



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Tuesday, September 3, 2019
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 3, 2019, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, and THOMAS were present. The Interim City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of August 19, 2019 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Ms. Peters.

Mayor Treece made a motion to add B290-19 to the introduction and first reading section of the agenda. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Skala asked for clarification. Mayor Treece replied the City's agreement with Columbia Public Schools to provide school resource officers had run through June 27, 2019. The Council had sent a letter to the Board of Education asking for further dialogue on that issue, but had not yet received a response. The City's agreement automatically extended to October 1, 2019, but there was not any extension beyond that date, and tonight would have been the last date to introduce a new contract. As a result, he wanted to amend the agenda to add this bill which would extend the current agreement until November 1, 2019 to allow time for the Columbia Public Schools to negotiate an agreement for Council consideration or provide them time to transition to another school safety system.

Mr. Pitzer understood discussion and vote would occur at the next meeting. Mayor Treece stated that was correct.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Trapp to add B290-19 to the introduction and first reading section of the agenda was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The agenda, as amended, including the consent agenda and the addition of B290-19 to introduction and first reading, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Skala.

Mayor Treece explained they had a special guest from Santiago, Chile, Ms. Constanza Astete. He noted she was a 16 year old rotary exchange student who was enrolled at Hickman High School. He pointed out Santiago had a population of 6.6 million people, but her town only had about 2,000 people. He asked everyone to welcome Ms. Astete to Columbia. He explained Earl and Kim Kraus were hosting her as their daughter was oversees as well.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC55-19 Jeffrey Hempstead and Irwin Schneider - Update on this past year activities of Columbia Neighborhood Watch.

Mr. Schneider stated he and Mr. Hempstead were present to update the Council on their activities as part of the Columbia Neighborhood Watch (CNW) this past year. He pointed out CNW was an all-volunteer group, and as a result, they used 100 percent of their funds to run the program. He commented that they had been steadily growing and making their presence known and had attended meetings held by the Columbia Police Department. He explained their Board was made up of nine members that had donated over 1,100 hours thus far this year and who sometimes donated money as well. They did not receive any monetary compensation and did not have any paid staff. He commented that all of the materials and services provided were without cost to those that wanted to join and benefit from being a CNW member. He stated they had participated in several public events this past year with an information booth to raise awareness and membership. They had added 145 new members. In order to increase their credibility, they had secured a Better Business Bureau accreditation and a Silver Seal of Transparency from GuideStar, a non-profit rating organization. They had continued to give presentations about CNW to organizations in Columbia and had applied for grants to run a public relations campaign in the 2020 calendar year to further assist in raising awareness of the CNW program. He explained they published a quarterly newsletter, which they sent out through their email service, and it allowed them to update their roster as members moved out of Columbia. He commented that they emphasized that one should say something if one saw something and to report it to the police, and noted that they felt CNW was an integral part of community policing and the Columbia Police Department. Over this past year, their roster had been used by the Columbia Police Department to reach out to their members. In addition, they had conducted six trainings thus far this year. Five of those were open to the general public while the other was a private, onsite training. He reiterated that this had resulted in 145 new members and 14 new captains, to include some people from the Strategic Plan areas. He provided a handout of his comments to the Council.

SPC56-19 Maria Oropallo - Concerns from city voters.

Ms. Oropallo, 208 E. Briarwood Lane, commented that voters were still signing, collecting, and educating each other about the value of a performance audit. She believed there was misinformation along with a lack of understanding with regard to what would be accomplished by a performance audit, and referred to a discussion she had held with City employees. She stated the City's fiscal year ended on September 30, 2019, and the proposed new budget document had projected tax revenues would be down because they would not actually have more information until December. If those projections were true, she could think of no better time to review the City's policies and practices. She felt it would be better to have some idea as to whether there was enough to do enough. She thought they should look at whether the City was operating economically, efficiently, and effectively now, and that would include revenue analyses, spending by departments, program management, etc. A performance audit would provide the elected body with an objective third-party analysis of operations to help improve performance and reduce costs. A focus on performance would cover benefits accomplished for citizens along with due process and fairness in the delivery of service. A performance audit would bring together partnership, participation, transparency, and broad application. She commented that she believed Mr. Glascock's work predicated on

his stated values of building and nurturing relationships could be helped with a starting point of informed data-driven decisions.

SPC57-19 Dale H. Roberts, Columbia Police Officers Association - The need for a performance audit by the state auditor.

Mr. Roberts, 1301 Vandiver Drive, provided a handout and explained he was present on behalf of the Columbia Police Officers Association (CPOA). He noted that 18 months ago, the CPOA, the Columbia Professional Firefighters, and the Columbia Board of Realtors had submitted a request for a performance audit, and wanted to remind the Council of that request. He felt now was a good time since they were discussing the budget and because there had been a change in the management of the City. He stated he did not have any reservations about Mr. Glascock's management and did not want him to be tarnished by anything that had carried over from the mistakes or misbehavior of his predecessor. He believed an audit between administrations was a good management practice. He understood the City had \$13 million above and beyond the rainy day fund in the reserve account, and the CPOA could identify examples of waste and abuse. He thought there were likely other examples as well. He believed everyone agreed the City needed more police officers and could not afford many more police officers. As a result, revenues would need to be found somewhere, and taxpayers had shown in the past a resistance to support increases in revenue under the current conditions. He understood some felt taxpayers would not vote for an increase while an audit was pending, but stated he thought taxpayers would not vote for an increase without an audit. He asked the Council to reconsider the issue.

SPC58-19 Mark Johnston, Mid Missouri Radio Control Association - Thank the city for use of leased property.

Mr. Johnston, 209 Longfellow Lane, explained he was representing the Mid-Missouri Radio Control Association (MMRCA) and they had leased property adjacent to the Wastewater Treatment Facility from the City since 2012. He noted over \$15,000 in improvements had been made to the property, and those improvements had been paid for by MMRCA club members. He stated they wanted to thank the City for this agreement, and in order to give back, they were helping to raise funds for the Food Bank's Buddy Pack program. This year's event in late July had resulted in over \$1,800 in donations to the Food Bank, and they planned to hold this event again. He reiterated his thanks to the City for allowing them to use that property.

SPC59-19 Kerri Schafer - Support of the conversion therapy ban.

Ms. Schafer, 809 N. Eighth Street, stated she wanted to speak in support of a proposed ordinance prohibiting the practice of conversion therapy on minors as it was important to her and many others. She explained she was a licensed psychologist working at the MU Counseling Center where she provided therapy to many LBGTQ students and was also the Vice President of the Transgender Health Network, which aimed to improve access and quality of healthcare to transfolks in Mid-Missouri. She commented that conversion therapy was an abusive power that had been widely discredited and renounced by many healthcare organizations and licensing bodies, and asked the Council to ban it in the City of Columbia. She noted there was widespread agreement in the healthcare community that sexual orientation and gender identity were not changeable traits, that LBGTQ identities represented normal and positive ways that human sexuality and gender developed, and that attempts to change them resulted in long-lasting harm. She explained conversion therapy was any practice or treatment that sought to change an individual's sexual orientation or gender identity, which included behaviors, gender expressions, and sexual and romantic attractions. In 2009, the American Psychological Association issued a report based on years of research outlining the direct harms of conversion therapy, which included depression, guilt, helplessness, hopelessness,

shame, social withdrawal, substance abuse, lower self-esteem, increased self-hate, and suicide. She commented that this involved a population of young people that were already at an astoundingly high risk of suicide when they were not supported by the adults in their lives. She felt allowing the practice of conversion therapy in the community was to knowingly allow trauma to be inflicted on an already vulnerable population. She believed people that were trusted to provide guidance and healing and chose to provide conversion therapy were cosigning the belief that there was something wrong with a young person's identity or expression. They were giving young people hope for change, often to be more congruent with their own or a family member's religious belief when they did not have any scientifically valid evidence that was even possible or safe. It left young people with deep shame, not only for being who they were, but also for being unable to change through no fault of their own when promised change was possible. She felt this left them with hopelessness because they had been deceived into believing there was not any affirming path to adulthood. She noted the professional recommendations for appropriate treatments for LGBTQ young people and their families were in direct contrast with conversion therapy. Treatments that provided accurate information on sexual orientation, sexuality, and gender increased family and school support. She listed the major healthcare organizations that had condemned conversion therapy, which included the American Academy of Pediatrics, the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, the American Psychiatric Association, and the American Counseling Association among others. All had expressed LGBTQ identities were not pathology and could not and did not need to be changed. She stated 18 states and Washington D.C. had laws or regulations banning conversion therapy practiced by licensed medical providers on minors. Neither the State of Missouri nor any cities within Missouri currently had a ban for conversion therapy for minors. She commented that the City of Columbia had already taken important steps ahead of the State in demonstrating the value of LGBTQ lives by ensuring legal rights and protections, and felt it should be a leader by protecting youth from this dangerous practice. She felt laws were needed at the local and state levels to protect LGBTQ children and teens from licensed providers that would practice conversion therapy. She pointed out most conversion therapy was practiced by religious and lay-counselors who would not be subject to the regulations by these laws, but a local ordinance banning it could be a tool in creating a social norm against it. She believed it could serve as a tool for youth and allies to find safe and appropriate treatment and support. Uninformed parents and counselors who were exploring options might think twice about subjecting a young person to conversion therapy, and it would send a message to the community that no one's identity or expression was in need of changing. She stated conversion therapy still happened in Columbia and other parts of Missouri, and within the next few weeks, they would hear personal accounts from people who had gone through it. She believed the Council had an obligation to protect the youth from this dangerous, ineffective, and unnecessary practice, and that they owed this to those that had survived conversion therapy, those who had not, and any youth suffering now or who might be subjected to it in the future.

SPC60-19 Lynn Maloney - Transparency Matters.

Ms. Maloney commented that she was speaking on behalf of Transparency Matters and was urging the Council to support a performance audit. She believed a performance audit would address the causes and create solutions to high turnover and multiple vacancies in essential service departments, such as utilities and public safety. She wondered how effective and efficient the City's plans were for keeping up with the market demand of essential staff. She stated the performance audit would investigate the frustration of the stated and actual function and use of the City's many boards and commissions, like the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB) and the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee. She understood Mr. Thomas had indicated the possibility of the CPRB meeting with the Council to discuss the CPRB mission and function as it currently spent a lot of meeting time wondering about its mission and function. She felt an audit of all boards and

commissions were needed in relation to their function within the City. She believed the audit would explain issues related to access to information about City finances and how they were managed, such as surpluses and lack of funds. She stated the audit would look at recommendations passed by the Council that were not implemented by City staff, and provided the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence recommendations approved in 2014 as an example as many of those recommendations had not been implemented. She commented that an internal auditor for the City had revealed a breach between policy and practice for add-pays in the amount of \$871,000 as these small reimbursements were practiced unevenly. It had taken that auditor three months to find the misalignment between the policy and implementation of the policy. She wondered how much the City might have saved or how much integrity and efficiency might be restored by a review of policies across City departments. As they prepared for next year's budget, she believed they should think of a performance audit as a way to potentially save significant sums of money. She stated the estimated cost to bring in a team of senior auditors to do a citywide performance audit over three years was \$500,000-\$750,000, and at 0.06 percent of the annual budget, she felt that was a bargain for the potential savings it could yield. She commented that a performance audit could increase efficiency by finding inconsistencies in practice, increase integrity by reviewing actual practice in contrast to policy, increase transparency in terms of how the City spent money and implemented policy, and improve the functions of boards and commissions. She noted the cost of keeping finances and practices in a better and more transparent order could save money, and reiterated a performance audit would not cost that much.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- PH36-19 FY 2020 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
Discussion shown with B237-19.
- B233-19 Adopting the FY 2020 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
Discussion shown with B237-19.
- B234-19 Amending Chapter 5 and Chapter 11 of the City Code as it relates to
Public Health and Human Services Department fees.
Discussion shown with B237-19.
- B235-19 Amending Chapter 12A of the City Code as it relates to stormwater utility
charges.
Discussion shown with B237-19.
- B236-19 Amending Chapter 17 of the City Code as it relates to Parks and
Recreation fees.
Discussion shown with B237-19.
- B237-19 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to planning and zoning
processing fees.

PH36-19, B233-19, B234-19, B235-19, B236-19, and B237-19 were read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock and Ms. Peveler provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece commented that at Monday's work session, there was \$150,000 dedicated to a matching grant for a makerspace, and asked about it. Ms. Peveler replied that was the \$144,000 identified as the Economic Development Initiative and it would go back to fund balance. Mr. Glascock explained they could not find a document that had come to Council or even that the City Manager had signed approving that amount of funding. As a result, they would let it lapse.

Mr. Thomas stated he had general questions with regard to terminology in the budget that related to the discussion of how transportation sales tax was allocated among the different transportation systems. He explained he had been looking at both the transit and airport funds, and there were a couple of designations that sounded similar but different. In the revenues, expenses, and changes in net position table for each fund, there was a quantity called net position, which had a beginning and ending amount in each fiscal year, and in the financial sources and uses table, there was an unassigned cash reserve amount that also related to uses and sources. He understood that was the number they had to keep an eye on in terms of 20 percent of the annual budgeted expenses policy. He asked for the difference between the cash reserve and the net position. Ms. Peveler replied the net position came from the CAFR and the basic formula involved assets and deferred outflows less liabilities and deferred inflows. When looking at the airport fund, the net position at the end of FY 2018 was \$51 million, but of that amount, \$44 million was actually capital assets, such as the land, buildings, runways, furniture, fixtures, etc. As a result, that was not money they had to spend. Mr. Thomas understood it was not liquid. Ms. Peveler stated that was correct. She explained one of the reasons they started showing the financial sources and uses a few years ago was to try to provide a layman look at what money they really had available for operations and how much money they should have available for operations. She pointed out the answer was different for each fund. Water and electric had a lot more infrastructure than some of the smaller funds so it made sense for them to have a higher cash reserve target than some internal service fund like custodial and building maintenance. She noted they had attempted to take things that were related to cash, i.e. either generating cash or using cash, and place that in the financial sources and uses. She explained they would not see depreciation in the financial sources and uses because it was not really cash going out of the door. She commented that they also stripped off some of the GASB adjustments. They were required to make the adjustments, but it did not mean cash actually went out of the door. She provided the example of interest as they had to do a mark to market, which was not real money. It was an adjustment they were required to make on the statements. She pointed out they would not see principle on the net position page as principle was money that went out of the door. It was shown on the financial sources and uses page because it would decrease cash.

Mr. Thomas commented that as they looked specifically at the airport fund net position table, it had showed a net position of \$51 million at the end of FY 2018, \$57 million and \$63 million for adjusted and estimated for FY 2019, and \$74 million at the end of FY 2020. He asked what was behind those increases in terms of actual or estimated net position over those 2-3 years. Ms. Peveler replied at the end of FY 2018, there was \$51.5 million in net position, which mostly involved capital assets. The adjusted FY 2019 number was \$56 million. It had been calculated by taking all of the things that were revenue, i.e. operating revenues, non-operating revenues, transfers in, and capital contributions, and subtracting the expenses, i.e. operating expenses, non-operating expenses, and transfers out. Mr. Thomas asked if those were cash inputs and outputs. Ms. Peveler replied no. Mr. Thomas asked for the nature of a non-cash input. He noted the airport fund increased by about \$6 million in over a year in its net position, and wondered what exactly had caused it. Ms. Peveler replied she thought it was mostly related to FAA grants the City was receiving for capital projects. She explained another interesting thing about the net position statement versus the financial source and uses involved the line called Capital Contribution CIP. It was the FAA grant portion they were putting toward airport capital projects. She pointed out they would not see the expense side of those CIP projects, and as a result, it was confusing. Mr. Thomas understood the cash was not actually coming in from the FAA in those years. Mr. Glascock explained that when FY 2018 had begun, they had a crosswind runway that was 75 feet wide and 4,500 feet long. That crosswind runway had been increased to 100 feet wide and 5,500 feet long. As a result, the asset increased in value the previous year. Mr. Thomas

understood they had spent money to increase the value of the asset. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct, i.e. the asset was worth more. Mr. Thomas commented that if FAA grants had paid for it, it would still show up as a capital asset.

Mr. Pitzer understood the transportation sales tax was a half-cent and the capital improvement sales tax was a quarter-cent. Ms. Peveler stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked why the transportation sales tax was not twice that of the capital improvement sales tax in the amendments. Ms. Peveler replied she understood certain items were excluded from one particular sales tax versus the other, but did not know the specifics. She noted she could provide that information later if Mr. Pitzer was interested. Mr. Pitzer understood they should not be surprised that the one amount was not exactly twice the other. Ms. Peveler stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer asked for more information regarding the 13.8 kV underground system replacement project. Mr. Williams replied he believed that was Capital Project B0107 and that they had about \$288,000 available as of this morning in this year's budget. For FY 2020, they were looking at appropriating an additional \$50,000. Looking forward in the future, they had a funding plan through FY 2024. From enterprise funds, they anticipated \$200,000 per year for the next four fiscal years. He explained they had \$750,000 slated to be appropriated when the second bond sale occurred. In the current budget, he thought it had been scheduled for next year, but noted it was dependent on whether they actually sold bonds for next year's project. The utilization of those funds was for the replacement of their 13.8 kV underground system as they had to make repairs to it on an annual basis. He pointed out he had sent emails to Mr. Pitzer with regard to some of the circuits that had been high priority due to the number of faults that had occurred on them. Typically when it came to the underground system, the equipment was replaced as a result of failure. It was challenging to inspect because it was underground, and as a result, most of it was replaced upon failure. Mr. Pitzer thought staff was trying to have a more comprehensive look at potential failure spots. Mr. Williams agreed they were. He explained they were working with the GIS staff to identify neighborhoods where the non-jacketed direct buried cable would have been installed. They understood it had been installed in the late 1970s through the mid-late 1980s. They would need to look for homes that were built during that period and cross-reference that with any documentation they might have with regard to those installations. They might have to dig up and expose the area to see where they might or might not have the non-jacketed direct buried cable.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the current funding levels would be enough to address these types of larger projects, repairs, etc. Mr. Williams replied the \$200,000 on an annual basis got them to what they tended to spend annually for repairs. They were hoping that the injection of the \$750,000 from the second bond sale would allow them to do some larger projects, such as entire neighborhoods, in one shot. He explained doing an entire neighborhood would be fairly disruptive as they would have to dig up a lot of front yards to replace the cable. As a result, they wanted to make sure they were doing it in the right place and minimizing the number of customers that would be impacted by directional boring from transformer to transformer as opposed to open trenching. Mr. Pitzer asked how long it would take to identify these hotspots. Mr. Williams replied it would be an ongoing process. He explained the records of installation back then were not the best. As a result, they would have to rely on the GIS data with regard to when homes were built to help try to identify the best target areas. He stated it would also be an iterative process. When they identified an area that might have a lot of homes built between the late 1970s through the mid-late 1980s, they would have to inspect it by digging up the cable, which could result in exposing a problem that was not a problem until they started digging.

Mr. Pitzer asked where this project would rank in priority when looking at the other preventive maintenance programs. Mr. Williams replied they strove to keep their reliability indices as high as possible. Maintenance of their overhead electric system was fairly easy. They could inspect it on an annual basis and know what they had to replace.

The underground system was a little more challenging. It was not quite as old as the overhead system, and most of it did not create any problems. Identifying areas that were or could potentially cause problems had been a bit challenging in the past. It was hard to do a trend analysis without a series of the same type of fault in the same place on the same feeder circuit. It tended to vary all over the place. He stated this made it more challenging for them to say there was or was not a bad section of underground cable in a particular location.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Williams if they found a series of trouble spots that exceeded the funding levels if staff would come back to Council for an appropriation instead of waiting to deal with it 2, 3, or 4 years out. Mr. Williams replied if they found a trend that suggested a particular neighborhood was a hotspot ripe to be replaced and they did not have an appropriate funding level that particular year, they would have to come back to Council for an appropriation to fund it.

Mr. Skala commented that he appreciated the challenges staff had in trying to establish the difficulties due to the origins of some of the cables, and asked how specific the data was that they had. He assumed they used a statistical model to evaluate the number of failures and then tried to narrow it to a particular area. He wondered about its level of reliability. Mr. Williams replied it had been extremely challenging to date in trying to pin down a reliable program to replace something before it failed. More often than not, they were actually replacing it at failure. The majority of the system was designed at a redundant enough level so it was easy to switch around when a particular piece failed allowing them to get the customer back in service and time to fix the actual failed piece of equipment. In terms of doing an analysis, they were only now at a point of leveraging the information that was in the GIS system and trying to identify the locations that would have been installed during that time frame. He explained he could not provide a success rate because they were at the beginning. He commented that most of the time when power was restored, it was not due to them repairing the problem. It was due to switching things around. It could take several more hours or several more days to actually fix the faulty equipment.

Mayor Treece explained he had inquired about the Blackberry Lane Main Replacement at \$120,000, and understood there had been \$135,000 budgeted for it in the 2017 CIP Plan. He asked why the price had gone down. Mr. Williams replied he had not had a chance to look into that yet. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Williams if he could look into it. Mr. Williams replied he would.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Kelley Lucero, 407 Sanford Avenue, stated she worked for Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA) and had been working for non-profits in Columbia since 1991. During those years, she had done a lot of outreach and had participated in a lot of meetings, and there tended to be a common theme at every human service agency meeting, which involved transportation. For at least 19 years, they had discussed transportation being one of the biggest obstacles regardless of whether it involved families trying to escape abuse, early childhood, offenders that were being released into the community, etc. She commented that she had run the taxi program at CMCA last year as well. She asked that the Council consider reinstating some of the later runs in the short term so people had the ability to get to the store after work. She thought it was also time for a task force on transportation as she believed they could do so many things so differently and noted more buses might not be the answer. She noted Springfield, Missouri had its own ridesharing app, and they competed with Uber and Lyft at a much reduced rate. She thought alternate transportation might be an option or the subsidization of shuttle services. She referred to a 2015 study by Nathaniel Hendren, a Harvard University economist, which showed the relationship between transportation and social mobility was stronger than the relationship between mobility and several other factors, including crime, elementary test scores, and two-parent family households. She commented that she had flown out of the Columbia Regional Airport and believed if one could afford to fly out of

there, one could afford \$3, and noted she would pay more. She could not imagine someone deciding to fly out of St. Louis for a \$3 per day parking fee. She stated she could do 12 subsidized taxi programs with that \$260,000.

Mayor Treece understood Ms. Lucero had flown out of the airport recently, and asked when the last time was that she rode a City bus. Ms. Lucero replied once within the last year. She explained she usually walked because she lived close enough that she did not have to ride the bus and needed the exercise.

Ms. Lucero asked the Council to consider how important transportation was to the fabric of every other service provided in Columbia as they made budget decisions tonight.

Rene Powell explained she lived in the First Ward and appreciated the investment the City was making in working with the University, but understood it was contingent upon improving transportation for students. She was glad the City was working on paratransit because she believed the reason paratransit was needed was because the City had not been doing its job. While they considered how to improve transit for students, she thought it would be prudent to look at improving access for the disabled on the fixed routes via accessible bus stops, routes that traveled to places the disabled visited, later routes, more full service routes, etc. She understood students had designed some great bus shelters, but they had never been ordered. Mr. Skala noted they had been too expensive. Ms. Powell commented that she had seen someone whose chair battery had died, and one of the great things about those shelters was that people would be able to charge their wheelchairs. She wondered if they could finally get some shelters and a stable route system so they did not have routes that changed every few years. She urged the Council to give some attention to accessibility.

Jeffrey Ford stated he had lived in Columbia for about 11 years and noted he was currently in his second year as a full-time student at the University of Missouri. He explained he was also a Missouri Student Association Senator on the External Affairs Committee and served on several standing committees for the Chancellor including a Planning and Space Utilization group. He commented that he had spent over a year in Gainesville, Florida, riding a robust transit system. He stated Gainesville was similar to Columbia in terms of it being a college town and its size, and the University of Florida had a U-Pass system where the students swiped their cards and rode the bus. He noted it was not only for University students as it was open to the entire community. He believed that in order to be a full-service city, they needed to have a full-service transit system. If the City and the University were going to meet their sustainability goals, they would need to work together. They had \$13.8 million, but were only spending \$77,000 on sustainability, which essentially involved only one study after another study. He explained he wanted to work as the student representative by proposing legislation within the student body to bring the City and the University together in developing a plan that would work for everyone, i.e. the students, the disabled, the elderly, the disadvantaged, etc. If they did not bring everyone along, they would not get there. He reiterated he was willing to do what he could with the student body to find the revenue. He pointed out there were brand new televisions and refrigerators in all of the dorm rooms every semester, and thought they should be able to figure out a way to ensure parents were purchasing those items in Columbia as the sales tax from that alone would likely match what could be generated by a \$3 per day parking fee at the airport, which he did not feel was unreasonable.

John Trapp noted he lived in the Second Ward and stated he was present to speak in favor of Mr. Thomas' proposal to reapportion the transportation tax in order to increase funding for public transit. The money taken from the airport could be made up from a nominal airport parking fee. While that plan would not solve the problem of the chronic underfunding of the transit system, it would be a first step in providing a system that worked. It would also be a good faith move by the Council to show transportation was important for all of them. He believed Columbia should receive accolades for having a Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) and Social Equity plan, but planning and

setting up commissions was cheap, and in the end were meaningless without action. He commented that a working transit system was a small step toward fighting climate change and bringing about social equity. Tonight, the Council had the opportunity to take that small step. He commented that Columbia had some of the worst social upward mobility in the nation. If one was born into poverty in Columbia, that person could expect nothing better than to die in poverty. He felt that was unacceptable and hoped it was unacceptable to the Council as well. He reiterated a working transit system was a small step in righting that wrong. He stated he had been told there was not money for a working transit system, but did not believe that was true. He felt they did not lack the money, and only lacked the will. When the State needed \$2 million for a bridge 20 miles from the City, the money was there, and when the airport needed \$500,000 in emergency repairs, the money was there, but he was told they could not have a working transit system. He commented that they needed leadership from the Council to have a working transit system, and urged them to pass the budget amendment as a first small step toward a system that worked for everyone.

Peter Norgard, 1602 Hinkson Avenue, explained he was present to make comments with regard to B237-19, which involved the formalization of a fee for a zoning review letter and the establishment of a new Board of Adjustment (BOA) fee for hearing appeals and other applications. He stated the BOA was a quasi-judicial body charged with the task of hearing appeals to decisions made by the Community Development Department. Due to its position as a quasi-judicial body, he noted he had concerns as he felt establishing an onerous fee might dissuade people who might not be able to afford having their appeal heard, which would deny them a certain degree of due process. He suggested building in a safety valve of some sort, such as a means test, to determine whether a fee could be assessed or waived. He felt that would be a step in the right direction in terms of ensuring everyone had access to their legal rights.

Mayor Treece stated he appreciated Mr. Norgard's thoughtful email on this subject as he had not really considered the impact to due process in terms of access. He commented that one of his concerns was how the Council, as appropriators, saw that fee increase as it was added to the departmental budget. He understood Mr. Norgard's point was that they were paying for City employees to do the job, and when they charged external to that, there should be a corresponding offset. He stated he would look at that.

Mr. Norgard explained another concern was that many of the people that were asking for an appeal had already paid a planning and zoning fee already. This was an additional fee because their particular plan was not in accordance with what the Community Development Department Director felt it should.

Mr. Skala asked Mr. Norgard how he would feel about granting some sort of exemption whether via a means test or something different. He commented that the BOA was the last appeal and one had to pay in order to make that appeal. He wondered what Mr. Norgard thought of a system whereby they could determine if someone was eligible for an exception or exemption. Mr. Norgard replied that was his request. He did not have a problem with a fee being charged as a certain fee was reasonable, but in some cases, people might not be able to afford a fee, particularly individuals. He had concerns they would be holding them up from an appeal process in which they had a right to participate. He thought Mr. Skala was suggesting what he was suggesting.

Ginny Chadwick, 305 Alexander Avenue, stated she was the Western Regional Director for the Preventing Tobacco Addiction Foundation and noted she traveled across the country working to raise the sale age of tobacco products from 18 to 21 years of age. She pointed out she traveled a lot with her job, typically 1-2 times per month, but sometimes more often. She commented that she also often flew out of Kansas City, St. Louis, and Columbia, and when flying out of Kansas City or St. Louis, she paid \$7-\$9 for offsite parking. She stated she sometimes sprung for the \$15 or \$26 parking if she was running a little late for her flight or knew she would not be parked there for too long. When traveling from the Columbia Regional Airport she paid nothing for parking. She

explained she flew with people that did not think twice about standing in line for 20 minutes to purchase a \$4 cup of coffee. She noted she sometimes purchased at \$20 breakfast or sprung for a pair of headphones for \$30 if she forgot hers. She commented that she then returned to her home on Alexander Avenue, which was within one of the lowest income neighborhoods. Recently, she had seen a lawnmower in the middle of her street because the guy who mowed lawns for a living had run out of gas and did not have the money to get more gas. People in some parts of the community could barely afford to buy food or their mortgage costs were less than her \$496 air ticket. Riding the bus was their way to get to work, and the bus fee would sometimes cost about a half-hour of their pay. She understood the Council was considering a budget amendment that would reallocate funds to the public transit system. She noted that through her work, she had attended many council meetings throughout the country, and they allowed testimony from all kinds of people for an indefinite period of time, but that testimony often did not come from the most disenfranchised, minorities, or lowest income people in the community. She asked the Council as leaders to make decisions that would protect those that needed it the most. She stated paying \$3 to park at the Columbia Regional Airport would not change her flying habits, and asked the Council to consider the inequities and how to bridge those gaps. She believed reallocating sales tax funds to the transit system would help. She explained her daughter was a freshman at Mizzou, and prior to this year, she could ride the bus for free. Recently her daughter had told her she had not ridden the bus because it was \$1.50. That small amount impacted some college students and those with low incomes. She asked the Council to pass the budget amendment and to consider making ridership on the public transit system free.

Matt McCormick, 300 S. Providence Road, explained he was the President of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce, and noted the Columbia Regional Airport was a vital economic driver and transportation service for the people and businesses in Columbia and Mid-Missouri. Its rapid growth and success was a testament to the worthwhile investment made by the City of Columbia, Jefferson City, Boone County, the State of Missouri, and various other stakeholders including the University of Missouri and the business community. He did not believe the success of the airport would be possible without the continued support and dedication of the region. The overwhelming support in 2016 for the expansion of the airport terminal further proved the importance of this service for a wide swath of the community and region. The plan had been to charge for parking at some point in the future to help offset maintenance and operation of the airport. He asked for the City to stay the course and follow the plan, and that when the time came for a parking fee that those revenues be used to support the maintenance and operation of the airport so they continued to have an effective, efficient, and sustainable airport that serviced Columbia, Mid-Missouri, and the region.

B.J. Hunter, 4310 Montpelier Place, stated he was the current Chair of the Airport Advisory Board, and at their meeting last week, the Board had voted to oppose the proposed amendment. It was not because they were opposed to public transportation. They just felt the timing was bad. People were trying to operate out of a 50 year old terminal that had been built well before issues such as transportation security needed to be addressed. At 6 a.m., it was a mess as there were three flights leaving within about an hour of one another. The Board felt there were enough issues in the lives of their passengers due to the existing terminal and did not want to add to any frustrations. They would like the numbers they were seeing at the airport to continue.

Marth Brownlee commented that when she had last spoken to the Council there were two things she had not known. She explained she had said that she thought it was an empirical question and had offered to do a survey, but understood Mr. Thomas had already conducted a survey with regard to whether charging for parking now would change ridership decisions, and 75 percent of respondents had indicated it would not change their ridership patterns. Mr. Thomas noted it had not been a scientific survey. It was a survey of the 3,000 or so people on his email list and he had received over 100

responses. Of those that responded, about 75 percent had indicated it would not change their flying habits.

Ms. Brownlee understood Mr. McCormick and others felt the budget amendment would change some people's flying habits, and did not believe that was true. She commented that she traveled frequently and always flew out of Columbia. She noted the parking fee would not make a difference to her. She stated she wanted to bring to the forefront that Mr. Thomas had done some sort of survey that demonstrated people would not be put-off. She noted she had not realized the airport was being subsidized by a sales tax, and pointed out sales tax was the most regressive tax and disproportionately affected those with the lowest incomes, to include people with disabilities and the elderly. As a result, the people that were least likely to ever see, much less fly, out of the airport were disproportionately supporting it. It was a bigger burden to them, which seemed to be the exact opposite of the City's espoused values for equity and sustainability. She asked the Council to think about the issue of equity and having the poorest people paying to subsidize an airport they would never see. She hoped the Council would vote to make investments in infrastructure to be able to provide public transportation in creative ways so they could address both equity and sustainability.

KJ Thunder, 700 Washington Avenue, stated she was a bus rider and did not have any other options. Anyone that had another option was utilizing that other option. No one that had any other option took the bus because the bus did not go anywhere nor did it go very often. Tonight's council meeting started after the bus service ended for the day. She understood the City had a second service to just get people to and from meeting such as this since the bus service did not cover it. She commented that it was incredibly frustrating, and explained she had to utilize the bus to grocery shop. She had to wait in the hot sun with melting frozen foods. The buses were on time more now than they used to be, which was good, but it hardly traveled anywhere. She noted she had taken the green bus to the Eastside shopping area and it had been a very short bus. She understood there were a lot of sharp corners on the route so a longer bus could not be used. If she with a shopping cart, a person with a walker, and a person with a wheelchair needed to ride the bus at the same time, they would fall on each other. She commented that she was supportive of the airport, but would never be able to get out there. She stated she liked the idea of the task force as it could think about the system in its entirety, to include bus service with extensions, etc.

Peggy Placier noted she resided in the Fourth Ward and wanted to add her voice to the comments in favor of a \$3 parking fee at the airport in order to improve the public transit system. She noted she had ridden the bus and had the job of teaching refugees in Columbia how to ride the bus. Before the most recent cuts, it took a refugee mother and her two toddlers two hours to get from an apartment on West Broadway to the Women and Children's Hospital for a clinic appointment. This was just one example of many. She understood economic development was the golden idol of Columbia, and at this point, she was in favor of redistribution. She believed \$3 for an airport parking fee so additional funds could go to public transit was the least they owed to the poorest citizens. In the era of trying to encourage clean transportation, subsidizing air travel was not what they should be doing. They should instead utilize more public transit. She commented that she was more concerned about the social equity aspect of public transportation, but thought they needed to think about the environmental side as well.

Susan Carter, 2105 Hillsboro Drive, stated she also wanted to speak to the transportation issues as she worked with individuals with disabilities that were trying to get to places to shop, doctor's appointments, and jobs. She noted those that could even find the bus often had to walk long distances to get to the bus stop. It was also taking people two hours to get to four hour jobs. They were spending eight hours to work a four hour shift. She thought there might be other alternatives to the bus, and believed one of the reasons people were not using the bus system was because they no longer trusted they could get where they needed due to the continued changes. She pointed out they had to find other

options, and sometimes those options involved not working, not going to medical appointments, and shopping at a convenience store instead of a grocery store. She felt they needed to determine what kind of City they wanted to live in and what they wanted for their citizens. She noted the people that used the bus system tended to live in Columbia all of their lives, and believed they owed them affordable, accessible healthcare, transportation to the grocery store, and the ability to work. If they could not get to jobs, businesses would not have workers. As they thought about climate issues, she stated busing would cut down on the use of other vehicles. She also suggested they consider incentives for utilizing the bus and disincentives for bringing vehicles to the downtown. She explained one of the reasons she did not use the bus was because she would have to walk almost two miles to get to the bus stop. Oftentimes she could make it where she was going by foot before she even saw a bus.

Barbara Jefferson, 305 N. Fifth Street, commented that she was very much in favor of the budget amendment proposed by Mr. Thomas in terms of more sales tax going towards public transportation. She thought they had heard most people say they were willing to pay \$3 for a parking fee at the airport. She pointed out she never intended to use the airport and it bothered her that the sales taxes she paid allowed people to park for free at the airport. She noted those asking for 60 minutes of bus service back were the same people that paid sales taxes. She reiterated it was not right that those taxes allowed people to park for free at the airport. She stated she was also supportive of a transit task force. She thought they could do better and suggested free transit, especially when they were spending a lot of money to expand the airport and to rebuild a bridge. They needed to help those in Columbia that used the public transit system to survive.

R'Velle, 19 N. Fifth Street, stated he did not believe the C.A.R.E. program should be taken from the community as it provided young people jobs and helped prepare them for the real world. If they took the C.A.R.E. program away, he felt it would create more problems in terms of crime as a job eliminated a lot of that. He pointed out the C.A.R.E. program had helped to prepare him for college and the real world. It had mentally prepared him for life outside of high school and had helped him to become more independent. He understood the budget cuts would impact 68 kids and one adult, and thought they should try to not cut it. He reiterated it allowed kids to be more independent or help with bills if their parents were not financially stable. He asked the Council to maintain the C.A.R.E. program as it had helped direct him toward the right path in life.

Tyree Byndom explained he had not been bothering the Council for about three years because he had been in Dallas, Texas. He commented that being in Dallas allowed him to see things that worked well and things that did not work as well. It provided him the perspective to see Columbia in a different way. One of the cities he had resided in had 200,000 people and they had scrapped the bus line because they had wanted to remain a town. They had stopped the connection to the Metrolink and had isolated themselves. He noted they could not find people to do service work and had food deserts due to the lack of public transportation. He understood an issue was whether transportation was a right or a luxury. He explained he had moved to Columbia from St. Louis 30 years ago, and in St. Louis, they had indicated the reason they did not have transportation throughout the city was because they did not want negative elements accessing all neighborhoods. They wanted to regulate it to keep people in Jim Crow areas. He listed some statistics for Columbia, such as median income, the number of families in poverty, those owning homes, those married, etc., and the disparities were significant for the minority population. He pointed out many communities did not know their histories, and provided the Sharp End as an example. He noted they had a lot of information available, and felt they should create the budget needed and ask the community to come up with it so they did not have to push anything to the side. He suggested innovation, strategic planning, creating alliances, and doing the work. He pointed out he was willing to contribute more so they did not have to get rid of anything, and believe there were other citizens that were willing to do the same.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, commented that he was still trying to connect the dots with the water utility and electric utility budgets. He understood the City had proposed a 3 percent water rate increase, but what they had really wanted was a 3 percent revenue increase, and they had not increased the water rates by 3 percent. They increased the rates to get a net of 3 percent more in revenue. He believed they owed it to the public to make that distinction and should make that more clear in the future. He commented that he had not seen any increase in the budget to support training for Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) members. Mayor Treece explained he had inquired about that per Mr. Conway's direction on Monday, and Mr. Johnsen had assured him that all they had to do was ask and they would receive the training money needed. He noted there had been a \$98,000 increase in the travel and training budget for the department and wanted to ensure there was at least \$5,000-\$10,000 available for WLAB members to pursue independent training on rate-making, utility finance, etc. He asked if that was adequate. Mr. Conway replied yes, and noted he thought they needed to determine what was needed and then determine the cost to meet those needs. He wondered from where the money would come as they had eliminated the contingency in the budget. As part of the training, he offered his experience and acumen knowledge. Due to his past tenure on the WLAB and his professional experience, he thought he could work with staff to identify and develop some training for the WLAB members. He noted he had provided a review of the water utility budget and the electric utility budget and had not received a response. Mayor Treece stated he would take a look at it again.

There being no further comment, Mayor Treece continued the public hearing to the September 16, 2019 Council Meeting.

Ms. Peters commented that B237-19 referred to a \$150 refundable advertising fee and asked for clarification. Mr. Teddy replied that was to pay for the newspaper advertisement as there was a required public notice. It was refundable because staff did not know exactly what that charge would be and would refund the portion that was unused. Ms. Peters understood part of it was refundable. Mr. Teddy noted all of it would be refundable if the case was withdrawn before an advertisement was placed in the paper.

Mr. Pitzer asked if staff was trying to recover a certain percentage of the cost in proposing these fees. Mr. Teddy replied it was not based on a cost recovery ratio and the charge would not go to the Community Development Department even though it was collected by them. They viewed it as helping to offset the impact to the general fund. It would be a step in recovering some costs of providing a service for some exceptional cases, such as variances to the zoning rules. It would not compensate staff or the department. It would offset the impact on the general fund. In reviewing all of their fees, they had noticed they did not have an application fee for BOA cases. It was now being proposed and was up to the Council as to whether they wanted to collect the fee or not. Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Teddy if a review of what other cities did had been done. Mr. Teddy replied yes. He thought included with the staff memo was a sampling of charges in other cities, and there was a range of about \$50 to over \$800.

Mr. Skala understood Mr. Norgard had mentioned the potential for relief for some people. Typically, \$250 was not a lot of money if it was a commercial development of some sort, but it could be an onerous burden if it was a residential issue. He asked if it would be appropriate for the Council to determine what might be an exception or if that was something staff could develop. Mr. Teddy replied staff could probably propose something to bring a little bit of equity to it. He noted an applicant could be completing a room addition or garage on a home and encroaching on a yard setback. It was a relatively low value project as opposed to a large commercial building with a large budget that also had an encroachment on a required yard. He stated they could look at that and maybe make some suggestions.

Ms. Peters stated she had talked to some people that felt they already had staff to address this and wondered about the reason for the extra fee. Mr. Teddy replied he felt it involved the same logic as zoning application or subdivision fees. It was not something

everyone in the City would request and resulted in a number of additional tasks that were dedicated to that particular application. It was a means of some cost recovery.

Mayor Treece referred to the amendment sheet dated as of August 29, 2019 and asked if anyone had an objection or comment related to the proposed amendments identified as 1 through 9. No one objected.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had a comment related to the proposed amendments identified as 10 through 15.

Mr. Skala referred to the proposed amendment identified as 12 in relation to the REAL Toolkit, and explained he belonged to the Racial Equity and Leadership (REAL) Council, which was a National League of Cities (NLC) program. In FY 2019, the Council had allocated \$50,000 to take a racial equity lens look at the City's ordinances. Requests for proposals (RFPs) had been issued, and three responses had been received. Those responses varied in scope and in size. The \$50,000 had been a best guess estimate. He encouraged the Council to support an additional \$25,000 for a total of \$75,000.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Skala how he had come up with this amount since the highest bid was over that amount. Mr. Skala replied they would obviously not be able to do an amount higher than \$75,000. He explained they had received a bid of about \$25,000 and wanted to ensure they could get a mix of assistance from the national level and the local level. He asked Mr. Glascock to comment further. Mr. Glascock replied staff had met with Mr. Skala and Mr. Thomas to discuss the scope of the RFP, and they had received responses that varied in cost. As they conducted interviews, they would need to determine which entity was the right fit, and they might also have to reduce the scope. He pointed out they might not get everything they wanted depending on the amount of money they had.

Mayor Treece stated he had been comfortable with providing \$50,000, but was not sure he wanted to add to that based on RFP responses.

Mr. Thomas commented that he supported the amendment as he believed they would gain tremendous value for the community from this project. He hoped they could use both the national and local experts in some combination. He stated he felt this was a reasonable request that would have a tremendous return on investment. Mr. Skala noted that was his goal as well.

Ms. Peters stated she was okay with it. She believed they should do it well enough to where they received some information back if they were going to do it.

Mayor Treece thought overfilling the Budget Officer position was essential to transition the work to the new hire.

Mayor Treece asked if there were any other comments, motions, etc. regarding the proposed amendments identified as 10-15, to include 12. No one commented or objected.

Mr. Skala asked if the Budget Officer position was the Auditor position or if it was different. Mr. Glascock replied it was Ms. Peveler's position.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had any comments related to the proposed amendments identified as 16 through 19.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding the public access channel and the community access center. Mr. Glascock replied it was CAT-TV, and they would no longer be in business after this year. As a result, staff had been asked to issue an RFP to provide that service, and they had received one response of \$45,000. Staff was recommending budgeting \$35,000 because there was a lot of equipment involved that the City did not have the use for and the entity that received the contract would receive that equipment.

Mr. Pitzer understood it was a one year proposal. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Ruffin asked if they would have a dedicated space within the City. Mr. Glascock replied no. It would be a contract for someone to provide this service.

Mr. Thomas commented that for five years, the City had a contract with Columbia Access Television (CAT) to provide community media training and resources along with a public

access television channel and online media, which had provided a number of functions, including skills development and economic development in the community. It provided people a voice. He understood it had been a part of a federal approach of public access, education access, and government access whereby cable franchise funding in many communities had been split into those three components. At the end of the five years, the City Manager at the time decided to end that because he preferred to put more of the money into the City's Channel. He commented that he believed public access was extremely important for providing a voice to people that did not have a loud voice in the community. The funding had been reduced every year, and eventually, when it had ended up at \$35,000, the City Manager had included it as a permanent budget item in the budget of the Office of Cultural Affairs. At that point, the non-profit could no longer make it and had decided to close its doors. He explained there were other groups associated with the True/False Film Festival and the Ragtag Cinema that were very interested in taking over the service. He noted they had received a letter from a group of them, which he believed might have been the same group that had responded to the RFP. He has hoped the \$35,000 that had already been built into the budget of the Office of Cultural Affairs could be made to be an annual contract for an organization via a competitive bidding process every year or every three years, but had since learned the \$35,000 was no longer a part of the budget of the Office of Cultural Affairs and understood Mr. Glascock had suggested a one-time allocation, which he thought was good based on the proposal received. He commented that assuming they did this, he felt they also needed to find a way to continue it as an annual program after this budget year.

Mayor Treece explained he had been under the impression that they were phasing out subsidizing CAT-TV, and that it was one of the reasons they had decided to fold. He was not sure it was fair to take that money, which was no longer available to them, and to then transfer it to another entity and continue to go through this again and again. He understood Mr. Thomas felt it should be a permanent item and noted he was not sure that was something within the City's core responsibilities. He agreed they did a great job and believed public access was important, but it needed to be self-sustaining.

Mr. Thomas commented that he did not believe it was self-sustaining anywhere and also did not feel it was a taxpayer subsidy since the money was coming from the cable franchise fee. While it was not a federal law, it was a norm for the money to be distributed three ways in many communities to allow for government access broadcasting, education access broadcasting, and public access broadcasting. He did not think it was true that CAT closed its doors because there had been a threat that the money would go away. The money had been secure at that time. He noted they had closed their doors because they had not had any other operations. It was just community media and public access. The \$35,000 and the amount the one part-time staff member could fundraise would not do it. He commented that there was now a coalition of organizations that had a lot of other programming related to the same area who could take this under their wing as a program, and they would essentially be subsidizing it by providing a space, etc. The City would just provide the \$35,000 in addition to any leftover equipment.

Ms. Thompson explained that for this particular budget item all staff was asking for at this point was to keep the \$35,000 in the budget as a potential expense. Council would still have to approve a contract going forward. There was a state of flux at this time with an FCC order that would become effective on September 25, and it would allow cable companies to deduct the fair market value from the fees the City currently received from video service providers. The City did not know what that number was, and it might actually be such a number that it put them out of the business of requiring three PEG channels. The City currently had an ordinance requirement for three PEG channels that companies had been providing for no additional charge. Come September 25, the FCC had determined they could deduct that from the fees they paid the City.

Mayor Treece understood the value of those three channels on the spectrum would be in

excess of what they were paying the City. Ms. Thompson replied staff did not know at this time. From a staff perspective, they had received the proposal and had been prepared to bring that forward to the City Council subject to the contingency that it could be withdrawn if the cost of continuing to provide those channels was too great. She reiterated they were in a state of flux, and was hopeful they could bring something forward with full information so the Council could make a fully informed decision. At this point, the \$35,000 would only be in the budget as a placeholder. It would come back to Council later whereby they could have a full debate.

Mr. Skala commented that he was not too uncomfortable with agreeing to allow the \$35,000 as a placeholder as he understood those interested seemed to be making a genuine attempt to resurrect something in which a lot of folks had seen some value. He stated he was encouraged by the City getting rid of some of the equipment that was no longer of use. Mr. Glascock explained it would be a part of the deal because the City did not have any use for it. Mr. Skala noted they would face a decision with regard to this contract and in terms of whether they decided to fund it on a yearly basis. He reiterated he was reasonably comfortable with it being a placeholder item pending additional information.

Mr. Pitzer stated he would rather move away from the placeholder strategy and consider a one-time appropriation when they had complete information. He noted he would prefer to vote on it.

Mr. Skala understood Mr. Pitzer was suggesting the money go back into the general fund, and to deal with funding when the contract came forward. Mr. Pitzer stated he would prefer to consider an appropriation then.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to keep the proposed amendment identified as 19 on the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and approved by roll call vote with Ms. Peters, Mr. Ruffin, Mr. Trapp, Mr. Skala, and Mr. Thomas voting yes, and Mr. Pitzer and Mayor Treece voting no.

Mayor Treece understood the proposed amendments identified as 16 through 19 would remain on the amendment sheet as there were not any other objections.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had any comments related to the proposed amendments identified as 20 through 26.

Mr. Thomas understood voting yes on the amendment sheet would make the \$75,000 associated with 23 be allocated. Mayor Treece commented that not objecting to it would keep it in the budget.

Mayor Treece understood there were not any objections to the proposed amendments identified as 20 through 26.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had any comments related to the proposed amendment identified as 27.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding 27. She thought they had allocated \$100,000 for Vision Zero expenses and could not believe \$99,000 was still remaining. Ms. Peveler replied part of it would be used to help fund the \$35,000 for public access television. She noted they were combining three pieces as some would come from the budget of the City Manager's Office, the budget of the Office of Cultural Affairs, and the budget of the Vision Zero program. Mayor Treece understood this was a three year pilot project that was being completed with leftover money.

Mayor Treece asked if there were any objections related to 27. No one objected.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had any comments related to the proposed amendments identified as 28 through 38.

Mayor Treece asked for clarification regarding C.A.R.E., which were associated with the proposed amendments identified as 31 through 38. Ms. Peveler replied the proposed amendments would allow half of the money that had been proposed to be cut to be reinstated.

Mayor Treece commented that as much as he thought the C.A.R.E. program was a valuable asset, he did not believe the proposed cuts were commensurate with restoring some of the funding. He mentioned the elimination of emergency phones, the elimination of construction temporary staffing, and the reduction of park ranger temporary staffing as concerns.

Mayor Treece asked for clarification regarding the C.A.R.E. program and asked if there were employers asking for this. He had the sense that there were more C.A.R.E. participants than employers interested. Mr. Griggs replied staff did a good job of finding employers to place C.A.R.E. participants. Mayor Treece understood the City paid their salary. Mr. Griggs stated the City paid them for 20 hours per week. He commented that they tried to place them in jobs where there was a potential for a career, such as a veterinarian office, animal hospital, or daycare facility so they could learn about potential career positions. He explained they were not doing labor-type jobs such as washing dishes at restaurants. It was something they might do as part of an overall view on how to operate and manage a restaurant, but it was not their only job. He noted the businesses were expected to do some mentoring and training as well so it was a little bit of a burden for them. He stated they had started some preliminary discussions with some businesses about picking up some of the salary or providing sponsorships. He pointed out they were looking at other options. Mayor Treece asked if any of those potential cost share agreements could offset some of these proposed cuts. Mr. Griggs replied he did not know as it had not been done yet.

Mayor Treece commented that there was 1.6 percent unemployment and was shocked that they had to pay businesses to take these participants. Mr. Griggs replied these trainees were kids that were generally at-risk that needed some assistance. He explained they were also being trained on how to dress for an interview, how to act for an interview, how to build a resume, how to open a bank account, etc.

Mr. Skala asked if they had some metrics and if they had a way to follow up with some of the kids that had gone through the program. He also understood the cuts had been suggested by staff so they must not think they were too significant. Mr. Griggs explained they had made significant cuts in every other area in the last five years. There was not anymore fat to trim. Every year they had asked to include cuts to C.A.R.E. as part of the burden, but the previous City Manager had not wanted to cut it because he felt it was a great program, so they would restore the money to C.A.R.E. and make other cuts prior to anything coming forward to Council. They were at the point of having cut just about everything else and any additional cuts would need to involve C.A.R.E. Ideally, they would prefer to cut 2-3 percent from every program across the board so no one really felt the pain, but since C.A.R.E. had survived all of the cuts in the past, it was time for them to be affected.

Ms. Peters understood the C.A.R.E. program was within the Parks and Recreation Department budget because they had experience hiring underage kids and knew of all of the labor rules, but it was not just a Parks and Recreation Department program, and asked if they should consider taking \$48,000 from the general fund to reduce the cuts since they were already tapping into reserves. She noted it had been an arbitrary decision as to how much they would take from reserves anyway.

Mr. Glascock suggested they look at it more holistically than just looking at cuts within the Parks and Recreation Department. He noted they were adding \$50,000 in the Police Department budget for a cadet/explorer program. They were trying to broaden what they were doing into different departments. He pointed out they had to train their own staff. He reiterated it was not just cutting C.A.R.E. It was also expanding into other programs. He thought they should look at it across the entire City.

Ms. Peters understood they were not really cutting the C.A.R.E. program because it would be a cut to the Parks and Recreation Department budget. Ms. Peveler pointed out there would still be a cut. Mr. Griggs explained they were going to go from 185 to 120, and now they would be at about 150 if some of the funding to C.A.R.E. was restored.

Ms. Peters understood they had to make all of the additional cuts to the Parks and Recreation Department budget in order to do that. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece understood, if they did not make this amendment, the C.A.R.E. program would still exist for 120 kids. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct. Ms. Peveler replied it would be about a 20 percent cut.

Mr. Pitzer understood some of those trainees were within City departments to include the Parks and Recreation Department. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked if he knew roughly how many. Mr. Griggs replied he thought some of that information had been provided in the packet. He pointed out they could not hire some of the younger ones because one had to be 18 years old to run mechanical equipment. Many of them worked in the front office, helping with filing or bookkeeping, etc. He thought there were likely a dozen departments that participated with at least one C.A.R.E trainee.

Mr. Pitzer stated he liked those efforts as it was consistent with Mr. Glascock's efforts of growing their own. He also appreciated the fact that Mr. Griggs had pointed out that this was the one program that had not really been touched for a period of time in prior years, and that he had indicated at the work session that as long as the program was in place, they could scale up from 120 to 150 without too much additional work. He understood this was a summertime program and asked at what point in the year they needed to know how many positions they had. Mr. Griggs replied around the end of February. He explained they started working with schools in February to help identify applicants, but pointed out they normally had more applicants than jobs so they did not have to recruit people to apply. They would need to have them going by mid-May, i.e. right after school was out for the year.

Mr. Pitzer suggested providing Mr. Griggs the opportunity to look at the partnerships mentioned and holding off on restoring the cuts for now. He noted it could be revisited in February.

Mayor Treece asked how many of those kids worked within the Utilities Department in either the water utility or the electric utility. Mr. Griggs replied he did not believe any did due to the age requirement. Mayor Treece asked if one had to be 18 years old to use a shovel. Mr. Griggs replied it depended on where they were working. If they were working around high voltage areas, it was a concern. Mayor Treece stated he had dug ditches for the municipal utility in the town he had grown up in and did not believe he had been 18 years old.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Johnsen if the Utilities Department could take \$48,000 worth of C.A.R.E. trainees. He explained there was a career pathway to be made there.

Mr. Trapp commented that he did not like these cuts to the Parks and Recreation Department, the C.A.R.E. program, or any of the other cuts they had made. They were in extreme budget difficulty, and he believed the amendments as written tended to capture the least bad option on the table. He thought they should look at what they could do with C.A.R.E. in the future in terms of community support because it was central to their social equity agenda and in tackling the deplorable statistics they had about people being born in poverty staying in poverty. He wondered if they could contract with a non-profit to do this service with the same kind of impact. He thought they should start examining longer range solutions. He felt a 10 percent cut was a lot to bear for such a critically important program, but noted it captured the tone of where they were at in terms of the budget. They could not keep having declining revenue and a greater need for service. He stated he was supportive of leaving the amendments as identified. He felt the reduction in the splashground season would impact some people's lives and noted he did not want to see them backing away from certifications and continuous quality improvement assessments, but there were not any good answers. They would have to work hard next month when considering how to bring more revenue in so they were not worse off next year.

Mr. Ruffin asked how significant the proposed cuts to the Parks and Recreation Department budget were in terms of the public's perception of service. Mr. Griggs replied

he thought the biggest one would be closing the sprayground a month earlier in the front and at the end of the season. Mr. Ruffin understood Mr. Griggs felt the average person would not notice anything other than that change. Mr. Griggs stated he did not think they would notice changes with construction as it would only take a little longer to get some projects done. With regard to the reduction in park ranger temporary staffing, there would be some hours where there would no longer be a temporary person helping out. Patrolling all of the parks was hard for two people so they usually hired someone to assist. The person was not a public safety officer, but they still had eyes and ears and could assist with unlocking facilities, correcting breaker outages, etc.

Mayor Treece stated he was most concerned about eliminating the emergency phones in the parks and trails as he believed people relied on them and they enhanced the comfort of those walking or riding on the trails, especially at night or at dusk. He felt it would be extremely problematic to get to one of those phones and not have a dial tone. He noted he was also concerned about the reduction in park ranger temporary staffing as he believed that was another safety issue. He stated he would be opposed to adding back half of the cuts unless the Utilities Department wanted to pick up 30 summer trainees and one of the job coaches. He believed there were good careers there and plenty of work for someone under 18 years old. He reiterated he had done it for three years and it had taught valuable work skills.

Ms. Peters understood that when the emergency phones had been installed there had not been many cell phones, but most people now had phones. She wondered how often the emergency phones were even used. She had been told that many times they were used for crank calls versus anyone actually needing help. Everyone tended to walk, bike, or run with a cell phone now. Mr. Pitzer commented that once was all it would take. Ms. Peters agreed, but noted someone would have to be near one of the 11 phones. Mr. Pitzer commented that the way he looked at it was that if they were going to have a Parks and Recreation Department, they needed to do what was core to them, which involved park rangers and taking care of their facilities. If they were going to have spraygrounds, he thought they should be open.

Mr. Skala asked if the justification for the Parks and Recreation Department handling the C.A.R.E. program was because they had a lot of experience with summer help, etc. Mr. Griggs replied yes. He explained they hired 700-800 part-time people every year. They knew how to hire young people and how to schedule them so they did not violate any labor laws. Moving the program to another department had been discussed previously, but it had not been favorably looked upon by other departments because they did not know all of the rules. In addition, they had the infrastructure in place to deal with the mass number of hires.

Mr. Skala stated he liked the suggestion of Mayor Treece, but understood the proposed amendments were a compromise position as well.

Mr. Griggs explained they had tried to come up with suggestions that would not have drastic impacts like closing a pool. They tried not to eliminate anything. Even with the phones, they would have them at all of the major trailhead facilities.

Ms. Peters stated she was satisfied with all of the proposed amendments.

Mayor Treece made a motion to eliminate all of the expense items, i.e. the proposed amendments identified as 32 through 38, and to replace those with expense items from the Utilities Department. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pitzer.

Ms. Peters asked if it would be a transfer from the Utilities Department to pay for the 30 summer trainees and 1.5 job coaches. Mayor Treece replied yes. Ms. Peters understood they would all be hired and managed through the Parks and Recreation Department, but they would be working in the Utilities Department, and if they could not be placed within the Utilities Department, they would then not spend that money.

Mr. Thomas asked if C.A.R.E. trainees were placed within City departments or if they all went to the private sector. Mr. Griggs replied several City departments utilized the services of C.A.R.E. trainees. Mr. Thomas understood there was a precedent and asked

which departments had participated in the past. Mr. Griggs listed a few and explained a trainee would be placed there if they were willing to take them. Mr. Thomas understood it was open to all departments, but had just not been done within the Utilities Department to date. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas noted he liked the proposal of Mayor Treece based on that information.

Mr. Trapp asked if the City Manager or City Counselor had any comments with regard to this proposal. Mr. Glascock replied Mr. Johnsen had indicated this was doable so they would try it if approved by Council. He stated he was not aware of any reason it could not be done.

Mayor Treece commented that he viewed it as being similar to the Explorers Program in the Police Department. He thought it would be a good introduction.

Mr. Glascock pointed out they would not put them in places they would get hurt.

Mayor Treece stated the work he had done had taught him he did not want to do that for the rest of his life.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Pitzer to eliminate all of the expense items, i.e. the proposed amendments identified as 32 through 38, and to replace those with expense items from the Utilities Department was approved unanimously by roll call vote with Mr. Pitzer, Ms. Peters, Mayor Treece, Mr. Ruffin, Mr. Trapp, Mr. Skala, and Mr. Thomas voting yes.

Mayor Treece understood there were not any other comments or motions associated with the proposed amendments identified as 28 through 38.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had any comments related to the proposed amendments identified as 39 through 43, 44 through 47, or 48 through 52, and no one did.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had any comments related to the proposed amendments identified as 53 through 55.

Mayor Treece understood 53 was a correction. Ms. Peveler explained 53 was the request to move 2.1 percent of the 1 percent back to general fund so projects would have to be funded from existing balances.

Mayor Treece understood no one had objections to 53 through 55.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had any comments related to the proposed amendments identified as 56 through 58, 59 through 64, or 65 through 69, and no one did.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had any comments related to the proposed amendments identified as 70 through 76.

Mr. Pitzer commented that they had discussed not reducing the funding for the deep well abandonment at the work session on Monday. Ms. Peveler stated she had missed that one.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to restore the \$20,000 in cuts to the Deep Well Abandonment project in the water utility. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece understood no one had any other comments or objections to 70 through 76.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had any comments related to the proposed amendments identified as 77 through 85.

Mayor Treece asked if the capital projects were being moved up on the list or if they did not get transferred into the budget. Ms. Peveler replied there were two systems, a dotProject system where they put the projects in and the Munis system where they actually budgeted for the projects and those did not get budgeted. They could be found in the budget document, but they had just not gotten into the Munis system so this was correcting that.

Mayor Treece understood no one had any other comments or objections to 77 through

85.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had any comments related to the proposed amendments identified as 86 through 87.

Mayor Treece understood 87 would be deleted since it was associated with the amendment made earlier to restore part of the C.A.R.E. cuts. Ms. Peveler stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece understood there was not any objection to 86.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had comments associated with the proposed amendment identified as 88.

Mr. Thomas commented that one of the clear messages from the testimony they had heard earlier was that the City ran a very poor level of bus system service. It was an objective statement and not a criticism of staff in any way. It was simply an underfunded situation. He noted they could look at the numbers as to how similar college towns funded their bus systems along with the level of service that allowed them to provide. Another message he had heard was the call for a long range community engagement planning process, possibly a task force similar to the Mayor's Task Force on Climate Action and Adaptation Planning or the Pedestrian Safety Task Force with a clear scope of work to study and make recommendations in the big picture for the future of transit or providing transportation services in a variety of forms for the community. He stated he would want that task force to really study the value to the community of having a really good transit system and to determine how it contributed to other efforts such as their social equity plan, Vision Zero plan, and the CAAP. He suggested a review of the long term problems that had developed in Columbia, which would include the planning and zoning codes as he did not feel they wanted to continue annexation and sprawl and thought they should densify along corridors. He commented that transit-oriented development was a really effective economic development tool when done in certain locations. He recommended looking at partnerships with the University of Missouri as he believed there was renewed interest. He noted they had also been talking about a partnership with the Columbia Public Schools for a number of years. He believed the budget needed to be reviewed through that task force process as well. He commented that he could not rationalize a city with an equity focus being comfortable providing \$3 million per year of sales tax funding to subsidize airport operations in the long term. He was not suggesting they cut that funding immediately, but thought they needed to review their values along with how they invested money and come up with a plan to change that status quo. He believed it made sense to place more of that money into the transit system. He explained he had proposed a reallocation of \$262,800 from the airport to transit. He noted it was a somewhat symbolic gesture, but thought it showed commitment for what they wanted to do in the future, and it happened to be the same amount the airport could raise and replace with a \$3 per day parking fee on paved lots. He was not sure that requiring that was a part of the amendment and felt the amendment was really just the budget reallocation. He pointed out the \$262,800 would allow them to provide fare-free transit to everyone that rode the bus. He believed that was another interesting potential change for the future. He explained it had been done at Missoula, Montana, 3-4 years ago and had resulted in an enormous spike in ridership. He understood Chapel Hill, North Carolina, had done it, and it had been successful there as well. He pointed out Kansas City, Missouri, was now considering it. He stated he was not suggesting they do that this year, but thought it was interesting that they could charge a small fee at the airport for parking and use the money that was reallocated for the transit system to then offset all of the fares received. He commented that he hoped the Council would support his amendment as it would show they were committed to improving the transit system for the entire community, and not only those that relied on it.

Mayor Treece stated he agreed with everything said by Mr. Thomas up until the part he suggested taking money from the airport and moving it to transit. He agreed they had to have a plan for mass transit and felt they needed to have a plan prior to reallocating

funds. He noted this amendment would reallocate funds to a system no one liked, and as had been mentioned by Mr. Glascock, all they would be doing was expanding a bad system. He thought they needed to have the planning process first and noted he would be happy to appoint a task force. He agreed with Lawrence Simonson with the PedNet Coalition who had suggested they get everyone in the room to imagine they did not have a public transit system, i.e. that they were starting from scratch and had \$7 million to build a system that worked for everyone from the international community to underemployed community to the business community. To take money from the airport via taxpayer funds or consumer funds to just put it in the bank account was not a smart move in his opinion. He pointed out a planning process had occurred with the airport, and it had since grown and blossomed to the point they needed a new terminal. A part of the parking fee would be to pay for those improvements. He commented that he did not believe they could charge taxpayers for something they were currently receiving for free when they were not seeing an improvement in it. He believed that would philosophically damage them in the future when they tried to pursue other revenue enhancements.

Mr. Skala commented that his view on this issue had evolved as he would have agreed this time last year that they did not want to compromise the future of the airport since it had been a success, but he was now struck by the number of people that had come before them on a number of occasions. He noted some had mentioned the regressive nature of sales tax, which he agreed was true, but pointed out that sales tax was not only paying for the airport. It was also paying for transit and the roads. He explained they were over-reliant sales tax, and those taxes were declining due to internet sales, etc. It was a problem they would have to solve. He commented that he did not feel a \$3 fee was onerous, and pointed out the percentage of taxes that went toward the airport, transit, and roads had been arbitrarily chosen. A few months ago, he had suggested they reallocate it by 1-2.5 percent, and this was even less onerous than that. It was also a step in the right direction in terms of the environment and social equity. He believed there needed to be a redistributive process by which some of the least among them could benefit from some of the things they absolutely needed.

Mr. Trapp stated he did not feel the airport was overcapitalized. It was dependent upon sales tax as well and sales tax was in decline. He commented that the airport had shown tremendous growth, but that had been through strategic partnerships, providing a service people wanted to use, etc. Since he had started his role on the Council, he had become a big believer in the airport. When looking at economic development and what they were going to do to raise people out of poverty, they would have to do that through the creation and recruitment of living wage jobs that did not require a college education. They had previously not landed those types of economic development opportunities because principles could not get flights from their home towns. He believed there was a connection between the recent successes they had with recruitment and the airport. In addition, it made the community livable for people who were going to invest and create opportunities for living wage jobs as that was a pathway out of poverty. He agreed with Mayor Treece and Mr. Thomas with regard to rethinking how they should do transit, but did not feel this symbolic measure would be successful. He commented that when they started moving toward this as a real policy, he was not sure it would have the kind of support it had had tonight. He noted he had worked hard to bring about partnerships in transit and believed transit was needed for many of the reasons stated earlier tonight, but did not feel this measure was the way to do it.

Mr. Ruffin commented that he agreed that they needed a fresh look at the transit system and a more comprehensive plan in terms of how to address the concerns presented tonight. He explained a concern he had with this particular proposal was that it seemed premature in terms of planning. He did not feel there was a simple way of putting a system in place to collect and process the fees. He felt it needed more thought prior to moving forward. He commented that he was also not sure this small amount of money would have a significant impact on the problems because the problems were much

greater than \$262,000. He stated he was committed to addressing the problems and finding solutions. He wondered if \$3 was even enough and questioned whether it should be \$5 or \$7. He noted they had not done a study to determine what the market would absorb. He stated he was not sure it was a bad idea, but felt it needed more thought before they said yes.

Mr. Pitzer noted the common thread appeared to be the fact they were lacking a plan. The idea of imposing an arbitrary fee at an arbitrary amount and just placing the money in a bank account for an indefinite period of time did not make a lot of sense to him. He stated Mr. Thomas had justified ill-will with regard to the current state of the transit system, but if money was going to solve it, they would have seen some improvement by now. He noted they had more than doubled the subsidy to the transit system over the past decade, which was a larger increase than to streets and the airport, and it had not appeared to help. He commented that they had a plan for the airport, which included a fee for parking in a couple of years, and to illustrate further the lack of a plan for transit, that had not been considered as part of this proposal. He thought this would do more to hurt them than to help them in the long run since it was an ill thought out plan and would generate additional bad will toward how City government was trying to run things.

Ms. Peters stated she would support a task force to look at transportation, whether that involved buses, Uber, etc. She was not sure just expanding the bus system whereby people still had to walk 0.5-1.5 miles to get to a bus stop would be very helpful. She reiterated she was supportive of a task force to determine what they might need to do to address the issue in a more comprehensive fashion.

Mayor Treece made a motion to delete the proposed amendments identified as 88, 91, and 92 from the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin and approved by roll call vote with Mr. Pitzer, Ms. Peters, Mayor Treece, Mr. Ruffin, and Mr. Trapp voting yes, and Mr. Skala and Mr. Thomas voting no.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had comments associated with the proposed amendments identified as 89 through 90 and 93 through 95, and there were none.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had comments associated with the proposed amendments identified as 96 through 100, 102 through 105, or 106 through 114.

Mayor Treece understood 108 would be deleted since it was associated with the amendment made earlier to restore part of the C.A.R.E. cuts. Ms. Peveler stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece asked for clarification regarding 113, which dealt with the police lieutenant position. Mr. Glascock replied they were moving the police lieutenant positions back to classified positions.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had comments associated with the proposed amendments identified as 115 through 122, 123 through 130, or 131 through 132.

Mayor Treece understood 127 would be deleted since it was associated with the amendment made earlier to restore part of the C.A.R.E. cuts. Ms. Peveler stated that was correct.

Mr. Glascock described the pay guidelines and explained he wanted the Council to be aware of them before they went into effect. Mayor Treece asked if there were any questions regarding the pay guidelines. There were none.

Mayor Treece asked if there were any further amendments to the budget. Ms. Amin noted a few pages of the budget had been replaced and those should be included as part of any amendment sheet the Council finally approved. Mayor Treece asked for clarification. Ms. Amin replied they had been at the end of the packet, but had not been included in the presentation. Ms. Peveler stated there had been one page in the Budget in Brief portion of the budget and a couple pages on the summary CIP projects, but those would likely change due to some of these amendments. From the original proposed budget, a few of the pages needed to be replaced.

Mr. Skala understood since they were aware of those changes, and could be reconciled without any difficulty.

Mayor Treece asked if there were any dollar amount changes. Ms. Peveler replied no. Mayor Treece understood they would see those before approving the budget in two weeks. Ms. Peveler pointed out there would be a few new amendments at the next meeting. Mayor Treece suggested a new amendment sheet be provided then, but that they vote on this one tonight.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend the budget associated with B233-19 per the amended amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH39-19 Proposed safety improvements to the Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT) crossing at Route B to include the installation of new concrete crossing surface panels, ties, rail and related track materials, roadway approach pavement and pavement markings.

Discussion shown with B242-19.

B242-19 Authorizing construction of safety improvements to the Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT) crossing at Route B to include the installation of new concrete crossing surface panels, ties, rail and related track materials, roadway approach pavement and pavement markings; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; authorizing a supplemental agreement for highway/rail crossing improvements with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission.

PH39-19 was read by the Clerk, and B242-19 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Williams provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

B242-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: THOMAS. (Mr. Thomas stepped out during the vote on this item.) Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH40-19 Consider the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and FY 2020 Annual Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds.

PH40-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece understood this public hearing would be held and the item would then be continued to the October 7, 2019 Council Meeting because there needed to be a 30-day waiting period between the hearing and the approval of the plans.

Mr. Cole provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters understood public comment would be taken until the first of October. Mr. Cole replied they would take comment until October 2, 2019, but if people had comments at the October 7, 2019 Council Meeting, they would include those comments in the plan as well. By statute, they had to have a 30-day comment period. Ms. Peters asked how people could comment if they wanted to comment prior to October 7. Mr. Cole replied the plan was posted on the website and people could email them or make comments tonight. He stated they had provided information on the listserve explaining how people could access the plan. He pointed out he had received a lot of comments via work they had done in the spring.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Steven A. Smith, 1603 Canton Drive, explained he was the President and CEO of

JobPoint and noted he appreciated the efforts of everyone. He complimented Mr. Cole and his staff for the work they did and the ease of working with them. He pointed out they did not always receive what they wanted or as much as they wanted, but staff was very open to working through situations that might develop. He stated they handled the money by the rules, which sometimes took an extra effort, but it was done right.

Teresa Gooch, 3908 Snow Leopard Drive, thanked the Council for their creativity in trying to reduce the C.A.R.E. program cuts. She explained her husband, who was a 14-year veteran of the Police Department, had encouraged her not to speak because he was under the impression that her support for the C.A.R.E. program would inevitably mean he would not receive a pay raise the upcoming fiscal year. She pointed out that she taught at Hickman High School, and many of her students were able to participate in the C.A.R.E. program. She believed it was a fantastic opportunity for them to receive job skills and to see themselves as a worker in a field they might not have considered. The students that participated tended to be disproportionately affected by the cuts and were those that mostly lived in the central and north neighborhoods. As the Council had been creative in finding way to reduce some of the cuts, she encouraged them to also look for ways to continue to return that funding for the next fiscal year.

Mayor Treece made a motion to continue the public hearing to the October 7, 2019 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

There being no further comment, Mayor Treece continued the public hearing to the October 7, 2019 Council Meeting.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B190-19

Approving the Final Plat of "The Backyard" located on Sixth Street and Seventh Street, between Locust Street and Cherry Street (120 S. Sixth Street and 119 S. Seventh Street); granting design adjustments relating to alley right-of-way width, corner truncations and reduced utility dedications (Case No. 82-2019).

The bill was read by the Mayor Treece.

Mayor Treece explained the applicant had requested this item be tabled to the October 7, 2019 Council Meeting.

Mr. Skala made a motion to table B190-19A to the October 7, 2019 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B243-19

Authorizing agreements for professional services with Horizons Energy LLC and Siemens Industry, Inc. for the development of an Integrated Electric Resource Plan, an Electric Master Plan and an Electric Cost of Service Study; amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Williams provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the 14 percent contingency was typical in contracts such as this. Mr. Williams replied it was usually about 10 percent. He explained the Integrated Electric Resource and Master Plan Task Force had discussed wanting to ensure they had adequate funding should there be any contingencies they wanted to explore.

Mr. Pitzer commented that this was a relatively large dollar amount and the percentage was larger. He asked what the effect would be if they did not have that size contingency. He wondered if staff would have to come back to Council asking for more money. Mr.

Williams replied if there were any change order needs, they would have to come back to Council for an appropriation to approve for those change order needs.

Mr. Pitzer asked if Council would approve amendments to the contracts if there were changes. Mr. Williams replied yes. Mr. Pitzer asked how often they typically had to get into the contingency. Mr. Williams replied most of the previous integrated resource plans (IRPs) and cost of service studies had involved at least one amendment if not two or more. In the past, there had been several change orders to these types of contracts. He anticipated a contract amendment would be brought forward at some point based on past experience.

Mayor Treece commented that 14 percent of even just the \$750,000 amount would total \$105,000 for the contingency.

Mr. Skala asked where the contingency would go if it was not utilized. Mr. Williams replied they were appropriating from fund balance so those funds would be returned to fund balance.

Rachel Hassani stated she was the Chair of the Integrated Electric Resource and Master Plan Task Force and noted the Task Force supported the request of \$900,000.

Mr. Pitzer asked how the Task Force had come up with the recommendation of \$900,000. Ms. Hassani replied they had taken estimates from the two companies, which were \$722,000 and \$68,000, and thought they should have a bit of a cushion. She noted 10 percent had been suggested, and they had then rounded up to \$900,000.

Mayor Treece commented that he was impressed with the response of Siemens Industry, and asked Ms. Hassani if she was comfortable with their acknowledgement of Columbia's renewable energy goals and climate action goals and them thinking about things in a different way, such as a micro-grid or the number of solar panels it took to equal a megawatt of avoided energy costs. Ms. Hassani replied it had been a very important part of their evaluation process, in writing the RFP and evaluating applicants. She stated they wanted to ensure they were choosing a company that had experience in the area while also being open-minded toward looking at new and fresh ways of trying things. Mayor Treece understood a lot of the demand projections that had been crafted for the previous master plan had not materialized. He noted he wanted to avoid going to voters to approve bond issues for projects that were no longer needed and wanted them to think about things in a way that complimented what the City was doing along with changes in technology. Ms. Hassani explained she had not been in Columbia when the last IRP had been approved, but believed they would do better this time.

Mr. Pitzer asked Ms. Hassani how she envisioned interacting with the consultants during this process. Ms. Hassani replied they had addressed that at their last Task Force meeting. As a group of community volunteers, they wanted to ensure they were speaking with the contractors regularly and with a unified voice. She stated they had voted to ask a staff member of the City of Columbia to be the point person and to regularly receive weekly updates from the contractor as well. Mr. Pitzer asked Ms. Hassani if the Task Force would be meeting with them in person when they were here. Ms. Hassani replied they had asked for a regular written report, but had also asked for them to visit with them in person fairly regularly.

Mayor Treece understood the work of the Task Force continued through the contract. Ms. Hassani replied their work continued until it was finished.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, commented that he found this unusual as it had never been standard practice to consider a contingency in an engineering services contract. He believed they would lose leverage by pre-approving the \$109,000. For the sake of transparency, he felt the contingency should have been revealed and explained as a part of the memo.

Mayor Treece understood Mr. Conway had previously questioned whether engineering services would be delivered under this contract and whether the principles delivering those services were licensed as professional engineers in Missouri, and asked Mr. Williams to clarify if that had been satisfied. Mr. Williams replied both agreements were for

professional services, and not necessarily engineering services. He thought the Law Department had reviewed the language in the contract and did not believe the City had any risk at this particular point in time. He pointed out staff had contacted both firms to make them aware of Mr. Conway's concerns, and both had assured staff that if they felt they were providing engineering services, it would be stamped by a professional engineer registered in the State of Missouri.

Mr. Conway suggested the wording be changed to Missouri professional engineer in future procurements rather than just professional engineer so it was clear.

Tom Jensen, 2416 Wild Oak Court, explained he was a member of the Water and Light Advisory Board, and by extension, a member of the Task Force. He commented that they felt the contingency was important for this set of contracts because the technology they were hoping to be able to integrate in their electric plans was very new and would rely on a lot of data analysis. Items such as spatial load forecasting, which would allow them to isolate issues and create some dynamic billing arrangements that would permit them to consider equities with regard to low-income residents and companies that used a lot of energy, required data and the quality of the data was likely not the best. He stated the complex models that were necessary to bring a host of clean energy concepts to the service area would all be data intensive, and much of the work would entail cleaning the data so the models could be run. He noted this was part of what had driven the process. It was the cost of a little bit of a modernization push for the utility. It did not matter if it was 10 percent or 14 percent because they were committed to transparency and the Council knowing about any changes to the contracts. He thought there needed to be some contingency so they could move forward with some alacrity to achieve the mandate given to them by the Council.

Mr. Pitzer stated he did not disagree with the comments of Mr. Jensen, but thought it should be built into the contract price if they knew that now. Mr. Jensen explained there was some degree of optimism from Siemens Industry of managing the issue and they would let the City know if it would cost more. He hoped it would not cost more.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Pitzer if he was comfortable with the contingency. Mr. Pitzer replied he thought it was too large and felt it would more likely than not be spent. He suggested erring on the side of reducing it and requiring them to come back for more if it was needed.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B243-19 per the amendment sheet, which changed 48 months to 48 weeks in the Siemens Industry contract. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Pitzer asked if \$850,000 would provide enough flexibility to address anything urgent since they could come back to Council if a larger amount was needed. Mr. Williams replied he thought they could work with that.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to amend B243-19 by replacing \$900,000 in Section 2 with \$850,000. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters.

Mr. Skala stated he thought this was the prudent thing to do because, as someone had indicated, it would likely be spent if there.

The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Ms. Peters to amend B243-19 by replacing \$900,000 in Section 2 with \$850,000 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

B243-19, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:

VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS.

VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B253-19 Repealing Article II of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the International Building Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article II of Chapter 6 of the City Code adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Building Code.

Discussion shown with B262-19.

B254-19 Repealing Article III of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2006 Edition of the International Code Council Electrical Code Administrative Provisions referencing the 2014 National Electrical Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article III adopting the 2006 Edition of the International Code Council Electrical Code Administrative Provisions and the 2017 Edition of the National Electric Code NFPA 70.

Discussion shown with B262-19.

B255-19 Repealing Article IV of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the International Plumbing Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article IV adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Plumbing Code.

Discussion shown with B262-19.

B256-19 Repealing Article V of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the International Mechanical Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article V adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Mechanical Code.

Discussion shown with B262-19.

B257-19 Repealing Article VI of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the International Residential Code for One- and Two-Family Dwellings and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article VI adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Residential Code for One- and Two-Family Dwellings.

Discussion shown with B262-19.

B258-19 Repealing Article VII of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the International Property Maintenance Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article VII adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Property Maintenance Code.

Discussion shown with B262-19.

B259-19 Repealing Article IX of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the International Fuel Gas Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article IX adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Fuel Gas Code.

Discussion shown with B262-19.

B260-19 Repealing Article X of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the Energy Conservation Code and enacting in lieu

thereof a new Article X adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Energy Conservation Code.

Discussion shown with B262-19.

B261-19 Repealing Article XI of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the Existing Building Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article XI adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Existing Building Code.

Discussion shown with B262-19.

B262-19 Repealing Article II of Chapter 9 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the International Fire Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article II adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Fire Code.

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy and Mr. Simon provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood this had been a collaboration of a lot of work by the Building Construction Codes Commission (BCCC) and the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) and was a process that occurred every three years. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mr. Simon continued the staff report.

Mayor Treece thought the Islamic Center was adding on more than 1,000 feet and asked if they were required to install storm shelter. Mr. Simon replied they were intending to install a storm shelter. Mayor Treece asked if they were required to put one in now. Mr. Simon replied he thought they had met the policy threshold for it to be required now as well. Mayor Treece understood this did not change that. Mr. Simon stated that was correct. Mayor Treece asked if it was because they had more than 50 students. Mr. Simon replied no, and explained the existing policy involved a 25 percent addition to the structure as a trigger. He noted the code had been silent on the issue previously. The 25 percent addition had been determined because of the way occupant loads were figured for schools in general versus the way occupant load space was required for a storm shelter. A 25 percent addition would allow for the whole school to be housed. He commented that with the new code, although the scoping statement said it would be large enough to house all of the occupants in the existing school, there were exceptions that would allow them to house only the occupants in the addition. He was not sure how one would make the call as to who would and would not be allowed in the storm shelter.

Ms. Peters asked how much space per student was needed in a storm shelter. Mr. Simon replied five square feet per student. Ms. Peters understood the idea was that they would all stand. Mr. Simon stated that was correct. He noted it was the same occupant load as a bar where there was not a fixed item in the way.

Mr. Simon continued the staff report.

Mayor Treece understood the ordinance was written with the deletion of Section 1103.5.1 of the International Fire Code. Mr. Simon stated that was correct. Mayor Treece commented that he had not decided whether he felt that was right or wrong.

Fire Chief White explained that particular code would be enforced from now on in newly permitted or new construction, but this particular portion of the code would make it retroactive to businesses that already existed. The deletion of that particular portion would remove the requirement that it be retroactive.

Mayor Treece commented that his concern was public safety, and not the cost of installing the sprinklers. For the six locations, staff felt would fall under that retroactive imposition, he asked Chief White if he was confident that 300 occupants or more would survive a catastrophic incident without a sprinkler system. Chief White replied that was a

difficult question to answer. This situation was similar to what they had in the sororities and fraternities as it had been presumed to be retroactive when it had been initiated. Mayor Treece understood someone had died in bed. Chief White agreed and noted it had taken years to get full compliance with the program. He commented that the BCCC had felt this would be onerous toward businesses, and the increase in safety was something that had to be weighed each time they had this type of situation. He explained he, personally, was not a fan of deleting anything from the Fire Code as it made it more difficult to do their business and enact things as needed, but he also understood the need to consider having something enacted retroactively to a business that was deemed to be perfectly safe yesterday and now was not at a cost of tens of thousands of dollars.

Mr. Skala asked if there was any way to compensate such as requiring more fire extinguishers. He wondered if there was some mechanism that could be a part of this. Chief White replied staff fully implemented what they felt was effective now. They already had things in place, such as annual inspections, overcrowding situations, review of building designs for egress, etc. Mr. Skala commented that he was thinking along the lines of compensating with something that could partially take its place. Chief White stated he could not think of anything additional that could be done to increase safety beyond fully sprinkling the occupancy.

Mr. Simon explained that per the code documents, that item had been included due to the night club fire in 2003 in West Warwick as a result of a pyrotechnic show. In Columbia, all of these occupancies were one-story occupancies that had significant capacity for egress. He felt it was important to know whether they were talking about a one-story building versus a several-story building along with the type of activities taking place in the building. He commented that it would be hard to imagine the Olive Garden having a situation that would require a full NFPA-13 sprinkler system as people were awake and there were multiple egress locations.

Mr. Simon continued the staff report.

Ms. Peters asked if anyone could slip under the spa and pool safety barriers, such as a 2-3 year old. Mr. Simon replied the barrier could not be more than 2 inches off of the ground. Mr. Teddy asked Ms. Peters if she was referring to the safety cover. Ms. Peters replied yes. Mr. Simon stated the safety cover would be snug over the pool. Mr. Teddy agreed and noted it was like lid over the pool. Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding modified pool and spa safety barrier standards and if that meant the barrier requirement was being reduced to 48 inches. Mr. Simon replied that would refer to the fencing. He explained that if one had a fully automatic powered cover for the pool or spa, they no longer had to have the other barrier.

Rick Shanker commented that with regard to the spa and pool, they were reducing the height of the fence, and if the cover did not work, there would not be any protection. He provided a handout of a kitchen and explained he would discuss the National Electrical Code Section 210.52(C)(3) of 2017. He referred to the handout and described what it included. He explained the code required a single receptacle in an island, but at one time, it had the 2- and 4-foot requirement. In other words, an 8-foot island would require multiple receptacles. In addition, the old code had required receptacles along the peninsula. Those making recommendations then realized those were too many receptacles, and as a result they had revised it to only requiring one receptacle. The 2014 code allowed them to have one receptacle at the end of a peninsula, but the new code might not require anything due to wording that was under debate and due to misunderstandings by many in the industry. He asked the Council to consider maintaining the requirement in the 2014 code as it required a receptacle at the end of the peninsula.

Mayor Treece understood the national standard did not require an outlet on the peninsula. Mr. Shanker stated that was correct as of this cycle, which was different than the last cycle that required one and different from prior cycles that required several. Mayor Treece asked if anything prevented anyone from placing a receptacle there if it was

desired. Mr. Shanker replied no, and noted it was required if there was a sink, cooktop, or oven there.

Mr. Skala asked if there was a requirement for ground fault interrupters. Mr. Shanker replied yes, and explained that was an entirely different subject. They all had to be ground faulted in the kitchen, except for the refrigerator, dishwasher and garbage disposal.

Mr. Skala commented that he did not have any issue with including that requirement by making this an exception. He explained that there was a receptacle on the end of the peninsula in his kitchen. He thought the question was whether take all of the 2018 recommendations or justify making an exception for that outlet.

Mr. Thomas asked staff if they had a strong opinion one way or the other on the suggestion of Mr. Shanker. Mr. Simon replied he did not have a strong opinion. He pointed out this had been brought up before and the BCCC had decided to move forward with keeping the code as it was in this case. Mr. Thomas understood this specific question had been discussed by the BCCC. Mr. Simon stated this discussion had been brought up at the BCCC previously. Mr. Teddy pointed out there was not anything in the code that would prohibit a layout as had been described by Mr. Shanker. It was just not required as a minimum.

Ms. Peters asked if the BCCC had voted on each issue separately. Mr. Simon replied there had been a proposal for this particular code change as they had discussed each code change individually. They then voted on whether to amend the code change, keep the code change, etc. Ms. Peters asked Mr. Simon if he recalled whether the vote on this issue had been fairly unanimous. Mr. Simon replied no. Mr. Shanker understood there was not a record of the specific vote.

Mayor Treece commented that he might have preferred that the recommendation to delete the retroactive item associated with the fire code to have come to them in the form of an amendment versus already being deleted in the ordinance.

Ms. Peters made a motion to amend B254-19 to require the receptacle at the end of the peninsula so it was consistent with the 2014 National Electric Code. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Trapp assumed it was required so extension cords were not utilized.

The motion made by Ms. Peters and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend B254-19 to require the receptacle at the end of the peninsula so it was consistent with the 2014 National Electric Code was defeated by roll call vote with Ms. Peters, Mr. Trapp, Mr. Skala voting yes, and Mr. Pitzer, Mayor Treece, Mr. Ruffin, and Mr. Thomas voting no.

Mr. Skala asked if anyone was concerned about the comment of Mr. Shanker with regard to pool and spa covers potentially not working and the fence being reduced. Ms. Peters replied it would still be a 4-foot fence. She thought they should be most worried about the 2-3 year olds. Mr. Pitzer understood a fence would not be required if there was a cover. Mr. Simon stated that was correct. If the cover met the ASTM standards, no other barrier would be required. Mr. Skala asked about a situation where there was not a cover. Mr. Simon replied if there was not a cover, a fence was required. Mr. Skala understood the fence had been reduced from 72 inches to 48 inches. Mr. Simon explained the fence had been increased from 48 inches to 72 inches by City ordinance years ago. The BCCC had voted to go back to the code language as written for a 48 inch barrier. He noted it had been a standard in the code for decades.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the covers were inspected. Mr. Simon replied they would verify the cover met the requirements when installed, but they would not inspect it otherwise. Mr. Teddy stated a property maintenance inspection might catch an issue if there was a complaint. The owner of the pool or spa was responsible for maintaining the cover.

Ms. Peters understood this only involved homeowners. It was not for a commercial or

homeowners association pool. Mr. Simon stated it was for both. She understood a homeowners association pool could be constructed without a fence around the pool with a cover that might or might not be working. She was not sure that was a good idea. Mr. Ruffin pointed out they could also have a fence with a gate that was not shut. Mr. Skala commented that he used to belong to a homeowners association that had a fence around the pool that was removed due to liability issues since the gate was sometimes left open.

**B253-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA,
THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

**B254-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA,
THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

**B255-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA,
THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

**B256-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA,
THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

**B257-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA,
THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

**B258-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA,
THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

**B259-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA,
THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

**B260-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA,
THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

**B261-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA,
THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

**B262-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA,
THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

B238-19 Amending Chapter 18 of the City Code to restore coverage for the chief of police under the Police Retirement Plan; amending Chapter 19 of the City Code to eliminate special deferred compensation provisions for the chief of police.

- B239-19 Authorizing a first supplemental agreement to the airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the reconstruction of Runway 13-31 and Taxiway C projects at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B240-19 Authoring a cost apportionment agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission relating to the City's financial commitment of participation in the replacement of the I-70 Missouri River Bridge at Rocheport; amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B241-19 Accepting a conveyance for street purposes.
- B244-19 Authorizing a second addendum to agreement for professional engineering services with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. for the More's Lake remediation and site restoration project at the Municipal Power Plant.
- B245-19 Authorizing an agreement for the donation of real estate with Ridgemont Development LLC for property in Ridgemont Park, Plat No. 1 Subdivision located southeast of the intersection of Ridgemont Road and College Park Drive to be used for open space and park purposes.
- B246-19 Authorizing an airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the Route H relocation project at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B247-19 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the issuance of birth and death certificates and associated information technology activities.
- B248-19 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for WIC local agency nutrition services.
- B249-19 Authorizing Amendment No. 3 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for public health emergency preparedness services.
- B250-19 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the 1-2-3-4-5 Fit-Tastic! Early Childhood Education project; amending the FY 2019 annual budget by appropriating funds.
- B251-19 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services relating to the Teen Outreach Program (TOP).
- B252-19 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri to provide for the services of an assistant fire marshal for fire inspections of University facilities, and to assist in the development of construction drawings, emergency operations procedures and fire safety training.
- R123-19 Authorizing various Adopt a Spot agreements.
- R124-19 Authorizing application to the Missouri Department of Transportation - Governor's Transportation Cost Share Program for financial assistance for the Discovery Parkway extension project, between the Gans Road

overpass and Rolling Hills Road.

R125-19 Authorizing a lease agreement with Discovery Office Park, L.L.C. for the use of a parking lot to accommodate overflow parking for special events held at A. Perry Philips Park.

R126-19 Authorizing the installation of street lights on Old Plank Road, Oakland Gravel Road, Grace Lane and Smarr Court; authorizing the upgrade of street lights in the area around Whitegate Drive and Sylvan Lane.

R127-19 Expressing support for the North Central Columbia Historic Survey - Phase III; authorizing submission of an FY 2020 Historic Preservation Fund Grant Application to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources - Division of State Parks.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

R128-19 Authorizing a special event operations agreement with Thumper Productions, L.L.C. for the 2019 Roots N' Blues N' BBQ Festival at Stephens Lake Park.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Schneider provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked for clarification on the drinks per person issue. Ms. Schneider replied Richard King had sold Thumper to Shay Jasper, Tracy Lane, and Jamie Varvaro, and the new owners had indicated they wanted to reduce the drinks per person from three back to two. Sergeant Perkins stated they had allowed three drinks to be sold at the same time last year when in previous years it had been two. When comparing the 2018 data to the 2017 data, there had been a huge discrepancy in the numbers. Part of it might be the way the data was being reported as they had a new software system for special events now, which documented whether officers encountered people that were intoxicated, arguing about a street closure, etc. In 2018, there had been 25 alcohol-related incidents documented, and in 2017, they had only found four incidents. He reiterated it might be the differences in reporting. He noted he had not been aware of any fights or assaults.

Ms. Peters asked who was addressing the solid waste issues if the City was not handling it. Ms. Schneider replied City staff would not provide on-ground waste collection during the event as had been done in prior years, but City staff would still provide roll-off dumpster deliveries, pulls, and pick-ups. Thumper Productions would have volunteers on the grounds during the event to empty receptacles into the dumpsters.

Ms. Peters asked what would be done with regard to security and whether it would be provided by the City. Ms. Schneider replied it would still be provided by the City. When this Festival had moved to Stephens Lake Park, they understood that one day they would have to reimburse the City for police services. Beginning next year, it would be a part of the agreement. They had not had the conversation early enough this year for the Festival to have the money and people in place for it. Police Chief Jones stated they had decided it was best to maintain the City's integrity based on the prior Administration's promises and assertions, and thus they had decided to honor not billing for those services this year.

Ms. Peters asked who received the extra tickets and whether they were used. Ms. Schneider replied the Parks and Recreation Department had an application process for people to apply for those tickets. Ms. Peters asked if they were all used. Mr. Griggs

replied they were still taking applications for the approximately 400 tickets they had. Last year, they had less than 300 tickets and had more than 400 applications. As a result, they had held a random drawing once they had verified everyone qualified. Essentially if one qualified for school reduced lunch, one also qualified for these tickets. He anticipated that they would give all 400 out again this year.

Mayor Treece asked how they prevented them from being sold. Mr. Griggs replied he thought the representatives of the Festival could explain the new process.

Jamie Varvaro stated the tickets could be picked up at will-call at the event itself, and a wristband, which would not come off, would be placed on the attendee's wrist. It would help to ensure the tickets were not taken and then sold.

Mayor Treece understood the City was waiving the staffing costs for police and fire services and asked about the value of it for the weekend. Chief Jones replied it had been roughly \$30,000 last year for police services only.

Mayor Treece asked what type of training they had for their volunteers and site leads to cooperate, collaborate, and follow the orders of the City's police and fire personnel.

Tracy Lane explained they worked comprehensively throughout the planning months with the City as they had a 74-page security manual. She noted they had ROTC officers that secured the area and paid security staff that had been with them a long time and helped to implement everything. Before this had become a requirement of the City, they had invited the Police and Fire Departments to direct the crowd security training and onsite security training the week prior to the Festival. She stated they brought the entire security team to the field for that training.

Mayor Treece understood one of the Festival volunteers had been arrested for failing to follow the orders of a police officer. Ms. Lane asked for clarification. Mayor Treece replied the person had been a member of the School Board. Ms. Lane explained he had not been volunteering for the Festival. He had delivered a computer for them, but had not been a registered volunteer. Mayor Treece understood he would not be a volunteer for the upcoming year and that a situation like that would not happen again. Ms. Lane stated he would not and it would not. Mayor Treece explained his concern was with five police officers and command staff having to deal with that issue instead of watching the crowd, which then put the crowd at risk. Ms. Lane stated that person had been asked to not return in any way, and they had added language in the security manual to specifically address the situation so that anyone representing the organization in any way that showed signs of intoxication would be removed from grounds and not be allowed back. Mayor Treece understood all leads and volunteers that utilized Walnut Street would follow police orders. Ms. Lane stated that was correct. If they did not, they would be removed.

Ms. Peters understood setup of the Festival would occur a day earlier and asked if that meant the sound checks would occur earlier as well. Ms. Lane replied no. The sound checks were scheduled for Thursday afternoon again this year. Setting up a day earlier allowed them more time to build the infrastructure and to ensure everything was as secure as it could be.

Mr. Skala asked if the Festival would have Hawaiian shirts this year. Ms. Lane replied yes, and noted they had been ordered last year based upon his request.

Ms. Peters commented that she had received complaints with regard to sound checks in the past and asked those conducting the checks to be mindful of that. Ms. Lane stated they would.

The vote on R128-19 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R129-19

Authorizing the notice of sale of Water and Electric System Revenue Bonds, Series 2019B.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Talbert provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece understood there was not an amendment sheet as this was only the notice to proceed with the bond sale. Ms. Talbert stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece asked for the time frame. Ms. Talbert replied the sale would occur on Monday, September 16.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, commented that the memo had indicated the short term impact was that the City would save approximately \$1.3 million over the next two years. He asked if that would be a refund to the water and electric users.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the savings were included in the budget before the Council. Ms. Talbert replied the first original payment based on the schedule she had seen would be in FY 2021 so until they knew the interest rate, they would not know how much they would actually save. The first payment would be in October 2020, so FY 2021.

Mr. Conway asked if the utility would just realize that cash flow. Mayor Treece replied he had asked that at the work session on Monday and understood the savings would accrue to the bottom line or extend the number of projects that could be completed with the same bond.

Mr. Conway asked for the interest rate that was used to determine the net present value of \$9.6 million. Ms. Talbert replied it had been a number that had been given to the City by their financial advisor. It had been based on the market in July.

Mr. Conway asked if the \$1.2 million was net present value or actual cash. Ms. Talbert replied she could not answer that question.

Mr. Conway asked how much of the saving would go to the water utility as opposed to the electric utility. Ms. Talbert replied the refunding was for two series. 2009A involved improvements to the water utility system and 2011A was a combination of water and electric as part of that had been a 2002 refunding for \$11.6 million. She understood \$22 million had been for improvements and additions to the City's water facilities and the remaining \$49.5 million had involved the purchase of Columbia Energy Center. Mr. Glascock thought the savings would be split based on those percentages.

Mr. Conway asked if this had gone through the Water and Light Advisory Board. Ms. Talbert replied no. It had been handled by the Finance Department.

Mr. Conway noted there was a typo on page 2 of the Preliminary Official Statement as it stated 2091 instead of 2019. He understood the City would refund existing bonds, and those existing bonds had a bond reserve amount in the bond reserve account. He also understood that when they issued the new refunding bonds, there would be a bond reserve account for those reissued bonds, and asked what would happen to the existing bond reserve funds that were attached to these two bond issues. Ms. Thompson replied it had been taken into account in the financial projections as it was rolled back into the financing and refinancing. She commented that if Council wanted to tell staff which questions were of importance to them, staff would be happy to do further research on those.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Conway to provide his questions to him and he would then get them to staff for a response. Mr. Conway replied he would do that.

Mr. Pitzer asked if there was a way to show the savings that had accrued with all of the refinancings that had been done over the past couple of years. Mr. Glascock replied he thought that was in the annual report. Ms. Thompson stated staff had been trying to provide Council with the pro forma on the bonds. If that had not been provided for this one, she noted it could be provided. Mr. Pitzer explained he was talking about consolidating all of the refinancings for a number of years to allow people to have a sense of what they were saving holistically. Ms. Thompson stated their window of opportunity was at the 10 year mark on bonds, although they could sometimes do an advance refunding if it made financial sense. She noted it was a difficult, but they would determine if there was some way to quantify it.

Mayor Treece asked what the fees were by bond counsel for the refinance. Ms. Thompson replied she thought it might have been \$40,000, but noted she was not positive. Mayor Treece understood it was not a percentage of the refinancing. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

The vote on R129-19 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R130-19

Authorizing the temporary closure of a portion of the sidewalk on the west side of Scott Boulevard between Christian Fellowship Road and Sussex Drive to facilitate the relocation of a utility corridor and construction of turn lanes and pedestrian walkway for the Westbury Village development project.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy and Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece commented that he had kind of initiated the public inconvenience fee, and at that time, they had a lot of growth downtown and people using the public sidewalks and parking for their materials, etc. He noted he had not anticipated it applying to someone who was doing something better than what they had by themselves. He explained he had seen the applicant's letter with respect to the asphalt shoulder that people used as a sidewalk, and understood they were replacing it with a better, more formal sidewalk as a part of the development. He asked for the thoughts of staff. Mr. Nichols replied the staff interpretation was that if they were doing the work on behalf of the City, it would be something the City would waive. This was being done on behalf of the development. Mayor Treece asked if that was the case even if they were improving the situation. Mr. Nichols replied yes. Ms. Thompson explained the difficult part with just saying "improving" the right-of-way was that most of the time there was an improvement of the right-of-way. In a lot of the instances, they were taking out the sidewalk and installing new sidewalk at the same time. The same was true of half-street right-of-way. A lot of times, there was public infrastructure being installed, whether that was a storm sewer, sanitary sewer, water, etc. She commented that they could create some sort of appeal or exception, but it currently did not exist.

Mayor Treece explained the other objective was to maintain an accessible sidewalk for pedestrians while the construction was happening so if the applicant could keep the sidewalk open, build a duplicate sidewalk, etc., this would not kick in. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood those days would be discounted in terms of the closure.

Mr. Skala understood it had involved the ingress and egress to existing businesses as well.

Benjamin Ross, an engineer with offices at 1113 Fay Street, explained he was representing the Westbury Village development, which had been approved by the Council for zoning. In addition, building permits and construction permits had been issued and the grading was about 90 percent finished. In the coming weeks, they would begin work along the Scott Boulevard corridor. He provided a list of the improvements that would be completed in the right-of-way or within an easement. He noted the pedway had been above and beyond what had been required as only a sidewalk had been required. He explained the public inconvenience fee associated with this would be about \$40,000. He commented that an exemption was needed for public good that was constructed in the right-of-way by a private developer as had been mentioned by some that had spoken at the December 5, 2016 Council Meeting when that fee was discussed. He stated he had testified as well and had shown a picture of a Ninth Street project whereby three different utilities had been installed in the right-of-way. He commented that these things were owned by the City, and but for the City's lack of resources, they would have been installed by the City. He noted the project had been to facilitate a 10-story building, but included a lot of other improvements from which the public benefited to include improved sewer capacity for seven blocks. He believed that for the short term inconvenience of Ninth Street being partially closed, they had received 100 years of new service to those

seven blocks in terms of sanitary sewer. He felt the Council at the time appreciated the difference between public improvements that would be owned and used by the City for many years versus a closure of a sidewalk or driving lane to make the construction space larger to build a private building. He reiterated there was a difference between public infrastructure that was being built versus closing publically owned space for private use. He noted an exemption had been added to the public inconvenience fee if public infrastructure that would be owned by the City was being built at the request of or on behalf of a governmental entity. He felt they met that exemption as they were trying to follow the current ordinances. He commented that the asphalt pavement on the west side of Scott Boulevard had been constructed by MoDOT in 1995. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) was passed in 1990. It had been designed by MoDOT to be a shoulder, not a sidewalk. He appreciated the fact people walked on it and rode bikes on it, but it did not meet the ADA. He pointed out the City had a transition plan whereby they would upgrade all of the sidewalks owned by the City over time. This particular asphalt pavement was not on that list because during the first few phases, the focus was on high use areas, and this was not a high use area yet. In addition, the existing asphalt pavement was either too narrow, the slope was not at 3 percent as required by the ADA, etc. He stated the City owned this asphalt pavement as MoDOT had given it to the City, and at some point, the City would upgrade it. In this situation, however, the Westbury Village development would upgrade it for the City for free as a public benefit. He noted the 13.8 kilovolt overhead utilities would be placed underground, and it did not serve only the adjacent property. It also served the Hyvee grocery store, Fairview Marketplace, the King Meadows Subdivision, etc. Other utilities would also be placed underground along with an additional conduit that the City had requested for future use. He commented that this was an upgrade to the existing system that would benefit not only this development, but many of the surrounding neighborhoods as well. He pointed out that by placing this important circuit underground, it would be less susceptible from damage to storms and an upgrade for that part of town. He explained they would be adding four turn lanes, two for public streets and two for private driveways, and this would provide a safety improvement for the 20,600 drivers that utilized Scott Boulevard daily along with the neighborhoods west of Smith Drive and the City in terms of meeting its Vision Zero goals. He stated there was currently a 6-inch water line north of Smith Drive on Scott Boulevard and a 12-inch line to the south, but there was a gap between the 8-inch line on Smith Drive and Scott Boulevard. The line that would be built by the Westbury Village development would create a loop to improve the resiliency of the system. They would also add fire hydrants. He pointed out that they had only needed an 8-inch line for their system, but they were installing a 12-inch line because the City had asked them to do this on their behalf and would pay the difference between the 8-inch and 12-inch line. He stated the sidewalk closure was necessary to construct a lot of public infrastructure in the right-of-way or easement that would be owned by the City. He stated Emery Sapp and Sons was committed to phasing the work to try to reduce the impact to pedestrians as much as possible. In order to get the work done quickly and to reduce the impacts to pedestrians, they needed the space to work. By closing the sidewalk, they could get the work done quicker. He asked the Council to clarify the intent of the fee exemption by indicating the public inconvenience fee was not required for improvements for the public good.

Mr. Pitzer asked if all of these improvements were required by the City. Mr. Ross replied yes. Ms. Thompson explained the improvements were required by the City Code, and City staff was enforcing the City Code. In that respect, the improvements were being required as part of the development. Whenever there was a private development and additional impacts to public infrastructure, there were requirements to update the public infrastructure to meet the current Code requirements. She pointed out that was the case with the 8-inch line. It was being upgraded to a 12-inch, but the City was paying the cost differential. There would still be a requirement to improve the water line. It was the same

way with the sidewalk. When a new development was constructed, sidewalks were required as a part of it. She noted half-street improvements were required adjacent to property along with street improvements interior to the property. In this instance, the developer was electing to put the electrical underground. It was an election on the part of the developer. They were not required to relocate it. She stated the more difficult problem was that there was not a process in the public inconvenience fee for the Council to do what Mr. Ross had asked them to do. There was not a waiver of that. She explained she had issued her opinion that this was in fact subject to the public inconvenience fee. If the Council wanted and felt this was the type of situation where a change was needed, they would have to amend the City Code because these particular improvements at this particular location would not have been done but for the private development.

Mr. Pitzer asked to see the language of the exemption presented by Mr. Ross. Ms. Thompson pointed out that was just a portion of it as there was a whole section on the fee. This was only one sentence. Mr. Pitzer understood there were other parts that made this not applicable to this situation. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. She explained this entire section talked about the fee and there was this one sentence that discussed public infrastructure if it was upgraded by the private contractor at the request or on the behalf of the governmental entity. She stated it was her opinion that a Code requirement in connection with a development was not an upgrade or construction at the request of a governmental entity. It was being done in conjunction with a private development. It was a bit out of context when taking this one sentence in isolation without reading the rest of the requirement as related to the development and the impact of the development. Those improvements were not being done at the request of the City. It was a City Code requirement because of the private development.

Mr. Ross commented that the sentence had been added as the amendment to the ordinance to allow the exemption. Ms. Thompson stated she did not recall the specifics. Mr. Ross commented that he believed it had been and noted Mr. Trapp had been one of the Council Member's that had advocated for it. Mr. Trapp stated he could not recall. Ms. Thompson explained if the water line that was being replaced by the developer was currently an 8-inch line and the City was requesting the developer install a 12-inch line, it was something being done at the request of the City. If there was a 6-inch line and the developer had to install an 8-inch line, it was a developer requirement under the City Code. She agreed the City was requesting an upgrade, but the upgrade requested by the City was not the impact causing the initial disruption of the public right-of-way. The disruption of the public right-of-way was being caused by the private development.

Mayor Treece commented that it seemed to him that there was not really a sidewalk there to close. He agreed there was a pathway. Ms. Thompson stated it was a walkway that was being used as a sidewalk. MoDOT never said they were installing a sidewalk on the right-of-way, but it was a pathway that was used as a walkway. It was also on top of a curb. When looking at the photo, it was a walkway on top of the curb.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Ross if they were only closing the sidewalk. He wondered if there would also be a lane closure. Mr. Ross replied the long term request was for the sidewalk closure. There would be partial lane closures as well, but they would not be long term closures.

Mr. Pitzer asked if this fee applied when they were closing lanes on the road. Ms. Thompson replied yes. She explained they could avoid the fee by having the closure beyond the walkway. The walkway could then be removed and closed at a later time for a shorter period of time. Mr. Ross stated that would not work as there were a lot of utilities that would go right where the sidewalk was located. The turn lane would go there too. He did not believe they could relocate the sidewalk and then come back to do the utilities and turn lanes. He reiterated they felt this met the current exemption defined in the ordinance.

Mayor Treece asked if they could build the new sidewalk and work their way out so they

took out the existing pathway after the new one was built. Mr. Ross replied he did not feel that was the most efficient way for the contractor. It was not the way they had bid the job.

Mr. Thomas stated he supported the opinion of Ms. Thompson as he felt the work being done was part of the Code, the ordinance, and the developer agreement. He did not believe it satisfied the condition of the waiver of the fee.

Mr. Trapp commented that it seemed as though there was a legal determination that was made definitively by the City Counselor.

Mr. Skala stated he wanted to see some clarification of the entire context. He was not sure if it would make a difference, but thought that information would be helpful in making any kind of judgement as to whether they should proceed in a different fashion. Ms. Thompson explained the challenge for staff was that if they were to take an interpretation that a Code requirement adjacent to a private development was at the request of the City, it would mean they would not have had a public inconvenience fee for any of those student housing developments where the sidewalk was removed and replaced because it would be at the request of City since it was a City Code requirement. She felt that would be an absurd result and not the intent. If this was not the result the Council had intended, they could amend the Code to fix it. She did not feel it was appropriate to change the interpretation as it had been charged in the past and they had continued to charge it. Mr. Skala commented that he was not suggesting a change, but noted he would feel more comfortable if they had the entire thing in front of them.

Mr. Pitzer understood a "no" vote would not allow the closure of the sidewalk or construction to occur. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. She explained what the Council had in front of them was a sidewalk closure request, and she did not believe the developer had suggested they not vote "yes" on this particular resolution. They did not want to pay the fee, but a fee waiver was not a part of the resolution.

Mayor Treece understood it was the opinion of Ms. Thompson that there was not a mechanism for a fee waiver under the current ordinance. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood this would also not obligate them to do the full 96-day closure if there was a better way to lay out the construction.

The vote on R130-19 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B263-19 Authorizing the issuance of Water and Electric System Revenue Bonds, Series 2019B; and prescribing other matters relating thereto.
- B264-19 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code as it relates to membership requirements for the Commission on Cultural Affairs.
- B265-19 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to personnel policies, procedures, rules and regulations.
- B266-19 Adopting the FY 2020 Classification and Pay Plan; providing for FY 2020 salary adjustments relating to the Classification and Pay Plan.
- B267-19 Establishing plan year 2020 active employee medical and dental premium rates, non-Medicare medical rates, and retiree dental premium rates for the City of Columbia; providing for payroll withholdings.
- B268-19 Authorizing provisions pertaining to conditions of employment for City employees represented by Laborers' International Union of North America,

- Local 773.
- B269-19 Authorizing a collective bargaining agreement with Columbia Professional Firefighters I.A.F.F. Local 1055.
- B270-19 Authorizing 2019 amendments to the collective bargaining agreement with Columbia Police Officers Association, Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #26.
- B271-19 Rezoning property located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Nifong Boulevard and Bethel Street from District PD (Planned Development) to District M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood); approving a developer agreement guaranteeing installation of public improvements and irrevocable letter of credit with Jeffrey E. Smith Investment Co. L.C. (Case No. 51-2019).
- B272-19 Rezoning property located on the south side of St. Charles Road, approximately 700 feet east of Dorado Drive, from District PD (Planned District) to District A (Agriculture District) (Case No. 101-2019).
- B273-19 Approving the Final Plat of "Harris Estates Plat 2" located on the south side of St. Charles Road, approximately 700 feet east of Dorado Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 141-2019).
- B274-19 Approving the Final Plat of "Samuels First Addition, Plat No. 2" located on the north side of Locust Street and east of Hitt Street (1107 and 1109 Locust Street); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 163-2019).
- B275-19 Vacating street rights-of-way along the west side of Conley Road/Business Loop 70 associated with the recently completed Conley Road extension project (Case No. 157-2019).
- B276-19 Authorizing a consolidated grant agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for FY 2020 transportation planning services (Case No. 207-2019).
- B277-19 Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with Mohammad S. Diab and Samantha Jo Diab for the acquisition of property located at 210 Hickman Avenue and 212 Hickman Avenue.
- B278-19 Amending Ordinance No. 023938 to correct the legal description for the District M-C (Mixed-Use Corridor) tract within Auburn Hills Plat 17 located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Brown School Road and Highway 763.
- B279-19 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to parking fees for unmetered off-street facilities.
- B280-19 Amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for additional equipment associated with the installation of parking facility gate arm systems in municipal parking facilities.
- B281-19 Amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by appropriating funds to cover overages in the Transit Fund due to an increase in fuel and maintenance costs and Paratransit ridership services.
- B282-19 Amending Chapter 13 of the City Code to permit licensed waste haulers to

- engage in food waste removal.
- B283-19 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.
- B284-19 Authorizing a joint funding agreement for water resource investigations with the U.S. Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior for groundwater monitoring of well sites in the vicinity of the McBaine wetland treatment units and the Eagle Bluffs Conservation Area.
- B285-19 Authorizing execution of a deed of dedication for utility easement to accommodate the installation of a public sewer main across a portion of the Norma Sutherland Smith Park property.
- B286-19 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Show Me Healthy Women program.
- B287-19 Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for funding for Teen Outreach Program club supplies and Community Services Learning resources; amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B288-19 Amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for the Fire Department training academy repairs project.
- B289-19 Authorizing a development agreement with Broadway Lodging Two, LLC to establish public infrastructure obligations relating to the construction of a new hotel tower on property located at 1106 E. Walnut Street; authorizing right of use license permits for emergency exit doors, balconies, an entrance canopy, footings and foundations, conduits, skywalks connecting the new hotel tower to the existing hotel tower, roof overhang and an awning.
- B290-19 Authorizing a first amendment to the school resource officer agreement with Columbia Public Schools.

X. REPORTS

- REP75-19 Water and Light Advisory Board Annual Report.

Scott Fines, a member of the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB), explained this was a report providing the information the WLAB believed to be of most use in summarizing the financial and operational aspects of the utility in FY 2019.

Mr. Skala stated he appreciated the graphics along with numbers as it was very useful.

Mr. Pitzer understood the WLAB did not look at the refinancings that had been discussed earlier. Mr. Fines stated it had been mentioned briefly, but not covered as a part of this report. Mr. Pitzer asked if the WLAB ever looked at the debt schedule and then asked staff if they were thinking about refinancing in a few months. Mr. Fines replied he was not very forward looking with respect to that. He understood they had looked at the debt schedule for the past refinancing that had been done 4-5 years ago. He thought it had been a part of the budget as well. They had not discussed the one that had been before them today.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Fines if he was concerned about the negative cash reserve for the water utility. Mr. Fines replied yes. He explained they always had to balance cash

reserves with the need to perform the operations. The cash reserves for the water utility were for capital improvement projects. He hoped the water bond would help them get ahead of that so they would not need to further deplete cash reserves.

Mayor Treece understood the rate increases had projected an excess cash reserve target of about \$4 million at the end of 3-4 years. Mr. Fines explained he tended not to trust projections that went out beyond a couple of years, but agreed the projections showed them eventually recovering the cash reserve.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Fines if he was concerned about the excess target cash reserves in the electric utility. Mr. Fines replied excess was a sign that they could do more projects. If they go above, he felt they should try to bring that number down to the target value. If they went below, he thought they should be seeking to raise it back to that point.

Mr. Fines pointed out electrical demand had remained relatively flat in the last year, which continued to be a very positive trend for them. He noted he would not expect that to continue indefinitely, which underscored the importance of the integrated resource plan. He explained they were getting a nice reprieve on a lot of infrastructure investments as a result.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought that was the fruit of things, such as the energy efficiency standards placed in the building codes. He noted he was happy to see their non-renewable energy usage down over ten years. They needed to do more, but it was good to see.

REP76-19 Amendment to the FY 2019 Annual Budget - Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds.

Mayor Treece explained this had been provided for informational purposes.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, asked if the City was still under an audit. Mayor Treece replied the City had an annual financial audit. Mr. Elkin asked if that was behind them now. Mayor Treece replied he thought they had just received it a couple of months ago. Ms. Peters explained one was done every year. Mr. Elkin wondered if they should look at the method chosen for keeping track of funds. He recalled someone explaining some numbers did not represent money. He thought it would be nice if it were simpler.

Mr. Elkin thought the transit system needed to be improved. He would be unable to provide successful homeless stories if they were unable to get to their jobs, grocery stores, etc.

Mr. Skala understood a portion of new road near Rice Road and Lake of the Woods Road included speed tables, and asked if that was a function of the improvements related to requests for retrofits to address speeding issues. Mr. Glascock thought those speed tables had been installed after the fact. Mr. Skala asked if that had been a part of the same process as everyone was always requesting traffic calming. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Mr. Skala explained he had been contacted by a constituent about looking into the possibility of a specific dog breed ban, primarily for pit bulls, and asked for a report to be provided.

Mr. Trapp asked if there was a time frame for the conversion therapy ban ordinance. Ms. Thompson replied she thought something would come forward from the Human Rights Commission. She was not sure of the time frame, but thought it would be within the next 30 days.

Mayor Treece asked if that would come back as a report or if it would come back as an ordinance. Ms. Thompson replied it would come back as a report unless Council

directed staff to come back with an ordinance. She thought an ordinance had already been submitted as a report. Mayor Treece stated his recollection was that they had received a report, and that they had done a resolution instead of an ordinance. He suggested they skip the report and just get an ordinance on the agenda. Mr. Trapp agreed. Ms. Thompson stated that could be done.

Mr. Thomas thanked the Council for organizing the voting on the amendments to occur at this meeting so he could fully participate in it since he would be absent from the next meeting.

Mr. Thomas stated B282-19, which was introduced tonight, would allow private waste haulers to be licensed to haul food waste. He understood it would have its second and third reading along with a vote at the next meeting, and asked if that could be delayed until the October 7, 2019 Council Meeting so he could participate in that conversation.

Mayor Treece understood they could table that at the next meeting.

Ms. Peters asked if it could be tabled now. Mr. Pitzer replied he thought it had to be done at the next meeting.

Mayor Treece stated he would make a note to do that. Ms. Amin stated she would put a note on the next council agenda indicating that Mr. Thomas had asked that this item be tabled so the public knew. Mr. Thomas thanked everyone.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 12:32 a.m.