



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, June 1, 2020
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

(One or more council
members may
participate via
videoconference.)

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, June 1, 2020, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri.

Mayor Treece explained two Council Members were joining via videoconference and there were physical changes to the Council Chamber, which limited its capacity. He asked those present for a specific agenda item to come into the room for that item and to step out when done to allow someone else to come in for a later agenda item. He noted the written comments received by 4:00 p.m. would be referenced throughout the meeting.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members TRAPP, SKALA (via videoconference), THOMAS (via videoconference), PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, and RUFFIN 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 May 18, 2020 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Ruffin.

Mr. Skala asked that B108-20 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

Mayor Treece stated he wanted to add an item to special items as a point of personal privilege and to ask the Police Chief to provide an update on a couple of items. He asked if there was any objection and no one objected.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B108-20 being moved to old business and the addition of the special item mentioned by Mayor Treece, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Trapp.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI10-20

Comments regarding widespread community unrest sparked by events in Minnesota.

Mayor Treece asked the Council to join him in a statement regarding recent events in Minneapolis and the repeated violence against communities of color. He stated that while these most recent protests started with the criminal acts that led to the death of George Floyd, an unarmed black man, this was not new. They had all heard the stories of Ahmaud Arbery, Breonna Taylor, Tony McDade, Sandra Bland, Eric Garner, and many, many more, and this violence was unacceptable. He noted people in this community and across the country were angry, grieving, and taking action for positive change. He explained they had been having these hard conversations in Columbia, and provided the

monthly meetings at Second Missionary Baptist Church along with the conversations with the many local activists as examples. He commented that it was their responsibility to breakdown systems of institutional racism and they would continue doing so. Working toward equality for all was not easy as they had to undo years of damaging and unfair laws, stereotypes, and learned behaviors, but they could all do their part. They could listen and take time to hear the experiences of fellow community members, be more understanding and empathetic, evaluate their own words and actions to see how they could make themselves better neighbors, and speak up when they saw and heard injustices. He hoped everyone would join them in working to make Columbia a better place for all people. He thanked those that had come out to protest peacefully along with those in the Columbia Police Department for protecting the rights of protesters to demonstrate peacefully. He stated he believed this was a good time to remind everyone of the Principles of Community the Council had adopted in April of 2018 as they reflected the City's vision that Columbia could be the best place for everyone to live, work, and play. He listed those principles, and explained he thought it was important to reflect on those values. He commented that on Friday after the protests downtown, he, Mr. Ruffin, Mr. Glascock, and Mr. Seewood had met with several members of the African-American community along with Police Chief Jones, and noted he believed it had been a productive conversation. He asked Chief Jones if he wanted to make any comments.

Chief Jones stated last week, for the first time, he had gone to work to find police officers angry. They were angry because they had seen something egregious that was now projected on police officers across the nation. He noted there was an internal sense that what they knew to be fundamentally unfair and within the history of the country and policing had come to a head in Minneapolis, Minnesota. He stated they were angry because they agreed with the message that there needed to be protests. They were also angry because that was not how they policed in Columbia. In the rare occasion, when they policed in a way that was inconsistent in the values read by Mayor Treece, they dealt with it. He explained they had the responsibility, individually and collectively, as the police to hold themselves accountable, hold each other accountable, and be accountable to the people they served. What happened in Minneapolis could not happen here, not in the sense that it was impossible, but in the sense that they could not allow it. They could not allow the things that had led to Minneapolis to occur here. He commented that to that end, they would hold themselves accountable and be transparent. He stated they had taken steps prior to Minneapolis due to what they had seen within the history of policing and how this country had marginalized certain groups of people. He explained that prior to him becoming the Police Chief, they had talked a lot and had planned to talk and listen to each other, but there had been very little action. In addition, as Police Chief, he had found that regardless of the action, change was slow. It was much slower than he liked and wanted to accept. He noted the things that kept him up at night were things that could not be changed overnight, and it was frustrating. He reiterated that they had done some things, but pointed out he would not say it was enough. He did, however, feel they were making progress. He commented that they had opened up their policy making and policy decisions to public input. They presented their policies to the public in an interested parties format so they could be reviewed together as a community. He stated they had formed a Vehicle Stop Committee and that group was reviewing the data to determine the reasons for the disparity. He pointed out there was a disparity, and they were not policing people of color the same way they policed others. The Committee had been charged with the monumental task of determining why. He explained they had hoped to have a recommendation in July, and although he was not sure that deadline would be met, he agreed the work had to continue. The group included people with varying opinions and the meetings involved a lot of heated discussions, but they were good and healthy discussions. He believed it would be very important for them to look at the recommendations of the Committee when received in terms of how they might move them forward, i.e., action steps instead of just talk. He commented that he did not

condone what had happened in Minneapolis, not only in terms of the officer that had murdered someone, but also in terms of the other three that had watched it happen as it was sickening.

Mayor Treece asked how Columbia's policies were different in terms of the three that watched. He wondered if there was a duty to affirmatively report or intervene. Chief Jones replied yes. He explained there was a mandate to report it, and thought they should review that policy and utilize stronger language to ensure everyone understood they also had a duty to intervene. He thought they all had that responsibility fundamentally, and that everyone knew it, but felt it could be shored up. He commented that they had officers within the Columbia Police Department that felt they had that responsibility, which he believed showed in the way they policed. He pointed out COVID had set them back in making personal contacts, which he believed was important, but it had not changed their outlook on what community policing should be like in Columbia. He stated he was looking forward to moving in that direction again.

Mayor Treece stated his appreciation to Chief Jones for being present tonight as he knew he had been busy, and for the patience and discretion exercised with the protests. He understood that when those demonstrations changed to something else, their response would change and also thanked him for that. Chief Jones commented that they would protect people that demonstrated as it was the cornerstone of democracy and they had the duty to protect it. If it turned to rioting, they would deal with it, but he hoped it would not move in that direction.

Chief Jones read the policy referred to earlier, which said "any officer present and observing another officer using force which was clearly beyond that which was objectively reasonable under the circumstances shall, when in the position to do so, intercede to prevent the use of unreasonable force" and "an officer who observes another employee use force that exceeded the degree of force permitted by law should promptly report these observations to a supervisor."

SI9-20

COVID-19 Update.

Ms. Browning provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Browning if she knew the percentage of asymptomatic cases based upon the total tested. Ms. Browning replied no, but noted she could probably provide that percentage later. Mayor Treece asked if it had been 35 percent or 50 percent. Ms. Browning replied she did not believe it was that high here, and stated she was interested to see the numbers from the testing that would occur tomorrow. Mayor Treece understood 1,400-1,500 tests would be conducted over two days, and asked when the results would be available. He wondered if they would have them within 24-48 hours or 5-7 days. Ms. Browning replied they had been told it would be 7-10 days, but had then heard from someone on Friday night that the results were coming back faster than that. She thought it would likely be between 4-7 days. Mayor Treece asked Ms. Browning what she thought they should be prepared for in terms of the results. He understood they were not ordered by a doctor and not necessarily people with symptoms. Ms. Browning pointed out they might not all be from Boone County either. Mayor Treece asked if it might be 10 percent. Ms. Browning replied she hoped it was not more than that. She explained they were seeing 1.6 with people that were symptomatic, and pointed out much of it depended on who chose to get tested. She stated she knew a lot of people that had still been staying at home that were planning to be tested, and they might not have been exposed.

Ms. Browning continued providing the update.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the 1.6 percent positive test rate had changed over time. Ms. Browning replied no. She thought it had been fairly consistent. Mr. Pitzer asked how many of the active cases within Boone County were hospitalized. Ms. Browning replied one. Mr. Pitzer asked if it surprised her that there were so few. Ms. Browning replied they had a younger and healthy community comparatively so those items could be in their favor. She noted they were getting people tested early and isolated, within the 24

hour window. She stated she was grateful for that and hoped that trend would continue. Mr. Pitzer asked about current testing capacity in terms of the numbers and whether the hospitals were utilizing all of it. Ms. Browning replied she thought they were doing fine. They had indicated they were not having any issues. Mr. Pitzer asked if the capacity had steadily increased over time. Ms. Browning replied she thought it had remained constant. She understood they were able to address the demand.

Mr. Ruffin understood there had recently been controversy with regard to choirs in terms of whether or not choirs should resume as churches opened because of the dangers of spreading the virus and asked for clarification. Ms. Browning replied they were considered super-emitters. She explained there were some occasions whereby droplets went beyond the six feet recommended for social distancing. People tended to project when singing and smaller droplets tended to stay in the air longer than heavier ones. As a result, singing in the setting of a choir would be considered as a higher risk. She noted those that talked really loud and had a booming voice would be considered super-emitters as well.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC20-20 Carol Allers - Negative effects of small cell wireless facilities (existing and proposed) near schools, neighborhoods and nursing homes.

Mayor Treece explained Ms. Allers had provided written comments instead of attending the meeting and had indicated concerns regarding the installation of these facilities in terms of health and safety, lower property values, lawsuits, etc. Those comments would be filed with items associated with this meeting.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH18-20 Proposed construction of Discovery Parkway from Discovery Drive to south of the intersection of New Haven Road and Rolling Hills Road.

Discussion shown with B111-20.

B110-20 Authorizing a federal aid program agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the construction of Discovery Parkway from Discovery Drive to south of the intersection of New Haven Road and Rolling Hills Road; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

Discussion shown with B111-20.

B111-20 Authorizing a Governor's Transportation Cost Share Agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the construction of Discovery Parkway from Discovery Drive to south of the intersection of New Haven Road and Rolling Hills Road; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

PH18-20 was read by the Clerk, and B110-20 and B111-20 were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Ms. Peters understood this had been in the works for a number of years and noted a

number of constituents had been waiting for it. She commented that there was some concern with regard to the Grace Lane area. Even though it would be built as a two-lane road now, it would ultimately be a four-lane road that met up with Grace Lane, which was a very narrow road. She thought they would have to continue to work with Boone County on that issue.

Mr. Thomas commented that he would vote against this project. He explained his objection was more with the transportation planning process than this specific roadway. It had flowed out of the CATSO Long Range Transportation Plan, which involved non-transparent process and very little access by citizens. He noted it also had a set of goals, objectives, and performance measures that were disconnected from the Plan itself. The goals and objectives were good, but there was not any linkage. If there was linkage, projects such as this would not be proposed. He pointed out most of the performance measures could not be measured as they did not have the capacity. He commented that the Plan failed to acknowledge other long range plans, such as the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP). He understood the cost was about \$7 million for 1.5 miles of roadway, and felt it would induce traffic. He stated there was good research indicating people drove more when big, wide roads were constructed. It would induce sprawl development, which contributed to safety, health, environmental, and equity concerns. He commented that the transportation section of Columbia Imagined, the current comprehensive plan, had three policies. They were to accommodate non-motorized transportation, improve transit service, and promote a mobility management public transportation system. It did not include anything related to expanding highways further out from the City into the County creating even more car dependence than already existed. He reiterated he would vote against this proposal.

Mr. Skala stated he recalled discussions related to this project on a number of occasions over its nearly two-decade history. He viewed it as an essential link on the east side and agreed there would be some controversy in the Grace Lane area, which would need to be discussed with Boone County. He commented that he was looking forward to the improvements finally coming to fruition. He agreed with Mr. Thomas with regard to improvements to the CATSO process, but reiterated he would support this project.

Ms. Peters made a motion directing staff to move forward with the construction of the Discovery Parkway extension (Discovery Drive to Rolling Hills Road) project. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece and approved by voice vote with only Mr. Thomas voting no.

B110-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B111-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B112-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds to finalize and close out completed capital improvement projects and to reallocate funds received from the Missouri Department of Transportation - Governor's Transportation Cost Share Program to provide funding for current and future capital improvement projects.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp stated he was pleased to see funds going to the Garth Avenue project.

B112-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH19-20 Proposed construction of the Lenoir Street improvement project.

PH19-20 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters stated she had attended the interested parties meeting and had driven on the curve mentioned. She believed it would be nice to straighten it out. Mr. Nichols agreed and noted more and more people would be using the road as the area developed.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to move forward with the final plans and specifications for the construction of the Lenoir Street improvement project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pitzer and approved by voice vote with only Mr. Thomas voting no.

PH20-20 Consider design/build contract proposals for construction of the new terminal building at the Columbia Regional Airport.

PH20-20 was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Button and Dave Hadel, a consultant with Burns and McDonnell, provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked how many passengers the new terminal was expected to service and over what time period. She wondered if they expected this terminal to work for the next 30 years. Ms. Button replied the build out was for the next 50 years. Mr. Hadel explained the Supplementary Terminal Area Master Plan (STAMP) that had been submitted had projected two different levels of service, passenger activity level (PAL) 3, which was what the original design was intended to satisfy and would continue to satisfy, and PAL 5, which would accommodate growth and was approximately 20-25 percent greater than the PAL 3 numbers. He noted the airport had been experiencing 130,000 enplanements per year prior to COVID-19. Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding PAL 3 and PAL 5 from a numbers standpoint. Mr. Hadel replied they had adequate capacity within the 52,000 square foot template to grow. In addition, they could add a fourth board bridge. The program currently included three boarding bridges with four parking positions, but within the design would be a fourth gate, which would be added as a part of Phase 2 to accommodate the larger level of service anticipated. Mayor Treece asked how many passengers per year would be accommodated. Mr. Hadel replied 135,000-155,000 enplanements per year. Mayor Treece understood they were at 113,900 now. Mr. Hadel stated they had about 128,000 enplanements last year prior to COVID-19. He believed they would rebound and surpass that to reach the 150,000 enplanement level. Ms. Peters asked if they expected to reach the 150,000 level within the next 50 years. Mr. Hadel replied they would exceed that 150,000 when they went to the next level, which would involve an expansion. If he recalled correctly, the expansion would take care of 175,000-195,000 enplanements. Ms. Peters understood they had grown that much in the last ten years. Mr. Hadel stated the enplanements had been just under 20,000 in 2006. The addition of two airlines allowed them to grow tremendously, and the projections were to add to that growth when they had scheduled service to Charlotte, which was pending now. He noted the terminal would accommodate that and more.

Ms. Peters understood they had gone from 20,000 to 125,000 and this new terminal would allow them to go up to 150,000 over the next 50 years. Mr. Hadel stated it would be 155,000 initially at its proposed current size. They had the ability to expand if they chose to do so in order to accommodate even more enplanements.

Mr. Pitzer understood there was room for additions beyond the four gates. Mr. Hadel

stated that was correct. He explained part of the plan was for the ability to expand in the future should the need arise due to additional carriers or more flights.

Ms. Peters understood the number of passengers that could be handled by this new terminal was dependent on when planes were scheduled to arrive and depart. Mr. Hadel stated that was correct. He explained the idea was to accommodate peak hours so they could accommodate the traffic that was in the terminal at any one time. Ideally, it would be nice to schedule them in a manner whereby they could avoid congestion.

Mr. Skala commented that they had previously discussed using this airport project as a potential economic opportunity driver for some minority businesses, and asked if that had been discussed with those that had submitted proposals for subcontracting work. Mr. Hadel replied this project had begun with that intent and would end with that intent. He stated multiple DBEs had been identified as players in the recommended team. He noted they had met with Jim Whitt and had sessions with design-builders in an effort to allow them to communicate opportunities with one another to be a part of the teams. He commented that they were also in constant communications with Mr. Whitt and his staff to address questions for that specific purpose. He thought West-Tech Mechanical would address the HVAC systems.

Mr. Pitzer asked if they could go beyond the four gates within the existing footprint of this proposal. Mr. Hadel replied four gates was the limit of the current building configuration. Mr. Pitzer understood going beyond the four gates meant they would have to expand the footprint. Mr. Hadel stated that was correct and pointed out they could expand to the north or the south in order to add gates.

Mr. Pitzer understood Nabholz Construction was the only one of the three that was not based here or did not have a local presence here, and asked if there had been discussion with regard to ensuring local labor was utilized and materials were sourced locally. Mr. Hadel replied a member of the staff for Nabholz Construction worked in Columbia currently. That person also lived within the city limits of Columbia. He commented that it was their intent to work with Nabholz Construction to find as many local components as possible while still staying within the program documents and dollars identified tonight.

Mr. Pitzer understood Nabholz Construction had the shortest construction schedule. Mr. Hadel explained all of the bidders had indicated they could meet the 730 calendar day requirement. The Nabholz Construction team had indicated there was an opportunity to finish sooner and had projected a standard finish of June 24, 2022 and a possible early date of April 15, 2022. Mr. Pitzer asked when they would have a shovel in the ground. Mr. Hadel replied he thought that would happen in February of 2021. The design would begin this summer with a duration of about nine months along with seventeen months of construction. He noted there were two planned packages. The first was a civil and site work package combined with footing and foundation that would overlap with the second package, which involved the vertical construction of the terminal itself.

Mayor Treece understood they currently had about four flights within 40 minutes of each other, and asked Mr. Hadel if he foresaw the ability of having 3-4 gates changing that or if that was an airline issue. He wondered how they could expect that to change. Mr. Hadel replied the airlines were the drivers of that as they had schedules they had to keep outside of Columbia, and the airport staff had to manage it. He noted they had been keeping the airlines involved in the process to help optimize what the terminal building was capable of doing.

Mayor Treece asked about the components of Phase 2 and for the associated dollar amounts. Mr. Hadel replied the original program had identified a Phase 1 of \$23 million, roughly \$9 million for Phase 2, and \$5 million for Phase 3 for a total cost, including escalation, of \$35.3 million. Several of the items that were scheduled for Phase 2 would be captured in Phase 1 at the \$20.5 million. Mayor Treece asked if that left \$6 million in Phase 2. Mr. Hadel replied that would have to be evaluated, and noted it included the transfer of the rental car facilities for them to be closer. The current plan was to repurpose the automated flight service station (AFSS), which was located directly south

of this improvement, creating a multipurpose facility to include the rental car facilities, airline operations, and additional building purposed areas. Everything that was not in Phase 1 would be moved away from the existing terminal building and the existing terminal building could then be repurposed, torn down, etc. depending on the needs. Mayor Treece understood there was not any connectivity to the previous terminal, i.e., no entrance, egress, baggage claim, etc. The new terminal would be completely freestanding. Mr. Hadel stated that was correct with the exception of the car facility until the transfer was made to the AFSS. All of the features were directed toward the passenger experience.

Mayor Treece asked how much money would be needed for Phase 2 if they moved forward with this recommendation. Mr. Hadel replied he would need to reassess the numbers to respond. He commented that they were banking federal funds for Phase 2 and some of those items could still be eligible for federal fund financing. They understood parking lots were intended to be identified in Phase 2 and Phase 3, and there was the potential to make this a two phased program depending on the type of cash available for Phase 2.

Mr. Skala asked if there had been discussion regarding any type of environmental certification, such as LEED certification. Mr. Hadel replied yes, and explained it had been discussed at the project team level and with the teams on a cursory review of interest by those teams. Mr. Skala understood there was discussion and wondered what that meant in terms of environmental design and certification. Mr. Hadel replied the basis of the design would adhere to current City policy. He noted Mr. Nichols, Ms. Buffaloe, and the rest of the team had been involved in the discussions.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Ms. Peters stated she thought this was a good airport design and was happy to support it. She wondered if shuttles to the City or any other form of transportation from the airport to downtown Columbia had been discussed. She asked if there were options beyond having to rent a car. Mr. Parks replied the only conversation they had participated in had involved rideshare companies, such as Lyft and Uber. They had not discussed transportation via City buses. Ms. Peters understood they had not discussed MoX or any larger van. Mr. Parks replied shuttles to lots had been discussed pre-COVID, but not shuttles to the downtown. Ms. Peters suggested they think about shuttles to Columbia and/or Jefferson City. She felt something other than an individual car experience would be beneficial because it would decrease the number of rental cars and parking lots needed.

Mr. Ruffin asked if parking was a part of the plan as there had been a lot of discussion about parking and parking fees. Mr. Parks replied parking fees had been discussed for 2022 to assist with the financing of the terminal. He noted they needed to determine the improvements necessary prior to charging for parking. There was limited asphalt parking now, but much of the parking involved gravel lots so he believed there would need to be quite a few improvements before they could charge for those. They would also need to add the infrastructure to actually charge for parking. Mr. Ruffin asked if staff was planning to pave the parking lot as a part of this new building. Mr. Parks replied the drive in front was included but not the parking lots. Mr. Ruffin understood they would have a beautiful terminal and still have gravel parking lots. Mr. Parks stated the distanced lots would continue to be gravel, but the ones up close, which were already asphalt, would continue to be asphalt, and they needed improvements as well.

Mayor Treece made a motion to authorize the City Manager to negotiate and execute a contract with Nabholz Construction. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece understood the cost share agreement they had approved for the Discovery

Parkway extension liberated about \$3.6 million in transportation sales tax revenues that had already been budgeted in that transportation improvement. He asked if there was any interest in using it to bring some of the pieces from Phase 2 into Phase 1 to save money in terms of escalation costs and to bring in some of the other amenities earlier. He thought they could ask staff to bring that forward along with an answer from Mr. Hadel regarding the costs for the other amenities and what the City Manager was able to negotiate so they could discuss it. Mr. Pitzer stated he was agreeable to information being provided for a discussion, but thought they needed to know about the cascading effects on other projects. Mr. Skala noted he was also agreeable to a discussion based on that information.

PH21-20 Proposed construction of improvements at the Worley Street Park to include replacement of an existing playground structure, landscape block retaining wall and drinking fountain, removal of existing playground equipment and construction of a new playground structure, restriping the basketball court and renovations to existing fencing and park benches.

Discussion shown with B117-20.

B117-20 Authorizing construction of improvements at the Worley Street Park to include replacement of an existing playground structure, landscape block retaining wall and drinking fountain, removal of existing playground equipment and construction of a new playground structure, restriping the basketball court and renovations to existing fencing and park benches; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division for a portion of the project.

PH21-20 was read by the Clerk and B117-20 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mr. Ruffin asked if all of the work would be done in-house. Mr. Griggs replied yes except for the playground installation. They found it was cheaper to bid it out as the contractor could construct it in a matter of days when it took staff a couple of weeks.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Ms. Peters stated she thought it would be a good idea to move forward with these improvements.

Mayor Treece agreed with Ms. Peters and asked how long the park had been in existence. Mr. Griggs replied he had played little league baseball at Again Street Park and this park was there so it had been decades. Mayor Treece asked if it had always been that long and deep. Mr. Griggs replied yes.

Mr. Griggs pointed out a crosswalk had not been accomplished as part of this so they would continue to work with the Public Works Department in that regard.

B117-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: TRAPP (Mr. Trapp stepped out during the vote on this item). Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH22-20 Voluntary annexation of property located on the southeast corner of Highway WW and Elk Park Drive (Case No. 117-2020).

PH22-20 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters understood this site had been considered for a fire station at one time, and asked if the applicant had been willing to pay more money for it. Mr. Glascock replied he was not sure if they were paying more money, but the owners had decided to work with this developer. He noted they had another site identified. Ms. Peters stated she was

pleased to hear that as she had thought the City had been discussing this site with the owner. Mr. Glascock explained the City had made an offer and the owner had never responded to that offer.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B348-19 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code to establish use-specific standards governing the operation of short-term rentals (Case No. 31-2019).

Discussion shown with B46-20.

B22-20 Amending Chapter 13 and Chapter 26 of the City Code relating to bed and breakfast establishments and short-term rentals of residential dwelling units.

Discussion shown with B46-20.

B23-20 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to add short-term rental provisions to the City's Rental Unit Conservation Law.

Discussion shown with B46-20.

B46-20 Establishing an administrative delay in the enforcement of Chapter 29 regulations related to short-term rentals, Chapter 22 regulations related to the requirement to obtain a short-term rental un-hosted certificate of compliance, and Chapter 13 regulations related to the requirement to obtain a business license.

B348-19A was given sixth reading by the Clerk, B22-20A and B23-20A were given fourth reading by the Clerk, and B46-20 was given third reading by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece understood B46-20 had a recommendation to table, but it was not what it appeared to be, and explained he thought it was the temporary abeyance on the City Manager enforcing the interpretation that short-term rentals were prohibited, but the interpretation of the City Counselor was that this was a temporary abeyance on new bookings that simply allowed existing short-term rentals to continue with their current bookings and not book any new ones. Ms. Thompson replied the bill did three things. It established an administrative delay on the enforcement of Chapter 29, but the administrative delay in Chapter 29 just did not allow new advertising or new bookings. It was only an administrative delay for that purpose. It also established an administrative delay of Chapter 22 and Chapter 13 relating to the new legislation that was being considered. If the Council wanted an administrative delay on the enforcement of Chapter 29 wholesale and not just on new bookings, it would need to be amended.

Ms. Peters stated she thought that would be difficult to enforce and hard to explain.

Ms. Thompson noted staff could come back with another administrative delay ordinance if the Council wanted to continue to table this one along with the other bills. Mayor Treece stated that was what he would prefer. Ms. Peters agreed. She thought they needed to keep the status quo. Ms. Thompson understood they needed to keep the status quo and, with that direction, she thought the City Manager would continue to honor it until they could bring back something more comprehensive at the next meeting.

Mayor Treece made a motion to table B348-19A, B22-20A, and B23-20A to the December 7, 2020 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Thompson how she preferred they move forward with B46-20.

Ms. Thompson replied she would suggest tabling it to the same date as the other ordinances. Mr. Pitzer asked for clarification. Ms. Thompson replied Council would need this particular bill at some point if and when the Council entered into short-term rental regulations. Mr. Pitzer pointed out it had dates in it that were out of date. Ms. Thompson agreed. She noted they would have to amend it. She stated they could also vote it down or move it from consideration if they wanted. Mayor Treece suggested they vote and defeat it. Mr. Thomas wondered if it would be easier to just withdraw it. Ms. Peters asked if it would make any difference with regard to how they did it. Mayor Treece replied no. Ms. Peters suggested they vote it down.

The vote on B46-20 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NO ONE. VOTING NO: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. Bill declared defeated.

Mayor Treece understood they had one more old business item. He suggested they then get through the consent agenda, new business, and introduction and first reading, and adjourn and continue the reports to the next meeting. He asked if they could do that, and if they could do it expeditiously. Ms. Peters replied yes. Mr. Trapp stated he was agreeable to that.

B108-20

Authorizing an annexation agreement with Steven P. Bell for property located on the north side of Mexico Gravel Road and west of Highway PP (Case No. 105-2020).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Skala understood this was within the urban service area, but it was another circumstance by which they were trying to retire a lagoon by connecting to the City sewer when there were other service providers for other services like electricity. He asked if there were any complications to providing services to this area. Mr. Teddy replied there was a sewer available on the west property line, and that the sewer was capable of handling the load from a single-family house. It originated in the Fox Creek subdivision as there was a pump station there. He stated staff believed the service could handle this. He noted the annexation would be some date in the future if the City became contiguous, and the City was not obligated to annex, but it was the policy to have the owners sign an annexation agreement in exchange for sewer.

Mr. Skala understood this had been on the consent agenda because the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) had agreed to it. Mr. Teddy stated no. He explained annexation agreements were not sent to the PZC as they were in peripheral areas and subject to the County's codes. These agreements went directly to the Council. If in the future it became contiguous and the City Manager as the attorney in-fact or the owner submitted a petition for annexation whereby it needed permanent zoning, it would then go to the PZC for that action.

Mr. Skala understood Columbia Imagined was scheduled for a review and update and suggested they start thinking about it. Mr. Teddy explained the review was already in progress as there had been sessions on it at the PZC level, including a session with the Utilities Director with regard to the urban service area boundaries. They expected to have a report to Council by the end of the year.

B108-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: TREECE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B109-20 Vacating portions of street rights-of-way and utility easements located on the west side of Arbor Pointe Parkway between Atwood Court and Meandering Court (Case No. 103-2020).
- B113-20 Authorizing construction of a storm drain replacement project on a portion of South Greenwood Avenue; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division or authorizing a contract for the work using a term and supply contractor.
- B114-20 Authorizing the replacement and improvement of the storm drainage infrastructure on a portion of Ross Street west of William Street; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division or authorizing a contract for the work using a term and supply contract; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B115-20 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for the replacement and improvement of the storm drainage infrastructure on a portion of Ross Street west of William Street.
- B116-20 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of the Stanford Drive PCCE #21 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project.
- B118-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds received for bid alternatives relating to the construction of Hangar 730 at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- R70-20 Authorizing a professional engineering services agreement with Engineering Surveys & Services for field surveys and design of the Ridgemont Road and Highridge Circle, Leslie Lane and Garth Avenue, and Glenwood Avenue and Glenwood Court water main improvement projects.
- R71-20 Authorizing a Year 2 Addendum to The Right Time initiative participation contract with the Missouri Family Health Council, Inc. for family planning services.

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, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R72-20 Authorizing an agreement for professional services with RubinBrown LLP for performance (integrated) audit services.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Seewood and Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece commented that his concern was that they had seen a range of proposed costs for a performance audit from \$400,000 by the State Auditor's Office to \$90,000 for an internal auditor they could not retain. Here they had a 65 year old nationally recognized auditing firm that was willing to do it for \$21,000. He stated he did not want this contract to hamstring them from probing where they needed to go in a department that might represent \$500 million. When this Council had crafted and reviewed the RFP, they had asked respondents to submit copies of actual performance audits for other political subdivisions, and they had not received that. He noted he had asked for those and they had been provided around 4:00 p.m. today. He stated he liked what he had

read, particularly the format and the depth, but it seemed light as some performance audits had only been five pages long. He explained he was willing to move forward, but as had been represented by Mr. Glascock. He wanted a robust scope of services with them which might require a budget that reflected that.

Ms. Peters stated she agreed with the comments of Mayor Treece.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the expectation of the kind of report they would receive if they entered into this contract. Mr. Seewood replied ideally staff would like the firm to become the City's internal auditor. The scope of services would vary depending on the project. As had been indicated by Mr. Glascock, they would meet with the engagement team. If it was a Council process, they would meet with the Council as to what they were looking for and the scope of services would be developed from those conversations. The initial scope of services had been developed by the RFP so it might not be everything they wanted, but when they were provided the goals and objectives, they would develop a scope of services from it and provide a cost for that scope of services.

Mayor Treece asked if the proposed discount they were offering on their fees was to get their foot in the door. Mr. Seewood replied yes. He believed they wanted to be the City's internal auditor and wanted to show the City what they could do.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Glascock if it was his intent to preserve the auditor's relationship with the Council in terms of the checks and balances they both wanted, i.e., the Council would help to determine the scope of services, what department or process was reviewed next, etc. Mr. Glascock replied yes. He stated it would be a checks and balances on how they operated as a City. As an internal auditor, they would look at what the City was doing to ensure the Council thought it was being done the way it should be done. He stated he wanted to preserve that relationship as it would give the Council confidence in him and would provide him feedback as to whether it was being done correctly. He pointed out it was hard to hire a consultant via the thoughts of the Council as there were seven of them and they each had different thoughts. He explained staff wanted to ensure what they wanted was included so they needed the input of Council.

Mayor Treece asked if staff saw this contract as fulfilling the position of the in-house internal auditor. Mr. Glascock replied that was his goal. Mayor Treece understood the City Manager would not hire another internal auditor. Mr. Glascock reiterated that was his goal.

Mayor Treece understood if they contracted with this firm for a performance audit and this firm eventually became the City's internal auditor, the nature of the contract would preserve the Council's ability to provide more oversight to them than if it was an in-house employee. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct, and noted the Council did not have the authority to supervise or give direction to employees so there was more authority.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend R72-20 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece pointed out they had received written public comment from John Conway that would be filed with this agenda item.

The vote on R72-20, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE.

Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece made a motion to adjourn the meeting and continue the balance of the agenda to the June 15, 2020 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Those items that would be continued to the next meeting included B119-20 under new business, B120-20 through B133-20 under introduction and first reading, REP29-20

through REP34-20 under reports, and any comments by the public, council, or staff, to include written comments received by 4:00 p.m. today.

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 9:21 p.m.