



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Tuesday, September 4, 2018
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, September 4, 2018, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The recitation of the Pledge of Allegiance was led by Star Scout Sedgewick and Tenderfoot Jordan of Boy Scout Troop 6, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members RUFFIN, TRAPP (left at approximately 1:42 a.m.), SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, and TREECE were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of August 20, 2018 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Pitzer.

Mr. Pitzer asked that B203-18 be moved from the consent agenda to old business. The agenda, including the consent agenda with B203-18 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Skala.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC49-18 Lynn Maloney - Racial bias vs. racial profiling: defining what we mean and why it matters.

Ms. Maloney stated she believed the City Council was allowing City Manager Mike Matthes to stoke white resentment against black citizens to pass a property tax. She commented that the City Manager's community oriented policing report blamed blacks for the need for more policing and Sergeant Fox's Columbia Business Times article was blaming blacks for needing more policing. In addition, the report completed by Milyo, which had been touted by the Columbia Police Officers Association (CPOA) and Chief Burton in a press release, had blamed blacks for needing more policing. She noted the City Manager, Sergeant Fox, and the CPOA all blamed blacks for the need for a warrior mindset instead of guardian mindset, and that there was not a need for anything more than additional officers. They had indicated there was not a need for community policing, and only a need for more money for more cops due to blacks. She understood the Milyo report had indicated there was not racial bias against blacks, and that the reason there was not a rebuttal for the Columbia Police Department (CPD) racially profiling blacks was

because blacks committed more crimes. She commented that the work session on the vehicle stops report held on August 23 had included a CPOA presentation based upon the Milyo report that was essentially arguing that racial profiling was necessary because blacks and whites in Columbia were different. In addition, it blamed blacks for having more warrants and committing more crimes. She stated this was based on cyclical reasoning as the population that was over-policed and issued more warrants would have more warrants. The Milyo report, and hence the CPOA and Chief Burton, who backed the report, did not include the fact the neighborhood was over-policed and chose to ignore the effects of systemic racism by saying African-Americans must continue to be heavily policed. She noted Milyo had gone back and forth with the terms racial profiling and racial bias as if he did not recognize any difference. She believed it was important to know the difference between racial profiling and racial bias because the vehicle stops report was data, and that data reflected profiling. Bias was a separate matter that could only be discussed in the context of incidents. It could not be discussed in the context of generalized data. She commented that Race Matters, Friends, had never focused on the behavior of individual officers, which was the arena of bias. They had consistently focused on profiling over the last three years, and believed that should be considered given the consistent and worsening racial disparity indices over 17 years across a myriad of categories. She questioned why the City Manager, Sergeant Fox, and the CPOA were blaming blacks in Columbia, and thought it might have to do with the call for more money for cops. She commented that blacks had more warrants because they were stopped more often by the CPD, and this was a direct result of systemic racism. She noted even Milyo argued that the disparities were likely due to accumulated bias against blacks and others prior to interaction with CPD officers, and wondered if that was something for which they should be proud. She felt Mr. Matthes and Sergeant Fox were so focused on scapegoating black Columbians that they forgot to respond to the Council's primary reasons for asking for a community oriented policing report. The report delivered did not discuss the vehicle stops report data as stated in the February 2018 resolution. It also did not discuss implementation of the recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence for community policing. If the Council accepted the community oriented policing report, they would be allowing Mr. Matthes to stoke white resentment against blacks to pass a property tax.

SPC50-18

Peggy Placier - Race Matters, Friends response to the August 23 Council Work Session on the Vehicle Stops Report.

Ms. Placier, 209 S. Greenwood Avenue, commented that prior to the August 23 meeting, Race Matters, Friends and the City were at somewhat of a standoff over interpretations of the vehicle stops report, and as a result, they had looked toward that meeting with great anticipation with the hopes of being provided an explanation. The meeting had gone over an hour before anyone had directly addressed the vehicle stops report. The City Manager had bragged about what the CPD was already doing and police officers had told them about their assignments and the impossibility of covering a beat while responding to calls. They had seen maps and had heard from experts as well. The news accounts the next day had focused on pieces of the meeting, but not the entire confusing mish-mash, and the reason was that they had all been a victim of policy whiplash. The City had provided three conflicting interpretations of the vehicle stops report data. One was that racial disparities resulted from officer biases. She understood some CPD efforts were based upon this idea, and provided an example. She noted the CPD had adopted a curriculum on fair and impartial policing created by self-styled national expert Lorie Fridell, and through an online connection, she had explained the CPD's new policy on using demographics in apprehensions. The policy assumed biases were inappropriate and set a high standard for justifying stops whereby officers had to have a specific suspect description and intelligence linking a geographic area and type of crime to that suspect, and implementing that policy would require training. Ms. Placier stated the

inference was that unwarranted stops would go down, and that those were the ones that most alienated communities of color from police. She noted Ms. Fridell admitted she did not have any data to support this, and understood her theory was based on individual psychology rather than systems or contexts, such as organizations and communities. Another interpretation was that racial disparities might or might not indicate a problem, but with better data, it would probably disappear. She pointed out Don Love of Empower Missouri had dismissed Mr. Matthes' poverty explanation of the vehicle stops report. Differences in poverty between whites and blacks in Columbia were high, but not high enough to create such disparities. His hunch was that the new data system would show that disparities were a result of hotspot policing whereby police were concentrated in high crime areas identified through data mapping, and the result would be that there were not any racial disparities because black people just happened to live in high crime areas where officers tended to flock and stop so many people that they eventually had some productive stops. Unfortunately a lot of innocent people would get caught up in that process. In addition, they did not know what would happen with the new data system. She noted they had also heard from the CPOA Executive Director Dale Roberts, who had attempted to summarize Professor Milyo's report, and the main point of Mr. Roberts seemed to be that the officers were not racist because black people committed more crimes. She felt that was an effort to vindicate the officers he represented while insulting the black community. In reviewing the study itself, Milyo had discredited the vehicle stops report as being poorly done and inciting underserved criticism of the CPD. She wondered why the CPD would need Ms. Fridell's anti-bias training when there was no bias. Although she had been granted very little time, researcher Tara Warne-Griggs had pointed out the purpose of that evening's discussion should not be to stage a battle over the data and that the purpose should be to examine the consequences of CPD practices on actual community members subjected to repeated stops and searches, i.e. those Mr. Roberts offensively identified as criminals. It was not a battle over data. It was a struggle to understand history and to construct an equitable community.

SPC51-18

Kate Canterbury - Policing.

Ms. Canterbury commented that she believed they were all racists. They all lived with unconscious bias that influenced their interactions at work and personally, and those biases had led to systematic racism in society. Study after study had proven this. By accepting it and working to combat it, they could be better coworkers, friends, neighbors, and community members. She questioned why the acknowledgement and confirmation of bias, intended or unintended, was not a central part of this piece on community policing. She also questioned why the outcome of unconscious bias and racial profiling was not addressed head on even though the vehicle stops report data clearly showed it taking place in Columbia. She commented that when she had acknowledged to herself that she had internalized racism she wanted to address, she began by taking a metaphorical backseat and listening to her friends, neighbors, family members, and coworkers of color as she believed listening was the first step in improving interactions with others and combating bias. She explained CoMo for Progress, the organization she helped to lead, had been so encouraged by the listening tour. They had promoted it widely to their over 3,000 members and had made it a priority to attend. They saw people at the meetings participating by sharing their experiences and listening to the officers and City officials that had attended. She asked where the feedback was from those listening sessions and why it had not been incorporated into the report. She commented that she wanted to believe that the best intentions had gone into commissioning this report on community policing, but the resolution specifically requested a timeline, project plan, budget, evaluation mechanism, etc., and those details had not been included. When the proposed timeline was mainly a list of steps to a ballot initiative for increased staffing, she could not help but think this was a boondoggle done solely to justify more police officers. As a citizen, she was deeply disappointed and felt betrayed. She noted the concept of servant leadership was very buzzworthy now, but believed it applied nicely to the Council

and City leadership as they were community leaders and public servants, as were the police officers. Servant leaders shared power and put the needs of others first to help people develop and perform as highly as possible. She commented that those in the community were the people, and asked the Council and City leadership to listen to them and work for them as they would find the power they had would be used to demand more of their leaders, especially at election time. She suggested they use their influence and authority to make real change in Columbia, and asked them to try again and to work better than that report. She felt the community was worth more than the report. She wondered when they would have the courage to make the necessary changes, and have their actions mean more than their words, and asked for real change. She did not feel it was about more police officers. She believed it was about community policing, and asked the Council to make that the priority.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- PH29-18 FY 2019 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
- Discussion shown with B183-18.
- PH30-18 Consider changes to the sanitary sewer utility rate, sanitary sewer utility connection fee and waste hauler disposal service fees.
- Discussion shown with B183-18.
- PH31-18 Consider a change to the fare for paratransit service operated by the city's transit division.
- Discussion shown with B183-18.
- B175-18 Adopting the FY 2019 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
- Discussion shown with B183-18.
- B176-18 Amending Chapter 12A of the City Code as it relates to stormwater utility charges.
- Discussion shown with B183-18.
- B177-18 Amending Chapter 13 of the City Code as it relates to hauled liquid waste rates.
- Discussion shown with B183-18.
- B178-18 Amending Chapter 17 of the City Code as it relates to Parks and Recreation Fees.
- Discussion shown with B183-18.
- B179-18 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to the fare for paratransit service.
- Discussion shown with B183-18.

B180-18 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to solid waste rates and services.

Discussion shown with B183-18.

B181-18 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to sanitary sewer utility rates.

Discussion shown with B183-18.

B182-18 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to water rates.

Discussion shown with B183-18.

B183-18 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to electric rates.

PH29-18, PH30-18, and PH31-18 were read by the Clerk, and B175-18, B176-18, B177-18, B178-18, B179-18, B180-18, B181-18, B182-18, and B183-18 were given third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters understood the \$2.7 million would include the land, the salt dome, the garage, and the fueling station. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Ms. Peters explained she wanted to ensure it was not just for the land. Mr. Matthes stated it was not just for the land. Ms. Peters understood another \$2.5 million would be needed for the fire station. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct.

Mr. Matthes continued the staff report.

Mr. Pitzer asked for clarification with regard to city general in terms of what would be cut. Ms. Peveler replied it would be a reduction in the fund they used to pay general fund employees that retired for vacation days and floating holidays owed so the department did not have a huge financial strain to keep the position open longer. Mr. Pitzer asked if that was in keeping with what had been seen over the last few years or if they were assuming a lower rate of retirement. Ms. Peveler replied this cut would reduce it lower than what they had actually experienced as it would be reduced to \$69,000. In the last 3-4 years, it had been about \$160,000 that had been transferred out of that fund to departments to pay out those vacation days and floating holidays.

Mr. Pitzer commented that the self-insurance fee amount was previously half of what was shown on page 7 of the amendment sheet. Ms. Peveler explained the amounts tied to the reductions for the self-insurance fee, the custodial fee, and the community relations fee had been doubled on the amendment sheet. The amounts shown in the presentation were correct.

Mr. Matthes continued the staff report.

Mayor Treece asked why they would eliminate additional evening security and emergency phones on the MKT trail. Ms. Peveler replied there were costs to those. She explained they had temporary people that provided the evening safety patrols, and there was a monthly cost for the emergency phones. Mayor Treece asked for the amount. Mr. Griggs replied they would eliminate 30 days of service of contract security coverage similar to what they were doing for the sprayground. Instead of having the coverage start on May 1, it would begin on May 15, and instead of going until September 30, it would end on September 15. He commented that half of the emergency phones on the trails had problems due to water, etc. They had been installed many years ago with volunteer labor, and when those phone lines were messed up or cut, it was hard to fix. He noted two had been out for three months and they were waiting on those to be repaired and replaced. They felt it was a \$4,000 expense that might not be necessary since many people had cell phones. He explained they were looking for cuts everywhere.

Mr. Matthes continued the staff report.

Ms. Peters asked for the goal in terms of how much general fund excess the City liked to keep in reserves, and if they had more or less than that goal. Mr. Matthes replied the

policy was for 20 percent of the annual expenditures to be held in cash reserves for emergencies. It would provide for a couple of months of operations if there was a significant event. He noted the \$3.8 million he had mentioned was in addition to the 20 percent. Ms. Peters commented that it seemed to be a fairly large safety net since that amount was over the 20 percent. Mr. Matthes explained it took a long time to get there, but they had that amount in excess, and it was obviously significantly more than the \$459,000.

Mr. Skala understood that safety net was in a one-time reserve account and would likely come into play if they decided to change the assumption of two percent to one percent and it did not pan out. He stated he was comfortable with that amount, and noted he was also comfortable with reducing the percentage, but unsure about an entire percent. He commented that the history of budgeting in Columbia had suggested that the estimates the Finance Department provided were fairly accurate. Mr. Matthes agreed they were accurate, and that they were usually within one percent of the actual.

Mr. Matthes pointed out there was also a hope for gain in the future as they were actively working on the Wayfair sales tax decision issue so there might be relief in the horizon, but there was not anything they could count on at this point.

Mr. Matthes continued the staff report.

Ms. Peters asked if the other fund costs were the enterprise funds. Mr. Matthes replied yes. Ms. Peters understood, in theory, they could increase fees if needed to cover those. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct.

Mr. Matthes continued the staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if the move to midpoint could be broken out by classified and unclassified employees. Ms. Peveler replied she did not have that breakdown. She explained she had it by pay grade, but did not have it by who was classified or who was unclassified. Mayor Treece asked to see the breakout by pay grade. Ms. Peveler replied she did not have it summarized by pay grade, but could do that for him. Mayor Treece asked what a summary would involve. Ms. Peveler replied it would show how many people in the general fund were in the A pay band versus the B pay band, etc.

Mr. Matthes continued the staff report.

Mr. Pitzer asked if everyone was at or above the current minimum. Mr. Matthes replied yes.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the cost if there was an option to move people by one-third or one-half of the way toward the current midpoint. He wondered if it would simply be one-third or one-half of that total cost or if it was more complicated. Ms. Peveler replied she thought that was correct.

Mr. Thomas asked for the amount for the solid waste collection workers. Mr. Matthes replied he thought the minimum was \$13.77 per hour now so a move to \$15 would be an additional \$1.23. If they wanted to move it \$2 per hour, it would total \$291,000. Mr. Thomas understood that would be a cost to the enterprise fund. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. It was a \$291,000 cost to the enterprise fund and zero cost to the general fund.

Ms. Peters asked if they had ever looked at how much money they would save by not having to hire temporary employees. Mr. Matthes replied it was hard to compare because the temporary hourly rate included everything, i.e., human resources, training, etc. costs. Ms. Peters asked how much the City had paid to temporary employees. Mr. Matthes replied he thought that information had been e-mailed to the Council previously, and noted he would make a point to send that information again or for the first time if they had not already sent it.

Mayor Treece listed the potential amendments per the request of Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Skala noted he would have a proposed amendment in terms of Racial Equity and Leadership (REAL).

Mr. Thomas commented that in addition to those listed by Mayor Treece, he would ask for funding for an elasticity study to determine the effect of charging a \$5 parking fee at

the airport and funding for a growth impact study. Mayor Treece thought Mr. Matthes had an updated slide on the Council use of surplus funds. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer explained he might have new amendments as well.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Cheryl Price, 2609 Whitegate Drive, explained she had a paratransit driver waiting outside and they normally did not run this late to pick people up. She noted they had tried to get something passed whereby they could run late for council meetings so those with disabilities could attend, but that had not happened because of the budget. She commented that she had been a paratransit rider since the beginning of paratransit in Columbia, and they had never been in worse shape than now in terms of the budget. She stated she feared the increase in the paratransit fee to \$3, which would bring in an estimated \$57,000 a year, would cause many to not be able to ride it any longer. She also felt reducing the service would keep people from being able to ride during those times. She explained she had received at least 12-15 phone calls and many emails from people that used paratransit that had indicated the \$1 increase would cause them financial problems. They would have to decide whether to go the doctor that week or go grocery shopping instead, and they would likely not be able to visit a friend or go anywhere for entertainment. She commented that when she had left the nursing home after her brain injury, she had been in that position, and understood that was the reality for many people. She implored the Council to not increase the paratransit fee.

Ms. Price explained she was Chair of the Public Transit Advisory Commission (PTAC) and noted they had grave concerns about the proposed FY 2019 budget cuts to transit and the increase in paratransit fees. They understood the budget struggles came in large part from a reduction in sales tax revenue over the past few years, which appeared to be getting worse every year. She noted Columbia's Strategic Plan addressed how the community could make progress in areas of economy, social equity, public safety, operational excellence, and infrastructure, and Columbia had always been dedicated to a commitment to healthy growth as had the PTAC. As the City sought to move forward in the areas she had mentioned, the PTAC felt a strong public transit system was vital to the overall success in any and all of those areas and initiatives. Placing a priority on funding a strong public transit system was one of the most important avenues they could take to demonstrate in a concrete way Columbia's commitment to the economy, social equity, public safety, and infrastructure. As citizens saw public transit services decrease, they were much less likely to even want to try using transit services, which was another problem as they wanted the entire citizenry to experience and use public transit. Some citizens, however, were reliant on public transit as their only alternative, and would suffer by losing transportation to jobs, medical appointments, the grocery store, and other outings that everyone that owned a vehicle could still go to, such as dinner with a friend, a movie, etc. After her brain injury, she had no access to transportation and felt not only physically trapped, but also emotionally and mentally as the loss of independence was worse. The overwhelming sense of being all alone and feeling trapped in a place one called home was something she did not want anyone else to experience. Unfortunately some did, and that was the reason she continued her advocacy in trying to make positive changes for people. She understood there had not been an increase in paratransit for many years, and that the cost was more than what was charged, but some would be unable to afford the \$1 increase per ride, and would likely have to make a choice between going to medical appointments, grocery shopping, volunteering, etc. They would only be able to afford the necessities. She wondered if an estimated \$57,000 in additional revenue was worth it, and asked the Council to really examine that. She commented that the PTAC supported shifting resources from the neighborhood loops to the black and gold routes and to improving frequency and service hours on those popular routes as that action would continue a level of service for those using the bus system now, while they worked on a long-term strategy for the future. The

proposed budget cuts that would reduce the number of fixed routes to six, stop service an hour earlier, and do away with Saturday service altogether would be overwhelming to a large number of riders, especially if they put nothing in place where they had transit. She proposed at least instituting a flex system as suggested by Mr. Thomas that was much like the paratransit system where a person would call the day before to schedule a ride and a van would pick them up and either take them to a stop within that particular zone or to the closest bus stop to catch a fixed route bus. This would at least provide people an option. She stated strong public transit affected every aspect of community life, and the feeling of independence, safety, and convenience was a profound indicator of emotional and physical well-being. She noted the PTAC felt the proposed budget cuts to public transit as well as the 50 percent increase in paratransit fees would create a true hardship for citizens, many of which were the most vulnerable and needed the service the most. It would also take them significantly backwards in those areas the City had been working so hard to emphasize. She stated the PTAC was asking the Council to reconsider this significant reduction in funding in the public transit system and to continue strong efforts to allocate needed funds to Columbia's transit system.

Pat Fowler, Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC), commented that with the funding provided by Council, which was \$10,000 annually, they fulfilled the missions of their enabling ordinance and the legislative responsibilities that had been given to them as they provided input to Council and the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) on certain matters. With the monies raised on the volunteer side, they sought to fulfill a mission of earlier HPCs of having an improvement fund that would help the small property owner of historic structures to maintain the cultural benefits received from having historic facades and historic buildings throughout Columbia. She understood there had been a couple of questions about the difference, and the fundraising piece was all done with volunteer time. The report later on the agenda would show over 750 hours of volunteer energy had been used in the salvage operations and salvage sales. She commented that salvaging a building was fun, but salvage sales were work. When the Unified Development Code (UDC) was approved, they had left an important piece undone, which was planning for historic preservation. It was a topic the PZC and Deb Sheals had brought up. The HPC had looked into the cost of a facilitated process to start that process, and as they were doing that, the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DCLC) had come forward with the idea of an additional charrette. As a result, the HPC had offered the use of their funds to add to those fundraising efforts if that charrette included planning for historic preservation. She felt historic preservation was important, and historic structures in Columbia were small. They were spread throughout not only the downtown where locally owned businesses prospered while serving community needs, but were also within small-footprint residential structures, and size had everything to do with affordability. Thus, setting aside some money to do that work, and carrying those monies over into next year and looking at next year's budget while adding to it in order to be part of a planning process for historic preservation would help with affordability. She thanked the Council for its continued support and noted they needed to get some work done on the volunteer side because they wanted to raise money for causes they knew citizens thought were important.

Dawn Zeterberg asked the Council to not raise the paratransit fees. She explained she had been talking to people and knew one person that would not be able to get to work because he did not drive. He worked at the University of Missouri and was dependent on paratransit. She stated he had indicated he knew others in the same situation. In addition, he had indicated they would be stuck at home if Saturday service was eliminated. She noted she was dependent on it as well, and did not want to stay home. She reiterated her request to not raise the paratransit fees. She commented that she would now wheel home since she did not have a ride home.

Deanna Quietwater Noriega commented that she had worked for Services for Independent Living, and two years ago, when she had realized her husband would not be able to leave

his wheelchair despite his hard efforts with physical therapy, she retired and started looking for an aging in place home for the two of them. She had chosen a home on the northeast side of town because it was one she could afford. It was a nice one-level home with doorways wide enough for her husband to get through in his wheelchair or walker. She pointed out she had chosen a home on the bus route, and noted it was a bit of walk as it took about 19 minutes at 2.5 mph to get to the bus stop. She explained it was one of the residential routes the Council was considering eliminating. She thought it would also put her outside of the paratransit service district, and when choosing her home, she had ensured she would be within that service area for access. She commented that she thought the Council needed to see the face of someone who would be impacted by what they were considering. She stated she had cashed in her retirement funds to be able to buy this home, which had been suitable for them, and they did not have a lot of other assets. She explained she had removed the carpet and installed laminate flooring so her husband could more easily roll his wheelchair, and she had a fence constructed so her German shepherd guide dog could have a safe place when taken outside. She pointed out her daughter had not been particularly happy with the neighborhood she had chosen, but it had been one they could afford. It was a mixed neighborhood with low income housing on one side of the street with mostly duplexes and some apartments. Her side of the street had single-family dwellings of which many were rentals. It could be a bit noisy, but it was a relatively safe area. The proposed changes in transit service would impact her ability to get to places. She noted she might still be able to walk to the supermarket, but it would likely take her over an hour and she would have to get home with the groceries. She stated she would do what she had to do to keep her husband out of a nursing home. She explained one of the reasons she had moved to Missouri was because her youngest daughter had gotten a job at the University of Missouri, and as a single parent with three kids, she needed assistance raising them. They had been unable to sell their business due to the recession, but had liquidated what they could so they could be stay-at-home grandparents for their three grandchildren. They soon realized they would not be able to provide their grandchildren with an adequate home and the kind of benefits their daughter had when they were raising her, which was why she had gone back to work prior to retiring. She stated these changes to the transit service would hurt real people.

Gretchen Maune, 1919 E. Walnut Street, Apt. 203, explained she had gone blind when she was a senior at the University of Missouri due to a rare genetic condition, and that meant she had lost the ability to drive. Since then, she had advocated for expanded public transit to anyone that would listen because there were many things she wanted to do on Sundays and in the evenings, which she found difficult to do due to the current transit system. When she had recently heard there would be cuts to the current system, she had been horrified. She noted she and many others around the City, to include those with disabilities and those who were low-income individuals, relied on the system. They relied on it to apply for jobs, go to work, go to the store, take their children to daycare, and participate in the community. If the Council made these cuts, they would hurt the City's most vulnerable citizens. They were citizens that voted and paid taxes. Currently, to make a paratransit trip, one had to live within one mile of a fixed route system, and one of the proposed cuts was to decrease that to three-quarters of a mile. If that occurred with the elimination of the neighborhood fixed routes that paratransit was reliant on, many people with disabilities would not be able to leave their homes. In addition, elimination of the neighborhood routes would impact low-income people that were already struggling to get by as they would soon be struggling to go where they needed to go. For people that wanted to be greener and more active, public transit was an awesome option, but for people that had disabilities or were poor, public transit was a critical necessity, and cutting this service was not something a city like Columbia that was committed to inclusion and equity would do. She asked those present who were against the cuts to stand or raise a hand. Approximately 40 people stood or raised a hand.

Valeri Berta commented that she believed the issue of public transit spoke to their soul and who they were in Columbia, Missouri. She explained she was a French citizen who had become an American citizen because she had encountered here a lot of the same values she had when she was growing up. In France, public transit was as basic, extensive, and respected as the post office because it reflected and honored some of the founding values of French society, which included social justice, equity, and inclusion. She liked to think, as Americans, they shared those values, and that the Council shared those values as well. She confessed that she did not ride public transit in Columbia, and believed that spoke volumes to why she needed it and why they all needed it. She felt they needed to expand it instead of cutting it. She commented that even though she could afford and drive a car, she knew many could not. She also knew the kind of community she wanted to live in was one that supported, funded, and cared for public services that she might not need, but others did. The kind of community she wanted to live in was one that lent a hand to those in need. It could be called social equity, access for all, or dignity. She liked to think that was who they were in Columbia, Missouri, and believed that was who they should be. She wondered what would happen if they invested in a public transit system that allowed them to not have to wait more than ten minutes for a ride, operated late at night and seven days per week, and connected everyone in the community with a stop within five minutes of their homes, the place they worked, did business, and shopped. She asked the Council if they could envision how such a small step could help the community and the world at large via a clean and sustainable future. She felt all it would take for Columbia to lead the way to a clean and sustainable future and a just and equitable presence for everyone would be to double the budget of public transit through a tax increase or a budget reallocation. She believed the money invested in the common future would be made back in no time if they did not have to drive their cars everywhere and every day. She asked the Council to back the amendments suggested by Mr. Thomas and to provide more than adequate funding for public transit.

Traci Wilson-Kleekamp stated she was very upset that Ms. Zeterberg had to come before Council to beg for a flex system for transportation while people who were able-bodied were allowed to park for free at the airport. She felt they should be able to charge people to park at the airport so they could fund public transportation. She believed it was disgusting that they would subsidize the airport while telling those that were the most fragile and the most dependent on public transit to beg to be able to take public transportation.

Kevin Carnahan, 2601 Braemore Road, explained he and his wife were currently blessed in that they had a two vehicle household, but that had not always been the case. He stated he could recall having to walk over a mile to get to the store and then trying to figure out how much could be purchased since it had to be carried back home. He commented that he was thankful he had been in that position before he had his two kids as he could not imagine trying do that now. He recalled riding his bicycle and trying to figure out how to affix groceries to it in a way that would allow him to ride home. It had not been easy to do. He stated he had experienced an underfunded public transit system. He pointed out he used to sit at home and plan his route to work, and it would inevitably take him 2-3 times the amount of time to get to work than it would have if had he just had a car. He commented that budgets were moral documents, and they needed to make budgets so they protected the most vulnerable in society. If the City cut the public transit system budget, he might not notice because he had two cars, but wanted the Council to think about those who might be walking to purchase groceries at the store. He stated he supported increasing the budget and Mr. Thomas' amendment as he would like to see as much funding toward public transit as possible.

Molly Housh Gordon, 703 West Boulevard North, explained she was the Pastor of the Unitarian Universalist Church of Columbia and a clergy leader with Faith Voices of Columbia, which was a multi-faith, multi-racial organizing collective representing more than two dozen religious communities and congregations in Columbia. She believed

those in the room were representing quite a number of people who were with them in spirit. She commented that Faith Voices was present this evening because they felt budgets were where their values either came to life or did not. She noted the City had a Strategic Plan that prioritized social equity, and that mission rang hollow if they did not put it into action with the way they created their budget. The mission of social equity rang hollow if the budget would cut vital services to those that were most marginalized by the way things were set up. As had already been heard with real and lived experiences, public transit and paratransit were vital services that affected the lives, livelihood, and well-being of many people. She believed it was a moral mandate for public transit and paratransit to be prioritized and expanded instead of being cut if they were serious about being a community where people of every income and ability could thrive. She commented that Faith Voices was representing many congregations today to urge the Council to adopt the proposed amendments of Mr. Thomas and to consider in the future how they might expand services to those that needed them the most as it was a matter of their faith and a test of their values.

James Cutts, 2401 W. Broadway, Apt. 819, stated he was friends of many of the people that had spoken this evening, and urged the Council to reject the cuts to public transit.

Ellen Thomas, 2616 Hillshire Drive, explained she was a pediatrician at Tiger Pediatrics, which was the largest private pediatric group in Columbia, and they had two major locations, one on Keene Street and the other near Rock Bridge High School. She noted transportation was a big issue for many families trying to get their children to be seen by doctors, and the east side location was only accessible using a neighborhood route. It was not on either the black or gold route. The south location was on the black route, but service was infrequent during the day as it was only available every 80 minutes. Thus, it essentially took a whole day when trying to make it to a doctor's appointment with a child since it was 80 minutes each way. She explained there were many reasons people could not or chose not to drive, and provided a teenager with epilepsy as an example. She believed many more people would be affected than they realized due to a medical condition, the inability to afford a car, being in a family with only one car that was already in use, etc. She thought it was critical to find a way to continue to fund and improve transit services.

Sutu Forte, 627 Bluff Dale Drive, commented that she had deliberately said goodbye to her car two years ago, and unlike many others, she could afford to take a taxi to the meeting tonight. She noted she had been invited to take a walk with Mr. Thomas on the west side of town last Thursday, and for the first time she had gotten on a bus in Columbia. She explained she had called the day before to find out the route. She had to start at the corner of Old 63 and Broadway by 8:55 a.m. and was dropped off at the Walmart on the west side of town to get on the purple route in order to arrive at her location by 9:40 a.m. She stated she believed the bus was great, and had only not ridden it previously because she had always had the convenience of having a car. She commented that she believed cars were hurting the environment as there were too many. She asked the Council to keep public transportation, and for everyone to leave their cars home one day a week.

Lillian Kraxberger explained she was a freshman at the University of Missouri, but had lived in Columbia her entire life. She agreed with the comments of others tonight with regard to public transportation and the suggestion of charging a \$5 parking fee at the airport. She understood Mr. Thomas had made that recommendation, and agreed it made sense. She believed it would create some revenue so more money could be provided to public transit. She did not feel it would impact the number of people that utilized the airport, and would allow for some equity as those who could afford to fly out of the Columbia Regional Airport could pay just a little more for parking, which would allow them to allocate more money to those that were struggling to get by and utilizing public transportation. She understood a new fire station needed to be built on the south side of town, and disagreed with how they were trying to fund it as it was not a sustainable way

to continue funding growth and development in Columbia. They were essentially subsidizing growth because the developers on the south side of town were buying cheap land and building houses for affluent people, and the rest of the community was paying for the infrastructure to support that area. She did not feel that was fair, especially when so many people were struggling financially, and believed it was unfair and unsustainable if Columbia wanted to be an equitable and inclusive place for all to thrive.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he agreed with adequately funding the public transit system. He believed those involved with the City's Strategic Plan should be ashamed with this enormous continuing push to reduce, eliminate, control, and not support the public transportation system in all of its forms. He explained the airport was a major economic driver and amenity, and felt they should support it, but pointed out he believed public transportation was just as important to the sustainable economic growth of the community going forward as the airport. He agreed with Mr. Thomas in regard to development paying for itself, and suggested hiring Eben Fodor, a competent student of the impact of rapid population growth on the fiscal status of cities. He believed charging parking fees at the airport was a part of economic development as every other airport in the country required some kind of fee, and they were only talking about a nominal fee of \$5. It was something they could do in terms of revenue to make economic development, which was important to the City, pay its fair share. He stated he was sad the Council had rejected many of Mr. Thomas' ideas, and noted Greg Cecil and other members of the Airport Advisory Board had come to Mr. Thomas to say they wanted parking fees at the airport and that it was being blocked by staff. He felt this was an example of staff getting in the way of an advisory board. He commented that he thought the parking fee could be in place by January whereby it would generate sufficient income to fund that development. They could then release some of the transportation sales tax used by the airport and fund the public transportation system more adequately.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, explained he was speaking on behalf of the disabled and felt empathy needed to be used. He asked the Council to cut funding to the airport and expand the transportation system.

Barbara Jefferson commented that she did not believe those involved should be asked whether they wanted to pay more money or have a cut in services as it was not an option for many. She believed there should be free service for paratransit users. She stated she was tired of hearing about growth in Columbia. She noted the Bible had indicated the need to protect the elderly, children, and the crippled, and felt that needed to be done. She was concerned about the construction of a \$7 million fire station in the southwest side of town, especially when they were trying to get an additional \$57,000 from those that used paratransit. She wondered how many wheelchair users resided in the southwest side of town. She thought a parking fee at the airport could be required along with not providing free shuttle service to football games and other events and charging for parking in the garages at all times. She believed there was failure in the mission of having an efficient government.

Rob Williams explained he was speaking on behalf of Kraft Heinz with regard to B 183-18, which would impact the electric rates, and noted they had received an e-mail on August 31 from John Wulff letting them know there would be an increase of 5.5 percent starting on October 1, 2018. He stated he was concerned about the timing as that had not been included as part of their budget for the year. He pointed out they could include that increase as part of the 2019 budget if the increase would begin January 1, 2019 instead.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, asked the Council to pay those on the trash trucks the full \$2 per hour increase they had requested. She understood the amendment sheet had included raising all permanent positions to a minimum of \$15 per hour, and the difference between \$15 per hour and \$15.78 per hour was \$1,622 a year. When one's household income was less than \$40,000 per year, \$1,600 was a big deal. Those on the trucks needed the ability to rest their bodies between shifts, access health insurance benefits, and not leave their late shift and go to their second or third job. She also asked the

Council to raise her rates in order to keep the City in good repair. She suggested they start with a transit utility so they could have a fully funded transit system that served all citizens. She commented that she felt the same with regard to stormwater and other utilities. She explained she had listened to very sophisticated arguments over the years about why the rates needed to stay the same and did not feel they were serving the citizens well with that philosophy. She asked the Council the set aside \$750,000 for the performance audit. She understood they had been without a treasurer, internal auditor, and now a finance director, which had raised red flags for her in that the City did not have a system of checks and balances and that they had been using assumptions that went back to the 1980s. She believed they needed an evaluation of whether they were spending their money efficiently and economically, and that the actual results were the intended results in meeting the needs of citizens.

There being no further comment, Mayor Treece continued the public hearing to the September 17, 2018 Council Meeting.

Mayor Treece understood the budget that had been proposed and presented to Council had been based on a property tax increase of \$0.43 per \$100 assessed valuation, and the Council had rejected that increase.

Mayor Treece made a motion to revise the budget to reflect \$0.4100 per \$100 assessed valuation instead of \$0.4329. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Pitzer commented that in his opinion the minus two percent was extraordinarily conservative. For this current fiscal year, he noted he would be astounded if they wound up down two percent as they had been up one percent through the first three-quarters of the year. He understood there had been some discussion with regard to the timing of some payments, but felt minus one percent was still very conservative for this year. For next year, they were trying to project for something 14 months away so there was some uncertainty, but a negative sales tax growth was out of line with what other communities felt would occur, even with the challenges of online sales. A couple of years ago, they had seen a very slight decrease. He believed that was the year they had a more significant impact from the reduction in the number of students at the University of Missouri. That impact had declined since then, and they were at a point in the economic cycle where they would be seeing a growth of 7-8 percent if it was not for online sales. He agreed the online sales was an impact, but did not feel it would be minus two percent. He commented that he was very comfortable going to a minus one percent and would also be comfortable going further.

Mr. Pitzer understood two motions would be needed, one to amend the current fiscal year numbers and the other to amend the next fiscal year numbers.

Mayor Treece asked why they would have to amend the FY 2017 budget. Ms. Peveler replied it would be FY 2018 and FY 2019 numbers. Mayor Treece asked why they would have to amend FY 2018. Ms. Peveler replied they took the actual FY 2017 number to get to an estimated FY 2018 number based on the assumptions. Depending on the assumption for growth and decline, they would then calculate the FY 2019 number.

Ms. Peters understood the last numbers they had for FY 2018 had come in at the end of June. Since they were close to the end of the fiscal year, she wondered how close they were to knowing the sales tax numbers for 2018. Mr. Matthes replied they were three months from having a good idea as it was determined three months after the close of the books. Ms. Peters understood that meant the end of December or January. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas understood they had a good idea for up to three months ago. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas asked where they were compared to projections three months ago. Mr. Matthes replied he did not have that report with him. Mr. Pitzer commented that through June 30, the actual sales tax dollars received had been up one percent compared to FY 2017. He pointed out that included

the payment they had discussed in terms of its timing. Mr. Thomas understood that was an outlier and not something they would normally expect. Mr. Pitzer commented that if they had assumed that should have come in FY 2017, it would have raised that number. Mr. Thomas asked where they would be in FY 2018 if that amount had been deducted. Mr. Pitzer replied FY 2018 would then be down, but that amount would need to be added back to FY 2017, and the decline from FY 2017 to FY 2018 had been about 10 percent, which had not made a lot of sense.

Mr. Matthes explained the \$459,000 was based on adjusting the assumption for both years. If the Council only adjusted one year, it would be less than half of that amount.

Mayor Treece understood FY 2017 was over. Mr. Thomas did not believe they were discussing FY 2017. Mr. Matthes explained they were discussing FY 2018 and FY 2019. Mayor Treece understood FY 2018 would only be changed to reflect the one percent decline from the previous fiscal year. It was not an actual change in the previous year's budget. Mr. Pitzer stated that was correct. It only changed the baseline for the FY 2019 budget.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to change the FY 2018 assumption to minus one percent. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece.

Mr. Thomas understood this was essentially a paper exercise whereby they were saying they were revising their projections for sales tax revenues coming in during the current fiscal year and the next fiscal year, and if they were correct in these new projections, they would have an additional \$460,000 in FY 2019.

Mr. Skala agreed, and believed this was a less conservative approach, but they had been reassured there was some backup if they were wrong.

Mayor Treece agreed they had a safety net of excess general revenue reserves.

The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Mayor Treece to change the FY 2018 assumption to minus one percent was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to change the FY 2019 assumption to minus one percent. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece understood Mr. Pitzer was suggesting they reduce the increase to the self insurance fee to zero percent as it would more accurately reflect the self insurance episodes in the recent past. Mr. Pitzer stated that was correct. He explained he had walked through those numbers at the prior meeting, and noted that fund had been very well funded and the excess cash in that fund had grown significantly. He stated they had kept the increase at zero percent last year after looking at that fund, and year to date, they were having another strong year fiscally in that fund. He understood it was ahead of expectations again, and felt it was safe to reduce the increase to zero percent again.

Ms. Peters asked for an explanation of what the self insurance fund insured. Ms. Cannon replied the self insurance fund insured their general liability, auto, property, workers compensation, etc. It was the City's deductible component of the insurance policy along with any other payouts needed. She explained it took a long time to be sound, and the goal was a confidence level of 95 percent. Ms. Peters asked how the 95 percent confidence level had been chosen. Ms. Cannon replied it indicated that they had enough money for 9.5 out of 10 years to pay out any claims in the pipeline. She noted an actuarial study was conducted based on historical data, the value of the dollar, medical cost projections, etc., and it determined the amount needed in the fund. Ms. Peters asked if everyone used a 95 percent confidence level or if some used 80 percent. Ms. Cannon replied some used 75 percent. She explained there had been a significant payout when a firefighter had been killed in the line of duty so they needed to ensure they were sound. She pointed out they were also sued often so they had to ensure there was adequate funding to cover the needs of the City.

Ms. Peters asked for the amount the City liked to keep, and if they were over that amount now. Ms. Cannon replied they were over it. She commented that after talking with Mr. Pitzer last year, they had decided to keep it at a zero percent rate increase. They had then massaged the percentages they would charge out for the next four years to keep the amounts charged to the other funds somewhat consistent. By keeping it at zero, it would take it down significantly, and they would then have to charge a significant increase to the other funds to get money back into the account to keep it well-funded. Ms. Peveler commented that at the end of FY 2017, they were \$1.4 million above the target.

Mr. Trapp understood if they changed the increase to the self insurance fund to zero it would lead to greater increases charged to the funds in future years. Ms. Cannon stated that was correct. Ms. Peveler commented that it depended on the claims. Mr. Trapp understood they would still be at the 95 percent confidence level at this time, but projections for future years would indicate the need for greater contributions in the future to maintain that confidence level. Ms. Peveler stated that was correct. She explained that the zero percent increase would use down the excess cash reserves more quickly.

Mr. Pitzer commented that even with the zero percent increase for the current year, the fund was still projected to have a surplus. Over the last ten years, roughly \$10 million in excess of actual expenses had been put into that fund. Ideally, those funds should be as close to zero as possible, but that was impossible to do, and a safety net was needed. He stated he felt there was a substantial safety net.

Ms. Peters asked for the percentage charge that had been proposed. Ms. Peveler replied four percent in FY 2019. She noted they had an eight percent increase in FY 2017, and it had generally been 8-9 percent increases each year. Ms. Peters understood that had allowed them to have the \$1.4 million excess. Ms. Peveler stated the claims in FY 2017 had come in lower than the actuarial had indicated was possible.

Mr. Skala commented that over the last ten years, a charge of 8-9 percent had created this excess. Ms. Peveler stated there had been a zero percent increase in FY 2018, and in FY 2017, there had been an eight percent increase. Mr. Skala understood it had generally been an eight percent increase on a yearly basis, and that had built up the surplus to \$10 million or so. Since they had cut that increase to zero, they were decreasing the fund. He also understood Mr. Pitzer felt there was still enough in surplus this year. Mr. Pitzer agreed, and pointed out the fund was still making money with a zero percent increase.

Mr. Skala asked if a surplus was necessary to have a 95 percent confidence level. Ms. Cannon replied no. She explained it became a funding ratio, and the actuarial report told them exactly what they had to have to meet the 95 percent confidence level. She noted they were at that point now, and had a little bit of a surplus in the fund. It was the reason they were bringing the rates down in terms of what would be charged to the other funds. She commented that a typical internal service fund would operate at zero ideally, but due to insurance deductibles and premiums, they could not project future costs. As a result, they had to ensure they were adequately funded to cover those unexpected costs. She stated they had taken great measures in terms of safety programs to reduce costs, but workers were still injured. She pointed out they also provided a self insurance fund report annually for review by the Council.

Mr. Skala commented that even though it was optimum to operate at a balanced position, some amount of a safety net was good due to unexpected occurrences. Ms. Cannon stated for police, fire, and electric linemen, they had to have a \$750,000 deductible per occurrence. All others deductibles were \$500,000.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to reduce the self insurance fee increase to zero percent for FY 2019. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece.

Mayor Treece noted they were 25 percent above the cash reserve target for this year.

The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Mayor Treece to reduce the self insurance fee increase to zero percent was approved by voice vote with only Mr.

Trapp voting no.

Mayor Treece understood Mr. Pitzer had also suggested the custodial fee increase be reduced to zero. The cash reserve target was \$375,000, and there was \$1.4 million in the fund.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to reduce the custodial fee increase to zero percent for FY 2019. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Ms. Peters asked what that would mean. She wondered if they would have less janitorial service and if they would have enough money to pay the staff. Ms. Peveler replied the balance had been built due to vacancies and turnover. The departments were charged based on the assumption every vacancy was filled, but they had not all been filled.

Mr. Thomas asked how much would be realized by this change. Mr. Pitzer replied it was almost \$11,000 to the general fund. Ms. Peveler stated it was \$10,791 to the general fund.

Mr. Thomas commented that he felt they were nitpicking around for \$10,000-\$11,000 in a paperwork exercise. He stated he was happy to support it, but thought it was bit meaningless in the big picture. Mr. Pitzer noted he did not disagree, but felt it had been a cumulative effect over a number of years whereby these monies were taken away from the departments' ability to deliver services. In theory, it was impacting the ability to do what people expected. Mr. Thomas thought they should consider addressing this through policy at a later date.

The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Mr. Skala to reduce the custodial fee increase to zero percent in FY 2019 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he would recommend the same for the community relations fee based on the same principles, and it would roughly total \$23,000 to the general fund.

Mayor Treece noted the cash reserve target on that was \$560,000 and the fund had accumulated \$1.7 million. They were 200 percent over on the cash reserve target. He explained he understood the comment of Mr. Thomas, but also felt the money should be put to work. It should not be stockpiled when it could be used to deliver services expected by taxpayers.

Mr. Skala pointed out these fund balances could be restored if necessary in the future if their evaluation was wrong. He agreed it made sense to put as much of this as cumulatively possible to work.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to reduce the community relations fee increase to zero percent in FY 2019. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece asked for clarification regarding the pension issue to incorporate allowances. Ms. Peveler replied the general fund cost was \$15,153. She explained cell phone and clothing protective equipment allowances were pensionable items, and those related pension costs had not been incorporated within the proposed budget.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a line item for that or if it was spread across departments. Ms. Peveler replied it was across all departments. It was about \$77,000 for all of the funds, and \$15,153 to general fund departments.

Mayor Treece made a motion to increase the pension amounts budgeted to incorporate the allowances offered to employees to ensure appropriate contribution to their retirement. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas asked how much they had with those votes. He wondered if it was about \$600,000. Mr. Matthes replied he thought it was a little more than \$500,000. Mr. Thomas understood it had been about \$460,000 with the change to the sales tax assumption and another \$100,000 with the self insurance and other fees. He asked if the proposed cuts added up to about \$950,000. Mr. Matthes replied yes, except two of the items that had been addressed were incorporated in that amount.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone had any objections to the cuts that had been offered by staff as a way to achieve some of the salary increases.

Mr. Pitzer understood the changing of the sales tax assumption would impact the parks and recreation budget and would potentially not require a cut to those service lines. Ms. Peveler explained the parks sales tax would increase \$114,475 in FY 2019 so they could choose to increase the subsidy from park sales tax to the general fund instead of going forward with the cuts offered by staff. She pointed out there had been two slides on the expenditure changes with one totaling \$69,001 and the other totaling \$55,650.

Ms. Peters understood there was an expectation with regard to the general fund when the parks sales tax had passed initially. Ms. Peveler explained the City had indicated they would not reduce the general fund support below the 2001 level, and pointed out they had not gone below that level. In FY 2019, there was an increase above the FY 2018 support level. She understood Mr. Pitzer had asked for ways to reduce that general fund support to the same FY 2018 level. Ms. Peters asked what had been the support in 2001. Ms. Peveler replied it had been \$4,568,278.

Ms. Peveler noted the amount of cuts to the parks and recreation fund totaled \$124,651, and they could increase the subsidy from the park sales tax of about \$114,000. Mr. Pitzer pointed out some of the other interdepartmental charges would be reduced as well. Ms. Peveler stated the interdepartmental charges were a little over \$11,000.

Mr. Trapp understood the potential cuts in the parks and recreation fund could be defrayed by the increase in parks sales tax due to the changing economic assumptions. Ms. Peveler stated that was correct, and pointed out it was also dependent on the pay plan changes made.

Mr. Trapp asked if the cuts were offered to get people to the midpoint. Mr. Matthes replied they had not had a specific outcome, but had gone through an exercise to provide for more funds. Mr. Trapp understood the Council could go in a different direction, but the numbers were based upon the cost to move those eligible to midpoint. Mr. Matthes stated they had been trying to accomplish the \$15 minimum and the move to midpoint.

Mr. Ruffin asked if the elimination of the parks and recreation budget cuts would protect the C.A.R.E. program. Mr. Matthes replied yes.

Mayor Treece asked if they could assume they had another \$950,000 to work with knowing there might be some minor objections to some cuts, which meant they had about \$1.4 million total, and if the Council had a preference in terms of prioritizing pay increases. He noted his preference was to target pay increases to front line employees that needed it the most. They could start that by moving the minimum pay for all permanent positions to \$15 per hour.

Mr. Skala explained his view was to try to raise the minimum to \$15 per hour and to do what they could to get those eligible to midpoint, but noted he also wanted to cap any increases in salary to those that made 2.5 times the \$15 per hour, which would involve salaries above \$72,000 a year.

Mr. Thomas understood Mr. Skala did not want to provide salary increases to those at a rate of 2.5 times the new minimum wage of \$15 per hour. Mr. Skala stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas stated he liked that.

Mr. Ruffin asked if this was for one year. Mr. Skala replied yes.

Mr. Trapp understood that would include line workers, which they were having trouble employing, and other professional jobs that demanded a high wage that they were not meeting in terms of the market now.

Mayor Treece suggested they dispose of the \$15 per hour minimum increase first since

no one impacted by it was at the level Mr. Skala wanted as a cap.

Mr. Matthes commented that he wanted to speak up for the supervisors who made those higher wages and put in the vast majority of the extra hours worked. He worried about morale if they told them they would not receive an increase.

Ms. Peters commented that she thought they should consider the additional 25 cents per hour first because that would impact all of the employees. They could then address the \$15 per hour minimum. She asked if they could look at this in that order. It did not completely help the supervisors, but it acknowledged they were not trying to make their salaries worse since they were not providing the \$1,000 again this year.

Mayor Treece suggested they do the \$15 per hour minimum first because he felt there was agreement to move the lowest paid people to that level. Ms. Peters asked Mayor Treece if he did not think there was agreement for the 25 cent across the board raise. Mayor Treece replied he was not saying there was not. He only wanted to handle this in the order of what was shown on the slide.

Mr. Skala made a motion to increase the minimum pay for all permanent positions to \$15 per hour. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Trapp understood they were primarily concerned about general fund costs because that had been constraining raises across the service lines and presumably almost all of the enterprises could bear some kind of rate increase to cover those costs, and that they would not raise rates to cover those costs this year. They would fund it out of the fund balance for each of those funds and then look at rate adjustments in future budget years. He asked if that was correct. Mr. Matthes replied that was the strategy staff had anticipated. He thought the impacts could be absorbed by the cash reserves this year, but increases would likely be needed next year in most of the funds.

Mr. Thomas commented that while many of those enterprise funds could raise rates to achieve those raises, the transit fund was one that could not because the only rates available to them were the fares people paid. He wondered if they should stop thinking about transit as an enterprise fund and put it into the general fund. It received almost all of its funding from a general source. He thought that was something that should be considered in the future. Mayor Treece noted it might be more protected in an enterprise fund.

Ms. Peters asked if there was a reason to not increase fees this year for certain services like trash. Mr. Matthes replied they could calculate that and get it to the Council. Ms. Peters asked if that would take them above the \$5 increase he preferred they not exceed in any one year. Mr. Matthes replied it probably did. Mayor Treece commented that he thought Mr. Sorrell had indicated it was 60 cents per house per month to do the \$2 increase. Ms. Peters understood the rate was about \$2.93 now, and the 60 cents would take them to about \$3.50. Mr. Matthes pointed out he did not know the percentage increase of that, and it was only one utility. They would have to do the calculation for all of them. Depending on the ideas the Council wanted to fund, they could come back with all of the calculations. He commented that all of those funds could fundamentally withstand the first year, but they would have to increase rates next year if they did not increase them now.

Mr. Pitzer wondered if they wanted to look at these things in totality because some items tended to relate to one another. If they did another 25 cents, they were taking the minimum pay to \$15.25, and not \$15. In addition, there was already 25 cents within the current proposed budget. Mayor Treece stated he wanted to ensure they were not double counting any of it. Mr. Matthes commented that staff would calculate every decision made tonight, and numbers would change since some items were not mutually exclusive.

Ms. Peveler commented that if the Council did the \$2 per hour pay adjustment for refuse collectors, the way it would be handled was that they would raise them the \$2 and then provide the across the board increase so they would get the \$2 plus the 25 cents. They would not move them to just the \$15 and not provide the across the board increase.

Ms. Peters asked if this meant the pay bands would change. Ms. Peveler replied no

because all of this would fit within the existing pay bands.

Ms. Thompson commented that the Council could cap it at \$15 as well if they made that a part of the motion. She noted they could choose to do whatever was greater between the \$15 and the 25 cents. Ms. Peveler noted they would cause compression if they did that, and it would be challenging for her to calculate it that way because she would have to review the rates of everyone to determine who would receive what. As a result, they generally moved it to whatever the rate would be and provided the across the board on top of that. She explained the Human Resources Department would also have to do it on a person by person basis so it would be very challenging procedurally. Ms. Thompson noted they could add the 25 cents first and then do the move to \$15 for anyone that did meet the \$15 at that time.

Mayor Treece asked if they wanted to address the additional 25 cents first. He thought they were in agreement that they wanted to do the \$15 minimum, but he did not believe they wanted to do \$15.25.

Mr. Thomas understood the extra 25 cents would add up to quite a lot. Mr. Matthes stated it would be \$525 per person per year.

Mr. Pitzer noted they could make the increase \$14.75 instead of \$15 if that would make the calculation easier.

Mr. Matthes commented that doing them globally in order of the pay plan would create the least amount of work, and that involved the minimum being addressed first, then the across the board, and then the performance increases if they were ever able to get to that point. He noted the system was set up for that. He pointed out Ms. Thompson was also correct in that it could be worded the other way, and they would do the work it would take to make that work.

Mayor Treece commented that every study regarding minimum wage showed it would go directly back into the economy, and \$1,600 for these households was a significant increase and would mean a lot.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Mr. Trapp to increase the minimum pay for all permanent positions to \$15 per hour was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece suggested they discuss the move to midpoint within the current pay bands for those that were eligible with five or more years of service. He understood that had a general fund impact of \$762,000.

Mayor Treece made a motion to move employees with five years or more of service in their current position to the midpoint of the current pay bands. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Peters if she wanted to amend his motion similar to item 3 on her amendment sheet as now would be timely for her to offer the amendment for this move to midpoint to be only provided to classified employees. He noted it would make that \$762,000 less. Ms. Peters read the item Mayor Treece had referred to, which indicated it would be a move to the current classification and pay plan midpoint for all classified employees with at least five years of tenure on or before March 1, 2018 who met the following conditions: (1) the employee had not been on a performance improvement or corrective action plan in the last 24 months; (2) the employee had not received any discipline resulting in a loss of pay; and (3) the employee's performance met most standards with an average score of 2.0 or higher as documented in the employee's most recent performance evaluation.

Mayor Treece commented that the current fiscal impact was about \$762,000 and Ms. Peters' amendment would drop that a little if it was only allowed for all classified employees. It also added a merit element to it by ensuring the employee was not subject to any discipline at the moment.

Mr. Matthes stated they would have to analyze the classified versus unclassified employees eligible for midpoint to determine the dollar impact. He pointed out the vast

majority of overtime and work happened at the unclassified level.

Mr. Trapp understood the rationale for this potential amendment was that unclassified employees had been given the ability to negotiate with management for increases, and many of them had, while classified employees had been bound by the strict work of the budget. Mayor Treece stated that was correct as they had not seen a significant step toward the midpoint since 2013 when they did 20 percent. Mr. Trapp understood this would not preclude those ongoing processes of negotiation that unclassified employees were able to participate in as long as the department head could find funds within the department budget. Mr. Matthes pointed out the vast majority of that negotiation was when someone took a new job, such as a promotion. It was rare it happened mid-year. If it did occur mid-year, it involved a larger circumstance, such as a gender equity issue or the job changing in a significant way. Most of the unclassified increases were at the time of promotion or when taking the job. It was rare for negotiation to happen outside of that process.

Mr. Skala stated he was speaking of base salaries when he had mentioned this earlier, and did not want to penalize overtime. He was only concerned about the base salary by which the overtime was generated. Mr. Matthes understood that as well.

Ms. Peters understood most unclassified employees were already at the midpoint or above. Ms. Peveler stated there were 7.95 people in the general fund that were unclassified and were eligible to the move to midpoint. She pointed out they were not all directors or assistant directors as two were not, and one person had been in their position for 21 years and still not at the midpoint. Mayor Treece asked for the fiscal note for those people. Ms. Peveler replied they would save \$90,110 in the general fund by not including unclassified employees.

Ms. Peters commented that even though she had suggested that amendment, it did not seem right. She thought classified and unclassified employees should be included.

Mayor Treece noted the \$90,000 divided by eight full-time employees totaled about \$11,000 of pay increases for those eight people. Some might be dramatically more and some might be dramatically less. Ms. Peveler pointed out that amount included benefits. Mr. Matthes commented that he thought it reflected how much below the midpoint those people were being paid now. He stated that it was a gender equity issue for three of them, and he recommended that be addressed. For the rest, they were that far below the midpoint. Mayor Treece asked why it would be a gender equity issue if they were operating within the pay bands. He wondered if the men had been given raises disproportionate to the women, and noted it was contrary to the reason they had pay bands. Mr. Matthes explained he had been working on this issue for seven years. This was the latest in the series. He noted he could not afford to fix all of the disparities at one time. As a result, he had been chipping away at it.

Ms. Peters commented that they needed to allow the Finance Department the ability to generate the information associated with these changes. She also wondered if they should only address the classified employees now with regard to the move to midpoint and determine where they were in two weeks.

Mr. Matthes explained he thought the confusion was that the pay policies, such as the move to midpoint strategy and the move to minimum strategy, applied to both classified and unclassified employees. He believed suspending the pay plan for one group was a problematic issue, but noted it was doable. He stated they could analyze it and provide Council those details, and commented that he felt he needed to speak up for all employees. Ms. Peters understood, but thought a \$7,000-\$10,000 increase was big compared to the trash people. Mr. Matthes thought those people would say that was how underpaid they were. Ms. Peters stated that might be true, but they only had a certain amount of money.

Mr. Pitzer understood that if they agreed to the move to midpoint, some people would see a fairly significant percentage pay raise. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct as it was different for each person. Mr. Pitzer asked if there was any way to quantify how large or

how many people might be seeing those kinds of raises. Ms. Peveler replied the main reason they had not been able to fund this thus far because a large number of people impacted were in police and fire, and they were in the general fund. Mr. Pitzer asked what kind of raise a move to midpoint would involve. Ms. Peveler replied she only had the cents per hour and did not have a quick way of adding it up. Mr. Matthes commented that he thought there might be some move to midpoints in the Police Department that were over \$20,000 and others at about \$500. It was information staff could provide without the names and by department and classified and versus unclassified.

Mr. Pitzer suggested a graduated approach to the move to midpoint instead of doing it all in one year. The estimated cost was a large amount, and it would continue every year hereafter. If they did a portion, such as one-third or one-half, they could then see where they were in terms of revenues and making it a priority in future budget years if the resources were there.

Mayor Treece commented that ideally they would have been funding this at 20 percent per year five years ago. Mr. Pitzer agreed. Mayor Treece stated he believed there were a lot of City employees that had chosen this job over a different job as a result of looking at the pay range and thinking they could be making the midpoint amount in 5.5 years, and that had been denied to them regardless of whether it had been a promise or not. He pointed out he thought they were paying for it in terms of retention at the police, fire, and refuse collector levels. He commented that he was not sure how to get this to the lowest paid workers first.

Mr. Matthes explained the concept behind the 25 cents across the board was to maximize the dollars in the lower paid bands. The move to \$15 was a reflection of that concept as well. The move to midpoint was really just a system to move everyone toward the midpoint over time. If the City had been able to fund the pay plan that had been created, they would have been able to get to midpoint in five years.

Mr. Skala commented that he viewed this akin to economic development as economic development was discussed from the point of view of entrepreneurial activity and retention. Raising the minimum wage to \$15 per hour was in the first category, and the move to midpoint was a part of the retention package. He noted they were hemorrhaging employees and believed they needed to do both. He understood the extent to which they could move people to midpoint was dependent upon how they manipulated the budget in terms of monies available.

Ms. Peters understood the current motion would move people to midpoint within the old pay bands, so even though they were raising the pay bands, next year those people might not be at midpoint.

Mr. Pitzer pointed out there would be another group of employees eligible for midpoint next year. Ms. Peters agreed and noted they would also have to get the current ones to the new midpoint then.

Mr. Matthes commented that this would get them current, but next year, there would be employees that had reached their five years, and the pay system called for that move to midpoint then. They would never be done.

Mayor Treece stated that regardless of the cost next year, the move to midpoint was the right thing to do.

Ms. Peters thought they might want to amend the motion so it was only for the classified employees. They could ask then ask for the numbers.

Ms. Peters made a motion to amend the motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Ms. Peters by limiting the move to midpoint to classified employees only. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece.

Mr. Thomas asked if this would cost \$762,000. Mayor Treece replied yes. Mr. Thomas understood they had \$1.4 million to utilize, and they had already spent \$229,000. Mayor Treece stated that was correct.

Mr. Matthes understood if they made the distinction between classified and unclassified employees, the associated cost would be about \$90,000. Ms. Peveler explained the cost

for classified employees only was \$671,911. Mayor Treece asked what it would be for the other funds. Ms. Peveler replied \$546,726.

Ms. Amin asked for clarification regarding the initial motion and the motion to amend the initial motion. Mayor Treece indicated the motion to amend the initial motion should include the merit items Ms. Peters had mentioned earlier in the discussion. Ms. Peters stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he would oppose the motion to amend the motion. If they did the move to the midpoint, he believed it was worth including everyone. It was a large number, but noted he did not feel the savings were worth it in this context.

Mr. Thomas understood that by voting for the amendment to the motion, they would exclude unclassified employees, and if they voted it down, they would vote again on including everyone.

Mr. Ruffin asked for clarification regarding the police lieutenants. Mayor Treece replied two police lieutenants would be included in the pending motion, and noted the City Manager had suggested the third police lieutenant that was not yet eligible for the midpoint be addressed as part of the collective bargaining process. Ms. Thompson pointed out the lieutenants would be addressed in a different ordinance. The situation would not be fixed by any action this evening. Mayor Treece understood the funding mechanism would be addressed here. Ms. Thompson commented that if the ordinance was approved, the funding would be in place because it would be directed, and budgeting would have to make whatever amendments were necessary to come in compliance with that particular bill. She thought the ordinance read that it would be to at least the lowest paid unclassified lieutenant. Mr. Matthes noted the ordinance would solve the problem, but they were looking to the bands on the slide to provide the funding mechanism.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought Mr. Pitzer's argument was proper and noted he would join him in opposition to the amendment to the motion.

Ms. Peters stated she would withdraw her amendment to the motion of limiting the move to midpoint to classified employees only and including the merit requirements. Mayor Treece agreed to its withdrawal.

Mayor Treece commented that they would go back to the original motion, which was to move employees with five years or more of service in their current position to the midpoint of the current pay bands, and asked Ms. Thompson if they should include the language with regard to meeting certain conditions. Ms. Thompson replied it was up to the Council, and dependent on whether they wanted to ensure that of the employees. Ms. Peters stated she thought it should be included.

Mayor Treece stated he would accept that as a friendly amendment, and indicated his motion was to move employees with five years or more of service in their current position on or before March 1, 2018 to the midpoint of the current pay bands if they met the following conditions: (1) the employee had not been on a performance improvement or corrective action plan in the last 24 months; (2) the employee had not received any discipline resulting in a loss of pay; and (3) the employee's performance met most standards with an average score of 2.0 or higher as documented in the employee's most recent performance evaluation. Ms. Peters who had seconded the initial motion was agreeable to the revised motion.

Mayor Treece commented that the fiscal note was the \$762,021 plus the \$581,822. Mr. Pitzer noted it would be less as some might be affected by the conditions. Mr. Matthes thought that would likely be a small number.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Ms. Peters to move employees with five years or more of service in their current position on or before March 1, 2018 to the midpoint of the current pay bands if they met the following conditions: (1) the employee had not been on a performance improvement or corrective action plan in the last 24 months; (2) the employee had not received any discipline resulting in a loss of pay; and (3) the employee's

performance met most standards with an average score of 2.0 or higher as documented in the employee's most recent performance evaluation was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece suggested they add the lowest paid CPLA police lieutenant to the current midpoint so they could make the ordinance change true. Ms. Thompson stated she did not believe they wanted it to read to the midpoint. She thought they wanted it to be the language contained in the ordinance that adopted the pay and classification. The exact number would have to come from the Finance Department. It was a budget amendment for a number, and not policy on the move to midpoint or anything else. Mayor Treece asked if this needed to be adopted. Ms. Peveler asked what the ordinance stated. Ms. Amin replied Section 3 of B212-18 indicated the following: effective as of the pay period beginning on September 23, 2018, for any position that on September 1, 2018 was occupied by both classified and unclassified employees as defined in Section 19-4 of the Code of Ordinances, the classified employees in such positions shall be paid a salary at least as much as the lowest paid unclassified employee in the same position. Ms. Thompson stated the Council already had the language in front of them in a different ordinance. It was only the number they were worried about at this point. Mayor Treece asked if what was shown on the slide was that number. Ms. Peveler replied she did not know and would have to look into it. Mr. Matthes stated it was that number.

Mr. Pitzer understood they had just moved two of the lieutenants. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, and this would address the third. He noted they would then sort out all of the numbers as some of this was connected, but as of the calculations today, that was the number. He commented that it could change to a small degree.

Mayor Treece made a motion to address the situation involving the classified lieutenants. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece asked where they were at in terms of funding now. Ms. Peveler replied she thought they had \$405,171 left.

Mr. Thomas understood they had moved the lowest paid worker to a minimum of \$15 per hour, but had not given the solid waste collectors the \$2 per hour raise they had requested.

Mayor Treece asked how many of the solid waste collector employees were below \$15 per hour. Ms. Peveler replied not very many, and noted she thought it was about twelve employees. Mayor Treece asked how many of them were eligible for the midpoint. Ms. Peveler replied not very many. Mayor Treece understood there was a gap, and asked Ms. Peveler if she knew what that fiscal note would be. Ms. Peveler replied it was about \$291,000. Mr. Trapp pointed out there was not any general fund cost to the increase.

Mr. Matthes commented that the entry level hourly salary was \$13.77, and the move to \$15 per hour as a minimum addressed about \$1.23 per hour, and if the Council wanted to get to a full \$2, it would be the difference. Ms. Peveler stated that they would all be over \$15 per hour if the Council gave them the \$2 per hour. Mr. Matthes thought it would get those at the minimum to \$15.77 per hour. He thought the decision of the Council was whether the \$15 per hour was sufficient or if they wanted to do the full \$2 increase for refuse collectors.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to increase refuse collector salaries by \$2 per hour. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin.

Ms. Amin asked if that was \$2 from the current minimum or \$2 above the \$15 per hour. Mr. Thomas replied \$2 above where they were now. Mr. Skala agreed it should be \$2 above the current pay. Mayor Treece commented that they were raising the floor, and then increasing where they were at regardless of whether they were eligible for the midpoint, but if they were at the midpoint, whereby they had been with the City for 5.5

years, they would not receive the full \$2 increase. Mr. Trapp stated they would raise the floor by \$2. Ms. Peveler thought they were raising each refuse collector by \$2. Mr. Thomas agreed. Ms. Peveler explained that would not increase compression and someone that had been with the City longer would still make more than someone that had not been with the City as long.

Mr. Pitzer understood they needed to exclude the refuse collectors from the \$15 minimum. Ms. Peveler stated that was correct as they would end up making more than \$15 per hour. Mr. Matthes thought they would definitely trade for this over that. Mr. Pitzer commented that they had just raised everyone to \$15 per hour, and asked if they now needed to go back to amend that minimum of \$15 per hour for everyone except refuse collectors, and then give the \$2 per hour increase to the refuse collectors.

Mayor Treece asked if they could continue to make these motions and have staff harmonize them. Mr. Matthes replied he thought staff was following the intent of Council, and would have it all locked down at the next meeting. He understood the intent of Council was to treat the refuse collector group differently than those being moved to a minimum of \$15 per hour by giving them all a \$2 per hour raise. Mr. Skala and Mr. Trapp agreed.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Mr. Ruffin to increase refuse collector salaries by \$2 per hour was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Trapp asked if they had enough for the additional 25 cent across the board increase. Ms. Peveler replied not quite.

Mr. Pitzer understood they initially had about \$1.4 million and had given raises of roughly \$1 million for items 1, 2, and 3 on the slide displayed. It almost tripled the amount of pay increases that were included in the City Manager's proposed budget. As a result, there was about \$400,000 remaining. He suggested that they use that \$400,000 to increase the number of authorized positions in the Police Department for the purpose of creating a downtown focused unit instead of providing further pay increases. He commented that the \$400,000 would provide for roughly four positions. He noted it could be the old downtown unit or a community outreach unit version for the downtown, but the point would be for a proactive regular presence in the downtown. He thought that would go a long way in terms of increasing competence among citizens, business owners, etc. If there was a permanent presence, the officers could be more engaged in a proactive type of policing that would hopefully prevent the reoccurrence of some of the issues they had seen.

Mr. Ruffin asked if there was anyone that would be negatively impacted such that they would be making less by not providing the additional 25 cent an hour raise to everyone. Ms. Peveler replied yes, and explained there would be a lot of people. She commented that anyone that was not impacted by the \$15 minimum or not eligible for the midpoint would only receive the 25 cents the City Manager had proposed, and would lose money. They needed to get 48 cents to keep even with the \$1,000 temporary payment from last year.

Mr. Skala commented that he tended to agree with where he thought Mr. Ruffin had been going with that question. He thought they needed to have equity across the board. He wondered about placing a cap on the higher end. He understood some of the higher end salaries had been increasing over the past few years while some of the lower end salaries had not been keeping pace. He commented that he did not want to penalize anyone in terms of overtime as he felt any restriction should be based on a base salary. He stated he was also not wed to the factor of 2.5 as it could be a factor of 3, which would be a little over \$86,000. If they really wanted to discuss progressive pay raises and make things right for those at the bottom end of the pay ranges, he thought something needed to be done for at least this year. He pointed out he did not want to penalize anyone, but did not want to provide those at the higher end an additional pay raise. Mr. Matthes

explained that was the philosophy of the 25 cents per hour increase from the perspective of staff as it was flat and across the board. It placed the most money in the hands of those that made the least while still preserving pay compression. Since everyone received the same raise, they all moved up together.

Ms. Peters stated she really liked the idea of a downtown unit in terms of public safety, but she would be more in favor of the 25 cent increase for everyone because she valued everyone within the City. She wished there was a way they could fund both.

Mr. Trapp understood they had a downtown unit, but it was just not staffed, and asked if there were plans to staff it as they had the positions. Mr. Matthes replied they had pulled from that unit for various reasons, such as workload, calls, the need for people in other places, but it had the ability to be re-staffed. He thought they were close to just having four vacancies so it was possible it could be achieved. He pointed out having dedicated funding would be helpful for the long term if they were able to accomplish it. He noted there were a couple of items on the horizon that might or might not work out that could assist, such as internet sales tax and the MoDOT ballot for gas that had policing as an eligible use, but he did not want to get their hopes up in case those things did not come to fruition.

Mayor Treece understood they had about \$400,000 left and asked if anyone wanted to make a motion. Ms. Peveler stated they could afford a 20 cent across the board raise with the amount left as it would total about \$394,298. Mr. Thomas understood that meant some people would lose a tiny amount compared to the current year. Ms. Peveler stated that was correct. Mr. Matthes understood it would be a loss of three cents per hour.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to provide an additional 20 cent per hour across the board raise. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Ruffin asked if it was possible to raise it back to 25 cents if they discovered more money at some point. Mr. Matthes replied the Council could always make mid-year amendments to the budget, and noted he knew 1,485 people that would appreciate it.

Mr. Ruffin asked if that could be a part of the amendment. Ms. Peters asked if Mr. Ruffin was asking for them to look at the situation mid-year based on the finances.

Mr. Skala asked for the number to get everyone the additional 25 cents. Mr. Pitzer understood this would take everyone to \$15.20, 20 cents over the midpoint, etc. Ms. Peters thought it would likely be another \$100,000 to get everyone to the 25 cents. Mr. Pitzer reiterated his understanding was that those they had moved to \$15 would then receive \$15.25. Ms. Peters thought that had already been calculated. Mr. Matthes stated staff would sort through the details to determine if someone would get the \$15 minimum, the 25 cents, the 20 cents, and the midpoint as he did not think a single person would get all of the above.

Mayor Treece commented that he thought the quarterly financial reports would have a whole new meaning over the next twelve months, and as they received them, they would be able to determine whether their crystal ball was correct on revenue and they would be watching the expenses more closely. He also thought they might want to go back to a supplemental budget around the spring break time frame to see how they stood.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Mr. Thomas to provide an additional 20 cent per hour across the board raise was approved by voice vote with only Mr. Pitzer voting no.

Mayor Treece stated he wanted to go back to the motion they had made with regard to the move to midpoint. He understood a file by file check would be required to determine whether or not the employee had been on a performance improvement or corrective action plan in the last 24 months or whether the employee had received any discipline resulting in a loss of pay because that information was not kept electronically. Only the scoring was kept electronically. He suggested they remove the two conditions staff would have difficulty determining, and only require the performance condition of meeting most

standards with an average score of 2.0 or higher as documented in the employee's most recent performance evaluation.

Mayor Treece made a motion to remove the employee not having been on a performance improvement or corrective action plan in the last 24 months or the employee not receiving any discipline resulting in a loss of pay as conditions to move employees with five years or more of service in their current position on or before March 1, 2018 to the midpoint of the current pay bands so that the only condition was that the employee's performance met most standards with an average score of 2.0 or higher as documented in the employee's most recent performance evaluation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Peveler asked if anything would be done with regard to lineman related salaries. Mr. Skala understood it would involve enterprise funds.

Mayor Treece commented that there had been a lot of discussion with regard to losing linemen as the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) had made a recommendation for a 15 percent increase, and asked staff if they had any input or guidance on the matter. Mr. Matthes replied staff could provide the cost of this on an average monthly bill if the Council wanted, and the total cost was estimated to be \$456,301.

Mr. Pitzer asked if any of those people would be captured by the move to midpoint. Mr. Matthes replied no because they were automatically at the midpoint. Mayor Treece understood they started at an amount above the midpoint.

Mayor Treece noted he had suggested moving the funds for the internal auditor position, which had been vacant for about nine months, to the Council budget with the intent of the Council to develop an RFP to attract and contract for an independent auditing function. He stated he thought it would advance their ability to be a little more responsive and to stay on top of some of these budget issues. He felt it was important to have those checks and balances in place separate from the Finance Department and the City Manager's Office and would add to the responsiveness or the promise of responsiveness on some of the inquiries they often had on those issues.

Mr. Skala commented that he favored the idea of Mayor Treece of taking the \$90,000 and making it as independent as possible, but understood there might be an issue with the Council being able to contract with someone per the Charter. If that was the case, he thought it could remain with the City Manager's Office, but the Council could demand deliverables and answers. Mr. Matthes explained there were mechanical pieces to this idea that they had not sorted out as a staff, such as who would draft the RFP, who would score it, etc. Currently only two people were empowered to sign contracts on behalf of the City, and that was the Purchasing Agent and the City Manager. He reiterated there were a number of mechanics to get through, but noted he thought they had options that could be explored if Council wanted. One example was that they could ask the City Manager to fill the job and audit certain departments or service lines with specific questions. They could also use the savings to fund an audit as originally requested. He commented that they were in the middle of an RFP to hire their next auditing firm, and an add-alternate could be included in that bidding process as well with regard to a performance audit to determine what they would charge. He stated there were a lot of ways to address the issue.

Mayor Treece commented that he felt the Council would benefit from some autonomy at this point by having the auditor report directly to them. He thought it was important to have an extra set of eyes on this. He did not believe they could direct the City Manager to fill that position.

Mayor Treece made a motion to move \$94,606 from the City Manager's Office budget to the City Council budget in terms of the internal auditor.

Mr. Skala asked if this meant it would be totally autonomous and it would be the City

Clerk's responsibility to draft the RFP. Mayor Treece replied he thought the mechanics could be sorted out, but felt they needed to have the appropriation in place first. He understood they could adopt a resolution directing staff to craft a scope of services just like they did for other professional services contracts, except the person or firm would report to the Council in this situation.

Mr. Ruffin asked if this was a permanent staff position or if it would be filled annually by an outside consultant. Mayor Treece replied the \$94,606 was the full time equivalent cost for the position that had been vacant since January. It would be an ongoing cost they could use. He noted they could do a five year \$480,000 contract for that position knowing they had \$94,000 available to do it. Mr. Ruffin understood they would hire someone. Mayor Treece explained they would contract with someone. Under Article II of the City Charter, the Council shall make an annual financial audit as frequently as it deemed necessary. He commented that he could see this internal auditor doing a series of small audits. The question was how much that \$94,000 would get them with an accounting firm.

Mr. Thomas asked Mayor Treece if he saw this as an alternative to the State Auditor's performance audit. Mayor Treece replied his preference would be to do both. Mr. Thomas asked if there was a model for the Council contracting directly with a contractor to do work for the City. Mayor Treece replied he did not know if there was or was not in a charter form of government.

Ms. Peters stated she would suggest holding off on voting on this issue one way or another at this time. She noted she had received an email today from the Association of Local Government Auditors Advocacy Committee, which she had not had a chance to review.

Mayor Treece listed the essential functions from the job description of the internal auditor and pointed out this was what they were not getting now because the position was vacant. He thought it was critical for it to be filled.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he liked this idea because of the independence and direct report to the Council as that was just good governance in the public and private sector. In terms of immediacy, he wondered how long it would take for them to figure out the mechanics of how to make this work versus directing the City Manager to fill the position and providing him with specific responsibilities. Mayor Treece noted nine months had already gone by and the position was not even posted on the City's website.

Mr. Matthes stated it had been on hold for this conversation, and explained in February, they had discussed one on one the goal in the Strategic Plan of creating a diversity and inclusion officer. The idea at the time was to delete this role and create that role. When Mayor Treece had suggested the performance audit, he did not want to put that on the table in the budget because it would look awkward and because he wanted to respect the conversation of Council with regard to the audit. He pointed out the position was easy enough to fill, and the last two people had been hired from the State Auditor's Office to fill that role in the past. He reiterated he thought it would be easy enough to fill the position if that was the desire of Council.

Mr. Thomas understood Mr. Matthes felt he had reallocated the duties of the internal auditor to various departments and Mayor Treece did not agree with that assessment. Mayor Treece commented that he thought there was a reason the internal auditor was separate from the Finance Department. To say they had reorganized those duties to the Finance Department eliminated one of those essential checks and balances that existed. Mr. Matthes explained his office still checked the fraud waste and abuse hotline, which had been created a couple of years ago, and the cash count of the drawers was handled by the Finance Department.

Ms. Peters understood one of the deputy city managers handled diversity and inclusion responsibilities already. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, and explained the concept in the Strategic Plan was a more intensified treatment. It had been assigned in the interim to a deputy city manager. Ms. Peters understood the deputy city manager could

continue that and an internal auditor could be hired that did more than just check the cash drawers. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, and noted he would be happy to work with Council to set up an annual audit plan.

Ms. Peters felt the internal auditor position should be filled and that the person should be required to do what was listed in the job description.

Mr. Skala commented that they could direct the contract to reflect the interest of the Council in terms of independence. He stated he would be happy to have the mechanics handled by the City Manager with the responsibilities being managed by the Council.

Mr. Matthes explained that when he filled the position, the person would still report to him, but he would work with the Council to create an audit plan and ensure they addressed every question the Council had. He noted he would have the auditor prepare the report and send it to all of them at the same time. He pointed out he would not be involved in the audit. It would be similar to the external third-party audit in that he would not be involved in that process until the very end, which was an interview process of whether he knew of any fraud, waste, abuse, etc.

Mr. Pitzer suggested they ask the Law Department to look at ways to ensure that internal auditor's independence and ability to report to them when necessary. He thought they wanted to guard the independence in case the auditor had to investigate something in the City Manager's Office. He stated he worried that if they moved it to the Council, it would be six months before they figured out what to do and another 6-9 months before they were able to fill it. He suggested they work simultaneously with the Law Department to ensure that independence was available to them.

Mayor Treece thought that argument underscored the importance of moving those funds directly to the Council budget. He noted they were prohibited from interfering with the City Manager's direct or indirect supervision of that employee. He believed everything Mr. Pitzer had done to review the budget to find budget savings to generate funds to do what the Council wanted to see done would be enhanced by having an internal auditor that reported directly to Council as that person could find the priority funding they needed.

Mr. Thomas pointed out the Council directed the City Manager so there was a direct line. Mayor Treece agreed they directed the City Manager. He commented that they had a treasurer position that had been vacant for two years, an internal auditor position that had been vacant for nine months, and they had just lost their finance director. He felt these were critical warning signs, and underscored the reason to do this. Mr. Thomas noted Mr. Matthes had just explained why the auditor position had been vacant for nine months. He had a vision to create a diversity and inclusion officer. Mayor Treece pointed out it would redirect the funds to a purpose other than auditing. Mr. Thomas agreed, but noted Mr. Matthes had discussed it with them individually, and understood the Council had been split on the issue. He explained he had been supportive of the shift of funds based upon what he understood at the time. He stated he was happy to reverse his position now having learned more.

Mr. Thomas asked why the treasurer position was empty. Mr. Matthes replied staff had attempted to recruit for that position on two occasions and had simply come up empty. Mr. Thomas asked if no one had applied. Mr. Matthes replied there had been applicants, but the talent level had not been there. Ms. Peveler stated there were not many qualified applicants. Mr. Matthes commented that the talent of Ms. Nix and Ms. Cannon had allowed them work around the vacancy. He noted they had shock tested the portfolio and had adjusted the portfolio. They had done the treasurer duties in the absence of that position being filled, but it was due to a lot of extra work by existing staff. Mr. Thomas asked if that position was funded at the midpoint. Mr. Matthes replied he thought it was unclassified. Ms. Cannon stated that was correct. She explained she had to raise it to the top of the range before any qualified applicants had actually applied. Mr. Thomas understood qualified applicants had applied. Ms. Cannon stated that was correct. She had requested five be interviewed, and three had dropped out prior to the interview date, one showed up over 35 minutes late, and the other person had not had all of the skillsets

needed for the position. Mr. Matthes noted the intent was to continue to try to fill the position as it was a critical role, but like every other role they were competing in the marketplace, which meant they sometimes came up empty.

Mr. Skala asked if Ms. Thompson had an opinion on whether or not it was possible for the Council to move these funds to a category by which they had total control of this autonomous auditor. Ms. Thompson replied yes, as an independent contractor, but not as an employee. The Council could not hire an employee, but could hire an independent contractor. She explained the difficulty would be the mechanics of how it would work. They would have to determine who would be in charge of managing the contract once it was enacted because the Council did not have anyone that was necessarily on staff on a daily basis to be able to do that. There was not anything legally wrong with the Council developing the audit plan and having a reporting structure.

Mayor Treece asked if it would be any different than how they hired and appointed a municipal judge. Ms. Thompson replied she did not have an answer to that. Mayor Treece noted the Human Resources Department had advertised for it and they then interviewed the applicants. Mr. Matthes pointed out the municipal judge was established in the Charter as an employee of the Council. Mr. Pitzer noted that was why they would have to go through the purchasing process. Mr. Matthes stated if the Council wanted to do that, there were mechanisms internally whereby the Purchasing Division would handle the RFP process and the contractor would report to him through the contract signature piece and the management of the contract. He pointed out that, in general, employees tended to do more work for the money than contractors. It was dependent on how much independence they wanted.

Mr. Pitzer stated he thought there was also an issue as to the authority this person would have as a contractor. If it was the City Manager's employee, he could direct departments to comply with the requests of that person. He wondered what would happen if the independent contractor went to a department for information and they did not provide it. He reiterated he liked the idea and was inclined to fill the position as soon as possible while working with the Law Department for a more robust structure for that position and to ensure some independence and autonomy.

Mr. Thomas stated he agreed with Mr. Pitzer.

The motion made by Mayor Treece to move \$94,606 from the City Manager's Office budget to the City Council budget in terms of the internal auditor died for the lack of a second.

Mr. Pitzer explained he had wanted to be sensitive to any other projects that were funded, especially through the capital improvement sales tax that had been approved by voters, when looking for a way to fund the southwest area fire station, which was why he had come up with the plan he had previously suggested. He understood Mr. Matthes had since indicated the Grissum Building renovations would not happen in this next fiscal year. He asked if everyone was comfortable with moving those timelines around as it was really a function of whether the Grissum Building renovations would move forward this year. He thought both options were viable solutions, and wanted to be sensitive to the fact they were discussing a project that had been on the Capital Improvement Program (CIP) list.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to move forward with a fire station in the southwest area per Plan A, which was shown as an option on the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Thomas commented that he wanted to discuss the cost of growth and where others on the Council were with moving forward with an analysis of the cost of expanding public infrastructure for growth as this was an example of that. He wanted to see a commitment to addressing that issue so they did not continue to run into these kinds of crisis problems where they needed to come up with \$2.5 million because they had not properly planned for growth. He asked if there was support for stopping this in the future if they were to continue with a temporary solution now.

Mayor Treece suggested they not discuss that until later when Mr. Thomas addressed the study because they did not have anything in place now, and there was funding to do what they wanted to do with regard to this fire station. He stated he was inclined to support the cost of growth study.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he did not completely agree with how Mr. Thomas had calculated some of the numbers, and noted his default position was that more knowledge was better than less. He stated he was concerned with the appearance that they might be going into this with preconceived results in mind. He understood Mr. Thomas was unhappy with some prior studies that had been done in terms of electrical connection charges, etc., but stated he would want to be careful in that it was a completely unbiased review and analysis.

Mr. Thomas thought they would just need to ask the right question, i.e., what it would cost per every additional 1,000 homes to expand the electrical system, road system, sewer system, fire department, etc. He felt that was a question they had never asked of a consultant.

Mr. Skala stated it was not true that they had never asked that question. He explained he was in agreement that they needed to assess the cost of growth, and was also in agreement with the idea with the way it had been presented to some infrastructure task forces in the past. Mr. Thomas noted he meant they had never actually hired a consultant to answer that question. Mr. Skala noted that was not entirely true either as a consultant had been used in the debacle for determining a development fee for roads, which had ultimately been defeated. He noted there had been a document entitled Community Impact Model - Fiscal Impacts of Land Development. He agreed some help from a consultant might be needed, but that document addressed a lot of the issues, and listed them. He explained there were data sets and tools to determine exactly what Mr. Thomas had mentioned. He thought some of this might be able to be done in-house utilizing those tools, and felt that would be a very useful exercise. He was not sure they needed to set aside \$75,000 for a consultant to do what they could do with a lot of the items that were already available. He agreed some questions had never been asked, and that those might need to be asked, but he disagreed with how to go about getting this information at this point. He stated they had asked staff if growth paid for itself, and the answer was that residential growth did not pay for itself and was subsidized, and while commercial growth could pay for itself, it did not necessarily happen. He commented that they really had not applied themselves to addressing this in-house. He explained his focus for the budget was a progressive model to get the wages and salaries adjusted. He might throw in other issues of social equity when the Strategic Plan was discussed. He did not believe the individual projects of \$50,000 here and another \$75,000 there were as important in his view as wages and transit.

Mr. Thomas commented that he would say the reason they were struggling to pay staff adequate salaries was because they had been subsidizing growth and not providing the level of service taxpayers and ratepayers expected. He believed the study would enlighten them on how much it really cost so they could charge that in development and connections fees so they did not have to continue to subsidize it and were able to pay staff adequately while providing a higher level of service to include transit service.

Mr. Skala stated he did not disagree in that they had not been keeping up the fees necessary to compensate them for growth. He disagreed with Mr. Thomas in terms of the mechanism by which they could obtain the answers to the questions.

Mayor Treece understood Mr. Pitzer was satisfied with Plan A versus the sweep of funds he had previously identified, which was shown as Plan B on the amendment sheet. Mr. Pitzer stated that was correct as it was a cleaner and simpler solution. Ms. Peters agreed.

Mayor Treece asked if the Grissum Building renovations had been approved by the voters. Mr. Matthes replied yes, and noted it had been included in the list. Mayor Treece asked why they were not proceeding with it. Mr. Thomas replied he thought they were and that

they were just changing the timing of the project. Mr. Matthes stated this would push that project back a year as a nod to reality and where they were in their workload.

Mr. Trapp understood the land for the service center had been a ballot approved project as well, and they were just switching out those two projects in terms of timing. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Mr. Trapp understood they had not promised a time frame.

The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Mr. Trapp to move forward with a fire station in the southwest area per Plan A, which was shown as an option on the amendment sheet, was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece understood there had not been any objection with proceeding with the departmental cuts to help pay for the pay plan changes with the exception of the Parks and Recreation Department whereby they would use of the parks sales tax funds of \$114,000 from the fact the assumptions had been changed from minus two percent to minus one percent as a buffer so the cuts were not as deep. He asked if everyone was agreeable, and everyone indicated agreement.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report with regard to transit.

Mr. Thomas commented that they had heard a lot of powerful testimony earlier tonight with regard to what the transit system meant to so many people in the community and the impacts those cuts that were being forced on them due to revenue shortfall reasons would have on them. He stated he had heard a couple speakers say that budgets were a moral document that reflected the Council's morals as decision makers since they approved the budgets, and he agreed. One particular moral decision they had was how to allocate the transportation sales tax they collected. At the present time, the transportation sales tax generated \$10-\$12 million per year and was declining on a per capita basis. Historically, one-half was applied to road expansion and maintenance projects, one-quarter was applied as a subsidy to airport operations, and the last one-quarter was applied to transit operations. The transit operating budget received a match from the Federal Transit Administration (FTA), which was the same as the local money raised, so as these revenues per capita and likely revenues in absolute were declining, both portions of the transit operating budget were impacted. He commented that the 50/25/25 was a moral choice they had made in the budget, and nothing was set in stone in that regard. He stated it was not something they should suddenly and completely restructure as it should be a phased process. He noted he would argue that providing \$2.5-\$3 million per year to airport operations had made sense 5-6 years ago when they had a very broad-based focus on strengthening the airport as they had received great stakeholder support from the University of Missouri, Boone County, business community, etc. to encourage airlines to take a risk on the airport. He commented that the gamble had worked well as they had paid out very little from the airline guarantees that had been provided and the airport was now doing extremely well. The future was rosy with large federal and MoDOT grants expected. They were in the process of an expansion and had spent a lot of money on runway improvements. He stated when he thought about the people that used the airport in terms of the level of service they had received and the level of self-sufficiency they already had, and weighed it against the people that used the public transit system in terms of the level of service they received, would receive if the proposed cuts went into effect, and the level of self-sufficiency they did not have, he felt it was obvious they needed to adjust their priorities if they wanted to make a good moral decision. He believed they should make a commitment to adjust the distribution of transportation sales tax to some different structure. He pointed out the transportation sales tax was a regressive tax that disproportionately impacted poor people as poor people spent a much higher proportion of their weekly income in sales tax than rich people. Rich people had all kinds of other ways of using their money that did not get caught by sales tax. He saw it as immoral to collect sales tax from poor people and use it to substantially subsidize an unnecessary

free perk at the airport for people that did not need that kind of support. He commented that he had polled the people that received his newsletter and a significant majority that responded had agreed with the position that a small parking fee at the airport would be acceptable. He noted they had also agreed with his suggestion that this would not drive people away from the Columbia Regional Airport. He explained he was talking about a long term adjustment of how they used the regressive sales tax they collected for transportation and saw the parking fee as a first step toward it. He believed implementing the parking fee and allocating more transportation sales tax to transit would level out the curve and allow them to provide a flex service to the areas of Columbia that would lose fixed route services. He felt that was a smart move and the move that had been proposed by the Olsson Associates study. The idea was that the money saved by going from a fixed route service to a flex service would improve the core routes, which they currently referred to as the black and gold routes and Olsson Associates had slightly modified to linear routes instead of loop routes. It would essentially cover the corridors where they had high ridership to further transit propensity. He commented that the contraction of the paratransit area, which was tied to the withdrawal of the neighborhood routes along with the withdrawal of those neighborhood routes, would negatively impact people. He stated he wanted to see a flex service and for the new transit manager, when hired, to determine how to combine a flex service with paratransit because they were similar in terms of being on-demand by a call on the previous day. He understood there would need to be a distinction as to whether someone qualified for paratransit versus the regular flex service, but felt the operations could be quite efficient and allow them to not abandon people. He thought it could be done at a cost of about \$550,000 as that was what the Olsson Associates study had predicted. He noted one of his amendments would be to start the flex route service at the beginning of June when the City Manager's cuts were set to begin, and pointed out they would have eight months to design it. He commented that they had been advertising something as a flex route service, which had not been a flex route service. It did not operate on the on-demand system or on the base of a dispatcher piecing together individual calls for rides into an efficient use of a limited number of vehicles. He stated it was really a fixed route service that ran once or twice a day if someone called, and felt they could do better. He explained his calculation was one-third of the \$550,000, which was \$185,000, which was different than what had been shown on the amendment sheet as he believed they only needed to provide four months of that service in FY 2019 since the cuts would not begin until June. He explained they would need the \$550,000 annually thereafter, and one possibility was to reduce the subsidy to the airport by charging a parking fee at the airport to replace those lost funds and reallocate the subsidy reduction to the transit system as part of their moral choice with regard to how they used transportation sales tax revenues. He understood some were concerned that charging too high of a parking fee at the airport might reduce the use of the Columbia Regional Airport so he would propose, as a first step, an economic elasticity study to determine whether a parking fee would have an impact and the level of that impact. He noted his straw poll had indicated a parking fee of \$3 or \$5 per night would likely not create a big impact. He reiterated his two proposals, which were to adjust the transit budget by \$185,000 in FY 2019 so they could provide a flex service for the neighborhood routes that would be cut in June, and to fund an elasticity study with regard to parking fees at the airport with FY 2017 savings, which the City Manager had indicated would cost about \$25,000.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Thomas how he intended to fund the \$185,000 increase in FY 2019. Mr. Thomas replied they would have to use reserves, and pointed out he was open to suggestions. Mayor Treece stated he was open to a fix. He did not want to see the paratransit fee increased or for too many people having to rely on the flex routes.

Mr. Thomas commented that public transit did not work well if it was at such a low level of service that the only people that used it were the people that had no other options. At least one speaker had indicated a desire to use public transit, but the length of time it

took to make it to an appointment using the current transit system was the reason she had a car. He believed a lot of people felt the same way. He thought he had received hundreds of emails opposing the transit cuts, and most were from people that had indicated they did not use transit. Mayor Treece commented that if everyone that had emailed him had purchased a bus ticket, they would not have a funding problem. Mr. Thomas agreed, and noted they could also allocate their tax money to the service they philosophically supported. They had an imbalance whereby all of their policies and funding favored those that used cars, which created a false economic incentive for people to use cars. Those who could not afford to have a car had to purchase a car due to this system. He pointed out they could not solve this overnight, and felt they had to have a visioning as to whether the community really supported the philosophy of public transit and then needed to fund it adequately.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to allocate \$25,000 from FY 2017 savings for an economic elasticity study to determine the impact of a parking fee at the Columbia Regional Airport. The motion died for the lack of a second.

Ms. Peters asked how much the City received in transportation sales tax overall. Mr. Thomas replied \$10-\$12 million per year based on the last 3-4 years. Ms. Peter understood one-half of that went to roads, one-quarter to public transit, and one-quarter to the airport. Mr. Thomas stated that was correct. Ms. Peters understood \$2.5 million went to the bus system.

Mr. Pitzer pointed out that in 2015 the Council had set a policy of allocating 50 percent of the growth of the transportation sales tax to transit. Mr. Thomas commented that there had not been any growth. Mr. Pitzer noted the transfer from the transportation sales tax to transit had gone up by \$1.2 million over the last ten years.

Ms. Peters stated she was agreeable to charging a parking fee at the airport and did not feel a study was needed. She asked if there was reason why they could not take some money from roads so that they received 40 percent instead of 50 percent of the transportation sales tax generated because she agreed they were affecting the people that could least afford changes to the transit system.

Mayor Treece commented that the citizen satisfaction survey had indicated streets were the number one or number two priorities in terms of services. Sadly, public transit was an area that had not scored as high, even with the dramatic impact it would have on people's lives.

Mr. Thomas stated the fact it had not scored high in the citizen satisfaction survey was an indication that people were not satisfied with it.

Ms. Peters noted it was difficult to use as she had tried to use it. Mr. Thomas agreed, and stated the reason was because it was underfunded. Ms. Peters explained it would take her three buses to get to a location that was only a mile from where she lived. Mr. Thomas commented that he believed the Olssen Associates study would have really moved them forward.

Ms. Peters asked if a motion needed to be made to move to the flex system by taking money from the transportation sales tax to fund it. Mr. Thomas replied he had been trying to do that via the portion allocated to the airport and asked if Ms. Peters was suggesting it come from the portion allocated to roads. Ms. Peters understood people would be unhappy, but it was a fairly small amount. Mr. Nichols pointed out the transportation sales tax funds were used for road maintenance only. Ms. Peveler stated it was used to fix potholes. Mr. Nichols explained the capital improvement sales tax was different, and that it was utilized for other road related projects, but the transportation sales tax was used for operational items only, such as street preservation. He noted it was stretched, and general fund money had been taken away from it. He commented that the suggestion of Ms. Peters would impact their rating system for roads. They were trying to get them to sevens, and might need to lower them to fives, before considering treatment. He noted it would have a long term impact on road conditions.

Mayor Treece suggested a moratorium to any change in the bus system for six months

to allow time to determine how to rebalance some of the priorities with the resources they had. Mr. Thomas pointed out the changes were not scheduled to be made until June. There was a small change scheduled for October to eliminate the final hour of service. All of the other changes would occur in June. He understood staff needed 6-9 months to go through a process with the FTA to make those changes. If they delayed this for six months, the time frame for changes would then need to be adjusted.

Mr. Matthes stated he had sensed some consensus with regard to paratransit fees so that could be accommodated as shown on the slide displayed. He commented that they had to start the federal process to reduce the transit service and recommended they not push that off, but noted they could come back with a more specific analysis of what Mr. Thomas had recommended with scenarios.

Mr. Skala commented that one of the problems they had with transit aside from paying for it had to do with the fact they kept changing it causing it to be less reliable. They also had a schedule where it was not efficient as some people had to wait 80 minutes. He understood the success of the transit system was dependent upon reliability and timing. He thought buses running every hour or half-hour would be great as he knew they likely could not get to ten minutes. He suggested they focus on the north-south-east-west route primarily as a backbone by making it very reliable and centralizing it. He felt they had lost a lot of ridership due to past changes. He stated he was not offering a solution, but believed they needed to focus on a regular occurrence of the service in addition to providing service to those who relied upon it.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he thought Mr. Thomas might find some support for a motion starting the flex service on June 1 by utilizing reserves for a year while they continued the conversation. He noted some changes were potentially coming as had been indicated by Mr. Matthes, such as the gas tax, which could address some issues in terms of roads. In addition, there were other things happening on the revenue front. He thought they could absorb the loss for this year.

Mr. Thomas stated he appreciated the support for that, and asked for an explanation of the opposition to explore a parking fee at the airport to determine if there would be a negative impact. Mayor Treece suggested they not discuss a motion that had not received a second. Mr. Thomas stated he thought he might have a second from Ms. Peters. Ms. Peters explained she thought they should just charge for parking. She did not feel a study was necessary. She noted she agreed with the suggestion of Mr. Pitzer.

Mr. Matthes commented that the assumption by Council of losing less in sales tax would positively impact the transportation sales tax fund by \$116,000. Ms. Peveler pointed out there were a lot of capital improvement projects in the next five years for which they would use transportation sales tax to fund. Mr. Trapp noted the wage changes had likely taken that \$116,000 plus some.

Mr. Thomas understood the Council was not willing to consider a study with regard to a parking fee at the airport. Mayor Treece noted they were also saying they were not willing to cut public transit now. Mr. Thomas commented that they would likely make the problem a lot worse in 6-12 months by delaying this. He felt they needed to make hard decisions at some point and believed now was the best time.

Mr. Trapp stated he was not supportive of delaying a decision. He explained he did not like the idea of transit cuts any more than anyone else, but the trend lines had been terrible. The transit fund had been in bad shape for as long as he had been on the Council. They kept tinkering with staff recommendations because it was hard to cut transit in the face of testimony similar to what they had heard tonight, and no one was bringing forward solutions. They had programmed growth in sales tax funds to go toward transit and had put some parking money toward transit since he had been on the Council. The reason there were issues with the transit fund was due to the fact sales tax growth had largely gone away and costs were rising. He noted they had made a lot of part-time drivers full-time drivers under a budget a year or two ago because living wage was important. They had made the same statement again tonight. Costs were rising very

quickly while the revenue was not rising at all. He felt they needed to balance the transit fund otherwise the cuts would continue to get worse every year. He understood it was politically difficult. He believed they needed partnerships in the long-run, and referred to a lobbying change that would allow the City to partner with Columbia Public Schools to bring in a new source of revenue whereby they could do neighborhood routes within high school routes. He commented that they had come close to passing that last year, and it had the potential to get them back to a transit growth pattern versus a transit reduction pattern. In addition, anything that addressed sales taxes would help address the transit situation. It would allow them to program that growth without cutting into other core functions. He pointed out roads were important to most of the citizens as he had heard about it on the recent campaign trail. He noted he had also heard a lot more with regard to the airport, and believed there was a broad source of support for the airport. He commented that he thought they had included the support for an increase to pay for transit in the survey 4-5 years ago, and the data indicated that support was fairly low. He stated not everyone saw the value of public transit. He felt they should go with the staff recommendations if they wanted to be responsible for how they were managing the transit fund without any new sources of revenue. He pointed out they could continue working toward a long term solution via partnerships with educational institutions and a sales tax fix.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to impose a parking fee of \$5 per day at the Columbia Regional Airport. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters.

Mr. Matthes commented that staff was concerned with charging a parking fee as it could impact people utilizing the Columbia Regional Airport. They felt some people might drive to other airports instead if the cost of parking was the same.

Mr. Trapp asked if charging for parking would impact MoDOT or federal applications associated with the airport terminal. He wondered if free parking had been a part of the proposal put forward. Mr. Matthes replied if they used any federal money to build parking, the parking would have to be free. Thus, local money would need to be used to build parking in order to charge for it.

Mr. Ruffin understood the temporary parking would be free, and they would only charge for overnight parking. Mr. Matthes commented that they could have a scenario whereby they used local funds for the short-term parking for which they might charge and used federal money for the free parking, which would be further away.

Mr. Thomas believed it would be fairly simple to do this as there were only two roads into the airport. They needed to place a booth and barrier on each road, which could be fully automated. As someone arrived, they would be issued a ticket with the date coded into it, and as they left, they could stick that ticket into the machine. If it was the same day, they would not be charged, but if it was a day later, they would be charged \$5. He did not believe it would be terribly complicated or expensive.

Mr. Ruffin commented that it might not be complicated or expensive, but did not feel they had the expertise to make that decision tonight. Ms. Peters asked if a parking study was needed to provide that information. Mr. Ruffin suggested they talk to the Airport Manager at the very least.

Mr. Nichols pointed out there were other users of the road, such as the mail service. Mr. Thomas thought they could be provided a special ticket that did not charge them. He reiterated he did not think it would be that difficult.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Ms. Peters to impose a parking fee of \$5 per day at the Columbia Regional Airport was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Thomas and Ms. Peters voting yes.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to allocate \$185,000 in the FY 2019 budget to provide a flex service for the last four months of FY 2019, i.e., June through September, when the neighborhood loops were discontinued. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters.

Mr. Thomas suggested the City staff really study proper flex service and look into whether that flex service could be combined with paratransit so both services could be provided in the outlying areas.

Mayor Treece asked if the \$185,000 would come from reserves. Mr. Thomas replied it would reduce the cash reserve. Mayor Treece understood it would reduce the transit cash reserves. Mr. Thomas stated that was correct.

Mr. Trapp commented that this would be a three-month fix that would balloon to \$550,000 per year starting with the next fiscal year. The transit fund was already in difficult shape with the staff recommendations, and the current flex system had not drawn significant ridership. He thought they would be spending \$550,000 per year for a service that would not be used much.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Ms. Peters to allocate \$185,000 in the FY 2019 budget to provide a flex service for the last four months of FY 2019, i.e., June through September, when the neighborhood loops were discontinued, was defeated by roll call vote with Mr. Ruffin, Mr. Trapp, Mr. Skala, Mr. Pitzer, and Mayor Treece voting no, and Mr. Thomas and Ms. Peters voting yes.

Mr. Thomas suggested they not raise the paratransit fee on June 1. Mayor Treece pointed out they had a mechanism to do that at the next council meeting as they could just defeat the associated bill. Mr. Thomas noted that \$57,000 would impact the cash reserves. Mayor Treece agreed.

Mayor Treece commented that he agreed with Mr. Thomas in that he did not believe it was worth the financial impact to those users for the \$57,000 it would generate to not fix the broken system. He stated he planned to vote no on B179-18 at the September 17, 2018 Council Meeting. Ms. Peters and Mr. Skala stated they planned to do the same.

Mr. Thomas asked why it could not be done now. Mayor Treece replied an increase would require an ordinance change. B179-18 would set the fare, and that would be the proper mechanism by which to address the issue. Mr. Thomas understood defeating that bill would have the same effect.

Mr. Thomas asked the Council to really think about the moral value about their decision as to how they used the transportation sales tax as he believed they were making the wrong decision.

Mayor Treece stated he kept hoping there was a way to rebalance the transportation sales tax. Ms. Peters agreed. She understood people wanted the roads to be in good shape, but noted they also had the privilege of having a car. She pointed out she had managed to drive around potholes in other communities, and thought they needed to consider that as an option.

Mr. Thomas commented that the reason they struggled to keep up with road maintenance was because they did not charge an adequate roads development fee to new development.

Mr. Matthes asked if they wanted to discuss the thought about not reducing the paratransit service area. Ms. Peters replied it would be helpful to not reduce the paratransit service area and asked about its effect. Mayor Treece asked what the financial impact would be over the next twelve months. Mr. Matthes referred to a slide that was displayed and pointed out it did not reflect what they had just decided, which was not to increase the paratransit fee. By keeping the fee increase and not reducing the service area, they could see the impact of cash reserves per that slide. They would be solvent for the next five years in that scenario, but there would be a negative trend line. If they did not increase the fee and did not reduce the service area, he thought they would still be solvent. Ms. Peveler stated they would have \$180,003 in 2023 if they did not reduce the area and did not increase the fee. Mr. Thomas asked what the cash reserves would need to be to meet the 20 percent. Mr. Matthes replied about \$1.4 million. Ms.

Peveler pointed out that calculation did not include the pay plan changes approved earlier tonight.

Mr. Thomas asked for the annual cost of keeping the paratransit area the same. He thought it would be a lot less than the \$550,000 projected for the flex service. Ms. Peveler replied to just keep the paratransit area, the cash reserves would be reduced by \$46,867 in FY 2019 and almost \$200,000 in 2020. Mr. Thomas asked why it was so much more. Ms. Peveler replied because it would only be a partial year change in FY 2019. Mr. Thomas understood it was roughly \$200,000 per year. Ms. Peveler stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to maintain the paratransit area for FY 2019 as it would involve a cost of about \$50,000-\$60,000. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece asked if they wanted to address the council reserve funds tonight. Ms. Peters replied no, and suggested it be done in October as the money would still be there. It was not something they had to allocate now.

Mr. Thomas pointed out a resolution was on the agenda for \$30,000 for CAT. Ms. Peters understood.

Mr. Skala commented that he had provided a debriefing with regard to the Racial Equity and Leadership (REAL) Council, which had been warmly received, and understood it fit within the Strategic Plan with respect to reviewing ordinances and policies through a racial equity lens. He thought \$50,000 could get them started. He pointed out he had not yet been able to discuss the details with REAL to determine if they had the potential for becoming a national leader in this regard.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Skala if he viewed this as part of the creation of the next strategic plan. Mr. Skala replied it could certainly fit into it. He noted he did not think this was something they could do in-house.

Mayor Treece commented that he thought it would be helpful to have an external third-party review what they had done and provide suggestions on how they could move the needle in the best way.

Mr. Matthes stated they would add that to the list for the next council meeting. He referred to the slide being displayed and indicated they would not include the funding for the fire station since that would be addressed in a different manner. In addition, he did not believe they needed to account for another temporary payment since the Council had addressed it with the pay issue they had discussed earlier.

Mr. Thomas noted they needed to address the \$75,000 for a growth impact study as he wanted to include it as one of the projects they would utilize the FY 2017 savings to complete. He explained this was the study that would provide information that would help them not get into unsustainable budget situations whereby they could not build the infrastructure needed because they had not planned and budgeted for it properly and equitably. He believed they needed to think about the cost of constructing and operating the public infrastructure systems in two particular categories, and all costs for any of their services could be divided into these two categories. One was the one-time capital construction costs to build the infrastructure system, and that cost would be larger with a larger number of dwelling units being served with the infrastructure system. The logical way to recover costs would be with a one-time fee on each home that was a part of the system. As the system grew, they had to continue collecting that fee because they had to expand the system. The other type of cost was the cost of operations, maintenance, and delivery of the service, and that would be logically recovered by the ongoing cost people were paying in either rates or taxes. He stated he wanted to focus on the one-time capital construction cost, and provided a handout. He explained it was not typically charged in a lot of communities, but those that did charge for those costs had a much more sustainable financial structure because they were adequately charging and

fairly charging for the cost of that infrastructure expansion. It allowed them to have very good infrastructure and a high level of service from the taxes and rates people were paying. Based on information on the electric utility he had received from Mr. Johnsen last year, the projects involving expansion and growth totaled about \$26 million from FY 2015-FY 2018, which was about \$6.5 million per year and \$130 per year for each household. It had resulted in more than \$10 per month as a subsidy to the expansion of the electric utility system. That cost was not recovered from the new development that was driving the necessity for the projects as there was not a connection fee for electricity. From FY 2005 to FY 2014, they had spent \$84.5 million on road system capacity expansion projects, but only \$9.3 million had been collected from the development fee for roads as that fee was only 50 cents per square foot of every new home. He noted the development fee collected only about 11 percent of the cost of growth in terms of roads. He displayed similar information for other infrastructure systems, to include sewer, stormwater, and water. He pointed out they had adopted a policy in 2014 to increase the sewer connection fee for new homes over four years from \$800 to \$2,400 for a standard home so it was now covering more than three-quarters of the cost, which he believed was adequate. He suggested they try to get the other systems to about the same level. He displayed information from a study conducted in Austin, Texas to determine the impact of a single home or a subdivision of 100 homes, and suggested something similar as it would assist them in making an informed decision as to whether the City's current fees were adequate. When they did not charge for new development, it was inevitably folded into rate increases that current residents and taxpayers had to pay. He pointed out it had been suggested that over time it evened itself out, but noted he did not agree, and displayed some slides illustrating that when including all costs of growth. He commented that it was a Ponzi scheme as it became more imbalanced over time. The cost of the infrastructure for the new development was subsidized by homes that had been in the community longer. He believed the fair and equitable way was to charge the cost of infrastructure growth to the development driving it.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to allocate \$75,000, which was an estimated cost, from the FY 2017 savings for an impact study similar to the one done in Austin, Texas, to estimate the cost of growth per new home, subdivision, or apartment complex.

Ms. Peters understood this would be from FY 2017 savings. Mr. Thomas stated that was correct, and noted they had enough based on the current allocations.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas to allocate \$75,000, which was an estimated cost, from the FY 2017 savings for an impact study similar to the one done in Austin, Texas, to estimate the cost of growth per new home, subdivision, or apartment complex was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Skala understood this was an estimate, and asked if they had the capacity in-house to answer some of these questions. Fodor and Associates had conducted the study in Austin, Texas in 2010, and in 2013, they had developed a Fiscal Impacts of Land Development model. He thought they might be able to do some of this work in-house. Mr. Matthes replied he thought they had the analysis capacity if he was asking them to take the model and apply it. What they would receive from a consultant was a more current view of best and common practices. He commented that they had obtained a sense of that by attending conferences and seminars, but utilizing a consultant would provide them the expertise of someone that did that all of the time. Mr. Thomas pointed out there would be a time and staff costs if it was done in-house.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Trapp to allocate \$75,000, which was an estimated cost, from the FY 2017 savings for an impact study similar to the one done in Austin, Texas, to estimate the cost of growth per new home, subdivision, or apartment complex was approved by voice vote with only Mr. Pitzer voting no.

Ms. Peveler confirmed the Council did not intend to make any motion related to the line workers at this time. The Council indicated that was correct.

PH33-18 Proposed design and construction of sanitary sewers to serve the Henderson Branch Watershed.

Discussion shown with B205-18.

B205-18 Authorizing construction of sanitary sewers to serve the Henderson Branch Watershed; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

PH33-18 was read by the Clerk, and B205-18 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Ruffin understood all of the properties were now contiguous. Mr. Johnsen stated they had three annexation agreements, and displayed a diagram noting the blue and purple areas would be contiguous, and the other area, which was across I-70, might not become contiguous upon construction of the sewer. There was the potential it would be contiguous shortly thereafter depending on how the entire area developed.

Mr. Ruffin stated he had received some calls and correspondence from residents in the First Ward, even by those that had supported the 2013 ballot, who had the perception that the City had reprioritized its commitment in dealing with infrastructure issues in the older areas of the community in order to allocate funds for expansion. He asked staff to address the City's commitment in dealing with sewer and stormwater issues particularly in the area of Aldeah Avenue. Mr. Johnsen replied a significant piece of the 2013 bond had been for improvements to the existing system. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. A very large portion of the 2013 bond issue that had been approved by the voters had been for the rehabilitation of the existing system, and every year, they had done about \$2.7 million worth of rehabilitation to the existing clay tile system that was within the older parts of town along with common collector elimination projects and other replacement projects. A report he had provided about a year or so ago had shown a fairly significant reduction in amount of wet weather related sanitary sewer overflows and the amount of reported building backups due to wet weather events. He thought they were making progress, and noted they were continuing to do those projects. He pointed out they had another \$2.7 million project that had just recently started.

Mr. Ruffin asked why Mr. Potterfield was not making a financial contribution to fund this expansion. Mr. Sorrell replied Mr. Potterfield's property was actually currently served by the Boone County Regional Sewer District (BCRSD). The BCRSD owned a piece of land out there that had a treatment facility on it so Mr. Potterfield's property was a customer of the BCRSD. As a result, staff had talked to the BCRSD about possibly participating since the City had an agreement with that entity, and that was where the \$600,000 project participation by the BCRSD came into play. The BCRSD would be a customer of the City, but Mr. Potterfield would remain a customer of the BCRSD.

Mr. Ruffin asked why the City would fund this expansion if Mr. Potterfield's property would still be a customer of the BCRSD. Mr. Sorrell replied that historically, since the late 1970s, the City had regionalized the sewer system by building one large regional facility and taking over 100 other smaller facilities out of service. He commented that they had historically worked well with the BCRSD, and when the BCRSD had an existing facility that was removed from service and was connected to the City's sewer, they kept the associated customers and paid the City an 80 percent rate for treatment alone. In addition, they maintained that portion of the collection system.

Mr. Skala understood property owners had to ensure their property was not in violation in terms of associated affluent, and that the cost to Mr. Potterfield to invest in a local solution if this project did not move forward was about \$600,000 while the cost to Mr. Bechtold was about \$100,000. He asked if anyone had actually asked Mr. Potterfield or Mr. Bechtold for a contribution. Mr. Matthes replied yes, and explained the response was that the annexation would provide sales tax. Mr. Skala understood the sales tax had

been self-reported and would be based upon total sales. In his conversations with Mr. Potterfield a year or so ago during a tour of the facility, he had asked about purchasing resources to enable his business, and Mr. Potterfield had indicated they tried to purchase locally, but a lot of his large purchases were made without sales tax, and a large part of his business was based on online sales. As a result, there was no way to corroborate the numbers. Mr. Matthes stated Mr. Skala was correct.

Mr. Thomas commented that he did not feel it was appropriate to talk about paying for the expansion of the system with ongoing sales tax because the ongoing sales taxes, property taxes, sewer rates, and other payments made to the City on a monthly ongoing basis would pay for ongoing services and maintenance. The cost of expanding infrastructure was a one-time cost that needed to be charged at the time a building was constructed or annexed into the City.

Mayor Treece asked for the connection fee for the users of this system. Mr. Sorrell replied if the gas station property was to connect to the City's sewer prior to annexation, the owner would have to pay a \$115,200 connection fee. If the property was annexed first, it would be a \$76,800 connection fee. Those outside of the City when connecting to the sewer had to pay 50 percent more. He stated the Midway USA property would pay \$36,000 if it was annexed when connected and \$54,000 if it was not annexed when connecting to the City sewer. He noted he had provided the amounts for the other properties in the 2016 memo.

Mayor Treece commented that he had read in the Columbia Missourian and the Columbia Daily Tribune that Mr. Potterfield had paid \$939,000 in a cost share agreement for a similar sewer extension in Ashland, and that had amounted to about 41 percent of the \$2.2 million extension. He asked if the City had ever gotten that specific with Mr. Potterfield on this extension. Mr. Sorrell replied he had not had personal conversations with Mr. Potterfield. He noted he had only had conversations with the BCRSD regarding this extension. Mayor Treece asked if anyone had participated in a personal conversation with Mr. Potterfield. Mr. Matthes replied he had participated in two meetings with the entire group of impacted property owners, and those concepts had been raised, but specific outcomes to those discussions had not happened. Mayor Treece asked how long ago that had occurred. Mr. Matthes replied at least two years ago. Mayor Treece asked if there had been any discussion with them within the last two years. Mr. Matthes replied yes. He pointed out he had not been personally involved, but conversations had occurred through the utility and the attorneys.

Ms. Peters asked if there had been any conversations with regard to Mr. Potterfield contributing money during the discussions between attorneys. Mr. Matthes replied yes, and explained everything the Council had asked for had been discussed. He noted annexation was felt to be the answer to all of those questions.

Mayor Treece commented that occasionally when they had large developments and employers around the periphery of the city limits, they would negotiate a job retention agreement in exchange for receiving services, and asked Mr. Matthes if staff had ever advanced a request for a job retention agreement whereby Mr. Potterfield would agree to keep or retain the current number of employees he had in exchange for this service. Mr. Matthes replied that had been included in the earlier two meetings and the most recent round of meetings as a concept, and the result was that the annexation would accommodate the desire for revenue.

Mr. Ruffin explained that when he had met with the attorneys, he had also asked for information regarding a commitment to diversity in hiring practices because he had heard they were biased in terms of hiring, and noted he had never received a response. He hoped someone in the audience could address that as he was looking for some indication that Midway Arms was committed to a philosophy that supported the City's social equity agenda and for some demonstration that they were benefiting other programs and projects philanthropically in the community similar to other major employers. He reiterated he had not heard back.

Mr. Trapp asked for the sewer connection fee in Ashland. Mayor Treece replied he understood it had been waived, and stated Mr. Potterfield had agreed to pay \$939,000 and the City of Ashland had agreed to waive the sewer connection fee of about \$232,000 for the \$2.2 million project.

Mr. Trapp asked if it was anticipated that sewer connection fees would pay for the cost of the extension project. Mr. Sorrell replied it was anticipated they would receive a full cost recovery over time. At the current rate of \$2,400 per residential unit, it would take less than 1,800 residential units to pay for the \$4.3 million estimated cost, which would be less than one home per acre because it would serve 2,100 acres. He reiterated there would be full cost recovery of the capital expense over time.

Ms. Peters asked if the BCRSD would maintain that sewer. Mr. Sorrell replied the area was broken up so the City would maintain the collection system for those people that were customers of the City and paid the City 100 percent. The area for customers already connected to BCRSD systems that would be eliminated would be maintained by the BCRSD, and the City would receive 80 percent. He noted it was similar to other agreements in place with the BCRSD. Ms. Peters explained she had heard the City only collected 80 percent of what it would charge from BCRSD so it was nice to know they were responsible for maintenance. Mr. Sorrell stated the City was collecting 80 percent based on the cost to treat the wastewater, but the BCRSD maintained the portion of the collection system they owned.

Mr. Pitzer asked how many BCRSD customers were hooked to the City sewer system. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought it was about 3,000 customers.

Mr. Pitzer asked how much money prior Councils had appropriated for this project above and beyond the bond funding. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought it was about \$1.3 million.

Mr. Pitzer understood that had been done through a prior budgeting process. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Jill Lucht, 100 Aldeah Avenue, stated she was present to encourage the Council to vote no on this extension at least in the way it existed now. She commented that many properties on Aldeah Avenue continued to be impacted by sewer water in basements even after inflow and infiltration work had been done in the neighborhood, and her house was one of them. She noted they had installed a backflow preventer at their own personal cost, which had been about \$1,000, because it was before the City had discussed cost-sharing, and while the backflow preventer worked most of the time, it had failed once since the pipes on their street were lined. She explained it had occurred on April 29 and 30, which had been the most recent major rain event in Columbia, and her property had not been the only one impacted. The property owners that were willing to say they had sewer water in their basements included 12, 13, 14, 15, 17, 20, 22, and 100 Aldeah Avenue and 406 W. Walnut Street. She understood City staff had indicated inflow and infiltration had been reduced by 19 percent, but stated it was not enough to keep the e-coli out of her basement every time they had a heavy rain. She commented that even when the backflow preventer worked, she could not use the water in her home so she was unable to flush a toilet, take a shower, etc. until it stopped raining and the backflow preventer opened back up. She thought that needed to be addressed before extending sewer outside of Columbia. She urged the Council to prioritize spending the sewer bond money on fixing problems in the existing neighborhoods as they were already paying into the sewer and stormwater utility, and she believed their problems should be fixed first. She noted she had been on the citizen committee that had promoted passage of the bond, and stated she would have never given her support to that bond if she had known they would be in this situation today. She recommended prioritizing keeping sewer water out of people's homes, and while she could not speak for all of the voters in 2013, she explained she had given her time and had voted for the bond because she thought the homes in her neighborhood would be the first priority. If she had known her issue would not be fixed, she would not have given her time or voted in favor of the bond. At the very

least, she believed Mr. Potterfield and others who would benefit from the sewer extension should pay the difference between the original \$2.6 million estimate and the current \$4.3 million estimate.

Mr. Ruffin asked staff for a response to the concerns of Ms. Lucht. Mr. Sorrell replied the City had done quite a bit of system rehabilitation in that drainage basin, and it had shown a 19 percent reduction in peak flow and a 46-48 percent reduction in total volume if he remembered correctly. He commented that some homes unfortunately were built at an elevation so close to the sewer that there was the potential for sewer to back up into the home when there was a surcharge sewer. The City now had a cost reimbursement program to share in the cost of backflow devices, and there were options of other backflow devices that would allow the use of facilities while it was raining. They were more expensive, but the City would pay for 50 percent of the cost. He pointed out that the property owners of that number of homes on Aldeah Avenue had not reported a sewer backup to the City during the April 29-30 rain event. If the City was not receiving that information, they would not know more action was needed.

Ms. Peters asked if it was a City sewer now or a private collector. Mr. Sorrell replied almost all of Aldeah Avenue was a City maintained sewer now. A few homes, however, were still connected to a private system on the south end.

Karie Watson commented that the City had purchased her home on Again Street, and noted it broke her heart to listen to Ms. Lucht's story. She wondered why no one was talking about the fact that there was already a wastewater treatment plant at Midway known as the Midway Crossing. She understood it was located at Rollingwood Boulevard and that it had been operating at less than 10 percent capacity in 2015. She was unsure of its capacity now, but wondered why that had not been considered. If this was really about fixing the serious Midway sewage pollution problems, she wondered why the \$600,000 could not be used to connect to something that already existed. She understood promises needed to be kept, but asked about the promises to those on Aldeah Avenue. She also understood some felt this project would pay for itself, but wondered if anything in Columbia had paid for itself. She thought some on the Council understood that taking care of the people in Columbia with sewer problems that had been waiting for decades had to take priority before helping neighbors. She asked Mr. Ruffin for his help in voting against this project as many in the First Ward were still dealing with sewage in their homes.

Susan Maze, 902 N. Seventh Street, commented that as of this morning, she was the first person approved for the sewer rehabilitation program. Unfortunately, the solution being offered would cost about \$12,000 because she would have to lose her porch to install a grinder pump. The City would split the cost of the grinder pump, which she appreciated, but she would have to take out a second mortgage for the rest of the work. She explained that last March she had asked the City through a Sunshine Law request for a list of the CIP projects over the last ten years, how much had been spent on them, and a few other questions, and after three months and \$100, she had received some of the information requested. The information showed her that the \$4.3 million for this project was more money than had been spent in three of the six wards in the last ten years on sewers. The only wards that had an investment of more than that were the First, Third, and Sixth Wards, and that was because there was major development in those areas. The amount of money to rehabilitate sewers in the First Ward for existing customers was just under \$2 million, and it included Anderson Avenue, Hubbell Drive, and Hunt Avenue. She stated the inflow and infiltration work had improved the situation at her home, but that meant she had 2-3 inches of sewage in her basement 2-3 times per year instead of 4-5 times per year. She noted she appreciated that, but her water heater would still need to be replaced and she would still have to spend money to further address the situation. She commented that she was agnostic about the Henderson Branch sewer extension, but would rather have the money be spent in the First Ward as there were problems that needed to be addressed there.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Maze for the share of the project cost she would pay versus the City. Ms. Maze replied the City would split the cost of the grinder pump itself, but in order to install the grinder pump, she would have to lose a tree or porch. She would rather lose her porch so she would tear down her existing porch and build a new porch. She explained it was not the City's responsibility to build her a new porch, but that was the amount of money it would take for her particular situation.

Bill Watkins, 10801 W. Walnut Grove Lane, Rocheport, stated he was not employed by anyone that would benefit from this project. It was a project that had started on paper during his tenure with the City so he wanted to see it done. He thanked the Council for their service and understood they made decisions based upon input received and not on any kind of malice. He noted the community was diverse and there were a lot of different approaches. He commented that he believed this sewer extension was a project the Council should move forward with for three basic reasons, and one was that it was environmentally the right thing to do. He explained the Henderson Branch Creek was a branch of the Perche Creek, and the Perche Creek flowed through the City of Columbia. This area had been in the City's Sewer Master Plan since its inception in 1973, and had been included again in the last update, which was completed in 2007. He did not believe anyone could say eliminating and preventing pollution going into the river or a stream flowing through Columbia was bad. He noted the City had received a lot of support and kudos when they had done the same thing in the Grindstone Creek Watershed. He explained this project was consistent with every City policy in existence, and pointed out most of the sewers in the City had been built via the 80-acre point policy, which had been updated to 100-acres. He understood that policy had been in effect since at least 1974 when he had arrived in Columbia. The City was responsible for building the trunk sewers to the point where the drainage basin would serve 80 acres or now 100 acres, and that was basically when a sewer line was changed to an 8-inch sewer line. The City had used this policy to fund most of the sewers that had been built, and that policy had funded many of the houses in which the Council resided. He noted the City had included a lump sum for an 80-acre sewer in each of its ballot issues every five years and had also included big projects so money was available for sewers in various areas to include the Cow Branch Watershed, the Battle sewer in the Hinkson Creek Watershed, the Hominy Branch Watershed, the Mill Creek Watershed, and the County House Branch Watershed. In the last dozen or so years, the City had worked with the BCRSD to help ratepayers within the City and within the BCRSD area save money by not having a lot of duplication. If the Council threw that policy out, he wondered how they would replace it. He did not believe they wanted a policy that said every sewer extension had to come to the Council for approval. He felt the City needed a clear and consistent sewer extension policy. He agreed with Mr. Thomas in that the utility should pay the cost, and thought they had made a lot of progress in terms of sewers. He commented that he believed this project made financial sense for the City. They had annexation agreements for all of the necessary properties except I-70, and MoDOT had a long policy of allowing annexation of their property and right-of-way when requested. He pointed out the Battle sewer and Battle schools had been built because the City had been able to work with MoDOT in terms of annexation. He noted taxes would come to the City once the sewer was built, and there would not be any loopholes. He thought previously there had been an issue of some of the properties not being contiguous since one annexation agreement was missing, and it was no longer missing. He commented that in 2016, Mr. St. Romaine, the former Deputy City Manager, had estimated the annual increase in taxes to the capital and general fund from Midway Arms and the Midway Truck Stop would be about \$480,000 per year. He stated there were other revenues, such as a 7.5 percent gross receipts tax for all of the utilities, and a hotel/motel tax would also be involved. Last year, the City sold bonds for these sewer projects at a 20-year term and an average rate of just less three percent so the ratepayers were already paying for the bond. He commented that if they took the annual debt service of the City and the additional revenues of the

utility less what the BCRSD would pay and the connection charges, the annual 20-year debt service for this project would be about \$241,000. This meant there was about a \$241,000 increase over and above the debt service. He noted the sewer rates should pay for operation, maintenance, and treatment. He explained they could use the designated loan fund if they needed cash flow assistance as well. He stated the bottom line was that City ratepayers would contribute \$241,000, but City taxpayers would gross about twice that amount, and thought that spread might increase since bond payments were fixed and would not go up. He noted this would provide for other general fund and capital improvement needs and projects. If the Council elected not to proceed, the immediate wastewater issues would be fixed for less money than \$480,000 per year in taxes and the \$628,000 contribution of the BCRSD. The major incentives to annex would be gone along with the opportunity to place reasonable City regulations on the properties due to annexation. He thanked the Council for its consideration of this project.

Matt McCormick, 300 S. Providence Road, stated he was the President of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce and echoed the sentiments of Mr. Watkins for the work of the Council. He noted he was speaking on behalf of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce Board of Directors and their Government Affairs Committee. Last year, the Government Affairs Committee had developed local legislative priorities, which had been unanimously approved by their Board of Directors, and one of those priorities was to support the outcome of ballot measure as proposed and approved by the voters of Columbia. The project being discussed was part of the much needed 2013 sewer bond that had been approved by nearly 80 percent of the voters. The Chamber of Commerce along with many businesses and organizations in the community had endorsed, supported, and promoted the passing of this bond election and the importance of it being approved. The bond package included many projects dealing with both repair and expansion, and the Council at that time had approved those projects to be put on the list associated with that ballot. He asked the Council to keep its promises to the citizens of Columbia, the nearly 80 percent of the voters that had approved the 2013 sewer bond, and those that supported and fought to pass the ballot associated with this project and many other important bond projects by approving this project tonight and continuing to move forward on all projects on the 2013 sewer bond list.

Matt Williams, 2609 Limerick Lane, commented that he empathized with Ms. Lucht as she had worked on the sewer bond issue with him and had been one of the hardest working and most tireless advocates for it. He asked the Council to not pick which promises were kept within that sewer bond issue, and to instead keep all of their promises. He pointed out \$28 million of the \$32 million of that bond issue would be utilized to fix issues similar to what Ms. Lucht had described. He encouraged the Council to continue to be diligent in supporting those projects while also keeping the promise for the expansion portion of the bond issue. He asked the Council for its support of this project.

Keith Ragsdell stated he lived in the 4400 block of Shoram Court in the Fourth Ward and noted 80 percent had been in favor of the bond issue. Whoever had devised the strategy of getting people to vote on the sewer bond issue had listed this Henderson Branch sewer extension as a ballot project. He explained he did not recall all of the projects listed, but specifically remembered that project, and he and his wife had both voted in favor of it. He urged the Council to keep its promise by voting for this project. He commented that in the military, he had learned how to analyze terrain and how to look at something in order to decide the major avenues of approach and boundaries. When looking at Columbia, it was evident that they had I-70, Highway 63, and Highway 40, and as the City grew, he believed it should look to expand along thoroughfares paid for by federal and state funds in an effort to save money, and Highway 40 was one of those major avenues of approach into the City. He commented that the river was a major boundary in the southwest, and it was logical that expansion should occur along Highway 40. He thought anyone that did a study of the City would determine the same thing. As a general contractor, he was

involved in the bidding process, and if someone came to him and asked how much something would cost in a non-competitive bid, it would be significantly higher than what he would quote when responding to a competitive bid because he would lower his risk with a competitive bid as much as possible in order to compete for the project. The estimate would always be higher because all of the risks would be included. He again urged the Council to vote in favor of this project and keep their promise to the voters.

Joe Bechtold explained he was with Midway Properties and noted this process had begun 17 years ago when Mr. Beck had been the City Manager, and at that time, they had not been interested in annexation. Ten years ago, when Mr. Watkins was the City Manager, they had revisited the issue and it still had not moved forward, and six years ago, Mr. Matthes had become involved in the process. In addition, he thought it had been before the Council in various iterations approximately 15 times. He believed Mayor Treece had been correct in asking for more information regarding the revenues and expenses associated with the project as it was complicated and without precedent. He agreed with Mr. Watkins in that if they took the numbers that had been provided, it was about a 15 percent return on investment, which he felt was financially viable. He did not believe there would be another situation like this and thought it was a wonderful opportunity. He stated he was 100 percent on board with moving forward. He explained he had seen the population of Columbia double since he was born, and was proud to be involved in this westward expansion. He noted he was also more than happy to pay his fair share of taxes when he annexed into the City. He learned this evening that his connection fee had increased by \$50,000, and expressed his excitement to be a part of this project going forward.

Mayor Treece thanked Mr. Bechtold for his willingness to participate in a solution that more accurately reflected the connection and the benefit he would receive.

Mr. Trapp asked Mr. Bechtold how many businesses were located within his commercial area in addition to the truck stop and the hotel. Mr. Bechtold replied about 13, and noted he ran and operated about seven of them. The antique mall was essentially the equivalent of the Boone County Fairgrounds, and was now nationally known. He pointed out he had also built a 20,000 square foot consignment furniture store a year ago, and thought it would continue to grow. He commented that they had renovated at the top of the hill with a new parking lot and new road going to it, and his intention was to do the same at the truck stop this winter. He reiterated he intended to upgrade and expand for a west side of the City that would make everyone proud.

Mr. Trapp asked how many small businesses operated out of the antique mall. Mr. Bechtold replied 425.

Mr. Ruffin asked Mr. Bechtold how many people he employed. Mr. Bechtold replied about 70, and noted he was an equal opportunity employer. The last two people he had employed had both spent 15 years in the State Penitentiary, and they were living in the motel as well.

Gail Plemmons, 17 Aldeah Avenue, stated she had sewer water in her basement whenever there was a heavy rain event. She thanked Mr. Ruffin for his comments and Mr. Thomas for explaining that annexation and growth did not pay for itself in continued services. With this annexation, there would be development of homes, and the City would be in the same place it was now as they would never be able catch up. She did not understand why there were not electric connection fees. She commented that the difference in what had been approved and what they had now involved millions of dollars. She thought the Council should keep its promises to its current citizens. She noted she had been a customer since 1985, and felt the City needed to keep its promises to her and others that had paid these fees for years.

Dave Putnam, 1109 Dunbar Drive, commented that they had not discussed the economic benefit of Midway to the community, and was concerned Mr. Potterfield might relocate his plant, which included a lot of well-paying jobs and would have a negative effect on the community.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Putnam if Mr. Potterfield's unwillingness to sign a jobs retention agreement to keep the jobs he currently had here might leave Columbia taxpayers on the hook if the City extended a benefit to a company that might not exist the day after it was constructed. Mr. Putnam replied he agreed that was a risk, but noted he thought they should consider how much he was involved in the community and assume he would stay. Mayor Treece stated he was not sure Mr. Potterfield was willing to take that risk at the expense of City taxpayers. He explained they had negotiated economic developments with surrounding businesses like Kraft Foods, Aurora Dairy, and American Outdoor Brands. He noted he was also concerned about spending \$4.3 million in order to allow two people to connect when one could not commit to being there. Mr. Putnam stated he understood, and pointed out there were other opportunities in that area beyond those two customers.

Jeremy Root, 2417 Beachview Drive, wondered what was lurking in the lagoon that was more important than what was lurking in the basements of the citizens of the First Ward and along the trail in the Fourth and Fifth Wards. When the City had wet weather incidents, raw sewage came into homes, parks, and places of recreation, and he felt that was the result of the backup of an existing sewer problem. In January, the Council had heard a report as part of the Integrated Management Plan for wastewater and sewer that had indicated significant collection system rehabilitation and inflow and infiltration reduction projects that had been completed since 2014, and despite those recent improvements the Wastewater Treatment Plant was currently unable to manage peak wet weather flows in a manner that effectively limited the number of sanitary sewer overflows within the collection system during very large events. He noted this project would expand the collection system by several miles and million gallons of wastewater flow, and it would only compound the problem that would reside at the Wastewater Treatment Plant, which today did not have adequate capacity to serve existing residents. The proposal to spend twice as much money as had been originally budgeted to expand a sewer to serve some businesses was not a worthwhile use of taxpayer resources. He believed the annexation would extend services that would require the consumption of those new revenue streams, and listed fire, police, roads, electricity, etc. as examples. He also pointed out the City was having trouble paying enough to those that provided these services now. If they annexed to the west, he felt they needed to do it from a position of strength, and not from a position of weakness. He noted he was not afraid of anyone leaving town, and if anyone chose to leave, he was not afraid of finding someone else to take that person's place because Columbia was a great community. He recommended the Council vote no on this project.

Tom Ratermann, 1314 N. Seventh Street, explained he was the General Manager of the BCRSD, and the BCRSD and the City had been collaborating on these types of projects since the late 1980s. He stated there were over 25 connection agreements like this, and noted Mr. Watkins had mentioned the cost-share agreement for Battle High School. He pointed out the cost-share agreement for this project had been entered into in 2015, and it had been an amendment to an agreement made in 2011. Per that agreement, the BCRSD was obligated to pay \$628,047 toward this project. He noted the BCRSD had four treatment facilities in that area. One served the four marketable lots owned by Midway USA, another served the Trails West Subdivision, another served the Midway Crossing Subdivision, and the last served the Rollingwoods Subdivision. He stated there were private Department of Natural Resources (DNR) permitted facilities, and one of those was owned by the Columbia Public Schools (CPS). He pointed out they were working with CPS now to get them hooked up to a BCRSD facility, which meant they would then become a BCRSD customer. Through cooperation between the BCRSD and the City, at least 50 facilities had been closed since 1985. It protected public health and the environment and prevented local creeks from becoming impaired. If local creeks became impaired, it would take a lot of time and money to get them off of the impaired list. He stated that was the reason he was asking the Council to proceed with this project.

Ms. Peters stated one of the previous speakers had mentioned a sewer. Mr. Ratermann explained the Midway Crossing facility had a design flow of 150,000 gallons per day, and currently the permit showed an actual flow of about 10,000-20,000 gallons per day. He noted a development had already committed to buying about 50 percent of the remaining capacity, and the Trails West facility was very antiquated. The plan of the BCRSD was to connect the Trails West Subdivision either to the Midway Crossing facility or the Henderson Branch sewer if it was constructed.

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

Mr. Skala stated he did not believe they would be here if there had been some good faith negotiations beyond the \$2.6 million that had originally been promised in the bond issue by those that stood to benefit the most. He understood the City Manager had indicated they had discussed sales taxes or revenue generation as a result of annexation. He commented that he had been troubled by Mr. Potterfield's recent change in tone. Some time ago, Mr. Potterfield had suggested Texas might be a reasonable place for him to relocate if he found himself disappointed with how Council would act on this particular issue, but more recently, Mr. Potterfield had mentioned Texas might be more reasonable since they did not have an income tax and Missouri did not have an exemption for income tax. Mr. Skala felt that characterized a situation in which this was just a matter of expedience. He explained he had read the ballot language and noted it had not included specific projects. He stated 4,528 people had voted yes, and 1,137 people had voted no. Only 8.03 percent of the electorate had voted to make up the 80 percent affirmative vote. He pointed out the list of projects provided to the voters had included the Henderson Branch sewer extension at a cost of \$2.6 million, and that was the promise. It was not a promise of a \$4.3 million project. He felt the bulk of the additional \$1.1 million from utility ratepayers in the enterprise fund, and the \$628,000 from the BCRSD should revert to those waiting, some for more than a decade, for municipal sewer backup relief within the city limits as that was another promise that had been made. He reiterated the Henderson Branch sewer extension negotiations had never been met with good faith offers by those beyond the urban service area who stood to gain the most at no cost. He wondered what the responsibilities were for Mr. Potterfield and Mr. Bechtold with respect to affluent violations. He stated Columbia taxpayers simply did not have the capacity to provide regional sewer relief throughout mid-Missouri. He understood Mr. Pitzer had indicated he thought the proposal was stronger today than it had been in May due to the additional annexation agreement with the Fritz family as it would make the entire project contiguous to the City. He agreed it would be contiguous, but noted it would not be compact, and felt it had been economically gerrymandered to the detriment of current Columbia taxpayers and utility ratepayers, especially those waiting patiently in line for municipal sewer backup relief within the City's current urban service area. He stated he intended to vote no on this issue.

Mr. Trapp commented that he believed this was an important project and it had definitely had due consideration and a lot of public process. He felt this situation was different than the situation with Ashland as the project near the airport would not generate sales tax. The area Columbia was considering would generate close to \$500,000 per year in sales tax. Also, the cost of sewer for a house in Ashland was \$750, and it was \$2,400 in Columbia. They had fundamentally different ways of getting to the cost of how to pay for sewers. He thought they had addressed the equity issue with regard to placing the cost of the new development on the new development through sewer connection fees, and wondered how many times a sewer extension capital project should be paid for and by how many people. The users of the service would pay for it through connection fees. In addition, they would be able to annex a major commercial corridor. He thought bringing a highway exit into the city limits was a wise move. He understood there were questions with regard to the cost of growth and how it was allocated, but felt commercial growth in a sales tax dependent environment like Columbia more than paid for itself. A heavy dose of commercial properties that were sales tax generators would come into the City. He

agreed Columbia did not have an electric connection fee, but pointed out neither did any other utility in the State of Missouri. He believed they should consider an electric line connection fee, but it did not matter in this situation because the area was served by Boone Electric Cooperative. As a result, the City would not have to expand its electric service. The Boone Electric Cooperative would provide electric and the City would charge a gross receipts tax on the utilities paid. He noted the situation was the same with regard to water. He commented that this was primarily a sewer issue, and they had rebalanced those costs to the point the cost of new development was firmly on the new development. He did not believe they would be able to shut down growth west of the Perche Creek, and if Columbia did not annex the property, he thought the area would incorporate creating another bedroom community or suburb on the western edge. He did not feel they wanted to be landlocked by other communities whereby people used Columbia as a job and cultural center, but did not pay into the City's tax system or follow its regulatory regime. He commented that Columbia had the strictest building codes in terms of energy efficiency, and a hypothetical Midway City would not have that approach to infrastructure. In addition, Columbia had strong stormwater regulations. He believed Columbia's regulatory regime would help protect the region, especially since the Perche Creek flowed into the Hinkson Creek, which was an impaired waterway for which they were responsible. He felt it was in the interest of Columbia due to gravity bringing affluent-laden water into the area to proceed with this project. He noted he applauded the regional sewer approach they had adopted and pointed out they had taken Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) money to build the system. He stated they had been able to do this due to the economy of scale. He agreed there were unanswered questions with regard to growth, which was why he had seconded Mr. Thomas' motion, and believed it was well worth studying as long as they were considerate of not pushing growth into the surrounding area as that created sprawl without any of the benefits. He reiterated he felt this annexation and sewer extension was very much in the City's economic favor, and it supported jobs and economic opportunity as there were 425 small businesses in the antique mall, which he considered a grassroots country incubator model for businesses to have a chance to grow. He commented that they would likely want to pass another sewer bond issue in the future, and by not supporting all of the ballot projects, he believed they would erode support for the next ballot. He felt there were costs and benefits to growth, and this particular project had much in favor of it.

Mr. Pitzer stated he did not think this would still be an issue when he was elected to the Council and certainly did not think they would be dealing with it 18 months later. In that time, there had never been four votes against the project, but there had been five votes for advancing it. He commented that he did not know a lot about Midway USA and their involvement in the community, but understood they were a multiple award winner of the Baldrige Award, which was what the Missouri Quality Award was based upon. Midway USA had won it multiple times while the City had many opportunities for improvement. He noted some of the criteria for the award were evaluating people, organizational learning, societal responsibility, and ethics and transparency. He thought the economic arguments were clear, and Mr. Trapp had done a good job of summarizing the situation with regard the fact the capital costs would be recovered by connection fees. He also did not believe they could ignore the commercial business aspect of this project. He stated they complained about not having revenue and not being able to fund anything, but when there were clear opportunities to increase tax revenue into the general fund, they did not take advantage of them. He commented that he planned to support this as he had before as he believed it was a worthwhile project that would be in the best long-term interest of Columbia.

Ms. Peters explained the environmental issue was a fairly large issue for her. It was not just the construction of a \$4.3 million sewer to Midway Arms as it would also include all of the little lagoons between the City and Midway, which would hopefully become a part of the City. She noted it was about being a good citizen and honoring the agreement

associated with having a regional wastewater treatment plant as well. She stated she had met Mr. Potterfield a couple of times, usually at a Boy Scout breakfast. She thought he was an Eagle Scout and was very supportive in terms of community involvement with the Boy Scouts. She commented that she did not know what else his company did, but was impressed the company had received the Baldrige Award as it was difficult to obtain. She stated she would continue to support this project. Of the \$32 million sewer bond issue, this project would only utilize \$2.6 million because the remaining amount would come from enterprise funds, which she realized others had contributed to, but there was a lot of other sewer funding they could to ensure was being spent properly for issues within the City.

Mr. Thomas explained he would vote against approval of this project because it was clear to him that it was not a good business decision for Columbia taxpayers and ratepayers. He felt even mentioning the sales tax and property tax revenues that would accrue was a failure to understand the economics of what was happening. He believed sales taxes and property taxes were ongoing revenues the City received in return for providing ongoing services. It paid for police services, road maintenance, sewer maintenance, staffing of a fire station that might need to be located in the area, etc. Those revenues were designed to cover ongoing costs. He stated the one-time infrastructure costs had to be considered separately, and the one-time infrastructure construction and capacity costs for a single home in a typical community was about \$30,000-\$40,000. He pointed out that included schools, which was the largest single cost. As a result, a \$200,000 home would cost \$230,000-\$240,000 when one paid for the public infrastructure capacity that was associated with it. He agreed the City has some development impact fees and connection fees, but it covered about \$5,000. Thus, there was a shortfall of about \$30,000. He commented that his opposition to this project was not really due to the sewer or the particular businesses that wanted the connection, and noted he understood the need. His opposition to the project was due to the fact the current cost recovery system was grossly inadequate to pay for the infrastructure. This had the potential to annex over 300 acres into the City, which would involve 1,200 homes on quarter-acre lots, and the City was losing \$30,000 per home. It was equivalent to a \$36 million one-time cost to the City to build out the necessary infrastructure due to inadequate impact fees, and the cost would be spread through bonds over the entire taxpaying and ratepaying population of Columbia.

Mr. Ruffin understood staff had been working on the issues affecting those on Aldeah Avenue and that there was an ongoing commitment to address the concerns, but some of the problems were beyond the City's ability to fix because of the location of the homes. Mr. Sorrell stated some of those homes would experience a backup when there was a sewer surcharge of even a small amount due to the elevation of the homes along with the elevation of the existing sewer system. The way the City could help try to address it was through the reimbursement program to put in a pressure sewer for the basement as it would allow one to use the facilities even if it was raining and operating. Mr. Ruffin understood the City was partnering in that program at 50 percent of the cost.

Mr. Ruffin commented that he was in a unique position because of the issues that continued to impact the residents of the First Ward who felt they had been ignored or betrayed by this project. He stated he certainly cared about the issue as he had seen the impact of what it was like to have sewer backing up in the basement, and it was not anything any of them would want or be willing to tolerate. He appreciated the fact the City was working on it and still trying to find solutions to those ongoing problems. He explained the challenge for him was to honor the concerns of the residents of the First Ward while making a decision that would benefit the City as a whole or a larger demographic, and that was the reason he had been pressing to know how many jobs were involved, the associated hiring practices, and whether there was a commitment to being a good citizen of Columbia to ensure that they were also embracing a good corporate partner in addition to addressing the environmental issues.

Mayor Treece stated he was struggling as well, and his litmus test on this had always been that the area had to annexed, the annexation had to pay for itself, and that there should be some type of cost share agreement between the two end-users of the development. For the first time, they had a contiguous property that allowed everyone to be annexed. He noted he was still in doubt as to whether the annexation would pay for itself because it was not just about extending and paying for sewer services. It also involved extending streets, providing snow removal services, building sidewalks, installing fire hydrants, installing storm sirens, and other essential functions. He stated he did not feel the sales tax revenue that was being generated was close to the increased obligation. He explained another concern was the absence of some type of cost share agreement or a job retention agreement as it left City taxpayers and ratepayers on the hook for this project. He believed they needed to take care of what they had before taking on this dramatic expansion without the revenues to pay for it. He noted he had voted to pursue the estimate to get to the number they were at now, and had hoped that over the last two years, they would have had a more serious conversation with the users to develop some type of cost-share agreement. If that had been done, this would have already happened. He commented that he believed a no vote would bring those parties to the table in a meaningful way to get the consideration City taxpayers deserved.

B205-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, PITZER, PETERS. VOTING NO: RUFFIN, SKALA, THOMAS, TREECE. Bill declared defeated.

- B206-18 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of sanitary sewers to serve the Henderson Branch Watershed.
Discussion shown with B209-18.
- B207-18 Authorizing an annexation agreement with the Fritz Family Gift Trust for properties located on Highway UU and West Van Horn Tavern Road.
Discussion shown with B209-18.
- B208-18 Authorizing an annexation agreement with Bechtold Properties LLC for properties located on West Highway 40.
Discussion shown with B209-18.
- B209-18 Authorizing an annexation agreement with VH Properties LLC for properties located on Highway UU and West Van Horn Tavern Road.
Mayor Treece stated action was not required on B206-18, B207-18, B208-18, and B209-18 since B205-18 had been defeated.
- PH34-18 Proposed construction of improvements at the Clyde Wilson Memorial Park to include the construction of amenities at three (3) park entrances, repairing portions of the trail surface, replacing existing retaining walls and railroad timbers, and the removal of invasive vegetation encroaching on the trail.
Discussion shown with B210-18.
- B210-18 Authorizing construction of improvements at the Clyde Wilson Memorial Park to include the construction of amenities at three (3) park entrances, repairing portions of the trail surface, replacing existing retaining walls and railroad timbers, and the removal of invasive vegetation encroaching on the trail; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

PH34-18 was read by the Clerk, and B210-18 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Jeremy Root, 2417 Beachview Drive, commented that this was a great park that needed some repair at the entrances, and encouraged Council to support this proposal as it would benefit the residents of the East Campus Neighborhood Association along with the newly established East Campus Traditional Neighborhood Association.

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

B210-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B147-18 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with TPR Enterprises, LLC, a/k/a EcoEngineers, for a feasibility study analyzing the potential for the City to upgrade its landfill gas to produce renewable natural gas to be sold as transportation fuel.

The bill was given third reading by the Mayor.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece made a motion to table B147-18 to the November 5, 2018 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B203-18 Authorizing a 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; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Pitzer understood this would fund three battery electric buses via a grant of \$1.7 million and a local match of \$336,000, and asked why they would need the buses since they would likely be making changes to the transit system. Mr. Nichols replied the grant had been processed about a year ago, and this money had already been set aside. He explained they had capital funds for the local match to purchase buses when grants came along, and it was the reason they built up those capital funds. He noted they had not had a grant application for 4-5 years.

Mr. Pitzer asked how many buses they currently had and for the length of the leases. Mr. Nichols replied these would be outright purchases. The agreement they had with BYD involved the lease of eight buses. They had also purchased four 40-foot buses, and would now purchase these three. They would ultimately have fleet of about 13 buses. He explained they could eliminate three of the oldest buses with this grant.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the operational savings by going with electric buses. Mr. Nichols replied they were struggling in calculating those numbers. They had thought they would see significant savings with electric buses, but they had been the Midwest experiment at this point. There had been some issues with the buses, and it had been difficult to find parts. He understood buses were being manufactured quicker than parts could be shipped to them so they were not really seeing them on the road for the length of time they wanted. He stated this grant would allow the Center for Transportation and the Environment (CTE) to look at the City's routes and design them for the terrain in terms of wheels, motors, length, etc., so this particular grant would address the production of the bus in more detail. He noted they would receive a lot of feedback and data by utilizing the services of CTE in conjunction with the grant to purchase the buses. The hope was

that this would result in information regarding the electric buses with regard to longevity, etc. He commented that the Kansas City Airport had purchased some electric buses for shuttle services so there was now a BYD technician in the area, which allowed them to be more responsive to the City when buses were in need of service. He hoped by next year they would see savings from the electric buses.

Mr. Pitzer understood these would be custom built buses. Mr. Nichols stated they would be custom built to how they would be operated on the route proposed. CTE would review the terrain and design the motor, back tires, etc. in order to maximize performance. Mr. Pitzer commented that they kept changing the routes. Mr. Nichols stated they might end up using these on the University route, which was fairly solid, and they would be customized for the route chosen.

Mr. Pitzer asked if these 30-foot buses were full-sized buses. Mr. Nichols replied 40-foot buses had been those they had used on the heavier routes, but 30-foot buses seemed to work better around town. Mr. Pitzer asked if smaller options had been considered to match the ridership. Mr. Nichols replied he thought this process had started in 2014 or 2015, so it had been a long process to get the grant in place. Things had not been like they were now when the grant had been submitted, and they had been awarded the 30-foot buses.

Ms. Peters understood it was harder to get the 40-foot buses around the curbs in the downtown. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct, and noted they were using those on the straighter routes.

Mr. Skala asked if this was the same vendor from which the City had purchased the 40-foot buses. Mr. Nichols replied CTE coordinated FTA grants all over the country and he understood there had been \$55 million in grant funds and 33 entities had applied for it. The City was fortunate to get the grant. He thought it might have been because they already had experience with electric buses.

Mr. Trapp left the meeting.

Mr. Skala asked if CTE had commented on the fact parts were hard to get. Mr. Nichols replied he thought they were aware now. He was not sure they had realized the demand and noted they had tripled the size of a plant in California. He reiterated Columbia was the first entity to utilize electric buses in the Midwest, and believed production and services would improve as electric buses were utilized by more entities in the Midwest.

Mr. Skala asked if the City had leased the original buses. Mr. Nichols replied yes because they had not had the capital to purchase them. He stated they had been able to convince the FTA that the lease option would satisfy the grant as an outright purchase was required. He thought the FTA had recognized it was about \$500,000 per bus, and a lot of entities could not accommodate it. After twelve years, the City would own those buses as they were making lease payments along the way. He pointed out they did not make lease payments when the buses were not on the road. The company did not receive a check if the bus was not in operation, and that had been in the lease agreement language.

B203-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: PITZER. ABSENT: TRAPP. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

B199-18 Rezoning property located on the south side of Worley Street and west of Stadium Boulevard (2502 and 2504 W. Worley Street) from District PD (Planned Development) to District M-C (Mixed Use-Corridor) zoning (Case No. 18-138).

- B200-18 Approving the Final Plat of Copperstone Plat No. 1B, a Replat of Lots 149 & 150 of Copperstone Plat No. 1, located on the southeast side of Stone Grove Court, east of Scott Boulevard; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 18-142).
- B201-18 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to all-way stop intersections.
- B202-18 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking along both sides of a portion of Buttonwood Drive between Nifong Boulevard and Providence Road outer roadway.
- B204-18 Appropriating funds received from the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) for mitigation expenses incurred relating to the 2016 flood event.
- B211-18 Authorizing an airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission relating to air service promotion for the Columbia Regional Airport; appropriating funds.
- R131-18 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the north side of Mexico Gravel Road and east of Spring Cress Drive (5705 E. Mexico Gravel Road) (Case No. 18-131).
- R132-18 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the northwest corner of the Scott Boulevard and Brushwood Lake Road intersection (Case No. 18-146).
- R133-18 Declaring the results of the special election held on August 7, 2018.
- R134-18 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the social services provider agreement with Columbia Interfaith Resource Center (d/b/a Columbia Alliance to Combat Homelessness) for overnight emergency shelter services.
- R135-18 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the social services provider agreement with Job Point for employment services for low-income residents with barriers to employment.

- R136-18 Authorizing an extension of the temporary closure of a portion of the sidewalk and three (3) parking spaces on the north side of Walnut Street, between Eighth Street and Ninth Street, to facilitate the construction of an office building at 807 E. Walnut Street.
- R137-18 Authorizing a product and services agreement with BridgePay Network Solutions, LLC to provide gateway services for online customer payments through the Columbia Financial Enterprise Resource System (COFERS) EnerGov module.
- R138-18 Authorizing a state aviation trust fund project consultant agreement with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. to complete a Supplemental Terminal Area Master Plan (STAMP) relating to the proposed new terminal site at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: TRAPP. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:**

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R139-18 Authorizing a special event operations agreement with Thumper Productions, L.L.C. for the 2018 Roots N' Blues N' BBQ Festival at Stephens Lake Park.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Sheets provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters noted this agreement was coming to Council only a month prior to the event, and asked what would happen if they did not approve it. Ms. Sheets replied they were on a tight time frame this year as Tracy Lane with Thumper Productions had come in mid-season. Ms. Peters asked when this would normally come to them. Ms. Sheets replied going forward they would allow for a better time frame so the Council received it in a more timely fashion.

Mr. Pitzer asked about the conclusion of their previous discussion about the number of drinks. Mr. Thomas replied he had planned to propose an amendment to increase the drink limit after public comment was received.

Richard King, 109 W. Parkway Drive, commented that he had asked for a three drink limit for the purposes of convenience. He explained he thought they knew their audience, and noted 60 percent of the audience was 55 years old or older. He stated this would be the twelfth year of the event and it had been trouble-free. He pointed out it was not a deal-breaker, but would appreciate that change.

Mayor Treece asked about the limit now. Mr. King replied it was two. Mayor Treece understood Mr. King wanted to go to three. Mr. King stated that was correct because it had been an inconvenience for people that would go up there and try to purchase drinks for friends. It resulted in them having to get back in line.

Jeremy Root, 2417 Beachview Drive, commented that as a member of the board of directors of a competing arts organization and even though they had poached Tracy Lane from them, he would support Mr. King, his event, and his proposed amendment as the

event was a great asset to the community.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to amend the agreement associated with R139-18 to allow a maximum of four drinks per person on a single visit to any alcohol vendor.

Mayor Treece stated he thought Mr. King had asked for three. Mr. Thomas explained trays carried four, and people tended to go in groups of four. He noted he would propose four, and if it was voted down, a motion for three could be made.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas to amend the agreement associated with R139-18 to allow a maximum of four drinks per person on a single visit to any alcohol vendor was seconded by Ms. Peters.

Ms. Peters asked if this would create an insurance or liability problem. Lieutenant Shouse-Jones replied she was not an insurance expert, but stated there were concerns from a police perspective with over-intoxication. She explained this event would occur at night in a fairly dark area and a City-owned large body of water next to it. She stated they had concerns with regard to people purchasing alcohol knowing the alcohol was intended to be consumed by someone other than the purchaser as the server was not allowed to observe the signs of intoxication they were taught to look for and was the basic premise of the server training the City required. It would take away the best tool those alcohol servers had to judge whether or not someone was being overserved or not. She stated they felt two was the documented best practice, and pointed out they only wanted it to be a safe event, and one of the ways to do that was to ensure the alcohol was managed responsibly. As a result, they would not advocate for four drinks being served at any one time.

Mayor Treece asked for the practice at other large events such as the Ninth Street Summerfest. Lieutenant Shouse-Jones replied this was the boilerplate language used for all of those agreements. In terms of Summerfest specifically, she understood they had a two-drink limit. In the research conducted leading up to the pre-council meeting when this had previously been discussed, there were a lot of insurance companies that recommended imposing that limit so alcohol was not being overserved, increasing the liability for the event organizer.

Mr. Pitzer stated he would make a motion to amend the existing motion so the limit was three drinks unless Mr. Thomas wanted to withdraw his amendment. Mr. Thomas withdrew his motion to amend the agreement associated with R139-18 to allow a maximum of four drinks per person on a single visit to any alcohol vendor.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to amend the agreement associated with R139-18 to allow a maximum of three drinks per person on a single visit to any alcohol vendor. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Skala stated he did not see the inconvenience of having more than one friend accompany the purchaser to an alcohol vendor to buy a drink, and stated he was inclined to support the staff recommendation.

Ms. Sheets commented that if the decision was made to increase the number of drinks to three, staff would recommend confirmation from the insurance company recognizing there was an increased liquor liability with the increased limit.

Ms. Peters asked who paid for the insurance. Ms. Sheets replied it would only be a written notice as the organizers of the Festival already carried liquor liability insurance. Mr. King stated they had already spoken with the insurance company.

Mr. King understood Lieutenant Shouse-Jones had indicated the Blue Note only served two drinks. Lieutenant Shouse-Jones explained Mayor Treece had asked about Summerfest and that same wording was included in that agreement. Mr. King understood it was just for Summerfest. Lieutenant Shouse-Jones stated she understood they actually had that limit as part of their day to day operations. Mr. King commented that it had not been the practice during the 34 years he had owned the Blue Note. Ms. Sheets explained she had spoken with current management, and they had indicated their best practice was to serve two drinks per sale unless more than one person came to the bar. She understood they would serve all at the bar if a group came to bar and one person wanted to buy the round.

The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Mr. Thomas to amend the agreement associated with R139-18 to allow a maximum of three drinks per person on a single visit to any alcohol vender was approved by roll call vote with Mr. Ruffin, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Pitzer, Ms. Peters, and Mayor Treece voting yes, and Mr. Skala voting no.

The vote on R139-18, as amended, was recorded as follows: **VOTING YES: RUFFIN, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: TRAPP. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:**

R140-18 Authorizing a business associate agreement with CBIZ Benefits & Insurance Services, Inc. for employee benefit consulting services.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Buckler provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked how much the City would pay. Ms. Buckler replied about \$65,000. Mayor Treece asked what they did. Ms. Buckler replied they ran all of the projections and assisted the City with setting rate structures, providing comparative benchmarks, bidding lines of coverage for those items that were fully insured, administering day to day claims, etc. Mayor Treece asked if this was just for the benefits side, and not with regard to salaries. Ms. Buckler replied it was only benefits. Mayor Treece asked if it was just health insurance or if it involved other benefits. Ms. Buckler replied it included all of the lines of coverage.

The vote on R140-18 was recorded as follows: **VOTING YES: RUFFIN, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: TRAPP. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:**

R141-18 Transferring council reserve funds to the Community Development Department to support a Fair Housing Task Force public engagement event in FY 2019.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece explained Mr. Trapp had asked for this to come forward.

The vote on R141-18 was recorded as follows: **VOTING YES: RUFFIN, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: TRAPP. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:**

R142-18 Transferring council reserve funds to the Office of Cultural Affairs to support Columbia Access Television (CAT) for operation of a public access channel in FY 2019.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Thomas explained he had proposed this and had made the case for it previously, and noted he believed they needed to restore the funding back to \$100,000 per year, which was half of what it had been when the original contract was signed because it created opportunities for people to introduce their opinions and share their voices. It also provided training in communication skills within the community.

Sean Brown, 4366 W. Millbrook Drive, explained he was the Managing Director of CAT and asked for the Council's support. The money would be an investment in CAT as he would try to hire a part-time employee and update the existing gear. It would help membership and increase the ability to create sustainable income, separate from the City grant.

Richard King, 109 W. Parkway Drive, stated he had worked with Mr. Brown at CAT on several occasions and thought the resource they offered to the City of Columbia impacted a lot of people. He also thought they needed assistance in terms of funding. He

understood they had helped film the Roots N' Blues Festival, and noted he had used all of their footage for commercial and advertising. He asked the Council to support CAT.

Mr. Skala commented that he was conflicted because at one time he had a show called *Counterpoint* that CAT had produced. He agreed the Council had reduced funding to \$35,000 over the course of the past few years. He stated he was sympathetic to restoring some funding, but could not support the more aggressive ask Mr. Thomas had suggested. He noted KOPN and other similar groups did not ask for a contribution from the City and had mounted quite an initiative to raise money. He pointed out KOPN was a community radio station, which also provided a good deal of training for those in radio. He stated his commitment tonight had been to focus on wages and salaries, and to not get too involved in individual causes. He commented that he was not likely to support this increase. In the future, he thought he could see his way clear of going to a total \$50,000.

Mr. Pitzer explained he was sympathetic to the cause as well, but the City had been scrounging around for \$20,000 and \$30,000 earlier to fund pay increases. As a result, he was not comfortable with the commitment he thought this extra grant implied of trying to find \$100,000 in annual funding. He felt they needed to focus on the must-haves versus amenity-type items.

The vote on R142-18 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, THOMAS. VOTING NO: SKALA, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. ABSENT: TRAPP. Resolution declared defeated.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B212-18 Adopting the FY 2019 Classification and Pay Plan; providing for FY 2019 salary adjustments relating to the Classification and Pay Plan.
- B213-18 Establishing plan year 2019 active employee medical and dental premium rates, non-Medicare medical rates, and retiree dental premium rates for the City of Columbia; providing for payroll withholdings.
- B214-18 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to personnel policies, procedures, rules and regulations.
- B215-18 Authorizing 2018 amendments to the collective bargaining agreement with Columbia Police Officers Association, Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #26.
- B216-18 Authorizing 2018 amendments to the collective bargaining agreement with Columbia Professional Firefighters I.A.F.F. Local 1055.
- B217-18 Appropriating fifty percent (50%) of FY 2017 General Fund savings to General Fund departments as part of the Incentive Based Budgeting Initiative.

- B218-18 Appropriating fifty percent (50%) of FY 2017 General Fund savings for projects identified by the City Council as part of the Incentive Based Budgeting Initiative.
- B219-18 Approving the Final Plat of "Corporate Lake Plat 13A" located on the south side of Corporate Lake Drive and east of Commercial Drive (Case No. 18-155).
- B220-18 Approving the Final Plat of "Barkwell's Plat No. 2" located on the south side of Nebraska Avenue and the north side of Business Loop 70, east of Seventh Street; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 18-141).
- B221-18 Authorizing a consolidated grant agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for FY 2019 transportation planning services (Case No. 18-179).
- B222-18 Appropriating funds for maintenance and repairs to the Tenth Street and Cherry Street municipal parking structure.
- B223-18 Authorizing a joint funding agreement with the U.S. Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior for operation and maintenance of a streamgage on Hinkson Creek to provide historical stream flow data and flood stage information.
- B224-18 Authorizing a joint funding agreement for water resources investigations with the U.S. Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior for groundwater monitoring of well sites in the vicinity of the wetland treatment units and the Eagle Bluffs Conservation Area.
- B225-18 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the issuance of birth and death certificates and associated information technology activities.
- B226-18 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Show Me Healthy Women program.
- B227-18 Authorizing an 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.

- B228-18 Accepting the North Central Columbia Phase II historic preservation grant from the Missouri Department of Natural Resources; appropriating funds.

X. REPORTS

- REP80-18 Draft Community Oriented Policing Report.

Mr. Matthes and Sergeant Fox provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece understood many people wanted to comment on this draft report, and noted he felt they could suggest changes to it. He asked if they wanted to hold a work session or do something different to allow for comment.

Mr. Skala suggested they bring this forward again as a report and allow people to speak when it was not as late in the evening. He agreed they could do a work session as well. He just wanted to allow people to comment on it.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification as to whether they would allow comment tonight. Mr. Skala replied he thought anyone that wanted to speak now could speak, but felt many were no longer in attendance due to the lateness of this meeting.

Mr. Thomas stated he supported bringing this back as a report on a meeting that had a much shorter agenda so they were able to get to the reports at an earlier time and people had the opportunity to comment during the discussion on the report or during the general comments portion of the agenda. He thanked Sergeant Fox for his work. He explained he had not had the chance to read it yet, and suggested it come back to them at the first meeting in October.

Mr. Matthes suggested it be a public hearing as it would then be earlier in the agenda. Ms. Peters thought that was a good idea.

Ms. Amin asked if it would be advertised like other public hearings. Mayor Treece replied he thought that should be done.

Mr. Thomas asked if they should aim for the October 1, 2018 Council Meeting. Mayor Treece replied yes.

Jeremy Root, 2417 Beachview Drive, commented that he agreed with Mr. Matthes' good suggestion to hold a public hearing on this topic as it would occur earlier in the meeting.

Ms. Peters hoped they would receive comments prior to then as well and understood there could be potential changes to the draft by then also.

- REP81-18 Correspondence from the Historic Preservation Commission requesting amendments to their establishing ordinance to include specific permissions to conduct sales, fundraising, and other programming functions.

Mayor Treece commented that the concept of a historic preservation fund was something other communities had.

Mr. Teddy stated he and Ms. Fowler had visited earlier in the evening, and she had pointed out the cover memo was inaccurate and misleading. Staff had characterized the report as a proposal for a new non-profit organization, and that was not accurate. That reference had come from an exhibit to the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) report. He apologized for that inaccuracy.

Pat Fowler, Chair of the HPC, explained she was concerned about the impression they had given. For the sake of completeness, she had attached what she felt had been a well written document from 2008 because she wanted to show they were making progress on that goal all of these years later with their fundraising efforts and to

encourage the Council to direct staff to help them write an ordinance so they could continue with fundraising programming and architectural salvage management. She stated it was difficult for her to appropriately express her concerns that their actions were being mischaracterized, whether inadvertently or otherwise at this late hour. She explained they were making a genuine effort in providing some services to meet the needs of the community with regard to historic preservation. The last time the HPC had come forward with a report, she had not been the person carrying it forward, but it had not gone well as they had not been provided the authorization to move forward with salvage sales. She hoped they could clear up some of the miscommunication that continued to occur because they were trying to make progress and wanted to be a participant of COMO Gives this year as they thought there were people that wanted to add to the fund the HPC had worked so hard to build. She pointed out they were at \$14,000 now in trying to fulfill the goal of the HPC.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Fowler what she would like to see happen. Ms. Fowler replied she wanted Council to ask staff to work on an ordinance and to allow them input in the drafting of the ordinance before it came back to the Council as an amendment to their enabling ordinance.

Mayor Treece understood this was a line item in the New Century Fund, which was the City's not-for-profit, and asked Ms. Fowler if she was comfortable with that in terms of deposits and accessing it for initiatives they wanted to sponsor. Ms. Fowler replied if they generated funds, the money was transferred to that account. The ability of the HPC to generate funds was limited in that they had been told by the Law Department they could not do a lot of the things they wanted without the permission of the Council. This included programming for house tours whereby they charged a fee, placing a modest fee on the walking tours, or holding more regular salvage sales so contractors could count on being able to access those materials so they stood a greater chance of being placed in buildings.

Mayor Treece commented that he had spoken at the Celebration of the Arts, and tickets for that poster party unveiling went back to the Office of Cultural Affairs without coming to the Council, and asked if there was a reason why the same could not be done with the initiative of the HPC. Ms. Thompson replied those actually came to the Council for appropriation. She explained the challenge was that boards and commissions did not have the independent authority to conduct activities and charge fees. Normally those types of activities were run through not-for-profit agencies that were doing that kind of work. They found the solution of the New Century Fund for any kind of collection of fees. Mayor Treece asked if there was any reason they could not have a more encompassing ordinance that allowed the HPC to move forward with the initiatives contemplated without having to come back to Council. Ms. Thompson replied she did not have an answer at 2:30 in the morning. When they had looked at it in the past, they had been unable to come up with solutions, but they could take another look at it.

Mayor Treece asked if there was any objection from Council to allow Mr. Teddy to work with the HPC to come up with a structure that might suit their needs. He noted they were doing great work, and there was a lot of interest from the community.

Mr. Skala suggested they come up with something to run through the proper channels, but was not sure why they should be prevented from working together to develop with a better product.

Ms. Fowler commented that they had the enthusiasm of volunteers now, and hoped they did not wear them down by saying they could not do this or that. She noted they had made a modest, but promising, start with \$14,000. They knew if they genuinely wanted a revolving loan fund, they needed more than \$100,000, and she did not want to lose momentum.

Ms. Peters asked Mayor Treece to reiterate what they were asking of staff. Mayor Treece replied for staff to work with the Chair of the HPC to develop some enabling ordinance that would allow the HPC to conduct walking tours, architectural salvage sales,

etc. with the money going to the New Century Fund since it was within its mission. Ms. Fowler explained the phrasing they were using was events, programming, and architectural salvage. Ms. Peters understood the HPC, Mr. Teddy, and the Law Department would be involved. Mr. Skala stated that was correct.

Ms. Thompson explained there was a concern of volunteer organizations raising funds and spending funds without Council oversight and authorization because they were supposed to be policy advisory committees. She stated they would have to work through it.

Ms. Peters understood the HPC, the Law Department, and the Community Development Department would work together to determine how to do this properly within the legal limits of the law.

REP82-18 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

Mayor Treece understood this report had been provided for informational purposes.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, thanked the Council for its work.

Ms. Peters asked for an updated report on where they were with regard to rehabilitating the old sewers, to include any inflow and infiltration work.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 2:34 a.m.