



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, July 1, 2019
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, July 1, 2019, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, and TREECE were present. The Interim City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

Mayor Treece explained the minutes of the June 17, 2019 meeting were not yet complete.

Mr. Thomas asked that B170-19 be moved from the consent agenda to old business. The agenda, including the consent agenda with B170-19 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

SPC41-19 Katherine Lee - 60th Annual Heart of America Marathon and Inaugural Fun Team Relay; Request for Council support to attend, help with presentations, and/or spread the word.

Ms. Lee explained she wanted to inform the Council of one of the most historic, notable, physical, and competitive events in the United States that was held in Columbia. She explained she was the race director for the Heart of America Marathon and a board member for the Columbia Track Club, and noted the Heart of America Marathon was celebrating its 60th run. She stated this was the fourth oldest continuously running marathon in the United States and had attracted people from 48 of the 50 states and overseas. She pointed out North Dakota and Vermont were the only two states that had not been represented. She explained the marathon had started with a taunt. Boxers, weightlifters, and distance runners associated with the Columbia Athletic Club had trained together in the late 1950s, and after some time, the boxers taunted the runners about their ability to beat them in a race. As a result, a challenge was made to run from Columbia to Fulton on Labor Day in 1960, and that had been the beginning of this marathon. She noted the feature article for *Distance Running News*, which was the precursor to *Runner's World*, was the Heart of America Marathon in Columbia, Missouri.

She displayed a route from the early days, which had sometimes been impacted by slow-moving freight trains, and noted the current route was also challenging as runners had to go down to the river and then back up Route N and Easley Hill. She explained winning was important, but the marathon was not just about who was the fastest. They had the Schulte Award, which was named after Dave Schulte, a charter member of the Columbia Track Club whose emphasis had always been on improving one's performance. As a result, the person that most improved their marathon time was the winner of the Dave Schulte Award. New this year was the Joe Schroeder Award as Joe had won the first Heart of America Marathon in 1960. She noted he had only run six miles prior to the event, and had been one of five people that had showed up for the first Heart of America Marathon. The five had not included any boxers as none had participated. Of the five runners that had participated, only Joe and one other person had actually finished. She pointed out this course was measured and Boston certified so anyone that ran this race could qualify for the Boston Marathon if they were able to meet the other requirements. She provided some examples of how the race had changed in terms of the course location, medical services, eligibility of those who could run, etc. She explained they had added a fun team relay to the event to make it more accessible to the entire community and that there was also a pre-race banquet. She asked the Council to attend the pre-race banquet to meet some of the runners, present some of the medals at the finish line, present awards at the awards ceremony, and to spread the word for the race that would be held on September 2. She stated Mr. Thomas had attended the awards ceremony last year and explained she had received a lot of comments about how it was great that the community supported the event. She provided the Council a flyer about the race and reiterated she hoped they would participate.

SPC42-19

Sutu Forte - What's next?

Ms. Forte provided a handout and noted she planned to focus her comments on truth and principles. She explained that ever since she had started coming to this microphone in 2008, she had established a relationship with the Council in terms of protecting a wilderness sanctuary in her neighborhood and felt they were growing together. She knew many wondered why she kept coming back and noted she was following what was in her heart. She explained new things were happening so they had more opportunities to grow together. She stated her group had circulated 200 flyers alerting the neighborhood of the bad things happening in the East Campus neighborhood and their support for Option 4 had been to keep those problems in that neighborhood versus them coming to their neighborhood. She commented that they had been unable to obtain information from the Columbia Police Department, but KOMU Channel 8 had been able to show where crime existed for four months starting in January 2018. She displayed a diagram of the crime in her neighborhood compared to the East Campus neighborhood and the downtown. She noted Channel 17 had a document indicating there had been 70 police calls on the MKT trail. She stated they had hired a private investigator regarding the hazards of bike trails, and displayed a list on the screen that had been included in the report from the investigator. It had indicated burglaries would decrease the value of homes, bicycle accidents would cause home insurance to increase, etc. She believed the items listed were very concerning. She displayed photographs of streets in her neighborhood and pointed out a blind turn and a cul-de-sac where people would park. She reiterated it was a concern and noted she wanted to speak with the Fire Department, the Police Department, and the City Council. She pointed out someone was now living in her beloved sanctuary. As a result, Officer Jake Waldrup told them to put up a sign indicating that it was private property and asking the person to leave. She noted she had gone to that location today and the tent was still there. She was concerned about three bridges coming into their sanctuary and neighborhood. She asked the Council to reconsider the plan and to talk to them at the very least as no one had talked to them about the repercussions of such a plan. She understood one council member had indicated they could not change their mind because that would affect the reputation of the

Council, and stated that disturbed her. She felt what was right was right, and asked the Council to hear them out.

SPC43-19 Maria Oropallo - Introduction to Transparency Matters.

Ms. Oropallo, 208 E. Briarwood Lane, introduced Transparency Matters, a political action committee (PAC) that had been created to raise the idea that community members as ratepayers were entitled to clear and unambiguous answers to their questions pertaining to whether the City was using their resources effectively, efficiently, economically, and equitably. They wanted transparency across all wards, streets, census tracts, zoning categories, etc. She commented that they expected the City through the processes the Council enabled to bring responsive information to the community, to include how decisions were made, what decisions were made and not made, and explanations that were clear and transparent. She noted she was the treasurer of the PAC and listed the other core members as Pat Fowler, Lynn Maloney, Susan Maze, and Diane Suhler. She explained they had been formed around the idea of transparency and had found that they supported issues through education, agitation, and organizing. She noted they would develop programs to maintain and build relationships between elected and appointed officials and would engage with stakeholder groups to assist on issue-driven campaigns, and potentially even recruiting Transparency Matters approved candidates. She did not feel they should underestimate the power of listening to the concerns and circumstances of someone else in their kitchen. She commented that their first event of community outreach would be held on Saturday, July 13 at DrinKraft, which was located at 300 N. Tenth Street, at 3:00 p.m. and all were invited. She noted they had been established on January 29, 2019 and they could be reached by email at transparencymatters65203@gmail.com. She displayed some of their partners and issues, and explained that while the list was long, many issues overlapped or nudged against each other. She commented that they had the opportunity to promote social equity, responsive governance, access to information and decision-making for not only those in the know, but for everyone who lived in Columbia, and they expected their elected and appointed leaders to be the models.

SPC44-19 Antionette Gray - Neighborhood hazards that effect our children's safety.

Ms. Gray did not speak as she was not in attendance.

SPC45-19 Sara Linde Patel - The trail on Bluff Dale Drive.

Ms. Patel, 617 Bluff Dale Drive, stated she had been a member of that neighborhood for eight years and understood change was inevitable, but noted she had some concerns with regard to the bike trail. She commented that she resided at the location of a blind turn and had seen close calls with children and other vehicles, especially when there was parking on the street. She pointed out that one of the things she loved about the neighborhood was the number of children playing outside and was concerned about the area becoming a bike pathway. She stated she was not against cyclists as she had friends that loved it, but was concerned about Bluff Dale Drive being the straight avenue to that trail. When the Moon Valley Trail had been built, she had walked it five times and had seen what Ms. Forte had shown a picture of, which was a campsite. It was not there today, but it had been there back then, and it had been about 40 feet off of the concrete path. She felt that might be happening at a larger scale and was therefore concerned. She stated she was not against compromise or doing what was best, and asked the Council to work with them so Bluff Dale Drive was not the main avenue to access the trail as it would result in heavy traffic for which the road was not built.

SPC46-19 Karen Sicheneder - Addressing policy and procedure for official communications and increasing communication and transparency for boards and commissions.

In response to a few prior comments, Ms. Sicheneder stated she thought they were all concerned about homeless communities and ensuring the entire City was a sanctuary for them.

Ms. Sicheneder noted there was a concern in the country in terms of what constituted freedom of speech. There was a certain expectation to surrender one's freedom of speech when running for office. It was not that one was no longer allowed to say whatever one wanted as that freedom was protected by the First Amendment, but when one became an elected official, there was an expectation to represent all people regardless of race, gender, orientation, religion, or expression. When running for office, one was running to work for the people, and that person's communication became a matter of public record. The sunshine law was not in effect to protect leaders. It was there to protect citizens. When holding office, one held an extreme amount of power and privilege and the power to affect people's lives. In order to avoid becoming a dictatorship, checks and balances were in place. She commented that she did not intend to discuss the rules governing those checks and balances as those existed with elections. She explained she wanted to address the policies and procedures in place for public employees, i.e., people put into positions of power that had not been elected. Like a private corporation, the only recourse was to file a complaint with the boss. It had recently been expressed how unfair it was for a boss to have public pressure placed on them to punish an employees for their freedom of speech. She commented that she would agree with that under the rules that governed a private company, but she wanted to discuss employees put in place to serve the public and paid with the tax dollars of citizens. She stated the line between a public figure and a private citizen became fuzzy and they needed to determine at what point an employee of the government became a public figure. They had recently had a public input meeting with the Columbia Police Department to discuss policies around social media within the Department in terms of how citizens viewed and interacted with that content. Unfortunately, they had not gotten around to discussing the policy, but she had reviewed it on her own time. She commented that social media was a beast that had taken on a life of its own. It affected everyone on a daily basis. Without any sort of policing or consequences for posting, social media had emboldened bullies and traumatized the vulnerable. It had real psychological impacts on everyone, which they needed to be mindful of when it came to policies and procedures. She states she was concerned about the policies governing public employees. Technology was moving and changing so rapidly that it was impossible for policies to keep pace. In addition, due to recent events, people were more emboldened to say things that had never been appropriate or acceptable in the past. She understood the current policy did not include repercussions of violations, which was problematic, and that most corrections were a human resources matter based on the circumstance and the context of employee's history, and not released to the public. She felt they had entered a time in history where the lack of accountability was eroding public trust. They could not afford to have trust in this body eroded. She asked for a review of the policy around communication of non-elected employees along with a policy that addressed what would happen in cases of violations. She believed they should be able to know when people needed to issue an apology for their words. In addition, education needed to be put into place for non-elected employees to fully understand how and when they surrendered their freedom of speech under the employment of this body of citizens of Columbia. She felt they also needed to carefully address the implicit bias training provided to staff, and noted her examination of the training showed it actually reinforced bias instead of working toward dismantling it. More input was needed from people of color on the implicit bias training. They also needed to do better. They needed to be

more thoughtful and careful about the words they spoke and how those words affected other people. She stated there were calls for decorum toward the public and wondered where the decorum was in terms of non-elected representatives and employees addressing citizens. She felt the communication should not only affect City staff, but should also affect people appointed to boards and commissions. She commented that there was also a need to address the deficiencies they saw in public record policies governing boards and commissions. At this moment, the City did not assign clerks to all of the boards to assist in taking minutes and producing agendas or documents for public consumption. The City also did not record the meetings or make audio recordings available to the public without a sunshine law request. She felt that was unacceptable. The work that happened on boards and commissions was just as valuable as the work that happened at the City Council. She explained she had been attending the meeting of one of the boards for several months now and oftentimes she was the only person there. The public had stopped caring or had never cared. She believed the Council regarded boards and commissions as only advisory and unimportant to the policy-making process. They were not installing people with any expectation of knowledge about how the City operated, how public meetings were to function, the City Charter, or the laws and ordinances specific to that board. They were not installing people to represent the City that understood implicit bias and how to communicate with people they were appointed to represent. She noted she had attended meetings where 45 minutes were taken to teach them about Roberts Rules versus doing the tasks prescribed by their mission statements. She felt that was unacceptable. She questioned why they even had the board if it was not a functioning board, and why they were wasting time and resources by doing the absolute minimum. She felt that was disrespectful to the citizens of the City, and believed the act of not keeping proper records was an act of violence on the citizenship. The only people with access to that knowledge were people in positions of privilege. She pointed out she took time out of her life to be there meeting after meeting because she had the privilege to do so. She thought they needed to do better for everyone else. In addition to addressing policy deficiencies around non-elected employee communication, she asked for more robust record-keeping for boards and commissions. She did not feel it should be up to a group of volunteers to film and record meetings for the sake of public record as that was what taxpayers were paying City employees to do. She understood Mayor Treece had run for reelection on the platform of transparency, equity, and inclusion, and asked him to prove that by improving transparency and addressing the issues of equity or inclusion in communication. She felt changing the culture of the City needed to be a top down approach.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH29-19 Proposed construction of a single-lane roundabout with splitter islands and sidewalk at the intersections of Sinclair Road, Route K and Old Plank Road.

PH29-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer understood the original design had been altered to address concerns from some of the neighbors. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. Ms. Anderson explained the alignment had been tweaked to reduce the impact to homes in the Cascades neighborhood. Mr. Nichols noted they could only impact the wetland minimally, and they would be on the edge by shifting the alignment slightly to the south. Any further movement would require a mitigation of the wetland in some fashion. Mr. Pitzer understood this adjustment had not pushed them over that threshold with regard to the wetland. Mr. Nichols stated it had not.

Mr. Pitzer asked how construction would be coordinated if this was approved as there was nearby school construction and construction involving a roundabout on the northern

end of Sinclair Road. He also wondered if it would be done by the time the new school opened. Mr. Nichols replied it would be difficult. The north projects were taking longer than anticipated in terms of easement acquisitions. He commented that they did not need easements for this project, but they still had to complete the final design should Council authorize it. They had been thinking about how both ends would be impacted and how they wanted to coordinate it. He noted they would have further discussions about the schedule before moving forward.

Mr. Thomas understood this intersection currently involved a two-way stop with Route K going straight through without any traffic control. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct and pointed out it was offset. He noted the engineers had the foresight to know these connections were needed when the Cascades subdivision had been platted.

Mr. Thomas asked if there were any speed measurements of vehicles on Route K and any crash history for the location. Mr. Nichols replied there had been two crashes in 2017, but no crashes had been reported from 2012 through 2016. He stated he was unsure of the speed, but noted there had been quite a bit of public comment with regard to the speeds on Route K.

Mr. Thomas asked for the design speed for vehicles on the roundabout. David Hurt with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, the consultant for the project, replied the approaches to the roundabout were designed for a 25 mph speed. The design speed within the roundabout was slower. He explained it was a design guideline to lower the speeds within the roundabout so the geometric components of the roundabout were meant to slow cars down.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Travis Miller, 7501 Madison Creek Drive, commented that the project essentially started right behind his property. He stated he was in favor of the roundabout as the number of crashes reported versus the actual number of crashes was vastly different. At present, cars came down the hill toward Columbia on Route K much faster than the 45 mph speed limit, and he thought this project would really help to reduce speeds and make the area safer. He thanked staff for the adjustment as it would have a lesser impact on the walking trail, which had been a concern since kids utilized it. He noted the gap had been increased and understood there were plans in the future to plant trees between the roadway and sidewalk, which he thought was wonderful. He stated they supported the roundabout being constructed for safety and hoped the Council would approve the revised plan, which he felt was better for the neighborhood and the environment.

Cynthia Burlinson explained she co-owned a property with her ex-husband that had the largest frontage along this project of any private citizen. As Mr. Miller had expressed, she thanked staff for listening to them and addressing some of their concerns. She noted she had submitted written comments, which had been included in the agenda packet. She commented that the asphalt that would be removed from the existing roadbed would essentially become her front yard, and access to the straight road would be reduced from three to two points, which she noted was okay.

Mayor Treece asked where the third point of access was located. Ms. Burlinson replied it was to the left. She explained it was near the barn and was gravel.

Ms. Burlinson commented that the land where the Cascades neighborhood and the City-owned park were located had been the boyhood home of John Sam Williamson. When she had moved out to Sinclair Road, it had been gravel and there had been horses in the pasture. What everyone was now calling the wetland had been called a swamp. It was not a place where egrets landed and caught minnows. It really was a swamp. She understood someone from the Corps of Engineers had walked it and had determined it was a wetland, but she felt it was a muddy area that never dried and needed to be fixed. She pointed out it had not even existed prior to the Cascades neighborhood being developed and the Arrowhead Lake dam being closed as that had changed the watershed in that area. The water that ran down the ditches of the existing road had formed a wet area but not a wetland that should be protected. She commented that she had

participated in a very informal conversation with Mr. Griggs, the Director of the Parks and Recreation Department, who had indicated it was not something they had intended to preserve as a feature. Her desire was to have the rusty 70 year old barbwire and poison ivy removed when the roadbed was removed, and she had been informed that this would not happen as it had not been included in the budget. She stated it was unsightly. Currently, she had nice road frontage and curb appeal and that would be impacted when the existing road was removed. She noted she was also concerned about maintenance. She understood it would be reseeded once removed and wanted it maintained to residential standards as that would be her new front yard. She did not feel a twice per year park mowing schedule was appropriate. She pointed out she was willing to maintain it if something could be negotiated.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Nichols about the plans for that area. Mr. Nichols replied that was a detail that still needed to be addressed. He explained utilities were adjacent to it so they would have to have some discussion with regard to preserving access. If they abandoned the road, he thought it would go to the property owner on either side with the boundary being from the centerline. He reiterated they would need to address the situation with the utilities. Ms. Burlinson noted the City was the property owner to the east and she just wanted it to be functional for all of them. She did not feel the Parks and Recreation Department wanted one little strip of new grass on the other side of a wetland, which she believed was a mosquito swamp. She stated that was a piece of this plan that had not been addressed properly. Mayor Treece asked Ms. Burlinson if she would want to maintain it if she took possession of that property. Ms. Burlinson replied yes. If it was conceded to them in ownership, they would certainly maintain it as a front yard.

Ms. Burlinson explained another factor was the storm sewers as this would involve curb and gutter construction. A primary concern brought up at the public meeting at Rock Bridge Elementary School in May had been how surface water would be handled. She understood the underground pipes had been extended to carry water to the retention pit. She noted she was still concerned about an open storm sewer dumping water out onto the surface into the wetland, i.e., the mud that never dried. In response to Mr. Thomas she stated the speed on Route K was of great concern, especially coming from the south because one would be traveling downhill. There was also only about 200 yards from there to the new roundabout. Even though it was posted as 45 mph, people were traveling 60-70 mph. She felt something needed to be done to mitigate the speed as it was a heavily cycled path down to the river. She pointed out speeds coming down Sinclair Road were equally bad.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Burlinson if she was in support of the roundabout as a concept. Ms. Burlinson replied yes. She pointed out she had been involved in meetings when the Cascades subdivision was being considered where there had been discussion about realigning Old Plank Road and Sinclair Road. At that time, she had been told it was likely that the patch of grass mentioned would likely be conceded to her if that were to happen. She reiterated they were willing to maintain it if it was conceded to them.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, stated he was in support of this roundabout. He viewed this roundabout as being similar to the one at Vawter School Road and Scott Boulevard as it involved a lot of the same geometry and a hill from the south to the north. He noted he drove through that roundabout many times during the week and it had become a safe haven for coming and going. He believed people would change their behavior after driving on that roadway a few times, and felt it was a very good safety feature for the area.

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

Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans and specifications for construction of the Sinclair Road/Route K/Old Plank Road intersection improvement project while considering the comments they had heard tonight. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pitzer and approved

unanimously by voice vote.

PH30-19 Proposed construction of a storm drain replacement project on a portion of South Greenwood Avenue.

PH30-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer understood the memo indicated this project need had been identified in 1993 and asked if that was correct. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought that was correct. He explained he had not been with the City in 1993, but the committee that had worked to create a stormwater utility and charge monthly fees had identified multiple phases of projects to present to the community to include this project. Mr. Pitzer understood it had not been funded. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct and pointed out there were other projects that had been identified in that 1993 ballot issue that still needed to be addressed.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to proceed with the South Greenwood storm drain replacement project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH31-19 Proposed construction of the FY 2019 storm water rehabilitation improvement project along portions of Ann Street, Bluff Dale Drive, McKee Street, Ridgemont, Rollins Road at Brewer Drive and Sinclair Road.

PH31-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked how long the project on Bluff Dale Drive would take to complete. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought each one individually would be a 1-2 day project.

Ms. Peters commented that the one associated with Ann Street appeared to be lined from Ann Street heading east near Fyfer Place, and asked why it stopped short of Fyfer Place. Mr. Sorrell referred to the diagram and explained the area in the red circle identified the section that would be lined and it had a retaining wall and other items on top of the pipe so it would not be able to be excavated. In addition, the piece to the east, where it said HDPE, had already been dug up and replaced with plastic pipe within the last few years.

Mr. Ruffin asked how they were able to line pipes with concrete. Mr. Sorrell replied a fiberglass reinforced concrete was used, and a machine was placed into the pipe that pumped in and spun the concrete so it became a thicker and thicker layer. It essentially built a new pipe in the existing pipe if he understood the process correctly.

Mayor Treece asked if it would be possible to change the legend to reflect gender neutral language. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought that had been done and apologized.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Brian Johnstone, 711 Bluff Dale Drive, explained the stormwater pipe ran between his house and his neighbor's house and began at the end of a ravine on the east side of Bluff Dale Drive. He commented that he had been reporting problems with that stormwater pipe for almost five years. He noted he was against replacing the pipe in the manner suggested. He understood the City had paid for two different businesses to obtain a video record of the pipe. The first company had come almost two years ago and had been from St. Louis. He recalled them being concerned about putting their cameras into the pipe due to the number of holes and the concern of losing their camera. They had indicated to him that they had planned to recommend the entire pipe be replaced and that plastic pipe or a spun pipe would not be supported due the holes in the existing piping. He noted he concurred with that statement. He had provided pictures to Ms. Peters and others of stormwater coming down the ravine in a rush and of the pipe that emptied into the creek bed. There was not any water coming out of the pipe, but there was a cavity

around and under the pipe. The crew from St. Louis felt the problem was that they did not know the level of earth being taken out from beneath the pipe since water had been going through it for at least 3-4 years. He understood that in order to be successful in putting in a liner, all of the empty spaces needed to be filled in under the existing pipe, and that could not be seen or determined without digging there and taking the pipe out. He commented that a more successful crew had come from Kansas City about a year later, and they had encouraged him to watch the monitor throughout the process. He noted the stormwater pipe had about a foot of open space in the corrugated metal, and that crew had also stated the pipe needed to be replaced as there was no way to tell they could adequately support a spun plastic pipe.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Sorrell if this scope contemplated a complete replacement if they found the pipe had collapsed. Mr. Sorrell replied this scope only contemplated doing a rehabilitation of the pipe. He thought a wing-wall that came off of one building was on top of the pipe. In addition, some very large trees would be required to be removed if they had to replace the pipe. They hoped they could get the pipe rehabilitated without excavation. He explained they had worked on a pipe very similar to this a few years ago under Worley Street near the old Biscayne Mall and Columbia Mall intersection as the bottom of that pipe was missing a large section. They had grouted it, put the liner in, and then pumped the grout into all of the voids outside of the pipe. It had been about 25-28 feet under the street pavement and appeared to have worked well to date. If they could do something similar here, he was confident the rehabilitation would work. If they could not, they would be back before Council asking for it to be replaced through the traditional means of excavation.

Mr. Johnstone stated his concern was that he had been told all of these stormwater pipes had been put in around the same time so they would all have the same level of deterioration and soil erosion. He thought the City should do the right thing by each stormwater pipe by looking after it properly. He also felt the information provided about the projected lifetime of 50 years for the effectiveness of the spun-pipe was likely inaccurate as the company from Kansas City had indicated it could be as short as five years if they were not able to totally support it. Replacing the pipe would guarantee a lifetime of close to 50 years. With regard to the trees, he noted he loved trees and expected the City to exercise appropriate care in going through the area along with utilizing the most current technology. He thought someone with sufficient credentials should research the issue in terms of the trees. He also suggested looking into another way that stormwater line could be brought through, such as a different space. He felt the issue should be researched. He stated he was alarmed the City was moving forward with the polyplastic liner when both companies that had done the videography felt it would not work.

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

Mayor Treece stated he liked the idea of trying to move forward with the least intensive possible solution and understood they would do the right thing if the pipe needed to be replaced. Mr. Sorrell explained that if it became apparent that they would not be able to successfully line the pipe, they would not proceed, and they would then come back to Council asking to excavate it in order to replace it.

Ms. Peters made a motion directing staff to proceed with the FY2019 Stormwater Infrastructure Rehabilitation Project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Ms. Peters commented that she understood the concerns of Mr. Johnstone, but noted she was not impressed with the advice of those from the larger cities of St. Louis and Kansas City, and would prefer to try lining it. If that did not work, they would then have to go forward with a project that would be more invasive and likely involve ripping up the street. If she recalled correctly, the storm drain also went right beside the foundation of a house so it would be a bigger issue if they had to dig there. If that was what they had to do, she was confident Mr. Sorrell would be back before them asking to move forward in that direction.

The motion made by Ms. Peters and seconded by Mr. Skala directing staff to proceed with the FY 2019 stormwater infrastructure rehabilitation project was approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH32-19 Proposed construction of the FY 2019 sanitary sewer rehabilitation project.

PH32-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas commented that there were not any maps or further information about the project. In addition, he believed the contact log was a replica for the contract log of the previous item. Mr. Sorrell explained there had been one meeting for both projects. As a result, the attendees were the same. Mr. Thomas understood feedback was provided for the sewer project and the stormwater project. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas noted it would have been nice to have maps or to have been provided more information about the individual projects. Mr. Sorrell explained staff was still finalizing the exact locations. If Council approved moving forward with the project, they would have the maps with the legislation authorizing them to construct.

Mr. Thomas understood this was the latest for the project that had also involved lining areas in the Flat Branch and County House Branch watersheds. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct and noted they had been doing this annually for about five years. They had rehabilitated about 31 miles of pipe to date. Mr. Thomas asked if it averaged about \$3 million per year. Mr. Sorrell replied it had been about \$2.7 million. It was a little higher this year.

Ms. Peters asked if the sanitary sewers near Aldeah Avenue and just north of Broadway had been relined. Mr. Sorrell replied not all of them. He noted those along drainage ways or those identified as being a significant source of inflow and infiltration or structurally deficient had been addressed. He pointed out there were still some private common collectors that needed to be addressed. Ms. Peters asked about the plans to address those. Mr. Sorrell replied they were working on them in areas within the Flat Branch watershed now, and that would likely continue for several years.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp stated he was pleased this project was moving to the Bear Creek watershed as it certainly had its own issues even though it did not receive as much attention as other areas.

Mr. Skala commented that he viewed these as programmatic expenditures.

Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to proceed with the FY 2019 sanitary sewer rehabilitation project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH33-19 Consider the FY 2020 Capital Improvement Project Plan for the City of Columbia, Missouri.

PH33-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked for a description of the alignment and design of the Discovery Parkway project. Mr. Glascock replied that if he recalled correctly, it had been built out to the edge of the University's tract so it essentially went from Highway 63 to New Haven Road across the South Farm property. He noted they had worked with the University to establish that alignment when the Discovery Parkway interchange had been built. He thought they had also donated the right-of-way or that was in process. Mr. Nichols clarified it was in process. Mr. Glascock pointed out part of the alignment had already been graded. Mr. Thomas asked for the length of the project. Mr. Glascock replied about two miles. Mr. Thomas asked if there was travel demand for the connection. Mr. Glascock replied there would be because there would then be a connection to Lake of the Woods via Grace Lane and people could avoid the Highway 63 and I-70 interchange.

Mr. Thomas stated he had had some serious concerns about the Discovery Parkway project, particularly in light of the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP), which had been adopted unanimously at their last meeting. In the transportation section, they were anticipating very significant reductions in private vehicle travel within the City as a whole over the next 15 and 30 years. He did not believe the Long Range Transportation Plan, the Major Roadway Plan, or the Capital Improvement Project Plan for streets had been reviewed in alignment with the CAAP and the mode-share changes that needed to be accomplished in order to meet the CAAP goals. He understood this was only a public hearing and they were not voting on it, but felt there were a lot of projects in the Long Range Transportation Plan that needed to be evaluated again the CAAP and the Vision Zero Plan as these types of roadways created a much higher likelihood of fatalities and serious injury crashes. He also believed they needed to consider social equity as they poured millions of dollars into sprawl inducing highways at the edge of town.

Mr. Thomas understood there was \$2.8 million in the fiscal year 2020 budget and asked if that was for design. Mr. Nichols replied it had been designed. Mr. Thomas understood construction would begin in fiscal year 2021 and asked about the purpose of the \$2.8 million. Ms. Peveler replied it was money that would be used toward the construction. She explained Council had expressed some concern about a the big balances in development fees, county road taxes, etc., and wanted to know what projects would be completed with those funds. As a result, staff planned to allocate those funds. Mr. Thomas understood it was only allocating the money from one account to another, but it would not be spent until fiscal year 2021. Ms. Peveler pointed out that it was a project that had been identified to be funded when the capital improvement sales tax had passed. Mr. Thomas stated he felt there were better things they could do with the money. Mr. Glascock thought the money had to be used for collectors or arterials. Mr. Nichols noted the development fee money did. Mr. Glascock understood that was the fund from where this money had come.

Mr. Pitzer noted there were a number of projects under the other general government category, such as building repairs for the armory, the Health Department building, the police station, etc., and asked if that was the same situation whereby they were allocating funds with a balance to specific projects. Ms. Peveler replied this did not involve a balance. This was actually new money. Normally, they would put some money in a project called public buildings major maintenance renovation (00021), but a building facility assessment had been completed last year and these were projects they had identified that needed to be done to facilities. This would be an annual ask and staff would show the Council the projects that were on the list.

Mr. Pitzer thought a series of repairs and upgrades had been done to the police station recently. Mr. Nichols explained the Police Department had its own funding for renovations, and this \$300,000 would be for some of the maintenance that was the responsibility of the Building Maintenance Division. Mr. Glascock noted the pump had just gone out of the elevator so it needed to be replaced. In addition, he had been told the HVAC appeared to be ready to go out. Those items still needed to be repaired. Mr. Pitzer asked for clarification as to why it had not been included in the two year renovation of the building. Mr. Glascock replied that had involved space allocation money for capital improvements inside of the building. Mr. Pitzer understood it was from the 4.1 percent general sales tax, and asked if that was the money that had been previously allocated to repair projects such as this. Ms. Peveler replied a portion of it had been. They would allocate \$100,000-\$150,000 every year to the annual public buildings major maintenance fund. Mr. Pitzer asked about the balance of the 4.1 percent. Ms. Peveler replied it went into the public improvement fund and could be allocated out. She thought they had allocated some money to the fire station from it last year. Mr. Glascock explained the public improvement fund was the catch-all account for those types of items. Mr. Pitzer asked if there were amounts over that \$900,000 or if that was the entire amount. He wondered if any money would still go into the public improvement fund. Ms. Peveler

replied she thought there would be, but would need to check. She pointed out a factor was that it was dependent on the sales tax estimate.

Ms. Peters understood the Grissum Building needed some repair work last year, but it had been delayed, and asked if that would be done this year. She noted she did not see it on the list. Ms. Peveler replied it was within the other general government category at \$4 million. Mr. Nichols stated it had been funded by the ballot initiative in 2015.

Mayor Treece asked if the vehicle wash bay was for the landfill facility that had been anticipated to be included when the building was constructed, but had later been dropped. Mr. Sorrell replied it had been bid as an alternate to the original project, but they had not had sufficient funding then to build it. They had put in the groundwork for it, and were now hoping to move forward with construction of it. Mayor Treece asked if it was like an oversized car wash. Mr. Sorrell replied yes. Mayor Treece asked why it was so expensive. Mr. Sorrell replied because it was a huge oversized car wash that involved a lot of steel, and the cost of steel had increased dramatically. Mayor Treece commented that it seemed to be a major preventative for future repairs. Mr. Sorrell stated it would be very beneficial to have it on-site.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, commented that the water projects within the CIP Plan for fiscal year 2020 totaled \$2,825,000, and there had not been a breakdown in the document provided showing what portions came from the enterprise fund versus the bond fund. In review of information provided to the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB), \$1,625,000 would come from enterprise funds and \$1,150,000 would come from bond funds. In the financial projections developed for the water bond issue, a segment had shown the future capital improvement project funding for five years at \$350,000. If all of the projections were based on \$350,000, one might wonder from where the remaining \$1,300,000 would come. He pointed out there was only one answer and that was increased water rates of about 5-6 percent. He commented that this did not make sense and felt staff owed the Council an explanation. When looking at the list of projects, each project had an account number, which was related to an existing CIP account, and many of those accounts had an existing balance of funds, which could include pooled cash and an old bond issue. He used the annual close loops fund as an example and noted the pooled cash totaled \$248,270 and the prior bond totaled \$89,220. They were now putting an additional \$300,000 in it for fiscal year 2020 so there would be \$637,490 in that account. He suggested staff supplement this report in terms of transparency so the Council knew the balance of each account on October 1, 2019. He referred the annual main relocation for streets and highways and pointed out there was almost \$1.5 million in the existing account and another \$400,000 would be added to it in fiscal year 2020. He noted they had not used the funds that were in there now and were adding more to it. He wondered about the reasoning for putting more money into the account. He acknowledged that there were likely a lot of water mains to replace, but felt the Council needed to know the balances for transparency purposes. He stated they also needed to know what the plan was for those funds so they could decide if more money needed to be put into those accounts. He moved on to the electric CIP projects and noted those totaled \$34,650,000. The portion from enterprise funds was \$5,560,000 and the portion from the electric bond was \$29,000,000. He noted the comments he made for the water utility and its projects were applicable to the electric utility and its projects. He reiterated he believed the Council needed supplemental information in order to better define needs. He stated that as of March 31, there was \$19,000,000 in the water and electric utility cash fund on the balance sheet and \$22,000,000 in the enterprise cash fund. If Council approved the fiscal year 2020 CIP, it would provide an additional \$34,650,000 in electric and \$2,825,000 in water. The total would then be \$78,000,000. If they included the \$15,590,000 approved for the water bond issue, they would be up to over \$93,000,000. He wondered whether there was a sufficient workforce to engage and administer a \$94,000,000 CIP program.

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

Mayor Treece asked if staff could respond to the comments of Mr. Conway. He wondered if they were double counting any figures and whether the funds left in the accounts were obligated. Mr. Williams replied there were several ongoing projects that currently had funding in them and would be spent down during the course of the year. The monies available today might not be there on October 1. In fact, a couple of water projects would be approved later tonight as they were on the consent agenda. Where they had annual projects, it was typically an amount of funding they knew they would need. He provided the annual water main replacements as an example and explained they knew they would replace approximately \$700,000 or so worth of water mains on an annual basis. They did not know exactly what they would do over the course of the year on October 1. He stated they typically tried to partner to get the most out of this money and were able to stretch those dollars as far as possible. Mayor Treece asked if those large round numbers came to Council in the form of individual projects. Mr. Williams replied yes. As an annual project was identified to move forward, they would typically go through the public improvement process, which started with an interested parties meeting, followed by a public hearing, authority to construct and acquire easements if necessary, etc.

Mayor Treece asked if there would be a better way to portray the data so there was more transparency. Mr. Glascock replied staff needed to review processes to ensure they were transparent and people understood what they were doing. He agreed there could be a better way, especially with those annual project funds. Ms. Peveler stated they had started to try to improve the process with streets and sidewalks. They had actually identified several annual traffic safety projects to put the money into. She noted they had heard the Council and were starting to do that.

Mr. Skala felt there at least needed to be some explanation with respect to bond funding and enterprise funding as he believed it would be useful. Ms. Peveler replied staff could provide that as part of the budget work session in August.

Ms. Peters asked if there was also a way to identify the projects that had been completed. She wondered if they could show the capital improvement projects completed over the last five years on the website. Ms. Peveler pointed out the CIP document was on the website so someone could look at it from year to year, but noted there was not a listing of the projects completed on the website. Mr. Glascock stated staff was in the process of developing a dashboard. He understood the Parks and Recreation Department did a good job of showing what they had done, and they were trying to do something where they could show all City projects in a consistent manner.

Mr. Pitzer understood if they placed \$500,000 in an annual project account, they might not spend that \$500,000 in a 12-month period. He asked if there was a process to monitor balances and identify needs. Mr. Williams replied they looked at the CIP at the beginning of the budget process and reviewed the current fund balance along with the projects for which they needed funding. They then determined what they might need moving forward. If they did an average of \$500,000 per year and had a balance of about \$200,000, they would reduce the amount needed for the following fiscal year to roughly \$300,000 unless they knew they would need more. He explained it depended on the annual project category. Mr. Glascock pointed out annual accounts provided flexibility in case something came up. If the money was tied to a specific project, it would have to go back to Council for a transfer to a different project. He understood this needed to change somewhat to provide more transparency. Mr. Pitzer agreed, but noted they also needed the ability to respond to emergencies.

Mayor Treece noted additional comments on this could be made as part of the budget hearings in August and September.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B162-19 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code to change the name of the “Columbia Community Development Commission” to the “Housing and Community Development Commission” and updating requirements relating to membership, meetings, duties and responsibilities, and conflicts of interest.

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

B162-19 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:

B170-19 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code relating to the private source inflow and infiltration reduction program.

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

Mr. Thomas asked if staff had explored the possibility of means testing the financial assistance grants. Mr. Sorrell replied the report from the May 20, 2019 Council Meeting had discussed financial means. He understood there was a minor home repair program that was administered through Community Development that had a maximum interest-free loan of up to \$5,000 with the first \$1,000 actually being a grant. He stated the maximum reimbursement at 50 percent for the program was \$5,000 so that program would allow a property owner to get up to \$5,000 interest-free for a \$10,000 improvement.

Mr. Thomas asked how the means was tested for the other program. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not know. Mr. Thomas explained the reason he was asking was because the utilities already had a program for low-income homeowners. Mr. Cole replied they income qualified every participant that applied and it was 80 percent or below the area median income for gross income. They looked at two months of bank statements, paystubs, last year’s tax returns, etc. It was a fairly rigorous process similar to someone applying for a bank loan.

Mr. Thomas understood people could apply through that program to pay for these kinds of improvements. Mr. Cole stated that was correct. He explained they had met as a staff and had explored how their funds could work together. It would stretch their dollars that were already being utilized for that program by expanding what they could do.

Mr. Thomas asked if this was well known and if it was advertised. Mr. Cole replied they advertised the rehabilitation and minor home repair programs. He noted they had not advertised it for this specific program, but had listed it as something they did, so they often had people that applied. He stated they currently had a waitlist so he believed it was starting to become more known. Mr. Thomas suggested the neighborhood associations in the area of Aldeah Avenue and other areas where the inflow problems were happening be notified. Mr. Cole explained that after staff had met, they thought an ongoing project might be a good test case, and they were working through that test case now. He thought they would regroup afterward to see where they could do more. Mr. Thomas stated he appreciated the fact it had been explored.

Mayor Treece asked if the \$1,000 and \$1,500 dollar amounts were enough. Mr. Sorrell replied there were a lot of different ways to eliminate an area drain, and one way was to install a sump pump, which could be done for \$1,500.

B170-19 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:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B161-19 Approving the Final Plat of "Academy Village Plat 3" located southeast of the Green Meadows Road and Carter Lane roundabout; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 120-2019).
- B163-19 Authorizing assignment of interests in grants of easements from Conley Road Transportation Development District relating to the recently completed Conley Road to East Business Loop 70 extension project.
- B164-19 Authorizing a lease agreement and temporary construction easement with Wendling Development, LLC for construction, operation and maintenance of a public transit shelter and pad on the east side of Carter Lane, approximately 200 feet from the intersection of Carter Lane and Green Meadows Road.
- B165-19 Authorizing the acquisition of additional easements for the Nifong Boulevard corridor improvement project between Providence Road and Forum Boulevard/Willowcreek Lane.
- B166-19 Authorizing the replacement of storm drainage and sanitary sewer infrastructure along a portion of Garth Avenue north of Lynn Street; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B167-19 Authorizing the extension of two 13.8 kilovolt electrical feeder circuits from the Rebel Hill Substation to the proposed ten (10) megawatt Truman Solar Facility located east of Burnside Drive; authorizing the Purchasing Division to issue a contract for a portion of the work utilizing a duly authorized term and supply contractor.
- B168-19 Authorizing a master power purchase and sale agreement confirmation letter with NextEra Energy Marketing, LLC for a capacity exchange as it relates to Midcontinent Independent System Operator's (MISO's) resource adequacy requirements.
- B169-19 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for replacement of the water distribution infrastructure along Country Club Drive South and Elliott Drive.
- B171-19 Amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by appropriating funds from the Sanitary Sewer Utility Fund retained earnings account to various FY 2019 sanitary sewer capital improvement projects.
- B172-19 Amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by appropriating funds from the sale of Water and Electric System Revenue Bonds to various FY 2019 water capital improvement projects.
- B173-19 Accepting conveyances for sewer purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B174-19 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- R100-19 Setting a public hearing; consider the installation of a traffic calming device on William Street between Broadway and Rollins Street.
- R101-19 Granting a temporary waiver from the requirements of Section 16-185 of

the City Code to allow possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages associated with the 2019 Hot Summer Nights - The Texas Tenors Street Dance event.

- R102-19 Authorizing an aviation project consultant agreement with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. to provide engineering and architectural services relating to the design and construction of a new airport terminal 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, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

None.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B175-19 Approving a major amendment to Lot 102A of the Copperstone Commercial C-P Plan by approving the PD Plan for "Copperstone Lot 102A" located on the west side of Frontgate Drive and approximately 300 feet south of Vawter School Road (4015 Frontgate Drive); approving a statement of intent; providing that approval of the PD Plan shall constitute approval of the preliminary subdivision plat for Copperstone Lot 102A; granting design modifications relating to entry door orientation, installation of landscape screening, installation of buffering, reductions in front yard setbacks, and reductions in minimum lot sizes; setting forth a condition relating to the construction of Frontgate Lane (Case No. 122-2019).
- B176-19 Changing the uses allowed within the C-P Development Plan for "The Broadway Shops" located northeast of the intersection of Broadway and Trimble Road (2703 E. Broadway); approving a statement of intent (Case No. 136-2019).
- B177-19 Approving the Final Plat of "Copperstone Plat 7C" located on the south side of Copperstone Creek Drive and west of Copperstone Court (4004 and 4006 Copperstone Creek Drive) (Case No. 134-2019).
- B178-19 Vacating utility easements on Lots 3 and 4 within Kitty Hawk Manor - Plat No. 4 located north and south of Kitty Hawk Drive and west of Stinson Avenue (Case No. 127-2019).
- B179-19 Authorizing an agreement with Columbia Community Land Trust, Inc. for the transfer of real estate and reservation of homeownership assistance neighborhood development funding for City-owned properties located at 6 Fourth Avenue and 19 Third Avenue.
- B180-19 Authorizing construction of the Third Avenue Alley restoration project, located between Third Avenue, Forest Avenue, Garth Avenue and Grand Avenue; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

- B181-19 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of the Third Avenue Alley restoration project, located between Third Avenue, Forest Avenue, Garth Avenue and Grand Avenue.
- B182-19 Amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for maintenance and repairs to the Eighth Street and Walnut Street (Plaza) parking structure.
- B183-19 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Black & Veatch Corporation for construction phase and resident project representative services for the Wastewater Treatment Plant Phase 2 Improvements - Digester Complex project; amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B184-19 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code as it relates to accounts receivable collection and write-off policies and procedures.
- B185-19 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the 2019 Missouri State Senior Games and Show-Me STATE GAMES.
- B186-19 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the FY 2019 summer food service program.

X. REPORTS

- REP61-19 Appointment of City Representatives to the Board of Equalization.

Ms. Thompson provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Thompson if the County Assessor had expressed any opinion different than that of hers. Ms. Thompson replied she had not talked with the County Assessor. She explained she had spoken with the County Counselor and neither one of them could point to anything other than the statute that indicated the City was allowed the same number of appointees it had when it had become a charter city.

Mayor Treece stated he thought they needed to preserve two slots. He noted he had personally received a lot of complaints about the eight percent reassessment. He explained it was something the City did not control or could influence. They only had a role in the appeals process.

Mr. Skala stated he thought it was important to restore the number of slots to which the City was entitled.

Mayor Treece asked if the Council wanted to appoint the Mayor or his designee to the Board of Equalization in the interest of urgency, or if they would like to advertise and obtain candidates.

Mr. Skala asked if there would be a term for the appointees. Ms. Thompson replied there was no set term for the City designees. The County appointments were three year appointments. In the future, she thought it would be wise for the City to have some continuity on the Board. She stated she would be hesitant to suggest a three-year appointment tonight due to the time constraint. She explained it would be a short active period, but would likely involve quite a bit of activity in that short period of time. After the appeals were done, the work of the Board of Equalization was complete for the year. As a result, the Council would have the opportunity to revisit the issue in January or February.

Mr. Skala thought the prudent thing to do was to appoint someone in this capacity for the interim period, and to then go through the regular process to determine the representative in addition to the Finance Director or his/her designee.

Mayor Treece asked what the Council thought about having a City employee like the

Finance Director on the Board of Equalization. Mr. Skala replied he rather liked the idea of staff being involved in it.

Mayor Treece commented that he wanted the property owner who had appealed his or her assessment to have a fair appeals process and wondered if there might not be a perception of bias with a government official that relied on tax dollars on the Board.

Mr. Pitzer understood there were four elected County officials on the Board so it seemed appropriate for there to be an elected City representative with the second position being appointed by the Council. He noted there were a couple citizen at-large positions the County appointed.

Mr. Skala thought it would be interesting to discuss who they would appoint, but felt there was some urgency now.

Ms. Peters asked Mr. Pitzer if he was suggesting someone on the City Council and then a citizen that was appointed by the Council for this year. Mr. Skala noted the precedent had been the Finance Director or a designee, and suggested the second position be someone from the City Council. Mr. Pitzer noted he thought Mayor Treece had volunteered. Mayor Treece clarified he had volunteered for the opportunity to appoint a designee.

Ms. Thompson stated she believed the Assistant Finance Director had been attending the meetings that had been held around the end of June. Those meetings had not been for the purposes of appeal. Mr. Glascock pointed out the Assistant Finance Director was a permanent employee.

Mayor Treece thought they could notice it and make appointments in two weeks if necessary. Ms. Thompson explained she was concerned they would lose the opportunity to participate in the appeals process because those were scheduled and she did not believe they would wait for a City representative. Mr. Glascock thought the City would only have one representative. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct because they could continue with the Finance Director or his/her designee, but suggested the Council formally make the appointment by motion if they wanted it to continue to be the Finance Director or his/her designee.

Mr. Trapp stated that seemed appropriate since that person had been a part of it. They could revisit the issue later. In addition, they could add the second person. Mayor Treece asked when it could be changed. Ms. Peters replied January or February.

Mayor Treece commented that the problem was that the reassessments had recently been distributed so most people were filing appeals now and there would not be anything to review in January. Ms. Thompson pointed out the deadline to file appeals had already passed. They were in the hearing process now.

Mayor Treece stated he preferred not to have a City employee on the Board, but he was also concerned about appointing someone that had not applied for it or agreed to serve.

Mr. Pitzer asked how they had become aware of this. Mr. Glascock replied the person that had been serving was no longer employed. Ms. Thompson explained they found out when that person had received a meeting notice via the monitoring of emails.

Ms. Peters suggested they set this up like they did other boards and commissions so this could be addressed in a more timely fashion in the future.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Pitzer if he would be willing to serve.

Mr. Pitzer asked how long the appeal season ran. Ms. Thompson replied she thought it was 30 days or less because the assessment books were due in August. She believed they were due by August 15. She noted there was a process whereby the property owner could appeal to the State Tax Commission if he or she was not satisfied with the decision of the Board of Equalization. All of that had to be completed in enough time to allow taxing jurisdictions to set their tax levy. She reiterated it was a short window and that they would likely lose their opportunity to participate in most of the appeals if they waited until July 15 to make the appointment.

Mr. Ruffin understood the City currently had informal representation, and that needed to be formalized. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. Since 1980, it had been done

with a member of the Finance Department as the appointee.

Mr. Skala suggested they continue the way it was via the Finance Director or his/her designee, which in this case would likely be the Assistant Finance Director. He also suggested the second appointee be a member of the Council.

Mr. Pitzer stated he would do it.

Mr. Trapp thought that was a great solution.

Mayor Treece asked if it could be fixed later. He thought having two at-large members or an elected and an at-large member would be better.

Mayor Treece made a motion to appoint Mr. Pitzer and the Finance Director or his/her designee to the Board of Equalization.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a time frame for when they had to make these appointments or notify the County of the appointments when they readdressed this in January. Ms. Thompson replied there was not a time frame. In addition, there were not any qualifications attached to the City appointees like there were for the County appointees. She thought it was good practice to use the same criteria, but it was not statutorily required. Mayor Treece asked for the next reassessment year. Ms. Thompson replied in two years, but pointed out there was a potential for this at any particular point in time due to new assessments. She suggested they review the issue again in January or February.

Mayor Treece noted another option would be to appoint the Chair of the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee. Mr. Skala thought that merited discussion, but suggested that be done after the budget season.

Mayor Treece asked if reassessments were done every three years by the County. Ms. Thompson replied every two years. Mayor Treece commented that in the interim, they should finalize that and appoint them. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

The motion made by Mayor Treece to appoint Mr. Pitzer and the Finance Director or his/her designee to the Board of Equalization was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

REP62-19 FY 2020 Annual Budget - Downtown Community Improvement District.

Mayor Treece understood the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) was required by statute to submit their budget to the Council for comment.

Ms. Peters explained she drove through downtown Columbia at 6:30 a.m. frequently and noted it was great to see their staff cleaning up from the evening before. She thought they did a great job.

REP63-19 FY 2020 Annual Budget - Business Loop Community Improvement District.

Mayor Treece noted the Business Loop Community Improvement District (CID) was required by statute to submit their budget to the Council for comment.

REP64-19 Flat Branch Park Expansion Project Update.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece understood the conversation would continue. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mayor Treece noted staff had Council direction if the conversation stopped. Mr. Glascock agreed.

REP65-19 Amendment to the FY 2019 Annual Budget - Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds.

Mayor Treece understood this had been provided for informational purposes.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, commented that B172-19, which had been a part of the consent agenda, involved the appropriation of bond proceeds for water capital

improvement projects that had been identified in the fiscal year 2019 budget and totaled \$13,250,000. From his reading of the bond documents, \$14,500,000 had been allotted to water projects. He wondered about the \$1,250,000 difference as it had not been disclosed in the memo, and thought that was important to explain.

With regard to the \$1,675,000 from enterprise funds in the water utility versus the \$350,000 for all five years the public had been told based on financial projections, Mr. Conway asked the Council to stand firm on the \$350,000 and not raise the water rates to generate the \$1,300,000. He felt that was only fair.

Mr. Conway explained that on January 30 at about 11:30 p.m., his wife had a heart attack so he had called 911 to respond. Firefighters from Fire Station 6 or 7 had responded and had saved her life, which they appreciated. He pointed out the proposed new fire station at the corner of Scott Boulevard and Route KK would assist with future fire rescue needs.

Mr. Thomas noted the CAAP had a section on waste and reducing waste generation, and understood the Office of Sustainability had an inventory of reusable plates, knives, forks, etc. He suggested those be used and someone be assigned to clean and prepare them for the next pre-council meeting instead of generating a lot of waste from disposable plates and utensils. He asked if that could be done.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a dishwasher in the room so they could load those items themselves so staff was not picking up after them. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know, but would check. He noted there was one on the second floor that could be used. Mayor Treece explained that would be his only concern.

Mr. Glascock stated staff would work toward that outcome, but was not sure it would be ready by the next meeting.

Ms. Peters commented that Barbara Wren had contacted her about the proposed Shepard to Rollins Trail as she and others wanted to revisit the issue. She noted she had told Ms. Wren she did not believe the Council would place a moratorium on the trail. She stated Ms. Wren and others were concerned about emergency access in terms of police and fire services. She informed Council that she had asked Mr. Glascock to check with the Police Chief and Fire Chief, who both thought access would be okay, about a meeting with the neighbors. As a result, a meeting would be organized to address their questions about safety and crime. She stated they were interacting with them and would continue to do so, but did not feel they should revisit the construction of the trail again.

Mayor Treece commented that he had asked for the traditional construction management meeting with the interested parties before the contractor started the work so they were more aware of the impacts.

Ms. Peters explained she had asked that the residents be provided information every week or so with regard to the project so they knew what to expect, and noted Mr. Glascock would facilitate that engagement. Mr. Glascock stated he and Mr. Sapp would develop a communications plan for that area.

Mr. Skala agreed the trail issue had been decided and had even been adjudicated in court. The advice he had given when he had been asked was for them to do what they could in terms of remediation after the fact. He thought that was where the efforts should be focused.

Mr. Skala stated he had recently attended a Racial Equity and Leadership (REAL) Council meeting in Indianapolis and had asked the City Clerk to send out information he had gleaned from the agenda for that meeting along with some handouts, which included links to resources. He noted a report would soon be released with regard to the road to affordable housing. They hoped to educate all of the National League of Cities (NLC) boards, commissions, and staff in terms of equity training. He commented that this fit into the efforts of the City with the \$50,000 that had been set aside, and felt it was

important to use some of that money in conjunction with some of the local people that had been involved in these efforts for a long time. He understood they would talk more about this in the future.

Mr. Glascock noted the RFP had been drafted.

Mr. Skala suggested anyone wanting to receive the list of resources to contact him.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Council would have the opportunity to see the RFP. He wondered if it would need the approval of Council. Mr. Glascock replied the Council had already approved the concepts, but staff could send it to them. Mr. Skala thought it would be worthwhile to have a discussion on it.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece wished everyone a safe and happy Fourth of July and adjourned the meeting without objection at 9:35 p.m.