



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### City Council

---

Monday, August 16, 2021  
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber  
Columbia City Hall  
701 E. Broadway

---

#### I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at approximately 7:00 p.m. on Monday, August 16, 2021, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Member IAN THOMAS, Council Member MATT PITZER, Council Member BETSY PETERS, Mayor BRIAN TREECE, Council Member PAT FOWLER, Council Member ANDREA WANER, and Council Member KARL SKALA were present. City Manager John Glascock, City Counselor Nancy Thompson, City Clerk Sheela Amin, and various Department Heads and Staff Members were also present.

Treece explained the minutes were not yet complete for the July 6, 2021, July 19, 2021, and August 2, 2021 regular meetings nor the August 9, 2021 special meeting.

Upon his request, Treece made a motion to allow Skala to abstain from voting on the Board of Health interest in public health vacancy. Skala noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that one of the applicants was his spouse. The motion was seconded by Waner and approved unanimously by voice vote.

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

#### II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

#### III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC8-21 Board and Commission Applicants.

Upon receiving the majority vote of the Council, the following individuals were appointed to the following Boards and Commissions. Skala abstained from the vote involving his spouse.

##### BOARD OF HEALTH

Szewczyk, Michael, 1404 E. Highlands Court, Ward 5, Term to expire August 31, 2024

Skala, Mahree, 5201 Gasconade Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire August 31, 2024

##### BUILDING CONSTRUCTION CODES COMMISSION

Kilgore, Trevor, 1917 Paris Road (Business), Ward 4, Term to expire August 1, 2024

##### COLUMBIA HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD

Rahn, Jama, 506 N. Garth Avenue, Ward 1, Term to expire May 31, 2024

##### HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Hagen, Melissa, 4704 Newcastle Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire September 1, 2024

TREE BOARD

Bybee, Stephen, 205 Spring Valley Road, Ward 4, Term to expire January 31, 2022

**IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

SPC47-21      Monica Lee - Experiences at the City Council meeting last Monday (8/9).

Monica Lee commented that as a Korean immigrant she had always been proud to live in Columbia and that her family had proudly called Columbia their hometown for the past 15 years. Lee explained she had attended the August 9 special council meeting to speak in favor of the mask mandate, but had been disheartened to see large numbers of people holding signs in opposition to the mask mandate outside of the building. Even though Lee had been uncomfortable, she had come inside to participate in the meeting. She, however, had not expected those in opposition to come inside of the building and meeting room without wearing their masks as required by the City. Lee noted they had ignored the repeated requests of Treece and had also continuously interrupted the meeting by shouting and yelling. After some time, Lee decided to leave the meeting because she felt her health along with that of her family's was in danger. Prior to the start of the meeting, Lee had spoken with the City Manager, who had indicated those in opposition to the mask mandate had every right to protest just like her, and wearing a mask was only a city policy. It was not a law. Lee stated she had felt uneasy by that response as it made her feel as though what she and they were doing was the same when she knew that was not the case. While it was their right to protest outside of the building, what they were doing inside of the building by not wearing a mask and putting other people's lives in danger was not. Lee believed they had intentionally and continuously endangered the public and had disregarded the rights of others along with the rules that had been set as a society. Lee did not feel it should have been viewed as a legitimate form of protest. Holding public hearings where all could safely make their voices heard was an integral part of a democratic society and a basic right. Those that had disrupted the meeting that night had denied many others of their rights. Lee commented that she had later learned that Chapter 16, Division 12 of the Columbia Code of Ordinances, which discussed offenses against public orders, indicated a person committed the crime of peace disturbance if that person unreasonably and knowingly disturbed or alarmed other people, and she believed that had happened at the August 9 meeting. Lee hoped measures would be implemented to avoid that from happening again in the future, and felt it desperately needed to happen in order to restore trust in the decision-making process within the City. Lee noted she also wanted to take this opportunity to thank the Columbia Public Schools (CPS) for implementing a mask mandate. After spending the past 18 months at home learning virtually, her 11 year old daughter was very excited to be going back to school, and Lee, like many parents, was relieved to be sending her children back to school safely. Lee agreed an effort was needed to get more people vaccinated, but understood some people would unfortunately not get vaccinated, and that was the reason she felt a citywide mask mandate was needed. It would protect them from those who chose not to get vaccinated and were unwilling to wear a mask. The rate of spread with the Delta variant was beyond alarming. Frontline doctors and healthcare workers in Columbia were pleading with them to do all they could to keep each other safe, and considering the alternative, wearing a mask was a small price to pay. Lee asked the Council to make her proud to live in Columbia again, and for them to not be afraid to do the right thing.

**V. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

PH31-21      Setting property tax rates for 2021 for the City of Columbia.

Discussion shown with B240-21.

- B240-21      Setting property tax rates for 2021.
- PH31-21 was read by the City Clerk, and B240-21 was given second reading by the City Clerk.
- Finance Director Matthew Lue provided a staff report.
- Treece opened the public hearing.
- There being no comment, Treece closed the public hearing.
- B240-21 was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, WANER, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**
- PH32-21      FY 2022 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
- Discussion shown with B244-21.
- B241-21      Adopting the FY 2022 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
- Discussion shown with B244-21.
- B242-21      Amending Chapter 11 of the City Code relating to certain Public Health and Human Services Department fees.
- Discussion shown with B244-21.
- B243-21      Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to suspend transportation fares for users of the GoCOMO Public Transit System for the period October 1, 2021 to September 30, 2022.
- Discussion shown with B244-21.
- B244-21      Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to water rates.
- PH32-21 was read by the City Clerk, and B241-21, B242-21, B243-21, and B244-21 were given second reading by the City Clerk.
- Treece commented that this would be the first public hearing held on the City's budget, and two additional public hearings would be held in September. In addition, a work session would be held this Thursday.
- Lue and Glascock provided a staff report.
- Fowler asked Lue how he accounted for the gap between \$443 million in revenues and \$474 million in expenditures as was shown on the first slide of the presentation. Lue replied that was due to capital projects for the most part. It required a lot of upfront money, and that money could fluctuate. Lue thought a good example this year involved the Airport. Last year, they had about \$20 million in the Capital Improvement Project (CIP) Plan, but this year, they only had \$6 million. Fowler understood those moneys were sitting in a separate account because they were the proceeds of a bond sale. Lue stated that was not necessarily true. Fowler understood the City was not deficit spending as they had the funding to fill the gap. Lue stated that was correct.
- Fowler asked if the telephone tax was related to the things for which they had sued CenturyLink. Lue replied he thought that lawsuit had to do with cable gross receipts tax. Fowler asked if that was the telephone tax. Lue replied no, and explained they were two different taxes.
- Fowler understood the cable franchise fee was declining because the market share for cable was declining.
- Fowler stated she would be interested in being provided more information as to how the telephone tax tied into the lawsuit against CenturyLink. Fowler wondered if they were trying to recover what had not been properly paid. Lue stated that was correct. Fowler understood the two were related. Lue explained there were two parts to the payment. One was related to the telephone and the other was related to cable or the internet.

Fowler understood there would be a three percent across the board increases for employees, and it would cost the City \$3.3 million total with \$1.75 million to be paid from the general fund. Lue explained the \$1.75 million was for the general fund employees. Fowler understood \$1.75 million went to the employees funded by the general fund, and asked for clarification regarding the remaining employees. Lue replied they would be covered by the other funds, i.e., enterprise funds, etc.

Fowler asked if the fire station that had been mentioned was one that had already been approved and funded. Fowler wondered if it had already gone through the capital improvement process. Glascock replied yes. Fowler asked if that was the one Pitzer had brought to the attention of the City as a need. Pitzer replied yes, and noted it had taken 3.5 years.

Fowler commented that she had heard reference to using CARES Act funding along with the American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funding to help bolster staffing at the Public Health and Human Services Department. Fowler noted she had also heard the mention of 32 full-time positions being ARPA funding eligible. Lue agreed they were eligible.

Fowler understood that when the City had removed 72 positions from the budget last year, there had not been 72 people filling those jobs. Glascock stated that was correct. Fowler understood no one had been laid off that they would now try to rehire due to a change in circumstances as they had been empty positions when removed from the budget. Treece pointed out not all had been empty positions. Glascock agreed, and noted 11 people had been laid off.

Fowler understood there was an allocation of a little over \$3 million for the Parks and Recreation Department in terms of the CIP, but it did not allow for the Sports Fieldhouse project to be included next year, and asked if that was correct. Lue replied he understood an amount for some work had been included, but he did not know the specifics. Fowler understood the Sports Fieldhouse was on the list of priority projects for the sales tax renewal, and asked if they would budget for it now if they wanted to advance it. Pitzer thought they could identify funding for the entire project, but the slide displaying the capital project amounts by department had included what might actually be spent in the next fiscal year. Lue agreed.

Fowler understood the Railroad would have \$100,000 appropriated for capital projects, and asked how the repair and/or removal of the bridge fit into that because \$100,000 did not match the estimated costs of either scenario. Glascock replied that total was associated with the capital projects involving the Railroad and he did not know whether that included the bridge. The slide only showed the amount identified for capital projects for the Railroad for next year. Fowler understood that if they wanted to talk about a repair to that bridge, they would need to make an amendment and/or other accommodation. Glascock stated he would need to check as to where it was on the list, and asked Fowler if she wanted him to check on that for the meeting on Thursday. Fowler replied yes, and explained she was very interested in the life span of the COLT Railroad.

Peters asked for the list of projects totaling the \$8 million for the electric utility. Utilities Director Dave Sorrell replied he thought each project was listed and identified for each of the utilities in the CIP portion of the budget.

Peters stated she did not see where in the budget they had listed the fire trucks as those were about \$1 million each, and asked for clarification as she understood they were replacing a number of them. Lue replied he thought those were in Fleet. Peters commented that she did not believe there was enough money in Fleet to cover those costs. Pitzer wondered if it had been included with the Public Safety capital projects as that total was about \$2.7 million. Lue agreed.

Fowler understood a fire truck was a substantial purchase but wondered if it was a capital project. Glascock replied they were capitalized because they cost \$1 million. Fowler understood they were depreciated according to however the City depreciated that type of equipment. Lue stated that was correct. Treece pointed out they were also often on a ballot issue.

Thomas asked if it would be correct to say that over many years the revenues and expenditures should balance out. Lue replied yes. Thomas stated it was his impression that they nearly always seemed to have a \$20 or \$50 million excess on the expenditure side compared to the revenue side, and asked if once in a while there would be a year whereby the expected revenues would exceed the expenditures. Lue replied they might have those years. Lue explained they only had about \$90 million or \$100 million in the general fund. The rest was within the enterprise funds that did not have to balance. Many times there were projects associated with those enterprise funds that needed to be paid, such as capital items, making them exceed revenues. Thomas commented that he felt the money in should equal the money out even in the enterprise funds. Thomas understood this was a budget, and there was a separate "actual" retrospective. Thomas asked if the actuals for each year had to balance over time. Lue agreed at some point in time it would balance.

Thomas understood the general fund reserve was currently over \$60 million, and the restricted reserve, which was 20 percent of the annual expenditures, was \$22 million. In addition, they had already received \$12.5 million in ARPA funding, and those funds were restricted. This left nearly \$27 million that was unrestricted. Lue stated that was correct. Thomas asked what that unrestricted amount had been about 3-4 years ago, and whether it was much smaller than that. Lue replied it was much smaller. Thomas asked for the cause of it to have increased so much in the past few years. Lue replied he thought it was the perfect storm of revenues coming in higher and expenses coming in lower. Thomas understood that had occurred year by year, and now they had this surplus of money that could be spent on anything since it was unrestricted. Lue agreed, and explained that was one of the issues of budgeting revenues low. Conservative revenue numbers required conservative spending.

Thomas commented that the City's actual sales tax collections had been very flat for at least four years according to the graph, and asked for the assumptions involved in the sales tax revenues going up rather steeply over the next five years. Lue replied most of it was due to the injection of cash from the ARPA and CARES Act. Moody's had projected a 16 percent increase in sales tax, and staff did not believe that would happen. Thomas understood the injection of the ARPA and CARES Act funds going into people's pockets meant that people would spend more. Thomas also understood none of this included a potential use tax that would collect the equivalent of sales taxes from online purchases, and if that legislation passed, it would create an additional revenue source. Lue stated that was correct.

Treece opened the public hearing.

James Melton, 5007 Bates Creek Court, explained he was the Chair of the Commission on Cultural Affairs (CCA) and explained the basic guidelines of the arts funding program and the application review process. Melton noted they had received 24 applications requesting just over \$162,000. In FY 2022, subject to the Council approving the budget, they anticipated the distribution of \$100,000 towards these projects as well as an additional \$3,000 for small requests. They would also augment City funds with \$8,100 from the Columbia Arts Fund, bringing the total annual funding distributions to \$108,100 plus the \$3,000 in funding for small requests. Melton commented that the impact these funds made was crucial to the operations of arts organizations. Many cities had determined the arts were a sound investment for increasing tourism, contributing to community livability, enhancing education, encouraging economic activity, improving public safety, and making a city a retirement destination. The funding the City provided encouraged all of this and was truly about providing greater access to art and cultural activities for citizens and visitors. They estimated that more than 195,000 citizens and visitors would participate in City funded arts activities and events in the current fiscal year, making the City's investment just a little more than 55 cents per participant. Melton noted the CCA commended and thanked the Council for recognizing the importance of actively supporting the arts in Columbia. Melton stated the arts were not

only important but were necessary, and as the Fine Arts Director for the Columbia Public Schools, he believed they were becoming more necessary every day.

Fowler understood that in addition to the funds received from the City's general fund, they included a small amount from another fund that had grown to \$383,000 from donations, and of that, they would distribute just \$8,000. Fowler asked for the reasoning for only providing an additional \$8,000. Melton replied it was based on a recommended calculation from their financial advisors in terms of how much they could distribute while continuing to grow the balance. Upon receipt of the recommendation, a subcommittee of the CCA made the determination. Melton explained they had seen great growth over the last year, and hoped to continue to have the ability to augment future funding as often as possible. Fowler understood it was an investment advisor decision to only spend \$8,000, and asked what they were growing that fund for if they were only giving out a small amount of money at a time when the arts were so crucial. Melton commented that from his perspective, they were growing it toward being able to double or triple their augmentation of City funds. They had been advised they did not have enough to be any more aggressive at this time.

Tom Rose, 5204 E. Tayside Circle, noted he was the Vice Chair of the Housing and Community Development Commission (HCDC) and asked the Council for its support of their FY 2022 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Investment Partnership program funding recommendations. The funding recommendations had been unanimously approved by the HCDC on August 4, 2021. Rose noted FY 2022 was the third year of the City's 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and explained the input process in developing the goals for that Plan along with the process for reviewing the applications submitted. Rose asked the Council to consider supporting the CDBG and HOME funding recommendations of the HCDC as submitted.

Treece thanked the HCDC for their work as he understood there had been a lot of requests and not all were fully funded or funded at all. Rose noted the requests for HOME funds had been less than anticipated. As a result, a newer RFP would be issued and he was confident that some of those organizations would apply.

Stacy Ford, 2701 Andy Drive, stated she was Chair of the Human Services Commission (HSC) and explained that because the City did not have the capacity to provide all of the social services needed in the community, the HSC and the Department of Health and Human Services were charged with making annual recommendations for the purchase of social services through professional service agreements with community-based providers utilizing the City's social services funding. Ford noted the social services provided and purchased by the City addressed some of the community's most challenging issues, many of which were rooted in poverty and inequity. The goal of the City's purchase of social services was to ensure basic needs were met, and in order to meet that goal, the City's social services funding was allocated into the two areas of basic needs and opportunity. Ford commented that detailed information about the issues and the social services funding process had been provided to the Council as an attachment to the budget. While they would have liked to have had an increase in social services funding, they understood resources were limited and applauded the Council's allocation of \$1.3 million in reserve funding for public assistance programs. They were also pleased with discussions regarding the spending of ARPA funds on greatly needed projects, such as a comprehensive homeless services center. As had been done with the public assistance funding, the HSC would encourage the Council to utilize the City's existing robust process for administering ARPA funds earmarked for social services, thus avoiding the difficulties that had arisen when the Boone County Commission had allocated CARES Act funding using a new process that had not included input from County staff or boards or with local funders. Ford pointed out the issues of poverty and inequity continued to conspire to keep too many community members from realizing their true potential. It was why the City's investment in social services, which not only assisted people in meeting their basic needs but also helped to build the skills and assets needed to move up and

out of poverty, was so critical. Ford stated the need for social services and the City's social services funding had never been greater due to the ongoing pandemic. Ford thanked the Council for its longstanding support of the City's investment in the social infrastructure of the community, and noted they looked forward to presenting the FY 2022 contract recommendations in December.

Thomas commented that the report Ford had mentioned had included a table that had separated basic needs and opportunity, and asked for clarification as he did not quite understand it. Ford replied the contracts were two-year contracts, and thus, the proposals were handled on a two-year opposing rotation. Thomas asked if funding would only go to basic needs for the next two years. Ford replied the FY 2022 funding would be for basic needs and the opportunity contracts they had entered into previously. Each year both categories were funded. They were only considering proposals for one category in the current year, but they would still pay on the second year of the contracts awarded last year. Thomas understood the package proposed for FY 2022 would include both categories. Ford stated that was correct.

Thomas understood Ford had indicated the HSC would be interested in the process for allocating the ARPA funds, which he agreed should go toward public health and human service needs, and asked if she had a proposal as to how that might work and what Council action might be required for the HSC to make recommendations. Human Services Manager Steve Hollis replied he did not want to speak for the HSC, but traditionally they would issue RFPs after identifying the priority needs. Hollis assumed Council would be driving things with a little more detail than just social services. From a staff perspective, they would take direction from the Council and the HSC and then utilize the RFP process.

Thomas noted the City Manager's budget showed the full \$25 million allocated in certain areas. If they were going to do this process through the HSC, Thomas assumed they would want to change that by not allocating those funds in that way as part of the FY 2022 budget or placing it in a different category to be considered by the HSC along with the HCDC. Hollis stated staff would not determine how the money would be allocated. The public assistance funding had been set aside and the CDBG recommendations had been utilized to allocate that funding. Hollis explained they had handled special RFPs with special funds in the past, but typically they were more grant funds. Hollis noted staff was there to support the HSC in any way they could. Ford explained the HSC could review whether the organizations had the capacity to take on the funding while providing the services they were purchasing through the proposal process. The organizations would also report back so the HSC could ensure they were doing what they said they could do. Thomas asked if the HSC also had their finger on the pulse of the needs for social and human services. Ford replied yes, and pointed out they spent a lot of time ensuring they had indicators of what was needed, and those indicators did not always correlate to what they thought. They were, however, the actual needs because through their connections, they could determine the actual needs. Ford noted they had been working on homelessness for quite some time, and there was now a greater need in that regard due to the pandemic.

Fowler commented that she had previously asked if the 11:1 ratio would hold up under the conditions of COVID because, while the City had been the recipient of funding, they did not know if their partner agencies from which they purchased services had as many resources as they had pre-COVID. Fowler asked if they knew whether that 11:1 ratio was holding up with their partner agencies. Ford understood Hollis had surveyed the organizations. Hollis explained he had not had the opportunity to run those numbers for the HSC, but would do so once they received the new proposals. Fowler noted that together they had a certain capacity, and wondered if that had shifted as she believed the needs had. Hollis stated he would try to get that number for the HSC and the Council and that he would also try and do another CoMoHelps on nonprofit status if they were able.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, explained he had been communicating with Pitzer over the last few months with regard to a FY 2022 water utility CIP evaluation as each project listed had existing money in the account. If they added the new money to the old money, they would have a new total. The CIP would go from \$7.6 million to \$13 million. Conway wondered if a closer examination of each project should occur to determine if that money was truly needed for that particular CIP. In looking at the enterprise revenue funding for FY 2022 for the water utility, it had increased by \$2 million, which in turn put pressure on the need for water rate increases. Conway wondered how that had been evaluated in the budget process. If the annual revenue in the water utility was \$26 million, and one percent of that was \$260,000, Conway felt they needed to compare that \$260,000 to the \$2 million. Conway asked that staff be required to evaluate each project in the water and electric utilities, and to provide a report with regard to the need. Conway understood the increase in the enterprise fund for the electric utility was \$3,675,000, which was substantial and put pressure on the need for additional revenue. Conway pointed out the CIP in total went from about \$8.5 million to about \$15.7 million. Conway noted there were a number of communities across the nation that had agreements with communication companies for equipment on water towers and received revenues from those lease agreements, and suggested that money be budgeted to the CASH program to help those in need in the winter with their utility bills.

Randy Cole explained he was the CEO of the Columbia Housing Authority (CHA) with offices at 201 Switzler Street and noted CHA was the community's leading provider of affordable housing, currently serving over 1,800 households. Cole stated he hoped to be at 2,000 by the end of the year. Cole noted he had submitted a letter to Council today outlining their request for consideration of \$3 million in ARPA funds along with \$1.2 million in HOME ARPA funds. The funds would directly impact 169 units estimated to serve up to 1,000 vulnerable Columbia citizens. The proposal would preserve existing affordable housing stock, expand new units, and ensure they were serving the full continuum of affordable housing needs. It would allow them to add 24 units to help the homeless population, 120 rental units for families, and 25 units of permanently affordable homes along with a potential partnership with the Columbia Community Land Trust. The City's investment would leverage close to \$31 million in total investments, support 109 full-time jobs during construction in the most distressed census tract, and increase the community tax base. Cole commented that the urgent need for affordable housing was broadly supported by elected officials, government officials, policy advocates, realtors, builders, bankers, appraisers, and major employers locally and across the country. There were currently over 16,000 housing-cost burdened households in Columbia, and the City's strategic plan identified affordable housing as important to maintaining a resilient economy and contained the themes of social and racial equity. It had specified outcome objectives of expanding the supply of affordable housing along with increasing investments in affordable housing, and this proposal would assist the City in achieving both of those goals. Cole pointed out affordable housing was also noted in the Consolidated Plan, the Fair Housing Task Force report, and via community input from the 2020 Affordable Housing Summit, the 2015 Affordable Housing Symposium, and the 2008 Affordable Housing Task Force report. The proposal would allow the community to invest in the most vulnerable populations and housing units that served their highest concentration of low-income minority populations. It would be an opportunity for the Council to make a real and direct impact on social and racial equity while advancing affordable housing through a one in a generation investment in the residents of the CHA. Cole thanked the Council for their consideration.

Treece understood the CHA was requesting \$4.2 million of ARPA funds. Cole stated that was the amount in total. Treece understood there would be additional ARPA funds specifically designated for housing. Cole explained that would be within the \$4.2 million. It would be \$3 million in the ARPA funding the City had discussed previously, and \$1.2 million in the HOME portion of the ARPA funding.



Thomas asked Cole if the 120 units for redevelopment was the long running project for which his predecessor had applied for low-income housing tax credits. Cole replied yes. Cole explained 597 units had been renovated through that process, and 120 were left to be done on Park Avenue and Providence Walkway near the CHA administrative building. Those units were built in the 1950s and needed attention. Thomas understood energy efficiency would be a big part of the improvement. Cole agreed, and noted a small fire had occurred in one unit, which had allowed them to see what was inside the walls. Several of the walls that were not cinderblock were wood and did not have any insulation. Upgrades were desperately needed.

Fowler asked if there was another channel of ARPA funds that was specific to housing that the Council had not yet discussed. Cole replied he had mentioned the HOME ARPA funding when the Council had held their work session, and recalled discussion then about that funding source. It had also been discussed at HCDC meetings. Fowler understood it was not a part of the \$25 million and that it was an additional channel of funding. Cole stated that was correct. Cole explained the City had been awarded about \$2.1 million and staff was waiting for guidance from HUD as to how it would be implemented. Cole understood the primary objective of those funds was to preserve and produce additional affordable housing units, particularly for the homeless populations. Fowler understood that was not reflected in the budget document yet because the City was still in the process of securing the funding. Treece explained the City had received notice of those funds, but the requirements had not yet been written for it. They knew about how much they would receive. Fowler understood it was similar to the other funds in that notification had been received indicating that if the City completed the paperwork properly they were entitled to \$2.1 million. Glascock stated the City was still awaiting the guidelines and suggested they obtain more information from staff.

Doris Littrell, 920 Timberhill Road, stated her main concern was with the homeless situation in Columbia, and noted she viewed the ARPA funds as a way to significantly deal with it. Littrell understood there had been several groups working for several years in Columbia to try to design a very comprehensive way to deal with homelessness, which included housing, community, social, and health services, job training, etc., and that a couple of those groups felt \$5 million was needed for that type of installation. Littrell suggested they use \$5 million of ARPA funding for that effort. Littrell commented that she had read in the paper about a crisis center involving Burrell Behavioral Health, and asked if that was the same mental health treatment center that was listed for \$3 million. Treece replied that would be the rapid access treatment center or the behavior crisis center. Littrell stated she did not believe \$10 million was necessary for broadband even though her broadband was terrible, especially with the federal government passing a bill involving \$65 million for infrastructure funding, and suggested some of that \$10 million be utilized for a well-done comprehensive effort to address homelessness in Columbia. Littrell noted she wanted Columbia to be a leader in country in that regard.

Julie Ryan, 5301 Regal Way, stated she was with the COMO Safe Water Coalition, which had been founded almost five years ago in September of 2016, and noted she thought they would have seen more by now. Ryan commented that in review of the flyers that were designed to promote the 2018 water bond, the public had been told three percent in 2019, three percent in 2020, three percent in 2021, and two percent in 2022. The total impact would be an 11 percent increase realized as an increase of approximately \$2.71 per month for the average residential customer. It had been what was promoted to those voting on the bond issue. Ryan felt that once the increases started happening, they began talking about revenue and where things needed to be while forgetting what they had told people. Ryan pointed out they had not done what they said they would do based on the water bond. In addition, they were muddling things together. It was not a simple operations increase or a voter approved increase because those items had gotten pulled into a change in the rate structure, which involved tiers along with an emphasis on conservation. Ryan did not feel these issues were being communicated

well, and did not understand why that was the case. Ryan commented that she had reviewed an article that had promoted the water bond whereby a Utilities Department spokesperson had been quoted as saying that if the bond did not pass, they would be forced to raise water rates by 30 percent over five years. Ryan asked the Council if they saw the circle of inefficiency in terms of not communicating what was happening and not doing what they said they would do. It was not helpful or transparent. Ryan wondered if the cost of service study that had been done was even being reference. Ryan noted she had spoken about the water utility CIP project identified as W0234 for a lime residual pipeline since at least 2018. Ryan felt staff was putting money aside for a residual pipeline because they did not want to fix the plant the way it needed to be fixed. There were multiple consultant reports telling them they would not be producing lime if the aerators and basins were fixed, but instead they kept putting money toward a discharge pipeline. Ryan stated she did not understand why that project was still within the CIP.

Treece stated he thought they had paused on the lime residual pipeline. Ryan noted it was still showing up in the CIP Plan. A year ago, they had been told there would be an RFP for the aerators outside of the contract involving the water treatment plant. Ryan pointed out there had been zero public outreach on the water treatment plant process, and they had asked to be a part of the process multiple times. Ryan stated these were areas they all needed to understand and felt the water utility needed to do better.

Treece noted they would likely discuss this further on Thursday and that he was inclined to pull B244-21 to push the discussion a bit further.

Rebecca Shaw, 2615 Vail Drive, commented that the fire and police fleet had not been included in the budget as they were funded by the capital improvement sales tax and reflected in capital improvements. It was one of the changes within the budget. Shaw noted the City's social services funding had been unchanged since 2010. The suggested proposed amount for FY 2022 was close to \$900,000, which was actually less than the amount funded in 2009. The proposed animal control budget on the other hand was about \$700,000. Shaw wondered why they were spending almost as much on animal control as the humans in town. Shaw suggested they look at the social worker pay for the proposed collaborative effort with police because they were not listing those jobs high enough to get anyone who might be trained and certified in de-escalation and crisis management. Shaw stated she was not sure if that was purposeful or if they were unaware of the market for those jobs. Shaw commented that she was not sure why the ARPA funds were within the budget because she thought they had all agreed it would be discussed following budget talks. Shaw explained that when they had asked why a certain project was included, the response was that it was something the people indicated was important. Shaw assumed they were referencing the survey from the HCDC, which had received about 400 responses. Columbia was a community of 128,000 people, and that number reflected 0.03 percent of the population. Shaw wondered why they were basing the things they were choosing to do on that small of a number. Shaw believed there needed to be robust public input on matters such as this. Shaw hoped more people would come to tell the Council what was needed as they continued talking about the budget because she did not see the values of the City reflected in it.

Matthew Schacht, 1617 Windsor Avenue, stated he was a fourth generation teacher and would be teaching classes at the University of Missouri and Stephens College in a week. Schacht noted he was also the studio manager at Vidwest Studios in his free time, and Vidwest Studios was previously Columbia Access Television (CAT). Schacht explained public access television was community owned media and had been created to balance out the privatization of cable channels, which were, for a time, the main way people communicated. In the last twelve months, they had accomplished a number of things with very little resources. One of those accomplishments had included sixteen live streams for the Bicentennial Celebrations in the State of Missouri, and one of those live streams had been in Jefferson City where the Governor had spoken. Their crews and equipment had been so well managed that the State Historical Society had trusted them with the

responsibility for doing those live streams for the entire State. They had provided those services without a City contract, which meant they had been funding the media center through their own grit and resourcefulness. Schacht stated he was proud of their team's expertise and service to the community as it was no small feat for a young non-profit to singlehandedly manage and fund a media center, but noted he was concerned about the media center moving forward. Vidwest was supposed to have a contract with the City. In September of 2020, the Council had voted to approve a second round of funding based on the results of the first year of funding. City staff had hesitated to close out the 2019 contract, which had been written by the City, was a manifestation of the City's priorities, and had stipulated the public cable access channel should be up and running. The public access channel was clearly not up and running. Schacht questioned why the City would make the cable channel a priority when they had social media, which was faster and cheaper and had greater access. Schacht pointed out that once a cable channel was lost, it was very hard to get back. Schacht understood putting faith in social media, which was privately owned, could lead to some very unpleasant scenarios whereby voices were censored, and agreed it might be wise to try to keep a cable channel until online speech was more secure. Keeping the channel had a purpose, and if that purpose was worth the cost, they would bid to try to restart the channel. Schacht stated Vidwest had the equipment and content, and was ready to broadcast, but Mediacom had not provided the fiber to send the signal from their location to the head channel, and they had been waiting for 20 months. Schacht noted they had invited City staff to help them by reaching out to Mediacom, but City staff had not participated as it had not been a priority for them. Schacht commented that he appreciated City staff as he saw how dedicated they were, and this was not meant as critique of them. Schacht only wanted to highlight the problem with regard to something with which they were struggling. Schacht explained Vidwest had continued on without a City contract and without support from City staff. They had continued their duties to the City and had kept in communication with Mediacom, which had involved requests for updates and timelines. They had raised money and paid bills even though fiber had not been installed and a new City contract had not been offered despite their timely and diligent communication. Schacht stated they were asking for funding to support the expenses from last year along with funding for this year. Schacht commented that he felt Mediacom had deprioritized their request to install cable, and that they would be more receptive if City staff took an active role in communicating with them. Schacht understood the volunteers of CAT had been joined by City staff to back them in their request, which had then led to the founding of the channel. Schacht suggested the contract for 2021 include contract terms that would achieve results, and felt asking Vidwest to unilaterally coax Mediacom into cooperating was a recipe for failure. Schacht stated he believed in the mission of community media, which would be a casualty. Once Mediacom installed fiber at Vidwest Studios, which was located on the Business Loop, they would have the pipeline needed to restart the channel and fulfill the goal of the City that Vidwest had set out to accomplish. Schacht asked the City to also consider executing the 2020 order to fund Vidwest so they received the funds that had been appropriated. Schacht noted the Vidwest volunteers continued to work hard for the community, and he did not feel it was fair to ask those volunteers to pay the electric bill after they had given their time and labor serving residents. Schacht felt the City could choose to fulfill its public promise by providing Vidwest with retroactive funding for the services delivered through 2020 and acknowledging that Vidwest had taken all reasonable steps to restart the channel, but had been unable to do so based on circumstances outside of its control, and by closing out the 2019 contract.

Thomas commented that a really valuable component of the work that CAT and now Vidwest provided was to make technical equipment and training available to people who would not be able to otherwise access those items to express their own opinions while building their potential as communicators and in producing a product. Thomas asked Schacht if Vidwest had been able to do that work over the last year or two. Schacht

replied yes, and explained that was one of the few things they had been able to do without interruption due to the pandemic. Since it had not involved large groups, they were able to provide gear rentals and one-on-one training to whoever had approached them. They were reachable in-person, by phone, by text, by email, and on social media.

Thomas understood Vidwest had not been able to broadcast the programs that had been produced by people in the community due to the failure of being able to get connected to high-speed internet service. Schacht explained they had the ability to broadcast the signal through the internet, but there were data charges associated with it. Traditionally, access channels received a direct fiber line that went from the public access channel studio to the cable company, and regardless of the amount of data that was piped in over that line, there were not any charges. Thomas understood that was because it had the designation of public access. Schacht stated that was correct. Thomas understood CAT had various studios during their time, and asked if those production centers had been connected with high-speed access to the network. Schacht replied yes. Schacht explained that Stephens College had a fiber line installed, and Sean Brown had a fiber line installed when he had moved the studio to North Second Street. Thomas understood Schacht felt Mediacom had not prioritized them as a customer because they did not think they would make money from them as compared to other customers. Schacht stated he believed Mediacom could have served them quicker, and by serving them slowly, it meant the channel would go dark, which could result in them making a claim to take back from the public. Schacht felt they needed to ensure Mediacom was not going too slow, and having City staff involvement in the process would help with Mediacom taking them seriously. Thomas understood Vidwest did not have any definite commitment of a date, process, or time frame by which the service would be provided. Schacht stated they had received general time frames in the past. The latest one was about three months from now, and in three months, when checking in, they would be provided a new time frame.

Thomas stated he would appreciate it if City staff would assist Vidwest in getting this infrastructure project done so the public access channel could be back on the air.

Fowler asked if the inability to have the line installed was the reason they were not eligible for the funding that went along with the contract with the City. Schacht replied yes. Schacht explained the 2019-2020 contract had stipulated they would get the channel back up and running, and when they had failed to do so City staff did not feel it was right to follow the order of the Council to refund them because terms were still unmet within that contract. Fowler thought they had asked City staff to rewrite the contract so it met the circumstances Vidwest had found themselves in when they could not obtain the connection. Schacht stated City staff had presented them with a new contract, but rather than giving Vidwest the flexibility to continue to work with Mediacom, it had actually double-downed on the responsibility of Vidwest so they would be solely responsible for getting the channel up and running within three months or the contract would be terminated whereby they would be legally liable. Fowler understood it was essentially impossible because they had to rely on an outside provider to install the line. Schacht agreed.

Fowler commented that she had been a member of CAT and had learned how to make television programming. Fowler recalled the beauty of public access television at the time was that they were in the lower package of the cable bill, but understood the cable company had moved them to a higher package, and asked if that was correct. Schacht replied that since Vidwest had been managing the studio they had not had the opportunity to see the channel live so he was not certain.

Fowler stated she was in support of the City continuing to financially support community television and would try to make that happen within this budget process. Thomas noted he would as well.

Peters asked Schacht if they had considered moving the studio to a location where they would have access to the internet. Schacht replied that had been looked into when it had

been clear Mediacom was not acting quickly. They had explored the idea of a shared access point, which was a location where fiber was already installed with a spare fiber line that went to the cable channels. Schacht explained there was one at City Hall and another on Worley Street at the Columbia Public School Administration Building, and those options had been deemed unacceptable by those in charge of those utility closets. Peters asked Schacht if he had spoken with Stephens College since the studio used to be on their campus or if they had checked the Tenth Street location. Schacht replied they had communicated with Chase Thompson at Stephens College who had been on the Board of CAT at one time, and Thompson had been unable to locate fiber where the connection had been previously per his recollection. Schacht noted that was the extent of their research into that idea. Schacht pointed out Stephens College had evicted CAT so he was not sure how warm they would be to accepting them again.

Kyle Rieman commented that he was still committed to the new budget process and was available to answer questions. Rieman thought there had been some confusion with regard to the revenue and expenditures not matching up, and suggested reviewing pages 45 and 47, which showed the anticipated general fund revenues and expenses, as the expenditures were actually about \$400,000 less. The proposed expenditures were higher due to CIP projects, vacancy savings, etc. since they had to budget for it even though it might not be fully expended and anticipated expenditures would be lower than what was budgeted. Page 50 was their attempt to try to explain this for all of the funds. Rieman understood there had been a comment about sales tax, and right now they were doing really good at 8.5 percent, which was equivalent to about \$19 million. With the remaining sales tax for this year, it would likely be about \$25 million, and the anticipated amount for FY 22 was \$24 million. Rieman thought they could add another \$3 million or so if they anticipated growth of about five percent. Rieman pointed out there was a lot of money still left to be spent, especially in the general fund, and suggested the Council look at ways to spend it. Rieman understood there had been some questions regarding the capital improvement projects, especially with regard to utilities, and referred to page 380 which was the beginning of the listing of some electric projects. Rieman explained some projects were specific, and others were not. The one on page 380 was an annual project and not specific, so Rieman thought they might want to consider categorizing it as an ongoing or operating expense in future years. Rieman reiterated he was available if the Council or the public had questions or concerns.

Thomas understood the budget appeared to be projecting deficit spending because a form of conservative budgeting was to project higher expenditures than was actually likely to occur. At the budget point it looked like deficit spending with expenditures over revenues, but at the end of the year, the actuals were much closer to balance. Rieman stated that was correct. Rieman explained that was the reason for providing a history in terms of what was budgeted and the actual expenses. The expenses were usually lower, especially operating expenses, due to vacancy savings, etc. The budget was an estimate, and the Council was actually budgeting the authority for the operations. Thomas understood it provided the ability for City staff to go ahead and spend the money even though they might not use it all. Rieman agreed. Rieman noted things could come up like vacancies or the ability to do some things due to weather and that meant they might not use all of the authority for that year.

Jeanne Mihail, 3101 Crawford Street, stated she was really concerned regarding the proposed ARPA spending listed as part of the presentation. Mihail noted those six items were good suggestions, but did not feel half of those items were truly intended to be funded by the ARPA. Mihail understood the goal of was ARPA to help people in a crisis. Mihail agreed a shelter for the homeless was intended, but was not sure about stormwater projects as that would not directly help people suffering from crisis now. Mihail suggested they spend more time asking those that were suffering the most what they needed now. If a survey had generated fewer than 500 responses, a better and more creative effort was needed to reach people to determine their needs.

There being no further comment, Treece continued the public hearing to the September 7, 2021 Council Meeting.

Thomas asked about transit ridership numbers from before the pandemic and through the pandemic with the fare-free system, and wondered if that could be provided at the next meeting as it was associated with B243-21. Glascock replied it could. Thomas wondered if there might be a sustainable model of funding going forward for the transit system so they could maintain the fare-free system. Thomas stated he was supportive of the fare-free system as people used the bus more when those systems were implemented. Thomas understood a way to help fund it was in partnership with the University, and felt they had lost the leverage of offering students free fares since everyone was eligible for it, but thought they could still gain interest from the University and the students by looking to expand services in the areas that would be of most use to students. Thomas asked if staff could respond to whether that was part of the long range plan for transit on Thursday during the budget work session. Thomas also asked to be provided an update on the contract for the park and ride service available to University students, which had been in effect for many years. They used to be five-year contracts, but were now only one-year contracts. Thomas asked for an update at the work session on all of these issues.

Treece noted they had received a phone call from Larry Berve asking the Council to use the stimulus funds to pay off water and light and sewer bonds and to provide the citizens a break on their utility bills.

Fowler asked for a list of other funding sources that might be available for those items identified to potentially be funded with ARPA funds. Fowler agreed there were a lot of fine projects, but felt there were other ways to fund them. Fowler felt the ARPA funds should be utilized on items they did not have other ways to fund or had not traditionally had the ability to fund. Fowler provided broadband as an example that might have another funding source. Fowler commented that members of the public had come to her regarding the mental health treatment center saying it appeared to be a benefit for the way they policed people with untreated mental health issues, and as a result, she wondered if it might be more appropriate for that to be within the budget of the Police Department. In terms of workforce development, Fowler wondered if it could be funded by REDI.

Thomas understood there would likely be proposed amendments to the budget and asked if those should be submitted at the next council meeting in preparation for the September 20, 2021 meeting. Treece thought it would be best if it was earlier. Thomas asked if they should bring those up on Thursday. Treece replied yes. Treece explained that would allow them to be posted with the September 7, 2021 meeting agenda, which would also provide the opportunity for them to take public comment and discuss them. They could also then lie on the table for another two weeks. Treece suggested they have a funding source or a concomitant cut if they were proposing an amendment to add money to a certain part of the budget. Thomas understood that would apply to the \$22.45 million of ARPA funds as well. Treece stated that was correct, and pointed out there was actually \$25.2 million proposed, but only half of that was on hand.

## VI. OLD BUSINESS

B209-21

Authorizing a memorandum and agreement of lease of parking rights with Cherry Street Hotel, LLC to establish terms and conditions for the provision of parking spaces in the Tenth and Cherry Municipal Parking Garage.

The bill was given third reading by the City Clerk.

Public Works Director David Nichols provided a staff report.

Treece understood the proposal had not changed from the July 19, 2021 Council Meeting. Nichols stated that was correct.

Skala commented that there were two dominant issues. One had to do with fairness in terms of people being able to move ahead of others for parking permits, and the other had to do with parking sufficiency in terms of developers purchasing additional parking or

placing some parking underground in order to accommodate the need. Skala stated he planned to vote in opposition of this item.

Thomas commented that for him the fairness issue trumped everything. It was hard to tell people that had been on the waiting list and were potentially about to obtain a space that they would be pushed back. In addition, some people would not be able to renew existing spots if not enough spaces had accrued to the hotel by the time it opened. Nichols stated that was correct, and explained they would have to make the spaces available when notice was received 90 days prior to the hotel opening.

**B209-21 was given fourth reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NO ONE. VOTING NO: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, WANER, SKALA. Bill declared defeated.**

B258-21 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code to add a new Division 8 relating to police officer rights and appeals to the Personnel Advisory Board.

Discussion shown with B259-21.

B259-21 Amending Chapter 21 of the City Code relating to the Citizens Police Review Board.

The bills were given second reading by the City Clerk.

Thompson provided a staff report.

Treece noted Chapter 19 was referenced specifically in the collective bargaining agreement with the exclusive representative of police officers, and understood City staff had met with them since the last council meeting and felt the amendment sheet reflected the discussion that had occurred. Thompson stated that was correct. Thompson explained they had engaged in three separate meetings with them since the first reading of B258-21, which involved the Chapter 19 changes.

Treece understood Thompson had indicated changes needed to be made due to Senate Bill 26 because they would not have any disciplinary procedures for police officers if they were not in compliance, but thought Senate Bill 26 also said a law enforcement agency that had substantially similar or greater procedures shall be deemed in compliance. Treece asked if the City's current disciplinary procedures were similar or greater than it. Thompson replied she did not believe they were because they did not have timelines set out in their current disciplinary procedures that placed limits on compliance time frames on police officer appeals before the Personnel Advisory Board (PAB). Thompson explained that what was being proposed to the Council was a similar process to the existing grievance procedure. It just had time frames incorporated that would allow the review by the PAB in a timely fashion.

Pitzer understood Senate Bill 26 closed all records involving an investigation. Thompson stated that was correct, and as a result, any hearing before the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB) would need to be closed and the records following that would be closed. The current City Code provisions provided for those records to be open. Pitzer understood that in the future the records associated with the result of an investigation would be closed and they could not say anything about the investigation even if it was a matter of significant public interest involving an investigation and was currently open. Thompson stated that was correct.

Pitzer understood Section 21-50 would be stricken if B259-21 were to pass, and it included a statement indicating "the city manager shall cause police department rules and regulations to be established that provide for internal affairs investigations." Pitzer asked if that meant internal affairs was going away. Thompson replied no. It was being struck from the Chapter 21 provisions, but did not mean the internal affairs investigations would go away. They would just not be in Chapter 21 as it related to the CPRB. Pitzer understood the City Manager still had the authority to create an internal affairs division. Thompson stated that was correct.

Don Weaver noted he was representing the Columbia Police Officers Association (CPOA) and thanked staff for meeting with them as they had participated in some productive conversations over the last couple of weeks. Weaver explained he had sent the Council a letter outlining their concerns with the changes and with Chapter 21 overall. Weaver agreed with Thompson in that the CPOA felt all of their concerns had been addressed through their collaboration sessions. Weaver pointed out that in 2007 and 2008 when the City was considering some form of civilian review over the Police Department, the CPOA had come out publically in support of such a body. They believed any fair, unbiased, and neutral person or body would find that their conduct was appropriate where it was appropriate. The CPOA supported the mission of improving policing, improving police and community relations, bridging the gap, and increasing trust. Weaver commented that the CPOA felt the Council would be sending a dangerous and unhelpful message to the police and the public by adopting the changes proposed by staff as it related to Chapter 21. It would take away the ability of officers to avail themselves of the opportunity to communicate with the CPRB or appeal a lower level of discipline to the CPRB. Weaver felt that removing the opportunity of officers to appeal to the CPRB would set a dangerous precedent as they would be communicating that it was not a fair or neutral body since they would focus solely on actions against the police. Weaver noted they would also be removing the only opportunity for alternative dispute resolution or the mediation that currently existed for complaints, and pointed out a lot of complaints could be resolved with the simple sharing of perspectives. Weaver believed adopting B259-21 as written was misleading and wrong at worst, and very confusing at best. Weaver stated it indicated police officers had to appear before the CPRB for questioning, and that violated Senate Bill 26. Weaver understood City staff might point to a provision of "notwithstanding the forgoing, any police officer under investigation shall have the rights provided in...Chapter 19." When going to Chapter 19, they saw some of those rights, but they also saw reference to the possibility of a collective bargaining agreement, and when going to the collective bargaining agreement, they saw a bargaining of policy of the Columbia Police Department (CPD). They would have to follow a very complicated map to determine exactly what the rights of officers were in this context. By adopting B259-21 as it was written, they would not provide clear guidance to the public. Weaver commented that Senate Bill 26 indicated the investigation must conclude within 90 days and there were three ways by which it could conclude. The police chief could declare the investigation was concluded, the police chief could render a decision, or the time allotted for the investigation could pass. B259-21 allowed the police chief to reconsider a decision and impose discipline after the fact, which Weaver believed violated Senate Bill 26. Weaver noted the city manager could also impose discipline at a late stage, and felt that also violated Senate Bill 26. Weaver suggested B259-21 be more clear by saying no recommendation of the CPRB could or ever would result in discipline of an officer since it could not due to Senate Bill 26 as that would minimize risk to the City, minimize confusion, and would help manage the expectations of anyone involved. Weaver stated the CPOA was proposing edits that would actually expand or double the scope of cases the CPRB could hear. Instead of cutting the times for appeals from 30 days to 10 days as had been proposed by staff, the CPOA was suggesting it be expanded to 60 days. Once they took an individual officer's discipline off of the table, the CPRB could function as designed, i.e., a collaborative and constructive body to help bridge the gap and increase trust. Weaver commented that nothing was more unfair than an employee of any sort, including a police officer, being told by a supervisor that they had done exactly what their training, policy, etc. had said and then having some other body later suggest the person should be disciplined. Weaver felt if the police chief and the CPRB had a disagreement on policy or practice, the issue would not be fixed by disciplining the officer. It would be fixed by the CPRB collecting public input, summarizing its perspective, and collaborating with the police chief to change the training, policy, procedure, etc. going forward. It was why he felt the CPRB was created. Weaver



reiterated he felt they needed to be clear to the public that no discipline could be imposed on a police officer at this late stage.

Treece asked Weaver if there was a concise line he would delete from B259-21. Weaver replied he had provided a mark-up of the entire bill along with a clean version so they could see how the end product would look.

Treece understood Weaver was not saying the CPRB did not have the authority to look at general conduct or to conduct a post-incident review, and that he was just saying there could not be an individual disciplinary review. Weaver believed that if they took the individual disciplinary action out of it, they would free themselves of the 90-day period timelines associated with Senate Bill 26. Weaver noted they would not be able to compel an officer to answer questions due to Senate Bill 26 because there was a prospect of discipline. If that prospect of discipline was removed, they could compel the officer. Treece understood that would allow them to see if there was a pattern or practice. Weaver thought they would be able to compel them to a post-incident analysis so they could collaborate on solutions or understand perspectives. It would remove the punitive practice, which was really just a recommendation.

Treece understood there was a time under a previous police chief whereby the officers wanted the ability to appeal personnel decisions to the CPRB. Weaver commented that, in general, the CPOA would appreciate the ability to have someone outside of the City's chain of command look at the facts.

Travis Pringle explained he was Chair of the CPRB and invited Weaver to attend one of their meetings as there was a lot of collaboration between the CPRB and the CPD. Pringle commented that he understood mediation was still in the ordinance and not being taken away so he was not sure about those comments. Pringle noted they had not taken the removal of appeals of police officers lightly, and pointed out they had not had a current officer come before them with an appeal. The purpose of removing the officers from their jurisdiction was to streamline the process due to Senate Bill 26 and ensuring there was no confusion among officers. The PAB had come about from their discussion as to the best way to ensure the due process rights of officers were protected. The reason for the removal of community service aides was because Senate Bill 26 did not cover them and the CPRB had never heard an appeal involving a community service aide. Pringle reiterated it allowed them to streamline the process. Pringle commented that it was hard asking for a cut in the timeline from 30 days to 10 days when they had just recently asked for the 30 days, but the CPRB wanted to ensure the voices of those that came before them were heard, and felt that change was needed to ensure the timeline imposed by Senate Bill 26 was met.

Treece made a motion to amend B258-21 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Skala.

Thompson pointed out the mediation requirement was contained in Chapter 19. It was not contained in Chapter 21. Treece understood that was why Weaver would not have seen it. Thompson agreed. Treece asked if it was preserved in Chapter 19. Thompson clarified it was preserved in Chapter 21. It was not preserved in Chapter 19 because they were coming against the time limits of Senate Bill 26. While it was an option as an alternative to the PAB, it was not an option used very often by City employees, and it would not be an option for police officers that were appealing to the PAB.

**The motion made by Treece and seconded by Skala to amend B258-21 per the amendment sheet was approved unanimously by voice vote.**

**B258-21, as amended, was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, WANER, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

Treece stated he was confused as to where the CPRB fit when it came to officer

discipline before and after Senate Bill 26 in terms the complaint, the determination of the police chief, appeal to the city manager, and appeal to the PAB. Treece asked if the CPRB was involved in that process now and whether they would be involved in it after Senate Bill 26 was in effect. Treece also wondered if the changes adequately reflected it. Thompson replied that there was some streamlining of the process as a result of Senate Bill 26. Right now, they had various convoluted paths for appeal of a disciplinary decision by an officer. The model of oversight that had been adopted by the Council provided for a review of citizen complaints. At some point in time in that process, it was decided that if they were going to give the citizens a right to appeal, they should also give the officers a right to appeal. At the same time, the officers had the PAB process. Senate Bill 26 and its 90-day cap had somewhat forced their hands because they no longer had the luxury of going to the CPRB and then appealing the recommendation of the CPRB by going to the PAB. Thompson stated the PAB process was really the full due process hearing that was required by Senate Bill 26. Thompson explained that was the rationale for removing the potential for an appeal by an officer through this side door channel.

Treece asked if the process was concluded once the police chief made a determination if the determination was made on the forty-fifth day, or if the balance of those 45 days could be pursued by appealing to the city manager, the CPRB, or the PAB. Thompson replied she thought the clock started again on the appeal. The first time frame actually applied specifically to the completion of the investigation. They then had the determination of the disposition and the rendering of the disciplinary decision within 90-days. There were two 90-day windows, and once one stopped, the other started. The ultimate decision-maker in all disciplinary actions was the city manager. They had to get through the entire appeals process and to the city manager within that second 90-day window. The CPRB in their oversight function on behalf of the citizens was also conducting a review, and while they could not force a subject officer to come and testify as it was limited by Senate Bill 26, they could hear from other officers that were not the subject of discipline and make a recommendation to the city manager. Treece asked if the CPRB would open an investigation after the police chief had concluded its investigation. Thompson replied the CPRB had its own process they were authorized to follow. It was not necessarily opening a different investigation. They did not get to do a brand new investigation and force an officer to testify. Under the amendments, the attendance of the officer was voluntary. Treece asked if it was just that officer that was subject to discipline or any officer. Thompson replied it was the subject officer. Treece asked if that was clear in B259-21. Thompson replied she believed it was. Treece understood it said notwithstanding state law to the contrary. Thompson stated the law was clear that they could not require the subject officer to testify. Treece asked if it was clear within B259-21. Thompson replied she did not know if it was clear in that many words.

Treece stated he wished this had been as neat and tidy as the Chapter 19 solution in terms of harmonizing the two processes.

Peters asked if it would be helpful to table it to provide more of an opportunity to think about it. Peters wondered if they would still be in compliance because they had passed one of the bills while working on the other. Thompson replied the City's ordinances currently required the records to be open so there were certain parts that were important. If the Council wanted to overhaul the process, they would need to look at the role they wanted for citizen oversight in Columbia, i.e. more of a policy review and review of policy enforcement versus a focus on individual officer discipline. This type of change would require a rewrite of the Chapter 21 requirements. Thompson thought they could see if the proposed changes worked, and if they did not, they could go back to the drawing board.

Skala stated he was not advocating an overhaul. Skala explained he only wanted time to reconcile the competing views and understand the essence of the arguments. Skala asked Thompson what she suggested as a reasonable amount of time. Thompson replied City staff had been in discussions with CPOA on these issues and could continue to have those discussions to determine if there were any additional modifications that

should be made to Chapter 21. From the staff perspective, they were trying to ensure they were not altering the current model of oversight, which was tricky when trying to accommodate the time frames associated with Senate Bill 26. Skala stated he understood, but believed it would be helpful to have a mini-whitepaper that would address some of the issues they had discussed. Skala asked how much time that might take. Thompson replied they could come back to Council at either the first or second meeting in September, but she thought the second meeting in September might work better. Treece noted they would still be involved with the budget then, and suggested the first meeting in October.

Skala made a motion to table B259-21 to the October 4, 2021 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Treece.

Pitzer understood Senate Bill 26 took effect on August 28 so the City would be in violation of state law for six weeks. Thompson replied that if there were any appeals, they would have to somehow ensure they were in compliance with Senate Bill 26. Pitzer was not sure which was the better approach, i.e., to wait until October or to move forward with this while still having the discussion to determine if further modifications were needed.

Treece believed it needed more work, and pointed out they might not be in compliance, but they were also not in violation. The risk was above zero, but it was not substantial.

**The motion made by Skala and seconded by Treece to table B259-21 to the October 4, 2021 Council Meeting was approved unanimously by voice vote.**

## VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B239-21 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code relating to conflicts of interest and financial disclosure procedures.
- B245-21 Rezoning property located on the south side of Bull Run Drive and west of Port Way (5530 Bull Run Drive) from District PD (Planned Development) to District M-C (Mixed Use-Corridor) (Case No. 193-2021).
- B246-21 Rezoning property located on the west side of Port Way and south of Bull Run Drive (705 Port Way) from District PD (Planned Development) to District M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood) (Case No. 194-2021).
- B247-21 Approving the Final Plat of "Eastwood Hills, Plat No. 2" located on the southeast corner of the intersection of Business Loop 70 and Eastland Circle (2518 E. Business Loop 70); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 186-2021).
- B248-21 Approving the Final Plat of "Hanover Plaza Plat 6-A" located on the east side of Hanover Boulevard and approximately 450 feet north of Clark Lane (1420 and 1430 Hanover Boulevard) (Case No. 143-2021).
- B249-21 Authorizing a first amendment to the consultant services agreement with Center for Transportation and the Environment, Inc. relating to the procurement and deployment of three (3) 30-foot battery electric buses to extend the term of services.
- B250-21 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of the Hinkson Creek outfall trunk sewer to serve properties along the eastern side of the Route B industrial corridor.
- B251-21 Authorizing a contract of obligation with the Missouri Department of Natural

- Resources to satisfy financial assurance requirements for proper closure and post-closure care with respect to a permit for operation of a solid waste disposal area.
- B252-21 Accepting conveyances for sewer purposes; accepting a Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenant.
- B253-21 Authorizing a second supplemental agreement to an airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission relating to air service promotion for the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B254-21 Authorizing a supplemental agreement to the airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for reconstruction of Taxiway A, Taxiway A1 and Taxiway A2 and portions of Runway 2-20 at the Columbia Regional Airport; amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B255-21 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for HIV prevention services.
- B256-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by adding a position in the Department of Public Health and Human Services in support of the COVID-19 and Adult Vaccination Supplemental project.
- B257-21 Amending Ordinance No. 020519 of the City of Columbia, Missouri authorizing the issuance of not to exceed \$59,335,000 principal amount of Sewerage System Revenue Bonds (State of Missouri - Direct Loan Program - ARRA) Series 2010A.
- R137-21 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of Fire Station #11 to be located north of the intersection of Scott Boulevard and State Route KK.
- R138-21 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of sanitary sewer rehabilitation project #8 in the Parkade Boulevard, Lynnwood Drive and Albert-Oakland Park areas.
- R139-21 Authorizing agreements with The Food Bank for Central & Northeast Missouri, Inc. for the use of Round 3 CDBG-CV and City general revenue reserve funding for the provision of supplemental food.
- R140-21 Authorizing a special event operations agreement with Trio Presents, L.L.C. for the 2021 Roots N Blues Festival at Stephens Lake Park.

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

## VIII. NEW BUSINESS

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

The resolution was read by the City Clerk.

Parks and Recreation Director Mike Griggs provided a staff report.

Thomas referred to the 30-mile loop diagram. Thomas understood the section of the Hinkson Creek Trail in the southwest to the Grindstone Nature Area was complete, and that staff had included the missing link from Stadium Boulevard to Bluff Dale Drive because it was in process. Thomas asked when that would be completed. Griggs replied it was under construction. Thomas wondered if that would be done by the end of the year. Griggs replied they were currently working with AllState Consultants to determine if there were other ways it could be done, i.e., they were looking to see if they could reduce the bridges so they were six feet instead of twelve feet. They were also reviewing low water crossings. It was something they preferred not to do, but might need to do. Thomas understood money was assigned to the project and it would be enough or close. Griggs replied they did not have the money to do the bridges they had originally intended, and pointed out they were not proposing any funding in 2021 for that project. Thomas also understood there was a connection under construction up to the interstate. Parks Development Superintendent Mike Snyder replied that was funded and staff was currently reevaluating the retaining wall design. It was essentially fully designed, but there would be some slight modifications to the retaining wall based on some of the stormwater events that had occurred. Thomas understood that would take them under the interstate to Clark Lane, and asked where a project on the Priority 1 list, which was another mile or two, would take them. Snyder replied it would take them to the Vandiver Drive improvements, and the Vandiver Drive improvements would take them to Mexico Gravel Road. Snyder pointed out there was already a mile of pedway along a section of the Hinkson Creek Trail as the Public Works Department had built it when the Vandiver Drive intersection was done. Thomas noted they also had the Bear Creek Trail and the little section of the Perche Creek Trail, which they had started to construct, and all of this came to a little more than 50 percent of the 30-mile loop. Snyder stated that was correct.

Thomas asked how long the 30-mile loop or the various components of it had been in City plans. Snyder replied several decades. Snyder thought former City Manager Ray Beck had spoken about it 40 years ago as a conceptual idea.

Thomas asked how long the Northeast Regional Park project had been in City plans. Griggs replied it was likely since Boone County owned it in terms of potential partnerships. They had proposed a joint county/city/private partnership, but nothing had come of it. Griggs noted it had not been on the plans like any of the trail projects. Thomas understood Boone County had wanted to sell the City the land, but the City had not been interested, and it was later given to the City. Griggs explained there had been several variations of proposals over time whereby the City's involvement was to manage it, purchase it, etc., and there had been a lot of differences of opinions at the time.

Thomas asked if Phase 1 of the Columbia Sports Fieldhouse had been a cost share project with the Convention and Visitors Bureau. Griggs replied yes, and noted they had received \$1 million in sports tourism development funds. Thomas asked if that had been considered to help pay for Phase 2. Griggs replied they had not asked for that because the hotel tax had been down, but understood Convention and Visitors Bureau Director Amy Schneider was looking at what they might be able to do to help. Griggs noted it would be ideal if they could provide another million.

Thomas understood Griggs had indicated that big sports tournament complexes were revenue generators, and asked if they provided profit to the Parks and Recreation Department or if they simply generated revenue that was used to pay for the maintenance of those facilities, staffing, etc. Griggs replied this last year was not a good year to use as an example, and explained it cost them just as much to mow a field with no one on it or with ten people on it. Griggs pointed out it was not necessarily revenue to the Parks and Recreation Department and provided the Show-Me State Games as an example.

The Parks and Recreation Department did not receive a penny from them even though they provided about \$35,000 in field rentals, but there was a value for the community restaurants, shops, hotels, gas stations, etc., due to all of the people that came to town that weekend. The economic impact more than offset that cost, and it was the reason it was a great use of park sales taxes. Griggs noted the Sports Fieldhouse would likely break even. During 2020, even though they had been closed, they had been very close to breaking even, and likely would have broken even with just two more tournaments.

Fowler commented that at a prior meeting, Dee Dokken with the Sierra Club had indicated money had not been allocated or used for land acquisition due to the sales tax revenues being down, and asked if adjustments would be made in the priority list for land acquisition to compensate for the fact there was less money allocated under the existing sales tax. Griggs replied no. Griggs explained they were hopeful that if the sales tax revenue kept coming in as predicated, they would be able to restore that at the start of the FY 2023 budget to the original 2015 levels. Fowler asked if adjustments would be recommended to Priority 1 or Priority 2 allocations under the next park sales tax ballot if the sales tax revenue was unable to restore that. Griggs replied probably not. Griggs explained the reason was to maintain a balance as there were people that questioned the need to purchase more parks or land. Griggs pointed out they tried to work with developers if a park was needed or if there was a natural feature or area they wanted to try to preserve as they were submitting conceptual designs. Griggs commented that as Columbia grew, they needed to keep up with the growth of neighborhood parks and greenspaces, but the need to acquire large chunks of land was not there at this time.

Fowler asked about Wi-Fi in the parks and whether that was within a priority project under the park sales tax or if it was something the Parks and Recreation Department would manage under its existing budget. Griggs replied they would probably do it soon at Douglass Park as a trial, and hoped to have that up and running by the end of the year. Fowler asked what part of that was a test. Griggs replied they wanted to see how it would work in terms of coverage, etc. Griggs pointed out they were working with the Police Department and park rangers with regard to installing a camera on a pole along with the Wi-Fi and would look at the pitfalls, problems, etc. Griggs noted the Information Technology Department was concerned about a Wi-Fi network that anyone could log onto, and explained they were also looking to see if they might be able to obtain free Wi-Fi from a provider. Griggs stated they would use current funds and staffing to provide Wi-Fi in Douglass Park, and would then see how it worked. Fowler commented that she believed this was important because low-income individuals might have a smartphone but not an expansive data plan, and the ability to go to a city park allowed the smartphone to be utilized as a computer to connect to everything that everyone else was using to access jobs, services, etc.

Fowler stated she was disappointed the Parks and Recreation Department had come forward with a list of project to be considered for ARPA funding given what the community was experiencing, to include families that would soon lose housing or had lost housing. While Fowler understood other communities were utilizing these funds for infrastructure projects, she believed the funds should be utilized in other ways, and noted she wanted to see the other potential funding sources for the items they had included for potential ARPA funding. Griggs understood and explained that the COLT Railroad project would connect to a community that did not have access to a trail. While it did not prevent someone from sleeping outside, it would provide a service. Griggs pointed out they had been asked to present some options, and those were the projects they provided. Fowler commented that she felt the COLT Railroad was still viable for transporting freight and people in either direction and was part of a climate action plan to get cars off of the road. Fowler believed a trail alongside the COLT Railroad was a wonderful idea and would provide a great benefit, but did not agree with it as a replacement for the Railroad.

Pitzer noted he was interested in the Sports Fieldhouse because it was taking up a significant amount of room on the Priority 1 list and because there had been incredible

demand with the first phase in terms of how much it was used. It was used Monday through Thursday by those within the City, and it also brought in out-of-town events. As those events were making plans, Pitzer thought it would be good to know when they might have a shovel in the ground to get them to Columbia. Pitzer asked if there would be enough certainty in funding if the parks sales tax were to pass in November and if they had half of the funding outside of the parks sales tax whereby they could get to work on engineering, design, and construction right after the election. Griggs replied yes.

Pitzer asked if there was data with regard to the hotel tax over the last two years compared to prior years. Schneider replied she did not have those numbers with her, but thought hotel tax revenues had been down by about 30 percent when comparing 2020 to 2019. When looking at 2021 to 2020, they were about two percent off of 2020, but were still at that 30 percent level when looking at 2021 versus 2019. It was slowing coming back, but would take some time. Pitzer asked what that 30 percent was in terms of dollars. Schneider replied she did not know that number.

Pitzer asked about the amount of funds available in the sports tourism development fund and whether there were plans already in place for it. Schneider replied the tourism development fund was one percent of the lodging tax so out of that tourism development fund, they had the signature series, which they saw in the form of Roots and Blues, True/False, and Art in the Park, sports funding, attraction development funding, community sponsorships, which were small dollar sponsorships that did not bring a lot of overnight stays but brought a tourism atmosphere, and a fifth one she could not recall. Schneider noted there were five funding mechanisms within that one percent. An amount was allocated in the budget each year, and anything unused went back into the one percent tourism development fund and could only be used for tourism development. Currently it had about \$3.6 million in it. Schneider pointed out they had provided money toward the bids for some of the events Griggs had mentioned, and provided the Missouri State High School Activities Association (MSHSAA) events as an example along with the NCAA Cross Country event. It was how sports were now. When bringing tournaments in, they probably included some sort of bid fee, so they had bid fees in future years that were promised along with the MSHSAA events of wrestling, football, etc. until the next round of bids, which would happen around 2023.

Pitzer asked Schneider if she thought they had roughly \$1 million in excess out of the \$3.6 million. Schneider replied yes. Pitzer understood the Convention and Visitors Advisory Board (CVAB) made recommendations with regard to funding. Schneider stated that was correct, and explained if this was something the Council wanted them to consider, she would ask that Griggs make a presentation to the CVAB to obtain their approval.

Pitzer asked if \$3.2 million sounded about right for 2019 revenues. Schneider replied yes. Pitzer understood 30 percent of that would be a decline of about \$1 million in both FY 2020 and FY 2021. Schneider thought that was correct.

Lawrence Simonson stated he was speaking on behalf of the PedNet Coalition, which had offices at 201 W. Broadway, and understood the Council had received a large number of letters in support of their analysis and recommendations. Simonson commented that the park sales tax was primarily funded by local residents, and the renewal of the park sales tax was also voted on by local residents. As such, the use of those funds should prioritize the needs identified by the residents. Simonson understood the Parks and Recreation Department had conducted a survey this year that had indicated which current park facilities residents used the most and what future facilities residents needed the most. The park facility residents used the most were trails as 81 percent of residents utilized them, and the park facility residents indicated they needed the most were trails with 71 percent of residents saying they needed access to more trails. Simonson noted this was equivalent to 34,000 households. Simonson commented that the park sales tax Priority 1 project list allocated ten percent of the total funding to the trails and greenbelts category, which included trail renovations, bridge replacements, parking lots, and new

trails, and thus, only eight percent of the total project list of funding would be allocated to meeting the needs of building new trails. In addition, it would build only 2.5 miles of trails within the next ten years. Simonson pointed out the Council had approved plans that specifically called for new trail construction, and mentioned the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP), which called for trail construction as a climate change mitigation strategy, and Columbia Imagined, which was the overarching comprehensive plan for how they would live and grow, as examples. Simonson believed there was perfect alignment between community-identified needs and the City's own identified priorities, and felt the park sales tax list had to include additional trails in order to respond to the needs of residents and move forward in meeting the goals of the City. Simonson noted the PedNet Coalition had analyzed the trails in the Parks and Recreation Trail Master Plan remaining to be built, and had identified three high priority trails that would improve equity in Columbia by providing trail access to neighborhoods that were cut off from the trail system, connect to people, local businesses, schools, and parks, and would together complete the entire northeast corner of the planned 30-mile loop. Simonson asked all of his fellow trail supporters to stand, and approximately 50 people stood. Simonson asked that on behalf of the PedNet Coalition and its 8,000 members, businesses, and organizations, the COLT Railroad Trail, College Avenue to Brown Station Road, the Bear Creek Trail, Blue Ridge Road to Brown Station Park, and the Hinkson Creek Trail, Brown Station Road to the COLT Railroad be included in the park sales tax Priority 1 project list.

Treece asked for the cost of those three trails. Simonson replied their rough estimate without having the full engineering was about \$6.5 million. Treece asked if these had been on the Priority 2 list. Simonson replied he thought the COLT Railroad Trail and the Bear Creek Trail had been on the Priority 2 list, but the Hinkson Creek Trail had not been on either list. Treece understood the COLT Railroad Trail was at a cost of about \$500,000. Simonson thought it had been a more. Griggs noted it was estimated at \$1.5 million.

Skala thought the trails and greenbelt category was at 14 percent, and asked how that reconciled with the eight percent Simonson had mentioned. Simonson replied he did not have a good answer, but understood Griggs had previously responded to that question so it might be best for him to respond again. Griggs explained they had also included a category of annual trails, which added \$1 million to it, and all of the annual funding was included in the category at the top. It was what they used to purchase land for trail greenways, grant matches, etc.

Treece asked Simonson if he had any corresponding offset for the \$6.5 million, i.e., if there were any projects he would take off of the list or if there were any new revenues he would want to add to it. Simonson replied they had been intentional about not making that suggestion because they understood City staff and the Council along with others in the public had more information than they did on certain projects and funding sources. Simonson commented that he had heard a lot of different possibilities, such as putting them on the list with the hope the Wayfair tax passed, identifying the funding through another mechanism later, utilizing the general revenue surplus funds, etc. Treece asked Simonson if he would support utilizing ARPA funds for these projects. Simonson replied his board had not taken a position on that so he could not speak to it.

Treece asked Simonson if he saw a problem with the fidelity of voters if they put projects on the list for which they might not have funding or be able to accomplish due to the lack of park sales tax revenues. Simonson replied it could have a negative consequence, but thought they had seen that occur before, even with trails, and they still had a large number of people supporting trails that would also support the park sales tax. Treece asked Simonson if he would still support it if these trails were not added. Simonson replied yes, and noted the parks were a gem of the community.

Carolyn Amparan explained she was speaking on behalf of the Sierra Club Osage Group and their 7,700 members and supporters, and noted they supported the comments of the PedNet Coalition. Amparan stated the park sales tax had originally been focused on



greenspace preservation as it had been conceived to deal with an opportunity that had not been in any City master plan, and it was important to have the ability and funding to acquire land when the right land became available. Due to the efforts of many people, to include former Council Member Barbara Hoppe and former Mayor Darwin Hindman, they had been able to get the park sales tax on the ballot, and it had been approved in 2000. The purpose had been to provide funding for parks, trails, natural lands, water quality, tree preservation, and recreation purposes. Amparan noted they could not forget the other items that had been included in addition to recreation. Amparan agreed trails were the most important to the local citizens, which should be considered when thinking about how residents would allocate the park sales tax. Amparan explained she was bringing this up because she felt trails and greenspace land acquisition were out of sync with the current Priority 1 project list. Amparan understood residents would allocate \$24 of \$100 for land acquisition and \$22 of \$100 for trails, and that was not reflected in the current proposal as land acquisition and preservation was only seven percent versus 24 percent. Trails and greenbelts were at 14 percent rather than 22 percent. Amparan pointed out this sales tax was the only dedicated source of funding for preserving greenspace and for the purchase of land for parks, greenbelts, stream buffers, and natural areas, and noted the proposed ballot language emphasized funding land acquisition for parks, greenways, and natural areas as it was listed first and was later stated again as land acquisition for trails and greenbelts. Amparan commented that land acquisition was an important part of what was being promised to the voters. Amparan explained there was not mention of sports tourism. As a result, from her perspective, there was use of this money to support sports tourism when it was not something that was really being presented to the voters. Amparan agreed with Simonson in that there were many plans that supported more land acquisition and greenspace preservation, and stated she would like to see some of the money allocated to ecosystem management, i.e., the restoration and repair of riparian buffers, the preservation of sensitive natural areas, connecting corridors, etc., once they had greenspace and land. Amparan understood there were a lot of opportunities for investment in preserving the landscape between Columbia and the Missouri River, in the Perche Creek Watershed, and at the Gans Creek Wild Area with a buffer. Amparan commented that they wanted a better balance in the Priority 1 project list.

Mark Haim, 1402 Richardson Street, noted he was representing Mid-Missouri Peaceworks and reminded the Council that they had adopted the CAAP about two years ago. Haim felt it was key to do the things that were included in the CAAP. Currently, 78 percent of trips made within the City were done via single occupancy vehicles, and the CAAP called for cutting that to ten percent by 2050. At the same time, it called for increasing walking trips from five percent to 25 percent, and biking trips from one percent to 20 percent. In order to meet those goals, they would have to take steps and invest money. Haim believed that meant providing a safe and readily available way for people to walk and bike, which in turn meant investing in trails. Haim noted that the PedNet Coalition had put forth some very good proposals, which Mid-Missouri Peaceworks supported. Haim explained the Sierra Club had also put together some very good proposals in terms of allocating money for land acquisition, which they also supported as it was good for the environment and sequestered carbon compared to development. Haim stated the transportation piece was the main one in terms of climate as it was one of the biggest sources of greenhouse gases, and the best way to bring that down was for more muscle-powered transportation. Haim commented that if they had to cut somewhere, he would recommend starting with the sports tourism items as he believed tourism and development funds should go toward it as opposed to park sales tax funds.

Treece asked Haim if he felt this was an either/or situation, i.e., either trails or park acquisition, or if he wanted both at the expense of some of the other items. Haim replied he felt both were important. The highest priority was trails, and the trails needed to safely take people to the places they needed to go, i.e., jobs, shopping, school, etc. Haim explained most of them did not just get in their cars to drive around. They got in their

cars to go places because they needed to get there.

Mike Powell commented that he was the Executive Director of the Greenbelt Land Trust of Mid-Missouri, and that they seconded the support for trails funding as had been articulated by the PedNet Coalition along with the support for increasing the proportion of funding dedicated to greenspace that had been articulated by the Sierra Club. Powell stated he would encourage the City to consider broadening the available use of greenspace funding as there were opportunities utilizing tools such as conservation easements, partnership grants, etc. If they were interested in protecting greenspace and creating a greenbelt, there were ways that could be done that were less expensive than the outright acquisition of land. Powell noted he was cognizant of the fact they had talked about the climate and funding, but was concerned that they had not given a greater portion of this process to equity. Powell pointed out they had a long and troubling history of unjust and inequitable land use, and thought it was important to have a conversation about the equitable and just distribution of funds involving public lands. Powell felt there was an opportunity for a much greater conversation to that effect. Some of the proposals as discussed, such as the recommendation of PedNet to reprioritize the three trails that would serve a significantly underserved portion of the community, would offer the opportunity to address the issue. Powell also believed that until they did some serious thinking and talking about the fact the outdoors were almost exclusively a white-affluent space and to a somewhat lesser extent a very male space, they had not done their sufficient due diligence.

John Stansfield, 1852 Cliff Drive, stated his support of the trails and greenbelts.

Chris Janku explained he was a member of the PedNet Coalition but was not speaking for them, and noted he supported the trails idea and would mention some revenue possibilities. Janku commented that when the fee structure for the ARC had been set many years ago, a certain amount of money was supposed to be set aside for repairs, maintenance, etc. Janku noted he did not know the fund balance at this point, but thought it could be a source for some of the projects at the ARC so that part of the budget could be reduced. Janku commented that he did not know for sure, but thought there might be a similar fund for the Rainbow Complex. Janku understood the tourism budget had taken a significant hit so he was not sure \$1 million could be taken from the balance at this point, but given the interest in new hotels in Columbia, he thought there was confidence that the tourism industry would come back. Instead of a one-time major draw from the balance, Janku wondered if they could provide \$100,000 per year over the ten years of the park sales tax period. Janku thought it could be used toward something like the COLT Railroad project, which was estimated at \$1.5 million. Another possibility for the COLT Railroad project was the sidewalk fund.

Peters commented that initially she was not sure she would be supportive of doing all three of the trails up north, but would now consider putting all of those on the Priority 1 list. In terms of what they would remove, Peters suggested the Sports Fieldhouse as she thought they should consider utilizing the excess general funds to construct it since that in turn would help tourism.

Peters recalled someone coming to Council with regard to the Whitegate Park and understood it was listed to be done in 2023. Peters suggested that remain on the Priority 1 list and that it be moved up to be done in the next year if the park sales tax passed.

Thomas stated he agreed with the comments of Peters. Thomas felt \$10 million out \$30 million for sports tourism was not reflective of how the taxpayers wanted the park sales tax money spent. Thomas pointed out the Northeast Regional Park had only popped up on their radar a few years ago, and if they had not acquired it, they would not even be talking about spending City tax money on it. Thomas understood there were potential other funding sources for the Sports Fieldhouse and presumably for the Northeast Regional Park. Thomas stated he did not feel they should have a Priority 1 list that was more than \$30.9 million. Since that was their best estimate of the funds coming in during the next ten years, Thomas thought they should make adjustments to keep it to that

number. Thomas noted he would like to see the three proposed trails included on the Priority 1 list and for cuts to be made for the two sports tourism projects.

Waner commented that she selfishly wanted Roller Derby spaces, but believed adding the COLT, Bear Creek, and Hinkson Creek pieces would allow the opportunity to align the goals of the City and the people within the City per the plans on the shelves. It would also expand access significantly to a portion of the community that had historically been underserved. Waner reiterated she wanted to see those three trails added to the list at the expense of the Sports Fieldhouse, and noted she would be open to using some of the reserve funds to push it across the finish line.

Skala stated the three trails that were suggested were in the northeast and would impact the Third Ward so he was obviously in favor of them, but he did not want the request for greenspace to get lost in the discussion along with the restoration of the funds that had been raided because of convenience. Skala understood everyone was picking on the Sports Fieldhouse and economic development in some manner, and felt there was some value to balance. Skala thought there was room to shift some items from the Priority 1 list to the Priority 2 list, and noted he would be inclined to favor that while maintaining the idea of balance because the economic development aspect was very valuable to the community at-large.

Pitzer understood it had been suggested to fund the Sports Fieldhouse with the reserve funds, and that made sense to a certain extent, but leaving some of it in there provided Griggs something to talk about as an additional selling point for the ballot. As a result, Pitzer did not feel it should be removed 100 percent. Pitzer felt allocating a certain amount of funding for it outside of the park sales tax and going ahead with the remainder was a good balance, and would allow them to get started much sooner. Pitzer pointed out roughly 50 percent of the first phase had been funded through the prior park sales tax ballot. If they stayed with that same 50 percent, it would be about \$2.9 million. Pitzer noted Schneider had mentioned that the CVAB could discuss a potential \$1 million dollar allocation toward that project if Griggs spoke to them. Pitzer commented that he also thought it made sense to think about ARPA funding as it could be spent on the replacement of actual lost revenues along with investing in the economically impacted industries of hospitality, tourism, and events. This would then allow them to invest in the areas where greenspace and trail access was needed. Pitzer understood the Northeast Regional Park was likely a few years out so they could think about allocating some amount from the general fund or the sports tourism development fund in the 3-5 year time period. Pitzer believed they could get to \$5 million in liberated funding while still moving forward with the projects listed, and potentially even accelerating what he felt were some of the more interesting ones.

Treece commented that he saw the value of leaving at least a line item amount for the Sports Fieldhouse, and wanted to try to cobble together funds to get it completed as they moved forward with the budget process to assist hotels, those that worked in hotels, etc., due to the recent impacts on them.

Thomas felt they were all in fairly close agreement as to what should happen, but noted he was not sure they should micromanage the list now. Thomas suggested they ask Griggs to come back with a revised Priority 1 list based on what he had heard tonight. Treece agreed that would still be timely as they needed to approve something before the November election to give voters some sense of how the money would be spent.

Griggs explained he had some meetings already scheduled for the end of August and for September, but this gave them an idea of what they could present. Griggs commented that while they agreed with the PedNet Coalition, some of those, such as the COLT Railroad, were difficult projects because trying to address easements with an existing railroad would take time. It was the reason it had been included as a Priority 2 project. For the Bear Creek Trail, they had a landowner that owned most of the property and was opposed to the trail. Griggs stated he did not want to condemn a mature landowner when they might be able to work with his children down the road.

Treece asked who owned the COLT Railroad. Griggs replied the City. Treece stated he thought it was an exciting project and would stimulate economic development.

Griggs commented that if they were coming back with another trail project, they would look at those where there were not any conflicts with landowners, such as in the area of the Perche Creek Trail by taking it to Smith Drive and beyond. Other options were some of the other Hinkson Creek Trail projects.

Skala understood the position of wanting to do the easy stuff when possible, but noted some of the hard stuff had real merit. They had been talking about a lot of these projects since 2013. These trails were very important in opening up the northeast and in terms of equity. Skala commented that he understood he could not be greedy so the Northeast Regional Park might have happen later. Skala pointed out he also did not want to leave out land acquisition as it was important as well. Skala suggested staff come back with something that might be more closely aligned with the discussion tonight and what the public seemed to want.

Thomas stated there was a ten-year time frame to build these projects, and understood there would be a little bit of risk, such as difficulty in obtaining easements, the uncertainty with the COLT Railroad, etc., but thought it was worth it since that was what the people really wanted. Thomas felt they should get them on the list and then start solving the problems.

Pitzer asked Griggs if he needed a list approved by the Council. Griggs replied they could probably wait until the next meeting if that was the preference of the Council. Griggs explained he was nervous about coming forward with a trail project whereby they would have to come to Council to condemn the property and might not have the votes for that to happen.

Treece stated he thought there was Council consensus to add the trails into the plan at the expense of the Sports Fieldhouse. Treece suggested they utilize the Thursday budget work session to determine if they could cobble together a sufficient budget to keep it on the list to be funded with some park sales tax funds. They could then consider a refined resolution at the September meeting.

Thomas noted he was in agreement with that suggestion as he did not believe they could redo the list tonight since they did not have a cost estimate for one of the trail projects. Griggs pointed out they usually spend a lot more time on research and cost estimates than what they had done here lately, but could prepare something.

Thomas asked that they include more for land acquisition closer to the percentages pointed out earlier, and wondered if they could cut back on the Northeast Regional Park in order to accommodate that. If it was a high priority, Thomas suggested they utilize general fund reserve.

Pitzer stated he thought they should have that discussion on Thursday, but felt they should be specific not only with regard to the trails they were adding, but also with regard to other funding sources for the Northeast Regional Park or the Sports Fieldhouse to ensure they were not lost in the shuffle. Pitzer believed all of that should be wrapped up in the same resolution approving the final list.

Treece commented that he would not want to pull off the Northeast Regional Park because of the incrementalism that the Parks and Recreation Department showed with regard to developing it. Since they received it for free, there was not an acquisition cost. Treece understood they had a master plan. Thomas did not believe they had a master plan for it. Griggs clarified they had a proposed master plan, and explained they would still continue with it. In terms of the coliseum, they had to determine if it was an equestrian, agricultural or other facility, or if they might be better off building another structure for agriculture that was not necessarily as big as what they had at the coliseum. Griggs noted those were the types of questions they had to work out. Treece commented that he did not want this political subdivision to let that mire in indecision the way the previous political subdivision had for 30 years. Thomas asked if they could reduce the \$5 million currently allocated for the Northeast Regional Park. Treece replied

he thought the Parks and Recreation Department did an excellent job of gathering public input and pointed out they had some representations to the Fair and the agricultural community whereby they had to continue to show progress.

Peters asked Griggs if he had enough direction. Griggs replied they would provide some options for consideration on Thursday.

**Treece made a motion to table R141-21 to the September 7, 2021 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Thomas and approved unanimously by voice vote.**

## IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B261-21 Granting the issuance of a conditional use permit to JAJ, LLC to allow an “assembly or lodge hall” use on property located on the west side of Port Way and south of Bull Run Drive (705 Port Way) in an M-N (Mixed-Use Neighborhood) zoning district (Case No. 217-2021).
- B262-21 Approving the Final Plat of “Rory Point, Plat No. 1” located on the west side of Sinclair Road and north of Cascades Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 202-2021).
- B263-21 Approving the Final Plat of “Columbia Industrial Development Corporation, Plat No. 2C” located on the north side of Mojave Court and east of Brown Station Road; authorizing performance contracts (Case No. 116-2021).
- B264-21 Approving the Final Plat of “Crossroads North Plat 1-A” located on the southwest corner of the Vandiver Drive and Range Line Street intersection; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 181-2021).
- B265-21 Approving the Final Plat of “OPR Subdivision” located on the south side of Old Plank Road and west of Bethel Church Road (200 W. Old Plank Road); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 200-2021).
- B266-21 Approving the Final Plat of “The Villages at Arbor Pointe Plat 5” located on the west side of Arbor Pointe Parkway and north of Waco Road; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 207-2021).
- B267-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for the purchase of buses and para-transit vans for the GoCOMO Public Transit System.
- B268-21 Authorizing the replacement and rehabilitation of a portion of storm drain pipe on Aldeah Avenue, south of Ash Street; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division or authorizing a contract for a portion of the work using a term and supply contract.
- B269-21 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B270-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for Parks and Recreation Department reimbursement of expenses to Risk Management.
- B271-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for construction of the Runway 2-20 extension project at the Columbia

Regional Airport.

## X. REPORTS

REP63-21 Health and Safety Implications of E-cigarette Use by Youth.

Waner commented that this was a very well done and thorough report, and was impressed with to see the amount of data compiled in it along with the recommendations. Waner thanked the Board of Health.

REP64-21 Monthly Finance Report.

Treece understood this report had been provided for informational purposes.

REP65-21 Amendment to the FY 2021 Annual Budget - Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds.

Pitzer asked for clarification regarding the \$300,000 transfer to “replace electronic water meters and endpoints and existing visual read meters with electronic remote read meters” as there was mention of it having been in the CIP budget and being moved to operations. Sorrell replied they had moved some items from the CIP budget into the operating budget because they were an operations maintenance expense, and they should have put some of it in contractual services and some of it in construction materials, but they had inadvertently put it all in contractual services. As a result, they needed to move some of the funds to construction materials to cover those costs.

Pitzer understood in FY 2021, they had moved \$300,000 from CIP to operations. Sorrell stated that was correct, and explained it was for the replacement of existing meters.

Pitzer asked if these were meters that could be read remotely without having to access the property. Sorrell replied yes. Sorrell explained their batteries were running out so they needed to be replaced. Pitzer stated he thought they had an existing major project for installing those across the City. Sorrell noted they were looking at doing an advanced metering system as part of the Integrated Electric Resource Plan. Pitzer understood these were not the advanced meters. Sorrell stated these were just the automatic read meters. Glascock asked if they had the backbone to read them. Sorrell replied they drove a vehicle through the area to get them read. If they installed the AMI system meters, it would require the backbone for the meters to talk directly to it so they would not have to have personnel drive around to do the reads. Pitzer understood the AMI system would save them this \$300,000 per year. Sorrell replied no as the batteries would still go bad requiring them to be replaced. Sorrell noted it would save some personnel costs.

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

Jackie Sample commented that she was the Chair of the Disabilities Commission and provided handout. Sample explained she wanted to provide a brief update on their efforts to initiate a virtual attendance pilot program for the City’s advisory commissions, and noted the pilot program would involve three commissions chosen by the Disabilities Commission to increase accessibility for commission members with the result of increasing the probability of meeting quorums for the continuance of City business. On July 19, Assistant City Counselor and staff to the Disabilities Commission, Adam Kruse, had sent an email invitation with a letter to the three commissions the Disabilities Commission had agreed should be invited to participate in the pilot program after vigorous discussion. The Disabilities Commission felt the Board of Health (BOH) would be important to include in an accessible and virtual format while the City continued to navigate COVID, but the Chair of the BOH had indicated they would not be participating in the pilot program since they did not have difficulties meeting quorum nor did they have any upcoming agenda items that would stimulate a lot of public participation due to not having a role in managing the COVID pandemic. The Youth Advisory Council (YAC) had

also been chosen given the age of the members since many were not yet able to drive, did not have a vehicle to get to the meeting, or did not have a parent or adult available to drive them. The YAC opted to require a quorum vote to approve participation, and due to not having a quorum at their August meeting, the meeting was canceled so a vote was not taken. The Disabilities Commission had also chosen the Columbia Vision Commission (CVC) due to having numerous canceled meetings over the past year with most being due to the inability to achieve a physical quorum. This group also opted to require a quorum to vote to approve participation, and due to not having a quorum, the meeting was canceled. Sample noted alternate commissions had been identified, and included the Broadband Business Planning Task Force and the Public Transit Advisory Commission, and the Broadband Business Planning Task Force had contacted them today indicating interest in participating in the pilot program. Sample stated the Disabilities Commission would continue to work toward commission involvement so they could report back on citizen participation and meeting quorum requirements.

Sample commented that in her previous reports to Council, she had talked about her professional role as an occupational therapist and an advocate of accessibility. Sample stated the goals of the Disabilities Commission included accessibility, access, and equity along with occupational justice. Sample noted the phrase occupational justice was first coined in 1998 by Dr. Ann Wilcock, who was an occupational therapist, and explained occupational justice continued to be studied and further defined and refined to ensure the occupational needs of all persons were being met. Sample pointed out occupation referred to how one chose to purposefully spend their time, and was not only pertaining to paid employment. Sample noted she would share the words of a current occupational therapist student she was working with who had reminded her of some critical information regarding occupational justice. Congruent with both social and critical disability theories, occupational justice addressed the right of each person to meet basic needs, have equal opportunities, and life chances to reach his/her potential through engagement and diverse and personal meaningful occupations. The principals of occupational justice advocated that regardless of disability, life contacts, or environmental influence, everyone should have a chance to pursue their ideal occupational mission. Success might be dependent on inherent motivation and ability, but occupational marginalization based on personal factors, including disability, gender, sexual orientation, race, ethnicity, age, or socio-economic status should not be a limiting factor. As they continued to address various access, accessibility, and equity issues within the City, they realized there was much to do and much to do better. They also understood they needed to take baby steps instead of expecting giant leaps of change.

Sample noted she wanted to bring attention to a current issue with the City's website, and referred to the first page of the handout, which was a screenshot taken from her personal commuter that showed how the website was not accessible and not usable. Sample explained she had tried various browsers and direct links provided to her by others with the same result every time. In addition, it impacted the ability for people to report issues via the website. Sample provided an example of a citizen that wanted to report a handicap parking violation, but was unable to submit a report. Not only was this person's mobility in the community negated or lessened due to illegal parking, her ability to self-advocate to work toward a solution was unavailable further lessening her ability to participate in City processes. Sample stated the website issue needed to be addressed and fixed now. Sample noted she was very disappointed in this failure of access when she knew at least one member of the Disabilities Commission had spent over 20 hours working with the Information Technology (IT) Department to ensure the new website was accessible. Sample commented that she had received an email today from someone with the IT Department who had indicated he had made a couple of changes and to see if the issue had been corrected. The results were unfortunately the same. Sample felt anything less than accessible was unacceptable by federal law. Sample explained the Disabilities Commission was working hard to do their job and hoped the response of the

Council would be to ensure known issues were addressed for collaboration on future endeavors.

Fowler asked Sample if she had any additional information about the City's acquisition of software that would assist those commissions involved in the pilot program. Sample replied the latest information she had was what had been shared the last time it was discussed at a council meeting. Sample pointed out the Broadband Business Planning Task Force in their acceptance of participation was concerned about people being able to provide remote presentations as the set up in the room in which they met was not working well.

Thomas asked about the response of City staff if or when someone walked into the building without wearing a mask. Thomas wondered if they asked them to wear a mask. Glascock replied they did, but explained it was a policy and hard to enforce. Glascock noted it was his policy and not an ordinance. If the Council wanted enforcement, an ordinance could be brought forward.

Thomas understood all of the people that were not wearing masks last week had been asked to put on a mask. Glascock stated that was correct. Thomas understood they had refused. Glascock noted that was his understanding.

Thomas noted he was getting questions from constituents, some of which were not in favor of wearing a mask, asking if it was optional, and he was not sure what to say.

Skala commented that there was a robust conversation about this on social media and understood there were stipulations in the City Charter with regard to disturbing the peace, which had the potential of a Class B misdemeanor. This was not in reference to masking as that was a policy, and they would have to have pass an ordinance as had been indicated by Glascock. Skala stated he thought the meeting on the prior Monday had been handled very well. It was a short meeting and the issue had not escalated, which was always a concern, especially when there were a number of people. Skala explained in the past there might have been one or two disorderly people that had been asked to leave, but there had been some reluctance to do that in the situation they had that Monday. Skala commented that he was not sure what the solution might be but noted there were some tools they could utilize. Skala pointed out it was a judgement issue.

Treece noted he would support an ordinance to enforce the mask policy, but the problem was that it would take two meetings and he would want it to be reevaluated every 30 days, which would be hard to craft. Treece stated he thought the City Manager's policy which was substantially similar to what the Columbia Public Schools had adopted and announced on Friday was good policy as he supported wearing masks in buildings. Treece felt they could ask someone coming in the building to pay a utility bill to put on a mask or leave because there were other ways to pay a bill, i.e., the drive-thru, mail, drop off the payment in the box, etc. This was the only city council meeting that one could participate in, and there was no trespassing or municipal code violation.

Skala asked if a violation of the fire code had been considered. Treece replied it had not been at the time.

Thomas thought everyone that walked into the building without a mask and encountered a City employee should be offered one and asked to put it on. Thomas stated he was not keen on heavy handed enforcement. Thomas noted it had been his understanding that people were just walking in and no one was asking that of them. Thomas commented that he had not heard Treece mention the policy over the microphone either. Treece pointed out that it had actually been the first thing he had said. Thomas understood it had been a very difficult situation that could have led to violence or vandalism if they had created a confrontation so he was not being critical. Thomas was also relieved to know the front desk staff knew to inform people of the policy. Treece pointed out the welcome desk had a box of masks as well.

Skala asked if the recycling center was returning at the Home Depot location. Glascock



replied it was based on what he had last heard, but would check.

Peters understood they now had the census data and wondered if they should ask City staff to look at the data in terms of population and provide their recommendations for redrawing ward lines similar to what they had now so they could see how much they would need to be tweaked. They could then decide whether they actually needed to put together a ward reapportionment committee or if they could make the decisions as the representatives of the City. Glascock understood they had the overall population, but they did not have the census tract breakdowns. Glascock explained he had asked Community Development Director Tim Teddy to get started on some analyses based on what they had, but they did not yet have the census tract data, which was needed to determine wards. Peters asked when that might be released. Glascock replied he hoped it would happen before the end of September. Peters understood they had time to determine how they might want to proceed.

## **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 11:34 p.m.