



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, July 17, 2017
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, July 17, 2017, 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 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 June 19, 2017 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Ruffin.

The minutes of the regular meeting of July 3, 2017 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Ruffin.

Mr. Ruffin made a motion to abstain from voting on B198-17. Mr. Ruffin noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that he was currently serving on the United Way Board of Directors. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to adjust the order of the agenda so B198-17 was the first item under old business. Ms. Peters stated she would rather not do that because people were present based on the published agenda and might wish to speak on other items. She expected the discussion on B198-17 to be long, and thought it would be best to address the other items first. Mr. Thomas stated he believed most people were in attendance for B198-17, but agreed the other items would likely move along more quickly. He withdrew his motion.

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

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC7-17 Board and Commission Applicants.

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

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN COMMISSION

Gortmaker, Ann Marie, 1714 McAlester Street, Ward 3, Term to expire July 31, 2020
Knoth, Nicholas, 1300 E. Rollins Street, Ward 6, Term to expire July 31, 2020

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION CODES COMMISSION

Connell, Brian, 2311 E. Walnut Street, Suite B (business), Ward 4, Term to expire

August 1, 2020

Creasy, Jay, 911 W. Rollins Road, Ward 4, Term to expire August 1, 2020

Pile, John, 707 Sunstone Lane, Ward 6, Term to expire August 1, 2020

Shanker, Richard, 1829 Cliff Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire August 1, 2020

Trunk, Jonathan, 204 Foxwood Court, Ward 4, Term to expire August 1, 2020

COMMUNITY LAND TRUST ORGANIZATION BOARD

Maze, Susan, 902 N. Seventh Street, Ward 1, Term to expire December 1, 2019

CONVENTION AND VISITORS ADVISORY BOARD

Hargrove, Heather, 102 Lexibelle Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire September 30, 2018

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Harris, Trevor, 1120 Sunset Lane, Ward 4, Term to expire September 1, 2019

RAILROAD ADVISORY BOARD

Moak, Steven, 4199 State Road H, Calloway County, Term to expire July 15, 2021

SUBSTANCE ABUSE ADVISORY COMMISSION

Mondloch, Danielle, 402 Chris Drive, Boone County, Term to expire October 31, 2019

Willoughby, Blake, 1338 Ashland Road, Apt. F, Ward 6, Term to expire October 31, 2017

YOUTH ADVISORY COUNCIL

Stevens, Haley, Ward 3, Term to expire June 1, 2019

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC44-17 Pat Kelley - Ridgeway alleys.

Ms. Kelley provided a handout and displayed a plat map of the Odon Guitar subdivision, which had been annexed into the City in 1906. Today, it formed the eastern half of the Ridgeway Neighborhood between Providence Road and Garth Avenue and Business Loop 70 and Sexton Road. Alleys had been a part of the original plat, and per conversations she had participated in with older people that had lived in the neighborhood, all of the alleys had once been usable. She pointed out the alleys east of Grand Avenue were still used. She displayed a picture of the alley next to Optimist Club Park, which was occasionally still graveled and maintained. She showed a picture of an alley to the west of Grand Avenue as it had been when the Ridgeway Neighborhood Association became active in 1998, and at one of their first neighborhood trash pick-up events, they had hauled away mattresses and liquor bottles from that alley. Since then, the active and involved neighbors had joined representatives of the City on alley walk-throughs, and the Office of Neighborhood Services had surveyed the alleys. Through partnerships with various organizations, they had been able to create beautiful spaces in the alleys similar to the picture displayed. She stated they would now like the City to help them follow up with their hard work, by enforcing easements, resurfacing gravel, and clearing brush and limbs. They also wanted to move to Phase 2, which they felt could improve greenspace and be a place to display public art. She stated the Ridgeway Neighborhood members had been meeting with representatives of Jabberwocky Studios, the Business Loop CID initiative, the Office of Neighborhood Services, and the Office of Conservation. This summer Jabberwocky Studios planned to paint two murals on Grand Avenue. She noted a member of the Neighborhood Association had planted an edible landscape in Downtown Optimist Park as well. She displayed photos from a Green Alley project in Chicago that could be part of transforming their neighborhood from rundown to wonderful. She hoped the City would join them to work toward making Grand Avenue grand as she believed it could help with reducing crime, creating a positive environmental impact, and decreasing the negative effects of poverty in one of the strategic plan areas.

SPC45-17 Ginger Owen - Columbia's trees provide a vital cooling function.

Ms. Owen, 5775 E. Heller Road, commented that trees were in their grandest splendor as they were all leafed out, and it was refreshing to sit in the shade of an old oak tree drinking lemonade. She noted trees had been a passion of hers since she was a very young girl, and she had planted hundreds of conservation trees in this area. Trees were life-giving and cooled the earth. She believed cities needed trees to cool the effects of asphalt roofs and concrete streets, and streets lined with trees were cooler than streets without trees. She felt there was a need for more urban wildlife areas, such as the 35-acre Altis property, which was located along the Hinkson Creek, east of the University of Missouri campus. It was an urban climax forest with natural walking paths, swimming holes, wildlife, and birds. She commented that she was studying a book entitled *The Hidden Lives of Trees*, and described the book. She felt building concrete roads and bridges along and across the Hinkson Creek would kill many large trees, and believed a better use of the GetAbout funds was safer pedestrian travel throughout the City via lighted crosswalks, sidewalks, etc. With another pedestrian death recently, she felt the need was greater for safety for all citizens. She did not believe another unnecessary recreation trail was needed for the few who used concrete to travel quickly across town, and thought they should focus on safety measures for pedestrians.

SPC46-17 Martha Brownlee - The economic case for Columbia to pursue excellence in reducing racial disparities.

Ms. Brownlee withdrew her request to speak.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH23-17 Proposed installation of LED sports field lighting on Football Field #4 and Soccer Field #3 at the Columbia Cosmopolitan Recreation Area.

Discussion shown with B192-17.

B192-17 Authorizing installation of LED sports field lighting on Football Field #4 and Soccer Field #3 at the Columbia Cosmopolitan Recreation Area; determining that the work shall be done by City employees; authorizing a grant agreement with the United States Soccer Federation Foundation, Inc. for "Safe Places to Play Field Enhancement" funds; appropriating funds.

PH23-17 was read by the Clerk, and B192-17 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp made a motion to vote on B192-17. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Skala noted the Parks and Recreation Department staff did great work and were assisted with a dedicated sales tax, which he hoped made their lives easier. He also hoped the community appreciated their hard work. Mr. Griggs stated the dedicated tax definitely made completing capital projects easier.

B192-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH24-17 Consider the FY 2017 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Annual Action Plan.

Discussion shown with R101-17.

R101-17 Approving the FY 2017 Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Annual Action Plan.

PH24-17 and R101-17 were read by the Clerk.

Mr. Cole provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp stated he believed these programs were run very effectively, and thought it had been good to raise the amount allocated to the City as they had been able to bring a lot of functions they used to contract out in-house for a better use of the dollars and had been every bit as effective as their non-profit partners. He commented that Mr. Cole was good at strategic thinking and in using diminishing dollars wisely, while also preserving housing subsidies. He pointed out a lot of communities had compliance issues, but Columbia did not due to Mr. Cole.

Mr. Skala understood there had been additional pressures from the national level for this kind of turnaround and thanked staff for its work.

The vote on R101-17 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B170-17 Approving a Major Amendment to the PD Plan for Residences at Old Hawthorne located on Residence Drive and east of Old Hawthorne Drive West to waive sidewalk construction within the development (Case No. 17-113).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked if sidewalks had been included when this PUD had been originally approved. Mr. Teddy replied sidewalks had been included in the plan to be built. Ms. Peters asked why the sidewalks had not been built. Mr. Teddy replied the developer had not been required to call for right-of-way permits since it was a private street as would have been required for each driveway in a conventional residential development, and those site inspectors would have checked for sidewalks as well. Ms. Peters asked if this would always be a private street. Mr. Teddy replied yes, and described the layout of the private street compared to a conventional city street. Ms. Peters asked if the requirements of a PUD were not firm, and only a recommendation as to how the developer should develop the property. She thought PUDs controlled what one was allowed to do on the property. Mr. Teddy replied a site plan had been required and had been approved showing the layout of the property and included sidewalks. This was a second thought whereby they were asking the Council to consider an amendment. Ms. Peters understood the developer had not built the sidewalks. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Ms. Peters asked why they had chosen not to construct the sidewalks. Mr. Teddy replied the testimony at the Planning and Zoning Commission indicated it had to do with the transitions between driveways and there not being a connection to make.

Mr. Skala asked about the difference between a plan change and a variance from a planning and zoning perspective. Mr. Teddy replied it was a matter of how the request was written. He explained they did not have private street standards that required a sidewalk, but they had a PUD plan requiring the sidewalk. Mr. Skala understood staff usually provided criteria with variances. He asked if staff was recommending this plan change. Mr. Teddy replied the recommendation of staff to the Planning and Zoning Commission had been to approve the plan change, and the Commission's recommendation had been to approve it as well by a vote of 7 to 1.

Mr. Thomas understood the reason this situation had arisen was because it was a private

street and some of the normal inspections that would happen with a public street were not needed even though there was a sidewalk on the plan. If this had been a public street, this would have been noticed during those inspections. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. In addition, the City did not have a uniform private street standard the way it had a set of public street standards. He commented that an inspector needed go out with knowledge of what was on the PUD plan.

Mr. Thomas asked for the circumstances that would lead to one private street in a development like this where there were public streets as well. Mr. Teddy replied in this particular case he did not feel there was enough space for two rows of dwellings and a standard sized city street due to the location of the golf course. Another option would have been for public street right-of-way with variances for the width of the right-of-way. Mr. Thomas understood a public street would not have fit.

Mr. Thomas noted the staff report had indicated sidewalks were not required along streets less than 250 feet in length. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He explained a cul-de-sac with a handful of units was a dual-use street at that point and would not generate much traffic. Mr. Thomas asked if that was within the City Code. Mr. Teddy replied it was only for short streets, and this was longer. Mr. Thomas asked if there were any other exceptions to the requirement for sidewalks other than streets less than 250 feet in length. Mr. Teddy replied no. Mr. Thomas stated he did not realize they exempted short cul-de-sacs.

Mr. Trapp noted the Planning and Zoning Commission minutes had indicated staff would assure this would not happen again and asked if that was referring to a change in the internal procedures in terms of when inspectors were sent to project sites. Mr. Teddy replied normally they had a check-in procedure when a set of construction plans were submitted to ensure all needed exhibits were included, which might include statements of the condition of developments. This was done to ensure they had a complete set of drawings so they could conduct an efficient review. It was not the review itself. During the review itself, going forward, someone from the planning side would check all plan developments to ensure conditions, such as sidewalks on a private street, were in there. He pointed out staff had caught the deficiency and had informed the developer, but it had not been done in a timely fashion.

Mr. Pitzer asked what would happen if this was denied. Mr. Teddy replied the developer would have to build the sidewalks per the plan. Mr. Pitzer noted they were supposed to build them previously and there did not appear to be any consequences. Mr. Teddy stated the City was holding a bond on it. Mr. Pitzer asked if the bond would be held indefinitely. Mr. Teddy replied if the Council did not grant this plan change, they would ask the developer to build the sidewalks according to the plan. Mr. Pitzer asked for the amount of the bond. Mr. Teddy replied he did not know. Mr. Pitzer understood the developer could choose to forfeit the bond. Mr. Teddy stated they would have a plan that was out of compliance at that point so that meant enforcement.

Mr. Skala asked if the units were occupied. Mr. Teddy replied occupancy certificates had been issued based on the number of parked vehicles, and he assumed a good number were occupied.

Mayor Treece asked who had submitted the original PUD plan. Mr. Teddy replied he thought it was an entity called The Residences at Old Hawthorne LLC. Mayor Treece asked if it had been in continuous ownership the entire time. Mr. Teddy replied no when going back to the original plat, but noted it had been one developer since the site plan was submitted. Mayor Treece asked if the person that was requesting the amendment or the variance the same as the person that submitted PUD plan. Mr. Teddy replied yes as far as he knew.

Mr. Ruffin asked for the time line for continuing the development of this neighborhood as it appeared as though it was only partially done. He asked if they were still building more units. Mr. Teddy replied he thought all of the units had been built at this time. He noted the photograph that had been displayed was dated as the imagery they had online was

from 2015. Mr. Ruffin understood the development was complete. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer understood the Planning and Zoning Commission minutes had included discussion about Trellis Lane being in a similar situation, and asked if it was comparable. They did not have enough room so they had built sidewalks at the back of the curb. Mr. Teddy stated there were generally sidewalks in all of the Old Hawthorne component developments. The Linkside development, which was to the east of this development, had built a sidewalk on one side. It was a PUD with a private street system and a gate. It was also a larger development with interconnectivity to the east. It was not a cul-de-sac. Mayor Treece stated he had driven Trellis Lane and it appeared they had added a sidewalk at the back of the curb between the mailboxes and the driveways.

Jay Gebhardt, an engineer with A Civil Group, explained he was representing the applicant and handed out a drawing. He noted the blue lines depicted private roads that were not required to have sidewalks. He felt the lack of communication between the builders and the owners and the fact no one had reviewed the approved PUD plan had caused this problem. He believed the builders were primarily responsible, but the owners did not have an issue with accepting responsibility. He commented that all of the units, except for the last eight, had been built and had received occupancy permits. This had come to light with the last eight units. As a result, everything had been landscaped, and irrigation and all of the utilities had been installed. If this had come up on the first building, they could have likely accommodated the sidewalk. At this point, the driveways had been constructed and the slopes were not ADA compliant. He thought two-thirds of the driveways would have to be removed. In addition, in order to avoid the utilities, people would be walking right into a parked car in a driveway as there was only about 23 feet from the back of the curb to the garage. He pointed out he had not been involved in this project in the beginning, and had been asked to be involved right before the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. He commented that the sidewalk was never about connectivity. It was always planned as a loop for the residents. He did not see this happening again so he did not think it would set a precedent. He stated he believed the owner was the same one that had filed the original PUD plan, and they were willing to make a payment in lieu of the sidewalk. He noted they had been told by staff that the money would have to be used for sidewalks in the general area, and after conducting an inventory, they could not find any public projects for which the money could be used. He pointed out the bond was 1.25 percent of the fee in lieu price of \$40,500, and it allowed them to obtain the occupancy certificates for the last eight units. He commented that he had been authorized to offer the payment in lieu regardless of whether it could be used for sidewalks. They would be okay if the City chose to buy a police vehicle with it. Mayor Treece stated he was not comfortable with that discussion.

Mayor Treece asked for the cost of installing the sidewalks. Mr. Gebhardt replied it was around \$40,500, and was how they had determined the payment in lieu amount. Ms. Peters asked if that included re-engineering the driveways. Mr. Gebhardt replied it included removing the driveways up to the units, moving utilities, etc. There was not much sidewalk to build as there was likely only 20 feet of sidewalk between the driveways.

Ms. Peters felt the number of feet from the door to the sidewalk should have been considered when the PUD plan was approved. Mr. Gebhardt explained there were a lot of subcontractors with construction projects, and the coordination and communication that was necessary had been lacking in this situation.

Mr. Thomas asked for the width of the street. Mr. Gebhardt replied 28 feet except for the boulevard section. Mr. Thomas noticed there were golf cart paths on the backs of the properties, and asked if that was public space. Mr. Gebhardt replied he had been told those were not open to the public and that they were restricted for safety purposes.

Mr. Skala asked if they could allow the sidewalks to be a foot narrower than standard practice if they decided to require them. Mr. Teddy replied he thought the Council could

since it was a PUD development, which allowed for flexibility, but noted he would not recommend allowing sidewalks of less than four feet.

Mr. Trapp commented that he thought they could all agree this was an unfortunate situation and stated he was glad staff had made some internal changes with the way they reviewed plans to keep this from happening in the future. They were still left with this problem and there was not an elegant solution. He understood there had to be a nexus for offsite improvements and there was not a good place to do other sidewalk infrastructure to make up for it. He thought they should grant this plan change to accept the facts on the ground and noted people had moved in with that level of connectivity.

Mr. Thomas stated he agreed with Mr. Trapp. He explained he generally loathed supporting sidewalk variance requests, especially if the staff had recommended against it, but in this instance the sidewalks would not really serve anyone except the residents of the street, and presumably, those people were buying their homes knowing there were not any sidewalks there.

Mr. Thomas asked why they could not accept the payment in lieu if it was being given for use for sidewalks elsewhere in the community. Ms. Thompson replied that regardless of whether it was freely given or not, a legal nexus was required. She respectfully disagreed that they would not be able to find a location in the proximity in which to use a fee in lieu for this particular matter. Mr. Thomas clarified he was asking about anywhere in the City, and not necessarily in proximity. Ms. Thompson stated it could not be used anywhere in the City as there had to be a legal nexus regardless of whether it was voluntarily given. The legal nexus required there be something close in proximity and time. It did not have to be something that was immediately available. They could set a time frame on a fee in lieu of seven years and if the City did not find a project within the next seven years, the funds would be returned to the developer or property owner. It was both a time and location proximity. It did not have to be immediate, adjacent, or owned by that particular developer. She reiterated the legal standard could not be ignored so it could not be spent anywhere in the City.

Mr. Trapp asked if Highway WW would be close enough to this development. Ms. Thompson replied yes. She commented that they might have some projects in close proximity where that fee in lieu could be used to build enhancements to either sidewalks or trails based on applications that were coming forward. She did not think there were any sidewalks currently along Highway WW adjacent to the driving the range and it would be an area close enough in proximity if the \$40,000 could be spent there.

Mr. Skala asked how narrow the interpretation was as Ms. Thompson had mentioned enhancements, trails, and sidewalks. He asked if it had to be along the lines of servicing pedestrian and bicycle traffic. Ms. Thompson replied it had to be transportation related.

Mayor Treece commented that he was frustrated because people regularly asked to be told the rules indicating they would then follow those rules, and in this situation, an applicant had submitted a plan for a PUD that had included sidewalks, but had failed to build those sidewalks, and now wanted an amendment or variance after the fact. He understood it would not be the most aesthetic and there was a lack of connectivity, but everyone else in the neighborhood had built sidewalks. He stated he was reluctant to grant an exception.

Mr. Skala explained he could see both sides and was relieved to hear the recent legal advice. He did not feel there should not be any consequences, but thought a payment in lieu for some public improvement appropriated to the area was a reasonable compromise. Mr. Thomas stated he agreed.

Ms. Peters asked if these homes were for sale or were rental properties or a combination. Mr. Gebhardt replied they were on individual lots that could be sold or rented.

Ms. Peters commented that the sidewalks had been included in the PUD plan, and felt the amount of room they had should have been measured prior to submitting the plan. This was a newer development and should have been built with sidewalks. She stated she would vote against this ordinance as she felt it should have been built properly in the

first place.

Mr. Pitzer noted he was concerned about setting a precedent. There was obviously not enough room to adhere to the public street standards so it was designed in this manner instead, and this was troubling, especially in light of the fact there were sidewalk gaps throughout the City that they were still trying to address. With that said, he also thought they needed to consider what was best for those living on this street. It was a tough balance. He felt there was value to an amendment to accept a payment in lieu, and it was nice to hear that advice as he did not believe that had come through in the discussion at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. He thought that was the best approach as tearing up the street and constructing the sidewalks was also a bad outcome.

Mr. Skala made a motion to accept a payment in lieu for the appropriate amount to expire within seven years for public improvements in the area.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a mechanism in the ordinance for a fee in lieu. Ms. Thompson replied a fee in lieu could be accepted based upon the existing City Code. In this instance, they would have to authorize a fee in lieu in lieu of constructing the sidewalks and grant the plan amendment.

Mayor Treece suggested they table this item to allow time for staff to bring forward the appropriate language for the amendment. Mr. Skala was agreeable and withdrew his motion.

Mr. Thomas understood staff looked at various options to include a fee in lieu, and asked if they had looked at Highway WW as a street that could have sidewalks added. Mr. Teddy replied he would not say they had definitely not looked at it, but thought they likely did not due to the amount of the payment in lieu of \$40,000 compared to costs of constructing sidewalks there. They likely looked in the immediate vicinity.

Mr. Thomas asked if Highway WW was a City maintained street. Ms. Peters replied she thought it was maintained by MoDOT. Mr. Thomas asked if there would be issues building a sidewalk in the MoDOT right-of-way. Mr. Teddy replied MoDOT would likely want to be assured they would not be responsible for maintenance, and it had not been a problem on other MoDOT routes.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to table B170-17 to the August 7, 2017 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B188-17 Authorizing a cost allocation agreement with Boone County, Missouri for a public infrastructure study of Grace Lane located between Richland Road and St. Charles Road.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters understood the City would initially pay for the entire cost of the study and request reimbursement from Boone County once the project was complete, and asked if the County was agreeable to paying for half of it. Mr. Nichols replied yes, and explained the County had already signed off on the agreement.

Mr. Thomas commented that R100-17 under the new business portion of the agenda appeared to be related to this, and asked for clarification. Mr. Nichols replied that was the agreement with the consultant. Mr. Thomas asked about this agreement. Mr. Nichols replied this was the agreement with Boone County to split the cost for the study.

Jack Donelon, 578 N. Grace Lane, explained the traffic count on Grace Lane in 2015 was 4,678, and that was the last traffic count that had been done for that street by Boone County. He commented that he was beginning to see a trend develop on Grace Lane as dump trucks had been going north and south every five minutes for two days last week. He had followed one of the trucks, which had been traveling at 45 mph when the speed limit was 35 mph, and it had traveled up Rolling Hills Road to another subdivision that had been approved for 70-80 homes. He was sure that would not be the last subdivision built

in that area so he felt a trend was developing of more traffic on Grace Lane. He pointed out those, like him, living on Grace Lane would have more difficulty getting out of their driveways. He understood the roadway would go all of the way out to Discovery Ridge, which meant there would be traffic from Old Hawthorne as well as this development. He thought people would end up traveling to Grace Lane to get to St. Charles Road and I-70, and wondered why that roadway had been approved. He commented that the old portion of Grace Lane, which had been built in the 1970s, did not have sidewalks, bike paths, etc., and every night, he saw kids from Volunteer Drive walking up Grace Lane to St. Charles Road to the convenience store. He did not feel it was safe for kids to be walking that street. He stated this was also creating difficulty in selling homes on Grace Lane. He suggested Richland Road be widened and taken past the Bay Hills subdivision through the woods to St. Charles Road. He explained he was not against progress, but felt the quality of life of an existing subdivision should be considered and something needed to be done to address this problem.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he was in favor of this study and was concerned the study area was not large enough. He understood an east area study had been completed, and believed this was the opportunity to conduct a southeast area transportation plan that was broader than just Grace Lane. He suggested City staff talk to Boone County to determine if it might be appropriate to do an entire east/southeast area transportation plan as he felt it would be useful and would not cost much more money.

Pam Short, 5315 Pebble Beach Drive, explained her road intersected Grace Lane, and noted she and her neighbors opposed the expansion of Grace Lane as it would be detrimental to the peace and quiet of the neighborhood. She understood it might even cause the need to take her home via eminent domain. She stated she was also concerned about the safety of the neighborhood if Grace Lane was expanded.

Mr. Skala commented that he had participated in some informal conversations with some Boone County Commissioners about this area, and saw this study as a way to start a formal conversation for the potential for solutions in terms of traffic flow and improvements on unimproved roads, such as St. Charles Road. He stated eminent domain was a severe term and a term of last resort when it came to public improvements. He felt the passage of this along with R100-17 was a way to get the conversation started. He commented that he thought they could explore the suggestion of Mr. Clark in the context of a solution for this small piece.

Ms. Peters asked how this worked with the CATSO plan. Mr. Nichols replied he thought this alignment of this corridor had been on the CATSO plan for over 40 years. The approval of Discovery Parkway on the capital improvement ballot had jump started the conversation about Grace Lane. It was a complicated connection. The study that would be done would incorporate the east area study that had been done for Highway 740 with some other long range planning that had been done. Ms. Peters understood Highway 740 was Stadium Boulevard. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct, and displayed the preferred alignment that had been adopted by the Federal Highway Administration.

Mr. Nichols explained this would allow for a study, but pointed out he did not believe there were any funds for improvements. They would need to address that once they determined how they wanted to proceed.

B188-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B190-17

Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to establish a cost reimbursement program for the installation of pressure sewers and backflow prevention devices or the removal of plumbing fixtures.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen and Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked for the budget for both programs. Mr. Sorrell replied there was \$100,000 available in this fiscal year's budget, and noted he would propose the same for next year. The \$100,000 would be for both the backflow and inflow and infiltration programs.

Mayor Treece asked if they had seen an increase in the number of people reporting backup events since this had been previously discussed. Mr. Sorrell replied no. He explained he had not received any additional reports since the rain at the end of April. From January 2014 through today, they had received a total of 31 reports of backup events at 27 addresses.

Mr. Thomas asked if this program was modeled on programs in other cities. Mr. Sorrell replied yes. Mr. Thomas presumed they worked well. Mr. Sorrell explained one of the things he liked about the program was that it provided the property owner the ability to choose a solution they were most comfortable with as opposed to the City dictating the solution.

Mr. Ruffin commended staff for developing this program and bringing it forward, and noted he believed it had been due to residents on Aldeah Avenue coming before the Council expressing their concerns and asking for help. He felt the benefit of this was that it would be available to anyone throughout the City that had these issues.

Mr. Ruffin asked if there was a plan to ensure it was promoted to those property owners that could benefit from it the most if it was approved. Mr. Sorrell replied they could contact the property owners that had reported backup events to them to make them aware of this being available if it was approved. They would also make any future property owner that reported a backup aware of the program. Mr. Ruffin explained he was most concerned about those who might not have reported a backup, but needed to know this was available. Mr. Sorrell stated the information would be on the City's website, but it would be difficult to notify someone if the City was not aware of the problem. Mr. Ruffin thought they could do a lot by promoting it through homeowners associations and neighborhood associations. Mr. Skala stated those were good suggestions, and believed the newsletter provided with the utility bill would be another good source. Ms. Peters suggested door hangers in the areas they knew had more backup issues. Mr. Matthes thought they could use the GIS system to determine those areas they felt were wet, and could then mail a letter or place door hangers on those homes.

Mr. Pitzer understood a homeowner could choose the solution, but there was not any assurance that what the homeowner chose would fix the problem. Mr. Sorrell stated any of the solutions could fix the problem. It was a matter of which was the most reliable and provided the highest level of comfort for the property owner. He explained a backflow prevention device was a simple valve, which worked well, but needed to be cleaned regularly or would likely not work when it needed to work. The pressure sewer system was more reliable. Mr. Pitzer stated his concern was providing for this program and still having problems. Mr. Sorrell pointed out any of the systems could fail to function at the wrong time, but they should all fix the issue if properly maintained.

Mayor Treece understood water followed the path of least resistance, and if one neighbor installed a backflow prevention device in their home, it might flow downhill to a neighbor's basement even if they had not had issues before. Mr. Sorrell stated it was possible for the hydraulic grade line to go up and backup into a building that had not experienced that issue before, but they would try to catch it before it happened.

B190-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B193-17

Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with Fred Overton Development, Inc. for the acquisition of property in Creek Ridge Subdivision located on the east side of Old Plank Road and west of Heath Court to be used for land preservation and park purposes; authorizing the

use of Park Sales Tax funds; authorizing the execution of documents by City officials.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece understood Stonehaven Road did not come through as it was a cul-de-sac. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood they had authorized a trail that went through there and connected. Mr. Griggs stated there would be a footpath, and thought Stonehaven Road would eventually get to the park. Mayor Treece asked how one would get to the park. He wondered if the entrance would be from Old Plank Road. Mr. Griggs replied there would be access all along it at a certain point in time. He thought Old Plank Road would eventually be improved with sidewalks, etc.

Mr. Trapp stated the Parks and Recreation Department did a good job on these land acquisitions in terms of being forward thinking and working with developers who would also benefit from a park that would anchor their development. He understood developers tended to want to provide undevelopable land to the City, but staff held out to ensure there was some developable land for picnic shelters, playground equipment, and other amenities. It provided for wildlife and greenspace preservation and developable areas for amenities. He stated he was glad they had approved the long cul-de-sac to make this possible.

B193-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B196-17 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to the City Utilities - Water and Light Department.

Mayor Treece understood staff had requested this be withdrawn. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. Mayor Treece asked if there was any objection to the withdrawal, and no one objected.

B198-17 Authorizing a professional services agreement with Heart of Missouri United Way for facilitation of a community engagement process for a community policing forum; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas explained there was an amendment sheet, which would correct a number of typographical errors and omissions in the contract. Mayor Treece suggested they address the amendment sheet after discussion.

Mr. Thomas and Mr. Trapp provided background information associated with how this point of an agreement for an engagement process on policing.

Ms. Peters asked if the bringing in of experts would be in addition to the current budget. Mr. Thomas replied yes. He explained it was always understood that United Way, New Chapter Coaching, and Menifield and Associates were not content experts in policing issues. He pointed out this was also the case with the Affordable Housing Symposium, and maybe to a slightly lesser extent to the Homelessness Summit. Those events, like the one they were proposing here, brought in content experts.

Ms. Peters commented that items such as staffing, officer safety, and morale seemed to mainly be police issues, and asked how community engagement would help with those items. Mr. Thomas replied he thought a lot of members of community did not understand how short staffed the department was, and felt the Columbia Police Department (CPD) could present information in terms of response times, a typical shift experience of a patrol officer, how hard it was to create the community outreach unit due to staffing, etc.

Andrew Grabau stated he was the Executive Director of the Heart of Missouri United Way and explained his organization and the City of Columbia had been involved in a number of

projects and initiatives throughout the years, including the Affordable Housing Symposium and the Homelessness Summit. More recently, they had worked with the City on a couple of particular projects focusing on social equity in the community. This included BackTALK, which was a social equity project focusing on youth and included the University's Inclusion, Diversity and Equity Office along with a number of stakeholders. It had culminated in an event at Stephens Lake Park with another event, Rock the Community. He pointed out the United Way had worked with Rock the Community last year in hosting a really fantastic event at Douglass Park, which had brought together minority-owned businesses, members of the First Ward, and the Police and Fire Departments. He commented that he was proud of their work with the City in terms of inclusion and equity, and believed they had demonstrated that they had the ability and the credibility in the community to execute an effective plan. He explained the role of the United Way in this scope of work was to be a convener, and noted their mission statement was to fight to improve lives in the community. He stated they had a good track record and the ability to organize a broad range of community members and organizations. He commented that when they had begun creating this scope of work in late February/early March, they had looked at key areas that had intentional efforts of inclusion and social equity already built into them. He pointed out the first step of the scope of work involved 72 hours devoted to organizing for success, which included an issue analysis. This meant taking all of the relevant data the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence and other stakeholders in the community had created so they were all talking from a similar taxonomy and were on the same page. He stated they were devoted to spending time on and defining as a group what would collaboration look like and what a successful project outcome would look like. He explained the United Way was committed to establishing a planning committee that would be built with a social equity lens. It would include residents of high crime neighborhoods, residents of neighborhoods that did not have high crime but were interested in the process and needed to be engaged, representatives of the Columbia Public School District, the University of Missouri, and the Chamber of Commerce, social service providers, etc. He noted the scope of work was aligned with the recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence to hold an annual symposium, and believed what they had in the scope of work would allow them to create a successful event. He also felt the qualifications of United Way, which had been described, New Chapter Coaching through their work with the neighborhood planning and empowerment project, and Angela Menifield through her work in civil rights at the federal level and her facilitation skills, positioned this to be a process that could be successful in developing a strong goal to advance the resolution that had been adopted in February. It would establish a process for all stakeholders to convene and hold conversations that would produce productive and agreed upon next steps for action. He reiterated he planned to utilize a lens of a practitioner and of a believer of social equity.

Mayor Treece asked if being a convener or facilitator was typically a part of the United Way mission. Mr. Grabau replied bringing people in the community together was certainly something they did, and mentioned BackTALK and Rock the Community events again. He pointed out they had also been engaged with the Homelessness Summit in a convener role. Mayor Treece asked if they had charged for it. Mr. Grabau replied they had sought sponsorships for it and other costs had been disbursed across other parties. They had not charged in the sense of having a contract with the City.

Peggy Placier, 209 S. Greenwood Avenue, stated she was representing Race Matters, Friends, and explained she and Tara Warne-Griggs had met with the three consultants that had submitted the proposal under consideration because they wanted them to know more about Race Matters, Friends and how much they had invested in community policing, which was aimed at dismantling racial injustice and disparities, and because they wanted to learn more about the thinking behind their proposal. After the meeting, the two of them considered whether they could support the proposal as written, and did

not want to be considered obstructionists. She noted they wanted a genuine community engagement process more than anything, and had concerns with the proposal. They were learning more this evening, but the proposal seemed to be a first draft based on a generic template that needed much more detail specific to this particular process. She thought it needed to be revised and resubmitted, and felt the Council could ask the consultants to go back to the drawing board or pass the proposal contingent on certain conditions. She explained Race Matters, Friends wanted to see recognition of the 2014 Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence report as a foundational document and a clear centering on community policing. She commented that the resolution adopted in February indicated that if the participants reached consensus on community policing, an estimated need for resources would follow from it, and pointed out they did not view community policing as a funding proposal. They viewed it as a philosophy that required professional development, commitment, and accountability. She stated they felt the staffing issues seemed to be related to population growth and salaries, and not necessarily community policing. She believed trying to handle the morale issues within the Police Department through this process might create problems, and suggested that might be better handled internally. She commented that they also wanted to see a process of building trust and support through grassroots outreach so those most affected by the lack of community policing and current law enforcement practices were more likely to participate. She did not feel they could have another meeting with only the usual participants. They needed the involvement of those that felt alienated from the police. She stated the proposal needed more detail on how the process would handle power imbalances and communication among the participants if they had broad representation and vision. There also needed to be a clear recognition that this would be the beginning of a long term process, and not the whole process. She understood the consultants had recognized the process was rushed and inadequate to that kind of task. She stated she hoped their concerns could be further addressed.

Molly Housh Gordon, 703 West Boulevard North, explained she was providing a statement from Faith Voices of Columbia, which was a multi-faith, multi-racial faith-based community organizing effort in Columbia representing about two dozen congregations. She stated Faith Voices of Columbia envisioned a community where all people were safe, respected, and able to thrive, and had witnessed that systems of oppositional policing made everyone less safe. In addition, they particularly lamented the systemic racism in the country and institutions that created a reality where people of color were statistically far more likely than their white counterparts to experience violation of due process, injury, or death during encounters with police. They believed this reality existed even despite the best intentions, efforts, and values of law enforcement professionals. She noted they saw a wholesale transformation in mindset, training, and the policing model as the only way to a justice system that was truly just. She commented that they believed the community needed community policing to save lives and safeguard dignity. They understood the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence had affirmed that need, and believed the way to implement community policing was by investing in the long term large scale work of building trust and centering the voices of those most negatively impacted by oppositional models of policing. She thanked Mr. Thomas for beginning a community engagement process, and noted they firmly believed the City needed to invest in community conversations of this kind, but did not feel the proposal put forth by the consultants was sufficient. She stated a one-time event held during a work day and planned without the broad impact of those most marginalized in the community would inevitably fail to engage those most affected by an oppositional system of policing as most would not be able to miss work to attend such a forum and likely did not trust that their voices would be regarded. She commented that the proposal as written seemed to center the voices of those already in power in the community, and believed they should listen instead more closely to those who society deemed the least and the last. She asked that time and effort be put into revamping the proposal and placing resources into a

long term, truly grassroots and authentic process of engaging in those most marginalized by current models of policing. She noted they suspected this would require routing resources to local leaders of color and leaders that were economically disadvantaged and already implanted in the communities. She stated they believed Columbia was capable of engaging this really difficult long term, deep, and broad work of creating transformation.

Mary Ratliff, 211 Park de Ville Drive, commented that she felt a bit undermined. In September of 2016, the NAACP had begun meeting with the Mr. Matthes, representatives of the CPD, and others to discuss the racial profiling reports in terms of how they could move forward in Columbia. During the initial meeting, they had recommended that they start meeting with all of the stakeholder groups throughout Columbia individually. Once those meetings were held, they had suggested the leaders of those groups come together to strategize how to move forward. She noted they had also recommended a convener, Lester Woods, at no cost to the City. She pointed out they had suggested a meeting with all of the groups the City had met with on August 22. She had hoped they could work collaboratively, but it appeared some things had already been decided. She commented that the United Way was a reputable organization, but did not feel they were experienced or able to lead a discussion in the African American community about racial profiling and other issues. She stated they were capable of strategic planning, and did not believe this should be planned for them. They wanted input in the process and wanted a situation where they could meet with everyone, to include the police, and openly talk about the problems they had to allow for a better understanding by all involved. She noted the racial profiling report needed to be addressed, and understood a part of the problem included economics. She thought they needed to determine what they could do to help move that forward. She stated the NAACP did not feel funding should be allocated as they had the necessary mechanisms within the community. She did not want another plan that would just be filed away, and hoped the August 22 meeting she had requested would be held.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Ratliff for her thoughts on the comments of Reverend Housh Gordon in terms of her desire to have a more ongoing dialogue with the affected communities instead of a one-day event. He asked what might be more effective in engaging that community. Ms. Ratliff replied she did not feel one meeting was adequate to serve all things. What they were proposing for the August 22 meeting was for all of the groups to come together with the goal of developing a strategic plan in terms of how they would move forward in the process rather than having it dictated to them.

Judy Hubbard explained she worked with Glenn Cobbins as a Neighborhood Outreach Specialist, and believed they had the best job within the City of Columbia as they were able to work with the people. She commented that as she was reviewing the proposal she had noticed a couple of important stakeholders had not been included because they were not organizations, and they were individuals that had lost their young ones to shootings, stabbings, or prison. She believed they needed to be brought into the conversation, and that there should be more than one conversation. It was great to have a purposeful day and great speakers, but this problem had not arrived in one day, and would certainly not go away in one day. She stated she would commit herself and Mr. Cobbins to getting those people at the table in some form or fashion. She thought the community outreach unit would be helpful in making that possible as well. She commented that they could develop the greatest plan in the world for community policing, but they would eventually have to sell it to the people that would be policed. If they were unable or unwilling, it would not be very effective. She thought they should also support each other in terms of the meeting Ms. Ratliff had set up and the intent of the resolution that had been adopted by the Council. She reiterated they needed to include the segment of the community that really needed to be heard so they did not make decisions for those that did not have a strong voice, and that this needed to be done from the beginning of the process.

Mr. Skala understood Ms. Hubbard had been involved in some of the strategic plan

neighborhood initiatives, and noted he had participated in a couple, which he believed were phenomenal as they each involved about 50 people, most of whom he had rarely or never seen at city council meetings. He asked Ms. Hubbard if she was suggesting they go to the people instead of requesting people come to them as that was intimidating. Ms. Hubbard replied she was speaking about both. She thought there was great value to going to where people were because that honored their personhood and showed they cared. She explained she and Mr. Cobbins went door to door, which was why they were able to get people to come to their events. She stated there was also something about having them come to City Hall. It was not easy for anyone to come here to speak, but she thought that opportunity should be made available. She commented that they also needed to be encouragers of those not represented.

Pat Kelley, 1007 Grand Avenue, commented that one of the stakeholders that had been left out were the neighborhood associations, and noted City-recognized neighborhood associations had a mandate to be inclusive, so even those that were unable to attend the meetings were kept informed by people going door to door, providing flyers, participating in extensive e-mail lists, and from social media pages. Those in the Ridgeway Neighborhood felt there was geographic profiling in that crimes that occurred in that neighborhood were not taken seriously or involved slower response times. She thought it was important to include neighborhood associations as stakeholders in this process.

Chip Cooper, 500 Longfellow Lane, noted he was supportive of proceeding with the proposed public process. He stated the comments tonight had been rich and illuminating, and felt this had been the beginning of the public process. He commented that it was gratifying to see all of the thought, passion, and concern people placed on these issues, and believed public safety, personal safety, and crime were things that united them. In terms of the specific process that had been laid out in the contract, he shared feelings similar to those that had spoken previously, and did not believe there would be anything wrong with going through a process to create the process. He stated he had completed the city survey, and had indicated a strong support for a tax for the Police Department as he had done a lot of research on his own and had come to the conclusion they were short-handed, but if there was not a public process, he would vote against any ballot issue on this topic. He believed this was an opportunity to really do something very meaningful for the community for years to come, and felt it might be one of the most important things they had ever considered. He reiterated if they rushed to a ballot without this process, he would be a no vote, and might even work against the ballot issue despite the fact he thought it was important and necessary. He explained he had moved to Columbia over forty years ago when Harold Warren was on the City Council, and Mr. Warren, who was the first black member of the Council, had been a decedent of slaves in Boone County. Today, they had one black person on the Council, and in the interim there had only been one other. In addition, they had not had many high level managers in city government that were black, and memberships to many civic organizations remained similar to years ago in terms of black participation. Columbia also had a dearth of black owned businesses. He commented that he thought the social equity initiative by the City was well placed and the revision and application of the mission of the United Way was critical and great, but noted he still saw Columbia much the way he did when he had arrived in the early 1970s in terms of showing the residual of segregation and what took place before that. He stated he also believed the community had a branding problem to the outside world, which was reflected in the precipitous drop in enrollment at the University of Missouri, which he thought would result in an unprecedented economic hit. The outside world believed there was a great deal of racial tension in Columbia due to the way the protests had unfolded and the declaration of Darren Wilson Day, and were not coming here as a result. He suggested they address the issue head on and do things they might not otherwise do in an effort to make the community much stronger in the future, and what they were discussing tonight was one of those things. He stated Columbia had been fortunate to have Elliot and Muriel Battle

as members of the community for many years as they had been responsible for many breakthroughs in dismantling historic segregation. They had believed in Martin Luther King Jr.'s dream that one day their children would not be judged by the color of their skin but by the content of their character, and to achieve that goal, they had worked inside the system and relentlessly outside of their comfort zone to demonstrate their worth and equality through deed. He felt it would be wise to not forget them and to follow their example by intentionally working outside of their own comfort zones to continue the long process necessary to heal the scars of slavery and segregation. He provided Council a copy of the documentary about their lives entitled *Battle: Change from Within*, and urged everyone involved in the process to convene a venue to watch the documentary because he believed if they could help achieve the dream of the Battles, they could then achieve their own dreams. He reiterated his support for moving forward.

Mayor Treece understood Mr. Cooper believed the CPD was understaffed or would benefit from additional funding, but would not support that without this community engagement process, and asked for an explanation. Mr. Cooper replied he did not feel the polling results were accurate regarding the level of support for a significant property tax. His experience through the years was that if the public did not feel a thorough process and consideration had been undertaken, the issue would fail when taken to the voters. He also believed many people would work against any ballot proposed at this time as he felt there was division in the community about the way policing was carried out. He commented that he was not sure they could solve that, but unless they followed a great deal of the advice tonight, they would not have much of a chance. Mayor Treece noted most of the advice tonight was to not proceed with this proposal, which he understood Mr. Cooper helped to write. Mr. Cooper stated he had not helped to write the proposal and had only provided minimal input.

Mayor Treece stated he was reluctant to spend public money on a process that was designed directly or indirectly to advocate for a tax increase. Mr. Cooper explained he was suggesting their needed to be a thorough public process. It might not be the one reflected in this particular document, and they might need to go back to the drawing board. He commented that what Mr. Skala had described in going out to the neighborhoods made a lot of sense as it was the kind of authentic interaction this community needed on this important topic. He was not sure how that should be done or if it required a lot of money, but if they did not convene the community in a very meaningful way, he did not believe a ballot issue would pass. In addition, he did not feel it would bring the community together to lay the groundwork for the future they needed. He had a sense there was some belief that the result of the citizen survey indicating a high percentage of people supportive of a tax was all that was needed to be able to hire more police officers, and noted he did not agree that was the case. He thought a sizable portion of the community believed they were essentially bringing in more oppression if that was done. He also thought there was a fairly large group that had very little contact with the police and did not have problems or concerns about public safety who might wonder what was in it for them. He pointed out he did not believe most of the community had any idea of the code zero status or how stressed police officers were because they did such a great job. He reiterated that he believed they needed to educate the community on the circumstances, and then listen to one another to determine how to proceed. It needed to be done at a grassroots level.

Mr. Skala understood Mr. Cooper had indicated he was not sure this proposal as written was the proper step or the right direction. Mr. Cooper stated he had said that because he was not an expert. He explained his first impression was that having one grand summit was not the way to do it.

Tara Warne-Griggs, 200 Longfellow Lane, commented that she believed there was expertise on this issue in Columbia to hold these kinds of meetings, and thought Ms. Ratliff and Ms. Hubbard had made that pretty clear. She stated this was about the community and had always been about the community and those in the community that

had not been heard. In presentations she had done in her own work, she always asked who was in the room, who was not in the room, whose voices were being heard, and whose ideas were being given primacy from those in the room. She noted there had been some beautiful comments made tonight that needed to be heard, listened to, and acted upon. This process was not about the Chamber of Commerce and their legislative priorities. It was not about what the CPD wanted in terms of funding as that was an internal management problem. It was an issue city government had to address. It was not the community's problem. She agreed they might want to talk about the issue, and noted there had already been a lot of research on staffing as to whether or not it was necessary at this time. As a planner, she did not believe they should fund something and then plan what to do with the money. They needed to first have a plan and decide what resources would be needed to accomplish the plan, and then fund it. Doing it backwards was a bad idea, and it certainly would not serve the members of the community that had not been heard previously.

Angela Hooper-Menifield explained she was with Menifield and Associates and noted she wanted to clarify what she felt were some misunderstandings. She had heard comments indicating the process had been planned for the community, and that was not the case. As consultants, they would work with the community to plan what would take place. The scope of work had been developed to state how they would go about the process, but they had not yet determined all of the stakeholders. She understood the survey list Mr. Thomas had started with had asked for other stakeholders to be identified, so they knew they did not have all of the names and parties that needed to be involved in the process. She noted there had been comments regarding racial profiling and they had all seen the report, but that was not what their proposal was supposed to be about so they had not discussed it. Their proposal was in response to the resolution that had been adopted unanimously in February. She stated there had been much discussion about a one day event, but pointed out there would be several bi-weekly gatherings of key stakeholders. The one day event would be a culmination of the other gatherings. The stakeholders would be engaged and involved for the entire five months. Regardless of the results, she wanted everyone to make an informed decision.

Laura Nauser, 5707 Bridlewood Court, commented that this issue was dear to her heart as she had put in a lot of time with the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence, which had been a very enlightening and engaging process that had taken over a year. A lot of people had been invited to speak during that process, and they had held three engagement events in the community whereby they had gone to the people, but as time went on, interest waned. She was concerned that would happen here as well if they had a process that took a lot of time. She stated that when they began asking people what community policing meant to them, they would likely receive a very diverse set of answers depending upon who was asked, where they lived, and their life circumstances. She thought the goal of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence had been to come up with a community opinion of what community policing meant. She believed community policing needed to be incorporated into all police officer activities, and not just in the three strategic plan neighborhoods. She explained she knew many people that felt community policing meant being soft on crime. They needed to get those people to the table to understand what community policing meant. She stated they had seen the great work of the community outreach unit and understood they had made a statistical difference in reducing crime and in increasing people's feelings of safety in their neighborhoods, and believed this needed to be applied to the entire community. She felt that was the purpose of this engagement process. They needed to decide what the community policing philosophy meant, and whether they wanted officers to go from call to call or a police force that had the time and adequate resources to talk to people in the neighborhoods to encourage engagement and trust. If officers were able to get out into the community and see the things that were impacting people's lives, it might have an indirect impact on other issues, such as racial profiling and issues with vehicle stops.

She hoped the Council would agree to allow the city manager to enter into a contract with the Heart of Missouri United Way to begin this process. She believed there would be a robust attempt to get every stakeholder involved, and felt they needed to move forward. They could not continue to hold meetings as that meant they would never have action. She asked the Council to allow this process to begin by approving this ordinance so they could begin a dialogue, which could lead to funding and the safety that funding would provide.

Irwin Schneider stated he was the President of Columbia Neighborhood Watch and introduced Jeff Hempstead, who was the Secretary of the Columbia Neighborhood Watch. Mr. Hempstead explained Columbia Neighborhood Watch was about community cooperation, and specifically neighbors cooperating with neighbors, with a goal of reducing crime by implementing crime prevention methods and working with the police. He commented that they believed this resolution aimed to enhance that goal by getting a large number of community members and organizations to engage in a process of addressing current problems, providing recommendations how to resolve these problems, and determining how to implement the recommendations. The process allowed for the voice of the community to be heard through the individuals and organizations that would be involved. He believed this would lead to a better acceptance of the results, and hopefully better involvement for police officers and the safety of Columbia. He noted they had held several training events, and in the past, beat officers would be in attendance, but lately due to the call volume, they were not showing up or were being called away if they were able to show up. The officers were constantly putting out fires because there was a lack of prevention. Community policing included prevention, and that was illustrated in the strategic plan neighborhoods. It allowed for the building of communication between residents and officers, which was needed. Mr. Schneider stated he agreed with Ms. Nausier in that they needed to move ahead to get the process going as it was important to Columbia.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, noted there had been some very interesting comments, and stated he had been particularly impressed by the thoroughness of Chip Cooper. He commented that absence a meaningful process, he would vote against a ballot issue. He provided a couple of ballot issues that had failed as examples and believed they had failed due to a lack of preparation, such as a year of work in developing a really good proposal and having that proposal come from a real conceptual framework that had moved on beyond the concept. He felt community policing was that kind of concept and discussion was needed over a long period of time. He commented that he believed the resolution adopted in February should be revised before moving forward because it was so flawed, and had resulted in a flawed proposal. He stated the proposal did not mention the most important issue from the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence, which was the trust gap between the police and the community. He understood the CPD felt they were doing community policing through the outreach program, and had not bought into the philosophy of shared responsibility and shared authority in deciding the kind of policing they wanted. He also believed they needed to specifically say there would be more than one event. He suggested the Council reject this contract tonight and amend the original resolution, and then come back with a request for proposals. He pointed out Columbia had a black police chief in the 1980s and early 1990s, and at that time, people were applying to be on the police force because Police Chief William Dye wanted to develop a professional police force. Once Chief Dye had been pushed out, the enthusiasm and idea of a professional police force had been lost. He commented that trust in between law enforcement agencies and the people they protected and served was essential to democracy and was key to the stability of their communities, the integrity of their criminal justice system, which was under serious indictment, and the safety and effectiveness of delivery services. He hoped and trusted the Council agreed, and noted the community needed to decide on the kind of policing it wanted. It was not the job of the police to decide. He believed that should be addressed as part of the process. He

reiterated his suggestions of not moving forward with this contract and to revise the previously adopted resolution before requesting new proposals. He stated he was skeptical as to whether the culture of the CPD would change with more funding, and was skeptical the voters would approve it. He suggested they not take that risk. If they did this right, they would model and build the kind of trust that was necessary with each meeting and step. They did not immediately need additional officers. He believed they immediately needed processes in which trust was constantly created, built, and modeled.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, stated he thought they needed to realize that they were all interconnected. He felt everything said this evening was so important, and suggested they educate and empathize.

Melvin Harvey suggested everyone spend a night out there in their shoes.

Dale Roberts, 1301 Vandiver Drive, explained he was the Executive Director of the Columbia Police Officers Association (CPOA) and agreed with Mr. Clark in that this was a flawed proposal and a one size fit all attempt to solve some issues. In listening to the speakers, he understood there had been different goals of what different people wanted to see addressed, and did not believe this document or process would address those items. The document presented had one single outcome objective, which was to build constituency and support for community policing in Columbia. He stated he believed they were there for the most part. He explained he spoke with public groups frequently and had lunch regularly with Lorenzo Lawson of the Youth Empowerment Zone, and had never heard anyone say they were against community policing. When the CPOA had initially met with Mr. Thomas and Mr. Trapp about this process some months ago, they had been given some assurance that their knowledge, experience, and expertise would be included, but they had not been contacted in preparation of this document. They had been led to believe law enforcement expertise and experience would be part of leading and facilitating the process. He felt they needed to have some input from someone that understood law enforcement and could explain why things were done the way they were done, and believed that had been omitted from the proposal. He reiterated the only outcome appeared to be to build support for community policing. He thought they were already there, and a \$70,000 price tag was pretty high to get to a goal that had largely been accomplished. The process objectives had indicated the goal would identify the kind of policing Columbia desired, and he was not sure how that could be adequately addressed without involving someone with a law enforcement background and there was not any provision to have anyone in law enforcement involved. He believed it would present a problem for them to be involved later, and the expense of bringing in experts would be above the \$70,000 budget. The CPOA strenuously objected to having \$33,000 taken away from the community outreach unit to help pay for this process as it seemed counterproductive. He noted the community outreach unit officers had made requests for badly needed gear, boots, vests, etc., and those requests had been denied due to funding shortages. Yet, they were looking to take more money away from a department that was in some level of distress already. The scope of work proposed required 69 hours on the part of the City, and that would mean close to 210 hours of involvement from police officers. He stated they were drastically short police officers on the street and would hate to see 210 hours go to a proposal with the only goal being to get people to buy into community policing. He thought it needed to be split into more than one process. He stated he had received an e-mail from Mr. Trapp indicating that if this did not pass, they might not have the support for the tax, and felt that held the Fire Department hostage to a process in which they were not involved. He also did not feel city funds should be used to support taxes. He commented that he was also concerned this had not gone through the public bid process. Even if this resulted in something wonderful, it would leave them open to criticism in that they handpicked the people they wanted to facilitate the process so they could get the result they wanted. They did not want to be put in that position. They did not want a weakness to be built into the process that could later be used

against the results of the process.

Mr. Pitzer asked how engaged the officers would be in lending their expertise and assisting in the process if this proposal moved forward. Mr. Roberts replied he thought they wanted to be as engaged as they possibly could, but staffing was a problem as officers were currently required to work overtime. This would drag away resources from a department that did not have the resources to spare. They wanted to be involved, but were in a difficult situation. In addition, the officers were greatly restricted in what they could say. No officer could really come forward and ask for money to not be taken from their budget as there were policies that prevented officers from saying what they were really thinking. He thought it was important to not only have input from the CPD, but other law enforcement professionals who might not be as concerned about what they might say.

Mr. Thomas thanked Mr. Roberts for speaking on behalf of the officers and wanted to assure him that they had been engaged in the process like all of the other organizations on the list. Their input from the survey along with the input of others was given to the consultants to review as they prepared their proposal. It was absolutely the plan that CPOA would be centrally involved in the planning of any event and the engagement process. They had not been bypassed. He asked if there was an outcome objective the CPOA wanted to put forward for the process. Mr. Roberts explained their officers supported community policing and loved the concept of community policing. In fact many of them, even those not in the community outreach unit, believed they engaged in it every day to the extent they were able while still going from call to call to call. He commented that some of the speakers had mentioned racial profiling, social equity, and the need to address different income levels, and was worried this was an attempt at a one size fit all solution when they might need different processes to address different issues. He was not sure how they could all be rolled into one in an economical and efficient fashion.

Jerry Wilhoit, 2607 S. Winding Trail Drive, stated they had to start this process somewhere, and the risk factor of doing nothing was too great. He pointed out the issues on the University of Missouri campus and noted the image of Columbia, Missouri was at stake. The decisions made would impact Columbia for years to come, and the process would not be completed in six months. He thought they needed to look at a one year plan and a five year plan. He stated he liked the fact the United Way was involved, and was surprised they were willing to lead this as their credibility was on the line. He pointed out they would bring full time staff to this effort, and would likely put in more hours than what they would be paid for because they saw the big picture. He thought the NAACP should have been included as a partner and believed their chances of success would then be enhanced greatly.

Michael Farnham commented that no one had mentioned the Patriot Place for veterans as he was having the same problems as the University of Missouri in terms of racism, and it was killing him. He stated he was thankful for the organizations that had spoken on this issue. He believed it was a step forward and noted it made him feel better knowing someone was trying to create an environment where they could all live together in peace and harmony without issues related to the color of one's skin.

Ms. Peters stated she appreciated all of the public comment as she had continued to go back and forth on this issue while hearing those comments. She commented that she was not sure this would get them to exactly what they wanted, and felt trying to address staffing, officer safety and morale, and community oriented policing might be too much for one meeting. She noted she agreed with Ms. Nauser in that they needed to start somewhere. She did not feel this was perfect, and stated it would need to be more than one meeting. She understood this would be five months of preparation for an all-day event. She believed the issue of more funding for the police department and a potential ballot issue was a secondary issue. She felt larger conversations were needed and this was a start.

Mr. Trapp commented that he agreed with much of what Ms. Peters said. He pointed out

this was not the only process that would address these issues. He noted Mr. Matthes had been working with stakeholders through his own process of a listening tour, and encouraged that process to continue as it was very much focused on the racial stop data and developing a plan of action. He agreed Bishop Lester Woods had a lot of credibility and could convene stakeholders, and encouraged that process to continue. He thought they had room for multiple processes as had been suggested by Mr. Roberts since there were a lot of issues. Columbia was a very divided community with a long history of racism and a moderate history of underfunding police officers while continuing to raise the expectations of what those officers would do. He believed this process was a good step forward. He explained it was not just a day event. It was a process of polling disparate stakeholders and topic experts, and bringing them together with trained facilitators to keep them on task and moving forward. He noted they had done activities under their own power and felt it was time to bring in consultants. He commented that he was grateful to the United Way for stepping forward and putting their agency's credibility on the line. He stated he did not know Ms. Menifield, but had been impressed with what he had heard and was glad she was working with New Chapter Coaching, which was a small business that was putting its reputation on the line as well. The consultants had submitted a credible proposal based upon the resolution that had been adopted. He agreed it was not perfect, but not much perfect came in front of them. He looked at it in terms of whether it was more good than bad and whether it was a justifiable use of the City's funds, and this passed those tests for him. He noted he could point to many consultant agreements that rivaled this in size and paled to it in importance for the community's future. He agreed with Mr. Wilhoit in that they were at a crossroads. He thought it was time to move forward with this agreement, and to participate in it with an open heart and as much effort as possible to bring the community together, keep themselves safe, and ensure everyone had a chance to thrive in Columbia.

Mr. Skala stated he was on record saying they did not need to spend a lot of money on a question they had already answered. He understood that might sound a bit presumptuous, but there had been a long history of talking about community policing in this community, some of which had been offered by the testimony of Race Matters, Friends. He noted he had brought back some information for several years from a group called Racial Equity and Leadership (REAL), who had led the charge for the National League of Cities with respect to structural racism. He stated he would not vote to endorse this proposal as he believed they needed a good deal more, and felt it was misleading to say \$70,320 was too much money as they likely needed to spend more. He explained he had become involved in this particular process after he had learned there was a meeting between Mr. Thomas, Mr. Trapp, Ms. Nauser, who was a former council member, and Mr. Matthes with regard to putting a proposal together as he had invited himself. At that meeting, they had learned the estimated cost was about \$70,000, and believed there was a consensus to consider something at half that magnitude. In addition, Mr. Thomas had indicated he would try to seek some contributions. At the next meeting, the estimated cost was \$60,000, so it had been trimmed by \$10,000, but Mr. Thomas had asked that City staff take over that \$10,000 worth of time and Mr. Matthes had agreed. He understood the content of the original proposal had been narrowed to the essential question of community policing although there had been some assurances there would be other communication and discussion as well, and the issue of funding had remained the same. He thought the cost might go beyond the \$70,000, which include \$38,000 in council reserve funds and \$33,320 in community outreach unit funds, due to the need to invite speakers. He commented that what was most disturbing to him about the proposal beyond the money, since he thought they likely needed to spend more money, had to do with the idea of who was invited and how they got them to participate in order to provide input. He believed the process utilized in the three areas as part of the strategic plan was a good one as they went to them and it involved many people he had never interacted with previously. They were not the people that typically came to council

meetings. The events in those strategic areas had a lot to do with community policing as safety was a priority item in many of those neighborhoods. He stated he saw this as a template to extend this conversation beyond the issue of the philosophy of community policing. He believed that could be used to discuss issues of racial profiling, structural racism, etc., and felt that was vital to the conversation. He commented that he was not prepared to support the current proposal because he did not feel it went far enough. He understood they needed to take a step in the right direction, but thought they were already doing so with some of their ongoing strategic plan initiatives. He stated he would oppose the proposal as written, and hoped they would focus more on outreach and engaging those that did not have a voice with regard to issues beyond community policing, like racial profiling and structural racism.

Mayor Treece commented that he thought they all agreed they wanted community policing and an effective community policing model. He also felt the three consultants involved in the proposal had great reputations and did great work in the community. He believed, however, the process they used to get here had been flawed. The lack of a competitive bid process had likely deteriorated their ability to get a cost-effective proposal and forfeited the opportunity for other consultants to bid and compete intellectually with a scope of services they could all agree upon. The typical process would have been to have a scope of services, which they could have debated like they were doing tonight, and to then send it out to bid once they had an agreed upon scope of services. For him, not having expertise in policing issues was a real barrier. It was a must have in terms of how they developed and executed a community engagement strategy. He did not believe it was fair to the public to provide input and have high expectations for a community policing model if that was not supported with best practices or law enforcement training and techniques the officers executed every day. He thought the input received tonight had been beneficial, and the concept of having multiple meetings instead of one during the week and including victims in the paradigm was important. The reality was that the NAACP, Race Matters, Friends, Faith Voices, and the CPOA all felt they were missing the mark with this proposal. He felt not listening to these stakeholders early on threatened to undermine the entire process moving forward. The issue was so important. He believed they needed to fully be transparent in how they did this, and thought it was worth the time to step back and have a competitive bid process. If they had done that in March, he thought they might actually be ahead of schedule. He stated he appreciated the initiative of Mr. Thomas and Mr. Trapp had taken on this. It was just extraordinary to the way they typically did things. He suggested they take a step back and try to move forward with the input received tonight.

Mr. Pitzer commented that like Ms. Peters he had gone back and forth on this issue a lot. He did not like the process in terms of how they had gotten to this point. In terms of a local group that could bring together a diverse set of stakeholders in the community and knew the community and its needs, he was not sure anyone other than the United Way could replicate that. With regard to some of the specifics that would be discussed or presented at this event, he was of the opinion that would be fleshed out in the 279 hours. He believed it was incumbent on them to reach out to all of the voices in the community and for all of the stakeholders to come to the table as well. He hated that they would take \$33,000 from the community outreach unit when they talked about them being strapped for funding. He pointed out he had reviewed the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence report since it had been such a topic of conversation, and there were things in it beyond the emphasis on community policing. It had indicated the CPD should be provided with the resources and leadership to attract, train, and retain the best officers, and that the Columbia community should develop programs to help officers feel appreciated and respected to aid in the recruitment of the highest quality officers that were representative of the diversity of Columbia. He felt things of that nature had been lost in the proposal. The outcome objective was building constituency and support for community policing in Columbia, and that support was likely there, but it was not had

been asked for in the resolution. The resolution had indicated they needed to address staffing levels, officer safety and morale, and community oriented policing. The Task Force recommendations were from a 2014 report, and the resolution indicated this would be a one year process, but they were almost half of the way through that year and still discussing whether they would move forward. There had been a rash of violent events this summer, and they needed to take action and make real decisions to move the ball forward. He reiterated the process was flawed and there were parts of it he did not like, and thought the time invested between now and November/December would be critical in determining the success of this process. The name and reputation of the United Way was not the only one out there as a couple of their fellow council members had put themselves out there as well on this issue. He stated he was still not sure how he would vote.

Mr. Thomas stated he was extremely encouraged by everything that had happened tonight as he believed they had started the community engagement process about policing. He did not think all of the different stakeholders had ever come together to talk about policing thoughtfully and publically. As a result, he felt tonight was a huge victory regardless of what happened in terms of this vote. He believed there had been a change in the community by all of the comments and found that he had agreed with almost everything that had been said even though it seemed many were saying very different and opposite things. He commented that he was upset Ms. Ratliff felt undermined by this process as that was not what they wanted. He was delighted that she was meeting with Mr. Matthes and representatives of CPD and had planned an August 22 event. He stated he planned to be there and saw it as something that would be integrated with everything else they were doing. He believed there had been too few of these types of conversations, and felt the more the merrier as they needed to talk and listen to each other in order to come together to develop a plan. He thanked Ms. Kelley for stating the importance of the involvement of neighborhood associations as that had been discussed. He thought it might have been an issue of the number of neighborhood associations and the difficult decision of whether to approach some or all of them, but noted he believed they had a very important place in the process. He commented that the approach had always been intended to be very flexible. He pointed out the proposal that had been put together had been criticized for being too vague and too specific, and felt they needed to leave it open for all of the reasons mentioned in that there were a lot of voices and stakeholders that had not had the opportunity to weigh in. He agreed at some point they had to start homing in and coming up with a concrete plan, and that was a difficult judgement to make. He explained he and Mr. Trapp had tried to focus on something after the resolution had been adopted, and this was the result. It was not a single meeting. It was a community engagement process to design a single meeting, and that community engagement process would involve many stakeholders. He pointed out the stakeholder survey had approached nearly 30 different organizations and several more had been identified tonight. It was not closed to anyone. The proposal suggested putting together a committee, and since they could not have a committee of 30-40 people, they could intentionally invite the other partners to the table every time. He understood that was what they had planned to do. If this particular plan moved forward, the engagement would occur over 4-5 months with a diversity of groups, and there would then be a big public event. In addition, it would not stop there. Although they did not have a specific plan for how it would continue, his suggestion would be for an annual forum focusing on crime, social needs, and discrimination as had been recommended by the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence. He noted this could be the first of an annual series of meetings, and explained he did not object to the many other suggestions. He commented that with everything they had heard, he was not sure if it was best to approve this ordinance with this specific proposal in it or to try to address the suggestions and improve it. He did not want to leave tonight with the issue unresolved, and preferred not to go through a competitive process at this point because they had already spent so much time on it. He

thought there had been enough support for these consultants for their facilitation and convening skills to do a really good job. He stated he would be happy to discuss a different scope or to approve this scope with the understanding it was intentionally flexible by reviewing all of the comments made tonight and adjusting the plan to ensure all of the voices were heard. He noted it was important for everyone to be engaged and for everyone's views to be respected. He commented that he was not sure how he would vote, and would only vote against this if they had another definite plan to move forward.

Mayor Treece asked who they were. Mr. Thomas replied the Council as they would have to make the decision about city resources and how to move forward. Mayor Treece stated the balance of the Council had not been involved in the process thus far. Mr. Thomas commented that this was that involvement. The meetings involving him, Mr. Trapp, Mr. Skala, and Mr. Matthes had not been closed meetings, although there might have been Sunshine Law issues if any other council member attended. They had met only to move the process forward. He thought they had heard tonight there was a lot of energy and support for a process, and that people did not want them to rush to a ballot issue for more money for police until they had done this properly. Mayor Treece reiterated he did not want to do anything that directly or indirectly intended to advocate for a tax increase as he did not feel comfortable spending public money in that realm. Mr. Thomas stated he did not either. He noted he did not feel it was anything he or Mr. Trapp had been interested in even though it had been interpreted in that manner. He also understood there were people that wanted a ballot to increase funding for police, but believed most people now agreed a community engagement process was needed before any discussion in that regard.

Mr. Skala commented that he would have preferred to have this evolve within the context of an RFP and with some of the comments included. He stated that although he was prepared to vote no on this given the specifics of the latest proposal since it appeared to be a narrowing of the scope of work, he could support a compromise that incorporated a lot of the conversation from tonight as he agreed they needed to move forward. He noted he also thought it was likely a good idea for this to be ongoing, but did not feel it should compete with their efforts of social equity. He reiterated he could support a compromise that included the conversation tonight.

Mr. Thomas stated the sense of a time pressure had made this difficult, and noted the reason he had felt a need to move this forward quickly and support a process that did not include an RFP was because he felt pressure from other council members to place the issue on a ballot as soon as possible. If they agreed they would do the process properly, it would allow for a better process as they would not need to rush it for an event in November or December. Mr. Skala stated he agreed with Mayor Treece in that this should not be linked to any ask, whether it was property tax or something else. Mr. Thomas noted that would allow them to free up the time line in addition to loosening the scope of work to incorporate the input they had heard tonight.

Mr. Trapp commented that he did not believe they would be able to craft a compromise as the public comment was disparate and from a lot of different approaches. They would not know if this would pass until they voted, and if it passed, they would have a process that enjoyed a lot of community support and a majority of Council support to get them started. If it did not pass, he thought they should develop a process of how they wanted to move forward. He stated he believed they had an under-resourced police department, and did not feel they could address that in any significant way with existing funds. He noted he was also uncomfortable with developing an ongoing process that would compete with the chance to take that case to the voters. If those that ran on funding police officers out of the existing budget were not able to identify cuts that could win majority support, the question of where they were in terms of resources would be answered. They had protocols on how they were able to comment at the dais, which essentially involved a two-time maximum, and they rarely took a second time because they all talked at length when they had the floor, and there was no provision in the ordinances that governed their

conduct for a third or fourth pass. As a result, he was not sure how the remaining people that had not used their second time would be able to craft a compromise that would win four votes. He believed the original proposal had the possibility of doing so and suggested they vote.

Mayor Treece stated he believed the proposal needed to be redone. He explained he was also concerned about taking \$33,000 from the community outreach unit for a \$70,000 conversation that they all agreed they wanted to have, especially when he had been told they could not afford duty approved shoes for officers on the outreach unit.

Mr. Skala pointed out another option was to table this to a date certain to try to craft a compromise as they would not be able to achieve a compromise if they did not try. He thought they could achieve a much better outcome with a much better product in a reasonably short amount of time if they made that attempt.

Mr. Skala made a motion to table B198-17 to the August 21, 2017 Council Meeting.

Mr. Thomas thought they would need to discuss a process if they were to do that, and noted he was open to it. He also thought they could pass the current proposal with the understanding that some changes in scope and time line would be incorporated.

Mr. Pitzer stated he was not comfortable passing the current proposal with changes anticipated in the future, and pointed out a vote to table was essentially a vote against the current proposal. He noted he was also troubled by some of the ballot issue talk because it sounded as though it was not meant to be a part of the discussion, but was then also the reason for the restriction on the time line or the artificial imposition of a deadline. He agreed the CPD was understaffed and under-resourced, and believed it was a management problem to a large extent. He commented that he was more inclined to vote against this and determine how they could improve it going forward.

The motion made by Mr. Skala to table B198-17 to the August 21, 2017 Council Meeting was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Skala suggested they broaden the perspective back to the level of the first incarnation of the proposal, which he felt involved a wider and broader conversation and a few more groups. He also suggested incorporating techniques to reach those that were difficult to reach given this kind of venue. He thought they should tweak this proposal to make it a much better and more palatable proposal for some of the disparate views heard tonight.

Mr. Trapp stated he would yield his seat at the organizing table if someone did not feel included and wanted to be involved in the process. Mr. Thomas noted he would be happy to as well. Mr. Trapp stated they could ask the city clerk to poll them to determine who might want to be involved so those that were less involved could craft something that could gain majority support and win the support of the community in order to move them forward. Mr. Thomas believed it would then be a stronger proposal.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Mr. Trapp to table B198-17 to the August 21, 2017 Council Meeting was approved by roll call vote with Mr. Trapp, Mr. Skala, Mr. Thomas, and Ms. Peters voting yes, Mr. Pitzer and Mayor Treece voting no, and Mr. Ruffin abstaining.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- | | |
|---------|---|
| B187-17 | Approving the Centerstate Apartments C-P Plan & Preliminary Plat located southwest of the intersection of Pioneer Drive, Vandiver Drive and Woodard Drive (Case No. 17-74). |
| B189-17 | Appropriating funds to conduct a building assessment of City facilities. |
| B191-17 | Accepting conveyances for drainage and sewer purposes; accepting |

Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.

- B194-17 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code as it relates to membership requirements for the Youth Advisory Council.
- B195-17 Amending Chapter 18 of the City Code to extend the sunset provisions for the Deferred Retirement Option Program (DROP) relating to police and firefighter retirement benefits.
- B197-17 Authorizing a preliminary funding agreement with Broadway Lodging Two, LLC relating to tax increment financing of The Broadway Phase II construction project; appropriating funds.
- R91-17 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of the El Chaparral riparian restoration project on a City-owned tract located along the south fork of the Grindstone Creek.
- R92-17 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of improvements at the Valleyview Park to include replacement of the existing playground and baseball/softball backstop and installation of an ADA walkway and drinking fountain.
- R93-17 Setting a public hearing: voluntary annexation of property located on the east side of Arrowhead Lake Drive and north of Sinclair Road (Case No. 17-156).
- R94-17 Setting a public hearing: consider changes to the sanitary sewer utility rate, sanitary sewer utility connection fee and waste hauler disposal service fees.
- R95-17 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the agreement for professional engineering services with Walker Parking Consultants/Engineers, Inc., d/b/a Walker Restoration Consultants, for preparation of construction documents and the provision of construction phase services for the repair and maintenance of the municipal parking structure located on the southwest corner of Sixth and Cherry Streets.
- R96-17 Determining that the Columbia Sports Fieldhouse at A. Perry Philips Park qualifies for funding under the Percent for Art program; authorizing the

Commission on Cultural Affairs Standing Committee on Public Art to begin developing the public art component for the Columbia Sports Fieldhouse at A. Perry Philips Park.

R97-17 Authorizing an operations agreement with Off-Track Productions for the Show-Me Totality solar eclipse event to be held at Columbia Cosmopolitan Recreation Area and Gans Creek Recreation Area.

R98-17 Authorizing an amendment to the CHDO agreement with Central Missouri Community Action for the development of property located at 3606 Woodside Drive.

R99-17 Approving The Vineyards Preliminary Plat #3 located on the south side of Elk Park Drive, approximately 150 feet east of Berkley Drive, and on the south side of State Highway WW, approximately 800 feet west of Stone Mountain Parkway (Case No. 17-100).

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

R100-17 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with George L. Crawford & Associates, Inc., d/b/a CBB, for a public infrastructure study of Grace Lane located between Richland Road and St. Charles Road.

The resolution was read by Mayor Treece.

The vote on R100-17 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. 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.

B199-17 Approving a major amendment to the C-P Plan for Lots 4 & 5 Discovery Park Sub. Plat 2B and approving the PD Plans for Lot 4 Discovery Park Plat 2-B & Lots 501 & 502 Discovery Park Plat 2-C for property located on the southwest corner of Nocona Parkway and Ponderosa Street; approving a revised statement of intent (Case No. 17-128).

B200-17 Approving the Final Plat of Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 2-C, a Replat of all of Lot 5 of Discovery Park 2-B, located on the west side of Nocona Parkway and south of Ponderosa Street (Case No. 17-129).

- B201-17 Approving a major amendment to the PUD development plan of A. Perry Philips Park, Phase I and approving the PD - Plan of Columbia Indoor Sports Complex Philips Park for property located on the northeast corner of Gans Road and Bristol Lake Parkway, west of the current terminus of Philips Farm Road (Case No. 17-142).
- B202-17 Approving the Final Plat of The Villas at Old Hawthorne Plat 9A, a Replat of a portion of Lot 5 of Old Hawthorne Plat 1, located on the west side of Screaming Eagle Lane and south of Old Hawthorne Drive East; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-139).
- B203-17 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. for construction phase services relating to the reconstruction of Taxiways C, C1 and C2 at the Columbia Regional Airport; appropriating funds.
- B204-17 Appropriating funds to cover overages in the parking utility due to the purchase of replacement parking meters and equipment upgrades.
- B205-17 Amending the FY 2017 Classification and Pay Plan by reassigning a classification.
- B206-17 Authorizing construction of improvements, repairs and upgrades to the leachate collection and storage facilities at the Columbia Sanitary Landfill; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B207-17 Authorizing construction of Bioreactor Landfill Disposal Cell #6 at the Columbia Sanitary Landfill; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; appropriating funds.
- B208-17 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Engineering Surveys and Services, LLC for design and surveying services relating to the Business Loop 70 Phase 6A water main improvement project.
- B209-17 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code relating to the metering of electricity for residential dwelling units.

- B210-17 Authorizing construction of improvements at the Valleyview Park to include replacement of the existing playground and baseball/softball backstop and installation of an ADA walkway and drinking fountain; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.
- B211-17 Amending the City of Columbia, Missouri, Money Purchase Plan.
- B212-17 Authorizing a school resource officer agreement with the Columbia School District.
- B213-17 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri, on behalf of its Missouri Small Business & Technology Development Center, to provide salary and benefits funding of an entrepreneurship program coordinator position.
- B214-17 Amending Chapter 24 of the City Code to add a new Article X pertaining to public utility rights-of-way management.
- B215-17 Amending the FY 2017 Annual Budget by adding a position in the Community Development Department - Building & Site Development Division; amending the FY 2017 Classification and Pay Plan by adding a classification.
- B216-17 Accepting donated funds from the Community Foundation of Central Missouri to supplement the funding for the trust specialist position in the City Manager's Office; appropriating funds.

X. REPORTS

- REP57-17 Removal of On-Street Parking Meters on Tiger Avenue.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood the University of Missouri was interested in removing all of the parking meters on city streets on campus, which involved a total of 300-350 meters, and replacing them with bicycle lanes. He believed this would have tremendous benefits for not only the University, but the City as well as it would remove a lot of traffic congestion on campus and encourage students and faculty to bicycle on campus, which would make it a lot safer. It would also allow the Tiger Line shuttles that picked people up from the remote parking lots and delivered them to campus to not get stuck in traffic, which would increase the level transit service. In addition, it would help in the transition to a lower car oriented community. He stated his appreciation for Mr. Matthes for working with Gary Ward on this initial pilot program, which he hoped was the first step to a much bigger effort to create a car-free or car-light campus.

Mayor Treece asked where these 37 people would go. Mr. Thomas replied he did not

believe there was a shortage of parking spaces. There were always hundreds of parking spaces outside Lucky's and Office Depot. Mayor Treece pointed out those were private parking lots that did not allow parking unless doing business there. Mr. Thomas stated he believed there was plenty of parking. It was just not exactly where people wanted it. Mayor Treece did not feel they could ask 300 students to find parking spots by taking away their meters.

Mr. Matthes stated he would characterize this as a pilot program. He thought the University was intrigued by the idea of changing congestion issues on campus. They could not afford to pay the City for all of them for a year so they were only testing the idea on one stretch on campus. He understood the theory was that those who parked their now would go to Trowbridge or the other campus lot and take the shuttle to campus. The intent of the pilot was to determine if that would happen.

Mr. Thomas asked if the University had plans to survey students about this program. Mr. Matthes replied this was a result of their parking study, and was a request from them. He thought they would likely do some kind of follow-up.

Mr. Pitzer asked if they would pay this amount annually if this became a permanent thing. Mr. Matthes replied that was something they would have to discuss. He was not sure they would be able to sustain that level of spend. One idea was to increase meter rates on campus to compensate for it, but that could not be done in the time frame requested so they had agreed to cover the cost for one year.

Mr. Thomas understood there might be other streets that might not be currently metered that could be metered in the future to increase the metered capacity. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. He noted it would depend on what they did for neighborhood parking programs as the North Village parking program had included some meters, and those had been successful. Some streets were still being metered with just the app sign, so the meters would be used. Mr. Thomas understood the 10-hour meters on Walnut Street and Ash Street were not very well used.

Mr. Skala understood Mr. Matthes had authority for a 90-day trial, and asked if that had been invoked at this time. Mr. Matthes replied he did not believe they had provided the authority yet. He understood the University wanted this done by August 4.

Mr. Skala asked Mr. Matthes if he agreed with Mr. Ward's assessment of this having the potential of shifting traffic to Trowbridge, etc. Mr. Matthes replied he was fascinated to see the results.

Mayor Treece stated he was okay with trying it for a year.

Ms. Peters asked if people would still be able to drive down Tiger Avenue and just not park on it. Mr. Matthes replied yes. He explained parking was already restricted on one side. This would restrict it on both sides, and both sides would be striped as dedicated bike lanes. The belief was that congestion would be significantly reduced.

Mr. Nichols pointed out they had pedestrian, bicycle, and vehicle counts so they had a baseline. Mr. Thomas asked when those counts were taken. Mr. Nichols replied it had come from the University when they had done their parking study or master plan. Mr. Thomas asked if it had been part of the Walker project. Mr. Nichols replied he thought so. Mr. Thomas asked if it had been within the last year or so. Mr. Nichols replied yes.

Ms. Peters understood a daycare was located on that street, and asked if the bike lanes would be striped along the curbs and if people would be required to pull over into the bike lane for pick up and drop off. Mr. Brooks replied yes.

Mr. Matthes asked if there was consensus to move forward. Mr. Skala replied he thought it was worth a try. Mr. Thomas agreed.

Mr. Trapp stated he felt this was a good deal as the University was covering the citation revenue and enforcement officers would just enforce elsewhere. Mr. Matthes noted he appreciated Mr. Ward being willing to keep them whole for one year.

REP58-17 Annual Water and Light Advisory Board Report to the People and City Council.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas stated he thought this was an excellent report. The work of the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) and how seriously they took their charge from the Council was exemplary. He commented that the data that had jumped out to him was that the City's electricity and water consumption had essentially been flat for the last ten years. He understood there was a general belief that they had to keep increasing supply because there would be increased demand, but that was not happening. While they did not want to endanger the supply, he thought they needed to look at the data before making decisions to greatly increase supply.

Mayor Treece understood Mr. Conway and Mr. Parker had attended the APPA Academy Governance Workshop, and there were three new members on the WLAB. He assumed there would not be any opposition to them attending some training as he understood some of them wanted to learn more about utility financing and accounting principles.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, Chair of the WLAB, explained they had updated the Google site for board member orientation. In addition, more recently, they were able to participate in APPA webinars, and had been given the opportunity to participate in the Renewable Energy Conference. Mayor Treece understood those were local, but there was also the APPA Academy, which was held nationwide, and that there was plenty of travel and training dollars to spread around among the board members. Mr. Conway agreed. Mayor Treece felt a live seminar was better than a webinar to understand utility accounting and finance. He thought there was one in North Carolina or South Carolina coming up. Mr. Conway agreed they would be more intense and broader than a webinar.

Mayor Treece asked when the last time was that the WLAB had received a financial report. Mr. Conway replied the last financial report had been dated September 30, 2016. Mayor Treece understood that was problematic for real-time decision-making. Mr. Conway agreed, and noted it casted an unknown with regard to the disposition of the finances.

Mr. Skala understood this was the result of switching to a financial new system. Mr. Conway stated he understood there was the inability to aggregate the various categories for an income or expense statement while ensuring it was a valid representation due the system conversion process. Mr. Matthes agreed there was a reporting issue. He had heard last week that the issue had been resolved by the software company, and they were now trying to catch up on closing out months and running the reports. He hoped information would be available by the next WLAB meeting.

Mr. Skala stated this report was indicative of people that had sense retired from the WLAB, and noted his appreciation to Mr. Conway and the current and former members of the WLAB.

Mr. Conway noted the annual Missouri Public Utility Alliance would be another conference the WLAB members could attend. It provided education and the state of affairs of public power in the State of Missouri.

Mayor Treece asked if it was true this was the first time a woman had served on the WLAB. Mr. Conway replied that was correct in his 28 years. Mayor Treece stated that was surprising since at least 50 percent of the ratepayers were likely women and more than 50 percent of bill payers were likely women.

REP59-17 Broadband Market Analysis Update.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked if the update had been affected by some of the larger players, like Mediacom, who had made a concerted effort to invest more heavily in broadband. He also understood the City had fiber in the ground and had been trying to decide to whether to light up the ends. Mr. Johnsen stated the study completed in 2014 had a

recommendation of a lit bandwidth, which meant they would light the fibers and sell the bandwidth as an official way to use the infrastructure, but that had not yet gone anywhere. A number of providers in the community had indicated they were making progress, so they had asked Magellan to re-poll the community. Mr. Skala understood part of the delay was due to this re-evaluation.

Mr. Pitzer explained he was intrigued by this idea of a broadband business plan, and asked if that was what Mr. Johnsen was referring to when indicating they would continue to look into it. Mr. Johnsen replied yes. Mr. Pitzer understood economic development had been specifically cited in the report, and there were also some issues of equity as parts of the community still did not have access to broadband. The combination placed some urgency to the idea of a business plan. He noted he fully supported trying to develop it.

Mayor Treece commented that six months ago he had spoken with a utility that had a broadband plan, which was ultimately abandoned because it was not profitable since technology was changing so fast. He understood this was different, but wanted to ensure they were not competing with the private sector. He knew the downtown might be challenging in that it was in the built environment, but this was also not like the rural electrification of lighting up the last mile because it was not profitable. He felt it was likely profitable if they were doing it, and if it was not, then they would need to determine if the City should be involved. Mr. Pitzer stated he believed those issues could be fleshed out and examined.

Mayor Treece asked about the next steps. Mr. Johnsen replied both plans had indicated the City should look at a business plan, and the next step decisions would be based off of that. He explained they had never intended to be the end-use provider of the service. It was more of a partnership in terms of infrastructure, and how that could be negotiated to allow for service to the largest population. If there were areas they were having difficulty getting to, they needed to determine the City's role in getting them there.

Mayor Treece asked if there was any additional capacity left in the scope of services with Magellan or if they had fulfilled their contract. Mr. Johnsen replied they had fulfilled their contract with the City as of right now. Mayor Treece asked how much more it would cost for the business plan. Mr. Johnsen replied he did not know. He understood they were interested in facilitating that work, but he was not sure how they would go about it at this time. They would have to determine if a citizens group was needed, if REDI would be involved, etc. Some decisions would need to be made prior to moving forward.

Mr. Skala understood the City was never going to compete directly with the private sector, but they had assets in the ground whereby they might be able to facilitate a connection with those that were not yet served by leasing the ends of the fiber. He asked if that was a fair representation. Mr. Johnsen replied yes. He pointed out the City leased dark fiber at this time, so the original plan was to light it to sell bandwidth because it was a much more efficient use of the asset, but they never had any plans to lease services to end users. It had not been a part of the business model in the past, but in putting together a business plan, it might be something that was reviewed. He reiterated, however, it had never been their plan.

REP60-17 FY 2018 Annual Budget - North 763 Community Improvement District.

Mayor Treece understood the North 763 Community Improvement District (CID) did not have a staff, and all of the money generated went toward debt service and legal fees.

REP61-17 Discontinue Use of Credit Card Capable Parking Meters.

Mr. Thomas asked about the long term plans for the options that people would have for paying for parking. Mr. Brooks replied all of the current meters accepted coins, the CoMo park card, and the app. He noted they were looking at options for other apps that could be used. Mr. Thomas asked if all current meters accepted all three now. Mr. Brooks replied yes, except for the meters they were talking about removing here as they did not accept the CoMo park card. Ms. Peters understood there was parking along

University Avenue that could only be paid for with an app. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct. He explained there were about 83 spaces that only accepted payment with the app. He noted they might move the meters from Tiger Avenue to some of those locations.

REP62-17 Citizens Police Review Board - Supplement to the 2016 Annual Report.

Mr. Skala stated there was fascinating demographic information in the report.

REP63-17 Status of CIP Projects.

Mayor Treece explained he had asked for this after a special interest group had issued a press release criticizing the Council for not following the will of the voters, and appreciated the follow-up from staff. He noted that since then, the City had promoted a community dashboard where people could see every project that had been approved by the Council or voters occurring throughout the community.

REP64-17 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, understood Mr. Thomas had indicated he had been limited to who he could have talked with when working on the contract with United Way with regard to the engagement process for community policing, and noted the Council could schedule a work session. They could post the meeting regardless of whether a quorum of the Council showed up, and they could have a discussion whereby the public could listen. Since it would be a work session, the public would not be involved unless invited to speak. He felt Mr. Thomas had hamstrung himself since they could have had work sessions. He suggested that be done in the future.

Mr. Clark stated he had been impressed with Mr. Pitzer's question with regard to broadband. He commented that he had been involved with a group that had worked on the digital divide whereby they were able to provide six computers in Ward 1. He liked the idea of a business plan, and encouraged the Council to follow up on it as it could significantly impact economic development.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, asked for more information about the Land Trust Board in terms of the current members and how they might be replaced, and suggested a brochure of who, what, when, where, and how. He suggested the same for community policing and ultimate goals so residents were able to know what was happening.

Mr. Elkin noted the veteran that had spoken earlier had indicated he had delivered flowers that had been donated, and asked if there could be some volunteerism program in that regard as he thought that was a nice gesture.

Mr. Elkin suggested the City condemn the property at Sixth Street and Elm Street as there were holes in floors and the use of bathtubs as bathrooms.

Mr. Ruffin explained the reason he had to abstain on the community policing proposal discussion was because he was currently on the Board of the United Way, and noted he was also not sure how much he could be involved going forward due to that. He stated he believed Mr. Trapp's historic knowledge and work on the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence was too valuable to the process for him to step away, and hoped he would continue. He commented that he had been concerned throughout this process by the fact his participation had not been engaged in a meaningful way as the First Ward Council Member and the only African American on the Council. He felt he had something to say about this issue and was uniquely qualified to reach out to a diverse African American community. He trusted as they moved forward he would be allowed to participate in some degree to help this process along in a more meaningful way than he

had been allowed in the past.

Mr. Thomas thanked Mr. Ruffin for speaking up, and noted he wanted to assure him that he had not intentionally been excluded from this process. He explained he had decided about a year ago that they needed to have some kind of conversation, and had reached out to every council member at that time. He had also discussed it publically in meetings. Only Mr. Trapp and Ms. Nauser had really responded so they had moved forward as best as they could. He reiterated that it was not intentional and noted he felt he had tried to obtain his input at different points along the way.

Mr. Thomas understood they had until the August 21 meeting to come back with revisions, and suggested a small steering committee be put together quickly to look at everything that had been said tonight along with the proposal they currently had in order to revise it. He noted this would need to be done in partnership with the consultants. He asked Mr. Matthes to lead the process going forward with the three consultants, and to involve some number of council members. He strongly recommended that Mr. Ruffin and Mr. Trapp be a couple of those members. He stated he was very happy to step back as he did not have a predetermined outcome. He just wanted them to get to the point of having a proper conversation and committing to doing something. He thought other groups that should be included were the NAACP, Race Matters, Friends, the CPOA, and the team of Glenn Cobbins and Judy Hubbard. He felt that would cover the major concerns that had been expressed about the specifics of this process. He noted that would be a group of about 10-11 to meet and make revisions.

Mayor Treece stated he did not want to be predisposed to those consultants. He noted he did not have any problem with them, but thought Mr. Thomas wanting to continue with those consultants caused a predetermined outcome. They had not hired them so they were not the City's consultants. The City had consultants that had been trained with the strategic equity plan that might have valid ideas on how to move forward at much lower price. In addition, there might be other consultants they might want to shop a revised RFP or scope of services to in order to determine what a budget might look like. He stated he was looking for those types of alternatives.

Mr. Thomas stated he was not supportive of stepping back. He wanted to move forward with the same consultants who had demonstrated themselves on similar processes. He agreed the NCCJ St. Louis facilitators should be a part of this process, and noted they had discussed a number of ways that could be done. He felt the time delay to even design the RFP would be a serious problem as they would lose the momentum they currently had.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to move forward with the same team of consultants that had already invested a lot of time and energy to this process as they moved forward preparing for the August 21 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought there was some advantage to proceeding with some of the work that had already been done, but noted he was not prepared to support the possibility of not allowing anyone else to participate that had the potential for creating a better product. He stated he was not dismissing the work that had already been done and suspected that would be the bulk of where they headed. He just did not want to exclude other possibilities should they run into them as they revised the proposal.

Mr. Thomas stated this was a first step and they had to start somewhere. There was plenty more work to be done. These consultants were process consultants. He agreed they needed content specialists as well, and that had always been intended to be a part of the process. There would be more work to do after this. He felt they needed to get started now. He did not believe they should step back and start again.

Mayor Treece commented that he was not willing to lose the benefit of Mr. Ruffin's perspective by the desire of Mr. Thomas to stick with these consultants. He explained part of the problem he had with this was the process they had used to get here, and the fact they did not use a competitive bid process. That process failed to give them a cost efficient comparison and forfeited the opportunity for consultants to compete intellectually

with the best scope of services or their best methodology on how to get the outcomes and trust they wanted to inspire. Part of the City's mission statement and value statement was to be democratic, transparent, and efficient. Those values would not be accomplished with this plan.

Mr. Skala stated he did not feel they were talking about starting at the beginning as he thought the current consultants likely had a huge advantage, but noted he was unwilling to exclude other possibilities.

Mr. Matthes commented that he thought he could deliver a refining of the scope of services into something that looked more like the resolution, but could likely not deliver much more in terms of an improvement by August 21. It also had the shortcoming in that as long as United Way was in the mix, it precluded the participation of Mr. Ruffin since he was on the United Way Board.

Mr. Skala stated Mr. Matthes' offer fit within his idea of how to improve this proposal, which was for it to be broader than what had been proposed tonight.

Mr. Matthes pointed out he imagined the consultant would want more time due to the delay and a broader approach.

Mr. Trapp commented that he had seconded the motion to continue to use the same consultants since the facts of the tabling implied it would be a modification of what had been in front of them, but noted it was painful to not have Mr. Ruffin involved.

Mr. Thomas understood the only thing Mr. Ruffin would not be able to be involved with was the decision to award the contract. Mayor Treece stated he disagreed as Mr. Ruffin could not be involved in the negotiation of the scope of services. Mr. Thomas agreed, but felt the real work would start afterwards. He understood Mr. Grabau intended to invite Mr. Ruffin to be centrally involved in the future, and there would not be any conflict then.

Mr. Ruffin asked if this was a decision that had to be made tonight. Mr. Matthes replied they had only made a decision to table the issue, and he could come back with something, but if he was working with United Way, he could not involve Mr. Ruffin. He could react to the comments regarding the scope of work if the Council wanted him to drive the process at this point.

Ms. Peters suggested they take Mr. Matthes up on his offer so they could get to a more normal way of doing business.

Mr. Thomas asked if some members of the Council would be engaged. Mr. Matthes replied yes.

Mr. Thomas stated it was not ideal since Mr. Ruffin's input could not be included. He thought they had made could progress tonight in that they had something to build upon, and suggested they move forward.

Mr. Thomas withdrew the motion to move forward with the same team of consultants that had already invested a lot of time and energy to this process as they moved forward preparing for the August 21 Council Meeting, and Mr. Trapp, who seconded it, agreed with it being withdrawn.

Mr. Trapp asked staff to follow up on Mr. Elkin's report regarding a nuisance property at Sixth Street and Elm Street.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 12:06 a.m.