



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Tuesday, September 7, 2021
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at approximately 7:27 p.m. on Tuesday, September 7, 2021, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Member BETSY PETERS, Mayor BRIAN TREECE, Council Member PAT FOWLER, Council Member ANDREA WANER, Council Member KARL SKALA, Council Member IAN THOMAS, and Council Member MATT PITZER were present. City Manager John Glascock, City Counselor Nancy Thompson, City Clerk Sheela Amin, and various Department Heads and Staff Members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of July 6, 2021 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Treece and a second by Skala.

Treece explained the minutes were not yet complete for the July 19, 2021, August 2, 2021, and August 16 regular meetings nor the August 9, 2021 and September 1 special meetings.

Skala asked that B267-21 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B267-21 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Treece and a second by Skala.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC48-21 Lydia Olmsted - Accessibility issues with the new CoMo.gov website.

Lydia Olmsted noted she was a member of the Disabilities Commission and wanted to express concerns along with potential fixes the Council could help to facilitate with regard to the City's website. Olmsted stated the website was not screen-reader friendly, and explained a screen-reader read what was on the screen to people like her that could not read print. Olmsted commented that she could not access the COVID information page, the boards and commissions page, the city council meeting broadcasts, and the strategic plan information. Olmsted pointed out there were many other pages that were not accessible with screen-readers, and those were only a few examples. Olmsted noted she had worked with Information Technology (IT) staff for about 20 hours reviewing the site and meeting with them regarding concerns with the site. Although they seemed fairly interested in helping, they were not overly familiar with the assistive technology she used. They also did not have access to the JAWS screen-reader so they were unable to test

the site to ensure it was accessible and ADA compliant. Olmsted suggested the City hire an outside expert who could specifically help to ensure the website was screen reader accessible and ADA compliant. Olmsted also suggested the City purchase a JAWS screen reader license so the site could be tested in terms of accessibility. Olmsted thanked the Council for listening to some of her prior comments regarding accessible pedestrian signals and truncated domes as they had been extremely helpful for her, and noted she hoped to see the similar changes happen in positive ways with the website. Treece thanked Olmsted for sharing her concerns and potential solutions.

SPC49-21 Susan Renee Carter - City demographics: racial disparities, concerns and needed changes.

Susan Renee Carter commented that she had some concerns about the City of Columbia profile page that would be included in the budget. One issue was that the City was measuring from 2015 to 2019 instead of the latest census data that was available from 2020. Carter understood the document indicated that the relationship between population changes and other economic factors was not clear, and questioned why that was not known when trying to develop outcomes for the City. In addition, the methodology used for measurements was not provided, and much of it seemed to be based on assumptions. The document discussed the relationships of population, income, and the use of services, but there was not any data in support of it. Carter understood the median household income for blacks was \$12,650 for 2019, which was a concern. Also, the poverty level for black households in 2019 was 35 percent, which was twice as much as white citizens, and the unemployment rate for the black population was listed as 9.9 percent, which was close to three times that of white citizens. Carter noted it had been skewed as being somewhat better than it had been, which was concerning to her. Carter suggested they ensure accuracy when speaking about numbers, and explained that given the mission statement, vision statement, and core values, she expected to see outcomes targeting the black population, but that had not been included. Carter stated she did not see any outcomes related to how black people were include with everyone in the community in terms of the City saying how it wanted everyone to live, work, and live the life they wanted to live. Carter noted she also did not see any data tied to how anything would be improved by spending all of this money. They paid people to provide job skills training and mental health services, but there was not information as to the results at the end. Carter suggested developing outcomes related to concerning statistics, ensuring the data was accurate, and showing whether or not the outcomes were being met. Carter felt listing demographics alone was meaningless and did not help plan for the next year in terms of what needed to be done for the people. Carter commented that if things were not going well, they should correct the situation by trying to determine what people needed to live a better life and whether what they were currently doing was useful. Carter suggested they look at all of the different agencies in terms of what they already had, and to then bring them together to help target people more specifically and deliberately. Carter felt they needed to consolidate resources for people instead of asking them to run around all over the place trying to determine where they could obtain certain types of assistance, like money for utilities or mental health services. There needed to be a unification of all of the rich resources available in the community.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH32-21 FY 2022 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.

Discussion shown with B244-21.

B241-21 Adopting the FY 2022 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.

Discussion shown with B244-21.

B242-21 Amending Chapter 11 of the City Code relating to certain Public Health and Human Services Department fees.

Discussion shown with B244-21.

B243-21 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to suspend transportation fares for users of the GoCOMO Public Transit System for the period October 1, 2021 to September 30, 2022.

Discussion shown with B244-21.

B244-21 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to water rates.

PH32-21 was read by the City Clerk, and B241-21, B242-21, B243-21, and B244-21 were given third reading by the City Clerk.

Finance Director Matthew Lue provided a staff report.

Treece asked for an estimate if they adopted all 39 of the staff amendments. Lue replied it would result in an increase of about \$6 million. Treece understood it would be paid for out of the various funds that were identified. Lue stated that was correct. Lue noted about \$2 million would involve the general fund, and the remaining would be scattered. Treece asked about the bulk of the general fund amendments. Lue replied it was due to the changes associated with Police and Fire. Treece understood that was referenced in Staff Amendment #22. Lue stated that was correct.

Thomas commented that he had requested an amendment to reinstate the \$35,000 for a community media center in FY 2022 and to provide that same amount of funding for FY 2021 as that had not been provided. Thomas understood Lue had indicated that amount was in the budget for FY 2022, and that the other \$35,000 had not been included. Lue explained they had included it on the amendment sheet handed out tonight, and it was identified as Council Amendment #5.

Skala stated he wanted an amendment so that excess sales tax would go toward restoring funds in the land acquisition category that had been diminished, and asked for that amendment to be prepared for the next meeting. Peters asked if that would come from the park sales tax. Skala replied it could. Skala understood there had been some accommodation by the Parks and Recreation Director to restore some of the funding, but he did not feel it was enough and wanted to see a standalone amendment with a mechanism to restore it to a level that was acceptable to the Council.

Pitzer asked for clarification regarding Staff Amendment #31, which involved the G&A fees for solid waste as it appeared as though they were taking them from solid waste and moving them to electric. Lue replied electric was subsidizing the G&A fees for solid waste, and had been for some time. This had been unknown and it was a big expense. As a result, they were going to phase those costs in over the next few years. Pitzer understood the electric utility had been subsidizing solid waste. Lue replied that was correct in terms of G&A fees. Peters asked for clarification regarding G&A fees. Lue replied G&A fees were general and administrative expense fees. Peters asked for further clarification. Lue replied they were items associated with human resources, payroll, inspectors, and some employees within the division along with fixed fees. Pitzer asked how long this had been going on. Lue replied he did not know. Lue explained they realized it when they had reviewed all of the G&A fees this year as they planned to include them as actuals versus budgeted amounts. When that review was done, they had noticed it would create a huge expense to solid waste, which could not be accommodated without an increase in the rates. Pitzer understood the electric utility had been subsidizing solid waste for a number of years. This year that cost would have been \$775,000. Lue replied he could not speak as to how long this had been happening, but when they had reviewed the G&A fees this year, this was the result. Glascock commented that for years, there had been a complicated G&A fee calculation. Glascock thought it had taken 27 different steps, and one never knew what the impact would be.

As a result, he had asked staff to develop a standard way of determining G&A fees so it was fair and predictable every year, and this was the outcome. They felt this was too much for solid waste to absorb now, but next year, they thought it would be back to where it needed to be and would be more predictable for each department. Pitzer stated he understood the need for predictability, but was trying to determine how electric got involved with solid waste. Glascock replied it had been the result of that complicated calculation.

Pitzer asked for clarification regarding Staff Amendment #18, which involved the seventeen temporary staff positions for the Department of Health and Human Services. Pitzer noted they had talked about how that should be a priority for the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds, but this amendment involved the funds coming from the general fund. In addition, the text of the amendment indicated the possibility of utilizing ARPA funding for it. Pitzer wondered if this amendment should be for the general fund or whether they should specify it would come from ARPA funding. Lue replied that was very much as Council decision. Pitzer understood the Council would need to amend this amendment if they wanted to utilize ARPA funding. Lue stated that was not necessarily the case. The amendment was not presented in terms of from where the money would come so if the Council wanted it to come from ARPA funding, they would be able to do that with this.

Treece commented that the fund or amounts could be changed when they took up the amendments as his intent was to walk through each amendment. They could then vote on them individually or as a group.

Fowler understood Staff Amendment #18 referenced other sources revenue as an offset, and asked if the offset from cooperative agreements was for just twelve of the seventeen temporary positions. Public Health and Human Services Director Stephanie Browning explained the amendment included what they anticipated as the total cost. Browning noted they had been told for more than a year that the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services would provide some additional funding. Browning stated they had provided \$255,000 to date, and she understood there would be more. Browning explained she was asking for what was needed in terms of authority, and pointed out the Boone County Commission had agreed to pay a third. Browning stated if she could find another way to pay for it, she would attempt to do so. Fowler understood that if they were going to take a portion out of the ARPA funds, it would be after all of those other sources had been exhausted. Browning stated that was correct, but clarified they might have to start with general fund or ARPA funding because they might not know for months what other funding they might receive. When they received the other funding, they would pivot so they were spending money from that new source immediately.

Fowler asked how much the City had received from the Volkswagen settlement. Glascock replied he did not recall. Fowler asked if it was apportioned annually whereby a new payment was received every year. Glascock replied he did not recall, but understood they had to apply for it.

Peters asked for clarification regarding the reason for the Volkswagen settlement. Glascock replied Volkswagen had not followed emission standards and had settled the issue with the United States Department of Transportation (USDOT), and the use of the funds from that settlement involved electric charging stations, buses, and other environmentally friendly items.

Fowler understood there would be an expenditure for software that tracked the fleet in solid waste, and that a statement was made indicating that tracking the fleet made the routes more effective and decreased idling times, and asked for clarification. Glascock replied he understood they had never run a computer simulation of the routes, and they wanted to model their routes to determine if they could be more efficient and effective in terms of picking up trash. This software would assist them in creating routes. Fowler asked if that would help them understand the cost of providing that service. Glascock replied yes. Fowler understood the City was in the beginning stages of the cost of service study for solid waste. Glascock stated that was correct.

Fowler asked if the reduction involving the WIC program was due to less money being available or changes to the eligibility requirements. Browning replied there had been a reduction in caseload, and that was how the funding was determined. Browning noted they had seen an increase in the caseload lately and thought there could be a mid-year adjustment if necessary. Fowler asked if the reduction in caseload had been due to people not circulating because of COVID or if there was another explanation. Browning replied it had varied over the years. Browning explained their caseload had increased dramatically when they had moved to the Worley Street location, likely due to accessibility. Browning pointed out it could also be associated with the demand at any particular time. Fowler understood it was still in the same location. Browning stated that was correct.

Fowler commented that there was a reference to a generous amount of grant funded money for marketing a new route at the airport, and asked for clarification. Economic Development Director Stacey Button replied it was through the USDOT SCASDP grant program.

Fowler asked Skala if he was not only speaking about a portion of park sales tax if it rebounded to address the land acquisition category, but an additional amount as well. Skala replied he was talking about sales tax in general as their targets were typically very conservative. In the last year or so, they had exceeded the targets by a substantial amount, which had put them in a good financial position. Skala stated he wanted the funds restored to the high watermark level for land acquisition as quickly as possible. Fowler asked for clarification on the amendment as she was having trouble determining how that would be calculated. Skala understood it would be based on sales tax returns. If there were excesses in sales tax returns beyond the projections in the budget, those monies could be set aside for land acquisition. Fowler understood that would be specifically for land acquisition by the Parks and Recreation Department. Skala commented that the Parks and Recreation Department typically oversaw land acquisition, but understood other funds were sometimes utilized and provided the purchase of land near the Flat Branch area that had involved both park sales tax and general fund money as an example. Fowler hoped they could define that better as it lacked specificity and she wanted to know exactly what she would be voting on.

Fowler understood \$1.5 million would be moved from the general fund to the Parks and Recreation Department budget for the Sports Fieldhouse, and asked if that was correct. Lue replied yes. Fowler asked how they would make up the difference in finishing up that project. Glascock replied that needed to be decided as he believed another \$3 million would be needed.

Treece opened the public hearing.

Traci Wilson-Kleekamp explained she was with Race Matters, Friends, and understood most of the amendments were staff amendments. Wilson-Kleekamp wondered about the analysis behind making the suggestions as a lot of them were very hardware oriented and there was not much that was people oriented. Wilson-Kleekamp wanted to know about the methodology of how things were chosen. Wilson-Kleekamp wondered how the amendments associated with funding the Sports Fieldhouse or the idea that excess sales tax should go to the Parks and Recreation Department to acquire land were chosen. Wilson-Kleekamp wondered why any extra funding would not be placed with the Public Health and Human Services Department instead. Wilson-Kleekamp asked if there was a rhyme or reason to the prioritization of these things. Wilson-Kleekamp understood the electric utility had been subsidizing the solid waste utility due to a certain formula, and they did not even know if that formula was fair. Wilson-Kleekamp asked how data was used to make decisions. There were charts, but not analyses or methodologies. Wilson-Kleekamp felt there were some serious challenges that needed to be addressed, and did not see that there was work behind the numbers.

Bill Folk referred to a commentary he had recently written that had been published in the *Columbia Missourian* and explained heat was the number one weather related killer in the

United States and that it would be much worse with the warming climate they were experiencing. Over the next 50 years, what they had considered once in a lifetime heat event would likely occur 4-5 times per year. Folk stated heat killed, and it especially killed the most vulnerable, i.e., those who could not control the heat stress they were experiencing. Folk thought they needed to be sure to anticipate what was going to happen due to the warming climate and felt the Council had the opportunity to use some of the ARPA funds to begin mitigating the heat stress they would experience. Folk noted one of the top ways to mitigate heat stress and heat islands was to plant trees. Street trees in particular reduced the heat stress that individuals experienced and removed the pollutants that were causing the warming climate. This included carbon dioxide and other pollutants that caused asthma and other respiratory problems. Planting trees would reduce the heat stress along with the causes of the heat. Folk stated he had not seen this really important aspect that had been highly recommended by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) in their plans for ARPA funding. Folk asked the Council to make a commitment to begin to restore the tree canopy in Columbia. Folk pointed out the First Ward in particular was well below what was recommended in terms of the projected tree canopy needed to reduce the heat stress they would experience. It was true of other wards as well. Folk explained about one-third of the trees in Columbia were in fair or poor health, and the heat they would experience would harm them as well. Folk stated they needed to make a commitment on an annual basis to ensure their tree cover was adequate for the projected impact of climate change.

Peter Norgard commented that the ARPA funding was a unique and unlikely opportunity for the City to demonstrate compassion and humanity toward those that had truly suffered through the COVID pandemic, and he feared those monies were at risk of being misspent. Norgard understood Congress had attached few requirements to how these allocations were to be spent, but they had provided some implicit guidance. Congress had authorized four general categories it deemed appropriate for the use of ARPA money, and they were for direct assistance to households, small businesses, and non-profit or to aid industries, such as tourism and hospitality, hazard pay to essential workers, public services, and necessary investments in infrastructure. Norgard felt the City's funding priorities should reflect the priorities Congress intended for the money and the needs of the community. Norgard commented that he lived two blocks away from the Salvation Army Harbor House, and the number of unhoused and homeless individuals had increased dramatically over the last 1.5 years. In addition, mental health crises were common and increasing. Norgard understood the City was prioritizing \$13 million for infrastructure projects, which was more than 50 percent of the entire allocation. Norgard noted Columbia had an entire shadow community of people in need, and they were, once again, on the verge of entirely missing the picture. They had chosen not to ask the right questions and were operating on limited information or information that was limited by their own sheltered middle-class experiences. They had also chosen to keep relying on the generosity of interfaith and non-profits along with their advocates who had been working tirelessly to stem the growing tide. Norgard commented that they were tossing out little scraps with the hope the problem would go back into the shadows. Norgard believed they had an obligation as a moral society to offer hope and assistance to the growing numbers of marginalized citizens. Norgard commented that the priorities reflected in the proposed ARPA expenditures did not reflect his values or priorities as a compassionate and caring citizen. Norgard asked the Council to subject the ARPA allocations to a robust public hearing process separate from this budget discussion. Norgard noted it was taxpayer money and felt the public should have a say in how it was spent. Norgard also believed the money should be utilized for people before projects.

Christopher Moody noted two business leaders, Jackie and Doreen, were starting a non-profit called Caring Hearts and Hands of Columbia that helped families of dying people by providing affordable options for care. Moody explained they had presented at a 1 Million Cups event, and people had asked for their stories. Moody had suggested to

them that they obtain video testimonials of people going through these life changing events to show they were making a positive impact in the community. Moody stated he had been on the Board of Directors of PACE, which was an organization that had gone under due to COVID, and they had classes teaching kids art, dance, and improvisational skills that were needed to grow. Moody believed it would have been great if they had been given the opportunity to video their work to show the community its impact, but they had not had Vidwest or Columbia Access Television (CAT). Moody understood there had been reference to trees and a shadow community of poverty earlier, and suggested someone take a camera and microphone to the areas to show how hot it was or to the homeless to illustrate their struggles. Moody believed public media and access to cameras, microphones, software, etc. was necessary. Moody pointed out he felt it was unacceptable that Mediacom was stifling fiber installation and preventing CAT from being streamed. Moody suggested everyone document what they stood for and broadcast it on CAT while also showing it to politicians and the community in an effort to make a difference.

Adam Saunders stated he was speaking on behalf of the Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture (CCUA) and Columbia's Agriculture Park, and noted they had been working with the City of Columbia via public/private partnership for the last six years. They had come a long way in broadening the vision of the Farmers Market with a permanent pavilion that connected to social service, food insecurity, education, etc. Saunders noted they had raised over \$5.8 million for the project to include 75 percent in privately raised funds, and asked for help with this last piece via the general fund, unrestricted dollars, or ARPA monies. Saunders explained they had also communicated with Boone County and understood the County was considering the request. Saunders commented that since the beginning, they had been action oriented, and this last piece would include a multi-purpose welcome center, which was shovel-ready. It would expand their educational programming for kitchen, gardening, nutrition, and entrepreneurship and would provide office space for CCUA and the Farmers Market. Saunders noted this investment could be further leveraged by investing in non-profit capacity to address some of the complicated problems related to food access, education, tree planting, etc. Saunders hoped they could work together in this budget process to complete this project.

Billy Polansky noted he was also with CCUA and commented that the Agriculture Park was a resource for the community that improved the health of their neighbors and created resiliency in the food system. They were growing food for families in need and empowering people with the skills to grow and prepare their own healthy food at home. Polansky pointed out the Park was the headquarters of CCUA and supported all of their programs, which were disproportionately serving people that lived in poverty and people who were within minority racial and ethnic groups as they were targeting the most vulnerable and underserved members of the community with their programs. Polansky explained they grew food at the Park, and this had equated to about 30,000 pounds of fresh produce last year that was donated to families in need. Polansky noted they had been able to use CARES Act funding to get produce from local farmers to the Food Bank, and their Opportunity Gardens program had impacted about 100 low incomes families per year by providing materials and teaching them how to grow their own fresh and healthy foods at home. In addition, they had about 20,000 student interactions per year with their farm to school partnership with the Columbia Public Schools as they helped Title 1 elementary schools with their gardens and students traveled to the Agriculture Park for field trips involving educational and healthy activities. Polansky pointed out they maintained garden sites across Columbia through different partnerships, helped with the Nora Stewart Early Learning Center, and had therapeutic gardening activities with veterans at the VA Hospital and Patriot Place. This year they planned to work with Phoenix Programs to provide therapeutic gardening for people in drug and alcohol rehabilitation, and last year they had launched the Henry Kirkland Black Farmer Scholarship whereby money would be given to African-Americans that wanted to become

farmers or expand their farming enterprises. Polansky noted all of these programs were coordinated from the Agriculture Park, and they were currently in an old classroom trailer. The proposed welcome center would be the headquarters of all of those operations.

Corrina Smith stated she was the Executive Director for the Columbia Farmers Market, which had been open since 1980 and had remained a centralized hub for fresh local food in the community. Smith noted it was a very unique space where urban met rural. Over the past six years, they had experienced tremendous growth by expanding their programming and partnerships, and one of the key partnerships had been with all of the organizations that worked at the Agriculture Park. Smith believed the Agriculture Park was a jewel for the community with the centerpiece being the pavilion that housed the Columbia Farmers Market. It was a blueprint for local agriculture across the country, and was paving the way for farmers markets to replicate nationwide. The programming they offered and the sales their vendors generated made a huge difference for their low income communities. In 2019, when they had moved into the pavilion, they had over 109,000 customers visit the Farmers Market. Thus far this year, they had over 85,000 customers visit. In 2019, they had estimated \$2.2 million had been sold in local food, which had gone back into the pockets of the vendors. Smith noted that like everyone else, they had expected more for 2020, but while things had not turned out like they had imagined, there were a few bright spots. The Columbia Farmers Market had not closed during the pandemic and while national supply food chains had broken down, theirs had remained open and strong. In addition, through many adaptations in 2020, their total sales were similar to 2019. Smith commented that they had already matched \$35,000 in SNAP and WIC benefits for Boone County residents this year through their SNAP and WIC matching programs, and it was surpassing prior year numbers. They had also dispensed another \$34,000 in SNAP benefits to customers. Smith explained the program allowed low income Columbia residents the opportunity to access and eat healthy locally grown and raised food. As they looked forward to the future and the final pieces of the Agriculture Park being completed, they anticipated expanded and continued growth. Smith noted the expansion of the pavilion would put the remaining two-thirds of the vendors under one roof, keeping them and their customers dry and safe from the weather, and the construction of the welcome center and commercial kitchen would offer Columbia food entrepreneurs a much needed space to cook their value added products, which could then be sold to the Columbia community. Smith stated this space would be another economic development opportunity offered through the Agriculture Park. Smith commented that the Columbia Farmers Market and the Agricultural Park made the community and their food supply chain stronger and better.

Dustin Stanton explained he was the President of the Columbia Farmers Market and was representing the 80-plus vendors, the staff and management, and their tens of thousands of customers. Stanton understood comments had made with regard to the low income residents they served and he wanted to point out there were low income farmers involved as well. The year 2020 had shown a farmers income with inflation added to it was the lowest it had been for over 30 years. The ability to have a place to market one's goods for a new generation to have the opportunity to grow an operation was truly beneficial. Education was important too since they wanted to train the current and next generation of farmers, consumers, and students. Stanton noted the Farmers Market had supplied the local area with food every week. In 2020, they had over 70,000 customers, and this year, they were at 85,000 customers to date. Stanton commented that job creation was important as well, and to date 134 jobs were being supplied by the farmers and farm workers. The anticipated growth for next year alone was 224 workers, and this number would continue to grow as more investments were made to the Agriculture Park. Stanton pointed out this investment impacted the people, i.e., customers and farmers, and that investment continued to stay within the City. Stanton stated they were looking for an opportunity to do what they loved and enjoyed, and building this would allow them to expand their operations.

Jonathan Asher noted he was speaking on behalf of funding for public media. Asher commented that about ten years ago while attending the University of Missouri he had come across the CAT-TV studios and had witnessed someone responding across the room to a complicated question asked by an elderly woman with purple hair, known as Pat Holt. Asher explained he had been intrigued by CAT but had no interest in having a cable show so he had never gotten involved. Asher stated he did not feel Vidwest, as an organization, was at all like the old CAT-TV. It was larger in scope with very passionate volunteers. Asher explained he had been to Vidwest Studios this past Saturday and had been able to see the run through of a movie that would be shot locally next month, and stated he would be going again this Sunday for pictures that would run in a local magazine. When the CUA Harvest Hootenanny could not be held in person, it was streamed live by Vidwest. In addition, Vidwest had live-streamed the State bicentennial which had involved about 30 events in three days. People also utilized the Vidwest Studios to film music videos. Asher stated there was so much that was accessible to people, and noted he viewed it as a mirror of the physical things that could be built in the Moberly Area Community College (MACC) Makerspace except that it involved digital assets. Asher asked the Council to fund it and to fund it more significantly.

Carrie Gartner explained she was speaking on behalf of the Business Loop Community Improvement District (CID) with regard to the shared spaces along the Business Loop, to include Vidwest Studios and the MACCLab Makerspace. Gartner noted both were modeled similar to the CoMo Cooks Shared Kitchen where there was a very low monthly fee for entry. It made it more accessible and lowered barriers for people that wanted to start a business. Gartner commented that minority and women business owners utilized the shared kitchen the most. They were people that did not have the funding to buy the equipment and build out a space. It was workforce development and entrepreneurship. The MACCLab Makerspace had a key workforce development component since it was connected to the mechatronics lab. It allowed people to start a business and trained them to work at other businesses by providing higher level skills. They were key elements for the Business Loop, and involved small amounts of money for the huge impact they would make on the lives of people that wanted to start a business in Columbia. Gartner stated she also wanted to advocate for stormwater management for the Business Loop as it was currently a sea of asphalt since it had been built in the 1960s and because stormwater was a barrier to some really interesting redevelopment there. A regional stormwater management system where property owners paid into the stormwater management system could really help encourage redevelopment in an area of town that was still affordable for people. Gartner commented that she realized this might not be at the top of everyone's list and that there would be other funding and opportunities in the future, but pointed out it was a plan that required the involvement of city government. It could not be done by a private entity and was too large to be done by a CID like theirs. Gartner noted they could all be partners, but it really had to be spearheaded by the City of Columbia. Stormwater management was an infrastructure program that would help them rebuild their street, and if they could make it beautiful with a trail that connected Cosmo Park and Stephens Lake Park, it would be icing on the cake. Gartner asked the Council to consider it as she felt it was a perfect project for the City to do.

Fowler asked if the shared kitchen was a City funded project or a Business Loop CID funded project. Gartner replied the CID had partnered with REDI. REDI had incurred the bulk of the cost associated with it, which included the equipment and buildout that needed to be done at Mizzou North. The CID funded staff, which included the kitchen manager, along with promotions, which included the booth at the Farmers Market. Gartner felt it was a great partnership between the two organizations.

Fowler asked if the funding provided by REDI had been from its subscribers or if it was City of Columbia money. Button replied REDI funds came from public and private entities so it included the City, the County, and the University along with over 70 private entities. Those funds were then allocated to their programs, one of which was CoMo Cooks.

Fowler asked how much it had cost to build out the kitchen. Button replied she thought it had been roughly \$70,000-\$75,000 for the equipment, space, and buildout. Fowler asked if that \$70,000 came from money the City had put into REDI or if it had been apportioned to all of the subscribers and investors in REDI. Button replied the funds that came in, regardless of who it came from, went into REDI's operating budget, and from there, reserves were set aside. The REDI Board then looked at various projects and programs to determine how those dollars would be invested back into the community, and this had been one of those programs.

Aimee Davenport asked for support for the public media center. Davenport noted she was a long time Columbia resident, a mother of two daughters, and a Vidwest board member. Davenport commented that she had moved here 25 years ago to raise her family after moving around a great deal when she was younger, and the reason was that Columbia had always been ever evolving and had offered opportunities for growth and learning in ways she did not think was possible for a Midwestern town. Davenport stated it was things like what Vidwest and other great organizations were doing that allowed her family to flourish and succeed. Davenport believed a healthy, public media center would facilitate more of that kind of growth and learning for the residents of Columbia to keep them evolving. Davenport noted it was a place where students, residents, small businesses, non-profits, and those without large marketing budgets could access and learn about technology to which they otherwise would not be exposed. Davenport felt it had a lot of value in getting stories out and in decreasing the socioeconomic digital divide. All segments of the community needed to be exposed to this kind of thing regardless of whether it involved the creation of a podcast or a commercial or the live-streaming of an event. Davenport stated Vidwest was ready to administer the program, and pointed out they were putting together a very aggressive fundraising strategy knowing the City had lots of priorities. It was their goal to supplement the funding they were asking from the City over the next year to two years. Davenport asked for the Council's consideration and vote to fund the media center in FY 2022 so they could continue with what they had done.

Charisse Smith commented that she was a local small business owner, and as an entrepreneur of the area, she had made use of REDI, the Women's Business Center, etc. Smith stated she loved being a member of the HUB, and thought it would be nice if she had digital services support prior to learning of Vidwest. Smith noted Vidwest was her digital makerspace, and with them, she had been able to expand the scope of 3-D services provided to her clients, which included Mizzou and others. Smith believed the video side of things was the future and felt it was important for it to be accessible to people that would not be able to access it otherwise.

Aida Guhlincozzi explained she was new to the Columbia community joining as a researcher, and had recently seen the choices that had been made with regard to performance pay and the three options for raises that had been proposed via a records request by Race Matters. Guhlincozzi felt the option chosen was the least reasonable in terms of statistical method and led to the fewest number of City employees receiving a raise. This was not only disappointing, but it had also led to a lack of faith in the fairness of the process. Guhlincozzi stated she had taken the data and examples provided from the records requests and had visualized some of them via graphs, which she had provided to the Council. Option 1, the selected option, had led to the fewest number of people receiving a raise and was often based on almost unattainable goals of performance scores. Guhlincozzi commented that her reason for bringing this up was due to her fear of a similar lack of data oriented process being put into place when making choices about spending ARPA funds. Guhlincozzi hoped this and future budget meetings would not end in the ARPA funds being categorized into usages prior to a thorough, transparent, and publicly engaged data-driven process for identifying the best uses for these funds per the entire community's wishes. Guhlincozzi asked the Council to engage the public before implementing the ARPA funds. Although Guhlincozzi was hearing many wonderful and

important projects being requested, she believed more time, discussion, and input from all members of the community was needed to ensure they were taking care of people, especially the most vulnerable and least represented on the Council and in government in general.

Aaron Phillips stated he was a local filmmaker who had moved to Columbia in 2015 to attend the University of Missouri for photojournalism, but had later realized documentary film was more his calling. Phillips noted he had been involved in filmmaking, i.e., documentary, commercial, or narrative, over the last 3-4 years, and most of that community consisted of volunteers. It was through relationships and friendships that projects were made. Studio money involved a high level, but everything else involved the sheer will of making something with the people around them. Phillips commented that he had been involved with Vidwest as a volunteer, helping to set up the studio, parse through the equipment, setting up the live-stream, and determining how that service could be provided to the community. Phillips noted he had seen several young African-American men in the Vidwest Studio that were taking photographs for paying gigs and would otherwise not have access to a studio. Phillips commented that this was a resource that would be different from what he understood the last iteration of CAT had been, and this was due to the fact that both technology and society were changing. Phillips thought a public television output like cable television could be a good product to offer, but he did not know if it should be the primary goal because offering a public media center to the community in terms of a place to go, equipment, and people available to teach the equipment involved such a high learning curve. Phillips explained he had been an instructor for a filmmaking workshop for high school students this past summer and it had been good to see the spark in the eyes of kids. Phillips felt that was the beginning of what Vidwest could be for the community.

Dani Perez noted she would provide numbers from the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), the National Center for Health Statistics (NCHS), and the U.S. Census Bureau. From January to June 2019, those with symptoms of anxiety were at 8.2 percent, those with symptoms of depression were at 6.6 percent, and those with both were at 11 percent. During December 9-21, 2020, those with anxiety were at 36.9 percent, those with depression were at 30.2 percent, and those with both were at 42.4 percent. Perez pointed out this was based on self-reported frequencies of both anxiety and depression so the numbers were likely a lot higher, but felt this data was more solid than anything she had seen provided from the City that supposedly supported the priority of a lot of the projects that had been presented in the budget. Perez commented that she believed infrastructure was important, but they were in COVID times, and there were people in town that had never felt this level of anxiety or depression. Many had not even been able to grieve properly, and others, like the Asian community, were dealing with hate due to COVID when they were not to blame. Perez suggested creating a local telehealth system and a mobile clinic that went to the many Columbia communities, including the homeless villages. Perez noted there were communities that felt they were never seen or heard, and there was not enough accessibility. The cost to see a psychiatrist was over \$300 even with insurance. Perez stated the lack of data was discouraging when considering the priority of projects. Perez hoped the data she shared would show the Council what the real needs were within Columbia. Perez felt data from credible sources was needed along with an explanation of the thought process as to how they decided on any project because no one currently knew how decisions were made. Perez reiterated she believed decisions should be made with proper data.

Lily White stated she was the Vice President of External Affairs at the Columbia Chamber of Commerce, and explained she wanted to highlight the rehabilitation needs of the business community and the areas in which they wanted the Council to focus in terms of ARPA funding. White noted they wanted the Council to consider allocating funds to support business development specifically focused on small, minority-owned, women-owned, and historically underrepresented businesses as they had been heavily

impacted during COVID-19. Anything that put those businesses further behind would affect the community's diverse culture and growth in those business areas. White also asked the Council to consider allocating funds to strengthen the community by developing improved infrastructure and public utilities, especially in terms of roads and reliable broadband. White commented that she thought it was important to note that infrastructure was generally the least reliable in the low income and historically underrepresented populations, which affected the equal opportunity in education and job availability. White suggested the Council also consider allocating funds to continue growing and developing the workforce in Columbia as the Chamber had found desperate workforce needs in all industries, specifically entry level areas. The Chamber's Workforce Division and other organizations in the community needed funding to create necessary programs to fill the worker gap that had been found. White noted that making these areas a priority would continue to address the inequities that were noticeable in the community prior to COVID-19 and had been highlighted as weaknesses throughout the pandemic. White stated the Chamber hoped to continue working with City leadership during the COVID-19 pandemic and any recovery process with regard to these and any other areas of focus with which the Council chose to move forward.

Chimene Schwach explained she had lived in Columbia for about 12 years and noted she had been appalled earlier when no one was able to say how long or why the electric utility had been subsidizing the solid waste utility. Schwach commented that Columbia was a mid-size city, and she did not feel there was any excuse to not utilize data and sound methodologies to make decisions as to how money was spent in the community. Schwach suggested the Council spend money to figure out how to do math, projections, analyze statistics, etc. Schwach stated she was a privileged middle-class woman with middle-class kids that played sports, and did not believe they needed another sportcation center in Columbia to help out her middle-class and upper-class kids' friends on a daily basis at the expense of kids that could not afford to be on AAU teams or other specialized teams. Those kids could not even get on the local high school teams because they could not afford to be on club teams and travel like others. Schwach noted they did not need another basketball, football, or special soccer facility to bring people into the City for those that could afford to pay for it. Schwach commented that the word "equity" could not be found within the main mission of the City's strategic plan, and this budget did not look as though it had any equity. Schwach asked that the ARPA funds not be included in the general budget, especially since at one point the Council had indicated they would not put it into the budget. Schwach believed the money needed to be set aside for a robust public discussion on all of the fabulous projects mentioned by various people, and that data was needed with regard to those projects, to include the amount of money needed, the outcomes of the project, and the accountability for those not meeting projections. Schwach stated they had the opportunity to interrupt structural inequities and suggested they put people before projects. Schwach pointed out there were enough people in Columbia with money who could help, but the City needed to take the lead. If the City used this money to interrupt structural inequities, everyone would rise up. By housing the unhoused, sheltering the unsheltered, providing everyone access to the website, etc., everyone would be able to participate, making the democracy and the community better, and ultimately everyone would become wealthier. Schwach commented that there was actual data and research that showed this.

Nickie Davis, 11 S. Tenth Street, stated she was representing the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) and referenced a letter that had been sent to the Council in July. Davis noted small businesses were still suffering from COVID. They were still in the middle of a pandemic and still having to pay their back rent, utilities, etc. Davis understood the City had offered reimbursement of the license fees and small businesses were still awaiting those checks. Davis asked for business recovery funding for small businesses. Davis noted many of the alleyways, sidewalks, and intersections in the downtown were not ADA accessible, and noted those items to be addressed if they

wanted the downtown to be a tourism spot. Davis stated businesses also had to deal with sewer and water main issues all of the time causing them to have to close. Davis asked that those issues be fixed so the businesses could survive and continue to offer services to Columbians and tourists in the downtown.

Pat Kelley, 1007 Grand Avenue, commented that she was the Acting President of the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association, and explained the Association had not met much this year since many of the neighbors did not have online access causing them to have to meet in person, but they had met with regard to the ARPA funding. Kelley noted they had unanimously supported the use of ARPA funds to directly help people whose lives had been directly impacted by COVID or those that had been traditionally underserved. Kelley stated they had also voted to support an inclusive public discussion to determine the best use of the funds. Kelley commented that those that had seen their neighbors sleeping in the park, met kids asking for food, or knew people who lived in constant pain because they could not access dental care understood this was a once in a lifetime opportunity to empower the least fortunate and give hope to people that had lost loved ones, work, housing, or healthcare this year as it would make Columbia a better community for all.

Andrew Hutchinson, 510 Spencer Avenue, explained he was the representative for Laborers Local 955 and was present on behalf of the City employees represented by them with regard to Council Amendment #1, which would provide hazard pay of \$1,000 monthly to police, fire, and solid waste employees. They had conducted an internal poll and had found the members to be supportive of this, but they also felt it should be extended to all essential workers throughout the City. If hazard pay was provided, it should be provided to members that worked in close quarters or who work in the public. COVID-19 had affected a lot of members in their work places regardless of whether they were mechanics working in close quarters in fleet operations, solid waste workers doing refuse or recycling or working at the recycling facility, or bus drivers dealing with the public on a consistent basis. Many had lost out on pay or had suffered adverse health impacts as a result of exposure to COVID-19. They had also used a lot of sick leave or bereavement leave. It had affected everyone in a lot of different ways. Hutchinson stated they appreciated that the Council valued the hardworking employees of City government, but asked that these payments be provided to all workers that worked with the public or worked in close quarters, i.e., those that had not had the privilege of working via Zoom. Hutchinson commented that even if the overall amount was lower, they believed the service of everyone should be rewarded.

Rebecca Shaw, 2615 Vail Drive, stated she had a lot of questions. Shaw understood there was a proposed amendment for hazard pay on which Andrew Hutchinson just commented, and asked for the data that had led them to the \$1,000 per month mark and the conditions that defined the hazardous working conditions. Shaw commented that she was sure the City had other staff interacting with the public in other areas during COVID, and wondered why they were not also included for hazard pay. Shaw explained she was supportive of hazard pay, but thought it should be extended beyond just the unionized members of the City. Shaw understood the letter from the Human Services Commission (HSC) had included a link to the CoMoHelps report, which had been a collaborative project between some of the nonprofits in town, and the report had showed that the greatest increased needs during COVID were food, healthcare, housing assistance, childcare, and education. Shaw thought data of that nature could lead the efforts in determining what the citizens most needed. It showed what services the organizations were unable to get from the City and the County along with the greatest needs. Shaw commented that she did not feel ARPA funds should be a part of the budget discussion. Shaw noted that during the budget work session, Mark Palmer with VAC stated they needed 3-6 months to fully form an operational plan and have a better understanding of the budget necessary to run an opportunity campus. Shaw asked why funds could not be placed on hold until they had that information as the shelter was obviously very important to many stakeholders within the City. Shaw agreed broadband was a worthwhile project,

but wondered how they knew \$10 million was needed. Shaw asked if there were reports or if numbers had been run by City staff showing there was a \$10 million need for broadband. Shaw also wondered about the timeline for that money, i.e., when costs would be incurred requiring money to be disbursed, etc., and asked if funding could come from multiple funding sources. Shaw believed it was concerning that \$10 million of the \$25 million would go toward one infrastructure project. Similarly, funding had been proposed for recommendations by the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence, but had not included a detailed list of which projects would be funded, how those were chosen, and how the estimated funding was valued. Shaw noted the public wanted to see those details if they were available.

Susan Maze, 902 N. Seventh Street, asked the Council to move the full \$25 million of ARPA funding to a separate process with robust public input as it was the public's money and the public needed to be aware of how decisions associated with it were being made. Maze commented that the \$25 million was about one-fifth of the general fund. It was less than a full year of policing and ten years of health and social services funding. It was an immense amount of money that could help people that were traditionally underserved and did not normally receive much help from the City. Maze stated she had sent an email to the Council in March of 2020 detailing what she was seeing from her front porch in terms of the unsheltered community. The numbers were increasing and the amount of desperation was obvious to anyone paying attention. People were sleeping in bus shelters and there were arguments and fights. There were no toilets, handwashing systems, etc. Maze noted she had invited the Council to sit on her porch to view what was happening, and the response from the City was to take out the bus shelter where people were living along with issuing a RFP she could not speak about in polite company. Maze commented that she wanted to disrupt and fix the problem for most of these unsheltered people with a place to stay and transitional housing options. Maze noted that someone had told her that it might be the neighborhood's responsibility to take care of these people, and after getting over being mad, she started providing one lunch a week for one of the organizations that did not receive public funding but still fed the unsheltered camps twice a week. It started out with only 25 people and had increased to over 50 people. The problem was not going away and needed to be fixed, and it could be addressed with ARPA funding. Maze asked the Council to keep the funds intact and for a robust public process.

Jessica Cooper provided a handout and noticed those speaking on behalf people of color had not been people of color, and stated she was concerned that black people were not being heard. Cooper explained she was a small business owner and a founding member of the Columbia African American Business Alliance (CAABA) referenced on page 83 in paragraph 8. Cooper noted a few other CAABA founding members/small business owners were in attendance. Cooper commented that they sat on the supplier diversity program with only a little under three months of operations. They had held meetings with various other small business owners to collectively work to build the black business presence in Columbia. Cooper pointed out some of their concerns were listed on the handout provided, but a few concerns not mentioned included the expansion of employment for the supplier diversity program. Cooper wondered why this was operated by an individual and not a collective. Paid jobs needed to be implemented into the budget to be able to begin the process of building the entrepreneurial ecosystem that was spoken of but not proven. Cooper understood the funding listed under services and miscellaneous for the supplier and diversity budget was only 18.9 percent of the entire economic development budget, just shy of \$130,000. Cooper commented that the supplier diversity program had 133 MBEs registered and wondered what the businesses could do with only \$128,672 as that was about \$967.46 per business. With only two grants given out annually, Cooper wondered how the strategic plan priority areas specifically focused on the resilient economy goal statement on page 82. Cooper asked what was being done locally to change the structural inequity those as black people were already forced to face in

America. In 2020, in America, approximately 450,000 black owned businesses had to close their doors, and approximately eight out of ten black owned businesses failed within the first 18 months. Cooper wondered what they were doing to prevent these economic disparities in Columbia. Cooper stated CAABA was ready and willing to speak with the Council before they finalized the usage of ARPA funds, and asked that they be spoken to directly about what they went through as small business owners within the City. Cooper also asked that they be allowed to collectively, with the City Council, agree on how to fund CAABA to provide a benefit to the businesses within the Columbia community. Cooper stated she looked forward to a response to the email CAABA would send the Council to schedule a conversation. Cooper asked the Council to show them that they actually cared about the black lives and businesses in the community by modifying the budget with data representation, analysis, and quarterly evaluations.

Jeff Stack, Sexton Avenue, stated he opposed the notion that they needed to provide \$5.8 million of ARPA funding to police, fire, and sanitation workers. Stack thought they needed to be selective and appreciated the comments of Andrew Hutchinson earlier. Stack noted he was potentially agreeable to a raise for the solid waste workers, but not necessarily the others because half of the money in the general fund budget was already spent on public safety. Stack felt they were giving too much money to the Police Department and suggested they re-envision what public safety really meant in the community. Stack noted he appreciated the amendment to remove the expansion of Forum Boulevard as there was plenty of concrete there already and heavy traffic for only a couple of hours per day. Stack did not feel they needed to put more and more concrete all across the community. Stack commented that he believed the ARPA funding should be considered separately from the budget, and that the items funded with that money should be developed from a public process. It was a unique opportunity to do a whole lot better for the community by recognizing the needs of people. Stack pointed out he had been at the soup kitchen last night serving about 60 people and 7-8 people had no place to go at the end of the evening, including a 25-year old woman who continued to show more and more dire signs of psychological deterioration. They continued to deny and pretend that these types of problems did not exist, but they were all a party to them via their collective neglect. Stack stated they needed to get on board to try to take care of the real needs of people and not try to rush through the ARPA opportunity. Stack implored the Council to take seriously the needs of the people within the community instead of rushing to benefit businesses, especially those that had a very narrow economic interest. Stack asked the Council to try and do better.

Treece understood this was not the first time Stack had advocated for the unsheltered population and asked if the Council should spend \$3 million tonight for a homeless shelter or continue to talk about it. Stack asked if it would be opened right away because he could see the wisdom of opening up some type of shelter. Stack noted the City had a great deal of funding in the general fund that could be used to support and open up a shelter now. Treece commented that he kept hearing that they should talk about it some more. Stack stated he felt that should be done for a long term project, but believed they could open some kind of safe space indoors now. Stack noted a lady pointed out to him last night that a guy was driving through the soup kitchen area to proposition a woman that might be desperate. Stack explained people were vulnerable, and a shelter should have been established years ago. Stack recognized more had been done than in the past in terms of support for Room at the Inn, but more needed to be done. Stack stated he had run into someone yesterday that had quit drinking and was doing well, but had started his habits again because they could not find him a place to stay. Stack noted City Hall could be opened up in the evenings as it was a big space. Stack felt they were only limited by their lack of creativity and lack of compassion.

Andrew Grabau commented that he believed the City had a tremendous opportunity to invest in homeless services, and as the Director of the Heart of Missouri United Way, he thought it was important to advocate for their nonprofits that were ready to invest and to

make the change that needed to happen in the community. Grabau stated he wanted remind the Council of two points and to urge action as they considered how to use the ARPA funds. Grabau suggested the Council look at the existing infrastructure in terms of City programs and to leverage the wisdom of its employees in trying to allocate the funding that was so important to alleviating disparities and advancing equity in the community. Grabau also asked the Council to consider an investment in capacity building in the nonprofit sector as he thought it was important that the Council ensure the agencies would succeed when providing ARPA funding. Grabau thought the last thing they wanted was to see the initial investment not be met with some of the organizational capacity necessary for success. Grabau stated they wanted the funds to be transformational and to change the community for the better, and suggested they ensure they provide organizational capacity support in addition to funding so they could succeed. Grabau commented that he believed having input from the nonprofit sector agencies providing day-to-day services was really important and that they continue to allow those voices to be heard along with providing opportunities for them to speak with regard to the use of funds in the future.

Susan Renee Carter suggested the City collect data, set goals, and determine whether those goals were being met. Carter reiterated that black households in Columbia had a poverty rate of 35 percent according to the 2019 numbers, and that 9.9 percent of black citizens were unemployed. Carter stated it did not make sense to hear people speak about not having employees due to those numbers. Carter thought they needed to figure out how to match businesses and people so people had jobs and a way to earn a living while businesses had employees. Carter believed they could do better in terms of data collection, determining outcomes, and being deliberate about how they helped people while also helping businesses.

Alyce Turner stated she was pleased to see the additional staffing of 17 people at the Public Health and Human Service Department as she believed it was needed given the COVID pandemic. Turner pointed out she had been distressed when hearing Public Health and Human Services Director Browning state they could not do mask enforcement when also promoting vaccinations due to staffing. Turner understood they might never have a mask ordinance, but thought there needed to be more testing. Turner suggested the City reach out to the University of Missouri as she felt the 600 active cases were not the only active cases since there was not enough testing in the community. People were walking around with COVID exposing their families and others. Turner understood the Columbia Public Schools (CPS) had some testing, but pointed out there was a lack of testing for the general public. Without accessible drive-by testing, they would not really know the burden within the community. Turner reiterated she thought the City should reach out in that regard.

Barbara Jefferson, 305 N. Fifth Street, commented that she believed a consultant was needed to obtain public input from those that had been burdened the worst even if it took 6-8 months so they could have the data to determine the best use of the ARPA funds. Jefferson felt those burdened the worst should benefit from that funding and 6-8 months was not long when they had several years to make use of the funds. Jefferson stated the money in the general fund reserves could be utilized for the homeless if the City wanted to do something now. Jefferson explained it bothered her that they had quickly gone through the budget and the amendments as it did not provide the public enough information. Jefferson suggested they find another way to address the budget. Jefferson commented that she was also upset that she, a black person, had been told she could not place a chair near the exit when there was now a white police officer in a chair there. There being no further comment, Treece continued the public hearing to the September 20, 2021 Council Meeting.

Treece suggested they go through the staff amendments and dispose of those.

Peters understood they would discuss the City's budget, which was separate from the ARPA money, and they were not comingling the two. Treece stated he thought that was

up to the Council. Peters understood what they would be reviewing now was strictly the City's budget. Treece agreed they were discussing the City's budget, but there were items in it that could be funded with ARPA funds if the majority of Council wanted to do so. Peters understood that at the moment they were listed to come from the general fund. Treece stated that was correct, and noted there was nothing in the City's budget, despite the slide, indicating they were appropriating money for stormwater, broadband, homelessness, etc. as that has been provided for discussion purposes only. Treece reiterated that if the majority of Council wanted to utilize those funds to pay for any of those priorities, he would be agreeable. Peters stated she would prefer to deal with only the City's budget at this time.

Fowler commented that she wanted to have a roll call vote on anything that might be ARPA funded if they decide to bring something forward utilizing those funds. Treece understood.

Treece asked if anyone wanted to discuss Staff Amendments #1-#4, and no one indicated they did.

Treece asked for clarification regarding Staff Amendment #5. Lue replied it was the result of the new way in which they were trying to budget to be more precise, and was an overstatement. Treece understood they had a grant last year they would not have this year. Lue stated that was correct. Fowler understood it was being offset so it could be zeroed out. Lue stated that was correct.

Treece asked if anyone wanted to discuss Staff Amendments #6-#9, and no one indicated they did.

Fowler referred to Staff Amendment #10 as she understood there was a separate channel of ARPA funding having to do with transit, and asked if there were others they had not discussed. Glascock replied this had come directly from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), and thought there could be funding from the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) involving the airport. Treece understood they also received CDBG funding. Glascock agreed and noted it came through a separate channel as well. The \$25.6 million was for general use, and the others were more specific in nature. Fowler asked if they would have additional information at another time about the other channels. Fowler stated she had heard reference to housing money, and understood that might be the CDBG money, but noted she was not clear on the amounts that had already been received. Glascock replied those would come forward to Council as the funds were programmed. Fowler asked how much CDBG money had been received. Glascock replied he did not know. Fowler understood the City had not received FAA funds, but were watching for it. Glascock stated some funds had been received from FAA. Glascock pointed out this amendment was related to an item they had not caught. It was an omission that should have been included in the original budget. Community Development Director Tim Teddy explained \$2.161 million in CDBG funds had been announced but had not yet been received. Teddy understood the Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) had indicated the City could not submit any plans or proposals until they had issued administrative guidance on that particular program. Teddy pointed out the funds were to benefit persons suffering from homelessness.

Treece asked if anyone wanted to discuss Staff Amendment #11, and no one indicated that desire.

Peters asked why water, electric, sewer, and solid waste were supporting a railroad they were not using in reference to Staff Amendment #12. Glascock replied the railroad did not make enough revenue to cover its expenses, and thus it was funded by the other utilities that used the railroad for the subsidy. Peters asked how these utilities used the railroad. Glascock replied there was sewer at the transload facility and trash was picked up there. Glascock commented that if they wanted to keep the railroad, they needed to provide it some revenue. This was the solution, but they could always utilize the general fund. Peters stated she did not want to go that route, but wanted a report as to what the railroad did.

Fowler commented that she shared that concern because the railroad was a unique asset for a city, and hoped they had the opportunity to have a complete discussion as Columbia had invested a lot in it over time.

Glascoc noted this process had been developed when Tad Johnsen had been the Utilities Director, and it had been discussed with the Council at that time. It had been covered before, but they could bring forward another report.

Treece noted it, like Staff Amendment #31, skewed all of their cost of service studies because the rate increases might not have to be as high if they were not subsidizing other utilities. Treece understood the electric utility had paid for part of the water rate study. Instead of comingling funds and subsidizing utilities with other utilities, Treece felt they needed to raise the rates of those items not meeting their cash targets or make changes to things like the railroad.

Treece asked if anyone wanted to discuss Staff Amendments #13-#15, and no one indicated they did.

Waner asked if the position associated with Staff Amendment #16 would be able to address any of the concerns that had been brought forward at the beginning of the meeting with regard to accessibility of the website with screen-readers. Glascoc replied the City only had one person that worked on the website, and when he was gone, there was not a backup, so this position would help with coverage in that regard. Glascoc thought that person could assist with the accessibility issue as well.

Fowler asked if an additional allocation was needed to obtain the software mentioned. Glascoc replied he did not believe so as he thought that could be done via a line item within the Information Technology (IT) Department that allowed the purchase of software. Glascoc pointed out he would also want to discuss the issue with staff before they actually included it in the budget if the Council preferred it be included in that manner. Fowler asked Glascoc if this would come back to the Council or if it would be handled administratively. Glascoc replied he understood there were lots of documents that were not accessible, which needed to be addressed, so they would either bring something forward or handle it administratively. In either situation, the Council would be provided a report indicating how it would be handled.

Treece asked if anyone wanted to discuss Staff Amendment #17, and no one indicated that desire.

Treece referenced Staff Amendment #18 and stated he believe the funding of the positions in the Public Health and Human Services Department was an appropriate use of ARPA funding as it was essential to their response to the public health emergency with respect to COVID-19. Treece noted he would prefer to change the source of funds from the general fund to ARPA funds in the amount of \$486,760.

Skala asked if they could go ahead with the general fund mechanism and change the funding to ARPA later should that be the decision the Council wanted to take or if they had to make that decision and change now. Glascoc replied he thought they could make changes to a funding source at any time as long as it was an appropriate use of the funds. Skala stated he would feel more comfortable doing that as that would allow them to leave the ARPA funding out of the discussion for now. Skala pointed out there were many people that felt it required more consideration and a separate process, and he agreed. Skala noted he also thought they had already agreed by consensus that this was how they intended to proceed. Skala understood there had been a page in the budget with a number of proposals, but those were just proposals, which he viewed as a placeholder, as they could all significantly change in the future. Skala stated he thought it should be a separate process and that they should proceed with the way it had been written on the amendment sheet. Skala noted it could be changed in the future if that was what they chose to do.

Thomas stated he agreed these were appropriate expenditures for the ARPA funds, but thought they should utilize the general fund budget for now. Later, when the ARPA funds were finally allocated, they could transfer the expenses to those funds if decided. Thomas

noted he wanted to flag this as one of the expenditures the Council felt should be paid for through the ARPA funds, which he would support. Fowler understood that support would be at a later time. Thomas stated that was correct.

Thomas explained he felt another process was needed for the decision, and his recommendation was to ask the Public Health and Human Services Department along with the Housing Programs Division to review all of the input received regarding ARPA in order to come up with recommendations. Thomas also felt they needed to use the appropriate commissions to vet those suggestions.

Pitzer stated it sounded as though they would wind up funding this through ARPA if there was not grant funding, and suggested they make it clear that this was the priority of Council with a vote.

Skala commented that a lot of people had suggested the need for more participation and advice from the boards and commissions, and felt they could always make the determination to shift these expenses to be funded by the ARPA funds later. Skala believed it was a good idea to flag it as a logical candidate for further discussion.

Peters stated she would leave it with the general fund for now, and thought they would have plenty of discussion in that regard in the future.

Treece understood it would be left to be funded with the general fund.

Treece asked if anyone wanted to discuss Staff Amendments #19-#21, and no one indicated they did.

Fowler asked if Staff Amendment #22 was to correct a prospective error whereby not enough money was budgeted or a shortfall in that the employees were underpaid. Lue replied not enough money had been budgeted.

Treece asked if anyone wanted to discuss Staff Amendments #23-#24, and no one indicated they did.

Treece understood Staff Amendment #25 was associated with B244-21 and noted they would forego the water rate increase. Fowler asked if this would be discussed or if this was a total withdrawal at this time. Glascock replied staff had recommended the three percent voter approved increase, but Pitzer had asked why the rate increase was needed, and they had not had any reason other than the fact the voters had approved it. This could wait until January like they had done this past budget year to allow for better data regarding revenues. Glascock stated it had been a mistake on his part to bring it forward at this time versus in January. Fowler commented that she agreed it would be better to wait until they had relevant data.

Treece asked if anyone wanted to discuss Staff Amendments #26-#30, and no one indicated they did.

Treece understood Pitzer had asked questions earlier regarding Staff Amendment #31 in terms of subsidizing the general and administrative fees of the solid waste utility with the electric utility. Pitzer stated he did not have any other questions and felt they had made their concerns clear so the issue would be corrected.

Skala suggested they be provided a report for clarification as to why this had occurred in the past and what the intent was for the future. Glascock commented that he felt an update was needed with regard to how general and administrative fees were administered, and believed the Council should establish a policy as to how those fees were calculated. This would eliminate the continuous change in how the fees were calculated by staff. Skala asked Glascock how he would propose that to be done. Skala wondered if it needed to be initiated by a report. Lue pointed out staff had corrected how general and administrative fees were being proposed and had that process in a written format so they could bring that to Council. Glascock noted he could provide information as to how it had been calculated in the past so the Council could see why it had been changed. Skala stated he felt that would be helpful.

Peters thanked staff for bringing this to the attention of Council, and noted she looked forward to seeing a report so they could understand it moving forward.

Thomas commented that he had experience in calculating these types of fees and there

were different ways of doing it, all of which were dependent on assumptions which were difficult to validate. They just had to do the best they could. It was not as if one utility was stealing money or being subsidized by another. It was about a set of assumptions. Thomas suggested they go with the recommendation of the Finance Director.

Treece stated he agreed with Peters in terms of this being brought to the attention of Council, and noted his concern was the undermining of the authority of Council to appropriate money as this was allowing money to slide around between different utilities at a time they were trying to base rates on the actual cost of service. They should not be gouging consumers by charging more than was actually needed for the actual cost of electricity and water. If they were using the electric utility to subsidize another utility, it needed to be addressed.

Glascok suggested the Council ask for that calculation with every budget moving forward.

Treece asked if anyone wanted to discuss Staff Amendments #32-#39, and no one indicated they did.

Treece made a motion to amend the budget document associated with B241-21 by approving Staff Amendments #1-#39. The motion was seconded by Waner and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Treece suggested they move on to the Council Amendments if everyone was agreeable, and everyone agreed.

Treece stated he would suggest using ARPA funds to provide hazard pay for police, fire, and solid waste employees as indicated by Council Amendment #1.

Treece made a motion to amend the budget document associated with B241-21 by approving Council Amendment #1. The motion died due to the lack of a second.

Skala commented that he thought they should continue with the way things were until they were at a point whereby they had more information and a more secure consideration of ARPA funding in general, i.e., the \$12.5 million the City already had in hand along with the next disbursement. Skala felt Council Amendment #1 could be a part of the discussion at that time.

Thomas made a motion to amend the budget document associated with B241-21 by approving Council Amendment #2. Thomas explained it would remove \$1.5 million being allocated to the Forum Boulevard widening project from the budget.

The motion made by Thomas to amend the budget document associated with B241-21 by approving Council Amendment #2 was seconded by Fowler.

Thomas noted it was a \$12.5 million project that would widen a road that did not have traffic congestion problems. Thomas did not believe the traffic counts justified the need for 4-5 lanes. Thomas explained he lived close to it and understood traffic flowed through it at 35-40 mph even at the height of rush hour. The only exception had occurred for about six months when Chapel Hill Road was closed for another project causing traffic to be diverted. Thomas commented that the portion of the road that was two lanes functioned better than the sections that were 4-5 lanes at the north end as it approached Stadium Boulevard and at the south end as it approached Nifong Boulevard where the speeds were greater. Thomas stated it was very difficult to navigate by bicycle and to cross as a pedestrian. By completing the project, they would make the road worse without solving any problems. Thomas understood this project had been on the CATSO Long Range Transportation Plan and the City's Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Plan for 3-4 decades and there had not ever been any analytical evaluation of the need or of other options to solve whatever problem it had been developed to solve. Thomas felt it was part of a systemic approach to growth in transportation planning, which did not make sense at this time when they wanted to focus on climate, equity, and safety as it worked against all three of those things. Thomas commented that later tonight they would receive a report from the Community Development Department on some systemic problems with

the CATSO Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) along with the need to look at that plan in conjunction with the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP). The CAAP called for a reduction in vehicle travel from 87 percent of trips to 15 percent of trips, and an increase in transit from one percent to 40 percent. Thomas stated he was not sure those goals were achievable but believed they needed to make the best effort they could to achieve them. Moving forward with the system of continually widening roads, whether needed or not, would not help with that effort. Thomas asked for the support of Council to remove this from the FY 2022 budget, have staff to evaluate the project, and allow for the comparison of the CATSO LRTP and the CAAP.

Pitzer commented that it was disappointing they had to talk about this again as the same motion had been made and had died due to the lack of a second a couple of years ago. Pitzer pointed out \$1.9 million had already been appropriated, and this would appropriate an additional \$1.5 million. It would continue the process to fund the project. The funding was coming from the capital improvement sales tax and the county road tax. They were funds that were voter approved specifically for roads and capital improvements. The voters had said they wanted to tax themselves to spend money on those projects. Pitzer noted the bicycle and pedestrian access was quite poor on both sides of the crossing over the creek. In addition, the bridge was not in great shape and was one of the few crossings they had over the Hinkson Creek that was prone to flooding with some of the more serious rain events they had experienced. Pitzer stated what troubled him the most was that later this evening they would be talking about projects they wanted to complete with the park sales tax should it be renewed, and they were asking voters to trust that they would do the projects they said they would do with the park sales tax while talking about defunding a project that was on the 2015 capital improvement sales tax list. Pitzer felt it was shortsighted and ran the risk of alienating people to ask people to trust them when voting for taxes and then changing their minds when it came time to appropriate the money and going against what the voters had asked be done by defunding the project.

Skala commented that for a while he had been fond of the idea of creating some road diets of three-lane roads along with turn lanes, but that had come to a screeching halt with Nifong Boulevard, which had been expanded due to the amount of traffic. Skala agreed with Pitzer in that this project had been around for a long time, and they had allocated \$1.9 million. In addition, it had been determined it was needed earlier, and things had not gotten any better in terms of traffic. Skala stated he did not intend to support this motion to remove \$1.5 million from the project.

Fowler understood this money would go to other roads if it was not used for this specific project so the money would not disappear or have to be given back. Fowler noted they had also heard a lot today from voters and residents regarding data to ensure they were spending money efficiently and effectively. Fowler stated she would support the motion to remove the \$1.5 million from this project as they had other road other projects that would welcome additional funding.

The motion made by Thomas and seconded by Fowler to amend the budget document associated with B241-21 by approving Council Amendment #2 was defeated by voice vote with only Peters, Treece, Skala, and Pitzer voting against it.

Waner made a motion to amend the budget document associated with B241-21 by approving Council Amendment #3. The motion was seconded by Peters.

Waner believed it was important to set the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Office up for success because they tended to say so much of what they did was undergirded by equity, diversity, and inclusion. It was a good opportunity to put their money where their mouth was by having actual people doing this work as their regular full-time job instead of other duties as assigned, which was how it had been done forever. Waner felt that only having one person do the job was a lot, and noted it was almost perfunctory to have one person in that role. Waner believed they should have at least one other person hired into that office so they could move the needle forward on ensuring all of the decisions they were making were based on data and equity in that data.

Glascock asked Waner if she would be amenable to using part of it for reconfiguring the City Manager's Office because there was not currently space for this person on the second floor. The entire \$86,000 would not be used because a person would likely not be hired until they were at least six months into the FY 2022 budget since the next city manager would make that hire. Waner stated she would be open to that.

Peters asked if there was a need to reconfigure the space so everyone had a separate office. Peters wondered if an office could be shared. Glascock replied there would need to be some movement of people and the reconfiguration of spaces.

Fowler stated she would support the motion as she wanted a second person in that office. Fowler noted she also wanted them to look more carefully at expanding the resources of that office because she felt dismantling equity in a community and in a dominant culture that had existed for generations would be a significant undertaking. Fowler asked for clarification regarding the reconfiguration. Fowler wondered if this would be a small fee or if they would be reworking the entire floor. Glascock stated they would have to rework the entire open area, which included cubicles and the conference room with the glass walls. Fowler suggested another portion of the budget be used for that. Glascock explained it was all general fund money, and all of the \$86,000 would not be used next year. Glascock noted he would only use a portion of that money for the reconfiguration and reiterated it was still all general fund money. Instead of personnel, it would be used for something else. Fowler commented that once they hired those two people, she hoped they would put additional resources into that effort.

Skala stated he thought it was a good idea to supplement the Diversity, Equity, and Inclusion Office with another position. Skala commented that a couple of years ago, \$50,000 had been set aside for a similar effort and that had been supplemented the following year. The money was to be used for a racial equity lens look at the City's ordinances and the plan had been to select a consultant along with local people that had talent in that regard as well. Skala noted that \$75,000 had never been spent, and he believed this was an opportunity to imbue this office with enough help to accomplish some of their goals.

The motion made by Waner and seconded by Peters to amend the budget document associated with B241-21 by approving Council Amendment #3 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Pitzer made a motion to amend the budget document associated with B241-21 by approving Council Amendment #4. The motion was seconded by Treece.

Pitzer commented that this was a continuation of their discussion at the last meeting regarding the park sales tax in terms of increasing funding from the potential park sales tax renewal for additional trail projects and reducing potential park sales tax funding for the Sports Fieldhouse project by backfilling it with another funding source. Council Amendment #4 would provide for those other funding sources.

Thomas understood this would move them closer to that \$5.8 million. Pitzer explained they would discuss an agenda item later tonight with regard to the park sales tax project, and he believed the memo associated with that item discussed these funding sources along with an additional park sales tax balance to bridge the gap. Pitzer asked if that was correct. Parks and Recreation Director Mike Griggs replied that was correct except that they would not be able to close the gap. The proposed plan was to cut the \$5.8 million to \$1.5 million in future park sales tax. That along with the \$1.5 million from the general fund and the \$1 million from the tourism development fund meant they would have a total of \$4 million and a gap of \$1.8 million. If they were to continue with the project, they would need to come up with another funding source for that \$1.8 million.

Thomas asked if the \$1 million from the Convention and Visitors Bureau (CVB) was essentially hotel tax revenue. Griggs replied yes. Thomas understood there had been an unexpected surplus in the general fund over the last year or two, and asked for the

amount of the surplus. Lue replied he did not have the exact number, but it was around \$30 million. Thomas stated he supported this amendment.

Pitzer understood there was surplus in the park sales tax, and asked Griggs if that would be proposed to help with the gap or if it would be general fund or another source. Griggs replied he thought they would look at a combination of those two sources. Griggs commented that even with the last few months being better than predicted, they were still not at the \$18 million needed for the 2015 park sales tax. They were close, but not quite there yet. They could use the balance of what they had in the park sales tax to either restore the \$1.4 million for land acquisition or use it along with general fund money for the Sports Fieldhouse project. Griggs noted he did not believe they had enough money for both.

Pitzer commented that he was a bit confused because they had discussed not reducing the Sports Fieldhouse amount from the park sales tax list without identifying other funding sources for it, and asked if an additional amendment was now needed to ensure that funding or if they needed to review the park sales tax list they would discuss later tonight to re-establish funding for it. Griggs replied he would prefer not adjusting the park sales tax list, and thought the choices were to utilize reserves or to look at the balance of the park sales tax that had not yet been appropriated.

Fowler noted there had been requests by Dee Dokken and Carolyn Amparan to backfill the land acquisition fund if funding levels in the park sales tax allowed for it, and pointed out she was not opposed to moving money out of the general fund reserves to finish the Sports Fieldhouse.

Pitzer asked Fowler if she was okay with changing the general fund amount associated with this amendment to \$3.3 million as that would fill the gap. Fowler replied she wanted to hear what others thought of that idea.

Fowler asked for the amount associated with land acquisition. Griggs replied the original 2015 park sales tax had included \$2.025 million for land acquisition. They were at \$600,000 right now so they were \$1.425 million short in terms of restoring it. Griggs explained they had hoped it would be restored by the FY 2023 budget or via a mid-year appropriation assuming they had the revenue. Fowler understood it was not in the park sales tax budget to move to the Sports Fieldhouse. Griggs agreed they did not have it at this time. Fowler asked if it was expected before the Council finished out the current fiscal year. Griggs replied the hope was that they would have enough by the end of this fiscal year. Fowler asked if that would be another \$1.425 million. Griggs replied yes. Fowler felt that needed to go into land acquisition. Griggs stated that was the intent of staff. Fowler stated she supported that.

Fowler noted she would like to hear how other council members wanted to make up the difference for the Sports Fieldhouse.

Skala explained he had been looking beyond a conservative estimate of regular sales taxes in order to restore the land acquisition fund to the \$2.025 million when he had originally made his request for another amendment. If the park sales tax revenues came in higher than what was needed to restore that fund, they could use it for any project, to include the Sports Fieldhouse.

Peters suggested they utilize the general fund for the money needed to fill the gap on the Sports Fieldhouse project.

Pitzer made a motion to amend Council Amendment #4 so it would include \$3.3 million from the general fund instead of \$1.5 million. The motion was seconded by Peters.

Thomas commented that he was not necessarily opposed to this motion as he believed the Sports Fieldhouse should be completed. Thomas asked about the time frame for expending this money as he did not believe it would all be built in FY 2022. Griggs replied they would hire an engineering firm right away if the ballot issue passed, and thought they could speed up the time it took by two years. Thomas noted they were in danger of treating the \$30 million surplus in the general fund as piggy bank from which to pull money and thought they needed to have a better process. Thomas stated another

project he thought would be appropriate for the general fund surplus was the Agriculture Park, which was a jewel of the community, and as a result, he was not sure he was supportive of the motion to change the \$1.5 million to \$3.3 million tonight and would like to hear the thoughts of other council members.

Peters stated she was in favor of the amendment because it would move the project forward if the park sales tax passed. If the park sales tax did not pass, they would need to discuss the issue further. Peters agreed she did not want to treat the surplus as a piggy bank, but noted they had money in the account over the required 20 percent.

Thomas suggested they schedule a work session in a few weeks to determine how much of the general fund surplus they wanted to expend this fiscal year along with how they might want to expend it. They could then decide whether they wanted to fund the Sports Fieldhouse with \$3.3 million or \$1.5 million.

Pitzer commented that they had discussed this at the prior meeting when they had gone through the list of park sales tax projects. If they did not do this, they would need to talk about it later tonight due to the agenda item associated with the projects on the park sales tax list.

The motion made by Pitzer and seconded by Peters to amend Council Amendment #4 so it would include \$3.3 million from the general fund instead of \$1.5 million was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The motion made by Pitzer and seconded by Treece to amend the budget document associated with B241-21 by approving Council Amendment #4, which would now include \$3.3 million from the general fund instead of \$1.5 million due to the amendment, was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Thomas commented that at the time he had proposed Council Amendment #5, he had been unaware that \$35,000 was already in the FY 2022 Office of Cultural Affairs budget. As a result, it would not make sense to vote on an amendment to do something that was already there, and asked Glascock if he agreed. Glascock replied it had been left in that budget and was not tied to any specific use. Thomas understood the City did not have a contract with Vidwest for the community media center project for FY 2021, which was coming to an end, and asked if that was correct. Glascock replied there had not been a contract for Vidwest for anything. Thomas stated he might want to propose an amendment to correct that by providing funding in the FY 2022 budget to retroactively compensate Vidwest for the work they had done, which he thought had met the goals of the Council and the goals of the public. Glascock explained that could not be done because they could not retroactively pay someone for work already done.

Thomas asked for the status of the relationship between the City of Columbia and Vidwest Studios. Thomas wondered if staff had decided to not negotiate any kind of contract or agreement until there was a cable broadcast channel. Glascock replied that in FY 2020, which would have started at the end of 2019, the Council had asked for the public access channel via the contract with Vidwest, and that had never been done as had been specified in the contract. As a result, that contract had not been met. Glascock pointed out staff had never indicated they would not work with Vidwest and they were currently waiting for the conditions of that contract to be met. If Council no longer wanted a public access channel, direction indicating so was needed.

Thomas stated he was persuaded by what he had heard from Schacht and others in that it might not make the best sense to do a cable channel, especially since they had run into some very significant barriers in terms of getting the channel working and because they had pivoted to providing similar outcomes for the community at the beginning of the pandemic with internet broadcast programming and the creation of the media center to allow for the voices of entrepreneurs and marginalized people to be heard. Thomas wondered if the Council needed to direct staff to work with Vidwest Studios to resolve the FY 2020 contract. Thomas commented that he did not know what that involved legally,

but was sure something could be done. Thomas noted Vidwest had done some work that might not have met the letter of the contract, but had met the spirit of the contract. Glascock stated he did not agree. Glascock explained there was not a public access channel. Glascock suggested the Council state what services they wanted to be provided with that money as contracts were contracts for service, and when the service was not provided, payment could not be made.

Fowler commented that when public access channel had first been established, it had always been included as part of the basic cable package, and those with cable had indicated it was no longer there. Fowler understood residents had to have a more fully featured package to actually access the public channel, and asked if that was correct. Glascock replied there was not a public access channel. Fowler asked about the City Channel. Glascock replied he did not know.

Fowler stated she was troubled by the conversation at the last budget hearing regarding Mediacom not providing the feed to reestablish the channel. Glascock understood Vidwest had paid Mediacom for the fiber and they were waiting for the installation to be scheduled. Fowler asked if the Mediacom fiber connection was how the cable channel could be reestablished. Glascock replied he assumed that was the case. Fowler understood that process was outside of the control of Vidwest. Glascock agreed, and noted it was outside of the control of the City as well. Fowler asked what the City could do to encourage Mediacom to complete its work. Glascock replied he was not sure the City could force Mediacom to do anything.

Treece made a motion to amend the budget document associated with B241-21 by deleting \$35,000 from the general fund for the Office of Cultural Affairs. The motion was seconded by Skala.

Treece commented that they were dithering over \$35,000 for a contract that had been unfulfilled, and they were now going to budget it again to provide another chance for it to be unfulfilled. Treece wondered why they were holding these funds if Vidwest could not provide a public access channel.

Peters wondered if they needed to look at this differently because it was not a cable access product without cable access. Peters thought the question was whether the City was willing and able to fund services for people to make videos for streaming, and asked if they would stream on the internet. Peters also wondered from where else they received funding or if the City was their only source of funding, and how many people they served, etc. Peters stated it was not cable related anymore and wondered if they should consider that it would never be cable related if Mediacom would not supply the cable line. Peters also wondered why the City was involved if there were other ways to get information out.

Thomas commented that it was not all about the broadcast channel as it also allowed for training, capacity building, entrepreneurship opportunities, etc. Thomas pointed out Carrie Gartner had discussed how it fit with the vision of the Business Loop of shared spaces and building capacity. Regardless of whether it was a cable channel or streaming on the internet, there was value to people working, learning, and building capacity in the work space. Thomas explained he had been to the Vidwest Studios Open House and there had been dozens and dozens of people working on their projects and demonstrating them to the public that attended. Thomas noted it was a vibrant incubator of democracy and communication, and he did not understand why the City of Columbia could not be a little more flexible by looking at the big picture and providing a meager \$35,000 per year for a really positive project. Thomas commented that since the \$200,000 per year that had originally been provided from 2008 through 2013 had been eroded by the previous City Manager, they had likely had over 100 people testify as to how great a program CAT was and how important it was to the community in such a variety of ways. Thomas stated he thought it was strange that some of them had to continue to defend this small appropriation year after year. Thomas hoped the Council would have the sense to give whatever direction was needed to staff so Vidwest could receive its funding to continue to do the good work they did.

Skala commented that he did not feel the history Thomas had provided was completely accurate as it was not the current or former City Manager that had eroded the funding that had gone toward this, and instead, it had been the City Council. The plan had been to start with \$200,000, and that amount had then been ratcheted down to \$100,000, \$50,000, and so on. Skala pointed out there was supposed to have been an attempt to raise money at this same time, which CAT-TV had been unable to accomplish. Skala noted that plan had been the product of several city councils. Skala stated he was somewhat sympathetic to the idea of helping Vidwest Studios since they were a different group with other expectations, and because it had some value in the community.

Thomas explained his recollection was that in the first year after the five year contract had ended, the former City Manager had removed that from the budget entirely, and some on the Council had fought to get it back to \$100,000. Skala agreed, but explained it was only a proposal similar to this proposed budget, and the City Council was who ruled on it.

Peters understood they could not just give this money away, and that a contract would be required. Peters also understood the previous contract had not been fulfilled. Peters suggested renegotiating a contract with Vidwest that was more appropriate in terms of what they were able to do and legal.

Thomas stated he would love for the City Manager to negotiate in good faith with Vidwest for a positive resolution to this situation.

Waner stated she would be supportive of that as well. Waner thought the point of Peters with regard to reframing this discussion was incredibly important as the landscape of community media had shifted completely. Waner pointed out her husband was a member of Vidwest, and she believed it was an incredible community resource and one that they should partner with as a municipal organization. Waner noted she would like for those conversations to occur.

Treece withdrew his motion to amend the budget document associated with B241-21 by deleting \$35,000 from the general fund for the Office of Cultural Affairs.

Skala asked if any further direction would be required. Treece replied no.

Thomas commented that he wanted a vote to occur because he felt this conversation had occurred previously, likely in November or December of last year, as the FY 2021 contract was being discussed, and direction had been provided then. At that time, they had known the COVID pandemic and the failure of Mediacom to provide fiber to the Vidwest Studios property had created barriers to Vidwest completing the terms of the contract, and they had provided direction without a vote then to renegotiate in good faith. That had apparently never happened, and it was now another year later. Vidwest had continued to operate without City funding. Thomas stated he would like some kind of vote so it was clear as to what the Council wanted to happen.

Treece noted that vote would happen next week since there was \$35,000 in the budget for Vidwest. Fowler stated she thought it was unspecified. Thomas commented that just because the \$35,000 was budgeted did not mean the City Manager would negotiate the contract. Thomas pointed out it had been in the budget last year and there had never been a contract.

Glascok explained the Council had provided a specific scope they had wanted for FY 2020, and that had not been fulfilled. Glascok noted he needed to know the desire of Council if they wanted something to be renegotiated, i.e., a cable access channel, a streaming service, etc. Glascok stated the Council needed to say what they wanted.

Treece noted they should not be addressing the scope of services this late in the evening when the budget had not even been passed. The \$35,000 in the budget would be approved at the September 20, 2021 Council Meeting. Staff could then bring forward a proposed scope of services as was done with other professional services agreements.

Thomas commented that he eventually wanted a vote of the Council providing direction to the City Manager with regard to what they wanted in terms of negotiating with Vidwest. Thomas stated he was agreeable for that not to happen tonight, but wanted to know how that would be handled in the future. Thomas asked if it would be an agenda item or if it

could be done during comments at the end of the next meeting. Glascock replied it could happen however the Council wanted it to happen. Thomas understood it did not have to be an item on the agenda. Glascock stated that was correct. Thomas stated he would plan to do something at the next meeting.

Treece noted there were other amendments to the budget including an asset useful life list, CIP project pages, a missing sewer project page, and a missing water project page, and asked if Council wanted to discuss any of those items.

Fowler commented that the asset useful life list appeared to be a depreciation schedule or something like a depreciation schedule whereby they were explaining how those items were carried on the books after their useful lives had been reached, and asked if she was correct in terms of the purpose of that document. Lue replied yes. Fowler asked how they got to a place where they had lots of assets that did not show any salvage value, and wondered if that was because those items would be used until they would no longer function. Fowler wondered about the value to the City if they were looking at the total assets of the City. Lue replied salvage value only came into play if something was sold. Fowler asked what was done when the asset was written off. Lue replied the City did not write off assets. The assets only depreciated down to nothing. Fowler asked how the City assessed the value of a particular infrastructure item currently in use if it was zeroed over time. Lue replied the only reason to depreciate an asset was to not pay for it all in one year. Once the useful life of that asset was done, it no longer had any attainable value in that way. Lue explained that if the useful life was 20 years for a \$20 million piece of equipment, after the 20 years, it did not hold a value for the City any longer. Lue pointed out this was an accounting issue.

Fowler noted many of the assets associated with the COLT Railroad had been in place for the full length of time one would depreciate those assets, but they still had value to the City and represented a substantial investment. Fowler agreed it had been written down to zero from an accounting point of view, but believed it still had value.

Pitzer asked why this document was being included as he did not recall ever seeing it before. Lue replied it had never been included in a budget before, and they had been going through a process of collecting documents that were useful for a budget and including them in the budget. The asset useful life document was one of those items. Pitzer understood they would see it in future years going forward, and asked Lue if he was looking for feedback or guidance on anything. Lue replied he was always open to feedback. Pitzer thanked Lue for bringing it to their attention.

Treece made a motion to amend the budget document associated with B241-21 by including the asset useful life document, the CIP project pages, the missing sewer project page, and the missing water project page. The motion was seconded by Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Pitzer made a motion to withdraw B244-21 from the agenda. The motion was seconded by Treece.

Fowler asked for clarification. Treece replied it was the bill associated with the water rates. Treece explained it would be withdrawn from the agenda and would not be on the September 20, 2021 Council Meeting agenda for a vote.

The motion made by Pitzer and seconded by Treece to withdraw B244-21 from the agenda was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Treece commented that at a previous council meeting, Pitzer had mentioned the idea of adopting a resolution expressing the intent of Council with regard to the ARPA funds and using that resolution to direct the City Manager to bring back items that would inform the opinion of Council as they pursued additional public input. Treece felt there was some general consensus of the Council in the areas of a homeless shelter, a mental health

crisis rapid access treatment center, workforce development, and community violence initiatives, and those items would add up to about \$9.5 million. Thomas understood the associated dollar amounts were very high-level ballpark figures and that no real analysis had been done. Treece agreed and thought they needed to give the City Manager some flexibility as to the City's contribution toward those items and the threshold of Council while allowing him to work with the groups that were organizing around these initiatives.

Thomas asked Pitzer if he had drafted a resolution. Pitzer replied he did not have a resolution. Pitzer explained his rationale involved them speaking about some of these items being urgent and things they needed to move forward with in all due haste because he was having trouble reconciling that with taking 6-8 months for a more robust process. If there was consensus, they could include dollar amounts now as ballpark figures while telling the City Manager to move forward with those items. They would receive feedback later as to whether they were in the ballpark or not.

Thomas asked Pitzer if he would be open to running all of this through the HSC and the Housing and Community Development Commission (HCDC) before getting to that point and for that to be included in the resolution. Pitzer replied no, but noted those commissions could have input into the process as it moved along as he was open to feedback, ideas, and suggestions.

Thomas asked what the Council would be directing the City Manager to do. Pitzer replied that with the homeless shelter and the mental health treatment center, there were ideas, groups, and organizations that were moving forward and the City needed to be at the table for those discussions. Thomas asked how they would respond to all of the calls tonight for a more robust public process. Pitzer replied he thought most of the calls were asking for them to do something in those areas. Pitzer pointed out he was not sure about specifics, and thought the specifics were yet to be determined as he did not believe they could figure those out themselves. Pitzer stated he did not want to try to figure out how to run a mental health treatment center, but he was willing for the City to be at the table for those discussions and for the City Manager to determine who was best to be there to shepherd that process along. If it was urgent, they needed to move.

Thomas commented that he thought Pitzer was right in that a lot of people in the room supported those projects, but that was not what he had heard people saying tonight. Thomas thought those that had spoken had expressed the need for a more robust public process before decisions were made. Thomas stated the only way he could think to do that was to utilize systems and processes in place, namely those commissions, to look at the allocations.

Fowler explained structural inequities continued because they kept doing the same thing over and over again, and due to the inequities seen during COVID, she felt the expectation was for a different result. Fowler stated she did not believe they would gain a different result if they did not do things differently. Within the budget was \$75,000 for project management funding that the people working on the opportunities center could apply for once the City issued an RFP. Fowler commented that she was not suggesting it would take them a long period of time to listen to the very people they were trying to serve. They had all of the people in this room that had been spending time with them week after week and had expertise and reach out in the community. Fowler did not believe they should make assumptions about how much money a project needed without having listened first to the community they intended to serve, i.e., homeless people, people with mental health issues, people that were struggling with housing security, etc., as those people might tell a different tale of what would actually help them than the assumptions they and others were making. Fowler noted that every time she went out in the community and asked someone she would ordinarily not speak with about their life experiences, she was always surprised their answer was different than what she heard and what they tended to discuss at the dais. Fowler agreed they were struggling with what that process should look like, and even though she wanted to serve those that were most in need as fast as possible, she thought it would be a mistake to allocate money to

certain items at this point when they had not spent the time on an evidence-based process with regard to what might make a difference in the lives of people that were suffering in the community. Fowler explained she and a member of the Disabilities Commission had spoken to homeless people at Field Park on Sunday morning at 8:00 a.m., and one young man had spoken to them for 1.5 hours. Fowler stated all of the assumptions she had made about what would help that young man with regard to his mental health, physical health, and housing needs had not been completely accurate. Fowler commented that it was not enough for her to talk to one homeless person at Field Park regarding his experiences, and believed they needed those that were navigators of services to bring people into a safe environment and talk to them directly as to what would make a difference. Fowler noted she had also spoken to some small business people over the weekend, including a pastry chef, with regard to the shared kitchen, and that person had explained to her that the business model of the shared kitchen did not work for her burgeoning business. They had essentially missed the mark with the fabulous idea of the shared kitchen. Fowler suggested they figure out how to listen to the people they were trying to serve without making assumptions and move forward with issuing the RFPs that would provide planning money. Fowler also suggested they assess the assets of the community so they could then determine how to move forward. Fowler stated she would not vote in favor of a resolution that would move along some money or included any idea of going ahead and allocating some of that \$25 million in ARPA funding.

Treece suggested they do a resolution directing the City Manager to proceed with a RFP process with no dollar amounts for the homeless issue, a mental access treatment, etc. Fowler stated she did not agree with that. Peters understood Fowler did not want to move forward with an RFP process and wanted to instead talk to people in the neighborhood. Fowler thought they needed to design a process and noted this room was full of people that could help. Fowler suggested a working meeting to talk about how this could be done. Fowler wanted them to sit down with people face-to-face with regard to how to proceed. Fowler pointed out the RFP that had been issued right after COVID for someone to run an emergency shelter had missed the mark as there was not an organization that could have accomplished all of those things. In addition, by the time it had been issued, there was less than a month left to provide those services. The organization would have also had to provide a lot of money upfront to make it happen with reimbursements happening later. It had not met the needs at the time. Fowler stated she was not in favor of staff writing an RFP until they sat down with those that had come to them repeatedly asking for them to listen, collect data, and move forward in a different way this time.

Thomas stated he agreed with the comments of Fowler, but felt the commissions he had mentioned could facilitate the process. It was part of their role as advisors to the Council. Fowler commented that she did not feel they were well versed.

Treece stated he thought Fowler was trying to limit public input. Fowler disagreed. Treece explained he felt Fowler wanted to hear from one segment of the population. Fowler stated she wanted to hear from those they wanted to serve because they never listened to them. Treece did not agree. Treece understood Fowler wanted more input instead of listening to the input received and doing something about it. Treece did not think they could wait for another eight months and risk squandering the money.

Skala stated he was sympathetic to a lot of what Fowler said, and explained he did not connect with everyone, but over the years, he had connected with a lot of them. Skala pointed out he had started office hours 14 years ago, and had met with several of the people that had spoken tonight at his office hours this past Saturday so they were being provided some of that information. Skala noted he felt one of the most successful programs had involved community policing in the underserved areas because when they had met with people in those area, they had found emergent leadership. In addition, many of the solutions suggested were a lot less expensive and simpler than the ones people had assumed would help. Skala also thought it was important to realize they had to

proceed and go forward with some of this. Skala agreed they needed to have their ear open to a lot of people that were in dire straits, and when they spoke about ARPA funding, they would need to talk about it in terms of proportionality. Broadband, for example, was not about people or projects. It was sometimes the same. Skala noted they were all here to try to do the best they could for the community and the people, and some of the projects served that goal. Skala felt the people should be the ultimate benefactor for this so they needed to accomplish something with those funds. Skala stated they needed information as to how best to spend the money, but he did not believe it was a matter of saying they should do something else and that they were crazy if they did the same thing because he did not feel they were doing the same thing. Skala commented that he thought they were responding to a very different dialogue.

Thomas asked if they could open the public hearing again to allow the public to respond to what they had been discussing as he thought it would be helpful. Treece replied no, and explained B241-21, as amended, B242-21, and B243-21 would lie on the table until the September 20, 2021 Council Meeting.

Thomas made a motion to reopen the public hearing to listen to more public input on the ARPA funding process. The motion was seconded by Fowler, and was defeated by voice vote with only Fowler and Thomas voting yes.

PH33-21

Proposed construction of Fire Station #11 to be located north of the intersection of Scott Boulevard and State Route K.

PH33-21 was read by the City Clerk.

Public Works Director David Nichols provided a staff report.

Pitzer asked when construction would begin and how long it would take. Fire Chief Any Woody replied he was uncertain at this time. Early on, he had been told 8-10 months for construction time. Pitzer understood staff had talked to members of the neighborhoods around this area. Woody stated they had, and he believed the neighbors were excited to have the fire station there. Pitzer stated he appreciated that along with some of the elements that had been brought into it, to include the community room and training center.

Fowler commented that it appeared as though the fire station was located lower in the grade than the surrounding area based on the contour lines of the diagram, and noted she was worried about stormwater runoff. Fowler asked if it would set low with more elevation around it or was it the same elevation as the areas around it. Nichols replied he had not paid much attention to the actual grades, but did not believe the architect would depress this into the ground without managing the stormwater. Nichols explained the piping would go to a retention basin on the northwest corner.

Nichols noted they would come back with a bid call ordinance once the final plans and specifications were complete so the Council would see this again soon, and they would then have a better date as to construction.

Fowler stated the drawings made it appear as though the areas on the external circumference around the building were higher than where the building would be located. Glascock commented that there was a drop inlet with a pipe at the very bottom of the drawing where the street was located, and that was the low area. Toward the top was the same thing, and that was the low area on that side. Fowler understood the building was higher than the surrounding area because she could not see the contour lines for where the building would be placed. Glascock stated that was correct.

Nichols explained there would be reviews of the iterations of the plan, and tonight they were asking for permission to move forward with the final drawings.

Treece understood they would not build off of these drawings. Nichols stated no, and explained these were designs and they would now move to construction documents.

Treece opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Treece closed the public hearing.

Pitzer made a motion directing staff to move forward with construction plans and

specifications for City of Columbia Fire Station #11. The motion was seconded by Treece and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH34-21 Proposed construction of sanitary sewer rehabilitation project #8 in the Parkade Boulevard, Lynnwood Drive and Albert-Oakland Park areas.

PH34-21 was read by the City Clerk.
Utilities Director Dave Sorrell provided a staff report.
Treece opened the public hearing.
There being no comment, Treece closed the public hearing.

Pitzer made a motion directing staff to proceed with the Sanitary Sewer Rehabilitation #8 project. The motion was seconded by Skala and approved by voice vote. Waner had stepped out of the meeting room during the vote on this item.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

R141-21 Declaring the intent of the City Council on utilization of the funds anticipated to be generated by the proposed ten (10) year extension of the one-eighth of one percent local parks sales tax; declaring priorities for expenditure of funds for additional parks projects in the capital improvement plan if additional funds become available.

The resolution was read by the City Clerk.
Treece noted there was an amendment sheet that reflected the funds and what staff had moved around based on the public input they had received at a prior meeting.
Thomas asked on which priority list the Bear Creek Trail project, from Blue Ridge to Brown Station Park, was located. Griggs replied they had moved the Bear Creek Trail project, from the Fairgrounds to Lange, to be on the Priority 1 list, and the Bear Creek Trail project, from Albert-Oakland Park to Lange, was on the Priority 2 list. Thomas asked if that was the same as Blue Ridge to Brown Station Park. Griggs replied it was not all of the way to Brown Station Park. It was from Albert-Oakland to Lange. Thomas understood that was on the Priority 2 list. Griggs stated that was correct.
Dee Dokken, 804 Again Street, stated she was speaking for the Sierra Club and noted they appreciated the additional \$500,000 for land acquisition although they felt that amount should have been higher. It raised the amount to eight percent of the total, but when people were surveyed, they had indicated they wanted 24 percent for land acquisition. Dokken noted they were happy with the amount identified, but felt more should have come out of the Fairgrounds project for it. Dokken stated she had been alarmed to hear talk of any 2015 park sales taxes that came in to be used for the Sports Fieldhouse since land acquisition had been on the list for which people had voted but the second phase of the Sports Fieldhouse had not. Dokken thought it had been settled that they would restore the land acquisition funding if possible and the only question involved how they would account for it. Dokken noted she was glad people had spoken up for that and hoped it was settled again.
Lawrence Simonson, 201 W. Broadway, explained he was representing the PedNet Coalition and wanted to commend the Council and staff for taking their request for additional trails seriously by doing everything possible to meet that request. Simonson thanked them for the work they did during the budget session to find a way to make all the trail projects requested along with the Sports Fieldhouse and the Northeast Regional Park a possibility. Simonson also thanked the Convention and Visitors Bureau for their part in ensuring all of the great facilities and amenities could become a part of what made Columbia a great place to live, work, and play. In addition, Simonson praised Gabe Huffington, Mike Snyder, Mike Griggs, and the entire Parks and Recreation Department staff for their hard work in meeting the requests of the public. PedNet had thoroughly

reviewed the changes made to the Park Sales Tax Priority 1 and Priority 2 lists and was impressed by the competency and professionalism of the Parks and Recreation Department. They understood compromises had to be made due to different challenges, but felt they had been well thought out, balanced, and reasonable. Simonson commented that based on this and their experience working with the Council and staff, the PedNet staff, board, and members would be showing full support for the park sales tax ballot initiative in November.

Barbara Jefferson stated she had watched the budget meeting from home and had noticed there had not been much money for Douglass Park, which was concerning. Jefferson commented that when thinking about parks and trails, she was not sure they had fixed what had been broken. Jefferson understood there had been reference to poor minority people making use of the parks and trails, and she did not feel money was being spent for everyone to truly enjoy what was paid for with taxpayer money. Jefferson stated she did not see that many people of color making use of the parks and trails. Jefferson suggested they really think about who was benefiting from the taxpayer money, and whether it was really everyone.

Peters asked for more information regarding the types of recreation and facilities people of color might want to use. Jefferson replied she appreciated the question and was not sure. Jefferson noted she did not want to go to football games. Jefferson commented that as far as she was concerned, Columbia did not have any entertainment for her. Jefferson stated she attended church, but understood not everyone attended church anymore. Jefferson noted she was not sure of the mixture of skin color at Albert-Oakland Park as she did not go to that park. Jefferson explained she also did not go to Douglass Park. Jefferson suggested the City invest in recreation that would be of interest to people of all skin colors. Jefferson pointed out she would not attend the Roots and Blues event at Stephens Lake Park either.

Skala explained Indian Hills Park was a very vital park. Jefferson asked if she was expected to go all of the way across town. Skala noted he lived close to it. Jefferson stated she understood and knew all about Indian Hills, to include the shootings. Jefferson understood people in the Indian Hills area would come to Douglass Park to be around people of their own.

Dani Perez noted she was supportive of trails and parks as she did not own a car for multiple reasons, and the trails were useful for those without a car. Perez agreed with not seeing many people of color on the trails as she walked them every day. Perez stated she did not have the answers, but knew there was not a lot of accessible public transportation to certain parks. Perez wondered why Cosmo Park did not have a bus stop. Perez commented that she thought they should be more mindful with regard to entertainment for different types of people. Perez noted she was a Latinx person, and everyone was different. Perez felt asking about recreating outside was a legitimate question because many people did not think people of color did things outside beyond having a barbeque. Perez believed further conversation in that regard was needed when speaking about parks. Indian Hills Park was a very nice park, but it was difficult for people without access to a car to get there. Perez suggested they also consider accessibility for those with disabilities. Perez thought it was great that there were a lot of concrete areas at parks, but noted not everyone had the means to drive themselves to the park entryways, and hoped that would be considered in the future as well. Perez asked that other wheels also be considered, such as skating, scooters, and wheelchairs. Those in wheelchairs tended to be overlooked, and they needed to be more mindful of that. Perez noted everyone deserved to explore the great outdoors and enjoy a car-free life.

Skala made a motion to amend R141-21 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Pitzer and approved by voice vote. Peters and Treece had stepped out of the meeting room during the vote on this item.

Thomas stated he believed this had been a good process with a lot of public input in a particular direction, and staff had responded with some good recommendations that fit within their plan even though it had not been their first proposal. Thomas felt they had reached a happy conclusion as to which projects would be funded.

Skala referred to the community policing pilot program whereby they had focused on four underserved areas, which also had large populations of people of color. The gatherings had been useful as the suggestions had been mostly simple solutions for complicated problems, such as street lights, sidewalks, and public facilities. The City had been disappointing with items such as public facilities, but other items had been relatively inexpensive. Skala suggested they pay some attention to that. This was a parks category, and they would approve projects that made trails accessible to people. Skala pointed out people had habits and their own ways with regards to the outdoors, and thought they should be mindful of the distances, car travel, etc. Skala stated he appreciated the input received and the work of the Parks and Recreation Department.

R141-21, as amended, was read by the City Clerk, and the vote was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, WANER, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

B267-21

Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for the purchase of buses and para-transit vans for the GoCOMO Public Transit System.

The bill was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Skala explained the reason he had removed this from the consent agenda was to ask about small buses, such as the paratransit sized vehicles, which were ADA compliant. Skala understood staff had indicated those types of vehicles did not meet the overall needs of the community. The smaller vehicles used gasoline or diesel fuel, the three CNG paratransit vans had numerous engine problems. In addition, they only had one entrance and exit point. Skala commented that staff had provided justifications, but was not very happy as he did not feel it terribly responsive to some of the needs they had, given their population and issues in terms of extending routes.

Nichols pointed out not all of the grant would be used for capital purchases. Some would be moved for operating expenses.

B267-21 was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, WANER, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. 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 City Clerk.

B261-21

Granting the issuance of a conditional use permit to JAJ, LLC to allow an “assembly or lodge hall” use on property located on the west side of Port Way and south of Bull Run Drive (705 Port Way) in an M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood) zoning district (Case No. 217-2021).

B262-21

Approving the Final Plat of “Rory Point, Plat No. 1” located on the west side of Sinclair Road and north of Cascades Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 202-2021).

B263-21

Approving the Final Plat of “Columbia Industrial Development Corporation, Plat No. 2C” located on the north side of Mojave Court and east of Brown Station Road; authorizing performance contracts (Case No. 116-2021).

B264-21

Approving the Final Plat of “Crossroads North Plat 1-A” located on the

- southwest corner of the Vandiver Drive and Range Line Street intersection; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 181-2021).
- B265-21 Approving the Final Plat of "OPR Subdivision" located on the south side of Old Plank Road and west of Bethel Church Road (200 W. Old Plank Road); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 200-2021).
- B266-21 Approving the Final Plat of "The Villages at Arbor Pointe Plat 5" located on the west side of Arbor Pointe Parkway and north of Waco Road; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 207-2021).
- B268-21 Authorizing the replacement and rehabilitation of a portion of storm drain pipe on Aldeah Avenue, south of Ash Street; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division or authorizing a contract for a portion of the work using a term and supply contract.
- B269-21 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B270-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for Parks and Recreation Department reimbursement of expenses to Risk Management.
- B271-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for construction of the Runway 2-20 extension project at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- R142-21 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the east side of Scott Boulevard and west of Persimmon Road (5170 S. Scott Boulevard) (Case No. 215-2021).
- R143-21 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located along both sides of Van Horn Tavern Road and east of Highway UU (5500 W. Van Horn Tavern Road) (Case No. 226-2021).
- R144-21 Granting a temporary waiver from the requirements of Section 16-258 of the City Code to allow amplified sound exceeding a distance of 100 feet in the Clary-Shy Community Park located at 1701 W. Ash Street for the Columbia Chamber of Commerce's "Small Business Fest" event.
- R145-21 Authorizing a lease agreement with NPG of Missouri, LLC for the installation, operation and maintenance of a camera and associated equipment on a portion of the exterior roof area of the north terminal building at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- R146-21 Authorizing an agreement for professional services with JAWhitt, LLC for development of a comprehensive program to assist disadvantaged business enterprises.
- R147-21 Authorizing an agreement for professional services with Bartlett & West, Inc. for design of structural repairs to rehabilitate the Green Valley Drive bridge over the Hominy Creek.
- R148-21 Authorizing execution of signature cards and certificates of resolution with Commerce Bank; providing for administrative authority to amend any banking authorization or corporate resolution forms and verify authorized signatories on the accounts held by City at such institution.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions read by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, WANER, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

None.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B273-21 Authorizing a second amendment to the collective bargaining agreement with Columbia Police Officers Association, Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #26.
- B274-21 Authorizing an amendment to the collective bargaining agreement with Laborers' International Union of North America, Local 955.
- B275-21 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to personnel policies, procedures, rules and regulations.
- B276-21 Adopting the FY 2022 Classification and Pay Plan; providing for FY 2022 salary adjustments relating to the Classification and Pay Plan.
- B277-21 Establishing plan year 2022 active employee medical premium rates, active employee dental premium rates, and non-Medicare medical and retiree dental premium rates for the City of Columbia; providing for payroll withholdings.
- B278-21 Voluntary annexation of property located on the south side of Richland Road and approximately 4,000 feet east of Rolling Hills Road; establishing permanent District R-1 (One-family Dwelling) zoning (Case No. 106-2021).
- B279-21 Rezoning property along the north side of Ivory Lane and west of Cutters Corner Lane from District PD (Planned Development) to District R-1 (One-family Dwelling) (Case No. 107-2021).
- B280-21 Granting design adjustments relating to the proposed Preliminary Plat of Old Hawthorne North located on the north side of Ivory Lane and the south side of Richland Road to allow longer block distances, a longer cul-de-sac length, and private residential driveways on collector streets (Case No. 105-2021).
- B281-21 Approving the Preliminary Plat of "Old Hawthorne North" located on the north side of Ivory Lane and the south side of Richland Road; authorizing a development agreement; directing the City Clerk to have the development agreement recorded (Case No. 105-2021).
- B282-21 Granting a design adjustment relating to the proposed Final Plat of Eastport Centre Plat 2-C located on the south side of Bull Run Drive and east of Port Way (5710 Bull Run Drive) to allow a terminal street without a turnaround at the closed end of Burnside Drive (Case No. 213-2021).
- B283-21 Approving the Final Plat of "Eastport Centre Plat 2-C" located on the south side of Bull Run Drive and east of Port Way (5710 Bull Run Drive);

- authorizing performance contracts (Case No. 213-2021).
- B284-21 Approving the Final Plat of "Forest Hills, Plat No. 2" located on the south side of Geyser Boulevard and west of Lake of the Woods Road; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 125-2021).
- B285-21 Approving the Final Plat of "Tandys Addition Block 1, Plat No. 1-A" located on the west side of College Avenue and south of Business Loop 70; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 93-2021).
- B286-21 Vacating a portion of a utility easement on Lot 3 within Westbury Village subdivision located on the west side of Scott Boulevard and south of Smith Drive (Case No. 111-2021).
- B287-21 Vacating utility easements within Arbor Falls, Plat 1 and Plat 2 located on the north side of Highway WW and south of Pergola Drive (Case No. 141-2021).
- B288-21 Authorizing a consolidated grant agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for FY 2022 transportation planning purposes (Case No. 276-2021).
- B289-21 Authorizing construction of the Grace Ellen Drive PCCE #27 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division or authorizing a contract for the work using a term and supply contract.
- B290-21 Authorizing a joint funding agreement for water resource investigations with the U.S. Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior for hydrological monitoring of well sites in the vicinity of the McBaine wetland treatment units and the Eagle Bluffs Conservation Area.
- B291-21 Authorizing a joint funding agreement with the U.S. Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior for operation and maintenance of a streamgage on Hinkson Creek to provide historical stream flow data and flood stage information.
- B292-21 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for crisis cooperative agreement program services to demonstrate measurable and sustainable progress toward achieving public health and healthcare preparedness capabilities and promote prepared and resilient communities.
- B293-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds to the Department of Public Health & Human Services for CARES Act COVID-19 expenses.
- B294-21 Authorizing a cost share request/agreement with the Missouri Department of Conservation for a Tree Resource Improvement and Maintenance (TRIM) grant for marketing consultant services to provide information on private tree care to improve the City's urban tree canopy; amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

X. REPORTS**REP66-21 Appointment of Stakeholders to the Hinkson Creek Collaborative Adaptive Management Stakeholder Committee.**

Skala explained he served on this committee and they were missing a couple of members. One was due to the demise of the Smart Growth group due to its success and the other was associated with a development council he was not sure still existed. Skala stated he, the Boone County representative, and a representative of the University of Missouri were suggesting those listed in the report be appointed, and they would appreciate Council agreeing.

Treece made a motion that Susan Hart and Leanne Tippet Mosby be appointed to the Hinkson Creek Collaborative Adaptive Management Stakeholder Committee. The motion was seconded by Peters and approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP67-21 CATSO Long-range Transportation Plan.

Teddy provided a staff report.

Thomas asked for a summary of the content of the memo he had provided to the CATSO Coordinating Committee, and Teddy provided a summary.

Thomas stated he thought it was more than just slimming down the performance measures, and understood it was to start a program to actually measure the performance measures. Presently, there was a long list of performance measures that were supposed to determine if the CATSO LRTP was achieving its goals, but they were not measured. Thomas noted he appreciated the recommendation to line up the CATSO LRTP with the CAAP as both were developed at about the same time. The process for the CATSO LRTP was the exact same as it had been every five or ten years going back to likely the middle of the last century, and it involved continually bringing forward more projects resulting in the City expanding.

Thomas asked for the next steps on the CATSO Committee as these suggestions were made but no action had been taken at the meeting a few weeks ago. Teddy thought they would do some work on the performance measures and the CAAP between the quarterly meetings. Thomas asked if that would be done at the staff level. Teddy replied yes, and explained they would then offer the CATSO Coordinating Committee some ideas. Teddy noted they were at a period of time whereby they would prepare for the next 5-year update in a few months so at some point this would just fold into that. Teddy commented that they had submitted a work program in the amount of about \$60,000 to obtain some professional services to help them with outreach in terms of public engagement. It was also something they planned to use with the Comprehensive Plan. If the Council wanted to change direction in the area of transportation, the Comprehensive Plan was a good place to do that. Thomas asked about the time frame associated with the next Comprehensive Plan. Teddy replied they would start next year, but they were already in discussions at the staff level with regard to how to approach the public engagement portion.

Thomas commented that in support of those efforts he wanted to make a motion that they as a Council ask the Climate and Environment Commission (CEC) to look at the CATSO LRTP alongside the CAAP, particularly the transportation section of the CAAP, with regard to the realignments needing to be made because at the moment the two plans were going in completely different directions.

Thomas made a motion directing the CEC to review the CATSO LRTP alongside the CAAP to identify any realignment that might be necessary. The motion was seconded by Fowler.

Skala stated he thought this was a good idea.

The motion made by Thomas and seconded by Fowler directing the CEC to

review the CATSO LRTP alongside the CAAP to identify any realignment that might be necessary was approved without objection.

REP68-21 Amendment to the FY 2021 Annual Budget - Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds.

Treece understood this report had been provided for informational purposes.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Lawrence Simonson, 201 W. Broadway, explained he was representing the PedNet Coalition and noted he was pleased with the conversation he had just heard regarding CATSO. Simonson stated PedNet wanted to encourage the Council, and was encouraged by the prior vote, to review the performance measures and evaluate the alignment of the CATSO LRTP with and against the goals of the City of Columbia. Simonson commented that he liked the idea of aligning the CATSO LRTP with the CAAP, and suggested they support the Chair of CATSO in his proposal to create a transit master plan.

Jeanne Mihail, 3101 Crawford Street, stated she wanted to shift the focus from planning in the short term with next year's budget to planning for the next decade, and specifically with regard to the redrawing of ward boundaries based on the 2020 census. Mihail explained she had expressed her interest in this project to Pitzer, who was her representative, and had shared recent analyses she had done of the ten years of prior municipal election participation data by ward and precinct. Mihail noted she had just started stitching together the 2020 census data to go with the precincts and wards to look at demographic data across the City in order to make informed and reasoned decisions with regard to how they might draw the ward boundaries. From her perspective, the primary reason for this was equity. When looking at the Council, they had done a nice job of gender equity, but had done a sorry job of representing the racial and ethnic diversity of the community. Mihail stated she believed drawing ward boundaries needed to be more than an exercise in just slightly altering what they already had. In the spirit of something new and the spirit of many of the comments this evening, Mihail thought they needed to do what they did based on data, and she planned on sharing what she was doing analytically in the hopes she could spur them to create a commission that thoughtfully considered the process.

Jonathon Asher, 313 William Street, appreciated the Council for listening to public comments at this time of night, and noted he had volunteered with Vidwest Studios in various roles since they had taken over the mantel of CAT-TV, to include helping to move and organize the equipment from the old space to the new space. Asher pointed out he had not been the only volunteer as they had received a lot of help. Asher understood the only thing that was holding up the funding the Council wanted Vidwest to have was the fact that Mediacom had not installed the fiber optic line. The content was being made, and the facility was running. The only party that had not held up their end of the deal was Mediacom. Asher understood the public, education, and government channels were in existence as a result of the monopoly of the cable companies with regard to owning the wires that went into the homes and not allowing others the use of them. Asher commented that while cable television was not something to which he paid attention, the monopoly affected him because he had a son in college that had to go to school online and his fiancé worked for a Fortune 300 company online through the Mediacom wires. Asher could not believe a company the size of Mediacom could shirk its responsibility for so long, and understood Vidwest had no grounds to sue or compel Mediacom to fulfill its legal obligations. The City, however, had standing in that respect. Asher noted the City was the only entity that could compel Mediacom to install the fiber optic line to make the channel possible. Those at Vidwest had done everything possible to hold up their end of

the bargain. Asher compared this to a project not being fully completed by a contractor and the City not paying its own employee because that had not been done. Asher reiterated he had an issue with the fact a company they were all beholden to in terms of service in order to function as human beings could drag its feet in a way that was strangling a tiny non-profit that wanted to do so much good. It was upsetting that there was a bureaucratic mess that kept them from moving forward.

Dani Perez asked the Council for some empathy and compassion as the Council was on a platform and were all white in terms of race. Perez commented that she was upset because she saw a white man telling off a woman for having the audacity to say they needed to talk more and meet with the people on the ground. Perez understood that might not have been the intention, but it was what she had observed. Perez stated she had privilege, an education, a family that loved her, and light skin, but the Latinx, Indigenous, and Asian person in her who was queer did not feel represented. Perez noted she kept hearing people saying the focus was on one demographic, or that they needed to focus only on people in the room. Perez explained she had cognitive and mental health issues, but was able to be medicated because she was lucky. There were people who would never come to council meetings and who also did not have the capacity to tell the Council what their needs were in a way the Council would understand. Perez did not feel the Council should exclude them. Columbia had Asian, Latinx, Slavic, and Middle Eastern populations, and some did not speak English. Perez wondered how their voices would be heard. Perez thought the City needed to reach out to all communities to be a part of the conversation with regard to the ARPA funding. Perez pointed out they also had people that were deaf or blind, who had difficulty accessing information on the internet. Perez reiterated she did not feel represented even though she attended many council meetings, and she attended because she knew those of demographics she was a part of would not or could not attend due to a disability, a job, children, the pandemic, etc. Perez believed priorities needed to change due to the pandemic, and pointed out the pandemic had not caused the issues, but had elevated them. Perez commented that she did not see any compassion and very little empathy at council meetings. Perez suggested doing something different so those that did not have the same privilege had a voice and reiterated that she believed the Council needed to come to them. In addition, regardless of the intent, the actions of the Council tended to activate people. Perez recommended the Council be mindful of their body language and that their actions mattered, especially since they were white and many of them were men. Perez thanked Thomas for trying to allow them to speak earlier. Perez understood there was proper order to things, but thought that needed to change due to COVID. Many people did not feel represented and did not agree with the assumptions and projects that would potentially be associated with ARPA funding. Perez reiterated that she believed the Council should talk to the many populations and groups instead of assuming how they felt or what they wanted.

Adam Saunders commented that he wanted to echo the accolades of Lawrence Simonson for the Parks and Recreation Department as he had also had the privilege of working with them over the past six years at Clary-Shy Park, which had been the home the ARC and was now also the home of the MU Healthcare Pavilion and the Agriculture Park. Saunders thought the Council might have been close to a motion, and appreciated their willingness to entertain more in terms of the Agriculture Park.

Traci Wilson-Kleekamp quoted a Canadian urban planner who said "the truth about a city's aspirations isn't found in its vision, it's found in its budget" as she felt that was something for them all to think about. Wilson-Kleekamp read from a post from *The Center for Community Solutions* dated July 30, 2021 entitled "Community Engagement on American Rescue Plan Act Dollars Vary Widely across the Country" and noted it had

been shared with the City's Public Information Officer. Wilson-Kleekamp thought the Council could have set up a process for public engagement over the summer, and pointed out many people could not attend council meetings because they were inaccessible in terms of the time. Wilson-Kleekamp noted she had a lot of privilege with a grandchild that was only with her every other week and the fact she was able to stay up late. The City did not provide childcare, had horrible public transit, and did not get proximate to the communities needing support. Wilson-Kleekamp stated she thought it had been interesting that a lot white people had advocated for people that were marginalized tonight as she felt that was radical for Columbia. Wilson-Kleekamp commented that she thought it was crappy that the public had not been allowed to speak to the changing course of the conversation regarding ARPA funds. The Council had the opportunity to speak all night while the public only had the opportunity to speak for a little bit. Wilson-Kleekamp noted she did not like the way Treece spoke to Fowler and Thomas, and did not agree with the comment made to her the other day indicating her behavior was similar to the protesters that had been at a prior meeting without their masks. Wilson-Kleekamp stated she found it extremely offensive as a black person. Wilson-Kleekamp explained she and others were present because they were the bench-holders for democracy for the people that could not be there, and believed they were asking legitimate, reasonable, and thoughtful questions. They were not trying to create a hostile environment. Wilson-Kleekamp suggested they set up processes to engage people to provide input because the ARPA funding was a once in a lifetime opportunity to do something with regard to equity, and she did not understand why they would not try to proceed in that manner. Wilson-Kleekamp hoped the Council received the message that the budget did not have the data and analyses necessary. Wilson-Kleekamp suggested the Council go to the community as council meetings did not have to be held in City Hall, and asked them to consider doing things differently than they had in the past.

Roy Lovelady understood many different white groups had spoken tonight with regard to how black and brown people were impacted by COVID, and believed there had not been many black and brown people in attendance because they did not feel the Council trusted their stories. In addition, some did not even know they could even attend meetings. In response to the inquiry of Peters with regard to the interests of people of color since they did not seem to utilize trails, Lovelady explained they went where they were systematically designed to be and where they trusted each other, and in those places violence wreaked havoc because of the lack of resources. Lovelady stated he would like for black and brown people to be a part of this process, for the City to trust their stories, and for the City to apply what they were saying in order to make a true change. Lovelady reiterated a lot of black and brown people did not come to the podium because they felt their stories would fall on deaf ears. If the Council met them where they were, they might have the ability to change the narrative. Lovelady pointed out that most of the people that had come tonight because they wanted a part of the ARPA funds, and had collected data in that effort. Lovelady commented that if he ran a non-profit, he would likely send someone that looked like those he was collecting data from to collect that data. They could then report back to someone that could come to a council meeting to tell the stories and apply for some type of grant or funds. Lovelady questioned the process and the various organizations trying to obtain money for the people since the people were still struggling. Lovelady believed the mark was being missed somewhere if people were still struggling. Lovelady noted that if he was at the dais, it would send a message to him to leave that place of comfort and obtain information directly from the sources in order to supply people with the correct resources. Lovelady stated he wanted to make sure the voices that were heard were the ones everyone had come to talk about tonight. Lovelady commented that everyone agreed the black and brown community had been impacted by COVID, and suggested they determine how to fix it. Lovelady pointed out he had counted about 36 people speaking tonight, and only one had been black or brown, but all had

agreed the black and brown community had been impacted the worst by COVID.

Jeff Stack, Sexton Avenue, commented that he had given up on coming to council meetings a few decades ago because he felt those councils had been unresponsive even though he was a white male with unearned privilege. Stack thanked Fowler for having front porch type discussions even when she had another job. It was the kind of outreach needed and was good modeling. Stack stated he appreciated Thomas for wanting an impromptu public comment time, and understood why Treece might have been frustrated. Stack noted he was a bit frustrated as well, and it was likely due to the privilege of not having to listen to other people at times. Stack explained he understood that Treece might not have been thinking or feeling that way, but it was the reality. Stack pointed out he wanted to be engaged because he believed they had a really special opportunity in terms of ARPA funding to make the money actually mean something. Stack commented that he had been frustrated with the discussion earlier tonight because it seemed as though there had been consensus to wait until after the City's budget was all settled to come back to the ARPA funds. Stack agreed with Wilson-Kleekamp in that this robust conversation could have started in June. Stack felt they were continuing to ignore people in their midst that were in urgent need of care, and provided Ernest Johnson, who was scheduled to be executed next month for killing three people in the community, as an example. Stack noted Johnson was a man that had been in their midst and had wanted help with drug rehabilitation, was intellectually disabled, and had been neglected. Stack stated they had people in the community now that were in dire straits and he believed they needed to do better. They could not just deal with athletic complexes as those were most likely for the privileged people on the south side of town. Stack suggested the Council exercise compassion and empathy, and try to realize where they were at now, the opportunities they had, and the opportunities they were about to squander. Stack encouraged the Council to have a robust effort to listen to those that needed assistance.

Barbara Jefferson noted she continually heard the words "poor" and "minority" and they were easy words to use, but those in that category received so little benefit. Jefferson suggested the use of those terms stop since they were not really benefiting. Jefferson understood there had been discussion about involving the commissions, and pointed out she served on the HCDC. Jefferson explained they had received 14 applications, and the "how does" question on at least 11 of the applications had been answered with "yes" which she did not find appropriate. Jefferson assumed it was the same response from prior years because those organizations knew they would receive what they wanted. Jefferson stated she did not feel it was good to depend on the committees of the City because she felt something was going since the same organizations tended to receive benefits with inadequate applications. As a member of that group, Jefferson felt it had been a waste of her time. Jefferson did not believe those applications should have been forwarded to her to be rated since they were not completed appropriately.

Susan Maze, 902 N. Seventh Street, wanted to point out the issue of the unsheltered in her neighborhood, which had existed since 2014, and noted no one associated with the government of the City of Columbia had ever come to talk to her about it until Fowler was elected to the Council. No one had approached the neighborhood to ask what needed to be done or how it should happen. Maze assumed conversations were happening, but they were not happening with them. Maze explained a reason People Before Projects had been started was because the ARPA funding was once in a lifetime money. Previously, she had assumed there was no money to assist unsheltered people, and because there was no money there was no point in talking about it. Maze pointed out there was now money, and she understood how politics, power, and influence worked so they have begun that effort. Maze stated she thought it was important for the Council to realize the people affected by their policies and those that needed things from the City did not get

talked to by the City.

Dee Dokken explained she was representing the Sierra Club and appreciated the changes that might be happening with the CATSO LRTP in terms of aligning it more with the CAAP, having measurable performance goals, and having more public process. Dokken understood the Boone County representative of CATSO had indicated the County did not have a plan similar to CAAP and was not sure how much that could thwart this effort, and noted the Sierra Club would probably try to help bring the County along with any progressive actions.

Waner asked if there was any indication as to how the excess reserve money would be spent. Glascock replied no if Waner was referring to the general fund excess, and explained that would come from discussions with the Council.

Waner commented that she wanted to speak to some of the public comment that had been made earlier with regard to the CCUA in terms of the Agriculture Park. Waner pointed out there was a lot of data that supported the work CCUA was trying to do in the community. Waner understood 34 percent of Boone County residents had low food access, and many of the qualified census tracts in the community that were the hardest impacted were touching the Columbia Farmers Market. Waner stated she would really like to see the City partner with the County in getting the Agriculture Park project across the finish line because they partnered with many organizations to include the Food Bank, CPS, Phoenix Programs, and Patriot Place. It was truly an investment in people and would be an asset that stayed on their balance sheet. Waner reiterated she thought that was worthwhile for them to pursue in conjunction with the County, and understood a big piece of the funds was to support the community, but noted they also needed to make the money stretch and partnering with the County and private fundraising was a good way to proceed.

Peters explained they had neglected some of the neighborhoods when working to adopt the Unified Development Code (UDC), and certainly the neighborhoods surrounding the downtown, including the West Ash, North Central, Old Southwest, Grasslands, Benton Stephens, and East Campus neighborhoods, in terms of being at risk to have properties combined and redeveloped. Peters suggested creating an ad-hoc committee to look at the impact of that on the neighborhoods and determine what might need to be changed within the UDC. Peters wanted to know how the Council felt in that regard. Peters noted she also wondered about a second ad hoc committee to review the other strange things that had come up with regard to the UDC as she understood the Community Development Department was maintaining a list. Peters provided the 300 foot street length requirement and sidewalks being required on both sides of the street as items they could review due to the amount of concrete involved. Peters explained she did not want to ask the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) to address it, which was why she was suggesting some ad hoc committees that could then go to them with their recommendations. Peters asked for the thoughts of the Council.

Thomas commented that he did not have any objection to the proposal of Peters, particularly with regard to how the UDC worked for some of the inter-neighborhoods.

Thomas stated he supported the comments of Waner to use some of the general fund surplus to assist the Agriculture Park as it was a real success. Thomas understood it had been 20 years in the making and there had been two previous attempts of something similar whereby people had the opportunity to learn from those experiences. Thomas noted there one final piece to finish, and he believed the City should be a part of it. Thomas commented that he thought they needed a process to decide how much of the surplus funds they wanted to spend in the short and medium term along with all of the potential ways to do that, and felt the Agriculture Park would rise to the top regardless.

Treece commented that he was not opposed to the suggestion of Peters, but noted they had a lot of plates spinning at this time. Treece did not know who would be on the ad hoc committee or when they would come back to the Council. It seemed to be a lot to embrace at this time.

Skala explained that in the past there had been a street standards committee that had made recommendations with regard to the width of streets and sidewalks on both sides, and that work had never been revisited. Skala stated he thought some of the other items mentioned were on the radar of the Community Development staff and the PZC to review, but not necessarily the issues involving the neighborhoods surrounding the downtown in terms of combining lots and redevelopment.

Peters thought it would be nice to get a group together. Peters understood there were a lot of plates spinning but felt this would be six months to a year in the making so she wanted to get the process started.

Fowler stated she appreciated the suggestion of Peters and wanted time to reach out to neighborhood association leaders since many of those neighborhoods were in the First Ward to determine where they were in terms of having the energy to participate at this time. Fowler asked if she could report back at the next council meeting. Peters stated she was agreeable.

Pitzer noted he wanted to know what some of the negative issues were with respect to the UDC and how those issues had played out. Pitzer understood Peters had mentioned the combining of lots, and the Council had voted several of those down. Pitzer wondered if there were others that were happening that he might not know about. Pitzer pointed out the issue of short-term rentals would likely impact the neighborhoods mentioned, and that might be the most impactful thing that would happen.

Peters understood the Community Development Director had the authority to allow lots to be combined so the neighborhoods with R-2, R-3, or multi-family zoning could be impacted without the issue ever coming before the Council. The issue in the East Campus neighborhood had been brought forward to Council because the neighbors had voiced concerns. Peters understood a couple of lots at Broadway and Fyfer Place had been combined because it was allowed by the UDC and no one had noticed it had been done. Peters thought that needed to be reviewed along with the appropriate overlays.

Peters suggested they speak with the impacted neighborhoods within their respective wards to determine if someone would be willing to take the time to participate in this effort before they lost those neighborhoods.

Peters understood the census population numbers were not too far off, and wondered if they wanted to proceed with a commission or just move about 2,000 people around while keeping things relatively the same. Peters noted they had heard from a constituent tonight that had indicated it needed to be reviewed for changes, but when significant changes had been discussed ten years ago, people had felt it was not appropriate. Peters pointed out they were the representatives of the City so she was not sure they needed another commission to deal with the issue, but wanted to hear the thoughts of others.

Fowler asked if this issue could be taken up at a time that was not so late in the night. Peters replied yes.

Peters explained that if they made ward determinations by the middle or end of October, it would allow the new ward boundaries to be used for the upcoming April elections. Peters understood they might not want to do that and she did not want people to feel they were being pushed in that direction. Peters asked the Council to look at the information that had been provided by staff with regard to reapportioning the wards so they could discuss how to proceed at the next meeting.

Skala noted it had not been discussed, but he thought there had been some

acknowledgement or a placeholder for the Northeast Park, i.e., the Fairgrounds, and wanted to ensure they kept that in the mix in terms of projects.

Skala asked for the status of the West Area Plan. Glascock replied he had not talked to the County about that lately, but would ask the next time he met with them.

Skala asked for a status on the recycling containers at Home Depot. Glascock replied he would bring something back in that regard.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 12:31 a.m.