Utilities Department and the Police Department over the last few years on this project. The Downtown CID had committed \$30,000 a few years back toward the project, and those funds would be used to purchase the photocells that would allow the lights to be dimmed and brightened as needed. The cost of the photocells was \$300 per light pole and there would be 100 new enhanced light poles and lights within this first phase. He commented that the new streetlights had been proposed for the safety and welfare of visitors to the downtown, employees that worked at night in the downtown, and the men and women of the Columbia Police Department that served the community when in the downtown as this would allow officers to more safely and effectively perform their duties. He stated it would allow officers to better and more quickly access and assess problematic situations and make their absolute best judgement as to a course of action or actions that might be required. He believed the new streetlights would assist in preventing and reducing the instances of damage, such as graffiti and the defacing of public and private property, to businesses and residences in the downtown. He commented that the new streetlights were a high profile crime prevention component and would enhance the quality of images from security cameras. They would also assist in disbursing drinking establishment customers that congregated outside businesses after closing time. He explained there was a reason bars turned on all of the lights inside their establishments at closing time. He believed the pilot project had provided proof that the technology associated with the new streetlights worked as had been the goal. The Downtown CID felt it was time to approve this project so the installation of the first 100 streetlights could begin. He noted they had spoken with the Police Department with regard to the topic of crime statistics and understood three years of data collection would be needed. He did not feel they could wait three years.

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

Ms. Peters asked if the diagram of the pole with the two lights was an example of what would be installed. Mr. Williams replied yes.

Mr. Pitzer asked how many light poles were in the downtown. Mr. Williams replied there were over 400 within the Downtown CID area.

Mr. Ruffin commented that he had heard there were issues for two-story buildings due to the higher light, and asked if consideration would be taken with regard to the location of the light poles to avoid any issues and to allow the use of both lights on the pole. Mr. Williams replied the plan was to replace the existing lights where they were currently located. He understood it was not necessarily the top light that caused the problem. It was the sidewalk facing arm that was at 20 feet or a second story window. He explained they had mechanisms that could be installed to direct the light away from a certain direction if they ran into conflicts or received complaints. He stated they would work on any complaint as they did with any other streetlight.

Mr. Skala recalled the outdoor lighting standards including complete shielding or shoebox shielding, and asked if there was any shielding on these lights as a rule or if there would be a special application for problem areas. Mr. Williams replied the LED streetlight technology was very directional in itself so they would almost aim each individual LED light. In an area without much other ambient light, they would be able to see that the lights did an extremely good job of cutoff behind the sidewalk. That factor along with shielding would allow them to almost direct where the light would shine. Mr. Skala noted the outdoor lighting standards had not taken modern LED technology into consideration, but understood the problems of glare had to do with point source, and not necessarily directionality. He stated he wanted to ensure the lack of shielding for point source glare did not cause more problems. Mr. Williams explained the shield technology cupped the LEDs individually so they had the ability to shield it in any direction.

Mayor Treece asked if the new heads were more energy efficient than the acorn heads. Mr. Williams replied they used approximately the same amount of energy, but the amount of light produced and the projection was greater.

Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to move forward with the replacement of streetlights in the Downtown CID as proposed and for staff to come back with an agreement with the Downtown CID. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin.

Ms. Skala commented that he would endorse this proposal. He noted he would have liked to have seen more data, but understood data related to safety might take considerably longer than a few months. In the spirit of safety in general and aesthetics in terms of standardization in the downtown area, he stated was prepared to support moving ahead with the project.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Ruffin directing staff to move forward with the replacement of streetlights in the Downtown CID as proposed and for staff to come back with an agreement with the Downtown CID was approved unanimously by voice vote with exception of Mr. Trapp who had abstained.

PH16-19 Proposed replacement of the water distribution infrastructure along Crown Point and Orchard Court.

PH16-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Trapp returned to the meeting room.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor Pro Tem Skala opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Mayor Pro Tem Skala closed the public hearing.

Ms. Peters made a motion directing staff to move forward with developing plans and specifications for the replacement of aging water distribution infrastructure along Crown Point and Orchard Court as had been described. The motion was

seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote with the exception of Mayor Treece who had stepped out during the vote on this item.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B83-19

Amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget and the FY 2019 Classification and Pay Plan to address department operational issues, correct personnel funding issues, adjust pay band assignments for certain department director classifications and lineworker series classifications, and provide for salary adjustments to lineworker classifications; transferring funds; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Buckler provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding exempt and non-exempt employees. Ms. Buckler replied exempt employees were not subject to overtime while non-exempt were subject to overtime regulations via the Fair Labor Standards Act.

Ms. Bucker continued the staff report.

Mr. Pitzer referred to section D of the council memo and understood a number of positions would change paygrades, but not pay, and asked if pay changes would be seen in the future outside of any across the board salary adjustments. Mr. Glascock replied no. He explained it only set the pay scale. Mr. Pitzer noted a move to midpoint had been done this fiscal year, and if that was done again, he wondered if those would see a larger pay increase in the future than they would now. Ms. Buckler replied she thought most were already at or above midpoint, but mathematically it could be a larger move to midpoint if they were below. Mr. Glascock agreed it was possible.

Mr. Pitzer understood the Pension Administrator position had been created a couple of years ago and had never been filled. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer wondered how those responsibilities would be assumed now. He understood the former Finance Director had some expertise. Mr. Glascock replied it would be the responsibility of the Assistant Finance Director and they were hiring for that position now. Mr. Pitzer asked who was overseeing the pensions now while that job was open. Mr. Glascock replied the Interim Finance Director, Janet Frazier.

Mr. Skala understood this was revenue neutral except for a couple of positions that were funded due to attrition, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Mr. Trapp asked how the decision was made to set the lineworker positions salary. Ms. Buckler replied a survey had been done of the electric utility. Since Ms. Peters had expressed interest in the lineworker series, staff had reviewed the data received and had discussed it with the City Manager. She explained they had looked at it in the context of the entire structure for everything they had in the pay plan for the City and had determined to keep the relative structure of the pay system intact. She pointed out the Utilities Director, Tad Johnsen, and Ryan Williams had also reviewed it, and they did not want to change any of the different levels, i.e., apprentice, journeyman, foreman, and line superintendent. She noted they also looked at equity across the City to determine what might work while also keeping it budget neutral. Mr. Glascock explained keeping the budget as it had been passed in September had been key. He pointed out they had eliminated positions to do that.

Mr. Trapp asked Mr. Glascock if he felt this would address the issue of retention and filling positions or if it was something they would continue to need to keep an eye on and make adjustments as necessary. Mr. Glascock replied he felt this was a first step. He did not believe this was the fix. He was hoping it would keep them from losing qualified personnel.

Ms. Peters understood the City was trying to keep the budget neutral while providing the lineworkers a pay raise, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Glascock replied yes, and explained they were also trying to keep the lineworkers. They did not want to continue to

lose staff. He commented that they could have gone further, but wanted to stay within the pay scale they had. He noted they had also tried to stay within the budget, which had been the direction of Council.

Ms. Peters asked what it would cost to go to what the lineworkers wanted for the rest of this year and next year as she understood they were not happy with this solution. Mr. Glascock replied he did not have that information at this time.

Mr. Skala understood this was revenue neutral and within the context of the budget already agreed to, and that the next step was to consider this in the context of the next budget. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. He noted there would be other series of scales to review as well. Ms. Buckler explained five surveys had been done, and this was just a piece of one of those surveys. Mr. Glascock noted those surveys were in draft and had not been finalized. He stated they needed to look at all of the series of jobs within the surveys. Mr. Skala asked if this discussion would be a part of the budget retreat. Mr. Glascock replied possibly.

Jim Windsor, 200 Manor Drive, commented that he had been a ratepayer and a customer of the utility for over 30 years at the same location. Over the last ten months, he had attended council meetings asking that the issue of non-competitive salaries for lineworkers be addressed. He understood the reason for inaction, even during the FY 2019 budget process, was that City Management had promised a study that would guide their decision. He believed the proposal tonight was misguided and would not solve the problem. He thought the Council and those that were customers deserved answers. He wondered why the Council had not been provided the report when a draft had been completed five months ago, why the study recommendation of over \$37 per hour for lineworkers had been ignored, why the study results that showed a median value of \$36 per hour for Missouri municipal and cooperative utilities surveyed had also been ignored when by ordinance the Council policy was to pay the median of the competitive market, why the salary of \$34.51 was proposed when the study showed that amount would be at the 37.5 percent level of the competitive market, why it was proposed as the midpoint of new salary range of lineworkers when it would make all lineworkers ineligible for the move to midpoint pay concept, and why all lineworkers were proposed to be placed at the same rate of pay without recognizing variations that currently existed due to years of experience. He wondered if City Management believed they could stop the loss of trained lineworkers and attract qualified lineworkers to fill existing positions by paying 37 percent of the competitive market and how they would justify proposing to pay line superintendents two cents more than line foremen when line foreman were paid overtime and line superintendents were not but were still required to work during outages. He also wondered when all of the other underpaid positions in the electric utility be addressed. He noted the study had indicated the cost would be a little over \$300,000 not counting benefits which would add 40 percent for the 42 positions substantially underpaid. He commented that this proposal implied it was necessary to eliminate positions to pay for the proposed pay changes. Personnel expenses for the electric utility were only 11 percent of the O&M budget and did not drive rate changes. He stated that paying competitive salaries, even when all benefits were included, was less than half of the cost of paying for contract labor. He asked the Council to consider the message this proposal sent to the remaining staff that maintained the critical electric infrastructure and whether they wanted those employees to think the Council did not care about the results of the study and to take what was being offered, retire, or go elsewhere. He noted the customers of the utility would ultimately pay for the decision and encouraged the Council to make a decision that assured a reliable system with highly qualified employees that were competitively paid to maintain the system.

Kevin Thornton, 16650 N. Old #7, Sturgeon, explained he was not speaking as a citizen of Columbia, but as one of the line superintendents of the electric utility. He thanked the Council for considering the pay changes proposed tonight which would hopefully retain the highly trained and qualified lineworkers that worked for the City. He stated his

concern with the proposal as written was that the raise offered to the lineworkers would not be enough to keep the employees they wanted to retain from leaving. He noted they could go to just about any rural cooperative in the area and make more money an hour or even two blocks from their location to make approximately \$10 an hour more. He commented that the City's system was much more complex than rural electric cooperatives as the system utilized both distribution and transmission lines ranging from 120 volts to 161,000 volts. When looking at other municipal utilities with compatible electric systems, such as the City of Independence and the City of Springfield, Columbia's pay for lineworkers was significantly less. Since 2015, they had lost four lineworkers to the City of Independence. He commented that he was not saying that wages were the only way they could recruit and retain employees, but thought wages were one of the easiest ways to recruit and retain employees, and noted it would not have any effect on the budget since they had been willing to give up positions. Unless they all worked together to come up with a plan to offer lineworkers something of significance, he believed they would continue to lose them to other places of employment. He pointed out the City had an obligation morally and legally to provide employees a safe work environment. By being staff with only 27 of 37 positions, they had made lineworking inherently more dangerous than it was already. He explained they were struggling to keep up with new construction and the complete maintenance on aging infrastructure. Only five of the current 11 lineworkers had ten or more years of experience, and three of them were right at ten years. The youngest line foreman had 15 years of experience. This lack of staffing and decreased experience levels created significant safety issues. He commented that if he could change anything about this ordinance tonight, he would take some of the raise issued to the line foremen and give it to the lineworkers as the foremen were not seeking employment elsewhere like the lineworkers. If this ordinance were to pass, he thought it should be considered a Band-Aid and that the Council should recognize the fact there was more to be done before the problem of recruitment and retention was fixed. If the Council was not willing to face this fact, he suggested they sell the electric utility as someone else might address the problems. He commented that he was sure the City would not sell the utility because so many other departments were dependent on it for revenue. He believed a lot more work needed to be done before they could even start rebuilding the work force.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that if the lineworkers were due a raise higher than had been proposed, it might be time to consider more than \$40 per hour as it was a dangerous job, similar to police officers and firefighters. He wondered if they should be more competitive than Boone Electric Cooperative to show they truly cared about their lives.

Brittney Wilhite, 7850 West Gray Road, Harrisburg, stated she was speaking on behalf of all of the wives and children of lineworkers as the lineworkers put their lives on line every day. She commented that in this line of work an accident with an injury was reported every 3-4 days and an accident with a fatality was reported every 8-10 days. She asked the Council to imagine having a job that had been ranked within the ten most dangerous and deadliest jobs in America. Lineworkers were unsung heroes that dedicated their lives to the line. Standing beside those dedicated men were loved ones that made endless sacrifices that allowed them to follow their passion and support their career. She urged the Council to imagine what it was like to love a lineworker and explained they prepared dinners that were never eaten or placed a meal on the table as they were rushing out of the house to an outage. They spent their birthdays, holidays, and anniversaries alone after the control center called and changed their plans. They packed bags without notice for an unknown number of nights to make repairs as a result of natural disasters. It left them with the task of running the home until they returned. She commented that their children went to bed missing their dads and wondering if they would come home before morning. The kids also scanned the crowds and audiences to see if their dads were able to make it to their game or school program. She stated they hunted Easter eggs and

waited for Santa without their dads because a house fire, broken pole, low lines, or a blown transformer had unexpectedly taken priority. The job of a line family was to wait. They waited for the simple things that so many people took for granted, such as a text, phone call, etc. She reiterated the sacrifices were countless and the hours were long and unpredictable. Since the lineworkers missed so many life moments, she felt the least they deserved was a safe work environment. They were stressed, anxious, fearful, and helpless with regard to the staffing issues they dealt with on a daily basis. She reiterated the lineworkers worked endless hours in the harshest conditions while being understaffed. They were tired, worn down, and exhausted, but it did not change their loyalty to the job. She commented that the experience of the current lineworkers was minimal, staffing was severely short, and morale was very low. She pointed out the job was dangerous enough without a staffing shortage and wondered why they should add more risks by not fixing the crisis they were facing. She asked the Council what they would do to fix it. She understood several lineworkers were actively seeking employment opportunities with other electric companies. In the past, they had seen many apprentices finish training, obtain their journeyman card, and leave for better opportunities. It was a situation that needed to be addressed. Qualified lineworkers were choosing other places to work because they offered a competitive wage and comparable benefits. She understood the City was short nine journeyman lineworkers, one line foreman, and one line apprentice. Without lineworkers, the City would be unable to sustain customer needs, and in order to address the shortage, they would have to address the obvious wage problem. She asked the Council to give lineworkers an identity when they made decisions about hiring and wages and when they provided excuses as to why they could not address the crisis. She believed the workers were more than their job title as they were the face of courage, bravery, hard work, and pride. It was a job that required skills that very few possessed and the courage to hold death in their hands on a daily basis. It took thousands of dollars and many years to train people to do this type of work. She asked the Council to look at each child and loved one in the room tonight and to understand their only goal was for the lineworkers to come home to them safely. She asked the Council to help them find a solution to this crisis before the unimaginable happened.

Jay Hasheider, 1812 Cliff Drive, stated he was a member of the WLAB and explained the WLAB had voted to recommend the passage of this wage increase before the Council tonight with the understanding that it was only first step. He noted he had been pleased to hear the City Manager say this was only a first step. He commented that he believed the utility should be looked at as an enterprise fund and not as another sector of the broad citywide wage and salary scheme. He understood this would be merged into a large payroll study where everything needed to conform. He pointed out enterprise funds could pay for the wage increases that were deserved. He hoped the Council would encourage management to start looking at it as an enterprise fund and not as another appendage to the general city workforce because the general city workforce had to survive on limited tax funded dollars. He felt that was regrettable, but it was a fact. He believed enterprise funds should stand on their own. He applauded the employees that were in attendance tonight because as a past employee he knew it was risky and nerve-racking since their bosses would not be pleased by it. He thought it showed the courage, tenacity, and dedication they were bringing to the job.

Mr. Thomas understood there had been quite a number of vacancies in the lineworker positions over recent years and asked if that was correct. Ms. Buckler replied there had been vacancies and the jobs had been posted. She noted the journeyman position had been posted in October and there had been applicants for the job, but the Division had decided not to interview anyone.

Mr. Thomas asked if the City had hired contract firms to do the work that would have been done by the City's lineworkers had they been fully staffed. Mr. Johnsen replied yes. He stated the City hired contract firms do line work. They did the work that could not be

done if they did not have enough crews to do it. Mr. Thomas asked for the comparative pay rate for an equivalent amount of work from a contract firm versus internal staff. Mr. Johnsen replied he did not know how much the contract crews as individuals were paid by the hour. The City hired them as a crew, which included equipment and manpower. Mr. Thomas explained he meant the cost impact to the City, and not the individual contract workers. He wondered about the fiscal prudence of having unfilled positions and hiring contract workers versus filling the positions. Mr. Johnsen replied he thought the current budget for crews was about \$250,000 per year. Mr. Williams understood Mr. Thomas was asking what the City would pay for a contract employee versus what the City would pay its own employee. He pointed out there was overhead built into the contract, but the cost was about twice what the City would pay its current employees. He was not sure how much the actual employee received and it covered the cost of profit and overhead. He explained the City typically always had a contract crew. Mr. Thomas understood they would be needed depending on workload. Mr. Williams stated it was costing the City more to utilize contract crews than if they did the work with their own crews.

Mayor Treece asked how the electric utility had gotten in this position. Mr. Johnsen replied he understood a compensation and classification study that had changed the whole pay structure had gone into effect in FY 2013. It was a major overhaul of the compensation and classification philosophy. The guidelines that structured pay had gone to the midpoint philosophy. Ms. Buckler pointed out all journey lineworkers had gone to the midpoint immediately. Mayor Treece understood this was regardless of whether they had five years of experience. Ms. Buckler stated that was correct. Mayor Treece asked if that was policy. Ms. Buckler replied it was a special pay provision for journeyman lineworkers. Mayor Treece asked when staff began to notice the attrition in the journeyman lineworker classification. Mr. Johnsen replied it had been shortly after the change in the compensation and classification philosophy. He pointed out that they had not kept up with what they should be paying citywide so there were a variety of issues beyond the demand for journeyman lineworkers. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Johnsen when he had become aware of the change in that environment. Mr. Johnsen replied about a year or two after the philosophy change. Mayor Treece understood that was in 2015, about four years ago. Ms. Buckler explained they were essentially back to the discussion they had in the fall when they had discussed the budget. They had not done anything to make paygrade adjustments for three out of the five years the plan had been in place so they had doomed themselves in terms of keeping up by not funding the market rate adjustments to the whole ranges and not funding the move to midpoint. It had been a good set of pay structure elements if it had been funded, but it had not been funded. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Johnsen if a budget request had been submitted to change those classifications. Mr. Johnsen replied there had been a number of discussions during the budget process with regard to pay changes, but the City's philosophy had been for everyone to operate under the same pay guidelines. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Johnsen if he had been asked to not submit a budget request for an increase. Mr. Johnsen replied he had spoken with the City Manager many times in the past of the need to do a better job of compensating employees because they were losing their competitiveness, and pointed out he had not been provided the tools to make the change.

Mayor Treece asked how many vacancies the electric utility had now. Ms. Baker replied there were 29 authorized full-time employees for apprentice and journeyman lineworkers, and they currently had 11 journeyman lineworkers and seven apprentice lineworkers. Two of those journeyman lineworkers were currently filled by electric distribution coordinators, which was part of the amendment tonight. They would take those two to the positions they were currently filling. Mayor Treece understood 18 of the 29 positions were filled so there were 11 vacancies. Ms. Baker stated that was correct for the apprentice and journeyman lineworkers. She noted they had 11 out of 12 line foremen

filled.

Mayor Treece understood there had been applicants for those vacant positions and asked why none of those applicants were interviewed. Mr. Johnsen replied he could not speak to the type of candidates they had, but explained they had to take the ratio of journeymen to apprentices into consideration. Mayor Treece asked how many apprentices a journeyman could supervise. Mr. Johnsen replied it was usually a 1-1 ratio. The furthest they wanted to go was a ratio of 50 percent apprentices and 50 percent journeyman lineworkers to get them up to speed. He stated it was a safety issue.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a residency requirement in terms of response time. Mr. Johnsen replied they needed to be within a 35 mile radius. Mayor Treece asked how that worked. He wondered if it worked well or needed to be improved. Mr. Johnsen replied it worked well most of the time. He noted they had discussed the need to revisit it to ensure it was consistent among all of the utilities. For the most part they had enough people to respond immediately. He explained they also had people on-call to ensure they had people who could be there within a short period of time. In addition, they had others that would come in when they could get a hold of them.

Mayor Treece stated he had heard testimony tonight that what the Interim City Manager had proposed was insufficient and that they should delete that from this ordinance and wait to discuss it with the budget when it could be addressed properly. He also heard that they should eliminate the line foreman raises and move that money into the journeyman lineworkers. Mr. Johnsen commented that while he agreed that this did not fix the problem, he hoped this was a step in the right direction in bringing the wages to a more competitive level. He reiterated this would not fix the problem and that this was the result of an effort to retain who they had within the existing budget.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Johnsen if he agreed that recruiting lineworkers was a problem. Mr. Johnsen replied yes. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Johnsen if he had any plans or ideas on how to improve the recruitment of lineworkers. Mr. Johnsen replied they had discussed closer alignments with some of the educational institutions in the area such as technical schools to try to get people up to speed faster. If they could get the apprentice program to operate more quickly, it would help, but they did not want to short-circuit the process because they needed people safe and well-trained. He believed compensation would be a critical piece. He explained a problem they had was that once they had trained the lineworker, the lineworker would go elsewhere. They did not want to be only an educational institution. They wanted to be able to retain people.

Mayor Treece noted there used to be a program to help medical students go to underserved areas via a loan forgiveness program. He also understood Linn State Technical College had a lineworker apprenticeship program and the IBEW had a journeyman program. He wondered if the City could sponsor some type of scholarship to those participants if they agreed to come back and serve the City for five years after their initial training was concluded. Ms. Peters thought it would be a good idea to look at something like that. She understood it was a two year program for education and then another four years to be a journeyman lineworker. Mr. Johnsen stated the apprentice program was a four-year program for the City, but if they had training, they would not necessarily start them at ground zero. For example if they had two years of technical schooling, they would try to get them into two years of the apprentice program. Ms. Peters understood they would then be eligible to be a journeyman lineworker. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. He pointed out there were a lot of differences in the systems, and the City had a system that had just about everything, i.e., transmission, generation, etc. They had about every aspect of an electric utility to which a lineworker could be exposed. Sometimes people with training had not been exposed to all of the aspects.

Mr. Pitzer understood staff was proposing to eliminate two of the journeymen positions and the one vacant foreman position, and asked if that was because they did not think they needed those positions or if it was because they were trying to keep this budget

neutral. Mr. Johnsen replied they were trying to keep the budget neutral and they did not have the ability to fill the positions this year. They would rather sacrifice the positions in the short run knowing they would likely remain vacant in order to retain the people they had. If they were able to get to a point where they could retain more people, they could then ask for those positions to be reestablished, and could offset it with reductions in contractual costs. This was currently a budget neutral way to provide tools to the existing employees as they did not have any reasonable expectation they would be able to fill those positions. Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Johnsen if he expected to ask for those positions back in September. Mr. Johnsen replied he did not expect that to happen.

Mr. Pitzer commented that the contract labor issue had been discussed previously and he had expected more information as to how much the City was spending in contract labor as a reduction in it was another way to be budget neutral. He wondered how much had been paid in contract labor in the last five years since they had started noticing these problems. He thought that once they were fully staffed, those funds could be used to remain budget neutral since they could use City staff instead of contract labor. Mr. Johnsen agreed and noted that when they were at a point of trying to add positions, they would provide those types of justifications. He explained he did not have the numbers tonight, but could provide a more detailed view of how contractual costs were split up if the Council wanted. Mr. Pitzer stated he thought they had been asking for that for a few months. He noted he was specifically interested in the amount that would be budgeted in contract labor if they were fully staffed and how much they had actually been spending as he was interested in that differential.

Mr. Pitzer asked for clarification on the requirements to report to work as they had heard testimony in terms of reporting to outages unexpectedly. Mr. Johnsen replied the residency requirement involved distance, and it was a 35 mile linear distance. He explained they had approached it in different ways in the past to include time, but that had not always work. He stated they had a certain number of on-call people to be able to respond with a crew on short-term notice. If that crew got to the outage and determined they needed more people or could not handle it, they would call in more people that were not on-call, but within the responding distance. It would take them a little longer to get there and become mobilized. He explained those were the two different levels they had to respond to outages. Mr. Pitzer asked how many people were typically on call. Mr. Williams replied typically they would have a single line crew on-call unless there was a storm event or something they knew was eminent coming. Mr. Pitzer asked if the secondary individuals were required to report or if they would only report if they were able. Mr. Williams replied the crews that were on standby were required to report as part of their job function. Those that were not assigned standby duty were not necessarily required to report. There would not be any disciplinary action if they did not report. Mr. Pitzer understood they kept going down the list until they found people who could respond. Mr. Williams stated that was correct.

Ms. Peters asked if these lineworkers were paid from the electric utility enterprise fund. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Ms. Peters asked if they had looked at whether there was money in the enterprise fund that would allow them to increase salaries even more. Mr. Glascock replied they had not used all of the money from the positions that would be cut so there was additional money available.

Mayor Treece commented that he was frustrated that there had been five years of warning signs and they were now being provided a half-hearted solution. He noted he could think of half a dozen other City employees by type that could make the exact same compelling and sympathetic argument. He also stated concern with elevating one type of employee to the midpoint without five years of service. He explained this was not an indictment of the Interim City Manager, but an accumulation of a policy plan that was not followed five years ago. He was not sure whether to take them out and address this as part of the budget process as had been recommended by Mr. Windsor or not.

Mr. Skala stated he viewed this largely as a safety problem as staffing was a safety

problem. He noted he had a daughter that was a police officer, which could be a dangerous job. He understood they had been hemorrhaging staff because of their inability to fund various aspects of the policy they had put forward. He commented that there was no point in having the policy if they could not implement it. He noted he was also frustrated they had not taken this issue up in the context of the budget last fall as they had delayed it to obtain more information. He thought they could use whatever it was they were saving in terms of eliminating positions as a Band-Aid until they could really discuss this issue in the context of the budget retreat. He explained his efforts would be to try and bring these salaries to a competitive level in the next budget cycle due to the safety concerns associated with the staffing levels. He suggested they do whatever they could now in the context of the budget as well.

Mr. Glascock agreed it was imperative that they address the problem and noted they had to figure out the pay philosophy they had. He commented that another piece to the philosophy they had never done and did not have a process for was performance pay. He stated they did not have any way to get people that were past the midpoint toward the top of the scale, and that had to be addressed in the pay package.

Mr. Trapp commented that he thought it was important to approve this tonight as it was a step forward. He agreed it did not get them to where they wanted to go, but felt they had made it clear as a Council to do more in the next budget cycle. He stated it had been tough citywide, and his preference was to look for universal solutions that would lift up everyone. The problems were not only in the water and electric utilities as they had issues with pay compression. The move to midpoint had some limitations and intrinsic unfairness built into it as well. He thought they needed to get back into a place of providing annual raises. He understood they could increase rates to cover costs with the enterprise utilities, but was concerned about the other parts of City. He stated he did not want to see them abandon treating the workforce universally. They would not want to allow a situation where someone that drove a truck in the electric utility received a raise, but someone that drove a truck in the street division did not as that was problematic as well. He noted there were not any easy fixes. He agreed they needed to cover some raises with some cuts, but thought they also needed to be diligent in their efforts to raise more revenue to cover essential services and take care of the workforce citywide so they could allow the enterprise funded workers raises. He stated there were fundamental things they needed to do to fix where they had not provided raises in the past and thought they could do that between this step forward and the budget process.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he agreed with Mr. Trapp and a lot of what had been said tonight. This was an accumulation of several years of the failure to look at the underlying issues. It was not something that could be fixed tonight. They had taken a few steps and would need to take more steps. For every step they took, there seemed to be unforeseen consequences that then needed correction, such as the move to midpoint. A more programmatic solution to annually address portions of it would be in the best interest of everyone. They did not want to allow the problems to build up again and to then try to solve it all at once as that would raise fairness issues and was not a sustainable way to conduct business. He appreciated Mr. Glascock bringing these issues to them in the middle of the year outside of the regular budget cycle as there were clearly items that needed to be addressed. He noted cuts had been made in some departments and several positions were closed so they were making steps. This was a step and he was certain there would be additional steps to come. He felt not taking this step would send the wrong message and set them back rather than help them get to the goal.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B83-19 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala stated he was prepared to endorse this and agreed this was a necessary first step. He noted he was looking forward to the discussion as soon as they could get to it with regard to reevaluating the policy they had never been able to fund and addressing the issues the Interim City Manager had identified in terms of pay beyond the midpoint. He felt they needed to overhaul the entire thing. He commented that due to safety concerns related to staffing, they would need to get to the point of competitive wages so they could be fully staffed.

**B83-19, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows
VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP.
VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

B87-19 Appropriating grant funds received from the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission and the Missouri Department of Natural Resources Volkswagen Trust Transit and Shuttle Bus Program for the purchase of one (1) electric bus.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B87-19 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B87-19, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows
VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP.
VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

B93-19 Appropriating funds received from donations, miscellaneous revenue and Park Sales Tax revenue to the Parks and Recreation Department.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B93-19 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B93-19, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows
VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP.
VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

Mayor Treece thanked staff for the markers for the African-American Heritage Trail. He thought it had been a great jumpstart to that program.

B98-19 Authorizing an agreement with the Boone County Fire Protection District to provide a stay in declaratory judgment action litigation as the parties seek a legislative fix to clarify the roles of the jurisdictions.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer explained he continued to hear that the City did not get along with the Boone County Fire Protection District (BCFPD) and that the two entities did not talk to each other, and asked how that had changed. Mr. Glascock replied he was not sure they ever stopped talking as the two entities worked together quite often. He pointed out they did

not always agree, but they continued to talk. He believed this law was passed due to a disagreement and noted he had reached out to the BCFPD so they could clarify who responded and in what manner. They had come up with this agreement until the State Law could be fixed to provide more clarification. Chief White stated he appreciated their history with the BCFPD and noted they had tried to work together when possible as it was mutually beneficial for both organizations to be able to rely on one another. He thought it was long overdue that they increased that relationship again.

Mr. Pitzer asked if there were any discussions in the works for other areas of cooperation. Mr. Glascock replied yes, and explained he had reached out to them regarding a fire station on the east side of town to determine if an agreement could be worked out to purchase one of their stations and for them to move further out. He commented that they were constantly trying to reinvent the way they worked with the BCFPD.

Mr. Pitzer asked Chief White if the Columbia Fire Department (CFD) currently responded to all calls within the city limits. Chief White replied yes. Mr. Pitzer asked if there had ever been a policy of not responding to calls within the city limits. Chief White replied the territorial agreements, which he believed involved a time frame of prior to 2009, had included situations where either one or the other would respond. Since then, especially from 2015 to now, the CFD responded to every address within the city limits. He noted the BCFPD also responded in the joint response areas.

Mr. Pitzer understood this agreement indicated that for any newly annexed territory the municipality had no obligation to respond to calls within that area, and asked if the policy would be that the CFD would not respond if the BCFPD responded within the city limits. Chief White replied that was correct based on how the agreement was currently written. Mr. Glascock clarified the CFD would not respond unless asked. Mr. Pitzer asked if it would be the BCFPD that would ask. Mr. Glascock replied it would be them or Joint Communications.

Mr. Pitzer asked if there were any conditions or guarantees of the level of service those areas would receive if the City did not respond. Chief White replied no. Mr. Pitzer understood the CFD had a target of responding within four minutes. Chief White replied within four minutes of travel time. Mr. Pitzer asked if the BCFPD had a similar target. Chief White replied he did not know. Mr. Pitzer understood there could be differences in personnel and equipment that responded to calls within the city limits as well if the BCFPD responded. Chief White explained the CFD operated on a career basis, had staffed stations, and had apparatus they knew would carry three personnel to every incident or event. The BCFPD worked off of a volunteer model so that was not always the case for them.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the ISO rating for the BCFPD. Chief White replied he thought it was a 4/5. Mr. Pitzer asked for the City's ISO rating. Chief White replied 2/2X. Mr. Pitzer asked for the ISO rating that would apply to the areas the CFD would not respond to within the city limits. Chief White replied it would be the BCFPD rating. Mr. Pitzer understood the City's uniform rating of 2 would not apply to the entire City. Chief White stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer commented that the City's ordinances indicated the fire chief shall have full power, control, and command over all persons at fires except police, and this agreement indicated the BCFPD would have incident command if both responded and if the BCFPD responded after the City, it would take over command. He asked how that complied with the City's ordinances. Ms. Thompson replied it was a complicated relationship. When the State Legislature attempted to give primary jurisdiction to the BCFPD, they had not resolved that issue. She explained the State Legislature dictating which agency had jurisdiction within the dual territory jurisdiction would take precedent over the City Code provision. The residents that would be covered by the BCFPD would have a right to vote on BCFPD issues and talk to the BCFPD Trustees with regard to the levels of service and what they expected out of the fire service that was providing services within their territory.

Mr. Pitzer asked if State Law had addressed incident command at all. Ms. Thompson replied no. As a result, it had created a gap where they had a dual service territory without any guidance for the two jurisdictions as to priority. She commented that they either needed to remove the dual jurisdiction or provide for who had the primary service.

Mr. Pitzer asked why staff felt they had intended to do that. Ms. Thompson replied staff had talked to the people that had introduced the legislation and they had indicated that had been their intention. Mr. Pitzer asked why they had not done it if they had intended to do so. Ms. Thompson replied she did not know. Mr. Glascock stated it had been done on the last day of the session last year.

Mr. Pitzer stated his concern was that they had not addressed command because they did not want to talk about command, and they instead wanted to talk about jurisdiction and who would remain in the BCFPD and who would not. He felt if they had wanted to talk about who would have command, they would have discussed who wanted to have command. He commented that he did not believe they had addressed the issue, and as a result, the City's ordinances still had control.

Mr. Skala noted that was the essence of this conversation. It was confounded in terms of control. He had wondered what would happen if both showed up at the same time. He stated the State Legislature had gotten involved in this issue and had not provided for some of the direction necessary to ensure it worked smoothly.

Mr. Glascock commented that it was about safety, and they did not want confusion when fighting a fire.

Mr. Skala noted the level of service was another unresolved issue.

Ms. Peters asked if the expectation was that the State Legislature would look into the situation this year. Mr. Glascock replied the City had asked them to address it.

Ms. Peters understood the dispatchers decided who to contact when someone called 9-1-1 regarding a fire. Chief White explained dispatchers worked off of preset parameters. The address would be keyed into a system, and the system would then automatically tell them who to send to the incident. It was predetermined. As a result, there would be a predetermined response by the BCFPD to an address within the city limits that fell within a new annexation area. If, at that time, the BCFPD requested the assistance of the CFD, they would notify dispatch to have a CFD truck dispatched as well. He noted that was the way mutual aid worked on a normal basis. He explained there was mutual aid and automatic mutual aid. What they had previously was an automatic situation where both organizations were automatically dispatched to an area they had agreed would involve joint response, and in that agreement, there was always someone identified to have jurisdiction. He stated that was very important for them as fire service agencies. When the CFD went to the County, the BCFPD had jurisdiction and CFD would respond and assist, and when the BCFPD had responded within the City, the CFD had jurisdiction in terms of command and control and the BCFPD assisted them.

Ms. Peters understood the BCFPD had primary responsibility for City addresses in newly annexed areas due to the legislation enacted last year. Chief White replied yes in a way. Ms. Peters understood the dispatchers dispatched the BCFPD to those addresses instead of the City. Ms. Thompson explained the BCFPD was telling the City that the intent of the 2018 legislative enactment had been for them to have primarily responsibility for those newly annexed areas. The litigation was really about the City saying the legislation did not say that, and because it was not clear, it was a dual service territory and both continued to have primary jurisdiction. That was the reason for the need for a legislative fix.

Mr. Skala commented that he saw this as buying some time to resolve some of these issues. There seemed to be a renewed effort to try to resolve some of these issues. He stated he was inclined to support this temporary fix until the issue was resolved.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he did not believe the agreement abided by the City's ordinances. In addition, he felt talk about legislative intent was a slippery slope. He stated he had been one of the most vocal people against the State Law that had been

passed last year. He believed it was simply bad policy. The way it had been passed was nontransparent, attached to an unrelated bill, and crammed through in the final day of the session when all of the attention was elsewhere. He noted he had also been one of the biggest supporters in being able to cooperate and work with the BCFPD. A year ago, at this time, he had participated in conversations with multiple members of the BCFPD and had been prepared to ask the rest of Council to support him in directing the then City Manager to resume discussion on a lot of these issues that had led to the perceived need for a fix at the State level. He commented that unintended consequences caused more problems. He stated he was 100 percent supportive of the City Manager and the Fire Chief discussing all of these issues with the BCFPD. He noted there had been a change in management and he was not sure this bill would have been necessary if the change in management had been contemplated then. He reiterated that it was a bad law and he did not believe the State should have been involved in legislating this type of local issue. He stated he was not in favor of asking the State to relieve the City of their responsibility to respond to calls within the city limits nor was he in favor of this agreement to the extent it would place some sort of stamp on the City endorsing the idea of asking the State to do that. He explained he was in favor of the City meeting with the BCFPD and working all of this out so they were not in court or bickering with each other in the press. He wanted them to work together for the safety of everyone involved. He understood some of the territorial agreements mentioned earlier had been working well. Funding had been a problem, but there had been a collaborative spirit and intent, which was not there now. He stated he did not like the precedent of not responding within the city limits and felt this agreement did not address any of the underlying issues. It was simply asking the State to step in again to address a problem it had created when it started meddling in the first place. The only thing he would be in favor of asking the State was to repeal that law and to then ask the City Manager to work it out. He reiterated he was not in favor of this agreement.

Mayor Treece stated he did not know how he would vote, but noted he shared the concerns of Mr. Pitzer primarily from the perspective of the taxpayer who was now paying twice and for a city service they would not be receiving by this agreement. He did not feel that was acceptable.

Mr. Trapp noted he was supportive of this agreement. He liked that they had opened up communication again. This agreement would get them out of court, which he felt was good. He stated he did not like seeing his County and City tax dollars paying for legal help to fight things out in court. He thought it was better if they could talk things through. He explained they started to have problems with the BCFPD when they stopped paying \$300,000-\$400,000 per year, which they had needed to add fire positions. He noted this was another symptom of the declining real dollars per person financial position. He would have preferred the State not get involved as well, but they had. He pointed out the City received 41 cents on \$100 assessed value and stated he believed people would still get a good value for the 41 cents of \$100 assessed value. The water system and electric system were service areas that were not exactly contiguous with the city limits. It created some strange situations as Columbia voters would make decisions on the electrical system when some were not serviced by that system and there were others that were serviced by the system that could not vote since they were not within the city limits. It was the reality of some isolated situations along the edge of the City. He stated he felt this advanced the City's interest. He noted he was also agreeable to reaching out to the State Legislature as he would prefer a repeal of the law in question. He commented that either of those options was better than the status quo of a lack of clarity with regard to who would respond as it created a risk to all firefighters.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Thompson if she had assessed a Hammerschmidt challenge on the amendment that had been passed on the last day of session last year. Ms. Thompson replied she had not. Mayor Treece asked if that would be a potential response if this agreement expired on June 1 without the State Legislature taking action. Ms. Thompson replied it was a possibility.

B98-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: PITZER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B89-19 Amending Chapter 5 of the City Code to establish a provision to exempt certain public and private schools and educational institutions from keeping chickens.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Browning provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked if Jefferson Middle School is the only school the City was aware of wanting chickens at the school. Ms. Browning replied yes at this time. Ms. Peters understood they anticipated 10-12 chickens and that there was not an upper limit so they could have 25 or 50 chickens. Ms. Browning agreed there was not an upper limit, but noted the Council could set a limit. She pointed out they would have to comply with all of the other rules of the ordinance so there could not be odor issues and it could not create a nuisance. One stated they would deal with any complaints like they would with anyone else.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a training requirement associated with the urban chicken ordinance. Ms. Browning replied there had not been a requirement to have them, but the Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture (CCUA) had offered training to help people learn how to manage chickens and build chicken tractors. Mayor Treece asked if that had included how to manage waste and slaughter chickens. Ms. Browning replied yes. Mayor Treece asked if there was a requirement for the students participating in this program to go through that training. Ms. Browning replied she was not sure of the science curriculum requirement, but was hoping the person running the program had a sincere interest and would know that information.

Mr. Skala commented that there had been an anticipation or potential anticipation of problems in terms of the number of people that would take advantage of this ordinance, but it had not really materialized. Ms. Browning agreed. Mr. Skala understood some third-party groups, such as CCUA, had assisted. He noted he had planned to ask about any upper limits, but was satisfied since they would have to conform to the rest of the ordinance.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, explained she was the immediate neighbor of Jefferson Middle School and stated she was delighted by this. She noted they could have as many chickens as they wanted.

Mayor Treece asked if a chicken concentrated animal feeding operation (CAFO) was otherwise prohibited. Ms. Browning replied that would involve thousands and thousands of chickens. Mayor Treece asked if an unregulated religious reformatory, i.e., a private school, could have a chicken operation. Ms. Browning replied they would have to conform to the setback requirements and the noise and other nuisance requirements.

Ms. Fowler stated she was well aware of and familiar with chicken barns and how many hens it could accommodate. She commented that she thought this was a delightful thing for her neighborhood and asked that Jefferson Middle School be enabled to have chickens.

B89-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B84-19 Amending and reestablishing the City of Columbia, Missouri Tax Savings Plan for City employees.
- B85-19 Approving the Final Plat of "Tiger Tots Place" located on the northeast corner of the Paris Road and William Street intersection; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 52-2019).
- B88-19 Appropriating funds from the Mill Creek Substation Transmission Capital Improvement Project to various FY 2019 electric transmission Capital Improvement Projects in the City Utilities Department.
- B91-19 Accepting a partnership warranty deed from MBS Realty Partners, L.P., acting by and through its General Partner, MBS Associates, Inc., for the donation of property located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Worley Street and Fairview Road to be maintained as a wooded natural area park; naming the park "Fairview Hollow Nature Area."
- B92-19 Authorizing the City Manager to execute an agreement for temporary construction easement to the Columbia Public School District for the construction of an accessible walkway to the raised landscape beds in Paquin Park.
- B94-19 Authorizing Contract Amendment No. 2 with the Missouri Department of Corrections to provide tuberculosis screening and testing services.
- B95-19 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and the 13th Judicial Circuit Court of Missouri for the development and implementation of the Youth Monarch Conservation Program.
- B96-19 Authorizing an airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the completion of a Documented Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) review relating to the proposed new terminal site at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B97-19 Repealing Ordinance No. 023806 which authorized the acquisition of a certain leasehold interest in property, identified as Hangar 350 at the Columbia Regional Airport, and enacting new provisions related thereto.

- R50-19 Setting a public hearing: proposed replacement of the water distribution infrastructure along Ridgemont Road and Highridge Circle.
- R51-19 Setting a public hearing: consider proposed options for the Flat Branch Park Expansion Master Plan.
- R52-19 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the south side of St. Charles Road and south of Talon Road (5200, 5202 and 5210 E. St. Charles Road) (Case No. 113-2019).
- R53-19 Authorizing a cooking matters satellite partnership agreement with Operation Food Search.
- R54-19 Authorizing the temporary closure of three (3) parking spaces on the west side of Sixth Street, between Broadway and Cherry Street, to facilitate the interior demolition and remodel of a building located at 19 S. Sixth Street.
- R55-19 Declaring the results of the April 2, 2019 municipal election.
- R56-19 Authorizing a state aviation trust fund project consultant agreement with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. to complete a Documented Categorical Exclusion (CATEX) checklist relating to the proposed new terminal site at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- R57-19 Authorizing execution of a temporary construction easement agreement with The Islamic Center of Central Missouri, Inc. for property located along the eastern edge of Flat Branch Park.
- R58-19 Authorizing an amendment to the grant award agreement with The Missouri Foundation for Health and Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture for a community food assessment and for construction and programming costs associated with the Clary-Shy Agriculture Park.
- R60-19 Authorizing a First Amended and Restated Cooperative Agreement with Community Foundation of Central Missouri to provide for reimbursement of the additional costs associated with temporary administrative assistance.

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

declared adopted, reading as follows:

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

R61-19 Authorizing the notice of sale of Water and Electric System Revenue Bonds, Series 2019A.

The resolution was read by the Clerk

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if this was on the water side. Mr. Johnsen replied yes. Mayor Treece understood it involved the voter approved bonds from August 2018. Mr. Johnsen stated approval was for water and electric system bonds, but it would be used for water projects. They were based upon water utility projects and water system revenues. He explained water and electric functioned as a single fund.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the Utilities Department had been involved in any of the financial projections or if that had been done by the Finance Department. Mr. Glascock replied it had been done by the Finance Department.

Mr. Pitzer understood the ratings downgrade had been connected to the financing of the parking garage and asked if the water and electric debt had been downgraded as well. Mr. Glascock replied no, and explained it was currently at the A+ level. He understood they would receive a rating on Thursday as they did not yet have it for this sale. Mr. Johnsen noted they had gone through the process for an update on their rating at the end of last year, and he thought the indication was that it would be the same for this specific issuance.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he believed this needed to be approved and the bonds needed to be sold, but in looking through some of the financial information, he had some concerns. When the water rate issue came around this year, he thought they needed to take a really close look at the underlying assumptions because what was in the preliminary official statement from the bond counsel in terms of how they were measuring the debt coverage ratio was different than the information that had been provided by the cost of service study, and the cost of service study had been used to drive a lot of the revenue requirements that had then been used to set the water rates. He stated he was increasingly losing confidence in how the cost of service study had been done. They now had a lot of moving parts and there would be a lot of information that was missing when it came time to think about water rates for next year. He suggested they be extra cautious with how they looked at that issue.

Mayor Treece stated he agreed and noted he had voted with Mr. Pitzer against that water rate increase. He understood the rates as projected would have yielded a \$3 million surplus over and above the target cash reserve, which meant the rates were artificially too high. He recalled Mr. Johnsen indicating the money might be needed to purchase pickup trucks and equipment. He noted he felt those items were an essential cost of service that should probably be included in the rate structure. He asked Mr. Pitzer if he had a recommendation as to whether the Council should proceed with this bond sale. Mr. Pitzer replied he thought they needed to move forward with the bond sale because the projects needed to be completed. His only comment was that just because voters approved three percent rate increases for the next three years did not mean they needed to enact them.

Mr. Skala commented that he believed the reserve policy was another conversation they needed to have and suggested a work session be held on the issue.

The vote on R61-19 was recorded as follows VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R59-19 Authorizing an agreement with Providence Bank for the subordination of CDBG loans executed by Nora Stewart Memorial School for property

located at 505 E. Ash Street.

The resolution was read by the Clerk

Mr. Zenner provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked if they were considering the Nora Stewart Memorial School a private residence. Mr. Cole replied no. Ms. Peters asked what the Nora Stewart Memorial School was doing in terms of repaying this loan or if they were not repaying it. Mr. Cole replied \$177,600 in loans were due to the City on the transfer of title. They were CDBG liens on the property and Nora Stewart Memorial School was not making any payments at this time. The loans were due if they stopped doing a CDBG eligible activity or sold the facility. He explained improvements had been done on the building between the 1990s and early 2000s before he was with the City. There was a significant CDBG debt on the property because loans were used to fund most of their CDBG funded facilities. He understood Nora Stewart Memorial School wanted an additional loan from Providence Bank and Providence Bank was requesting the City subordinate the City loans to their loan. He noted that was typically done with most banks.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification on the meaning of subordination. Mr. Cole replied they did not have any other debt on the property currently except for the CDBG loans so the City was in first position at \$177,600. This would move the City behind the \$50,000. If the property was sold, Providence Bank would be repaid \$50,000 first and the City would then be paid its \$177,600. He explained the reason they looked at the loan to value ratio was to ensure they were not bumping against 100 percent or over 80 percent. Since that ratio was around 50 percent he felt their funds were well protected.

Ms. Peters asked what would happen if they wanted to do this again with a different banking institution. She wondered if the City would be asked to be third in line in terms of repayment. Mr. Cole replied if the Nora Stewart Memorial School received another loan in the future that bank would likely request the City to subordinate as well. He explained there would be a point at which the City would not want to subordinate and that was typically when they were bumping up to 80 percent.

Ms. Thompson pointed out this was not an unusual practice for the City to subordinate a loan at the request of a lender on a CDBG property. The size of this loan was the reason it was before the Council. A City Code provision allowed the City Manager to authorize subordinations on smaller loans.

Ms. Peters asked for the reason the Providence Bank loan could not be the second loan to be repaid. Mr. Cole replied it was because Providence Bank wanted to be repaid first. He explained the Council could decide it did not want to allow the subordination of this loan. He pointed out that was normally not done, but Council could do what it wanted. Mr. Thomas understood they might not receive the loan if Providence Bank was second in line for repayment. Mr. Cole agreed that was a possibility.

Mayor Treece asked for the benefit to taxpayers in subordinating the loan. Mr. Cole replied he thought the CDBG loan funds would be more protected than the \$50,000 if the Nora Stewart Memorial School closed and the \$50,000 was second in line. Mr. Zenner pointed out this operation provided services within Ward 1 and within the City's Strategic Plan area to a population that was in need. The \$50,000 loan would address an operational issue. In addition, due to the value of the property and the Community Development Commission recommendation, they felt it was in the best interest of the community to allow the Nora Stewart Memorial School to continue to operate. He noted it was also not inconsistent with what had been done previously with other properties that had loans.

Mayor Treece asked how often CDBG or HOME funds were used for commercial or not-for-profit organizational enterprises. Mr. Cole replied they usually had at least one or two every year. He thought they might have had three in 2018. It was a very common use of those funds.

Mayor Treece asked why they did not have the same criteria for organizational investors as they did for single family homes under the same program. Mr. Cole replied it was a guideline they had just not developed. He explained this had only been the second request he had received for this type of organization since he had been with the City, but they could look into it if that was the desire of Council.

Mayor Treece asked about the experience and disposition of the first request for subordination. Mr. Cole replied he thought it had been a request from the Phoenix Programs in 2013 and it had been approved by Council at that time. Mayor Treece asked if that loan had been paid back or if the City was still subordinate. Mr. Cole replied the City was still subordinate. Mayor Treece asked if it had been an operating loan. Mr. Cole replied it had been for the expansion of the housing facility on the back of the property.

Mr. Ruffin understood the City had a lien against the facility, and as long as they continued to operate, they would not have to pay back the \$177,600. Mr. Cole stated that was correct. He explained that was how they enforced the rule of ensuring it was a CDBG eligible activity. Mr. Ruffin understood they were essentially free and clear as long as that was done. Mr. Cole stated that was correct. Mr. Ruffin understood the only debt obligation they would have was to start a repayment plan for the \$50,000. Mr. Cole stated that was correct.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, wondered why money was needed for operations. He asked if they did not generate income from the children that attended the facility.

Cheryl Howard explained she was the Director of the Nora Stewart Early Learning Center and noted they were a not-for-profit organization that charged tuition, but they based the tuition charged on a sliding scale for low income families. She stated they had been fundraising and hosting other activities to offset the costs.

Mayor Treece asked about enrollment now. Ms. Howard replied the enrollment was climbing and reiterated they were fundraising. She noted they had held a fundraiser about a month ago. Currently, they were in a situation whereby they did not have anything to fall back on if there was an emergency. Mayor Treece asked how many children they were now serving. Ms. Howard replied 28. Mayor Treece asked how many were on a waiting list. Ms. Howard replied two for the infant room.

The vote on R59-19 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B99-19 Authorizing the issuance of Water and Electric System Revenue Bonds, Series 2019A.
- B100-19 Rezoning property located on the southwest corner of the Vandiver Drive and Mexico Gravel Road intersection from District PD (Planned District) to District M-C (Mixed-Use Corridor District) (Case No. 71-2019).
- B101-19 Approving the Final Plat of "Tandy's Addition Plat 2" located on the southwest corner of the College Avenue and Wilkes Boulevard intersection; granting a design adjustment relating to street right-of-way (Case No. 72-2019).

- B102-19 Approving the Final Plat of "On The Ninth at Old Hawthorne, Plat No. 1-A" located on the east side of Bunker Loop and east of Old Hawthorne Drive West (Case No. 65-2019).
- B103-19 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Social Services - MO HealthNet Division for Medicaid reimbursements as it relates to the provision of paratransit services to qualified individuals.
- B104-19 Authorizing an administrative services agreement with the Mid-Missouri Solid Waste Management District for administrative and grant coordination services.
- B105-19 Appropriating funds for the replacement of the water distribution infrastructure along Ridgemont Road and Highridge Circle.
- B106-19 Authorizing a first amendment to commercial mobile radio service antenna agreement with Sprint Spectrum Realty Company, LLC, successor in interest to Sprint Spectrum L.P. (successor by merger with Alamosa Missouri Properties, LLC), relating to the lease of property and space on the Shepard Water Tower (1160 Cinnamon Hill Lane).
- B107-19 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code to reduce the number of members on the Mayor's Council on Physical Fitness and Health.
- B108-19 Authorizing a Memorandum of Understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for STD testing and treatment services.
- B109-19 Appropriating Share the Light funds for the purchase of dental supplies and training materials and tobacco cessation materials.
- B110-19 Appropriating funds for the redesign, printing, storage and distribution of the Convention and Visitors Bureau area guide.
- B111-19 Appropriating funds received from the Community Foundation of Central Missouri to provide for reimbursement of the additional costs associated with temporary administrative assistance.

X. REPORTS**REP31-19** Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code as it relates to the Youth Advisory Council.

Ms. Weidemann provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if the Youth Advisory Council (YAC) had a staff liaison. Ms. Weidemann replied yes. Mayor Treece asked who filled that role. Mr. Thomas replied Ms. Peters. Mayor Treece asked about her liaison service. Ms. Peters replied the high school students had plans, interests, and projects they wanted to pursue. She thought they were reporting to the Council on May 20. She stated they needed very little guidance from her.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Peters if they would benefit by having a staff liaison from the schools. Ms. Peters replied there had not been any for the last couple of years. It would be nice if they could find someone, but she imagined everyone was busy. In addition, the students seemed to be able to self-initiate.

Mr. Thomas asked if things were functioning well without the liaisons. Ms. Weidemann replied yes. She explained the students were very motivated and driven.

Mayor Treece asked if the Council wanted staff to bring forth an ordinance to make the suggested changes. The Council indicated they would.

REP32-19 Correspondence from the Historic Preservation Commission regarding the Preservation Plan.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, commented that the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) had been informed by staff that they needed to seek the permission of Council to undertake the process of writing a preservation plan, which was also needed in order to be included in the update for the Comprehensive Plan. She explained 18-22 people had joined them last Saturday at the Blind Boone Home for a meeting to begin the community input process. She pointed out that everyone that had attended the meeting had looked like her when the City did not look like her or the members of the HPC. She stated they wanted to do a thorough and intentional job of reaching all citizens when obtaining input on what they might want to see in a preservation plan and believed access was important in that regard. She relayed a story from when she was the Service Learning Coordinator for the University of Missouri. She was a paid networker for those schools and departments that wanted their students to do a service project as part of the classwork. She explained the University sent her in and out of 75 different not-for-profits during any given semester, and she had learned a lot about how citizens that had less than the rest of them accessed services and information. She thought it was important to use that experience to do the best possible job of reaching out to citizens. She noted she had outlined seven things the HPC intended to do in the letter that had been provided as part of the packet, and understood they needed the permission of Council to proceed. She explained they intended to attend every neighborhood association and organization meeting that would invite them and would seek to invite themselves to others. She stated they also planned to go churches, the library, and organizations, such as Centro Latino, where they knew citizens that looked different from them were so they could ask them for their input.

Mayor Treece asked if the other HPC members were on board with this. Ms. Fowler replied yes. She explained they had been discussing this since last December when they had been informed that if they wanted to be included in the Comprehensive Plan update that they would need to write a plan. She pointed out the questions that would be submitted to the citizens were questions the Vice Chair and Jessica Macy, who had assisted with the Strategic Plan, had developed.

Mayor Treece asked if the HPC had ever done a plan like this. Ms. Fowler replied she had been told by City staff that they had never had a preservation plan. She stated they

had done component pieces that would inform the plan, which included the economic impact study and surveys over the years.

Mayor Treece understood the HPC had been pretty aggressive on state grants and asked if that aided their ability to obtain additional grants in the future or if the preservation plan was a prerequisite. Ms. Fowler replied it was not a prerequisite, but noted she thought the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) that had been funding them for years to do these surveys would like to see them take the next step. As the money pool became smaller and the applicant pool became larger, she felt it would bolster their argument to continue receiving those funds if they translated those surveys into action.

Mayor Treece commented that his only concern was for the already spread-thin City staff having to go to additional meetings in the community, but noted he was not sure that was wanted or needed. He also asked that they be sure to properly post meeting notices, for the meetings to be accessible, and for minutes to be completed if necessary. Ms. Fowler stated most of the things they would do were similar to what had been done by Randy Cole, Jessica Macy, etc. to include a wider swath of neighbors and residents in the conversation.

Mr. Skala suggested encouraging outreach, especially in the underserved areas, but noted he was also mindful of not running afoul of some of the requirements for convening groups. Ms. Fowler explained they thought it would mostly be one of the HPC members being invited to any number of community groups to start the conversation. She noted the raw minutes would be available to any citizen that wanted to read them.

Mr. Trapp commented that the recommendation of staff to use Survey Monkey made sense if that would make it easier. Ms. Fowler replied Survey Monkey would be a tool utilized, but it would not be their only tool. Mr. Trapp stated he appreciated the extra effort and looked forward to seeing the plan.

Mayor Treece explained he liked the thought that more often than not these meetings would involve one HPC member. Ms. Fowler stated they would seek to be invited to as many community groups as they could. Mayor Treece commented that it helped to relax some of the requirements. Ms. Fowler agreed and noted they were mindful that staff had a lot to do. The intent was for it to be citizen driven.

REP33-19

Proposed Internal Auditor Policy.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer explained he had drafted most of this proposal and had received some help from Ms. Thompson on ensuring it was legal. He stated the intent was to establish some sort of internal audit policy. He thought it was important to strengthen and place parameters on the internal audit function while also safeguarding the independence of that position however they could within the guidelines of the Charter. He explained this was a part of the ongoing internal audit function. Regardless of how they might feel about a one-time standalone audit, he thought it was important to have a policy to strengthen the internal position that would be ongoing for an indefinite period of time. He pointed out this policy included best practices from other cities and ideas he had. He commented that it formalized some interaction with Council, such as providing Council the opportunity to approve audit plans annually. He explained that would be their opportunity to influence and guide the direction of audits. It would also require some reporting from the City Manager to the Council in terms of the audit results and other things. For example, if the Internal Auditor were to leave for any reason, the City Manager would be required to report that to the Council. He pointed out the City Manager would also be required to report violations of code of ethics or standards or the impairment of independence in fact or in appearance. He stated the Council managed the City Manager so that would be the recourse. He noted it was dependent upon them knowing there was some sort lapse in reporting or something warranted further investigation, but believed this policy would help give them some tools in that regard to better manage the City Manager in terms of his or her responsibility in that function as it would provide a critical piece of oversight. If there was support, this could be considered as a policy resolution in the future. He thought the

Finance Advisory and Audit Committee (FAAC) would be interested in looking at it. He stated his appreciation for this item being placed on the agenda in tandem with a proposed audit plan, which was the next item as it was the first communication of any kind he had seen from the Internal Auditor since he had joined the Council. He thought it was a good example of the kind of framework they could work from in the future.

Mayor Treece stated his appreciation for Mr. Pitzer's commitment to financial transparency and noted he had full confidence in the Interim City Manager and the new Internal Auditor. He explained he was looking at this in terms of the structure that he had experienced over the last three years. Like Mr. Pitzer he had never seen a report from the Internal Auditor. As far as he knew, the Internal Auditor had not completed an internal audit, and if the person had, he was not sure where those findings had gone because the Council had not seen them. He stated his concern with this reporting structure was that it put more power in the hands of the City Manager when it should be in the hands of the City Council. While he had confidence in Mr. Glascock, he was not sure the Council had always had that confidence. If anything, Mr. Glascock's great work in the last four months had really illustrated what they had not known over the last 3-7 years, and it was impossible to know what they did not know. He preferred a more clear line of reporting between the Internal Auditor and the Council as the elected representatives of the taxpayers. It was one of the reasons he had wanted to use the salary of the Internal Auditor for a contract position. He understood the Charter did not allow direct contact and this policy reinforced the idea that the Council should not direct the Internal Auditor to take or not take any action regardless of the circumstance. It left the City Manager the authority to move money or remove money from the Internal Auditor as he or she felt. He believed that exacerbated or dramatized the lack of checks and balances.

Mr. Skala commented that he concurred with some of the comments made by Mayor Treece and wondered if a Charter change was necessary to really maintain the independence of the Internal Auditor or to have that position be an employee of the City Council. He noted that would be a longer term fix because any Charter change would require a public referendum that would have to be scheduled so it would take some period of time. He stated he believed the work Mr. Pitzer had done was great, but it was the outline of a typical employee managed by the City Manager in terms of a wall of separation, which was necessary in the current form of government. He explained he would prefer the Council have complete oversight.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought this was a good step forward. He noted he was intrigued by Mr. Skala's suggestion of a Charter change as it might make sense to have that audit function under the Council. With the Charter they were bound by now, this would move them forward. There was a lot more accountability and transparency. He appreciated the work of Mr. Pitzer on this issue and thought it was something that should be brought back and adopted.

Mr. Glascock noted it would come back to Council as a policy resolution.

Mayor Treece stated he liked the suggestion of Mr. Pitzer to refer this to the FAAC prior to it coming back to Council as a policy resolution.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Bryce, the Internal Auditor, how things were going thus far. Ms. Bryce replied she thought she was making some progress. Mayor Treece asked Ms. Bryce how she would describe the environment she had inherited when she came. Ms. Bryce replied she had inherited pretty much nothing in terms of the former Internal Auditor, but the environment as far as the City was concerned had been very open. She noted she had not had any problems of anyone not wanting to speak to her or not wanting to share records so that was encouraging. Mayor Treece understood there were not any guidelines with regard to the audit procedures or policies or her relationship to the Council or the City Manager other than what her professional society might require. Ms. Bryce stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece understood Ms. Bryce had come from California and asked how many

other cities she had worked with as an internal auditor. Ms. Bryce replied she had not worked for cities. She explained she had worked for a county, a state, and the federal government. Mayor Treece asked about the reporting mechanism in those situations. He wondered if she had reported to management. Ms. Bryce replied no and explained she had reported to the board. In a situation like this, it would have been the City Council. Mayor Treece asked Ms. Bryce if best practice would be for the Internal Auditor to report to the City Council in her opinion. Ms. Bryce replied yes, and noted the standards demanded it.

Mayor Treece stated he thought they should have the Law Department draft a Charter change and have the City Clerk review what the Charter said about amending the Charter and when it should be placed on the ballot as an option. Mr. Skala stated he agreed.

Mr. Skala explained he had attended a WLAB meeting that Ms. Bryce had also attended and he believed her answers to the questions received were accurate in terms of the definition of a performance audit and efficiencies. He stated he had been favorably impressed with her interaction with that group and wanted to see an incremental approach with some departments, such as the Utilities Department.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he was supportive of amending the Charter if that was the route chosen. He agreed the reporting structure in a private corporation or in most entities was a dotted line reporting structure, but noted he had done a lot of research on this topic and not everything was as simple as it seemed because not all public officials were as free of corruption as he hoped they were so there were issues if that person was investigating the Council. He felt that issue would need to be considered and that it would require careful deliberation with regard to how it was structured because that structure would be what would ultimately make or break the relationship. Ms. Bryce stated perception was everything when it came to this.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Pitzer if he saw his proposal being a necessary framework they would adopt prior to any consideration of a Charter amendment. Mr. Pitzer replied he thought this was a good framework for their existing form of government.

Ms. Thompson commented that they could include in the policy that the Internal Auditor had the power to report to the City Counselor in the event there was some sort of activity in the City Manager's Office that was of concern. It would be a secondary stopgap since the Internal Auditor could not report to the Council. She noted the City Counselor would have the legal duty to advise the City Council of that as well. She explained it was another provision they could add that she had not thought about previously. Mr. Pitzer stated he thought that was a good idea.

Mayor Treece commented that none of this was a substitute for an independent external audit. Mr. Skala stated he was not sure about that. He noted they had a difference of opinion in that regard. Mayor Treece commented that if Mr. Skala liked an internal auditor, he would love an external auditor. Mr. Skala stated that was not necessarily true. It depended on political motivations and lots of other things, to include the cost and time with a staff that was already stretched in terms of productivity. He was unsure of committing to 2-3 years of an oversight audit when they could accomplish the same thing on an incremental basis with an internal auditor. Mayor Treece stated he was conscious of the fact they had an Internal Auditor's Office of one.

REP34-19

Presentation of 2019-2021 Audit Plan.

Ms. Bryce provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece commented that under a typical audit there would be an entrance interview and asked Ms. Thompson if Ms. Bryce would be prohibited from having that meeting with Council. Ms. Thompson replied no. She explained Council could not give direction to her, but they could provide feedback and their opinions. She stated Ms. Bryce was really good at listening and taking notes, and that was an assimilation of the audit plan. Mayor Treece asked what protection Ms. Bryce would have if the City Manager told her to ignore the input of Council. Ms. Thompson replied the Council would receive an audit plan and if the City Manager were to modify it, there was an obligation under the proposed policy

that the City Manager tell the Council the audit plan had been modified. If the Council was not receiving that communication from the City Manager, the Council had the ability to take action.

Mayor Treece asked what would happen if he suggested something be looked into and the City Manager indicated it was not necessary. Ms. Thompson replied that the Council had the opportunity to ask for items to be reviewed when they were provided the audit plan, like they had been tonight. She noted they would give direction to the City Manager to include it in the audit plan, and if it was removed, the City Manager had the obligation to tell the Council. The intent was for the process to be transparent and for it to provide guidance to the Internal Auditor.

Mr. Skala stated he liked the additional layer Ms. Thompson had previously mentioned in that the Internal Auditor could come to the City Counselor. Ms. Thompson commented that she hoped all employees knew they could come to her, but it was good in this kind of instance to put it into the policy.

Mr. Pitzer stated he liked the fact dates or timing had been included in the plan along with whether it was a full audit or something less. He understood the Council would be receiving a report in a year as to what happened in the past year, and that could be compared to what had been approved as the audit plan. If there were differences, it would open up the potential for inquiry. He suggested the FAAC also review the audit plan. If they chose to go down the route of the policy resolution, he wanted to take action to formally adopt the audit plan. It could then include any amendments or changes they might want.

Ms. Bryce commented that it was not delineated in terms of how long each would one take, and as the time was extended, it became more of list. She explained she had placed everything on the list that anyone had expressed concerns about based on her meetings, discussions, and readings, and not everything would be done in the next three years. Mr. Pitzer stated he understood. Ms. Bryce stated it was a list she had at this time. She pointed out she believed an audit plan should be a living document so adjustments could be made as necessary.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Bryce if she felt this structure gave her the independence to do her job effectively and without restraint. Ms. Bryce replied she felt this structure worked if certain people were in certain positions. She believed it was working now, but if there were different people in those positions, it would fail.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought it was important to explain there was a difference between a financial audit and a performance audit. There were lots of layers of financial audits. The focus of a performance audit was efficiency measurements and the focus of a financial audit was the accuracy and correctness of accounts. By definition, financial auditing was a routine job and not focused on specific areas. He noted he loved the expertise of Ms. Bryce on the performance audit realm.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Bryce if there was anything she wanted to add. Ms. Bryce replied she was happy to accept any kind of input to this audit plan from the FAAC, the Council, etc. She believed the quality of the plan would improve as she received more information and feedback.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that a disabled individual with a credit score of 800 could not move into one of the new Land Trust homes and thought that was sad as many would not have that kind of credit score. He was concerned about what the future held for the poor in Columbia, especially with increases to the water rates. He suggested the Council really look into the situation.

Mr. Elkin stated he was concerned about money going to the airport and wanted to see a pie chart showing where the money was going and the number of passengers traveling through the airport. He believed the airport was draining City funds.

Maria Orapello, 208 E. Briarwood Lane, commented that she was speaking as the Chair of the FAAC, and noted they had met Ms. Bryce and were happy with her. She explained one of the members of the FAAC had been on the interview panel. She stated she had been appointed to the FAAC in 2014, and at that time, the FAAC had met twice a year. They had met once to approve the contract for the financial audit and another time to receive a summary of the audit. She noted John Blattel had been the Finance Director then, and he had Greg Slinkard, the Internal Auditor, provide oral reports at those meetings. In 2016, Mr. Slinkard had come to a meeting and had said he could no longer work on a particular item because the City Counselor had taken him off of that project to do other special projects. This had brought to light the fact there was no policy or guiding principle as to how the Internal Auditor would do his or her job. She understood Mr. Slinkard had retired on January 31, 2018, and in March of 2018, they had been told by the then Finance Director that the City Manager did not intend to fill the position. As a committee, the FAAC had contacted the Council indicating that was not a good idea. She explained the FAAC had looked at other communities with regard to an internal auditor and they had all reported to the City Council or a City Council Member was on the FAAC. In addition, the internal auditor had provided monthly reports to the FAAC. She stated the FAAC felt the Internal Auditor should report to the City Council.

Mayor Treece commented that there were two vacant slots on the Mayor's Task Force on Bicentennial Celebration Planning and he would appoint Richard King and Dave Lineberry to that Task Force.

Mayor Treece stated he liked the continuity they had and suggested allowing Mr. Skala to remain the Mayor Pro Tem. He asked if anyone objected, and no one objected.

Mr. Thomas complimented the Interim City Manager and staff with regard to the way the situation at the airport had been handled in terms of responding and the communications. He explained he had been caught in it and had to stay an extra night in Denver, Colorado. He asked about the process for securing the 90 percent reimbursement from the FAA. Mr. Glascock replied the City would have to submit the costs and explain why it had cost more than normal. They would have to prove it was a cost that was appropriate. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Glascock if he was reasonably confident the FAA would reimburse the City the 90 percent. Mr. Glascock replied he was not sure all of it would be reimbursed, but thought much of it would.

Ms. Peters asked if any more conversation was needed as to whether they wanted to interview applicants for the PZC and the BOA. She noted Mr. Pitzer had some good points with regard to when the interviews would occur and the timing of everything.

Ms. Amin pointed out that if the positions were readvertised, which was the direction received, applications would be due by 5:00 p.m. on Friday, May 3, so the turnaround time to get notices posted and interviews scheduled on May 6 would be difficult. She also pointed out that the Council would be short two members on May 20, which was when the Council would likely make appointments, and wondered if they would still want to make those appointments then. She noted she had spoken with Ms. Thompson and their view was that the current members of the PZC could continue to serve if the Council delayed appointments beyond May 31. She explained two of the PZC members had reapplied. Mr. Pitzer stated that was two of the three that potentially could reapply. Ms. Amin noted the current BOA regular member had termed out so she did not think he could continue to serve, but they had alternate members so an alternate could fill in for a meeting or two.

Mr. Skala commented that he was not wed to the proposition of readvertising the positions. In the future with whatever advertising they did, he suggested they use interviews as a way to obtain more direct input from some of the applicants. He believed

it would help them with their decision-making. He stated that if they got into some timing issues that were problematic, they did not have to extend the advertising time. They could just try and schedule the interviews and ask the applicants if they wanted to participate.

Mr. Ruffin stated he agreed with Mr. Skala in theory with regard to interviews, but noted he was concerned about applicants not being able to meet their interview requirements because those who were able to attend would then have an unfair advantage. Mr. Skala explained there had been nine candidates for the PZC in 1999 and all nine had been interviewed by the Council as he had been an applicant at that time. Mr. Ruffin commented that he thought it was a great idea. He just felt it was very likely someone might not be available with the time constraints they had.

Mr. Pitzer asked why the Council had stopped conducting interviews. Mr. Skala replied there had been a change in administration. He commented that during his first term on the Council from 2007 to 2010, they had done it every year. He noted Mayor Darwin Hindman had been at the helm then. The subsequent year he had lost the election, and there had been a new group with Mayor Bob McDavid and Council Members Daryl Dudley and Gary Kesphohl. A determination had been made then to not continue that process. Mr. Trapp thought it had been reestablished for about a year in 2014 with Mayor McDavid. He stated it had been helpful because he had not known as many people. Since then he knew a lot of the applicants and had gotten better about looking through applications for qualities that would be valuable. It had then been disbanded due to scheduling issues and because they felt they were familiar enough or could reach out to applicants with questions. He stated he had seen it both ways. He believed it was valuable, but noted it was a cluster to get scheduled. If they felt it was needed, he was not against it, but he was also comfortable without it. He commented that he had seen it be helpful, but he had not felt the loss of not doing it. Mr. Skala stated he had always thought it was helpful. He believed the face-to-face interaction with candidates was very valuable.

Ms. Peters asked if they wanted to think about doing this in the future instead of starting it now. Mayor Treece replied he thought the time to do it was when they had three vacancies. He felt it might be fair to provide written questions so they knew there was some structure to the interviews. In addition, if they could not participate in the interview, they could answer the questions in writing. Mr. Skala stated that had not been a part of the process in the past, but it was a good idea. Mr. Pitzer commented that he thought scheduling would be cumbersome, and that written questions might be a way to obtain more information.

Ms. Amin stated she would be able to tell the Council how many applicants there were and who they were on May 6, and during the May 6 meeting the Council could decide if they wanted to interview everyone or narrow down the pool, and when they wanted to interview if they chose to interview or if they wanted to have a questionnaire process.

Mr. Skala complimented the City Manager and staff for more of a presence on social media. He stated he had noticed it for the snow events and the issues at the airport, and there had even been postings for awards. It was a much more impressive presence on social media than had been the case before. He thought the citizens appreciated it.

Mr. Glascock stated staff did all of that work and noted they were trying to be transparent and relay what they knew.

Mr. Trapp referred to the scheduled public comment with regard to the CPRB and stated he hoped they could facilitate members of the CPRB providing feedback on police policies as it made sense for all accreditations. He knew that open meetings rules could sometimes become cumbersome, but if they did not form a subcommittee, members of the CPRB could still participate. He thought they could also just notice the meetings and take minutes. He stated he wanted to see the CPRB live up to its statutory requirement to have more input in police policy. He thought that would add comfort in the community

about issues of policing and ultimately allow them to bring in more resources to meet a lot of their unmet needs, especially in regard to policing.

Mr. Trapp commented that the airport was nowhere near the City's biggest expense. He thought the City's biggest expense was power purchase for the utility to provide electricity. He stated the airport was expensive, but it was below a lot of other things, like streets and transit, because they had other sources of funds. It was down the list a fair way even though it was expensive.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 10:54 p.m.