



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, September 18, 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, September 18, 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 PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, and PITZER were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

Mayor Treece explained the minutes of the September 5, 2017 Council Meeting were not yet complete.

Mr. Trapp asked that B257-17 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.
Mr. Skala asked that B265-17 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.
The agenda, including the consent agenda with B257-17 and B265-17 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Skala.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC9-17 Board and Commission Applicants.

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

CITY OF COLUMBIA NEW CENTURY FUND INC. BOARD

Johnson, Tish, 4309 Jeana Court, Ward 4, Term to expire September 30, 2020

Nolte, Robert, 802 S. Fairview Road, Apt. B8, Ward 4, Term to expire September 30, 2020

Wilson, Betty, 1719 University Avenue, Ward 6, Term to expire September 30, 2020

COMMISSION ON CULTURAL AFFAIRS STANDING COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC ART

Sherman, Levi, 1025 Ashland Road, Apt. 205, Ward 6, Term to expire July 1, 2018

CONVENTION AND VISITORS ADVISORY BOARD

Hall, Stephanie, 1601 Hershey Court, Ward 3, Term to expire September 30, 2019

Hickman, Tim, 5004 Covington Court, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2019

Marcks, Melody, 3020 W. Wildflower Court, Boone County, Term to expire September 30, 2019

Strodtman, Rusty, 4009 Quinton Court, Ward 2, Term to expire September 30, 2019

Thomas, David, 155 Maple Grove Way, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2019

ENVIRONMENT AND ENERGY COMMISSION

Brown, Lincoln, 53 Broadway Village Drive, Apt. C, Ward 6, Term to expire June 1, 2019

MAYOR'S COUNCIL ON PHYSICAL FITNESS AND HEALTH

Samson, Megan, 2311 Hillsboro Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire November 30, 2019

PERSONNEL ADVISORY BOARD

Radar, Jerome, 2226 Shepard Boulevard, Ward 6, Term to expire September 30, 2020

Mayor Treece explained the appointment to the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Commission was a Mayor's appointment with the consent of the City Council and noted he wanted to visit with the applicants before making an appointment. Ms. Thompson pointed out at least four council members would need to be present in addition to the mayor as there was case law indicating a mayor could not vote twice on an appointment or removal. Mayor Treece asked if the TIF Commission intended to vote on October 4 when they met again. Ms. Thompson replied it was up to the TIF Commission to decide how they wanted to proceed. Ms. Amin asked if the vacancy should be readvertised. If it was readvertised, the deadline to apply would be October 6 at 5:00 p.m. Mayor Treece replied it could be readvertised since they were not voting until October 16, 2017. Mr. Skala agreed.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC56-17 Tory Kassabaum - An Equitable Warrant Amnesty Opportunity--making the municipal court's warrant amnesty offering more accessible to Columbia citizens.

Ms. Kassabaum, 115 Anderson Avenue, stated she was a member of Race Matters, Friends, and referred to a September 11, 2017 article from the Columbia Daily Tribune that described the warrant amnesty opportunity offered by the Municipal Court. She noted she saw value in the program and thanked Judge Cavanaugh Noce for providing it. It reduced the burden on the judicial system for cases unrelated to public safety and allowed people to avoid jail time for petty crimes, which at best only cost taxpayers money and at worst acted as a debtors prison. The almost 1,000 people that were on the list that had been published with the article had owed hundreds of dollars each and some had a warrant out for their arrest only for parking tickets. The need for the amnesty program showed her the current municipal fine system was not working and was not ethical. As they had seen in the Department of Justice Report on Ferguson, the municipal court that had handled most of the charges for the police department had done so with the primary goal of maximizing revenue instead of administering justice or protecting the rights of the accused. While she was not necessarily claiming Columbia had the exact same problem as Ferguson, she thought they needed and could make the municipal fine system more equitable so they did not fall into this trap. She commented that municipal court fines had been a line item in the budget and believed this meant they expected and counted on people to not pay tickets immediately and to accrue larger and larger fines. The reality of people that could not afford their fines went much deeper than a one-time visit to the municipal court as it created a ripple effect of not being able to pay off criminal fines and fees for decades, which reinforced and deepened the marginalization and isolation in social, economic, and political institutions. She felt Columbia should consider the suggestions on how to lessen the long term and unintended consequences of criminal justice financial obligations included in a report by John F. Kennedy School of

Government at Harvard University entitled *Shackled to Debt*, and provided the suggestion of amnesty to those that already held debt as an example. The evidence provided in the report questioned the value of pursuing debt from people who were unable to pay. She commented that accounting for and excusing this kind of debt would not only allow people to exit the destructive cycle of debt, warrants, arrests, court judgements, and incarceration, it also helped clear the administrative backlog in court systems. She urged the Council to use the warrant amnesty opportunity as a warning and a small step in the right direction in making Columbia a healthy and equitable town. She quoted California Senator Kamala Harris who said “this is an issue of economic justice, because the difference between sitting in jail or not is just how much money you have.” She stated she would provide a copy of the report and paper to the Council so they had the opportunity to read it.

SPC57-17 Jonathan Root, PhD, on behalf of Race Matters Friends - Importance of historical knowledge.

Mr. Root, 209 Anderson Avenue, explained he was speaking on behalf to Race Matters, Friends, and as a life-long historian, he believed history was crucial for the well-being of individuals in society because it taught self-reflection, character formation, and story formation. The most dangerous consequences of historical ignorance was a populous incapable of moral self-reflection and of forming coherent stories. He quoted a passage from a philosopher about how decisions were shaped by vision, and the ways people saw things were a function of their character, history, habits, and ultimately of the stories heard in which they identified themselves. He commented that a story that was badly-told led to self-deception and injustice while a story well-told led to empowerment and the pursuit of justice, and felt self-deception emerged from the desire to protect one’s identity. He referred to Malcolm X’s auto biography, which told about the self-hatred Malcolm X felt until he was in prison when he had heard the story of black Muslims as he had then learned he had not had his own story to provide him the skills necessary to recognize his own truth. He had finally learned of the falsity of needing to straighten his hair or do other things to fit into white society, and understood how to recognize his own humanity and path. Mr. Root noted the black Muslims had provided Malcom X a story and language to face up to his situation, and pointed out the story of Malcom X could not be his story due to the color of his skin. His story would be different and rooted in the acknowledgement of the evils of racial injustice. As an educated, heterosexual, bourgeois, white man, he had to learn to live as the victor and the ravager. He believed history could teach them and help to tell stories as a product of the past and that everyone’s stories could and should work together. He felt the pursuit of justice and history could show them the past.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

- PH30-17 FY 2018 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
Discussion shown with B277-17.
- PH31-17 Consider changes to the sanitary sewer utility rate, sanitary sewer utility connection fee and waste hauler disposal service fees.
Discussion shown with B277-17.
- B220-17 Adopting the FY 2018 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
Discussion shown with B277-17.

- B221-17 Amending Chapter 11 of the City Code as it relates to Public Health and Human Services Department fees.
Discussion shown with B277-17.
- B222-17 Amending Chapter 12A of the City Code as it relates to stormwater utility charges.
Discussion shown with B277-17.
- B223-17 Amending Chapter 13 of the City Code as it relates to hauled liquid waste rates.
Discussion shown with B277-17.
- B224-17 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to parking fees.

Discussion shown with B277-17.
- B225-17 Amending Chapter 17 of the City Code as it relates to Parks and Recreation fees.
Discussion shown with B277-17.
- B226-17 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to transportation fares.
Discussion shown with B277-17.
- B227-17 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to solid waste rates and services.

Discussion shown with B277-17.
- B228-17 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to sanitary sewer utility rates and sanitary sewer utility connection fees.

Discussion shown with B277-17.
- B229-17 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to accounts and billing and water rates.
Discussion shown with B277-17.
- B230-17 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to electric rates.
Discussion shown with B277-17.
- B275-17 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to personnel policies, procedures, rules and regulations.
Discussion shown with B277-17.
- B276-17 Adopting the FY 2018 Classification and Pay Plan; providing for FY 2018 salary adjustments relating to the Classification and Pay Plan.
Discussion shown with B277-17.

B277-17 Establishing plan year 2018 active employee medical premium rates and retiree non-Medicare medical rates for the City of Columbia; providing for payroll withholdings.

PH30-17 and PH31-17 were read by the Clerk, B220-17, B221-17, B222-17, B223-17, B224-17, B225-17, B226-17, B227-17, B228-17, B229-17, and B230-17 were given fourth reading by the Clerk, and B275-17, B276-17, and B277-17 were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

John Martin, 400 Longfellow Lane, stated he owned Pro Pumping & Hydrojetting, LLC, which provided grease-trap pumping services to many businesses and institutions in Columbia, and noted he was concerned about the proposed increase to the waste hauler disposal rate. The current charge was \$20.62 per ton, and this would increase to \$52.00 per ton, which was a significant increase and would excessively burden them. He explained the grease had been taken to the wastewater treatment plant, but in February, they were told it needed to be taken to the landfill, which was a great idea because the water and organic material helped to breakdown waste at the landfill. He pointed out they would not add trash to the landfill. It was mostly water with some grease that would be added to the landfill. As a result, he did not believe they should be charged the same landfill rate as someone with tires. He understood City staff had developed a new proposal, which would reduce the fee to about \$27.86 per ton after taking into account the fact half of the waste was water and incorporating other items. He noted that fee amount was more appropriate and asked that it be phased over a 2-3 year time period as it was a 35 percent increase.

Mayor Treece understood Mr. Martin supported the amendment currently in front of the Council. Mr. Martin stated that was correct, and explained they would only ask that it be phased. Mayor Treece asked for the current rate. Mr. Martin replied \$20.62 per ton. Mayor Treece asked how many tons one of his trucks would carry on average or for the impact to one of his customers. Mr. Martin replied he had three customers with 1,000 gallons per trap this past week, and the charge per the current rate had been \$261. If the fee was increased to \$52 per ton, the cost would be \$660. Mayor Treece asked what it would be under the new hybrid rate. Mr. Martin replied he did not have that exact figure readily available.

Mr. Skala asked staff if phasing this increase was a viable strategy. Mr. Johnsen replied the new proposed rate was a cost-based rate, and noted Council could provide direction to staff with regard to phasing the increase.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Martin for his thoughts on compliance with a significant increase. Mr. Martin replied the University of Missouri had indicated to him it would cost them about \$20,000 per year, and he believed those affected would ask for the grease to be pumped less often. Currently they pumped all of the cafeterias at the University of Missouri every month, and he thought they would stretch out the length of time to every 2-3 months. He noted they would comply with pumping, but if the traps were thicker, it could potentially cause grease to get into the lines, which would then cause problems for the City in terms of grease in the sewer system.

David Maxwell explained he was the Director of the Mid-Missouri Restaurant Association and agreed with the comments of Mr. Martin. He stated their operators needed equitable pricing for grease trap waste disposal, and believed any large increase in fees should be phased so they were able to accommodate the costs in their budgets. He pointed out there were a few alternatives to grease trap pumping in the area and outside companies tended to backhaul what they pumped to their communities to pay the local rates at their home stations. They had little or no liability for the quality of service or the grease entering into the sewer system. He felt it was important to have quality companies, such as Pro Pumping & Hydrojetting, LLC.

Mark Satterwhite commented that he worked for Boone County Family Resources, an

organization that served people with disabilities, many of whom used the bus system. He read a letter that had been signed by seven other agencies and sent to the Council in August, which expressed concern for the potential impact of the elimination of fixed bus routes 6, 7, and 8 as many with disabilities did not have the means or ability to transport themselves to and from work, social services agencies, medical facilities, and other places in the community. He noted the bus system was important to those that had no other affordable accessible transportation option. He pointed out a number of social service agencies and employers were located along the targeted routes with clientele and employees who relied on public transportation to access them, and listed those organizations. While they understood ridership was low, some riders they knew depended on these routes for basic access to and participation in community life. The elimination of the routes without any alternative would have a stifling impact on their ability to participate as citizens in the community. He asked that fixed routes 6, 7, and 8 be preserved until the Council was able to establish a flexible alternative that would continue to meet the transportation needs of those critically dependent on the service.

Christiane Quinn, 719 W. Broadway, explained she was a member of Public Transit Advisory Commission (PTAC) and noted the Commission had not had a chance to meet prior to this hearing to discuss the suggested budget cuts to transit. She stated she supported Option 4 and believed it reflected the overall position of PTAC as it would provide the most coverage to the most people within the current budget constraints. In addition, the flex zone pilot project would provide the opportunity to see how it worked. She also asked that the paratransit fare be increased by only 50 cents if it still needed to be increased.

Steven A. Smith, 1603 Canton Drive, stated he was President and CEO of Job Point, which was located at 400 Wilkes Boulevard, and explained they were not asking for the \$250,000 to be disbursed now. They were only asking for those funds to be reserved until they were able to raise a matching amount. He noted they were also willing to negotiate or work out what would be necessary for them to obtain those funds. He commented that he had shared a process plan with the Council, and pointed out the Job Point Board was very committed to that plan. He stated they were willing to meet the conditions of CDBG funds, which would put more restrictions on the use of those funds, even though these funds were not a part of the CDBG program. They felt there was an opportunity for them to place more people into jobs more rapidly due to the low unemployment rate, and because the interest rates were also low, they believed time was of essence.

David Jackson explained he was a disabled citizen of Columbia who resided in apartments through a program established by New Horizons and noted he was concerned about the elimination of bus routes. He commented that many people had to get to work. He understood there were problems, but felt the focus was on college students. He asked that the Council consider everyone, and not just college students.

Katie Essing, 11 S. Tenth Street, stated she was the Director of the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) and noted she would speak on the proposed parking fee increases. She understood one proposal was for a \$20 increase for permits per month for the Plaza Garage and the Eighth and Cherry Garage, and asked that the parking and traffic management commission, once established, be provided the opportunity to review and provide input on the increase prior to it going into effect. If that was not possible, she asked that the increase be spread evenly among all garage permit holders. She understood there was currently a waiting list for all garages so those permit holders would not have the option to go to a lower priced garage. With regard to the ten cent increase for all meters and a \$10 increase per permit for all of the garages, she asked that it be delayed to allow the commission, once established, to provide feedback.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that staff had unfortunately provided Council an all or nothing scenario with the utility rate increases. He thought some rate increases were necessary, desirable, and warranted at this time even though there was a lack of adequate information. He was not sure how Council would parse the issue. He stated he

did not believe the Council should increase the electric utility rates by the amount requested. He also did not feel there should be an increase in the residential trash collection fees, but thought other rates needed to be increased. He understood the Council had until September 30, 2017 to adopt a budget as it would otherwise be the City Manager's proposed budget, and suggested special meetings be held to work through the details of the utility increases for a reasonable compromise.

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

The vote on B221-17 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B222-17 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Ms. Thompson explained the grease hauling issue would be removed from this bill, B223-17, as it would now be included in B227-17.

Mayor Treece asked if they needed to deal with B227-17 first. He wondered if the amendment associated with B227-17 would affect this. Ms. Thompson replied no. The change was only with regard to where the grease was hauled. It was currently hauled to the wastewater treatment plant and was then ultimately hauled to the landfill. This would eliminate grease going to the treatment plant, which she thought was desirable by all parties.

Ms. Peters noted the language in B222-17 indicated it was for the acceptable liquid waste generated outside of the city limits, and understood this did not refer to grease. It was actually the activated sludge, the portable chemical toilets, etc. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

The vote on B223-17 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Thomas understood staff had proposed an increase to the rates in two specific garages by \$20 per month to fund repairs to those structures, and Ms. Essing of the Downtown CID had suggested the burden of those costs be spread to the whole system instead of only those garages. He commented that he did not feel strongly either way. It seemed reasonable to spread costs over the entire system when repairs were needed to any structure if there was a general policy.

Mr. Skala understood there were two ways to get what they wanted, and one was via an increase in permit fees. Mr. Thomas stated that was a separate issue. One issue was the staff proposal to pay for building repairs, and the other issue was his proposal to start moving forward on a residential parking permit program in the neighborhoods adjacent to downtown by increasing either meter fees or permit fees as staff did not have the capacity to do that at this time. Mr. Skala understood the same question applied as to whether to spread it amongst all parking structures. Mr. Thomas thought the general feeling was to increase the garage permit fees instead of increasing meter fees to fund the neighborhood parking program.

Mr. Skala asked if the increase in fees for the repairs would conflate with the increase in fees for the neighborhood parking program and any decision to spread it out throughout the garages. Mr. Matthes replied it would be an additive. There would be a larger increase if they did both.

Mayor Treece asked if staff had a fiscal note on what would happen if they kept the proposed increase the same and applied it to all parking garages to fund the residential

parking program. Mr. Matthes replied they had not analyzed the cost system-wide to handle the maintenance issues in the two garages, but had done that review for the neighborhood parking program.

Mr. Thomas asked for the amount that would be raised for the residential parking program. Mr. Matthes replied it was over \$250,000. Mr. Thomas asked how that was broken down as it seemed to be quite a lot. He thought they only needed a half-time staff person to meet with the residents. He pointed out there had been general support to pay a permit fee once the program had been established in the neighborhoods interested in this program in the Fourth Ward. He wondered if the amount proposed was higher than needed. Mr. Matthes replied it could be as there was not a specific program in mind. Staff had tried to determine what it would cost to have a program manager, an enforcement agent, and enough cash flow to purchase equipment, materials, etc. He noted they could consider coming back to this in the future. It did not have to be addressed now. He pointed out there was a general fund impact by increasing parking structure rates while there was not with increasing parking meter rates. Mr. Thomas understood this was due to the subsidy provided to staff to park in the garages. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct and noted the impact would be about \$46,000 per year. He suggested the Council table this discussion for the future.

Ms. Peters understood the ordinance in front of them was only to raise the fees by \$20 in two parking garages. She felt the issue was being muddled with the discussion about the parking permit program, and suggested they address only what was in the ordinance for now.

Mr. Matthes explained the parking permit program had been included in the amendment sheet for the budget. This ordinance really only involved the parking utility.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the proposal to increase fees in the two garages had solely been to cover the costs of maintenance. He wondered if it also had anything to do with the demand for those garages. Mr. Matthes replied there was a demand element as the two garages were considered prime downtown locations and had extensive waiting lists, exceeding several years. From an economic perspective, he believed those structures could sustain higher rates. They were also aging and had higher needs than newer garages. This was the reason they were suggesting an increase to only those two garages.

Mr. Pitzer asked if all of the fees across all of the garages were the same now. Mr. Matthes replied he thought so. Mr. Pitzer asked if there would be an impact on the general fund if the increase was spread across all of the garages. Mr. Matthes replied yes.

Ms. Peters asked for the reason for the \$20 increase on these two garages, but not any of the others. Mr. Brooks replied they had targeted those two garages based on their maintenance needs and high demand. They were the two oldest garages and would need substantial repairs soon.

Mr. Matthes asked Mr. Brooks to characterize the rates across the garages now. Mr. Brooks replied today the rates for all of the garages were the same. This included the permit rates and reserved rates. The parking lots had a lower rate. Mr. Matthes pointed out this ordinance would change that concept.

Mr. Trapp commented that he thought it was a good concept, and explained the Parking and Traffic Management Task Force had discussed differential pricing for the different needs of the garages. Since they had high demand garages that had high costs, he thought it made sense to increase the rates on those instead of spreading it across the garages.

Mr. Thomas understood if someone wanted to pay a lower price, they could get on the waiting list for one of the cheaper garages.

Mr. Skala stated this made sense in terms of the maintenance of the two garages as they needed the most attention since they were the oldest garages. He thought it also made sense to separate the issues so they did not conflate this with the neighborhood

parking program, which he felt would be more equitable if across the board.

Mr. Thomas noted he would support Mr. Matthes' recommendation to hold off on the neighborhood parking permit program again. Mr. Skala commented that it would be discussed later. Mayor Treece agreed they could discuss it as part of B220-17 or ask for an ordinance to be brought back in the future. Ms. Amin understood if Council passed B224-17 tonight as written, they could provide direction on the permit parking program tonight, but a new ordinance would have to be brought forward in the future to accommodate any changes. Mr. Matthes agreed if the Council wanted to increase the rates for the neighborhood parking permit program tonight, this was the time to do it.

Mr. Skala stated he thought they should increase the rates for the permits across all of the garages for the neighborhood parking program because it was a problem that was characteristic of the downtown in terms of overflow parking. He explained he was reluctant to go along with the increase in parking meter rates as it would impact the customers of downtown businesses.

Ms. Peters commented that if they were going to establish a permanent parking and traffic management commission, the commission should be allowed to provide input.

Mr. Thomas noted there had been a Parking and Traffic Management Task Force and the reason they had not moved forward a year ago was because they had wanted that task force to review it. He asked for a characterization of the thoughts of the Task Force. Mr. Skala replied it had been discussed by a subcommittee, and while some members wanted parking meters in the neighborhoods and others did not, they all felt something should have happened already to address the issues. Mr. Thomas understood everyone had wanted some kind of permit program. Mr. Trapp explained he had been on the downtown subcommittee and they did not have a problem with neighborhood parking programs, but were concerned about equity in terms of how the programs would be funded. They wondered if downtown parking needed to bear the burden for neighborhood parking issues. As a result, he did not believe it was a settled issue. Mr. Skala agreed.

Mayor Treece stated he wanted to explore a residential parking program and felt there was plenty of evidence as to why it was needed in the East Campus neighborhood and parts of the Old Southwest and North Central neighborhoods. He also preferred to keep the meter rates where they were as he believed that was designed to encourage shopping downtown. They would price people out if the meters were too expensive.

Mr. Thomas commented that he did not have a preference as to how it was funded, and did not believe they would price people out from coming downtown because they continued to hear from people that were unable to find parking. He thought the neighborhood parking permit program was good as it was bigger than only solving the problem for residents. It would also create an equitable market-based decision-making process for people coming downtown in terms of whether they would drive and park or use or support some other mode of transportation. Currently, there was personal economic decision making, which placed an unfair economic burden on others and stopped the community from getting to a transportation equity scenario. He stated he wanted to see the program move forward and understood additional staff was needed for that to happen.

Mayor Treece asked for the fiscal note for moving it forward. Mr. Thomas replied \$10 per permit per month. Mr. Matthes commented that at \$10, it would generate about \$262,000. If there was a concern of that being too high, he thought they could do \$5 as it would generate about \$131,000. They could then design a program. Mr. Thomas understood that would be \$5 per month on five of the garages and \$25 per month on the two central garages.

Mr. Pitzer believed it was fine to look into creating a permitting program, and thought the establishment of the new commission provided a prime opportunity for it to be discussed as had been mentioned by Ms. Peters. He felt once a plan was developed, they could then determine the will of the Council to move forward as they would then have a cost estimate and could decide how to fund the program. He thought this would be better than

trying to arbitrarily raise rates to have a pot of money that could be used for a nebulous plan that was not currently defined. He preferred to see a plan first and to then find ways to fund it. Mayor Treece understood user or participation fees could be considered to offset the cost of any plan based on Mr. Pitzer's scenario. Mr. Pitzer stated he wanted to see what the plan would look like before deciding to fund it.

Mr. Skala commented that a lot of people in the Benton Stephens neighborhood had worked on a plan two years ago, and there had not been any progression, not even striping next to some of the driveways. He felt some action was needed now to begin the process, and pointed out he did not feel this funding would be sufficient to implement the program. He also did not think this issue needed to be turned over to another commission as they knew the commission would make some of the same recommendations as the Task Force had in terms of overflow parking.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Skala if he was discussing the funding of an existing plan that had already been approved. Mr. Skala replied yes, and explained there had been discussions with staff. Ms. Peters asked if there was a plan for the Benton Stephens neighborhood. Mr. Matthes explained there had been some work with three very different neighborhoods that had significantly different problems with parking and views on solutions they were willing to contemplate. A lot of the conversation thus far involved wanting staff time to help design a program. He thought the concept here was to allow for staff time now, and to come back with specific plans. He stated the Council needed to decide if it wanted to take what had been done thus far and determine a cost, if it wanted to hire a person to drive the process, or if it wanted a commission to be involved.

Mr. Skala stated he thought staff was needed in order to proceed. Mr. Matthes explained that was the idea behind the permit parking increase. Mr. Thomas commented that he believed the process was stuck because staff did not have the capacity to work with the neighborhoods to design a program or to educate people about the different options. He noted some of the programs might be self-funded once designed, agreed upon, and implemented, and pointed out that was a message he had heard from a Fourth Ward meeting of a neighborhood close to the downtown. Currently, they could not move forward at all because there was no capacity to even meet with the neighbors to discuss it. He thought they had heard from the Task Force and plenty of residents that this was something people wanted.

Mr. Ruffin understood the increased fees were not to implement the program. They would simply be used to explore and refine plans so there was something to present. It would provide the staff necessary to move forward. Mr. Thomas stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala asked for the minimum needed to begin moving forward. Mr. Matthes replied the \$10 per month increase would produce \$262,000. This would create the high level manager position that had traffic and parking management knowledge and someone for enforcement at a later date if necessary based on the program developed. He noted they could fund half now and decide whether enforcement was needed at a later date.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to amend B224-17 by increasing parking permit fees by \$5 per month. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Ms. Thompson asked if the \$5 increase would also apply to the surface lots. Mr. Brooks replied it would.

Ms. Thompson understood the monthly rates would be increased by \$5, the quarterly rates would be increased by \$15, and the annual rates would be increased by \$60.

Mr. Skala pointed out two garages would also have an increase of \$20 per month. Ms. Thompson clarified that was already contained in the ordinance. The amendment would increase permit fees the equivalent of \$5 per month.

Mr. Thomas clarified his motion was to amend B224-17 by increasing the garage and surface lot parking permit fees by \$5 per month, which would result in a \$5 increase to the monthly rates, a \$15 increase to the quarterly rates, and a \$60 increase to the annual rates. Mr. Skala, who had seconded the initial motion, was agreeable.

Mayor Treece understood the fiscal note would be about \$130,000 to design the

residential parking permit program. They could then determine what might be needed to fund the actual program.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the cost to the general fund. Mr. Matthes replied \$23,000.

Ms. Thompson stated the Council would also need to amend B220-17 for those dollar amounts when that item was discussed.

Mr. Trapp agreed with the desire to move quickly, but noted he was not sure these were the people they wanted to tap for fees as these were not the people that were parking in the neighborhoods. They were the ones that were purchasing parking spaces and following the rules. He stated he did not feel he could support the amendment because it was not attaching the fees to those that would benefit from the program or those that were causing the problems.

Mr. Skala commented that he felt they were all in it together and that everyone was causing a bit of the problem. He believed this was a reasonable way to approach funding the severe needs in the areas around the downtown.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Skala to amend B224-17 by increasing the garage and surface lot parking permit fees by \$5 per month, which would result in a \$5 increase to the monthly rates, a \$15 increase to the quarterly rates, and a \$60 increase to the annual rates, was approved by roll call vote with Ms. Peters, Mayor Treece, Mr. Ruffin, Mr. Skala, and Mr. Thomas voting yes, and Mr. Trapp and Mr. Pitzer voting no.

The vote on B224-17, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: PITZER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B225-17 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Brooks if he could describe Option 4, which would save approximately \$500,000 per year as requested by Mr. Matthes. Mr. Brooks replied Option 4 would save the same amount of money that had been proposed in the current budget. The two routes to the south, which were the light green and purple routes, would run at the off-peak schedule all day, six days per week. It was similar to what currently occurred midday from 10 a.m. to 2:00 p.m. and on Saturdays. The same would apply to the orange and brown routes in the north in that they would operate on an off-peak schedule all day.

Mr. Thomas understood at the present time these routes had a peak schedule from about 6:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m. and 3:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct, and explained the peak schedule meant there was a bus on each route. With the off-peak schedule, a bus would essentially run one route and then run the other route, and continue on throughout the day. Mr. Thomas understood the frequency of the buses in the early and late periods would be reduced to about half of the current frequency. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas understood that meant they would run every 80 minutes instead of every 40 minutes. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct.

Mr. Brooks explained the dark green route in the south would also be eliminated. The vast majority of that route would be picked up by strategic expansions of the light green and black routes. The pink route would also be eliminated, and that was where the proposed pilot program for a flex route would be established. This would allow them to determine how the flex routes would work so they could then continue implementing the recommendations of Olssen and Associates for flex routes throughout a substantial portion of the community.

Mr. Thomas asked how staff planned to design the flex system and how long it would

take. Mr. Brooks replied staff felt they could do this quickly since they were only focusing on one small area. He thought they could have it implemented by November 1 since they could target the riders on that one route. He explained they would design a geographic area of about three-quarters of a mile around the route as it existed today. Anyone that lived within that buffer could then schedule a ride the day before either within that flex zone or to a fixed route in order to access the rest of the bus system.

Mr. Thomas asked how it would work when someone was returning home. Mr. Brooks replied they would have to schedule both rides the day before. Mr. Thomas understood the reverse would be done in that someone would be picked up at a bus stop to be delivered to their destination. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas asked if the pink route would continue to run until the flex route was implemented on November 1. Mr. Brooks replied all routes would continue to run until November 1. He noted they needed to communicate with riders between now and then. In addition, bus stop signs would need to be removed, moved, or changed.

Mr. Thomas asked how well aligned these changes were to the Olssen and Associates recommendations. Mr. Brooks replied he thought they were fairly well aligned in that they were reducing service in the areas that had lower ridership. Staff was looking at the data collected when making these strategic decisions. Mr. Thomas asked if they had recommended a flex zone for the east area. Mr. Brooks replied they had.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a potential to merge the paratransit system and flex zones in the future. Mr. Brooks replied it was possible, but the current paratransit program was overtaxed. It was a very busy system and tended to grow every year. It was at capacity now. They viewed the flex routes to be separate at this time as it could create confusion to merge the two systems. He noted there was a potential for merging the systems in the future if they could figure out how it could be done.

Mr. Thomas asked if other cities were operating a flex system. Mr. Brooks replied there were a few and listed Des Moines and Orlando as examples.

Mr. Thomas stated he would advocate for Option 4. Mayor Treece agreed.

Mayor Treece understood the paratransit fees would not need to be increased this year with this plan. Mr. Brooks explained that was a separate issue. Staff had proposed the elimination of \$500,000 in cost with the route changes. The rate increase for paratransit was a separate item. Mr. Thomas understood Mr. Matthes had indicated he would be happy to go another year with the current paratransit rate of \$2.50 per ride, and noted he would support that proposal. Mayor Treece stated he would support that as well.

Mayor Treece understood the route changes to the off-peak schedule would still be predictable for the consumer as they would know the times and locations of bus stops. Mr. Brooks stated that was correct. It was not an elimination of service. It was a reduction in frequency.

Mr. Thomas noted he had received a call from a bus rider in southwest Columbia, who he had explained the proposal to, and although she would have preferred an improvement in service, she understood. He stated she had also indicated the purple route had high ridership on the first run of the day, and the light green route did not have as high of a ridership for that same run. He assumed staff would look at the ridership to determine which should run first. Mr. Brooks explained they would and noted they were fortunate in that they had the data to make those decisions.

Mr. Skala commented that some of them would be attending the National League of Cities Conference in November, which provided the opportunity to interact with people from other communities to discuss successes and failures, and asked for a list of communities that utilized the flex route system so they could have those discussions. Mr. Brooks replied the Council would be provided a list.

Mayor Treece pointed out B226-17 only addressed the paratransit rate increase and suggested they defeat it or not vote on it. Mr. Matthes recommended they vote it down.

The vote on B226-17 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NO ONE. VOTING NO:

PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. Bill declared defeated.

Mayor Treece asked if they needed to vote on Option 4, which he understood would affect B220-17. Mr. Matthes replied yes.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to proceed with Option 4 to be implemented November 1, 2017. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece understood B227-17 involved the grease disposal issue and asked for an update. Mr. Johnsen and Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report. Mr. Sorrell explained this was a unique waste they would accept at the landfill, which was about 50 percent water, and the water did not stay at the landfill. It ended up going out of the landfill as leachate and discharged to the wastewater plant. Since the water would not take up space in the landfill, they had determined the landfill fee for the space did not have to be charged. They assumed a 50 percent water concentration and would charge the solid waste rate that was proposed of \$52 per ton to the other 50 percent and add the State of Missouri required landfill tip fee, which was \$2.11, for the half that was water and the charges to treat the water at the wastewater plant that the landfill paid the sewer utility. The total cost would then be \$27.86. It was a more reasonable rate and more in line with the market for disposal of grease. Mr. Johnsen pointed out the rate at the wastewater treatment plant varied depending on whether the customer was from in town or out of town as there was a 1.5 multiplier for those from out of town. They were proposing to not do that any longer and just have a single rate at the landfill. Mr. Sorrell explained this meant the cost to those out of town would decrease while the cost to the in town would increase. While some of the individual bills would change quite a bit, the overall impact to revenues would only be 3.9 percent.

Mr. Thomas asked for the operational reason for directing the grease waste to the landfill rather than the sewer treatment plant. Mr. Sorrell replied if taken to the sewer treatment plant, they would try to remove all of the grease and then haul it to the landfill for disposal, which meant they would then pay the full landfill rate. Depending on the ratio of grease to water, it could cost more to dispose of the grease than was being charged. Mr. Thomas understood this meant the sewer utility would lose money. Mr. Sorrell stated they could. He explained the grease was also an operational challenge as it got into meters plugging them up and tended to build up in the wet well. He thought they had 2-3 feet of grease floating there today. Mr. Thomas understood it was beneficial to the landfill. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct, and noted they had been taking it to the landfill for years. He pointed out it would break down at the landfill and help generate methane for the power plant.

Mr. Ruffin asked Mr. Sorrell for his assessment of the feasibility of phasing in the additional costs. Mr. Sorrell replied he would leave that decision to Council. It was only a total revenue rate change of 3.9 percent, and some customer bills would go up while other customer bills would go down. Mr. Johnsen explained they had tried to provide a reasonable cost rate, and would leave the decision of phasing to the Council.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the reason for the multiplier for the out of town grease, and whether or not they wanted to encourage people to bring grease to Columbia. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not want to encourage people to bring grease to Columbia. He explained he had tried to determine how the multiplier had come into effect. He understood state law allowed sewer systems to provide services outside of their corporate limits and to charge a higher rate if they did. When the City of Columbia established sewer rates in 1954, they had adopted the 50 percent surcharge for those outside city limits. He noted he could not find the reasoning in the minutes or the ordinance.

Mayor Treece commented that he was indifferent on the phasing issue, and suggested

better communication in the future as they would not have had a need to phase the rates if notification had been provided a few months ahead of time instead of only four weeks. He was glad staff was able to accommodate the concerns and develop a better solution.

Ms. Peters suggested they allow a phasing over three years. Mayor Treece wondered if three years was too long and if they were anticipating other rate increases in the future that might compound this. Ms. Peters asked about two years. Mr. Sorrell suggested two at the most with half of the increase this year and the other half of the increase next year. Mr. Skala stated that would be his inclination.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B227-17 per the amendment sheet, which would change the rate from \$52.00 to \$27.86. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Ms. Thompson noted the Council could set the rate this year and allow staff to come back with the intent to increase it to \$27.86 next year instead of trying to spell out both years now. Mr. Sorrell stated the amount for this year if they were to phase in only half of the increase was \$24.80.

Mr. Trapp commented that he would prefer not to phase it in as they had come a long way in reducing the rate. A problem with phasing was that they would end up with residential rates subsidizing the fee. It was money that would not come in to cover the cost of the landfill and the bulk of that cost would then be made up by residential users. He noted they were already increasing residential rates and did not want to subsidize business interests at the expense of ratepayers.

Mr. Thomas stated he generally supported phasing in costs for large increases, but this was only a 30 percent increase inside the city limits and a decrease for outside the city limits.

Mr. Pitzer pointed out the rate had increased substantially in over the last five years already. The phase-in would allow more predictability. He noted it had been increasing for several years. Mr. Trapp explained the reason was due to it being subsidized by residential ratepayers. Mr. Pitzer agreed, and explained they were getting to an appropriate amount.

Ms. Peters made a motion to amend the amendment sheet so the grease trap waste disposal rate would be \$24.80 for the first year and \$27.86 for the second year. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pitzer and approved by voice vote with only Mr. Trapp and Mr. Thomas voting no.

The motion made by Mayor Treece, seconded by Mr. Trapp, and amended by Ms. Peters, to amend B227-17 by changing the \$52.00 grease trap waste disposal rate to \$24.80 for the first year and \$27.86 for the second year was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on B227-17, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mayor Treece understood Section 22-262 of B228-17 had one change, which was to add "individually," and believed that would substantially change the definition of a residential user and would affect those residential users that might be on a master meter and pay a multiple sewer rate. He also did not feel that belonged in a bill that dealt with rate increases.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B228-17 by removing "individually" from the definition of a residential user in Section 22-262. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the reason staff had included that change. Mr. Sorrell replied residential users were currently those in single-family homes or apartment units that were individually metered for water. A structure with a master meter was charged the

non-residential rate. The change was included to clarify the way the billing was handled. He thought the language currently stated "served by one water meter," and every unit was served by one water meter, but one water meter might serve many units. Individually metered meant the residential rate while the master meter meant the non-residential rate.

Mayor Treece stated he felt it did the opposite with the way it was drafted. He asked for a practical example. Mr. Sorrell replied the residential rate was for any single-family home, duplex, or apartment unit that had its own individual water meter. If it had a master meter, the charge would be the non-residential rate, and the bill would go to the person that had the water account for that master meter. If one was in a residential unit that was served by a meter that served four other units, it would not be considered individually metered for water so the charge would be the non-residential rate. This was the way it was done in practice, and they felt this change would help clarify that practice.

Mr. Thomas commented that he thought there were bigger concerns in terms of the equity of the use of master meters and individual meters and the way base charges were assessed. He stated he did not want to make this wording change because he felt it would make it harder to address the deeper issues.

Mr. Sorrell noted it would not impact the operation or the current billing system to not make this change at this time.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Thomas to amend B228-17 by removing "individually" from the definition of a residential user in Section 22-262 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on B228-17, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mayor Treece commented that he did not want to support a higher rate increase. He understood staff had proposed four percent for water and one percent for electric. He asked where they were with regard to the financial reports with real time numbers for the target cash reserve. Mr. Johnsen replied he thought they had actual financial reports from the Finance Department through February. He understood the Finance Department was able to provide the current cash reserve levels, but was not able to provide the full financial reports at this time. He thought they would be able to provide more financial statements by the next Water and Light Advisory Board meeting.

Mayor Treece stated he intended to vote against B229-17 and B230-17 because he was frustrated they did not have more realistic information to review. He suggested they not pass or vote on B229-17 or on the one percent electric rate in B230-17, and allow the water and electric utilities to catch up on their financials to four weeks in arrears, execute the independent rate study on the water utility, which was what had previously been proposed to Council prior to it being pulled out of the executed contract for the Integrated Water Resources Plan, and be three months error-free with regard to the billing software as it continued to be a problem. Once those items were addressed, he felt the Council could then consider whether to increase rates with more realistic figures.

Mr. Thomas noted he also planned to vote against B229-17 and B230-17 for a different reason. He stated he continued to believe there was a significant inequity between current customers and future customers and between customers that used small volumes of water and electricity and customers in the same rate class that used larger volumes. He thought there might even be a third inequity between rate classes. He understood the base charge, which was often stated by city staff as covering the customer related costs of metering, billing, and customer service, was much higher than the cost of providing those services such that about two-thirds of it went toward the general operation and maintenance of the entire system. He felt those costs should be built into the volume charge so that the more one used the system, the more that person

paid for operations and maintenance. He noted there was no connection fee for electricity, and understood the City paid for a lot of the onsite installation of electrical infrastructure instead of new development. In addition, new development was not charged for the cost of the increase in the capacity of the system.

Ms. Peters asked if the Finance Department would be able to provide up-to-date financial statements within three months. Mr. Matthes replied all operating units were without financial reports so it was not just the water and electric utilities and the issue was related to the implementation of the new financial system. The Finance Department was working to catch up and was on a path to be current within the next few weeks. He noted the year end was September 30, and the financials had to be finished soon afterward to be audited. He thought they were through April now. He pointed out this was a financial reporting issue, and staff had access to the data. The information was just not available through the reporting mechanisms. He commented that he thought they were only a month behind the normal schedule, which was August for September.

Ms. Peters asked when this information would be provided to the Water and Light Advisory Board and the Council. She wondered if they would have it in three months. Mr. Matthes replied he thought it would be available then, but pointed out they would not normally have this information when discussing the budget as that information was not used to create the budget. It was a way for people to judge the numbers, but it was not something that would be available normally.

Mr. Trapp stated he would support the four percent increase in water rates. In looking at the CIP plan, it appeared important maintenance and repair projects of the system would be funded. Any time they paused or stood still with infrastructure funding, they fell further behind. He noted integrated planning for water had started, and they knew they would have steeper increases in the future to meet regulatory requirements. They had spent most of the water bond funds and the increase was at four percent because they would pay for projects through the enterprise fund. This meant they were paying for repairs as they went along instead of going through the bond process and paying back the bond along with lending costs over the next 30 years. He pointed out there were advantages to both. If they charged the costs over 30 years, it meant those that moved to Columbia and benefited from the system would pay their portion, but it also meant a higher cost due to the lending cost. He commented that the salient issue when considering whether to support a rate increase was whether it was needed to cover the operating and capital costs of the utility, and he was convinced it was necessary. He did not believe they should not approve this due to the lack of financial reports and the disappointments in customer service due to the change in the billing system. He thought they were singling out the water and electric utilities because of a more engaged and active board as they did not have the financial reports for the other utilities either. In terms of the argument regarding the equity in service, he pointed out staff tended to also be criticized for money spent utilizing outside consults. He believed the Council needed to continuously monitor equity issues amongst rate paying classes and different user groups, and adjust it when necessary, which he thought had been done during his tenure on the Council. He stated he was supportive of moving this rate increase forward as it was in the best interest of the utility users and the City of Columbia.

Mr. Skala commented that he had been struggling mightily with regard to this issue since he had learned there was dissention amongst the Council with regard to approving any rate increases. He noted he had also attended the last Water and Light Advisory Board meeting where there were three votes in favor of the increase and two votes against it. As a result, his inclination was for a compromise rate increase. He thought they had singled out the water and electric utilities because a substantial part of the budget was attributed to them, and felt the public wanted to know whether the reports had been generated and whether the utilities were delivering on their promises. He pointed out utility billing and the payment of those bills was how most of the public interacted with the City. He understood there were legitimate needs in the water and electric utilities, and that the four

percent increase in the water rate was roughly equivalent to the one percent increase in the electric rate. He stated he did not feel he could support the full increase when there were some real shortcomings that needed remediation, and thought the suggestion of Mayor Treece was interesting as well in terms of restoring confidence in billing and what could be delivered prior to approving the increase. He understood the rate increases were based upon projections, and not necessarily on the reports they were lacking, but noted there was still a lack of confidence so he was reluctant to endorse an increase in the rates.

Mayor Treece commented that he wanted to push back on the notion they did not use financial reports in budgeting. They had always been provided end of March and end of June financial reports, which were also posted on the City's website in May and August. He was not sure how they could determine a four percent increase was needed when they did not have real time data.

Mr. Skala stated he was not sure an outside consultant was needed for an audit as they had a lot of auditing tools. He thought a consultant might be needed to assist with rate increase projections as it would provide an independent review. He pointed out these increases were a result of the torrid growth of the City of Columbia for some time. He commented that he was inclined to agree with Mayor Treece in that they might need time for clarity and assurances.

Mr. Pitzer explained he, like Mr. Skala, had been struggling with trying to determine the best approach and agreed there was a lack of confidence in the information provided. He understood the four percent water rate increase and the one percent electric rate increase were roughly equivalent in terms of dollar amounts, and felt the rate increase was far more impactful to the water utility than the electric utility. The water utility was much smaller and in a much more precarious financial position than the electric utility, and had been for a number of years. He noted it had actually been declining when looking at their cash reserves. In addition, there had not been as many rate increases. He thought there had been a two percent increase last year, but no increases the prior two years. Previous to that, there had been some voter approved increases. Operationally, there had not been an increase since 2012. He felt he could justify the water rate increase much more easily, and believed the water utility was getting to the point where they needed to ensure it had adequate financial support to move forward on necessary projects.

Ms. Peters commented that she had attended the recent Finance Advisory and Audit Committee meeting, and understood there was concern about the target cash reserve as it did not meet the adequate percentage required per policy. They were below the amount necessary and there was not a plan as to how to correct it. She believed not increasing the rates this year would only put them further behind, which would be a problem when they attempted to sell bonds as the financial institutions would look at how fiscally conservative they were and the robustness of the budget.

Mayor Treece asked for the time frame for executing the independent rate review that had been represented to Council, and how it might impact a bond in the future. Mr. Johnsen replied the intent was to finish the two current planning processes. The Integrated Water Resources Plan was mostly done and the Drinking Water Planning Work Group intended to finish its work this year or during the beginning of next year. They would then put the rate structures together and provide a cost of service analysis to the Council so a decision could be made as to bond. Mayor Treece asked if they would go to bid during the beginning of next year or have the results back by then. Mr. Johnsen replied he hoped they would have the results then. The intent was to go out to bid and hire the consultant by November or December. Mayor Treece asked when the data would come back from that study as to potential rates for that bond and if the study would address what the rates should be across classes without consideration of the bond so they had information regarding equity. Mr. Johnsen replied it could. He explained the intent of staff was to use the study to formulate rates for a debt instrument, but it could include how they might proceed if they were not using debt to fund the utility. Mayor Treece

asked when the results of a consultant's rate study would be back to the Council. Mr. Johnsen replied his goal was January or February.

Mr. Skala understood much of the incremental increases was a function of trying to keep rates stable, and noted he would dread not having the ability for small incremental increases as it could result in a much larger increases 1-2 years down the road. He noted Mr. Pitzer had a point in that the water utility was in a different situation than the electric utility.

Mr. Matthes commented that page 584 of the actual budget document showed a grim future. With the four percent increase, they would still use more than they would generate in revenues. He noted the cash reserve target was \$8.1 million, but the end unassigned cash reserve would be \$3.6 million, and with an increase, it would still drop \$1.4 million in FY 2019. The water utility was underfunded in terms of meeting a goal of 20 percent in savings. If the Council chose not to do the increase, it would accelerate the problem to the point they would run out of cash in FY 2019 or FY 2020, but that could be avoided by not moving forward with certain projects.

Mayor Treece stated they would have new information in January or February with respect to what rates should and could be moving forward in a 2018 bond issue. He suggested they not act on B229-17 until they received the independent rate review as it would also allow time to catch up on financial reports and to have three months free of billing errors.

Mayor Treece made a motion to withdraw B229-17.

Mr. Thomas noted he wanted to ensure the discussion included an analysis of connection fees for both the water and electric utilities along with the allocation of cost between the base charge and volume charge. Mayor Treece assumed staff would come back to Council with the scope of services, and that would provide a good opportunity to have the equity discussion. He agreed he thought it should be equitable across all customer classes.

The motion made by Mayor Treece to withdraw B229-17 was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Pitzer commented that this meant almost six months, which was about half of the year, and suggested they vote B229-17 up or down. They could integrate the results of any study into next year's budget.

Mr. Trapp stated he agreed with Mr. Pitzer, and noted they had heard some compelling information about the financial health of the utility. Incorporating the increase mid-year was equivalent to cutting it in half, and that was assuming everything went according to plan. He suggested they move forward with this rate increase and pointed out they would have lots of opportunities to adjust it if they felt there were inequities in the classification systems. He recommended voting in favor of this increase and making changes next year after reviewing the analyses.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Thomas to withdraw B229-17 was defeated by voice vote with only Mayor Treece, Mr. Skala, and Mr. Thomas voting yes.

The vote on B229-17 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, PITZER. VOTING NO: TREECE, THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mayor Treece commented that he thought they needed to have valid financial reports and a larger discussion as to how to set rates. He noted the Council had been informed of all of these utility rate increases four weeks ago, and for the last two years, the Water and Light Advisory Board had not had the opportunity to adequately advise Council with respect to their decisions. The initial discussion had been colored by staff in terms of how it had been presented to Council. He felt these were serious issues in that a utility rate increase was similar to a tax increase. He believed it needed to be deliberate and well justified. He noted he had also attended past Water and Light Advisory Board

meetings, and the financial reports they had been provided for the period ending January 31, 2017 had shown revenues were up \$3 million while production costs were down \$2 million. He also did not think the \$1 million in proceeds from the Sutter site had been included as deposited back into the fund. He thought there were plenty of reasons the one percent was not well justified at this time.

Mr. Skala explained he would oppose this electric rate increase as it was difficult to make decisions with a lack of information and there did not seem to be quite the urgency as there had been with the water utility. He asked the Utilities Department to provide them with more information in order to make decisions and to restore some trust with the public. He commented that he also wanted a consultant hired with regard to the rates as he believed it would help staff and the Council.

Mr. Thomas stated he would vote against this bill. He felt it was clear with the electric utility that current users were being excessively burdened by the cost of growth and future users were greatly subsidized.

Mr. Trapp stated his support for the electric rate increase, and explained rates were set through financial projections with regard to how much was needed for operations and capital projects. The projects identified for the FY 2018 CIP plan were projects he supported and were critical for the future of the utility. Even with the one percent increase, they would be below the cash reserve target if they had typical weather for the season. He understood some wanted to send a message, and did not believe this was the way to send the message. They had management options they could exercise through their meetings with the City Manager. They did not only have the power of the budget to exert their political will on management as they had management strategies and the chain of command, which were better for exercising their due diligence. He commented that they had done rate equity studies in the past and also had a certain level of staff competence to do those. He noted staff had attempted to reduce consultant fees. The number of staff per 1,000 people had been declining even in the enterprise funds so they continued to try to find efficiencies and cheaper ways to do things. He thought staff was cognizant and aware, and that they tried to keep overall rate increase packages below \$5. This would become increasingly challenging if they did not move forward with the recommendations of staff. He thought not approving the rate increase would lead to steeper increases in the future. As a result, they would likely have to drop needed maintenance and replacement projects, which he did not feel was in the best interest of the ratepayers or the residents of the City of Columbia. He felt it was critical for Council to support this, and noted they had expressed their desire to see financial reports for which they had received a commitment the reports would be provided. He reiterated he did not feel this was an appropriate way to send a message.

Mr. Pitzer explained a lot of his constituents were City of Columbia customers, but he was personally a Boone Electric Cooperative customer, which meant his rates would increase. He commented that he thought the opposite was true of everything he had said about the water utility for the electric utility. He had less confidence in the numbers. It was a larger utility and there had been more wild swings in projections versus actual financial results. This year alone the cash reserve position was \$7 million better when looking at the projection from the beginning of the year to the current projection for the end of FY 2017. In looking at prior year budgets, he noticed similar wild swings, and in most cases, it appeared as though they wound up in better shape than projected. He noted the size of this increase was not significant, so even if he was completely wrong, it would not make or break the utility. The reserves were such that they would be fine for another year. He stated he would vote against this.

Mr. Matthes asked which projects the Council wanted to delay since there did not appear to be support for an electric utility rate increase. He noted the operating rate would be reduced by \$1.3 million, and there would be a decrease in the PILOT to the general fund of \$91,000.

Mr. Skala understood the projects initially provided were those that would be the least

painful for the utility, and others were provided later. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. The list had been created based upon a number of things, but one was that these were items they thought could be pushed off into the future without undo panic. Council had asked for a larger list to choose from so other projects had been provided for consideration as well.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he was not entirely sure all of these cuts were necessary based on how inaccurate some of the other projections had been in the past. He could not say with confidence that anything would need to be cut.

Mayor Treece stated he agreed with Mr. Pitzer, and thought most of these items would have to come back to Council as a contract. Mr. Matthes explained not all of the items would have to come to Council, and provided the replacement of a vehicle as an example. He agreed the Council did not have to make any of these changes. The utility had \$31 million in reserve so if they went ahead with these projects, it would take that amount down to \$29 million. If the Council wanted to make expenditures equal to revenues as forecasted, a list of projects had been provided to potentially delay. Mayor Treece understood the projects in the CIP were not in the budget. They were in a separate document. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, but they were also in the operating budget for the current operating year. Projects were listed in the CIP plan, and the currently funded projects were also included in the budget. Mayor Treece reiterated that he agreed with Mr. Pitzer in that he was not sure anything needed to be cut at this time. It appeared forecasts and projections were used for revenues and real cash was used for expenditures. He felt that was backwards.

Mr. Thomas explained he did not want to cut anything either, and noted he wanted to see an electric utility connection fee to bring more revenue into the utility as he thought that would be a more fair and equitable way to fund the growth on which they spent a lot of capital improvement dollars.

Mr. Skala commented that there were costs of growth, and the torrid pace of growth the last 20 years or so was the reason they had cost of service fees, increases in rates, etc. He agreed they needed to look at this in the context of the strategic plan so everyone paid their fair share.

Mayor Treece suggested they either spend down the \$31 million in reserves or wait until they received an accurate financial report to determine if they even needed to reduce any of the expenses.

The vote on B230-17 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP. VOTING NO: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. Bill declared defeated.

Ms. Buckler provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if everyone had signed off on the process in terms of the time table, economics, etc. Ms. Buckler replied yes. She explained they had tightened up time frames and had added a middle review for less severe discipline. Mediation had also been added as a step for employees or the unions if there was disagreement about the administration of the contract. There was also a change to Section 19-25 with regard to employee relations as it provided for a tighter schedule for the collective bargaining agreement process and mediation for that process.

B275-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: TRAPP (Mr. Trapp stepped out during the vote on this bill.) Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Ms. Buckler provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece assumed the changes were salary neutral for the employee and budget neutral for the City. He understood some accommodations had been made in

anticipation of the overtime requirement. Ms. Buckler stated no one's pay had been changed to do what they were now doing.

B276-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: TRAPP (Mr. Trapp stepped out during the vote on this bill.) Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Ms. Buckler provided a staff report.

B277-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Matthes commented that they needed to accommodate about \$115,000 in the general fund due to the increase in parking permit fees and not approving the one percent electric rate increase. He suggested taking \$100,000 from the contingency account and \$15,000 from miscellaneous contractual in the city general budget.

Mayor Treece asked how much was in miscellaneous contractual. Mr. Matthes replied he thought \$140,000. Mr. Pitzer understood it was \$104,000. He understood this covered miscellaneous items that came up during the year and was not sure it should be budgeted as they had a contingency account and reserves. Mayor Treece stated he was not inclined to decrease the PILOT for the \$91,000. He would rather draw on the miscellaneous contractual account if and when the financial reports were provided indicating they were not on track to reach that \$91,000 PILOT contribution to the general fund. He would then like the balance for the increased parking requirement to come from the contingency fund. Mr. Pitzer noted he was agreeable.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Matthes for his thoughts on that suggestion. Mr. Matthes replied the miscellaneous contractual was important to them. It had been used when a water pipe broke in a meeting room. He stated he would prefer it be preserved and that they use the contingency fund. He stated it would take a longer process to appropriate the contingency funds if they were needed, which was why he would recommend it be used first. Mr. Trapp thought that was wise. Mayor Treece stated he was fine either way.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Matthes if staff had what they needed for transit in terms of Option 4. Mr. Matthes replied yes, and asked Ms. Peveler to take them through the amendment sheet dated September 12, 2017.

Ms. Peveler understood for general fund they would cut PILOT for electric on the revenue side and miscellaneous contractual on the expense side. In parking expenses, they would increase the permits by \$23,097 and cut the contingency fund by that amount. That would address the general fund. In transit, they would do the third item listed, which was Option 4.

Ms. Peveler noted they needed to talk about whether they wanted to add back the overtime for special event as it had been cut from the proposed budget. Mr. Matthes recommended adding back the overtime for special events as it was a decision they could make in the future. He explained it involved the free shuttle for Roots and Blues and True/False. Mayor Treece asked for the cost to continue it. Mr. Matthes replied \$20,000. Mayor Treece asked if that would come out of the contingency account. Ms. Peveler replied no, and explained it would hurt the position of transit by \$20,000.

Mr. Skala made a motion to restore the overtime for special events in the transit fund. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pitzer and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Peveler explained another issue that needed to be addressed was the \$1,000 payment to employees, which would be a \$40 payment over 25 pay periods. The general fund and a few other funds would be paid for by the Council's portion of the FY 2016 savings. This expense would need to be included in the budget for the other funds, such as the utility funds, and that was shown on the amendment sheet.

Mayor Treece made a motion for the adoption of those items coded by the letter "M" on the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Peveler if she wanted to walk them through the position changes. Ms. Peveler replied when they had made the changes to transit as proposed by the City Manager, they had failed to make changes to these two accounts so that needed to now be done. The custodial and building maintenance fund request was a result of needing to change two of the senior building maintenance mechanics from A10 to A11, which would have an impact of \$10,217. The timing of it did not allow it to be included in the proposed budget.

Mayor Treece understood for transit where it said reserves would increase by \$170,000, it did not mean that money would go into reserves. It meant the condition of the fund would be better by \$170,000. He noted they were cutting \$500,000 from the transit fund at the same time. Ms. Peveler replied they had intended to cut \$500,000, but had not, and this was the rest of the \$500,000. Mr. Pitzer asked if it handled the decisions on paratransit rates and overtime for special events. Ms. Peveler explained this \$170,000 just had not been reduced when they had discussed the route changes, and the result would be that the position of the transit fund would be \$170,000 better than what was shown in the budget document right now. Mr. Matthes asked if this was where they were replacing temporary hours with permanent staff. Ms. Peveler replied yes. Mr. Matthes explained it was not a service reduction. They would use full time staff to do the work rather than temporary staff, and needed the budget to reflect that. He noted they were looking for Council to support those staff requests and the position changes shown on page 4 of the amendment sheet.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to approve the staff request and position change items on page 4 of the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on B220-17, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B267-17 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Burns & McDonnell for an evaluation and feasibility study for construction of the Option "E" 161 kV transmission line to the Perche Creek substation.

Discussion shown with B268-17.

B268-17 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Quanta Technology, LLC for a reliability study of the City's electric distribution system.

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

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

Mr. Skala understood the coordination of scheduling would be accomplished by the amendment sheet as had been suggested by the Water and Light Advisory Board. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. He explained a separate Board meeting had been held to discuss these contracts specifically.

Mr. Thomas understood one of the major drivers for increasing capacity with a new substation was a request by the University of Missouri for a very large increase in its power capacity, and asked if staff would follow up with the University to determine if the same increase was still needed. Mr. Williams replied the University had asked for additional capacity in the transmission system, and Option E would not address that type of capacity. The study by Quanta Technology would involve the distribution system. He noted the University of Missouri would have to figure out a way to get that capacity on its own if they truly needed it at this time. Mr. Johnsen explained the University did not operate at the distribution level and the line was connected around the University. It would be an influencing factor so when staff came back to the Council later, they would try to obtain an idea of the University's plans and how integration might occur. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Johnsen if he thought they still needed it. Mr. Johnsen replied staff would ask the University as they needed to represent what they saw going forward. He understood there had been changes on their system, but noted he did not know their plans for the future.

Mr. Pitzer understood no one would look at the physical route for the Burns & McDonnell contract and thought that was odd. Mr. Williams explained this level of engineering study would be a paper analysis. They would not do any surveying. After this study was completed, they would have the cost figures for both Option A and Option E. Regardless of the option chosen, an interested parties meeting would be held along with another public hearing. Once they had the public hearing, they would have to follow up with any remaining design work. With Option A, they had gotten to the 50-60 percent design level. With Option E, Burns & McDonnell would provide an engineering cost estimate, which would be at a roughly 30 percent design level. As a result, additional design services would be needed. He commented that staff would ensure that was included in the cost estimate so comparisons could be done. Mr. Johnsen explained there were two areas where information was needed. One was from the existing transmission provider as they would have lot of information on the path and it was likely already very well mapped. If onsite data needed to be collected, staff could accommodate it to help keep costs down.

Mr. Pitzer understood SEGA had indicated there had been some changes to the Option A design in terms of the types of structures and foundations and the location of gas and water lines, which might increase the project costs significantly, and asked if those types of changes would be included in the costs that would be updated. Mr. Williams explained typically 15 percent of the project cost was expected to be transmission line design fees for a transmission line project, and since they knew they were about 50-60 percent of the way through for Option A, they also knew they only needed about five percent of additional engineering services and fees for Option A while they would need 15 percent for Option E. He asked if that made sense. Mr. Pitzer replied yes, but noted he was not sure it answered his question.

Mayor Treece commented that SEGA had identified problems with the Option A route, such as gas lines, trees, a fire station addition, etc., and asked if the scope of services for Burns & McDonnell included reviewing those costs to determine not only the engineering cost increase, but also the construction cost increase that could result from the route. Mr. Williams replied no. He explained they would look at a higher level design than that. He expected those fees to be included in the more detail level design. He stated SEGA had been at a place where it was ready to describe the easements. They were about 50 percent of the way through the contract, and whatever services they did not finish would have to be included in a higher level design, which would be needed for

either Option A or Option E. Mayor Treece asked what other costs Burns and McDonnell would look at on Option A. He wondered if they would look at land acquisition or easement acquisition costs. Mr. Williams replied they would look mainly at the construction cost for Option A since they already had the approximate number of parcels and acreage needed for an easement cost for Option A. For Option E, they would develop that parcel count and acreage cost for the easements so they would be able to have a dollar value for not only the construction costs for Option A and Option E, but also the easement acquisition costs for Option A and Option E. Based upon the construction costs, staff would propose that the next level of engineering for Option E would be roughly 15 percent of the estimated construction costs and roughly five percent for Option A. He thought that should provide as close as possible apples to apples comparison. Mayor Treece stated he did not understand the differential for the engineering costs and why they would apply only five percent for Option A, and asked if it was because they had already incurred the other ten percent. Mr. Williams replied yes. He explained the only thing that was really missing from the SEGA study for Option A was detailed pole design. They had held an interested parties meeting where they had debuted the location of the poles so they could begin to finalize pole design and make any necessary tweaks to the route if a particular pole location was particularly bad. They had been ready to describe easements as the entire route had been surveyed. They would not have that level of design nor would they expect it from Burns & McDonnell for Option E. That would be included in the next level of design should they move forward with Option E. He pointed out they would still have to do some of that detail level design as far as pole design with Option A as well. Mr. Pitzer commented that he would be hesitant to call this a true apples to apples comparison in light of the fact SEGA had identified issues as those issues could increase the project costs significantly.

Mr. Pitzer asked if Burns & McDonnell had a professional relationship with Ameren. Mr. Williams replied he thought they might have worked with Ameren in the past as they were a major consulting firm in the State of Missouri. Mr. Pitzer understood the City was waiting to be provided more information from Ameren after the most recent conference call, and had not received that information yet. He wondered whether Burns & McDonnell would be any more successful in terms of finding ways to collaborate. Mr. Williams commented that while Burns & McDonnell would help them work with Ameren, he did not believe they would act as an interface for the City.

Mayor Treece stated he seemed to recall from the phone call with Ameren that they would prefer the City use a consultant that was familiar with their system. Mr. Williams explained he did not recall that as one of the actions items they listed, but noted he was certain Burns & McDonnell could work with any of Ameren's design constraints in helping with the cost analysis. Mayor Treece thought there might be some efficiency with Option E in terms of costs with respect to pole placement and easements since the poles and easements already existed.

Mr. Pitzer asked if Quanta Technology would be looking at whether the currently selected site for Mill Creek was still the best site given the development that had occurred around it or if that was outside of their scope. Mr. Williams replied that was beyond their scope. He pointed out the current proposed Option E had no distribution level solution so if they were not going to include that with Option E, they had to determine what other options they had available to them. Would they be able to add capacity to other current existing substations and build longer express-type feeders or were there other design and construction alternatives that could be leveraged that might not have been available ten years ago.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Williams if he was saying the Mill Creek substation did not make sense if they were not moving forward with Option A. Mr. Williams replied the current proposed Option E had no connection to the Mill Creek substation. They could not have a substation that was not powered. It was something that could be looked into if they chose to build Option E. If the Mill Creek substation was the best way to provide for the

distribution future, they would need to develop a way to power it. Mr. Thomas asked if the Quanta Technology contract would look at other possible substation sites to provide the capacity to south Columbia that might be further out to the southeast and connect to the 161kV line going down Highway 63. Mr. Williams replied he thought Quanta Technology would mainly focus on whether a new substation was really required. They would be agnostic as to its placement. He believed they would try to determine if a new substation was or was not required and what was the cost differential between building a new substation and other solutions that might be available.

Mr. Trapp understood the City did not have the legal authority to use the existing Ameren easements for Option E. Mr. Williams stated Ameren had easements along the current corridor. The City did not. Mayor Treece explained his point was that if one did not have a powerline in the backyard now, that person would not have one under Option E either. Mr. Trapp understood the City easement would run parallel to Ameren's. Mayor Treece thought they would have to add about 70-75 feet under one scenario. He believed it was also worth exploring whether they could share or upgrade their structures.

Mr. Skala commented that Mayor Treece had alluded to the fact there could be savings for Option E due to the existing poles, etc., and thought questions of sharing poles, etc. were questions Ameren had to answer. He asked if Burns & McDonnell would be involved in any recommendation as to the types of structures that would be necessary to support that kind of colocation or if they were just looking at a parallel plan. Mr. Williams replied Ameren had yet to make a firm determination as to whether or not they could share structures. It was one of the action items for which Ameren was responsible, and they had not supplied that information as of today. Mr. Skala asked if Burns & McDonnell would be involved with the type of pole design that would be necessary once they received that information. Mr. Williams replied Ameren had indicated during the conference call that they already had a structure type they would utilize to support 161kV and 345 kV structures. It would be a steel monopole design. They had the ability to instruct Burns & McDonnell as to the type of structures that would be utilized if on the edge of the right-of-way instead of leveraging a shared pole structure and they would defer to their best engineering judgement. The modern design for 161kV systems was a steel monopole design. Mayor Treece understood the steel monopole design would be proposed for Option A since it would be the same kV system. Mr. Williams stated Option A included the steel monopole design.

Mayor Treece asked if the Quanta Technology study would come back in time to show them if there was another option that might be available. Mr. Williams replied Quanta Technology was solely focused on the distribution system. The proposed Option E could solve the transmission level needs into the Perche Creek substation, but it did not have a mechanism to address future load growth. Quanta Technology would look at whether a substation was absolutely necessary to handle load growth, and what other options might be available if it was not needed.

Mayor Treece commented that on the conference call Ameren had also indicated they would be willing look at other solutions to the City's objectives for a fee if they knew the objectives, and asked if they saw that as being part of the scope of work for Burns & McDonnell or Quanta Technology or yet another unanswered question. He wondered if they were missing something in terms of other potential solutions and if the scope of services of these contracts would get at that issue. Mr. Williams commented that neither of these contracts would accomplish the consideration of a third option or an alternative that had not yet been proposed. Mayor Treece understood that would come from the inside. Mr. Williams stated the City would need to make the determination of whether to explore something else based upon the results received.

Mayor Treece understood the connection of Option E to the Perche Creek substation was a part of the Burns & McDonnell Option E evaluation, and asked if there was another scenario where they would not add a 161kV to Ameren's 345kV system, but would instead lease the power while still making the connection from Ameren's 345kV system

to the Perche Creek substation. Mr. Williams asked Mayor Treece if he was talking about building a 345kV substation and bringing that to the Perche Creek. Mayor Treece asked if that could be done if they leased power from Ameren. Mr. Williams replied it would not work under a lease agreement. He would propose the City own and operate the substation. He noted Ameren worked in the MISO market so they would not need to lease the power. It would just be an interconnection point between the City and Ameren. It would be an option they could explore. Mayor Treece understood that would be generated in-house. Mr. Williams stated neither of the agreements in front of the Council tonight would address that issue.

Mayor Treece asked if Quanta Technology would look at potential substations outside of the City limits as part of their scope of work. Mr. Williams replied they would be agnostic to substation locations. Assuming a substation location, it would be near the centroid of where the load growth would be located. He assumed whatever substation, i.e. Mill Creek or elsewhere, would be relatively close to the centroid. If Quanta Technology determined a new substation was not the answer, they would look at adding capacity to the existing substations and whether or not there were any constraints. In doing this, feeders that were longer than initially anticipated would need to be built. They would look at whether there were other more modern technologies that could be leveraged that would allow them to not have to build a substation.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Williams for his sense of when something might come back to Council. Mr. Williams replied he thought Quanta Technology had committed to a ten week turnaround and they had requested Burns & McDonnell have a draft ready by mid-December. Mayor Treece asked if the contract amendment reflected this. Mr. Williams replied yes.

Mr. Thomas understood the goal was to connect the Perche Creek substation to another part of the high transmission voltage network for redundancy purposes and that they did not want it at a dead end in case a tree fell on those lines. Mr. Williams stated the City would have trouble demonstrating compliance with some of the federal transmission planning standards if they did not have a redundant feed. Mr. Thomas asked if simply connecting the Perche Creek substation to the Ameren 345kV system would accomplish this without building a parallel system to the Bolstad system. Mr. Williams replied they could not just connect the 161kV system to a 345kV system. They would have to build a new 345kV to 161kV substation, and run the 161kV system into the Perche Creek substation. It would essentially accomplish the same thing. Mr. Thomas asked for an approximate cost relative to building ten miles of transmission line. Mr. Williams replied he did not know. Mr. Thomas asked if that had been something they had been thought about or looked at previously. Mr. Williams replied it had been looked at in the past as there had been several data centers that had wanted to leverage property north of town that had wanted to tap into the 345kV line. None had ended up paying Ameren for the study because it had come back cost prohibitive. He commented that the City could make some initial inquiries to determine if Ameren would even be willing to allow them to tap into it to build a substation, and it could be brought back as an alternative option if desired. Mr. Thomas noted it would be a very short distance of high voltage wires. Mr. Johnsen stated one of the first steps in that process would be load flow studies. He explained there could be issues because it was such a strong source and could potentially overload parts of the system so they needed to conduct a coordinated load flow study. He noted that had already been done with the 161kV path. Any alternative would have to begin with a coordinated load flow study for the region. He pointed out the price would likely go up with a 345kV system as well.

Mr. Pitzer asked if it was feasible to do a 345kV to 69kV substation or if two substations be needed. Mr. Williams replied they could step down from one to the other, but noted he was not sure where Mr. Pitzer was proposing to connect at a 69kV level. Mr. Pitzer understood 69kV came out of the Perche Creek substation. Mr. Williams pointed out there was already transformation there from 161kV to 69kV. If a 345kV was done, he

would propose it be a 345kV to a 161kV system, which could then be plugged into the Perche Creek substation.

Ms. Peters asked if Ameren was not using all of the electricity from the 345kV line now. Mr. Johnsen replied they were interconnected at a lot of different points now. They used the Ameren transmission system now. It was a system design issue in that they needed to determine how they would connect together so both were able to operate safely. The energy flow of where it came from was not as important as how the systems behaved together. They had to be able to ensure the City system at that point with that connection would be compatible. Ms. Peters understood at this time they did not know if it would be compatible, if it could be stepped down, or the cost. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct, and noted they were working on it. Mr. Pitzer noted they were not working on that. Mayor Treece understood that was not part of the scope of work. Mr. Johnsen explained they were attempting to answer the questions on the 161kV side, but not on the 345kV side.

Mayor Treece asked what staff would do in-house over the next ten weeks to round out the discussion if they approved these contracts. Mr. Johnsen asked if he was referring to the 345kV system. Mayor Treece replied on everything discussed. Mr. Williams explained they could look at the 345kV substation solution to determine if it was viable from a power flow perspective. If it was, they could potentially ask Ameren to look at it as an additional piece to this for whatever they would propose to charge the City.

Ms. Peters asked if it would be reasonable to look into it before reviewing the transmission line issue. Mr. Williams replied they had never entered into a 345kV system because it had been cost prohibitive in the past. Mayor Treece commented that it would only be the drop and some internal movements or work arounds. Mr. Williams stated it was a piece of the puzzle they could bring back along with the cost to obtain the information from Ameren.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, thanked the Council for finally getting into the weeds of the scopes of services as they had not received what the Council needed from consultants in the past. They had only received what the staff thought they needed. He commented that he understood they needed another 161kV line into Columbia due to growth and that they needed it to connect to the Perche Creek substation. They also needed to ensure they were adequately redundant and appropriately balancing the substations to distribute power from the 161kV inputs. He did not believe that had been adequately understood by prior councils, and was not sure why they did not further explore Options B and B-1. Somehow Option E showed up and they were no longer discussing those other options. He understood staff and the consultants had not looked at Options B and B-1 for anything other than the substation. It had not included anything with regard to the 161kV line. He suggested these contracts include those options for more apples to apples comparisons. He also recommended the City contact the University regarding their needs in order to adequately advise the consultants and the Council.

Mr. Pitzer commented that it felt as though they would still have unanswered questions after receiving the results of the consultant contracts, but understood they needed some answers.

Mr. Skala understood some of the answers needed were from Ameren. These consultant contracts would at least address the transmission line issue with respect to two options and the load issue in terms of distribution. He reiterated the need for information from Ameren, which he thought would have been provided when they paid Ameren to look into Option E. He noted he was surprised they had only indicated they could be good neighbors as there was not any detail associated with it.

Mr. Thomas felt there was still a failure to go through a process of defining problems and needs, identifying all of the possible solutions that could address the needs, and developing metrics for each solution in terms of quality to create a simple comparison. It appeared they were still floundering without clear direction.

Mayor Treece stated he tended to agree with Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Skala commented that he recalled going through a pretty exhaustive series of discussions over a long period of time, about seven years, and then entertaining a potentially new solution. He understood some of the other options as had been mentioned by Mr. Clark had been discredited. Mayor Treece noted those were 69kV lines. They were not even apples to apples comparisons.

Ms. Peters thought there were other options, like Option B-2, which would have been a new line, and those that lived in that area were upset about that possibility. She noted she and Mr. Thomas had spoken with at least one gentleman that had an Ameren line through his property that had no intention of providing any more of his land for any reason. Mayor Treece understood there were a few people like that on Vawter School Road as well. Ms. Peters stated she also felt they were floundering in this regard.

Mr. Trapp commented that he thought there would be problems and uncertainties with any solution they decided upon. This would allow them to get closer to answering the questions that had been brought forward. He stated he was comfortable that Option A had been exhaustively researched and that it was the least worst option that was technologically viable. He thought they needed to put some numbers to this. He noted he was not impressed with the ability of Ameren to communicate and partner, and was not sure how that would bode toward enhancing that partnership to a considerable degree with co-location or sharing the same route. He believed they needed to put that issue to rest so they could move forward to a solution. He noted they needed to understand the situation with regard to loads and have a cost estimate. For him, it did not appear as though Option E was workable on paper, but he was not an electrical engineer. He felt there were some inherent advantages to Option A since they had already done a good chunk of the engineering work for it. Those investments would be lost and ultimately end up in the rates. He reiterated the need to move forward to obtain more information.

Mayor Treece noted the Utilities Department had assured them the money that had already been invested was on items that could be applied to other substations and inventory. He also thought Burns & McDonnell would examine the work that SEGA had done and show them why Option A was not the best route.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B267-17 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B267-17, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER.
VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B268-17 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B268-17, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER.
VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

B273-17

Appropriating FY 2016 General Fund savings to General Fund departments as part of the Incentive Based Budgeting Initiative.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp commented that he loved the incentive based budgeting. He explained he had managed budgets at other organizations and had spent down his education and materials budgets because he wanted to protect those for the future. He thought the incentive based budgeting process enshrined trust in department heads and encouraged frugality. He noted he had been impressed with what departments had chosen to spend the money on as it had been for items that advanced the mission of the department, and provided

examples. He stated he was happy to support this as he believed it was working well.

Mr. Skala noted he agreed with Mr. Trapp. There had been a lot of interest in this process when Mr. Matthes had spoken at a National League of Cities meeting as it providing an incentive to not spend the entire budgeted amount. He commented that he would hate to change the process as he believed it was a win for the staff and the Council.

Mr. Pitzer complimented the theory behind this process as keeping expenses in check was a great idea. He noted he wanted to reiterate what he had said before in that he would like to apply the same theory to the utilities as they were not incentivized in the same way to find savings. He also hoped they would discuss separating the reduced expenses from revenues that had come in over projections in the future.

Mr. Matthes pointed out he planned on scheduling a future work session after the audit but before the budget was delivered so they could discuss how to operate moving forward in order to allow Council to provide input earlier in the process.

B273-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B274-17 Appropriating FY 2016 General Fund savings for projects identified by the City Council as part of the Incentive Based Budgeting Initiative.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked if the grants for the purchase of accessible vehicles would only be the amount that was the difference between the cost of the vehicle and what it took to make it accessible or if the City was purchasing the vehicle. Mr. Matthes replied a specific program had not been developed, but they had calculated this amount based upon the assumption that this would be gap financing and not total financing. Ms. Peters understood the program parameters once developed would come back to Council for approval. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. He explained the Council was only appropriating money to fund a future program.

Mayor Treece commented that some of the input he had received was that this would ideally be used for the gap and could fund three \$15,000 grants, and that the balance be used for a coordinated telephone line to ensure those cabs were instantly available to those who needed them. He explained he liked the idea of this program and wanted to see the details once developed. He pointed out there were other providers for paratransit, medical transport, etc. He thought this would augment the transportation networks.

Mr. Pitzer asked if there was a time restriction on the Job Point proposal in which they needed to raise funds. Mr. Matthes replied that had not been done in the past with Welcome Home, the Boys and Girls Club, and the Blind Boone Home, but noted something of that nature could be added.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked the step by step process Job Point had outlined, but wanted to add a step of the proposal going to the Columbia Community Development Commission (CDC) for review and a recommendation prior to approving the final distribution of funds. He had heard the Commission had thought this was a very good project and would have likely funded it if there had been more funds available. He believed it would create more of a level playing field with other potential uses if the Commission were to review it and provide a recommendation.

Mayor Treece commented that he would prefer to be the support that put Job Point over the top instead of the seed money for the project. He explained he had discomfort with them providing money for a mortgage as it was much different than them supporting a program of services.

Mr. Ruffin stated he understood the City could only contract for services. Ms. Thompson

commented that she was a bit confused. The bill and amendment sheet before them were budgetary items, and the conversation had gone to contract and programming terms for this particular budget item and there was not really a place for that in the legislation. She explained she was not familiar with the terms they were discussing because it was not part of the proposal before them. The proposal before them was to hold \$250,000 while an agreement with Job Point for the use of those funds for a public purpose for services rendered back to the City was negotiated. She noted they had to receive services that met a public purpose in exchange for the expenditure of public funds. Mr. Thomas commented that the proposal provided by Job Point had indicated the funds were not for services. They were for the purchase of the building. Ms. Thompson stated she had not seen that communication, but spending the money on a building would be an inappropriate use of public funds if services were not received in exchange for it. She commented that for the Boys and Girls Club, staff had been able to talk to them to determine what types of services the City could receive in exchange for those funds. The receipt of City funds had freed up some of their programming funds to be used for the brick and mortar building. The money the City provided was for services and the use of the structure over the life of the building. Mr. Thomas stated he had been under the impression that the proposal was to put \$250,000 toward the purchase of a building for Job Point, and that had been the request to the Community Development Commission also. Ms. Thompson explained that type of expenditure of funds without something further would not be a lawful use of funds. A contract would need to be negotiated that would identify a public purpose and services received by the community for the use of those funds. She noted she could not say what that would look like as they were discussing the budget and whether to set aside \$250,000. They could explore that purpose to determine whether they could identify sufficient services, and if they were unable, the funds would not be expended. A check would not be written on October 1 to Job Point. They would have to negotiate for services before expending the funds. She pointed out the Council would have to approve that contract like it did for the Boys and Girls Club.

Ms. Peters asked if they wanted to specify that the \$250,000 would be a placeholder with the expectation they were using it for the strategic plan. Mr. Matthes replied this was just a budget and the only description tied to this \$250,000 was Job Point. They would then negotiate over the next year to develop a contract with what they were legally able to do while helping the institution achieve its goal. He noted they had not paid money to build the gym for the Boys and Girls Club. They had paid money to arrange time to use the gym for the public for the foreseeable future. The service purchased was publically accessible gym time for their client base in the strategic plan. He thought they would end up with something similar with Job Point. The money would not be spent if they were unable to agree to terms.

Mr. Thomas commented that he felt the fee for service model with the Boys and Girls Club had been contrived afterwards as it had not been discussed during the budget process. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas noted he was not sure he liked that process. He asked whose proposal it was for the \$250,000 to go to Job Point. Mr. Trapp stated he had had asked for this amendment to be drafted. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Trapp for the purpose. Mr. Trapp replied it was to assist Job Point in its fundraising goals, and explained he understood the process of purchasing services. He commented that he thought this was close to how they had supported Welcome Home, which lacked fundraising capacity. The early gift from the City had allowed them to accomplish their fundraising goals. He felt Job Point was similar in that they had been struggling, but had moved into the black recently. He pointed out Job Point provided critical services in addressing poverty by helping people obtain living wage jobs, and this investment was important in ensuring Job Point remained in the community. He was agreeable to the investment being formed through a contract for services if that was necessary. The step they were at now was to just appropriate the funds, which he thought had led to the

confusion.

Mr. Skala agreed Job Point provided tremendous benefits to the community, but thought they should discuss the services. He suggested the money be tied to the strategic plan as a placeholder instead of the Job Point name. They could still have access to it should they meet their fundraising goals. He commented that he believed in the strategic plan. They were talking to people that did not attend city meetings in the three strategic plan areas allowing them to participate. He understood Mr. Pitzer had suggested \$160,349 go toward a fire station as it was a public safety item, but pointed out the neighborhood discussions tended to involve infrastructure, such as sidewalks and street lights, which also provided for public safety. He commented that he would prefer any remaining savings, to include some of the money that could go to Job Point, be placed in a strategic plan infrastructure fund for underserved areas. Money could still be provided to Job Point since that funding was associated with the strategic plan.

Mayor Treece stated street maintenance and repairs were a great use for one time funds, and it was one of the top priorities in the citizen satisfaction survey.

Mr. Skala reiterated he believed public safety and infrastructure tended to go together, and thought they should show they were putting more money toward the social equity aspect of the strategic plan.

Mr. Pitzer stated he believed they should set aside savings and allow it to build up in order to help fund needs they knew would be needed in the future, and that was the intent behind his suggestion that money be included for a future fire station.

Mr. Ruffin understood the ongoing infrastructure needs in primarily the First, Second and Third Wards as those desires had been expressed by many that attended council meetings, but noted he also understood the economic disparity that existed in the community had to be addressed in a very strategic and intentional way if they were ever going to move the needle on poverty, unemployment, etc., and Job Point was one avenue in which they could address the disparities in a very intentional way. He believed the purchase of services had worked beautifully with the Boys and Girls Club. He pointed out it did not have to be decided tonight as there was a long range negotiation that would occur. If they really wanted to support Job Point in becoming more financially independent and having the ability to offer more services and serve more young people, the idea of support from the City of Columbia with money set aside would provide for an important marketing strategy that would generate more contributions. He felt it was important to maintain the plan they had of reserving these funds. They were not committing to anything tonight other than saying they supported Job Point.

Mr. Thomas stated he thought it was a good proposal, which he supported, but noted it had not been what they had discussed for the last 3-4 weeks.

Mr. Matthes explained the amendment sheet only included Job Point for \$250,000 and the account number, and that was the extent of the action being taken tonight. It was just setting aside funds for them. Exactly how the relationship evolved was yet to be negotiated. It would not be for the purchase of the building, but it might allow that purchase to happen.

Mayor Treece commented that none of this money had to be spent. It could all be placed in the council contingency fund and dealt with at another time. Mr. Thomas stated it could also be placed in the general fund reserve. Mayor Treece agreed, but noted it was harder to retrieve. Mr. Matthes recommended moving forward with the employee payment portion of this bill.

Ms. Peters understood the amendment sheet only listed Job Point as opposed to the strategic plan implementation. Mr. Matthes stated the amendment would only add Job Point back to the list. If they did not do this, the \$250,000 would flow to general fund reserves. Ms. Peters asked if the money would be lost if it was in general fund reserves. Mr. Matthes replied the Council could access it from there as well as they were the elected representatives of the City. Ms. Peters understood the \$250,000 would be added and nothing else would be removed. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece asked what would happen to the \$250,000 if the amendment sheet was not approved. Mr. Matthes replied it would flow back to the general fund reserves if they did not identify another use for it.

Mr. Skala commented that he did not think there was any reason they could not create a strategic plan reserve fund and use it for Job Point should they demonstrate the need. Mr. Matthes agreed it could be added to the strategic plan implementation line item as had been suggested. Mr. Skala stated that would be his inclination. Ms. Peters pointed out that would still require an amendment.

Steven A. Smith, the President and CEO of Job Point, commented that while they had indicated the general purpose for the funds was to purchase a building, the immediate savings would go toward programs that would contribute to the strategic plan and consolidated plan. He thought they could negotiate in that respect. He noted he had spoken at the last two council meetings, and this was the first time the money being used toward the building had come up as an issue. He felt they could make something work.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he objected to the Council portion of incentive based budgeting. Encouraging frugality from the departments was a great goal, but he felt this budgeting process was being sold to the Council as free money and money not needed for other fundamental activities, such as public safety. He suggested the money be placed in the general fund. He noted he did not think other communities would do this unless they wanted to play to their council members. He felt frugality could be accomplished by including it in the performance evaluations of department heads and the budget staff. He considered this fake savings as they did not know from where the savings had come. It was only the change in the general fund balance. He believed it was gimmicky and encouraged the Council to deposit all of this in the general fund and decide how to spend it during the year. He reiterated his suggestion to get rid of this fake savings program.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B274-17 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B274-17 by adding \$410,349 to strategic plan implementation and eliminating the funding for the future fire station, which would also change the sum being appropriated in Section 2 to \$1,110,349. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Ms. Peters asked if this action would dilute the support for Job Point. Mr. Ruffin stated he wondered the same thing and asked if Job Point could still legally say they had the promise of support from the City of Columbia. Ms. Thompson replied the promise of City support would be contingent upon entering into an agreement. She did not feel it was a legal issue. Mr. Skala pointed out the money did not have to be spent on anything else. It could be held in reserve until Job Point demonstrated sufficient fundraising abilities. Mr. Pitzer stated he felt that was how it would be regardless and believed explicit support for a specific organization was more meaningful. Mr. Trapp commented that the money could be moved to strategic plan priorities if Job Point was unable to reach their fundraising target. Mayor Treece noted that would require an amendment. Mr. Trapp agreed it would take Council action. If the goal with the appropriation was to support the Job Point fundraising effort, he thought it would weaken their position to not explicitly identify funds for it. Mr. Pitzer suggested including a deadline for Job Point to achieve its goals and for the money to be rolled over to the strategic plan account if the deadline was not met as that would alleviate the issue of an amendment being needed in the future.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Mr. Thomas to amend B274-17 by adding \$410,349 to strategic plan implementation and eliminating the funding for the future fire station, which would also change the sum being appropriated in Section 2 to \$1,110,349, was defeated by voice vote with only Mayor Treece and Mr. Skala voting yes.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought the suggestion of Mr. Pitzer had been interesting as it would pledge support contingent on a certain period of time, and the money would revert to the strategic plan fund if the deadline was not met.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Smith if he had a recommendation for a time frame and suggested 18-24 months. Mr. Smith replied he thought they could meet that time frame.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to amend the amendment sheet by placing a deadline of 24 months on the funding for Job Point, and for the money revert to the strategic plan implementation fund if the deadline was not met. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Ms. Thompson suggested the language indicate if a written agreement was not entered into between the City and Job Point for use of the funds on or before October 1, 2019 for such funds to then be transferred to the account number listed for strategic plan implementation, and asked if that was acceptable. Mr. Pitzer and Mr. Skala both agreed for that to be the motion.

The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Mr. Skala to amend the amendment sheet with language indicating that if a written agreement was not entered into between the City and Job Point for use of the funds on or before October 1, 2019 for such funds to then be transferred to the account number listed for strategic plan implementation was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas suggested they add to the procedure for the allocation to be reviewed by the CDC before the final award was made. He asked if that could be done. Ms. Thompson replied the problem was that this was a budget amendment, and not a process amendment. By placing contingencies on a budget amendment, they no longer really had a budget amendment. Mr. Thomas thought the time line was a process amendment. Ms. Thompson replied it was, and noted it would be difficult for staff to track. She pointed out it had a specific trigger, which was a date certain for a written agreement to be in place, and if that was not done, the money would be moved from one account to another. It was budget related. Mr. Thomas asked if they could include not having a recommendation from the CDC for that same time frame as a trigger. Ms. Thompson replied if they wanted to provide a date certain for that action, it could be included, although she would recommend against it as it would be difficult for staff to track. The contract was a concrete trigger because it had to come back before the City Council for action. Taking something to the CDC, which was a recommending body, was a loose requirement. She suggested they indicate their desire to the City Manager, and if that condition did not occur, the Council could choose not to approve the contract. Mr. Matthes agreed the Council could direct the City Manager to ensure it would happen. He commented that they did not know what would be included in the agreement so it might or might not make sense to submit it to the CDC when completed.

Mr. Skala suggested the money allocated for a future fire station be moved to strategic plan implementation. Mayor Treece recommended they dispose of the motion regarding Job Point first.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp, seconded by Mr. Ruffin, and amended by Mr. Pitzer to amend B274-17 per the amendment sheet with language added indicating that if a written agreement was not entered into between the City and Job Point for use of the funds on or before October 1, 2019 for such funds to then be transferred to the account number listed for strategic plan implementation was approved by voice vote with only Mayor Treece voting no.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B274-17 by moving the \$160,349 from the future fire station category to the strategic plan implementation category so that category would

have \$360,349 instead of \$200,000. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Trapp commented that a future fire station was needed in Valleyview, which was in his ward, but the amount allocated was such a small amount of money. He stated he understood the thought process of Mr. Pitzer in that they should put small amounts of money towards it over time, but noted they also had a capital improvement project plan process, which would likely be needed to fund a future fire station. As far as strategic plan implementation, the Second Ward focus area was unique in that it was fairly brand new so infrastructure needs were minimal. In the First and Third Wards, however, there were a lot of infrastructure needs and a general feeling that the north side, north Broadway, was not a priority, and that those issues would not exist on the south side. He understood some of it was timing in terms of when they started requiring sidewalks, but some of it was also a historical lack of investment on the north side. He reiterated he was supportive of funding fire stations, but felt they would need another funding source for it due to its high cost. He also thought the \$160,000 could make real impacts in their most needy neighborhoods.

Mayor Treece stated he felt the way to adequately fund the poorer areas of town was to change the way they funded appropriations. He preferred not to bifurcate the funding mechanism to have a separate pool of money for areas they had traditionally left underfunded, and would rather do that through the traditional public works public improvement process and capital improvement process. He believed they all needed to be more conscience of ensuring equity among all six wards.

Mr. Skala agreed with Mayor Treece, but pointed out there were special needs in the targeted areas identified by the strategic plan. He thought this had been wildly successful in reducing crime and addressing other issues. The filling of a sidewalk gap or street lighting could make a big difference in terms of public safety in these neighborhoods. He felt they needed to stress upon the public that they were serious about funding the implementation of the strategic plan.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend B274-17 by moving the \$160,349 from the future fire station category to the strategic plan implementation category so that category would have \$360,349 instead of \$200,000 was approved by voice vote with only Mayor Treece and Mr. Pitzer voting no.

**B274-17, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER.
VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

B278-17 Authorizing a collective bargaining agreement with Laborers' International Union of North America, Local 773.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Buckler and Mr. McManus provided a staff report.

Regina Guevara, 708 Mount Vernon Avenue, explained she was representing Local 773, which had offices at 611 N. Garth Avenue, and commented that this was historic as there had not been a contract with the City of Columbia since 1982. She thought what they would likely work on the most next year was wages as it had been two years since they had across the board increases. She felt employees needed to be the priority in the future. She thanked the City for the \$1,000, but noted they had been disappointed in the way it had been allocated.

B278-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B279-17 Authorizing a collective bargaining agreement with Columbia Police Officers Association, Fraternal Order of Police Lodge #26.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. McManus provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece understood there had been discussion about some underlying administrative rules that had been negotiated as part of the process, but not as part of this collective bargaining agreement, and asked for clarification. Mr. McManus replied City staff felt it was important to have the discussion with the Columbia Police Officers Association (CPOA) as to what would happen with those issues. The most significant had to do with the filing of public complaints and combining it with the internal investigation process and discipline. In those areas, they had worked to better define the process in a written document. They had shared the development of those policies with the CPOA and the Columbia Police Lieutenants Association, and had received some helpful comments to incorporate in the drafts. As of last Wednesday, those drafts had been circulated to the employees of the Police Department for an opportunity to comment. The hope was that they would be put into place soon after the two week comment period closed. He noted they had committed to the CPOA that they would be made aware of any comments received.

Mayor Treece asked if those policies were incorporated as part of this agreement. Mr. McManus replied the contract was not contingent upon any policy amendments unlike the changes to Chapter 19. Mayor Treece understood they were not incorporated or attached to the agreement, or even contingent upon the agreement passing. It was a separate process. Mr. McManus agreed it was a separate process and was done per Section 19-22 of the Columbia Code of Ordinances, which provided the authority for departments to establish administrative rules. They were referred to as policies, but they were essentially administrative rules.

Mr. Skala understood there was a requirement within the Police Department for the policies to be placed online, and Policy 1020 online was still the former policy. He assumed it would be updated after the comment period was over so it would be available to the public. Mr. McManus stated that was correct. He noted all of the policies in effect for the Police Department were on the Police Department website. Mr. Skala understood the policies would be updated if changed. Mr. McManus stated once the changes were put into effect, they would be updated on the website with the assistance of the Information Technology Department. Mr. Skala understood there was not anything unusual. This was done in order to allow the vetting of the policies for those involved, and the community would have access once that process was complete. Mr. McManus stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas asked if the changes to Policy 1020 and others had been driven by the negotiations between the City and the CPOA. Mr. McManus replied he was not sure he could say they were driven by it. There was a mutual interest in addressing them. He noted the Police Department was working toward complying with the CALEA standards so they could be nationally accredited, and they happened to be in negotiations with the CPOA at the same time. The CPOA wanted to know what would be happening and how internal investigations would be handled. It allowed for a good opportunity for it to all be discussed in the context of these negotiations. Ms. Buckler pointed out the Chapter 19 changes on the disciplinary process and grievances and complaints were also tied to this so there could be a clear division between what was a regular employee discipline and an internal investigation. Mr. Thomas asked if the Chapter 19 changes were the internal policy changes. Ms. Buckler replied no, and explained those were the ordinance changes the Council had adopted earlier tonight. Mr. Thomas asked if that had been a part of the budget process. Ms. Thompson stated Chapter 19 referred to the City Code. It was Chapter 19 of the Code of Ordinances. Ms. Buckler noted it was where all of the personnel policies were located. Mr. Thomas stated he understood.

Mr. Thomas understood there had been a good opportunity to consult with the CPOA on the internal department policies to obtain their input and reach a new version of some policies with which everyone was satisfied, and asked if that was a fair characterization. Mr. McManus replied he thought so, and explained that was the impression he had come away with from the discussions. He believed the discussions during the course of the negotiations had been very constructive and felt this had resulted in a good agreement along with amendments to Chapter 19 and the administrative rules. Mr. Thomas asked if the changes to Chapter 19 had been referenced in the contract. Mr. McManus replied yes. Mr. Thomas understood if the contract was approved, the changes to Policy 1020 and others would take place and potentially be changed again, but the contract would continue to reference Policy 1020 in whatever form was current at the time. Mr. McManus explained that in the unlikely even the contract would not be approved, the administrative rule process would still go forward as those were two separate processes and not legally linked.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that he had been approached by someone earlier tonight suggesting the Council postpone this decision to allow time to read what had been negotiated, and he agreed.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he was glad the City had decided it could enter into at least one year contracts with employee unions. He noted he found it offensive that the policies could only be addressed within the Police Department as he did not feel the use of force policy was the same as a grievance policy. He believed there should be an extensive community based strategic planning process, which would include a review of these policies. He stated community oriented policing was about the equal sharing of authority, and felt the policy manual for the Police Department would need to come to the Council for approval. He asked if the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB) had been consulted about any of these changes. Mr. McManus replied he understood the Police Department expected to receive comments from the CPRB down the line, and those comments would be given serious consideration. Mr. Clark asked how far down the line. Mr. McManus replied he would guess within their next couple of meetings. Mr. Clark asked if they would be fully informed and involved with a chance to comment prior to any decision being made for a change to any policy, to include Policy 1020. Mr. McManus replied the idea was that these policies were not static documents and would evolve overtime as they received feedback from members of the community, including the CPRB. They did not view this as the end of the line. He noted these were very important changes that would make the process more transparent for everyone. Mr. Clark stated these were very important to police officers, their supervisors, the Council, and the public, and suggested they be reviewed by the CPRB prior to the finalization of any new policies.

Alan Mitchell explained he was the President of the CPOA and noted this had been a very long process. He stated they had been pleased with the process in terms of Mr. McManus, Ms. Buckler, the Police Chief, and the Police Department administrative staff that had been involved. There had been a lot of bargaining, and it had been done in a very sincere manner. After months of negotiation, the contract before the Council was what they had all agreed upon and the officers had voted to accept. He believed it was a good step forward in trying to heal the department and raise morale. He asked the Council to vote in favor of it.

Mr. Trapp stated he was glad to see this was moving forward. He understood the policy changes being reviewed were a part of an ongoing process where feedback would be continued to be received, and those policies were being reviewed for the purpose of accreditation. This meant they would operate according to nationally known and recognized best practices and would be a feedback driven organization that ran on data. From a city management perspective, he believed the changes would be appropriate, and they did not feel they needed to know the end the result even though the policies were referenced in the contract. From the perspective of the union, he could see them wanting to know their input was included, and it appeared they were comfortable with where they

were in the process even though the documents had not been finalized. If management and the union were both comfortable, he was also comfortable with allowing the process to move forward by approving this contract.

Mr. Skala commented that he was particularly struck by the clarification of this information evolving and being publically vetted by various entities, and that the policies were not directly related to the contract. He stated he was comfortable and would enthusiastically support the contract.

B279-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B280-17 Authorizing a collective bargaining agreement with Columbia Professional Firefighters I.A.F.F. Local 1055.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. McManus provided a staff report.

Travis Gregory stated he was representing Local 1005 and noted it had been a long nine months. He thanked Ms. Buckler, Mr. McManus, and the Fire Chief for working with them on all of these issues.

B280-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B257-17 Rezoning property located on the northwest corner of Stadium Boulevard and Primrose Drive from R-2 (Two-family Residential District) to PD (Planned District); approving the Sidra Subdivision PD Plan (Case No. 17-170).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Trapp asked if there was a mechanism whereby fencing could be added to the plan. Mr. Teddy replied the Council could insist on it being added to the plan or a condition of the ordinance. Usually, if it was something that went above the minimum code requirement, they wanted a response from the applicant as the applicant could self-impose a condition to be written in the ordinance.

Tim Crockett, 1000 W. Nifong Boulevard, understood the concern of Mr. Trapp was for the potential of people leaving this development and walking through yards to get to Breaktime, which was to the north. He noted that once the site was graded, there would be a retaining wall. The subject site would sit below the property to the north and the retaining wall would prohibit pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Trapp asked for the height of the retaining wall. Mr. Crockett replied they were still in design, but thought it would likely be 3-7 feet tall. He commented that they would not be opposed to installing a fence if the retaining wall was not included. Mr. Trapp asked if the retaining wall was noted on the plan. Mr. Crockett replied no.

Mr. Trapp asked if there was a way to note fencing would be required if a retaining wall of at least three feet was not built along the edge of the property. Mayor Treece asked when a fence would be required on a retaining wall. Mr. Crockett replied it was at four feet and if in a pedestrian area. He noted they had planned on landscaping in that area, and if a fence was installed, the vegetative material would only be in a very narrow area between the fence and property line. He stated they would have to reduce some of the screening material. Mr. Trapp explained he was not insisting on a fence. He only wanted to ensure there was a retaining wall, and wanted more than just their word. Mr. Crockett

stated he understood, and noted he thought they would be willing to amend the plan to indicate a fence would be placed along the north property line if a retaining wall of at least three feet was not constructed.

Marilyn Garret, 2105 N. Stadium Boulevard, explained she and her brother owned a home in the area that their parents had built 55 years ago. If the subject property was rezoned from R-2 to PD, it would contain a five-unit single-family attached development. It would also face Primrose Drive, which was at the bottom of the hill. It would not face Stadium Boulevard or Rashid Court so five back doors and patios would face their side yard, which was an eyesore. She stated they had a concern of safety with regard to people walking through there to the nearby convenience store as they would likely not want to walk around to go up Stadium Boulevard to get to it. She noted she was also concerned about privacy as five families would be able to look into their yard and windows. She pointed out the convenience store was open 24 hours a day, seven days a week. She wanted to ensure there was a substantial barrier, and thought some would just jump right over a four foot fence instead of walking around.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Garret about the location of her house. Ms. Garret described it using the locator map displayed. Mayor Treece understood the home faced Stadium Boulevard. Ms. Garret stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood the proposed development would not face Stadium Boulevard, and would face Primrose Drive. Ms. Garret stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood the gas station was north of Ms. Garret's property. Ms. Garret stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer asked if people traveled through her yard now. Ms. Garret replied yes. Mr. Pitzer asked if what had been discussed would be more of a barrier than what was there now. Ms. Garret replied yes, and explained there was not any access from the back because the nearby trucking company had a fence.

Mayor Treece asked if there was still a vacant lot there. Ms. Garret replied there was a vacant lot between her property and the gas station.

Mr. Thomas commented that there was not a sidewalk on Stadium Boulevard, so that created part of the problem.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Garret if her experience with the applicant in addressing issues, other than this issue, had been good. Ms. Garret replied they had requested a high fence for privacy. It appeared the plans would only include two flower beds and a tree, which would not separate them. She understood some in Valleyview Gardens had indicated it would have a large parking lot in the front.

Mr. Trapp understood the site sloped downward so they had to have the drainage toward the bottom, which was why there was not a nicer raingarden feature between the properties. He thought the plan had been heavily influenced by the front door ordinance in the Unified Development Code (UDC), and was the reason it was a planned development and had not gone through the regular process. He noted he had questioned the wisdom of the front door policy and this was a result. Had it not been for that policy, the development would have faced Rashid Court. He felt this was an important infill project. There was not any reason for a grass lot there, and multi-family seemed to be appropriate. He thought they might have gotten too restrictive with the UDC as the way this property was developed was an unintended consequence. He noted no one had considered this site when the UDC was adopted. He commented that they were still seeing a lot of planned unit developments with the UDC and thought they would likely have to monitor the situation to ensure it would work. With regard to the concern of Ms. Garret, he stated he believed a three foot retaining wall would stop almost all cut-through pedestrian traffic.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B257-17 by including language at the end of Section 4 indicating if a three foot retaining wall was not constructed along the north property line at the time of construction, a six foot privacy fence would be installed and maintained there. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B257-17, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

- B265-17 Authorizing a license agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission relating to the construction of a sidewalk and trail connection as part of the Clark Lane West Sidewalk and Hinkson Creek Trail Connection Project.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Skala thanked staff as this was the vaunted Clark Lane West sidewalk from Highway 63 to Paris Road. It was a must have in terms of transit as it created difficulties for bus riders. He was glad it was moving forward.

Mr. Nichols explained this step was required since they would be going underneath MoDOT structures.

Mr. Skala understood that had delayed this project. Mr. Nichols stated that along with a change to the design of the connectors. In addition, the start of the Conley Road project had required some changes.

B265-17 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B258-17 Approving the Clary-Shy Agriculture Park - PD Plan located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Ash Street and Clinkscapes Road; approving a statement of intent (Case No. 17-188).
- B259-17 Approving the Final Plat of Clary-Shy Agriculture Park, a Replat of Lots 1 & 2 of Columbia Recreation Center Plat, located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Ash Street and Clinkscapes Road (Case No. 17-192).
- B260-17 Approving the Final Plat of Northern Heights Subdivision Plat 2, a Replat of Lot 7 of Northern Heights Addition No. 1, located on the southeast side of Flora Drive (2906 and 2908 Flora Drive); granting a waiver and a design modification relating to the construction of a sidewalk along a portion of Flora Drive; granting a design modification relating to street right-of-way width (Case No. 17-178).
- B261-17 Approving the Final Plat of Columbia College North Subdivision located on the west side of Range Line Street and on the north side of Wilkes Boulevard; granting a design modification relating to street right-of-way width (Case No. 17-183).

- B262-17 Approving the Final Plat of Campus Lutheran, a Replat of Lots 1-7 and an Alley of Amended Plat of J.H. Guitar's Subdivision, located on the northeast corner of the intersection of College Avenue and Anthony Street (304 S. College Avenue); authorizing a performance contract; granting a design modification relating to street right-of-way width (Case No. 17-187).
- B263-17 Approving the Final Plat of Breaktime Vandiver Route B, a Replat of Tract 1 of Mid-Missouri Industrial Park & A Tract of Land Located in the NW ¼ of Section 5, Township 48 North, Range 12 West, located on the northeast corner of Vandiver Drive and Route B (Paris Road); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 17-193).
- B264-17 Approving the Final Plat of Copperstone Plat 7A, a Replat of Lots 102A and 217A of Copperstone Plat 7, located northwest of the Silver Valley Drive and Copperstone Creek Drive intersection (Case No. 17-195).
- B266-17 Appropriating funds to finalize and close out the Avenue of the Columns streetscape project.
- B269-17 Appropriating Demonstration of Energy & Efficiency Developments (DEED) scholarship funds to be received from the American Public Power Association for assistance in the planning and development of the 2018 Advancing Renewable Energy in the Midwest conference.
- B270-17 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Human Services for the Show Me Healthy Women program.
- B271-17 Authorizing an intergovernmental agreement with the County of Boone, Missouri relating to the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program and the allocation of FY 2017 funding.
- B272-17 Appropriating tax increment financing (TIF) application fees received from Broadway Lodging Two, LLC.
- B281-17 Appropriating funds for payment of legal fees associated with litigation relating to the CoMo Connect branding of the transit system.
- R128-17 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of a 120-foot diameter single-lane roundabout at the intersections of Nifong Boulevard and

Sinclair Road and Nifong Boulevard/Vawter School Road and Old Mill Creek Road/Country Woods Road.

R129-17 Authorizing various Adopt A Spot agreements.

R130-17 Transferring funds to cover accrual payouts associated with employee retirements.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

R131-17 Expressing support for the Standing Rock Sioux and their efforts to protect their land, water and cultural resources.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Monta Welch stated she was with People's Visioning and thanked Mr. Ruffin for lending a special hand in bringing a resolution forward. She commented that there might have been an inadvertent error with regard to the title as it was a resolution on clean energy, clean water, and human rights. Another oversight was limiting the water they were discussing to only drinking water because the water they were talking about was for agriculture, livestock, etc., for everyone up and down the Missouri River. She asked if those corrections could be made. She noted they had been working with about a dozen organizations and hundreds of people who had signed on to a previously proposed resolution. She thanked those in support of it.

Carolyn Matthews explained she was with the Native American Support Group and People's Vision and pointed out they had received the support of various other organizations. She commented that she agreed with the need for the title to be changed as it would be especially helpful for someone trying to find it or wanting to know what was referenced in it. It was beneficial to have a title that meant something and made sense. The removal of the reference to drinking water was also necessary because they all had the protection of the Missouri River in mind, and the Missouri River provided water for many things, such as showers, cooking, gardening, and fishing. It was more than just drinking water. She noted human rights had been included as they had the right to assemble, the right to freedom of speech, and in the case of Native Americans, the right to freedom of religion. She commented that they were not expressing support only for Standing Rock as they were also expressing support for all of those that lived along the Missouri River or in Missouri that would be impacted if something were to happen to the Missouri River. She stated the intention was to be inclusive. She pointed out there were lawsuits regarding the pipeline throughout the country so this controversy and the movement to protect the waters were not going away. She emphasized this was important to Missouri and Missourians even though they were honoring the Standing Rock people as there was a connection between the two.

Mr. Ruffin made a motion to amend R131-17 by changing the title of the resolution so it was a resolution on clean energy, clean water, and human rights, removing the word "drinking" from the third and fourth whereas statements and the final statement, and adding human rights and clean energy to the final statement. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Ms. Thompson commented that it was improper to change the title of the resolution because it would not provide adequate public notice. She explained they would have to hold it over to the next meeting if it were done since the title would be significantly different than the existing title.

Mayor Treece stated the resolution did not bind the Council into any action or the appropriation of money. It also did not seem like an inappropriate depiction of what they were attempting to do that would create an objection. Ms. Thompson noted it was not objectionable to her personally. Mayor Treece asked who would sue them over this. Ms. Thompson replied she was not sure anyone would, but if it were to be challenged, it would be considered an improper change. She noted it was the prerogative of Council to do what it wanted though.

Mr. Skala commented that he had no objection to the changes, but pointed out there was a good deal of reference in the body of the resolution to the Standing Rock Sioux.

Mr. Trapp asked for the penalty if it were challenged. Ms. Thompson replied it would just not be effective. She stated it was fine if the Council wanted to do it on this one because she could not see a penalty emerging from it, but it was not something they could do on a regular basis.

Ms. Peters asked if it would make a difference to postpone it for two weeks. Ms. Welch replied probably not, but noted she understood this might benefit some in their legal cases. Ms. Peters understood Ms. Welch felt it was time sensitive. Ms. Welch stated that was correct.

Mr. Ruffin asked if the issue was only the title change as he wondered if they could still remove "drinking" from throughout the resolution. Ms. Thompson replied yes.

Mayor Treece asked if they approved the original motion made and let it lie for two weeks, if they could then just adopt it as a consent agenda item next time. Mr. Matthes replied it would be an old business item.

Ms. Thompson suggested they add a whereas statement under the existing title indicating the City Council's desire to express its support for clean energy, clean water, and human rights. It would be in the opening whereas paragraph. They could also delete "drinking" everywhere in the resolution.

Mr. Ruffin withdrew his previous motion and Mr. Trapp, who had seconded it, agreed to the withdrawal.

Mr. Ruffin made a motion to amend R131-17 by adding a whereas statement under the existing title of the resolution indicating the City Council's desire to express its support for clean energy, clean water, and human rights, removing the word "drinking" from the third and fourth whereas statements and the final statement, and adding human rights and clean energy to the final statement. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on R131-17, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. 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.

B282-17

Approving the PD Plan for Tower Drive Industrial Park located at the terminus of Tower Drive, north of Prathersville Road; granting a design modification to allow a stem lot that exceeds 250-feet in length (Case No. 17-169).

- B283-17 Approving the Final Plat of Bristol Lake Plat 1-C, a Replat of Lots 52 thru 95 and Lot C-1, Bristol Lake Plat 1, located on the northwest corner of the Bristol Lake Parkway and Bristol Lake Drive intersection (Case No. 17-168).
- B284-17 Changing the name of Roosevelt Avenue to Sugar Grove Road (Case No. 17-201).
- B285-17 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for WIC local agency nutrition services.
- B286-17 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Traffic and Highway Safety Division for a DWI enforcement unit; appropriating funds.
- B287-17 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Traffic and Highway Safety Division for DWI enforcement relating to sobriety checkpoints and saturation patrols; appropriating funds.

X. REPORTS

- REP76-17 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

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

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Angela Whitman, 2501 Quail Drive, Apt. B, stated she lived in one of the worst neighborhoods in Columbia, and noted she was upset and angry. The crime, drugs, etc. were real, and everything was wrong where she lived. She commented that the street she resided on did not have enough lighting or any sidewalks. She explained the kids on her street were in danger every day due to people speeding and not having activities nearby. She stated she had come from Ferguson, but was not new to Columbia as she had lived here from 1992 to 2003. She had raised her children in Columbia, and had worked for the Columbia Public Schools. She commented that she advocated for what she believed in and would stand for what was right versus what was wrong. She was from the poor community they had mentioned earlier that had been forgotten. She stated she wanted her community to look like the Rock Bridge and Forum communities. She commented that she did not miss many strategic plan area meetings, and her area likely had one of the biggest gatherings. The media had shown up for the first meeting, but had not been there since. She explained they had been provided a list of projects for the next 3-10 years, and none would impact her community. The Boys and Girls Club was not located in her community, and they did not have enough transportation to get kids in her neighborhood to after school programs. She noted there were three types of people where she lived. There was a group that did not care, there was another group that wanted change, but did not know how to accomplish it, and there was another group that would come and tell the Council how they felt. She stated she had to knock on the doors

of her neighbors to ask them to turn on their porch lights because there was not enough lighting, and pointed out they did not have a nearby park like Rock Bridge either. She noted she planned to bring others from her community to future council meetings and invited the Council to her community because the Council did not live in communities that looked like her community. She felt Columbia had become divided at some point, and no one seemed to care about her and that side of town. She did not think they were asking for a lot as they only wanted their kids to have lights, sidewalks, and a place to go. There was a lot of crime because there was nothing to do. She noted she could not even get the library bookmobile to come to her community. She asked the Council to help her community as she and others did not have the money to live in the Rock Bridge and Forum neighborhood areas. She stated she wanted a substation in her community, and understood the issue always had to do with money. They felt as though no one cared about them.

Mayor Treece stated the Council heard her and cared. He asked Ms. Whitman what three things would make things better where she lived better. Ms. Whitman replied street lights, sidewalks, and a place for the kids to go. She commented that every morning at 5:45 a.m. she made sure her 21 year old made it safe to her car since there was not light. She noted she did not go back to bed as she made sure the other kids in the neighborhood made it to the bus stop as her street was drug infested.

Mr. Skala stated he wanted to assure Ms. Whitman that they were listening. He noted two veteran police officers had recently been added to the community policing contingency and they had discussed an infrastructure fund related to the strategic plan for underserved areas earlier this evening to address issues she had mentioned. He stated he would continue to try to reduce the discrepancy between the Quail Drive area and the Rock Bridge and Forum areas.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that they all needed to understand what a community was as the lack of understanding was causing some of these issues. Everyone was connected to the community of Columbia. He suggested more officers be provided for the Quail Drive area, and noted they needed more police visibility on Northland Drive too.

Monta Welch stated People's Visioning had a lot of ideas that were not very costly and might help with situations as described by Ms. Whitman, and noted they would be willing to share those with Ms. Whitman and with the Council again.

Mr. Skala commented that a member of Race Matters, Friends had discussed the issue of fines earlier in the evening, and pointed out that the fines were set by the municipal judge. It was not a function of the City Council. He thought Municipal Judge Cavanaugh Noce had been doing a remarkable job of being sensitive to those types of issues.

Mr. Thomas explained he had issued a mayoral proclamation yesterday for Crop Walk, which was a nationally coordinated program of walks to raise money for people in poverty and people with hunger. The organizer had asked him to pass his regards to the Council.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 1:00 am.