



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, September 21, 2020
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, September 21, 2020, 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 TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, and FOWLER 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 17, 2020 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mayor Treece.

Mayor Treece explained the minutes of the regular meeting of September 8, 2020 were not yet complete.

Ms. Fowler asked that R113-20 and B243-20 be moved from the consent agenda to new business and old business respectively.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B243-20 being moved to old business and R113-20 being moved to new business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Skala.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI13-20

COVID-19 Update.

Ms. Browning provided an update.

Mr. Skala asked if the reduction of time with regard to contact tracing was due to people being better accommodated to the job and the additional staff that had been hired. Ms. Browning replied the additional staff had definitely helped.

Ms. Browning continued with the update.

Ms. Fowler asked if interview completion meant interview and outreach completion or just the interview of the person that had tested positive. Ms. Browning replied a case investigator interviewed those that tested positive, and that was about 2.7 days out on average. She noted some took longer because the person did not answer their phone. She pointed out that was the average for both the University of Missouri and the City/County Health Department combined. Ms. Fowler understood that once they were able to contact the person, the interview was completed in either a little over 10 hours or 24 hours. Ms. Browning stated that was correct. Ms. Fowler asked when they reached out to the contacts. Ms. Browning replied that information was collected during the case investigation, and the contact information was then given to the contract tracing team, who then reached out to all of the contacts. Ms. Fowler asked how long that took. Ms. Browning referred to the diagram which showed the numbers. She explained they had gone down to about an hour for interview completion with the contacts. Ms. Fowler understood the average was about two days for the person that had tested positive, and once they had all of the hours loaded, they were down to 10 hours and 16 minutes. Ms. Browning replied they were now down to 1 hour and 2 minutes.

Ms. Browning and Mr. Clardy continued providing the update.

Mr. Skala asked if the difference in the amount of time it took to obtain the test results was within or between labs. Mr. Clardy replied there was an out of town lab that one provider seemed to use all of time, and it was sometimes 7-14 days before they had the results. He noted it was one particular lab.

Mr. Clardy continued with the update.

Mayor Treece asked if the City/County Health Department received independent data directly from the lab that was conducting the tests. He understood the positive results were sent to them, and asked if they received the negative results. Mr. Clardy replied no. He explained they only received the positive results.

Mr. Clardy continued with the update.

Ms. Fowler understood the definition of the positivity rate was the total number of positive cases of the total number of cases of tests taken, and that more negative cases would lower the positivity rate. She stated she found it curious that the demand for testing was down. Mr. Clardy explained two things affected the positivity rate. One was if they had more positive cases and the other was if they had more negative cases. More positive cases would drive it up, and more negative cases would drive it down. He commented that they needed to have plenty of testing, and pointed out there were some free testing events that did not require a doctor's order. Considering the size of Boone County, the uptick on that had not been as much as he had anticipated. In addition, they had seen very few positives. He explained they needed to consider whether they were testing enough people any time there was a positivity rate of above five percent. He felt they needed to increase testing, but that would not happen if there was not a call for it. The hospitals and healthcare systems that were providing testing were not going to devote staff to something from which they could not get revenue.

Ms. Fowler asked Mr. Clardy if he was concerned that people had come to the conclusion that testing was hard to get or that they thought they would not be eligible for "no barrier, no cost, no show of insurance card" testing. She wondered if that was the reason they were not seeing enough demand for testing. Mr. Clardy replied they had advertised the testing that Compass and the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services had in as many ways as they could. They had utilized social media and he had tried to mention it every time he had conducted an interview. In addition, they had sent the information out to a wide variety of partners asking them to distribute it through their networks. He noted they were open to ideas for better ways to advertise it. They wanted as many people as possible that wanted to be tested to take advantage of it. Ms. Fowler asked if they had looked at evening testing or other odd hours as some people were not able to attend due to work. Mr. Clardy replied the testing conducted by the State had been from 12:00 p.m.-7:00 p.m. on the first day and from 7:00 a.m.-12:00 p.m. on the following day. He understood that might not accommodate shift workers, but there had been a 12-hour time period within two days that had hopefully provided a time for someone to get tested.

Mr. Pitzer understood they had changed the way positive cases had been reported and that they were now reported by the date of the test taken. Mr. Clardy stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked if today's 16 cases had been taken on the same day. Mr. Clardy replied no. He referred to the information hub, which showed the number of tests each day, and explained that information was by the date of collection. They had 16 positive cases, and those had not necessarily been conducted on the same date. Tomorrow, when they updated the information hub, it would be clearer as to when the tests were taken.

Mr. Pitzer understood the 16 cases had been reported to the City/County Health Department over the last 24 hours, but those tests could have been taken any time in the last two weeks, and that would remain the case. Mr. Clardy stated that was correct. He explained it was why they would tie them to the day they were tested and adjust the positivity rate based on the date if necessary. This was in place of adjusting it based on

the date they had received the information. He noted it was not a measure of the fact they were positive today. A positive test was a measure of the fact the person was positive on the day the specimen was collected. He stated that was the way they wanted to represent it in the data. Mr. Skala understood it normalized the time between the test and when it was reported. Mr. Pitzer understood they had a daily series of positive case numbers and that was by the test date. Mr. Clardy stated that was correct in terms of what was on the information hub. He noted they had changed the label on it as it was previously identified as the number of positive tests by date reported. It was now the number of positive tests by date of test.

Ms. Browning continued with the update.

Mayor Treece asked for the next set of milestones Ms. Browning would follow so they could follow along as well. Ms. Browning replied they were looking for a declining number of cases along with hospital capacity and the other normal benchmarks. She noted they needed to also look at testing as she was concerned by the fact the number of tests taken was lower.

Mr. Skala asked if the issuance of some of these health orders was dependent upon a 2-3 week incubation period from a significant event. Ms. Browning replied yes, and pointed out the next significant event would be this weekend since there would be a home University of Missouri football game. Mr. Skala asked if something like the Lake of the Ozarks motorcycle rally impacted Columbia and Boone County. Ms. Browning replied it should be a factor for the entire State. She commented that if one viewed the State website with regard to the number of cases, one would see that the biggest increase in cases currently was in rural Missouri. The top ten percent of fastest growing number of cases were within rural counties, not within the metro areas.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the City/County Health Department had started to do any work in terms of preparation for a potential vaccine. He wondered if they had spoken to the State with regard to their role. Ms. Browning replied the planners had been working on this for about six weeks. If it was anything like it had been with H1N1, the City/County Health Department would be a recipient of the vaccine and would distribute it to different partners to administer based on priorities. Mr. Pitzer understood they had eventually gotten to the point of walk-in vaccinations with H1N1. Ms. Browning stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked Ms. Browning if she anticipated something similar in this situation. Ms. Browning replied yes.

Mr. Pitzer asked if any thought had been given to Halloween and whether recommendations or guidelines would be issued. Ms. Browning replied staff was working those guidelines now.

Ms. Peters understood that as the restrictions were loosened due to the number of cases decreasing, people would begin to make poor decisions, especially when drinking. The longer and later people were drinking, the higher the chances were for poor decisions. She understood, based on the comments of Ms. Browning, the bar owners felt they could control it better in their establishments and wanted to be able to go until midnight. She noted that even if there were parties in private homes, it usually involved smaller groups of people and people that tended to know one another. If they kept parties limited to 20 people or less, she felt the numbers would remain low. She explained she was concerned about the flu season compounding the problem and asked if the City/County Health Department would loosen the requirements again in November or if they would maintain where they were as the bar owners, students, and others were reasonably happy. She stated she thought it would be nice if the schools could move to in-class instruction. Ms. Browning commented that the numbers this week were working toward the favor of in-class instruction. In terms of flu season, she pointed out they were already beginning their flu season plans in terms of vaccines. They were working on vaccines for all public and private school students, creating a drive-up vaccination program at the department, and actively encouraging people to obtain a flu shot anywhere as they did not have to come to them. She noted she had seen some great slides from Dr. Havens

at the VA Hospital last week. One had showed the 2019 flu season in the southern hemisphere along with the number of tests completed by the type of illness, i.e., Influenza A, Influenza B, etc. They also had a diagram showing the 2020 flu season which had involved about the same number of tests along with a radical reduction in flu cases, which she attributed to mask wearing and social distancing. She stated they might have something positive to look forward to with flu season.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Browning if she could extrapolate a correlation between the numbers they were seeing and the matrix the Columbia Public Schools was using to potentially resume a hybrid or in-seat classes. Ms. Browning replied they were using a per 10,000 population value along with 14 days. She was hoping that if the downward trend in the numbers continued, they could be back in school via some form, such as potentially just the younger kids while working their way up to the older kids.

Mr. Trapp asked if there was any indication as to how well the flu shot was matching up with the flu profile. Ms. Browning replied it was too early to tell.

Ms. Fowler commented that she hoped there would be some qualification or conclusion in that there could be long term health effects for those that had experience COVID as they continued to work on the criteria for a change in the health department orders because they, as a community, did not have the ability to attend to that. She did not feel it was only about the number of beds they had in the hospitals, the positivity rate, etc. They also had to consider the long term consequences to the members of the community. Ms. Browning commented that when she had spoken with the hospitals last week, they had indicated that while they had fewer people that were acute or not needing a ventilator, they had more people with chronic conditions that were there longer. It was not as acute, but it took longer for them to get better. Ms. Fowler noted what that did to those individuals along with their families and the community was substantial. Ms. Browning agreed.

Mr. Skala understood the development of a vaccine was a hypothetical situation at this time along with any distribution in terms of priority. He stated he had heard discussion regarding the vaccines going to the first responders and those needing it the most first. He asked Ms. Browning if she anticipated the rules coming down from above and whether it would be consistent with how she would manage it. Ms. Browning replied she was sure they would be given rules, and thought they would likely start with healthcare workers and essential personnel, like first responders, prior to moving to the elderly, such as those over 70 or over 65, depending on the number of vaccines they had. She felt it would be dependent on risk.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC8-20 Board and Commission Applicants.

Upon receiving the majority vote of the Council, the following individuals were appointed to the following Boards and Commissions.

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Crew, Jefferson, 3902 Foxcreek Way, Ward 5, Term to expire May 1, 2024

BROADBAND BUSINESS PLANNING TASK FORCE

Low, Sarah, 2701 Malibu Court, Ward 4

CITY OF COLUMBIA NEW CENTURY FUND INC. BOARD

Gilbert, Keri, 3900 Frontenac Place, Ward 4, Term to expire September 30, 2023

Johnson, Tish, 4309 Jeana Court, Ward 4, Term to expire September 30, 2023

Nolte, Robert, 108 N. Glenwood Avenue, Ward 1, Term to expire September 30, 2023

Mayor Treece asked that the vacancy for the Columbia Housing Authority Board be readvertised.

CONVENTION AND VISITORS ADVISORY BOARD

Beard, Joan, 154 W. Green Meadows Road, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2022

Burgin, Barth, 7615 Black Walnut Drive, Boone County, Term to expire September 30, 2022

Cristal, Scott, 2205 N. Country Club Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire September 30, 2022

Hargrove, Heather, 2911 S. Providence Road, Apt. 202, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2022

Jarvis, Aric, 7565 W. Golden Willow Drive, Boone County, Term to expire September 30, 2022

Lawson, Eric, 61739 W. Business Highway 50, Moniteau County, Term to expire September 30, 2022

Weise, Teri, 3007 S. Rodeo Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire September 30, 2022

MAYOR'S COUNCIL ON PHYSICAL FITNESS AND HEALTH

Nevills, Sean, 3908 Gorham Oak Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire November 30, 2020

PERSONNEL ADVISORY BOARD

Rader, Jerome, 2711 W. Ash Street (Business), Ward 6, Term to expire September 30, 2023

PUBLIC TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMISSION

Lewis, Amanda, 2607 Eastwood Drive, Apt. 27, Ward 3, Term to expire March 1, 2023

SUBSTANCE ABUSE ADVISORY COMMISSION

Haxton, Chastity, 3101 Old 63 S., Apt. C003, Ward 6, Term to expire October 31, 2020

Mayor Treece stated he would like to readvertise the Tax Increment Financing Commission vacancy.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC54-20 Sterling Brown - People's Defense positions on various topics.

This was continued to the October 5, 2020 Council Meeting due to miscommunication between staff and the scheduled public comment speaker.

SPC55-20 Kate Kelley - Defunding white supremacy in Columbia.

This was continued to the October 5, 2020 Council Meeting due to miscommunication between staff and the scheduled public comment speaker.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH30-20 FY 2021 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.

Discussion shown with B235-20.

B210-20 Adopting the FY 2021 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.

Discussion shown with B235-20.

B211-20 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to eliminate transportation fares in FY 2021 for users of the GoCOMO Public Transit System.

Discussion shown with B235-20.

B232-20 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to personnel policies, procedures, rules and regulations.

Discussion shown with B235-20.

B233-20 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to residential curbside refuse and recycling collection.

Discussion shown with B235-20.

B234-20 Adopting FY 2021 Classification and Pay Plans; establishing implementation dates of September 20, 2020 and October 1, 2020; providing for salary adjustments for eligible employees.

Discussion shown with B235-20.

B235-20 Establishing plan year 2021 active employee medical premium rates, active employee and retiree dental premium rates, and non-Medicare medical rates for the City of Columbia; providing for payroll withholdings.

PH30-20 was read by the Clerk, B210-20 and B211-20 were given fourth reading by the Clerk, and B232-20, B233-20, B234-20, and B235-20 were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece pointed out staff had distributed a new set of budget amendments for the consideration of Council.

Mr. Glascock, Mr. Lue and Ms. Peveler provided a staff report which included the items on the newly distributed amendment sheet.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding Amendment #1. Mr. Pitzer replied the budget proposal had been to reduce the health saving account (HSA) contribution to individuals in the high deductible plan by 50 percent and this amendment would restore that.

Mr. Trapp understood there was not a mechanism to fund this ongoing annual expense and asked if it would come out of fund balance. Ms. Peveler replied yes for the employee benefit fund. Mr. Trapp understood funding was not planned for the future. Ms. Peveler explained those costs were recovered through a fee known as the insurance administration fee. As they used down the fund balance in the employee benefit fund, they would reach a point where they would have to start charging the department more money for an insurance administration governmental charge. Mr. Trapp understood it would have longer lasting budget implications, but through the fund being depleted and the charges to departments in future years. Ms. Peveler stated that was correct.

Ms. Peters asked if this was something that would be better to discuss during a pre-council meeting or a work session versus amending the budget at this time. She understood this was not the only thing they were considering in terms of health care. Mr. Lue agreed there was another amendment proposed. Ms. Peters wondered if this was something they needed to look at more globally than via two amendments to this budget. Mr. Glascock explained they looked at the benefits as a package, and they had proposed this cut since they were trying to reduce expenses. It appeared as though the City was putting more into it than others so they felt it was something that could be cut. He noted that amending the budget to put this back in only restored what they were currently doing.

Mr. Skala understood this would then be an additional liability. It was something they would have to pay for and had the means to pay for, but was liable to have ramifications in the future since they would have to increase the fee. Mr. Glascock commented that in the past they had pushed the employee benefit fund to almost \$0 and then had to supplement it with \$1 million. He noted it was dependent on expenses against the fund, and if they had more than anticipated, it would potentially require additional funding.

Mr. Skala understood there were two different groups of amendments, i.e., those requested by the Council and those recommended by staff. He also understood the staff amendments were more integrated into the City Manager's budget proposal in terms of

what could be accommodated. Mr. Glascock stated some of the staff changes were errors or omissions that had failed to be included in the original budget. The others were the ones requested by Council within the last two meetings.

Mr. Lue and Mr. Glascock continued with the staff report.

Ms. Peters understood Amendment #7 would provide for mandatory City bags and was similar to Amendment #4. The City would keep the black bag system and ratepayers could purchase extra bags if they wanted them. In addition, bulky item pickup would need to be scheduled and there would be a \$5 per hour add-pay, which had been above and beyond what the Council had asked for since it was the recommendation of staff. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Ms. Fowler commented that she did not believe that had been above and beyond what the Council had asked for. Mr. Skala thought it was likely consistent with what they had requested. Ms. Peters asked Ms. Fowler if it had been consistent with what the Council had requested. Ms. Fowler replied she believed it had been. She understood Mr. Skala had an alternative that he had proposed that would be discussed later, but the \$5 per hour add-pay was consistent with what the Council had asked for although it had originally been suggested by Mr. Sorrell. Mr. Glascock noted Amendment #7 was a package that had been put together for Council consideration after the prior proposal of staff had been defeated.

Mr. Lue continued with the staff report.

Ms. Fowler understood Amendments #11 and #12 would result in fare-free transit for FY 2021, and asked if adding the related amounts equaled the cost of running the transit system fare free for a year or if there was other money involved. Mr. Lue replied other money was involved. Ms. Fowler stated that information had been missing from the staff report and noted she was trying to determine that cost. Mr. Lue replied staff could provide that number to her later.

Mr. Lue continued with the staff report.

Mayor Treece understood Amendment #17 involved a reduction in revenue for leased space, and asked if another amendment would be required to increase revenue to the parking utility if a new tenant was identified. Mr. Lue replied he understood the plan was for the City to take over that space instead of leasing it out. Mayor Treece asked if the City would lease it from the parking utility. Mr. Glascock replied yes. He noted there would be a charge depending on who utilized it. Mayor Treece asked if the revenue still needed to be reduced to reflect this. Mr. Glascock replied yes, and noted they would have to bring something back to Council after they knew how the space would be utilized. Mr. Lue pointed out it would also take time to prepare the space.

Mr. Lue continued with the staff report.

Ms. Fowler understood the Land Trust had been successful in getting some very generous anonymous donations and asked if Amendment #28 had to do with moving money from one of those donations to cover the implementation of solar panels. Mr. Lue replied he believed it involved the solar panels, but was not sure. Ms. Fowler understood the funding for that had been a donation. Mr. Glascock replied he was not sure.

Mr. Lue continued with the staff report.

Ms. Fowler asked if Amendment #29 was related to personnel, an expense, or consumables. Mr. Lue replied he thought it had to do with equipment replacement. Ms. Peveler stated she believed it had to do with replacement of equipment within the Council Chamber. Mr. Glascock thought it was related to the audio/visual in the room. Ms. Fowler understood it was in the Council Chamber as opposed to Conference Room 1A/1B. Mr. Glascock stated he believed it was for the Council Chamber.

Mr. Lue displayed a slide that addressed the Housing and Community Development programs as they related to the budget. Mr. Glascock stated this had been missed at the prior meeting and he wanted them to be aware of it as it was a part of the budget.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding the last page of the amendment sheet which showed the budget amendment totals by fund as it appeared they were \$1-\$1.5 million in the red for FY 2020 and FY 2021. Mr. Lue replied that would not be where they ended

up. This page only showed what the amendments would do to the original budget. Ms. Peveler stated it showed the impact on each fund of just the amendments that they had discussed. Ms. Peters understood the FY 2020 net was \$1.6 million in the red and the estimated FY 2021 was \$1.2 million in the red. Ms. Peveler referred to the second item, which involved the transportation sales tax as it was part of the amendment whereby they would use some transportation sales tax for the operating subsidy in transit instead of CARES funding, and they flip-flopped the other way in FY 2021 whereby it was going down \$1.9 million. Ms. Peters asked if the expense was going down \$1.9 million. Ms. Peveler replied yes. It was the transfer from transportation sales tax to the transit fund. She explained they had originally anticipated using CARES funding for it, and they were now using the CARES funding for capital projects. Ms. Fowler stated she was not sure how to read that document, and asked for clarification. Ms. Peveler replied the first three columns were FY 2020 revenue, expense, and net, and those were estimated numbers. They were the changes that would be made to the estimated numbers based on the budget amendments that had been presented. It showed the impact, i.e., whether it increased cash or decreased cash, which was shown in the column identified as net. The last three columns were the FY 2021 budget revenue, expense, and net. Ms. Fowler commented that for the transportation tax, they had \$1.7 million they expected to spend and they actually spent it. Ms. Peveler stated that was not correct. She explained staff thought they would use CARES funding so when the estimated budget had been prepared, they had reduced the operating subsidy to transit. In talking to the Federal Transit Authority (FTA) about the CARES funding and the match requirements, staff had determined they would get more out of their money by moving it to a different spot and restoring the operating subsidy for FY 2020. Mr. Glascock stated these numbers involved the operating budget, and the money was moved to the capital budget, which was not shown on this page. Ms. Peters understood this involved the reduction due to fare-free. Ms. Peveler stated no. She explained the fares did not amount to much in the transit budget. The biggest source of money was the operating subsidy and the FTA operating grant. Normally the FTA operating grant was used for operations and they had to have a 50 percent match. The City had received notice that they did not have to have a 50 percent match due to COVID-19, but had later found out it would only apply to direct COVID-19 expenses, which involved extra cleaning, Plexiglas, etc. Those costs in transit were not significant. They were told by the FTA that they could use the FTA operating grant on the capital project side, and there they would only have to have a 15-20 percent match versus the 50 percent they had to have for operations. The amendment would shift things around so they could get the most out of their money. Ms. Peters asked if there was another sheet that would show the capital improvement expenses that would have the \$1.7 million. Ms. Peveler replied Amendment #13 was one place where they were taking the transit grant and putting it toward the capital project side instead of the operating side. She commented that they also had an extended time frame by which they could spend the FTA operating grant, and part of it would be in the FY 2022 budget as was shown on a forecast page. She explained that was not on the amendment sheet because it was not happening in FY 2021. She did not believe they would be able to see the entire picture by looking at the amendment sheet.

Mr. Cole commented that the \$50,000 tied to Amendment #28 had been approved by Council in August, but the expenditures would not occur until FY 2021 so those funds had to be appropriated within the FY 2021 budget. Ms. Peters asked what those funds would be used for. Mr. Cole replied solar panels.

Mr. Cole provided a staff report regarding the recommendations of the Housing and Community Development Commission for CDBG and HOME funding at their August 26 meeting, which usually occurred in June.

Ms. Peters asked if the Council had been provided this as part of the agenda packet. Mr. Lue replied no. Ms. Peters asked if she could be provided a copy. Mr. Cole replied he would email it to Mr. Glascock to provide to the Council.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Rick Shanker, 1829 Cliff Drive, commented that he was present to urge the Council to approve the proposed changes to the City's trash system. He explained he had attended the pre-council meeting that had been held in February whereby staff had described problems with regard to trash pickups, and was appreciative of staff for these new proposals as he believed they would solve some of the problems that had been pointed out. He asked the Council to support the changes.

Mayor Treece noted a written comment had been received from Jason Doty, 1612 Woodmoor Court, who indicated concern for Amendment #7 to the FY 2021 budget as he did not believe the practices listed were fair or reasonable and that they would hurt the middle and lower class citizens the hardest. Mr. Doty stated his household was a family of three and during any given week, he had five large trash bags and one box of folded boxes. He noted he paid \$16.52 per month which equated to \$0.82 cents per bag. With the increase of \$0.85 per month and \$2 for any bag over three per week would make his bill \$33.37. He asked the Council to consider that as it would raise the cost for his household alone by over 100 percent. He also felt limiting the amount of trash an individual could place at the curb would backfire as people would drop their trash on the side of the road instead of spending the extra money. He felt a rate of \$1 per bag would be more reasonable if the bags were actually strong enough to hold 50 pounds. He urged the Council to deny Amendment #7 in an effort to keep the City clean. Mayor Treece noted this written comment would be filed with the items associated with this meeting.

Robert Carter explained he was a full-time refuse collector with the City of Columbia. At the prior meeting, there had been discussion about the \$5 per hour add-pay for full-time employees that were actually throwing the trash in the back of the truck. He pointed out that in situations where there was a full-time driver and two temporary employees on the back of the truck, the driver would assist if they came across a situation whereby there was a lot of trash at a particular house. He reiterated the driver assisted with the collection of trash when necessary. He commented that the mechanics, who had requested an increase to their tool allowance, were the reason the Solid Waste Division was able to operate, and he understood they did not have enough staffing either. If the Solid Waste Division had a situation whereby two trucks needed to be repaired and there was not enough staffing or if they did not have the equipment needed to fix the trucks that day, it would cause a delay in terms of trash pickup. He listed items that could be set at the curb currently, which included couches, mattresses, lawn mowers, weight sets, treadmills, etc. He noted he threw away an entire Gold's Gym weight set recently and was not sure that was safe to put into the back of the trucks. He believed that would cause a breakdown at some point in the future. He pointed out some people would cut up an entire tree and then set it at the curb for pickup. He stated treadmills were also placed at the curb, and it was difficult for that type of item to be picked up. They were liable to get hurt at some point.

Demetrius Edwards stated he had been with the City for about 15 years, and they had eight trash routes when he had first started. They still had eight trash routes even though Columbia had doubled in size during that time. He pointed out that when they had recycling as well as trash, they were picking up both. He stated they were getting beat up and that it was rough on them. He noted he and those that were standing there with him came to work every day. He commented that he was on the \$750 deductible health insurance plan, but some of the new people had to go into the high deductible plan. He felt bad for them, especially since they had young kids. He stated they picked up king size mattresses and other things in the rain, sleet, or snow. He noted he had two temporary employees on his truck, and was out of the truck constantly with them picking up trash. He felt it was unfair to provide the add-pay to only those with two full-time staff on the truck because those with the temporary employees were working hard picking up trash as well. He believed a flat raise across the board was needed because those newly employed could get the same pay at Walmart.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Edwards what his salary might have been when he was hired. Mr. Edwards replied he thought it had likely been \$10.50 per hour. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Edwards if he was at about \$17 now. Mr. Edwards replied it was around \$17 per hour.

Mayor Treece noted he wanted to try to help. He agreed the bulk pickup needed to be reformed as it was not fair to them as employees or to the neighbors.

Jimmy Hart commented that he had been in the Solid Waste Division for seven years, and noted Mr. Glascock had indicated he could not provide them a raise because he would then have to provide all CDL drivers the same raise. He wondered why those other CDL drivers could not help them out at times. He pointed out that they received the call to help push snow in the winter, but when they were short-handed no other department helped them. The City hired contract workers at \$22.50 per hour, but the full-time employees did not receive that amount. He felt the system was broken, and that they needed more money along with the mechanics.

Clyde Benson commented that those that visited Columbia saw downtown, Stadium Boulevard, and the surrounding central areas, and they did not want to see trash. He noted they could no longer keep up due to the growth of Columbia. The hole was getting deeper, and finding a way to get out of the hole would help them and the City as a whole. It would also help keep Columbia cleaner.

Mayor Treece noted a written comment had been received from Bill Weitkemper who indicated residential and commercial property had been receiving a sweetheart deal by having property available for occupancy the same day. Once a property was constructed, there was \$166 utility fee to occupy the property. The renter of a property could request a same-day occupancy because the property was constructed. Mr. Weitkemper believed the City could require a property to be physically disconnected from the electric, water, and sewer grids when the utilities were shut-off. The owner of the property would then have to pay another water and sewer connection fee along with the actual cost of reconnecting the property. He suggested a very modest \$10 per month fee per utility that the owner of a property would have to pay to the City to assure the City maintained capacity in the respective system for connection at a future date. Mayor Treece noted that written comment would be filed with items associated with this meeting.

Robert Smith stated he was a mechanic with the City of Columbia and was representing the mechanics at the Grissum Building, in the Parks and Recreation Department, and at the Landfill. He pointed out that this year had been twisted by the coronavirus, and they had all thought about the virus in terms of what it could do to them and their families. He asked the Council to leave the health insurance as it had been without any changes. He felt the last thing they needed to worry about was their insurance plan. He commented that there had been a lot of talk about hazard pay in terms of the Solid Waste Division. He believed mechanics also deserved hazard pay since they had to be in the back of the trucks with the broken glass, used needles, etc. working on the trucks. In addition, they had to work on the electric buses when they had not been sanitized. He explained that when a truck broke down, they were called out to work on the truck. He asked the Council to imagine being on some of the busiest streets while having to be underneath the trash truck to work on it or changing a tire on a loaded roll-off truck as their backs were turned to 50-60 miles per hour traffic. He noted one wrong move might be disastrous. He commented that they were also asking for a \$200 increase to help with the price of their tools as they needed to keep up with new vehicles, such as the electric buses, the CNG powered trucks, new street sweepers, etc. He stated he had been able to speak with a couple of tool dealers last week to obtain some updated prices. A set of Snapon test leads used for wiring had cost \$72.50 last year, and this year the cost was \$78.75. This was a \$6.25 increase in just one year. The cost of a Matco grinder sander combination air tool was \$248 last year. This year the cost was \$274, which was an increase of \$26. In 2018, he had purchased a new power probe at a cost of \$231, and that same kit sold for \$279 now. It was a \$48 or 20 percent increase over two years. A

Snapon half-inch impact that had been \$398 was in the newest Snapon sales flyer for \$494. It was almost \$100 more and was on sale. He explained these were just a few items they had to purchase, and every mechanic had their own story and list of tools.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Smith if any of the items he had mentioned had been brought up during collective bargaining with the City or if that had been included in the package presented to the City Manager. Mr. Smith replied he did not know.

Mayor Treece noted written comment had been received from Jeff and Mary Jo Kopp asking the Council to vote in favor of B233-20, which would reinstate the community residential pickup for recyclable items as the environment depended on them being good citizens of the Earth. They felt stopping pickup had deterred Columbia residents from recycling, thus creating more harm to their beautiful green city. Mayor Treece noted this written comment would be filed with other items associated with this meeting.

Robert Hemmelgarn, 805 Alton Avenue, stated he was speaking on behalf of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood Association (NCCNA), and explained the NCCNA worked to represent the people that lived and worked within their neighborhood, including those that worked in service to the community. He noted the pandemic had made clear that the City's solid waste workers provided the community an essential service. As such, the NCCNA took the position that it was in the best interest of the neighborhood and the entire community to support these essential workers by meeting their needs and improving the proposed amendment to Chapter 22. The NCCNA supported ensuring City workers were paid fairly, and that their health and well-being were protected to the greatest extent possible. While they generally supported pursuing a more equitable tax and rate structuring so these financial burdens were not disproportionately borne by the most financially insecure among them, they were supportive of this small, flat residential rate increase in order to meet the immediate needs. He commented that they supported prioritizing budget allocations for essential workers and encouraged the Council to pass a budget that supported the immediate needs of the solid waste workers and the mechanics in terms of pay, healthcare coverage, and quality of life reforms as they felt the return on the investment would benefit everyone in the neighborhood and the entire City.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, understood there was an increased liability to the City when a truck was broken down. He did not feel the City wanted its liability insurance to increase. He noted they wanted traffic to move constantly and did not want stalled vehicles within the main traffic flow. He suggested the Council look into this situation, and recommended the vehicle be towed to the shop where the tools were located and where it was safer.

Matthew Schacht commented that he was representing Vidwest regarding the budget amendment associated with CAT. He explained they had just done their first commercial livestream with CAT, and that generating revenue would be their model to make CAT self-sustaining. He stated they hoped CAT could continue to be a positive resource in the community, and they wanted to see it be able to stand on its own feet. In order to get there, however, they had to build CAT up. He pointed out they had a very strong partnership with the Ragtag Film Society, which had a long history of success in the community, and felt CAT could become a really powerful ally for them in the sense that they could provide a lot of the technical expertise, video equipment, and teaching and classroom space they lacked. He stated there was a lot of potential for Vidwest and CAT to become a permanent player in the local arts and education community, and they only wanted the chance to do that.

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

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #1 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020.

Mayor Treece noted the amendment would restore the cut within the City Manager's budget to the HSA contributions. He understood it would result in no change if the amendment was adopted. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

The motion made by Mayor Treece to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #1 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020 was seconded by Mr. Pitzer and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #2 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020.

Mayor Treece explained this amendment would result in a \$180 savings that would be put back into the general fund.

The motion made by Mayor Treece to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #2 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020 was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #3 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020.

Mayor Treece understood this would rearrange funding to some line items and would not impact the budget.

The motion made by Mayor Treece to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #3 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020 was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding this amendment since it did not have any impact financially on the budget with \$0 in the revenue, expense, and net columns. Mayor Treece replied there were certain line items for each board and commission, and the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) wanted to change the amounts within a few line items, such as reducing printing and increasing miscellaneous contractual by that same amount. For the HPC to have the authority to spend a certain amount in a certain account, this budget amendment was required.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #3 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece understood Amendment #4 would restore the cut within the City Manager's budget for black bags for trash and Amendment #5 would restore the cut within the City Manager's budget for blue bags for recycling. He pointed out they had already made the policy decision, and these were the appropriations associated with that decision.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #4 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020.

Mr. Trapp stated that voting against Amendment #4 better captured what he wanted than what was captured within Amendment #30. He thought they could get to the same place without the logo bags if they just limited the number of bags.

Mayor Treece commented that a previous City Council had made a bargain with ratepayers indicating they would get free black trash bags, blue recycle bags, and weekly curbside pickup with a modest rate increase. He was afraid of eliminating the bag program because they would not be decreasing ratepayer rates. He thought they could move to more of a pay-as-you-throw system, which Amendment #7 and Amendment #30 arguably accomplished.

Mr. Pitzer pointed out there was a proposal to increase rates because they had increased all of these other expenses, and this was another expense.

Mr. Skala understood the increase was primarily based upon the add-pay of \$5 per hour for personnel. The rest of it was relatively neutral.

Mayor Treece stated the adoption of Amendments #4 and #5 restored the cuts and maintained the status quo and the current rate structure. If they wanted to do something

else, it could be captured by Amendment #7.

Ms. Peters commented that she felt Amendment #7 would allow for the City to provide black bags with the logo. She was not sure how that was different than Amendment #4. She asked why she would want to vote for Amendment #4 and Amendment #7. Mayor Treece replied the City Manager's budget had contemplated the removal of the black bag and the blue bag programs along with the elimination of curbside recycling, and the Council had already decided they did not want to go along with that so they needed to put that money back in the budget, which was what Amendments #4 and #5 did. Ms. Peters understood that once they put it back into the budget, they would then go to Amendment #7. Ms. Fowler stated they would likely debate Amendment #7 at some length. Mr. Pitzer explained Amendment #7 indicated ratepayers could only put out black bags with the City logo on them.

Mr. Trapp commented that they set rates by determining how much it cost to provide the service and then dividing it by the number of people, which was then the rate per household, and the particular service they provided was based upon that. He noted they had decreased service to not have a rate increase in the past and had reduced the number of black trash bags from 100 to 50 a few years ago. He thought not supplying the bags was appropriate, and pointed out no other community he was aware provided bags. He felt a more elegant solution was to reduce the rate increase by not supplying the bags and only setting a limit to how much people could throw away.

Mr. Skala believed one of the goals was to restore the status quo with curbside trash and recycling. The situation with the bags was an attempt to ensure they did not have as many complaints and problems with people buying their own bags of lesser quality. He pointed out that even the representative of the company that was supplying the bags had made that recommendation. He commented that the provision for more substantial bags was a function of protecting them from having trash strewn all over due to animals or other elements. A logo or the color of the bag tie would ensure the solid waste workers could rapidly identify the high quality bags.

The motion made by Mayor Treece to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #4 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020 was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved by voice vote with only Mr. Pitzer and Mr. Trapp voting no.

Mayor Treece stated Amendment #5 was the same except it was for the blue bags. He noted the City logo had been on those bags for years. People were used to it and it seemed to work well.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #5 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020. The motion was seconded by Ms. Fowler and approved by voice vote with only Mr. Pitzer voting no.

Ms. Fowler suggested they restore the funding cuts for refuse collectors so they could restore residential recycling, which was addressed by Amendment #6.

Ms. Fowler made a motion to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #6 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece and approved by voice vote with only Mr. Pitzer and Ms. Peters voting no.

Mayor Treece understood Amendment #7 was the staff recommendation due to Council action of not agreeing with the City Manager's plan as it had been proposed in the budget. This new proposal would mandate the use of City bags, provide residential customers two bags per week, allow the purchase of additional bags at \$2 per bag,

require the scheduling of bulky items, allow for the \$5 add-pay for refuse collectors and senior refuse collectors with an \$0.85 per month rate increase to cover that cost, and provide for the addition of a code enforcement specialist for Community Development.

Ms. Fowler commented that she believed the best part of this was the addition of the code enforcement specialist to make sure the changes to benefit the residents and collection workers actually happened. The items not bagged would be addressed and a tax bill could be attached if needed. She noted she believed the other components were good ideas. She stated she agreed with the trash collection workers in that they were in hole and felt they needed to get themselves out of there as they moved forward to a ballot issue she expected to be on the ballot in April whereby the citizens could vote on whether they wanted to move to automated trash collection. She believed this was an interim measure that could help them get there while also benefiting employees and drawing more people into working for the Solid Waste Division as that was necessary for public health. It was also a job most of them did not want to do. She commented that she was concerned with how the \$5 add-pay was structured as they would have to have permanent regular employees on all positions on the truck to be eligible for it. She felt that was short-sighted and would not accomplish what was needed in terms of pulling them out of the hole and having full-time regular employees collecting the trash while earning an appropriate wage for that work.

Ms. Fowler asked how many workers on trucks would actually be eligible for add-pay based on current staffing levels. Mr. Sorrell replied on a Monday a couple of weeks ago, they had nine drivers on the residential routes. In that instance two people would be eligible for the add-pay. The other seven drivers would have had temporary agency staff on the back of the trucks. He noted for the other four days that week, they had 11 drivers, and in that instance, six people would have been eligible for the add-pay. The other five drivers would have had temporary employees on the back so they would not have received it. He stated that as they had more staff, more people would receive the add-pay. Ms. Fowler asked how many trucks had been on the road on Monday. Mr. Sorrell replied there were eight residential trash routes and nine City employees on that Monday. Ms. Fowler understood the two full-time employees that had been lucky enough to be on the one truck together were the only ones that would have been eligible for the add-pay on that Monday, and asked for clarification regarding the following day. Mr. Sorrell replied there had been eight trucks and 11 employees so three routes had been fully staffed. Ms. Fowler understood those lucky enough to be on those three routes would have received the add-pay.

Ms. Fowler understood there was a process by which people were hired by the City as a temporary employee while waiting to become a CDL driver which came with it the permanent full-time employee status, and noted she had concerns about that process. If the goal was to draw employees into the Solid Waste Division, she thought they should allow those on the trucks to be eligible for the add-pay during this interim time so it was not related to the luck of which truck one ended up on. She felt they needed to draw more people in while compensating them fairly for the dirty, messy, stinky work they did. She thought that was a more equitable way to implement add-pay. She noted she understood add-pay was a problem because it would go away at some point, especially if the City and voters decided to move toward an automated trash collection system as that would change the dynamic of what the employees were subjected to on those routes. She asked the Council to consider a \$5 per hour add-pay for every route during this interim period, i.e., to allow it for every person on the truck that was involved with residential curbside pickup. She also asked staff to work hard in converting the temporary employees into regular full-time employees regardless of whether they had a CDL.

Mr. Thomas commented that he was not sure it was fair to say luck should not have anything to do with it. They could view it as the good luck of particular workers receiving the \$5 per hour add-pay or the bad luck of having that significantly more difficult and dangerous job of throwing the bags in the back of the truck. The \$5 was for the job of

doing that. He stated he believed the goal was to bring more full-time City employees into this by creating the \$5 per hour extra incentive. As more people became workers on those routes, they would have the opportunity to earn the additional money for that difficult job. He understood it would involve some time to ramp up, but felt it was designed to do that. He reiterated that ultimately the goal was to do what Ms. Fowler wanted by fully staffing the routes with City workers who would all then receive the additional pay.

Mr. Skala referred to Amendment #31 and noted it involved a \$2.50 per hour add-pay for the solid waste residential route CDL employees at a cost of about \$88,556. He noted a concern was equity in that if they changed something for CDL employees in one particular area it should be done for all CDL employees. He understood the City had about 400 CDL employees, and at a \$1 per hour increase, it would amount to about \$832,000, which he did not believe they could do with the budget. If they provided a \$1 increase only to those solid waste residential CDL drivers, it would amount to about \$34,400. He felt in some ways there was a fairness issue. CDL drivers with temporary employees would not receive the \$5 add-pay that they would otherwise receive if they were on a truck with another permanent employee even if they helped with trash collection. Amendment #31 would allow a CDL driver to receive a \$2.50 add-pay if they were paired with temporary employees. If the CDL driver was with another permanent employee throwing bags, they would receive the \$5 add-pay. This would compensate CDL drivers that had temporary employees on the back of the truck.

Mr. Pitzer commented that Mr. Skala was starting to get to part of the problem, which was the equity of pay across different departments. He noted Mr. Skala had indicated a cost of \$832,000 for a \$1 increase for only CDL drivers, which he had dismissed as not being an option. They were only discussing increasing pay for certain positions. He understood that with a \$5 per hour add-pay for refuse collectors, the starting pay would be \$22 per hour. A post-certified police officer started at \$22.29 per hour and a firefighter started at \$20.26 per hour. He commented that there were likely a number of other positions across the City that were being similarly underpaid and were not receiving hazard pay or any other add-on as none were proposed. He pointed out this was being discussed because they were in the hole since they had a system that did not work. It was broken, and they had seen that materialize with the cancelation of recycling this past summer. He stated he did not feel as though they were addressing the problem. They were instead arguing about who deserved a raise here and there. He noted everyone deserved a raise. He believed an actual solution was needed, and that this would only put address the issue for a few months. The root of the problem was that the current system did not work. He noted Mr. Sorrell had indicated they had only had nine permanent employees at work on that Monday for eight routes, and asked the Council to think about the absurdity of that. He commented that he was in favor of giving everyone a raise if they could, and pointed out no one else in the City was getting a raise this year because they could not afford it. They were in the middle of a pandemic and had no idea of the economic situation they might be in. He stated he could not support singling out one small group of employees by giving them a raise solely because they were not willing to make the difficult choice that really needed to be made.

Mayor Treece asked when the last time a salary study had been done on all of these grades. Ms. Buckler replied all of these had been done in the maintenance plan this year. The salary ranges were okay. The ranges included all of the numbers they had been discussing. She commented that an add-pay was different than a pay raise. An add-pay was for an activity, and was not included in the base pay. She reiterated they had all been studied this year. Mayor Treece stated that had been his recollection as they had moved some grades up and down. He understood what they were proposing for the refuse collectors were with the range of that. Ms. Buckler stated the amounts fell within the ranges that had been established.

Mayor Treece commented that he felt Mr. Smith's point had been good with respect to

the tool allowance, but his preference was that these items be discussed as part of the collective bargaining process. He would rather have those priorities brought up through the bargaining unit, who could then engage with the department and City Manager. He reiterated he believed Mr. Smith had made a valid point for an additional \$200 as the tool allowance had not been changed in years.

Mayor Treece commented that what staff had come up with was the best solution at this time regardless of whether it was a Band-Aid for the problem with which they were currently faced.

Ms. Fowler recalled the discussion about the difficulty of trash collection in 2015, and that it was equal in danger to firefighters. At that time, she had said that if it was as dangerous as being a firefighter, the trash collection workers should be paid as if they were firefighters so they could rest their bodies between their shifts while accessing healthcare and not having to work a second or third job in order to provide for their families. She thought they had likely been making about \$12 per hour at that time. She appreciated that they were at about \$15 per hour now. She stated she believed they were looking at a transition as she had every confidence they would have a ballot question in April and that they would be looking at automated trash collection afterward. She noted it would not be a permanent wage increase. It was a transition to something that they had been talking about as being a difficult situation for a difficult job that few City employees wanted to do as they moved toward an automated trash collection service, which had been supported by the union. In terms of equity, they had people that had been doing this work since 2015, and they had not been able to provide the relief needed so they had certainty in the collection of garbage and recyclables.

Mayor Treece asked for the response of staff with regard to pulling refuse collectors onto snow routes since they were CDL drivers, but it not being reciprocated when they were short-handed on the refuse side. Mr. Glascock replied that had been done when the Solid Waste Division was within the Public Works Department as the Street Division staff had gone out on the routes when needed. It likely had not happened since 2015 when the Solid Waste Division had been moved to the Utilities Department. Mayor Treece asked if it was something that could happen. Mr. Glascock replied he was not sure why it could not. Mr. Sorrell explained they had at times sent people from the Sewer, Stormwater, Water, and Railroad Divisions to provide assistance. It tended to not work out well because those employees were not familiar with the routes and it left the other divisions short-staffed. It was essentially only shifting the problems back and forth. He noted that had been done recently.

Mr. Skala commented that he was not as sanguine about the inevitability of going to another system. He understood an initiative petition was being circulated and he hoped they were successful, but it then had to be ratified by the public, and he was not totally convinced it would pass. He explained they had restored the service as it was at the prior council meeting, and there were some remedies via these amendments that might solve some of the problems in the short term. To suggest there was not a way to fix it and that these solutions were only temporary was short-sighted. He thought they should wait to see the data as the increase could bring more people into this service that they were trying to restore. He believed there were some tremendous improvements in the proposal in terms of the impact of the lives of the trash collectors on a daily basis. He believed they would likely have a hybrid automated system if it happened because it would not be easy for an automated system to work in some parts of town. He stated he would support Amendment #7 for those reasons.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #7 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Ms. Peters understood Amendment #7 involved solid waste collection and asked if that also included recycling. She understood it would include the blue bags, but was not sure it included the curbside recycling pickup. Mr. Glascock replied they had restored

personnel for curbside recycling via Amendment #6.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Thomas to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #7 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020 was approved by roll call vote with Mr. Trapp, Mr. Skala, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Peters, Mayor Treece, and Ms. Fowler voting yes, and Mr. Pitzer voting no.

Ms. Fowler understood they had foreclosed on Amendment #30 by adopting Amendment #7. Mayor Treece stated he believed they had. Ms. Fowler asked if they had also foreclosed on Amendment #31. Mr. Skala replied he was not sure they had.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #31 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020. The motion died for the lack of a second.

Mr. Thomas commented that Amendment #8 was related to the Discovery Parkway Extension, which was a part of a systematic growth model that had been in Columbia for many decades and had brought with it a lot of negative long term consequences for community residents and local government. It drove an excessively automobile-oriented culture, which increased carbon emissions and traffic fatalities and undermined the health and equity benefits of a system geared more toward public transit, walking, and bicycling. By driving low density residential and commercial sprawl, they undermined locally owned businesses that tended to operate in more compact and smaller areas that were not car-oriented. It also created a situation whereby they had too much in maintenance costs and in the distance to travel to provide services, and the sales and property taxes generated from the area were not enough to cover those costs. They were essentially bankrupting the budget by continuing to support this pattern of development. He felt it would be a strong statement to vote down this project and to then really review the long range transportation plan so they were looking to the future in a way that was consistent with their values as a City and with the benefit to the residents and local government.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #8 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020. The motion died for the lack of a second.

Mr. Skala commented that he appreciated the perspective of Mr. Thomas as he shared some of it in terms of sprawl and the related environmental aspects. He understood Mr. Thomas was encouraging a change in culture, but noted they sometimes had to build or improve roads in already developed areas, which required rights-of-way and involved higher costs. Those situations were obviated by this approach of building in the area before some of the development occurred so they were able to do it at a lower cost. He understood about \$800,000 had already been invested in this project, and noted he was not willing to forgo that kind of investment at this time.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendments #10, #11, #12, #13, #14, #15, #16, #17, #18, #19, #20, #21, #22, #23, #24, #25, #26, #27, #28, and #29 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020 as they were all technical corrections. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by roll call vote with Mr. Trapp, Mr. Skala, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Pitzer, Ms. Peters, Mayor Treece, and Ms. Fowler voting yes.

Ms. Fowler commented that she thought they could dispose of Amendment #32. She explained she had asked for a report, and understood they were still waiting on costs. She noted she did not want to disrupt certainty for the employees, but wanted to explore over the next year how they tuned the health insurance plans to meet more of the needs of City employees, particularly those whose jobs involved physical labor and those who were modestly paid. She stated she did not plan to ask for a vote on that amendment

tonight, but wanted to express her intention to continue to work on this with City staff and the Council over the next year.

Mayor Treece understood the \$750 deductible plan had been grandfathered, which was why Ms. Fowler wanted to consider opening it up, and pointed out those that participated in that plan paid for part of that through their salary. A concern he had was that those lowest paid employees who might also be the youngest employees would likely much rather have the money in their paycheck every two weeks than they would like to have a \$750 deductible. He was sure there was a math calculation on that.

Ms. Fowler stated she agreed, but noted a high deductible plan worked well for people that had financial means to adjust their spending and plan for it differently than she and others might. She felt those in the middle should have the option along with other affordable options. She agreed not every employee would take the option, but reiterated she believed they should have the choice, which was why she wanted to work on it during the upcoming year.

Ms. Fowler made a motion to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #9 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Ms. Fowler stated she was a CAT alumni and was aware of the investment of the City over the years along with the benefits it had allowed individual citizens and residents. In her instance, it had provided her the opportunity to be a better informed citizen so she could work with others in improving issues she cared about. In order to leverage the investment the City had previously made in CAT, she wanted to ensure they gave Vidwest every opportunity to succeed by holding the appropriation from the City stable at \$35,000.

Mr. Trapp understood this involved one-time funds and was not an ongoing obligation of the City, and asked if this would involve a contract to convey the equipment along with the money as a start-up fund for the project. Mr. Glascock replied there would have to be some kind of contract as Vidwest would have to show what they would do with the money. Mr. Trapp understood there would be a contract for the delivery of services, and asked if that contract would also involve the conveyance of the equipment. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it had already been conveyed.

Ms. Peters thought they had agreed to a three-year commitment, and they were past the first year. She recalled a three-year start-up commitment to Vidwest, and that they would take CAT over by then. She asked if that was correct. Mayor Treece replied he thought that had been the old incarnation. Mr. Glascock stated he did not recall a three-year commitment. Mayor Treece noted they had done an RFP to convey the equipment along with providing some start-up money. Ms. Peters stated she thought it had been a three-year commitment. Mayor Treece thought it had been a three-year commitment with a step down with the prior entity.

Ms. Peters asked if the commitment to Vidwest had only been one year when they had agreed to this last year. Mayor Treece replied he thought it had involved the conveyance of the equipment and some modest start-up costs. Mr. Schacht explained Mr. Glascock had asked for a long term strategic plan to make CAT self-sufficient. There was an agreement that no one wanted CAT to be forever funded by the City. They, Vidwest, had offered a plan of what it could look like to make CAT self-sufficient of the over the next three years. This had been done at the end of June. When Vidwest had won the RFP for CAT back in 2019, it was a short term solution of the original not-profit dissolving and someone needing to come in to manage the year so it was not destroyed and to then build a new plan for a streamlined version of CAT that did not require full-time staff or a budget of \$200,000. He commented that the model of the \$200,000, which had been based on cable franchise fees, had sunk the old CAT because it could not survive in that way. He noted Vidwest was trying to create a new model that utilized volunteers to develop its own commercial services so it could be its own funded entity and independent of the City. The City would continue to be a partner since it still owned all of the

equipment.

Ms. Peters asked if this was expected to happen in another year or two, or if it was only hopeful that ongoing City funding would not be needed. Mr. Schacht replied they had developed some strategies for raising the money. He explained one of the services they wanted to offer was a professional portable live stream service. He noted Mizzou sporting events and graduations were often live streamed with a crew of people and a portable rig with a camera and lots of cabling. When they saw they could not open a physical space this March, they had taken the approach of providing a portable live stream service which would be a way to generate revenue in response to COVID since people were unable to gather while organizations still needed to reach their patrons and supporters. They felt this live streaming could be valuable in the non-profit side along with the commercial side. He commented that no one knew the future, and they could not guarantee anything in three years, but they had provided a business plan that had the best thinking they had to offer.

Mr. Skala commented that he had been on the Council when the funding for CAT had first been discussed and there had been several hundred thousands of dollars in subsidies. He noted the funding had been stepped down over a period of time. In addition, there had always been a promise to try to become self-sufficient. He stated he hated to oppose any worthy subsidy or program, but in the COVID era whereby there had been the elimination of open positions and layoffs, he did not feel they should continue to provide a subsidy for an agency or service as the City had its own financial issues.

Mr. Thomas noted funding had been cut each year until it had reached \$35,000. After that, the former City Manager had put it permanently into the budget within the Office of Cultural Affairs. The previous organization had not been able to sustain itself on that level of funding so it had come to an end, but the Council had agreed to the \$35,000. He commented that the City received much more in franchise fees than that amount, and the purpose of PEG, which had been federal law at one time, was to put money into community media production and broadcasting along with government and education due to the private sector's monopoly of commercial broadcasting access. He thought most of the franchise fees received went toward the City's own channel. The \$35,000 was a very small piece. He stated he did not see it as a subsidy for an organization. He saw it as a really important part of a broad based and very democratic process of giving a voice to people that did not normally have access to utilize their creative skills in developing programming for broadcast purposes. He commented that CAT had an incredibly loyal and committed cadre of alumni, of which he was one, who had continued to contact the Council asking them to keep it alive. He noted he had a lot of confidence in the ability and creativity of Mr. Schacht in building the institution up again from this level. He pointed out they had a lot of equipment, which had some considerable value, and they, as a Council, had previously agreed \$35,000 was the level at which they wanted to fund it. As a result, he thought they should continue to fund it.

Ms. Fowler stated she was not bothered by the fact they might have a three-year agreement with Vidwest in order to help them underwrite their efforts for fee for service work. When she had been a CAT volunteer, they had not been able to do fee for service work to be able to raise money. They had to go to grants and other not-for-profits. She commented that she wanted to support the full \$35,000, and noted she would remain open next year if they were to come forward and ask for assistance again as she felt it was a good investment in the community. She also noted it was an equity issue in that they made it available to all citizens regardless of financial abilities as long as they had an interest to learn and do the work.

The motion made by Ms. Fowler and seconded by Mr. Thomas to amend the budget associated with B210-20 with Amendment #9 on the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2020 was approved by roll call vote with Mr. Trapp, Mr. Thomas, Ms. Peters, and Ms. Fowler voting yes, and Mr. Skala, Mr. Pitzer, and

Mayor Treece voting no.

Mr. Pitzer explained he had a question regarding an amendment that was not on the amendment sheet. He noted Mr. Glascock had sent the Council a letter this morning in response to some questions from a citizen. The letter had indicated there were principle and interest savings of \$4.5 million for FY 2021 as a result of a water and electric bond refinancing the Council had supported in August, and that the refunding had only closed a couple of days ago so there was not time to prepare an amendment. He understood the water and electric utilities were showing a loss for this year of about \$2.7 million and asked if that \$4.5 million in savings would bump those utilities into a positive position. Mr. Lue replied he was not sure if it would bump them into a positive situation, but noted it would help out. He explained some of this was due to the fact it was pushed from FY 2020 into FY 2021. It was that large of a savings due to the timing of the refunding. Mr. Pitzer understood \$4.5 million was getting pushed out of the FY 2021 budget and asked if some of it would be repaid this year. Mr. Lue replied yes. Mr. Pitzer noted they were showing a proposed budget at the end of FY 2021 of spending down roughly \$5.2 million of cash, and asked how that would be different as a result of this refunding. Mr. Lue replied the City would not have to pay as much in principle and interest for FY 2021 so there would be some wiggle room to do something different with those funds. Mr. Pitzer asked if he could assume it would be \$4.5 million better than what was in the budget. Mr. Lue replied it was actually \$3.7 million, and stated that would be discussed at the end of the meeting. Mr. Pitzer explained the \$4.5 million had been on the summary from the ordinance they had passed on August 17, and asked if it was really \$3.7 million. Mr. Lue replied he had \$3.7 million and noted he would look into it. Mr. Pitzer understood a more timely projection of the cash reserves at the end of FY 2021 would be a couple of million better than what was in the budget. Mr. Lue asked to be able to run the numbers and provide that information to him at a later time. Mr. Pitzer replied that would be okay.

Mayor Treece thanked Mr. Pitzer for bringing that up. He noted they had approved a lot of refunding bonds, and he would usually ask how those savings were reflected back to Council. He commented that they had raised voter approved rates to pay for the debt service on the bonds issues, and asked when they would be able to relax what they had charged ratepayers to pay for the bonds for which they now had a better interest rate. Mr. Lue replied they had seen some relaxation of rates since they had not increased rates even when they had been proposed to be increased similar to what had been done this year. Mayor Treece stated he would like to see the math on it more often.

Mr. Skala asked that they revisit Amendment #31 with an add-pay rate of \$1 per hour instead of the \$2.50 per hour, which would cost them about \$34,400. It was less than half the amount associated with Amendment #31.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend the budget associated with B210-20 by providing a \$1 per hour add-pay for all permanent residential collection CDL employees.

Ms. Fowler thought they had already voted for the add-pay. Mr. Skala stated they had voted for the \$5 per hour add-pay for the employees that actually threw the bags into the back of the truck. Ms. Fowler understood the drivers got out of the truck to throw the bags along with whoever was on the back of the truck. Mr. Skala noted this would across the board regardless of whether the driver had two temporary employees on the back of the truck or one permanent employee. Ms. Fowler asked if that would supplement the \$5 per hour. Mr. Skala replied no. He explained it would be whichever was higher. The drivers would receive the \$5 per hour add-pay if they were actually throwing the bags, but if they were not because they were primarily driving, they would make \$1 per hour more. Ms. Fowler felt that would confuse the issue in that they wanted the drivers that were getting out of the truck to help with throwing the bags to get the \$5 per hour of add-pay. Mr. Skala stated they would receive the \$5 per hour if they were in fact throwing bags and had a permanent employee on the back of the truck.

Ms. Peters understood Mr. Skala was speaking about the drivers that had the temporary

employees on the back of the truck. Mr. Skala stated that was correct, and explained it was to supplement the driver regardless of the circumstance they were in, but if they were actually getting out and throwing the bags, they would receive \$5 per hour instead of the \$1 per hour.

Ms. Peters understood the drivers had indicated they get out of the truck to help, but did not believe they would be paid the \$5 per hour add-pay if they had two temporary employees on the back of the truck. Ms. Fowler stated they should be paid that amount. Ms. Peters pointed out they had not voted for that. Mayor Treece asked for clarification. Mr. Glascock commented that the drivers would not be getting out of the truck once they moved to the new system since there would only be two bags so the drivers would not be receiving the \$5 per hour. Ms. Fowler understood they would when they had more full-time employees on the back of the truck and back to that rotation. Mr. Glascock agreed. Ms. Fowler stated she did not want to take that away from them. Mr. Skala stated he did not either. Mr. Glascock understood Mr. Skala was discussing the situation when there were two temporary employees on the back of the truck. Mr. Skala agreed. It was only to benefit the drivers that were not eligible for the \$5 per hour add-pay.

The motion made by Mr. Skala to amend the budget associated with B210-20 by providing a \$1 per hour add-pay for all permanent residential collection CDL employees died for the lack of a second.

Mr. Trapp commented that they usually spent all of their time on budget amendments so he wanted to discuss the budget as a whole. He noted they had done a lot of great things with the budget. They had balanced it under difficult times with a lot less revenue coming in while still largely putting out the face to the public in terms of services. He stated he wanted to also acknowledge that they had made a significant investment of \$2 million in street improvements and had funded the crisis response unit to help take the load off of police officers. He pointed out that was a lot of money in a difficult budget year, and thanked Mr. Glascock and the budget team. He thought they had a simpler budget with a template toward moving to a more understandable budget. He stated he had been impressed with the financial team in terms of communication with Council. Every budget year, they tended to get caught in the sideshows of the small budget amendments they made, which were significant to a small number of stakeholders, but the larger themes of the budget were sometimes lost. He reiterated he wanted to call out the hard work everyone had put into this. He also thanked Ms. Peveler for her long service with the City.

Mr. Glascock agreed and thanked Ms. Peveler as well for her 30 years of service with this being her last budget.

The vote on B211-20 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B232-20 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B232-20, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B233-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, TREECE, FOWLER. VOTING NO: PITZER, PETERS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B234-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES:

TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B235-20 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B235-20, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B210-20, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH31-20 Proposed Phase I construction of the Perche Creek Trail, from the MKT Trail to Gillespie Bridge Road, to include construction of a 10-foot wide concrete trail, a bridge over the Perche Creek and a small trailhead on the south side of Gillespie Bridge Road.

Discussion shown with B247-20.

B247-20 Authorizing Phase I construction of the Perche Creek Trail, from the MKT Trail to Gillespie Bridge Road, to include construction of a 10-foot wide concrete trail, a bridge over the Perche Creek and a small trailhead on the south side of Gillespie Bridge Road; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division for a portion of the project; authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Crocket Engineering Consultants, LLC for design of the trail project.

PH31-20 was read by the Clerk and B247-20 was given second reading by the Clerk. Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer understood they would delay the construction of the Chapel Hill connector and asked if that was correct. Mr. Griggs replied yes. Mr. Pitzer understood that meant this trail would end at Gillespie Bridge Road, which to him did not appear to be a particularly pedestrian friendly area, and asked about the status of that connector. Mr. Griggs replied they had to reduce some of their capital projects in terms of their scopes of work since they had not received the amount of sales tax money as had been anticipated, and this was one of the phases they had removed. He referred to the diagram and explained the next phase would have been to go underneath Gillespie Bridge Road so they would then be on the north side. They would have had a pedestrian bridge across the Perche Creek and taken the connector all of the way up to the sidewalk that went to Louisville Drive. They would not be able to do that now, but would put it on the 2021 ballot issue. The goal was to keep going with Council approval while they were still out there if they had a successful ballot issue as this project would be winding down in about a year.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the cost of that connector. Mr. Griggs replied the original estimate was about \$500,000. Mr. Pitzer asked if they could apply the \$250,000 grant toward that if it were to be received. Mr. Griggs replied it would help. He explained they were concerned about the cost of the bridge so they would want to know the amounts of those bids prior to moving forward.

Mr. Pitzer asked staff to try to find a way to tie all of it together. He noted it was a huge residential area, but he was not sure there would be a lot of usage until there was a better trail. He stated he would hate to see them do this great project by providing the connectivity all of the way down there and people not really being able to access it for a year or two.

Ms. Peters asked if this phase was funded. Mr. Griggs replied yes. He explained they

had removed the second phase, which Mr. Pitzer had mentioned. He reiterated they had the \$1.2 million for the first phase.

Ms. Fowler understood it was a concrete trail and that concrete was a contributor to climate impacts, and asked if going forward they could look at other hard-pack surfaces that would meet their needs, particularly for those that had to ambulate with chairs and other things. Mr. Griggs replied it was hard for them to utilize surfaces other than concrete. He noted the Bear Creek Trail was a gravel trail and they received a lot of complaints every time it rained and flooded because the gravel was washed into the natural creek. It resulted in a lot of limestone that was not natural in the creek beds. He commented that the good news about this project was that they would work with the Utilities Department in creating a stormwater detention area. He believed it would be a better site even with the 10-foot concrete trail.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Mayor Treece noted written comment had been received by Annette Triplett, the CEO of the PedNet Coalition, who indicated their support for the trail. They felt it was a critical first phase of the Perche Creek Trail, which would make up the entire western section of the planned 30-mile trail loop. Once the full Perche Creek Trail was built, it would provide trail access for transportation and recreation to residents on western side of the City, which included Wards 4 and 2. It was especially important for Ward 2 citizens as the only trail access was the Bear Creek Trail and it was currently disconnected from the rest of the trail network. They understood budget constraints had caused the Chapel Hill connector to be removed and asked that the Parks and Recreation Department continue to identify funding to allow the connector to be built in the future. They noted Phase 1 would end at Gillespie Bridge Road on the north end, and until the connector was built, the short distance along Gillespie Bridge Road between the trail and the Chapel Hill sidewalk would not be passable for most people due to the steep hill grade and lack of sidewalk and shoulder. The connector would be necessary to allow children, older adults, people pushing strollers, and most people riding bikes to travel between the trail and the neighborhoods of Chapel Hill. Mayor Treece noted the written comment would be filed with other items associated with this meeting.

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

Mr. Thomas stated he supported this project. He commented that the Parks and Recreation Department always did an excellent job of communicating with the public and delivering on projects. He noted the creation of the 30-mile trail loop was a very popular vision and was about 50 percent completed. This would allow for another mile. He stated it would be a great attraction for the City of Columbia once it was completed as it would provide healthy recreational opportunities for residents and would be a tourism attraction to the City. He commented that many parts of the trail system functioned well as walking, biking, and commuting routes, which would assist in reducing the vehicle miles traveled and the reliance on the road system. He hoped they would all vote in favor of this.

B247-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH32-20 Proposed installation of backup cooling equipment on the roof of the City Hall Building for the Information Technology data center.

Discussion shown with B248-20.

B248-20 Authorizing installation of backup cooling equipment on the roof of the City Hall Building for the Information Technology data center; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

PH32-20 was read by the Clerk and B248-20 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Chapdelaine provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood the project had been designed so there were not any unanticipated problems in terms of the roof being able to support this equipment. Mr. Chapdelaine stated that had been taken into account.

Mayor Pro Tem Skala opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Mayor Pro Tem Skala closed the public hearing.

B248-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: TREECE, FOWLER (Both has stepped out during the vote on this item). Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH33-20

Voluntary annexation of property located on the south side of Bradbury Drive and east of Kipling Way (Case No. 161-2020).

Mayor Pro Tem Skala read the public hearing.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked if this was within Ward 3. Mr. Skala replied yes, and explained it was north of Broadway.

Mayor Pro Tem Skala opened the public hearing.

David Butcher explained he was an engineer with Crockett Engineering and was representing the property owners. He displayed the plat from the time Wellington Manor had been platted, and pointed out a street/cul-de-sac that had fallen into the jurisdiction of Boone County, but noted he thought it was a City maintained street. He commented that some of the users of that City street were County residents at this time. He stated there was an existing lagoon on the property, and while Mr. Teddy had indicated his client would be able to access City sewer, he pointed out the intention was to access City sewer as the property owner wanted to get rid of the lagoon. As a result, there would be a significant public benefit with this annexation. He commented that he would also be bringing a plat forward in about a month that would add a portion of another lot to it at the end of the cul-de-sac so they could create a two-lot subdivision. He explained the point of this was to be able to subdivide the end of the cul-de-sac and include a portion of County property with a City lot. Since he had been unable to do that due to it being multi-jurisdictional, they were proposing the annexation. He reiterated they would also address the sewer problem with the annexation.

There being no further comment, Mayor Pro Tem Skala closed the public hearing.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B230-20

Authorizing the issuance of Taxable Special Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2020C.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Lue provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters understood this was for the parking garage. Mr. Lue replied yes. Ms. Peters asked which parking structure was involved. Mr. Lue replied he was not sure. Ms. Thompson stated this was for the Short Street garage.

Mr. Trapp noted they were chipping away at the million dollars in cost overruns they had on that garage.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B230-20 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B230-20, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B236-20 Rezoning property located on the northwest corner of the Green Meadows Road and Green Meadows Circle intersection from District R-1 (One-family Dwelling) to District PD (Planned Development); approving a statement of intent; approving "The Godfrey PD Plan"; granting a design adjustment relating to front entrance placement (Case No. 127-2020).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy noted the Council had received a request to table this item to the October 19, 2020 Council Meeting.

Mayor Treece asked if a representative of the applicant was present. Mr. Teddy replied he thought Mr. Gebhardt had left.

Ms. Peters understood this involved the PD plan that had been rejected by the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). Mr. Teddy stated it had been brought forward with a vote of eight against and none in favor. Ms. Peters understood the applicant wanted it to be tabled, and asked if they would be taking it back to the PZC by then. Mr. Teddy replied no. He explained the PZC had already made its recommendation. It would only go back to the PZC if there was a reason to send it back to them.

Mayor Treece commented that letter requesting the tabling had indicated that it had come to their attention that some of the neighbors wanted more time and notice which they wanted to try to accommodate. He noted he had reached out to all of the neighbors that had contacted him, and no one had spoken to them. He understood the applicant and engineer had been invited to participate in a neighborhood association meeting on Friday, but had declined the invitation. He stated he was not inclined to grant the motion to table. He noted it had been a 0-8 vote and felt any adjustments to the plan should go back to the PZC.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to table B236-20 to the October 19, 2020 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Trapp and Mr. Thomas if they had met with the applicant. Mr. Thomas replied he had. Mayor Treece asked if he had been offered any adjustments or inducements to the plan to gain his support. Mr. Thomas replied no. He explained it had only been a general high level discussion about the goal of developing truly affordable housing and making it compatible with the neighborhood and acceptable to the nearby neighbors. He noted he had also spoken with at least two members of the Rock Bridge Christian Church Social Justice Team who were interested in exploring some kind of compromise between the different goals of the different parties, and he thought it made sense to give that process time to happen. He was not sure they would end up approving anything in four weeks, but felt there was a good discussion that would potentially have bigger impacts than just this one project. Mayor Treece commented that he was not sure those negotiations should happen outside of this process.

Ms. Peters stated the applicant had met with her also, and they had only told her about the project. She noted it had not sounded like affordable housing to her at all. If the PZC rejected it entirely, she was not sure they would be able to do enough with negotiations for her to be willing to approve it.

Mr. Skala commented that this Green Meadows area had a history of proposed projects over time, but there had been a series of rejections by the neighborhood influencers and residents in the area. He agreed it was almost incumbent on the applicant to negotiate as they wanted and to then go back through the PZC process due to that 0-8 vote.

Mr. Pitzer explained this was in his ward, and noted he had spoken to a lot of people about it. He stated he did not see the harm in waiting until October 19. He was not sure of the kind of discussions that would happen between now and then or if anything would change, and reiterated he did not see the harm in giving it time to see if something did happen. He commented that he had been invited to that neighborhood meeting on relative short order and he had also been unable to attend. He did not feel they should penalize someone for that. If they came back with a drastically different idea, they could

then send it back to the PZC for review. He stated he did not see the negative of waiting until October 19.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Mr. Thomas to table B236-20 to the October 19, 2020 Council Meeting was approved by voice vote with only Mr. Skala and Mayor Treece voting no.

B250-20

Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for airport operations and annual transit projects back to transportation sales tax fund balance for future allocation for transportation projects; appropriating capital project funds identified for the Battle Park Phase I project and Chapel Hill Connector - Perche Creek Trail project back to parks sales tax fund balance for future allocation for parks projects.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. McDonald provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B250-20 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B250-20, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B243-20

Authorizing an operating agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri and Bird Rides, Inc. for implementation of a shared active transportation operation for small dockless electric vehicles.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Ms. Fowler commented that she wanted to table this item for six months. She explained they were in the middle of a pandemic that was adversely affecting downtown businesses and they were looking at ways to do business differently, which could involve employing more of the sidewalk and perhaps the parking spaces in front of their business. She did not want to yield that space to a business that was not located in Columbia when they could allow the downtown businesses time to determine how they wanted to continue to operate given the restrictions related to COVID.

Ms. Fowler made a motion to table B243-20 to the March 15, 2021 Council Meeting.

Mr. Nichols stated they were not allowed on the sidewalk or in the parking areas. They were supposed to be utilized on the streets. Ms. Fowler understood, but noted that had not happened the last time they were in Columbia.

The motion made by Ms. Fowler to table B243-20 to the March 15, 2021 Council Meeting was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Ms. Peters understood the Bird scooters were supposed to be on the roads instead of the sidewalks, and asked about the penalties. Mr. Nichols replied there was a pretty stringent set of rules within the contract as they had learned quite a bit from their previous experience with Bird Rides. He noted working with the University on this issue had really tightened up on the controls. He explained that if a user was found to be in noncompliance, they were no longer to activate the Bird scooters. He stated the contract also included criteria based on complaints whereby follow up was necessary. He reiterated this was a tighter contract than the prior one.

Ms. Peters asked if the contract would automatically renew in a year. Mr. Nichols replied no. He explained they would come together to decide whether it had been a worthwhile pilot year or not, and based on that discussion, they could renew the contract or terminate it. He pointed out there were provisions indicating they could terminate it at any point.

Ms. Peters stated there had been a lot of scattered Bird scooters on the sidewalks when

they had previously been in town, which had obstructed pathways and disabled accesses. She asked if there would be a place for them to be properly parked. Mr. Nichols replied he understood a lot of instructions were included, and if there was a complaint, it had to be addressed with two hours by Bird Rides. He commented that toward the end of the period that they were in town, there had been very few complaints via his office or the contact center. Ms. Peters asked where they would be parked since they could not be in the roadway. Mr. Nichols replied they could be leaned up against a parking meter or in other similar types of places.

Ms. Peters asked how they had chosen 500 Bird scooters to be the appropriate number. Mr. Nichols replied that was the number from last year that they felt it was manageable. He pointed out this was all in response to an RFP. Ms. Peters understood the University had not been real happy with them the first time they had come around so they likely had very specific requirements. Mr. Nichols stated they did. He noted they had specific locations as they could create corrals for them. He pointed out the University had made quite a bit of money impounding the Bird scooters, which had likely caught the attention of Bird Rides and was why they were trying to work to resolve the issues.

Ms. Peters understood there was geofencing and asked if that was for speed or just with regard to where they could go. Mr. Nichols replied it could be done for both. There was a way to just shut them off in certain geofenced areas. Ms. Peters asked if that was the same with the speed. Mr. Nichols replied yes. Ms. Peters asked how they had chosen 15 miles per hour. Mr. Nichols replied he understood that was the industry standard, but if there were areas they wanted them to go slower, it could be geofenced. Ms. Peters asked if the University required slower speeds. Mr. Nichols replied he did not recall them making any comment in that regard. Ms. Peters asked if 15 miles per hour was okay for them. Mr. Nichols replied they had not mentioned speed. He understood there were locations the University did not want them, such as tailgate locations where there were a lot of people.

Ms. Fowler stated she had questions if they chose not to table this item. She noted she was concerned about the social norming of the proper use of a Bird scooter on top of the social norming work they were doing with the pandemic in terms of social distancing and utilizing masks. She felt it was asking too much of the residents and the downtown businesses at this time.

Mr. Skala commented that he had voted against the contract with Bird Rides when it had come before them previously. It was not because he felt it was not a reasonable service. It had been due to the fact he did not think the agreements were ready to be executed in terms of unanticipated and anticipated problems. He understood some of these issues were addressed this time. He stated he would not normally be inclined to agree to a tabling of six months, but three months would take them into the winter anyway. In addition, they were in the middle of COVID. As a result, he would support this tabling for the six month time frame.

Mayor Treece stated he had some questions regarding the contract and its severability. It was a three-way agreement and the termination clause was not clear. It seemed to suggest the University and the City had to agree to terminate.

Mr. Pitzer noted he would vote against the tabling motion because he would like to discuss the issue and allow for public comment to determine if there were advantages to the downtown business community of having the Bird scooters.

The motion made by Ms. Fowler and seconded by Mr. Skala to table B243-20 to the March 15, 2021 Council Meeting was approved by voice vote with only Mr. Trapp, Mr. Thomas, and Mr. Pitzer voting no.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

B231-20

Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to eliminate the safety helmet or

- headgear requirement for motorcycle operators or passengers as required by state law and modifying the agency responsible for establishing minimum protective standard specifications.
- B237-20 Rezoning property located on the north side of Texas Avenue and approximately 650 feet west of Providence Road (13, 103, 105 and 107 E. Texas Avenue) from District R-1 (One-family Dwelling) and District R-2 (Two-family Dwelling) to District M-OF (Mixed-use Office) (Case No. 142-2020).
- B238-20 Granting design adjustments relating to the proposed Final Plat of Boone Electric Plat 2 located on the west side of Range Line Street and north of Business Loop 70 (1413 Range Line Street) to allow an alternative location for utility easement dedication and a lot line to bisect an existing structure (i.e., parking lot) (Case No. 135-2020).
- B239-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Boone Electric Plat 2" located on the west side of Range Line Street and north of Business Loop 70 (1413 Range Line Street); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 135-2020).
- B240-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Fyfer Place Plat 1" located on the southwest corner of the Broadway and Fyfer Place intersection; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 144-2020).
- B241-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Deerfield Ridge Plat 2-A" located on the northwest corner of the Scott Boulevard and Route K intersection; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 148-2020).
- B242-20 Authorizing a consolidated grant agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for FY 2021 transportation planning purposes (Case No. CATSO-000181-2020).
- B244-20 Authorizing a contract with Consolidated Public Water Supply District No. 1 of Boone County, Missouri relating to the relocation of a waterline along the north side of Route K as part of the Sinclair Road/Route K/Old Plank Road roundabout improvement project.
- B245-20 Authorizing an agreement with Regional Economic Development Incorporated (REDI) for the lease of office space at 500 E. Walnut Street located in the Fifth Street and Walnut Street municipal parking facility.
- B246-20 Authorizing an economic development agreement with the Columbia Chamber of Commerce, Boone County, Missouri, The Curators of the University of Missouri and Regional Economic Development Incorporated (REDI).
- B249-20 Authorizing a non-federal reimbursable agreement with the Federal Aviation Administration for a commissioned flight inspection of the Runway End Identifier Lights System (REILS) on Runway 2-20 at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B251-20 Accepting conveyances for drainage and sewer purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B252-20 Accepting conveyances for utility and temporary construction purposes.

- R110-20 Setting a public hearing: consider options to provide enhanced fall protection and related self-harm deterrent measures for the Fifth Street and Walnut Street municipal parking structure.
- R111-20 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of improvements at the Again Street Park to include replacement of the existing playground structure and swings, installation of an asphalt overlay and restriping the basketball court, installation of an ADA compliant walkway from the basketball court to Pershing Avenue, installation of park benches and a disc golf basket, replacement of a drinking fountain, and drainage and fencing improvements to the baseball field.
- R112-20 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of improvements at the Lake of the Woods Golf Course to include construction of a replacement golf cart barn, cart washing station and a secured storage area for a fuel tank and dumpster, and installation of perimeter fencing.
- R114-20 Expressing support for the installation of an electric vehicle charging station along the Alternative Fuel Corridor at or near the intersection of I-70 and U.S. Highway 63 including intended financial participation by the City of Columbia of up to \$50,000.00 to assist with the construction of such charging station.
- R115-20 Authorizing the submission of an application for and acceptance of the receipt of coronavirus relief funds administered by Boone County for allowable expenses under the federal Coronavirus Aid, Relief, and Economic Security (CARES) Act; establishing an effective date.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R113-20 Expressing support for replacement of downtown public housing units with the construction of the Kinney Point Apartments and the Columbia Housing Authority's Associated Application to the Missouri Housing Development Commission for low-income housing tax credits.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Fowler explained she had asked for this to be removed from the consent agenda because she had been asked by the applicant to write a letter of support, and since she was a new member, she wanted guidance as to how that might be done. In addition, the request had been for the City Council to rank the Kinney Point Apartments application as the highest priority low-income housing tax credit (LIHTC) project for the City of Columbia this year. She noted she had received a certified letter regarding this particular project and another project within Columbia. She felt this created a decision point in terms of whether they would agree the Kinney Point Apartments project was the highest priority, low income, housing tax credit project for the City this year.

Mayor Treece stated he had received those letters as well. He understood the Missouri Housing Development Commission (MHDC) had a very competitive process, and he had always tried to have a good mix of low-income, disabled, and senior housing.

Ms. Fowler noted the second request had been for Freedom House. Mayor Treece

understood there was a recommendation for the City to fund them with CDBG funds. Ms. Fowler agreed and pointed out that had been the case for the Kinney Point Apartments project as well. She noted there were recommendations for a modest amount of money for both projects.

Mr. Pitzer asked for clarification regarding the language she had concerns about in the resolution. Ms. Fowler replied the staff report had indicated the Columbia Housing Authority (CHA) had requested the Council rank the Kinney Point Apartments application as the highest priority low-income housing tax credit project for the City of Columbia this year, and noted she was not sure how to reconcile that with the resolution that was in front of them. Mr. Pitzer stated he did not see that language in the resolution. Ms. Fowler explained it was in the staff report, which was why it had raised a question in her mind. Mr. Pitzer pointed out the resolution only stated the City of Columbia supported the application, and it did not say they could not support multiple applications. Ms. Fowler stated that was the reason she wanted their guidance. Mr. Pitzer reiterated he did not see anything in the actual language of the resolution that precluded them from doing anything else. It had only been in the correspondence.

Phil Steinhaus, 201 Switzer Street, stated he was the CEO of the CHA, and noted Freedom House was not applying for tax credits. He understood they were only applying for HOME funds. He commented that he knew that specifically because they both utilized the same consulting group and he had received a copy of the letter as the Director of the CHA. He reiterated they were not in competition for low income housing tax credits. With regard to the Kinney Point Apartments, he explained the support of Council as the priority for low-income housing tax credits carried a lot of weight with the MHDC. He pointed out both St. Louis and Kansas City ranked their projects and the MHDC listened to them. He noted the Council had passed a similar resolution in 2014 in support of CHA projects, and explained the problem was that the Council did not follow through with Missouri State Senators like Caleb Rowden or members of the MHDC to say this was the number one priority and that they wanted to see it funded. He noted he needed that kind of support because he was in a blackout period and could not do it himself.

Ms. Fowler read from the letter regarding Freedom House, which indicated it was for LIHTC and National Trust Fund funding to demolish and reconstruct their apartment community known as Freedom House I. Mr. Steinhaus stated they must have changed their mind as he had been assured they would not compete with the CHA application.

Mr. Teddy commented that Freedom House had been recommended for funding by the Housing and Community Development Commission, and in that application, they had specified one of their sources of funds would be the four percent low-income housing tax credit. They had not mentioned the nine percent that the CHA was applying for. If those were considered two different programs, it might be a way to reconcile the apparent conflict. He stated he did not know if that had changed and if they were now going for the nine percent tax credit.

Mr. Skala understood Mr. Teddy had based the recommendation in the staff report on the dichotomy between the four percent and the nine percent, and that there was now apparently a change as it was nine percent for both. Mr. Teddy stated he had not written the staff report and pointed out the resolution was simply a statement of support without any indication of rank. Mr. Skala understood it was not exclusionary either. Mr. Teddy thought a resolution that had been adopted in 2014 had indicated the CHA projects downtown and in the central neighborhoods were the priorities of Council for a three year period. In other years, the Council had done separate resolutions of support for organizations that had made the request of them.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he thought the four percent and the nine percent were both for LIHTC, but involved different buckets. As a result, that explanation would make sense if it was true.

Ms. Fowler asked for guidance when they were asked to provide a letter. She wondered

if they wrote them as individuals who happened to be a council member or if she needed to come to the Council asking for a joint letter in support. Mr. Trapp replied he frequently wrote letters and did so as the Second Ward City Council Member. He explained they could obtain the assistance of the City Clerk to put the letter on letterhead, make a copy, and send it to the requester. He noted a copy had to be saved and the City Clerk was happy to assist with that. If they wanted a more universal item, they could seek out the support of others. Mayor Treece stated a resolution would be an appropriate vehicle for that type of item. Mr. Trapp agreed, and noted they could also do a joint letter whereby they all signed if they wanted to speak with one voice.

Mr. Trapp commented that all of the affordable housing projects that came before the MHDC for LIHTC were worthy projects they would be happy to have in the community. It was a very competitive process, especially for the nine percent tax credit. As a result, the Council had passed a policy resolution in 2014 favoring the CHA projects. In that time, there had been a robust public process whereby the community had been engaged in a way that no other affordable housing provider had previously done. The original vision of Mr. Steinhaus had been to include mixed-income housing and some larger renovations, but the community had rejected it. As a result, Mr. Steinhaus had gone with what the community had indicated, which was the rehabilitation and replacement of these units. Mr. Trapp noted there had been an added layer of public participation in the CHA project. He pointed out those in St. Louis and Kansas City spoke with one voice in supporting the projects of their respective housing authorities, which he felt was a good policy. In addition, the CHA had been given the opportunity to apply for the RAD program, which involved a public-private partnership that brought with it a permanent subsidy. He explained CHA funding had been in decline and most of the housing authority projects had been rehabilitated through this project, which meant they had level funding for the next 20 years. He thought it was singularly important to support the redevelopment of their central city housing. He stated the Freedom House project was worthy of being rehabilitated, but there had been a more robust public engagement participation process with the CHA and the RAD program. He noted the CHA had also started a non-profit arm that provided self-sufficiency services and social services to supplement just being a housing provider in an effort to move people out of poverty in a real positive way. He commented that this was why he felt this resolution was appropriate. He pointed out they had supported some of these projects individually and had also defeated some because they would compete with CHA projects. He stated another Jeff Smith senior housing project did not necessarily meet the core need like the CHA projects. He noted he was very supportive of this resolution.

The vote on R113-20 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B253-20 Repealing Section 4 of Ordinance No. 024210 to lift the temporary waiver relating to the completion of employee performance evaluations.
- B254-20 Voluntary annexation of property located on the south side of Bradbury Drive and east of Kipling Way (4000 Bradbury Drive); establishing permanent District R-1 (One-family Dwelling) zoning (Case No. 143-2020).
- B255-20 Changing the uses allowed within the "Schapira Clinic" O-P Development Plan located southwest of the intersection of College Avenue and Rogers Street (411 N. College Avenue); approving a revised statement of intent

- (Case No. 149-2020).
- B256-20 Granting a design adjustment relating to the proposed Final Plat of Nowell's Addition, Plat No. 2 located on the northeast corner of Wilkes Boulevard and Sixth Street (600 and 602 Wilkes Boulevard) to allow a reduced utility dedication (Case No. 74-2020).
- B257-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Nowell's Addition, Plat No. 2" located on the northeast corner of Wilkes Boulevard and Sixth Street (600 and 602 Wilkes Boulevard) (Case No. 74-2020).
- B258-20 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes relating to the proposed Final Plat of Moon Valley Subdivision Plat 1 located southeast of the terminus of Moon Valley Road (Case No. 08-2020).
- B259-20 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the power purchase agreements with Crystal Lake Wind III, LLC for the purchase of wind energy.
- B260-20 Accepting conveyances for temporary construction and drainage purposes.
- B261-20 Authorizing construction of improvements at the Again Street Park to include replacement of the existing playground structure and swings, installation of an asphalt overlay and restriping of the basketball court, installation of an ADA compliant walkway from the basketball court to Pershing Avenue, installation of park benches and a disc golf basket, replacement of a drinking fountain, and drainage and fencing improvements to the baseball field; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division for a portion of the project.
- B262-20 Authorizing construction of improvements at the Lake of the Woods Golf Course to include construction of a replacement golf cart barn, cart washing station and a secured storage area for a fuel tank and dumpster, and installation of perimeter fencing; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division for a portion of the project.
- B263-20 Authorizing renewal of an intergovernmental user agreement with St. Louis County, Missouri relating to the prescription drug monitoring program.
- B264-20 Authorizing a Memorandum of Understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for STD testing and treatment services.
- B265-20 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services for Epidemiology and Laboratory Capacity (ELC) CARES funding for case investigation, contact tracing, coordination and reporting activities associated with COVID-19 testing.
- B266-20 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Increasing Adult Influenza Vaccination Rates Project.
- B267-20 Authorizing an intergovernmental agreement with the County of Boone, Missouri relating to the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program FY 2020 Local Solicitation.
- B268-20 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation -

- Highway Safety and Traffic Division for acceptance of a grant for a DWI traffic enforcement unit.
- B269-20 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Highway Safety and Traffic Division for acceptance of a grant for DWI enforcement relating to sobriety checkpoints and saturation patrols.
- B270-20 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Highway Safety and Traffic Division for acceptance of a grant for dedicated enforcement of hazardous moving violations.
- B271-20 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Highway Safety and Traffic Division for acceptance of a grant to conduct special traffic enforcement of hazardous moving violations.
- B272-20 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Highway Safety and Traffic Division for acceptance of a youth alcohol enforcement grant to conduct compliance checks.
- B273-20 Authorizing acceptance of an Assistance to Firefighters grant from the U.S. Department of Homeland Security for the purchase of fitness equipment and training sessions for the Fire Department.
- B274-20 Repealing Ordinance No. 024240 which amended the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating designated loan funds for Phase I construction of the terminal building project at the Columbia Regional Airport and enacting new provisions related thereto.
- B275-20 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code to establish poll worker leave for City employees.

X. REPORTS

- REP50-20 Citizens Police Review Board: Proposed Amendments to Chapter 21.
- Mayor Treece understood the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB) had recommended three changes to the deadlines to appeal the notice of the chief's decision. Mayor Treece asked what would happen at the October 19, 2020 Council Meeting. He understood the consultant that had been meeting with various stakeholders since the murder of George Floyd. He suggested they place these recommendations in the bucket of reforms that they considered at that October 19, 2020 Council Meeting. Mr. Glascock explained he was trying to limit the items on the October 19, 2020 Council Meeting agenda so they were able to have a good discussion regarding the stakeholder process, what they had learned, what they thought going forward, etc., and these recommendations could be added to that as well. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Glascock if it was his vision for all of the groups that had participated in these interviews to be invited to speak in a public hearing format. Mr. Glascock replied they would notify them the plan was to do it in that manner. He noted it would be a special item and stated he was trying to place more emphasis on it. Mr. Thomas commented that he thought that was a good idea, and asked that staff ensure the stakeholders were all aware of the date with as much notice as possible.
- REP51-20 Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) Board of Directors - Membership Change Due to Resignation.
- Mr. Trapp stepped out of the meeting room. Mayor Treece stated it was his intent to appoint Aric Jarvis to a term ending February 2021 to fill a vacancy on the Downtown CID Board, and asked for the consent of Council.

REP52-20

The Council consented as there were no objections.

Correspondence from the staff of the Downtown Community Improvement District related to the downtown curbside pick-up pilot program.

Mayor Treece asked Nickie Davis, the Executive Director of the Downtown CID, to speak. Ms. Davis commented that the Downtown CID had conducted a small survey to get a better feel from the businesses as to how the program was working, and it had been overwhelmingly positive. She explained they had proposed closing Ninth Street this Saturday due to the football game, and the businesses were concerned about losing the curbside spots even when only for one day. She stated the Downtown CID was asking for a continuation of the program with less than 35 spots, and noted she thought they were at 31 or 32 right now. They hoped the Council could see value in continuing this program.

Mr. Pitzer stated he supported the program and the need to make adjustments with the current locations if that was determined to be needed. He asked if there was support from businesses with regard to the idea that had been discussed earlier utilizing the sidewalks or parking spots in front of them. Ms. Davis replied support was split. She explained parking had always been the enemy of downtown businesses so to even lose 1-2 spots was a big deal for some businesses. Some were ready and willing to try it, but others had concerns because their products were heavier. They felt that forcing people to carry something heavy a bit further, whether only a half-block or a full block would hurt their business. Since the businesses were split on this idea, the CID was unsure as to how to proceed. She understood it was something the public wanted, but finding places to implement the idea that had the support of the businesses had been difficult. Mr. Pitzer asked if they had looked for places to conduct a pilot. Ms. Davis replied yes, and explained it was something they would continue to pursue, but pointed out the support of the businesses would be needed before they would feel comfortable moving forward.

Mr. Pitzer asked Ms. Davis if the businesses downtown liked the scooters. Ms. Davis replied she thought support for it was also split. From her perspective, she believed investing in scooters was important for a progressive town, but as they continued to invite businesses to utilize sidewalks and potentially parking spaces or streets, she was not sure now was time to consider them. If in the future, they wanted to consider them again, she thought obtaining feedback from the businesses would be helpful.

Ms. Fowler understood the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council supported the continuation of the curbside pick-up spots at no additional fee through the end of this year.

Mr. Skala commented that push back with regard to street closures usually came from the Fire Department in terms of access, and asked if that had been incorporated in the discussion with businesses. Ms. Davis replied yes in terms of some of their larger events, such as Halloweenie. With regard to closing streets to allow businesses to extend their services, they had worked with the Convention and Visitors Bureau and the Chamber of Commerce to develop a compromise of an 8-10 foot median in the middle for access. She understood an issue was the need for solid barriers for cars.

Mr. Thomas stated he was intrigued by the fact there was not much interest in the parking spaces being used. He thought the parklet had been popular with businesses, and asked if that had changed. Ms. Davis replied they had been popular, and noted a certain percentage of businesses had to be supportive in order for them to be placed in a certain location. She noted some businesses consistently said no because they were concerned about parking spaces and customers accessing their businesses. While it brought vibrancy, there were businesses they had to consider that were not supportive. Mr. Thomas asked if the businesses that wanted this could be supported in terms of only the spaces in front of their businesses. Ms. Davis replied yes, and noted they were discussing that more intently. She explained they would have to work with the City to determine how that would look.

Mr. Glascock pointed out the City was looking about \$8,000 per month on the 27 metered spots currently. He wanted the Council to be aware of the monetary loss associated with the program. Ms. Davis pointed out it helped to bring in sales tax. Mr. Glascock agreed.

REP53-20 Monthly Finance Report.

Mr. Trapp returned to the meeting room.

Mr. Pitzer noted several of them had asked for this type of report, and it showed some of the work that had been done over the past several years. He hoped people realized the \$68 million in savings over the next 20 years would benefit everyone in terms of either lower rates or better maintenance of the utilities.

REP54-20 Amendment to the FY 2020 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

Mayor Treece apologized to Sterling Browning and Kate Kelley with regard to their scheduled public comments as they had not received confirmation indicating that their request to speak had been approved. As a result, they did not know they were on the agenda tonight. He noted he had spoken with Mr. Sterling indicating they could speak now or they could speak as a scheduled public comment at the next meeting, and they had chosen to speak at the next meeting.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, stated a garage sale had been held to raise money for the car camp, and it had resulted in over \$500.

Mr. Elkin suggested those at the podium remove their mask when speaking as it was sometimes difficult to hear the speakers. He also felt a surround sound type system might be needed since people were not always speaking into the microphone.

Mayor Treece understood a draft audit report would be submitted to staff in mid-September and asked if that had been received. Mr. Glascock replied he had not received it, but noted he would check with Mr. Seewood.

Mr. Skala commented that he had asked for a speed limit evaluation on East Walnut Street a few weeks ago, and had several constituents that had asked for the evaluation of the speed limit on Ballenger Lane from Mexico Gravel Road to Clark Lane as well. He asked if an evaluation could be arranged for it along with the one on East Walnut Street. Mr. Glascock understood the portion of East Walnut Street needing to be evaluated was the portion east of Old 63. Mr. Skala stated that was correct.

Mr. Trapp stated he had met with Bruce Alspaugh, the chair of the Broadband Business Planning Task Force, who had indicated the industry representatives had thwarted making quorum resulting in slow progress. In addition, they had not appointed every member of every broadband provider to the task force. He noted Mr. Alspaugh had suggested they look at the form of the Task Force, and explained he would be interested in a resolution reforming the Task Force so providers that were not members were invited to participate. He commented that he had suggested Mr. Alspaugh submit a report, but understood there might be support without the report as Mr. Alspaugh had spoken with many of them. He stated he thought they should do something to move in a brisker manner so they were not wasting the work of their consultant.

Mr. Skala explained he was a non-voting member and the co-chair of the Task Force and there had been difficulties largely due to COVID-19. He had anticipated that it would take six months or so to convince the private sector that they were not competing with each

other. He understood some wanted to benefit from the information the City or consultant could provide, but they were not willing to release a lot of information because they felt it was proprietary. He suspected it was premature to undo something that had taken a significant amount of time in terms of trust, and suggested they tighten up the attendance requirements because when they had reconvened from the COVID break only two of seven that had RSVP'd had shown up for the meeting. He reiterated his suggestion of giving it some time prior to undoing what they had in terms of the formation of the Task Force.

Mr. Trapp thought bringing something forward that added attendance requirements would be beneficial. Mr. Skala agreed as he understood most boards and commissions had some sort of requirement.

Mr. Thomas stated Chief Jones had met with him and Mr. Trapp last week to discuss their request for an ordinance prohibiting neck restraints and chokeholds. He understood the interpretation of Chief Jones of the current policy was that those kinds of holds could only be used intentionally as an act of deadly force, but the wording did not read that way to him. He explained Chief Jones felt if it was a more nuanced issue than some might think. He asked for a draft ordinance within a report. He stated they were particularly interested in how the dozens of other cities that had enacted these kinds of prohibitions were doing so when Chief Jones felt it was completely antithetical to the work of the Police Department. He thought a report would allow for discussion, and noted they had discussed potentially asking the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB) and the Commission on Human Rights (HRC) to review it prior to moving toward a vote.

Mr. Glascock asked when he wanted the report to come forward. Mr. Thomas replied he thought they should discuss it on October 19, 2020 since they would be discussing some of those issues earlier in the evening. Ms. Thompson asked Mr. Thomas if he wanted it to go before the CPRB and HRC prior to it coming to Council. Mr. Thomas replied he was not sure of the best order. He suggested a report to Council with staff input and a draft ordinance. They could have the initial discussion then and could later refer it to the CPRB and HRC if necessary.

Ms. Peters commented that the Shepard Boulevard Neighborhood had organized a beautification of a median on Shepard Boulevard. She understood they had worked with Steve Fritz, the City Arborist, and had been very appreciative of his help in determining what might be appropriate in terms of trees and how to keep them alive. She noted it was nice to see a fairly large group of neighbors work to beautify a median on a Saturday morning. She stated it had also been nice to hear about Mr. Fritz's support of it.

Ms. Fowler stated she had been impressed with the success of CoMoHelps this past spring as they had raised \$1,066,000 for not-for-profits, and wondered if Mr. Glascock could speak with the Community Foundation and Mr. Baker with regard to whether it would be feasible to establish a business interruption fund to help businesses that had been adversely affected by COVID. She noted the federal government did not have that type of program and believed the pain would increase and continue for small businesses.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 10:35 p.m.