



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, August 6, 2018
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, August 6, 2018, 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.

The minutes of the regular meeting of July 16, 2018 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Trapp.

Mayor Treece asked that B169-18 be moved from the consent agenda to old business. The agenda, including the consent agenda with B169-18 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

SI9-18

Presentation of the Howard B. Lang, Jr., Award for Outstanding Volunteer Service.

Mayor Treece explained the ninth Howard B. Lang Jr. Award for outstanding volunteer service to the City of Columbia would be presented tonight. The award had been created by Leo Hill, who was Columbia's first City Manager and had worked with Howard Lang, Columbia's mayor from 1953 to 1957, to honor the memory of Mayor Lang and someone selected annually to be recognized for his or her significant volunteer activity, impact, and initiative in support of the City of Columbia and its mission. He stated this year's recipient of the award was Cheryl Price, and noted Ms. Price was a deeply devoted citizen and advocate that had served the City well for many, many years. In the words of her nominator, Rachel Ruhlen, Ms. Price would "just not live a life without advocacy to the benefit of the community if also the concern of her friends." He commented that Ms. Price had served multiple terms on the Public Transit Advisory Commission (PTAC) and the Disabilities Commission, and was a founding member of both the Brain Injury Association of Missouri and of America. She had also served on numerous other boards and commissions locally and more expansively. He noted Ms. Price was often one of the, if not the, most knowledgeable people in the room, and was in many rooms, especially those related to ADA issues, brain injury services, pedestrian safety, veteran issues, and a host of disability issues. If she did not know how to solve a problem, she would find those that knew how to solve the problem and bring them in to help. He pointed out her advocacy for people with disabilities was recognized locally, statewide, and across the country. He stated she had provided over 25,000 hours of volunteer service in terms of case management and aftermath support for survivors of brain injury and their families so they were able to receive the community resources needed.

Another supporter of her nomination had indicated that her faithful volunteerism was driven by her vision of a better, fairer world, arising from her sincere compassion for people suffering from misfortune and discrimination. Ms. Price believed society could and had to provide supportive services so everyone was able to achieve their potential. Mayor Treece commented that it was truly inspiring that Ms. Price's path of volunteer work had strengthened as a result of a brain injury. Her own disability, combined with her passion had resulted in years of powerful service that had impacted thousands of people. He asked Ms. Price to join him at the podium while a tribute video played, and presented her with a plaque. He noted a cash gift of \$1,000 went with the award, and understood Ms. Price had chosen two local charitable organizations to benefit from the gift along with selected service veterans at Patriot Place.

Ms. Price thanked Mayor Treece, the person that had nominated her, Rachel, and the committee that had chosen her. She stated she had been very surprised and honored when she had received a call from a former mayor, Bob McDavid, indicating she had picked as the recipient of this year's Lang Award. Of all of the awards she had received over the many years of her volunteer work with numerous non-profits, individuals with brain injuries, their families, and veterans, the Lang Award for Volunteer Service was one she had always considered special and did not think she would ever receive. She commented that she had really enjoyed the hundreds and hundreds of hours she had spent volunteering in the community along with the many other dedicated citizens that had also given their time. She wished they could all have the experience of receiving this award. She hoped she had contributed in some small way to making the best services possible to their most vulnerable citizens. She noted she had dedicated most of her time and energy in Columbia as a member of the Disabilities Commission, the PTAC, and other committees formed to increase safety and provide social equity to citizens. She thanked those in attendance and her 30-plus year partner and husband, Joe Alder, who had made her volunteer service possible. She commented that after she had sustained her brain injury in a fall while working as a nurse at the VA Hospital and could no longer work in her chosen profession, she had thought her life was over until she had discovered a second career as a volunteer, which had been just as rewarding and to which she was able to bring her passion and skills. She thanked those that had anything to do with choosing her for this prestigious award for volunteer service along with those who had come to share this special time and honor with her. She commented that initially when people had asked her what she did or where she worked, she would say she was only a volunteer. One day a legislator friend of hers explained to her that she was not just a volunteer, and suggested she say she was a proud volunteer as she did it for no compensation and only as service to her fellow man. She hoped everyone that did any volunteer work thought of it in that way from now on as well.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC40-18 Eric Scott and members of LIUNA Local 773 - Just compensation for city workers.

Mr. Scott stated he was a representative of employees of the City of Columbia at Local 773, and wanted to discuss compensation and equitable treatment for solid waste employees in particular and the Public Works employees in general. He noted the solid waste workers were the foundation of the quality of life in Columbia. Most people could call into their jobs, and the average citizen would not notice they were gone, but if the trash did not get picked up, everyone noticed. He pointed out solid waste pick-up was one of the hardest, most physical, and most dangerous occupations in the United States. It was in the top five in terms of workplace injuries and physical strain. He commented

that they had been in a repeated and chronic staffing shortage for quite some time. He understood everyone had split routes today, taking their normally assigned routes and other routes in the 100 degree heat for which they were only given an extra bottle of Gatorade. He stated he had been told by the employees in the Solid Waste Division that the trucks could get so hot that just laying a hand accidentally on the side of the truck was enough to cause significant burns. The task of picking up the bags and putting them into the trucks was physically demanding, causing repetitive strain injuries, back injuries, and knee injuries. He believed it was the most important job in terms of quality of life for the citizens of Columbia. At one time there were over 30 full-time solid waste truck drivers, and today, there were only 17 in a community that had been growing tremendously. The solution that had been put into place of temporary staffing had recently fallen through with the cancelation of a contract, and for several weeks, only those 17 full-time employees had been collecting trash for the entire City of Columbia. Those 17 people were working every day, and working overtime every day in the July heat in order to provide this service. He understood the City now had a contract with another agency to provide some help at a cost of \$20 per hour. The starting wage for a solid waste driver at the City was \$13.77. He commented that part of the reason there was a chronic staffing shortage was due to the compensation not being enough for this physically demanding job. It was why they were reliant on expensive solutions, such as temporary staffing instead of full-time dedicated employees. He stated there had not been significant raises over the past decade for any City employees. In order to keep pace with places they were losing employees to, they had suggested a \$2.00 per hour increase as part of the collective bargaining process, and management had come back with a \$0.25 per hour increase. He noted they understood the City had budget troubles, and had come back to the table with a \$0.50 per hour increase, and had been told it could only be \$0.25. He did not feel that was good faith bargaining as there was not a willingness to provide more. He thought they needed to stop spending money on temporary fixes as they were spending enormous sums on people that were not invested in the City or long-term employees of the City. He felt those that picked up trash and made Columbia a livable place should be paid well and have a living wage.

Jimmy Hart, 2115 N. Creasy Springs Road, explained he had been with the City for six years, and the largest raise he had received was \$0.27 cents. Some employees had been there 15-20 years and had received the same raises, and new employees were being hired at the same rate as him or only three cents less. He did not feel that was fair. He pointed out they were there every day regardless of the weather, and they were shorthanded.

Clyde Benson stated he had been with the City for almost three years, and commented that the City was continuing to grow. He wondered how they would keep up when they were already short-staffed. If something was not done, the hole would become bigger.

Mayor Treece thanked them for their comments, and noted many wanted to make sure they had a wage that recognized the work they did and the dignity deserved. He thought there would be more discussion tonight, and at their work session on Monday, August 13.

SPC41-18 Jim Windsor - Council's pay philosophy.

Mr. Windsor, 200 Manor Drive, commented that the Council had passed a resolution outlining the compensation philosophy for employees five years ago. In addition to stating the City competed for talent in both the public and private sector, and would provide salaries and benefits that were externally competitive, it had indicated it would recognize individual performance. The last part of the philosophy said, the City would target benefits and compensation levels of the median of the competitive labor market. He pointed out the root of median was medi, and medi was a Latin word that meant middle. The pay philosophy presented by the City Manager and passed by the City Council accepted that 50 percent of the labor market would pay more than the City of Columbia. Although, the philosophy stated the City would recognize individual

performance, that portion of the philosophy had been ignored as there had not been any merit raises during that five-year period. He pointed out medi was also the root word for mediocre, and the current pay philosophy as drafted and enacted supported an environment of mediocrity by setting the goal of always paying less than 50 percent of the labor market. The results were apparent as the citywide turnover rate had set new records in each of the last three years. Some of the most talented employees had left the City for other employers. While better pay was a strong inducement, it was not the only reason employees had left. They also tended to leave when recognizing mediocre management, feeling their concerns were ignored, or because they were not supported in doing an effective job. He commented that mediocre management used the same excuse year after year without acting to address competitive salaries, even when the proposed FY 2019 budget estimated the general fund cash reserve amount would be 25 percent above the cash reserve target. He noted mediocre management would not allow department heads to counter outside offers when employers recruited the highest performers from the City. He also pointed out that mediocre management did not inform the Council of critical electric utility staffing issues, and when made to acknowledge it by a group of retirees had immediately made the reduction in tax revenues excuse even though the electric utility was an enterprise fund and did not use tax revenue. He commented that mediocre management took the fiscally irresponsible position of hiring contract crews at over twice the cost of total employee salary and benefits rather than making employee pay more competitive. As a taxpayer and ratepayer, he did not want mediocrity, and did not believe the Council wanted mediocrity. As a recent retiree, he knew there were still talented and dedicated employees at the City, but many had lost confidence in management, and were looking elsewhere. The years of experience already lost to turnover would take time to replace, but hopefully talented people could be retained through recognition of individual performance and better leadership. The Council had the authority to change course and stop the spiral of mediocrity. Mediocre management could and should be replaced. He pointed out enterprise fund and internal service funds could deal with raises, and general fund revenues had been used as an excuse from providing any reasonable raise. He referred to \$4.2 million in excess general fund cash reserve shown on page 152 of the budget, and a note on page 151 that had showed \$2.9 million in FY 2017 general fund savings that would be appropriated in the end of FY 2018. The combination of these two numbers was 12 percent of the FY 2019 general fund personnel budget on page 146. He did not feel there was any legitimate reason the FY 2019 budget could not include up to a five percent merit raise for all employees. In addition, the electric utility had funds remaining in the FY 2018 contingency account that could provide a larger merit increase for line workers, which was needed because the pay was so far below neighboring utilities. A 15 percent raise to the highest rated line worker down to a 7.5 percent merit raise for lowest performer was needed, and line foremen and line superintendents should be included in that process. He urged the Council to recognize that public safety could not be assured, critical infrastructure could not be maintained, and none of the programs the citizens wanted and needed could be provided without qualified and motivated employees. He felt the ratepayers and taxpayers deserved more than mediocre government. The Council had the authority to act now to address employee needs and had the time to make the hard decisions for future budgets that had been made by other public entities faced with these issues. He asked the Council to not allow the spiraling of mediocrity to continue.

SPC42-18

Maria Oropallo - Getting to a workable Finance and Audit Committee.

Ms. Oropallo, 208 E. Briarwood Lane, explained she currently served on the TIF Commission, and as the Chair of the Finance Advisory and Audit Committee (FAAC). She explained the mandate of the FAAC was to advise the Council on financial matters involving the City, and noted the expertise of the members spanned the banking industry, academia, and state and commercial venues. They were not afraid to ask questions and challenged each other, staff, the community, and the Council to gain a deeper

understanding of how revenues came into the City, where they went, and what happened when they went out. In the past few years, staff had agreed to meet more regularly to accommodate the FAAC from two times per year to monthly. Under the direction of the outgoing Finance Director, Michele Nix, staff was addressing nearly every issue that had been brought to the table, even when it cost them time, energy, and headspace. She noted staff was providing a working relationship with the FAAC rather than merely reporting to the FAAC. She stated she was speaking for herself, but felt there was a level of frustration by the members in trying to understand how the money came to the City, from where it came, how it was used, the effects, when it went out, and the ramifications of policies, practices, procedures, reporting, and accountability. Similarly, there was a level of frustration from staff who repeated answers to questions that were obvious to them. It was difficult to page through a 69 page response to the pooled cash question, through the 242 page Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR), through the 570 page 10-Year Trend Manual, or the 696 page Annual Budget. She stated they were often directed to the website where the financial reports were located. In the past ten years, the number of employees in the Finance Department went from 37 to 52, an increase of 12 percent. By contrast, the City of Columbia population had gone from 95,700 to 119,000, an increase of 24.1 percent. She pointed out a number of the 52 positions were vacant, and understood some fairly high positions were still vacant. She noted one had been vacant for almost two years, and the person occupying the second position in that division had suddenly resigned. The senior finance staff, specifically Ms. Nix and Ms. Cannon, had done a remarkable job of keeping things moving along while juggling several issues in the ten divisions of the Finance Department. She understood they often struggled to hire and keep competent and motivated employees, and heard the salaries were not competitive. She pointed out those that made careers of municipal work enjoyed a high level of mobility within the city structure, had the confidence of job security and retirement, and sometimes even did interesting work. She stated they had heard there were a low number of certified public accountants (CPAs), individuals who were licensed to provide accounting services to the public, in the Department. As a result, many employees were learning on the job rather than bringing skills and knowledge to the Department. Given the lack of enough personnel and resources, staff relied on the old way of doing things. They knew some actions were governed by statutes, ordinances, policies, and best practices, or because that was the way it was always done. She was concerned about that as the gossip in her circle of friends was that there appeared to be an overall inability to judge the security of revenue streams, and that there might be too much emphasis for saving for disasters or saving because that was the way it had always been done. She commented that the City might be sitting on too much money in some accounts. She stated that looking for answers to questions posed by the Council and the public had made for more frustration from City staff and the public. As a member of the FAAC, they were often stymied by the questions because the resources to dig deeply were not available to them and there were generally not any straightforward answers. Transparency was a cornerstone of good government, but they still struggled to find answers to questions. She thought they had only scratched the surface of what had been decade-long practices without any change, and felt that was concerning. She felt the Council and public could have a level of confidence in the financial decisions made by the City through the proposed performance audit.

SPC43-18

Pack Matthews - City budget issues relating to community policing.

Mr. Matthews, 1108 Chantilly Court, explained he was speaking on behalf of Race Matters, Friends, and stated transparency was a term battered about frequently with respect to issues of concern within the City. They all professed to be for it, and it was needed due to the lack of trust. In order for government to be accountable to those it governed, as established by law, the public needed to know what government was doing more than what they were saying. He noted the two did not always match up, and provided a recent lawsuit by the Columbia Police Officers Association (CPOA) as an

example. It has forced the City Manager to release innocuous content related to the internal culture of the Columbia Police Department. He commented that it was concerning that Mr. Matthes had fought vigorously to prevent this release to the tune of \$28,000 of taxpayer money, and once released, he was uncertain as to why that had been done. The only item they were aware of was that it contained identifying information of individual officers. He stated the Sunshine Law defaulted to releasing all public records except where statutorily closed, and redacting the names would have been appropriate while releasing the rest of the content. In the face of this flagrant non-compliance with the law, he wondered if the Council would hold Mr. Matthes accountable. In a future closed session to evaluate Mr. Matthes, he wondered about the plan to address this behavior in a way that restored public trust. He noted trust was the basis of all healthy relationships, private, work-related, and governmental. As human beings, they were only as trustworthy as the policy guardrails maintained. An ongoing spirit of trust did not generally exist between the governed and the government, and thus, they had things like the Sunshine Law. Mr. Matthews commented that he believed there was also a disconnect between the published minutes of the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB) and the minutes taken by Race Matters, Friends. He felt the minutes should include documentation of the deliberation and decision-making process similar to what was done in the minutes for the City Council. In reviewing the City Council meeting minutes, they could find detailed information with regard to what was said by the public and what questions and statements were made by City staff. The minutes of the CPRB were lacking in this transparency. A note was made merely indicating a presentation was given. The content of the presentation was omitted along with the questions and answers following the presentation, which led to the impression that nothing of importance or value was said at the meetings. He wondered if City Administration was curious about the content of the work of the CPRB. He commented that the minutes of the FAAC were also not available to the public for a six month period following the meeting, and the minutes did not offer the same amount of information available in City Council meeting minutes. The most recently available minutes for the FAAC included a comment indicating members of the FAAC had asked questions as the presentation was given. He felt it gave the impression that City staff did not value the work of citizen committees. He stated Race Matters, Friends, had an interest in the minutes of the FAAC in relation to several issues involving the City Manager's so-called commitment to social equity. Financing for sewers in the City's current boundaries as well as financial proposals for sewers that would benefit developers over residents was an issue they wanted all citizens to be informed about. In addition, the movement of funding from the Police Department's personnel budget to make material purchases was also of great interest as they awaited the City Manager's report on transitioning the Columbia Police Department to department-wide community-oriented policing. He commented that they were also concerned about the long-term absence of a City auditor as Council prepared to approve next year's budget. He believed better minutes that were made available in a timely manner was essential in creating the transparency and accountability without which Columbia would not have social or racial equity. They were simply asking for the same level of documentation that existed at City Council meetings in terms of minute taking, video streaming, and recording. He felt it would be easy to do, and could start with a request by the Council at the end of the meeting. He believed restored trust and a repaired police-community relationship would do much to further the level of trust and accountability in the community, and asked the Council what they planned to do. He wondered if they would continue to talk the talk about the need for change, and what tangible steps would be made to inspire change.

SPC44-18

Jeremy Root - Moonlight Hoops program in Douglass Park.

Mr. Root, 2417 Beachview Drive, commented that in 1989, Tracy Edwards, Scott Williams, and Rodney Estes had decided to start the Moonlight Hoops program in Douglass Park to give youth an opportunity to do something fun that they enjoyed in the

evenings when kids might chose to engage in other behaviors that were less productive. It was right in the middle of Columbia, and was a wonderful place. Every time he had visited Douglass Park, it had been a great experience for him. He most recently met Everett Roberson, a young man who played in the league and had a T-shirt making business. After reading about the murder of Rovon Blocker in west Columbia on Hulen Drive, he had decided to make T-shirts and donate the profits to the family as they had been struggling with the loss. Mr. Root commented that it had been meaningful for him because the site of that crime was where his kids walked to school every day during the school year, and as a result, he met Mr. Roberson at Douglass Park to purchase a shirt. When he had gone to meet him, there had been about a hundred people there watching and playing basketball. It got him thinking about the program, and the hope and wish for everyone to know about it because it was a treasure. He thought Douglass Park was a treasure with its pool, baseball league, skateboard facility, and this basketball tradition. He stated the championships of the league were this week on Tuesday and Wednesday. He pointed out it was modest league, and the largest budget item within its allocation was a transfer from the Parks and Recreation Department to the Police Department for officers to attend. He asked that as they thought about the issues around community policing, social equity, racial justice, and the needs they had in the community that they also celebrate the good programs they had. He noted it was difficult to find information about the Moonlight Hoops program on the City's website, and it was not well advertised. He recommended everyone read the August 2nd issue of the Columbia Missourian where India Garrish did a photo essay about the program. He stated he planned to take his kids to the championship games this week, and hoped to see others there. He commented that an officer had been quoted in the Columbia Tribune in 2009 as saying they wanted to show the people that although they were law enforcement, they were a part of the community as well, and that they wanted to assist in giving people a positive environment within the community, and he believed these were the exact same issues currently before the Council. He noted he had been honored to come before the Council to speak about this good work when asked by Traci Wilson-Kleekamp because social equity was important to him personally and professionally. He thought they needed to celebrate programs within the City that provided opportunities for at-risk youth to do something fun and had been in existence for years.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH25-18 Proposed installation of traffic calming devices on Sexton Road between Business Loop 70 and Providence Road.

PH25-18 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters commented that \$30,000 did not seem like a lot for six traffic calming devices. Mr. Nichols explained they would do the work with an in-house crew. The \$30,000 was essentially material costs. They had not included an estimate of the cost of staff time.

Ms. Peters understood a sidewalk needed to be replaced, but the City did not have the easements. Mr. Ray stated that was correct. She asked where the sidewalk was located now. She wondered if it was on private property. Mr. Ray replied the current sidewalk did not meet ADA specifications for width so the acquisition of easements and rights-of-way were needed to make it wider. Mr. Nichols explained segments of the roads had not been built to current standards. He noted they would come back with a replacement project to resolve that issue, and did not want to slow down the installation of traffic calming devices.

Mr. Pitzer asked how they were able to do this work with in-house staff, and not the other traffic calming projects. Mr. Ray replied they had been doing them all in-house. Mr.

Nichols explained they had bid this out as a term and supply contract, but had not found anyone that was interested since the work was too sporadic and involved a small set up. As a result, it had been done with their own crews.

Mr. Pitzer asked if anything other than the speed humps had been considered. Mr. Ray replied they had looked at speed tables at each of these locations, but there were drainage issues whereby it would cause more problems than what it would solve in terms of getting the water off of the street. They had also run into some utility issues as manholes had been in the general locations they had considered. He explained the speed humps fit into the nature of the road better.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the work had already been scheduled. Mr. Ray replied yes pending Council approval because they wanted to get this done before school started. Mr. Pitzer asked when it was scheduled. Mr. Ray replied tomorrow if they received approval from Council. Mr. Nichols pointed out that since they were using in-house crews, their work could be reprioritized. He noted this project had scored the second highest in the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program so it warranted some action.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought speed tables had a cost of \$10,000-\$20,000, and asked if the cost of speed humps were about \$5,000 each. Mr. Ray replied the speed humps were about \$5,000 each. He explained the speed tables were a bit wider, and those costs were generally between \$8,000 and \$10,000. Mr. Skala asked if the costs had always been figured without labor. Mr. Ray replied they had been using in-house crews. Mr. Nichols pointed out costs also went down with volume on a certain stretch of roadway. He explained they used some asphalt prices they had, and thought it would be within that range.

Mr. Thomas commented that another traffic calming technique he liked involved bulb-outs and a pedestrian crossing if a crossing was warranted at the location. He asked for the relative cost of that device and the relative benefit in terms of traffic calming. He also asked when that was used. Mr. Ray replied that technique was being used near the school on Rollins Road. It was a good demonstration of where that type of traffic calming would work as it would enhance an existing pedestrian crossing with the added benefit of traffic calming. Mr. Thomas understood they would not want to include this type of calming where there was not the propensity for people to cross the street. Mr. Ray stated that was correct. It would need to be done in connection with a pedestrian network that was already in place or soon to be in place. Mr. Thomas asked for the cost of the bulb-outs. Mr. Ray replied the cost was site specific, and on Rollins Road, he thought it had been about \$35,000. Mr. Thomas understood it was a lot more expensive than a speed hump. Mr. Ray stated that was correct. In the Rollins Road situation, it had been associated with the improvements they had to make to the existing ramps.

Mr. Thomas asked if it was beneficial to have a variety of different types of devices along a route. He was concerned that six speed humps along one corridor would be frustrating for motorists. Mr. Ray replied every street had different characteristics, and they tried to pick traffic calming devices that would best fit the nature of the street. He noted they felt the six speed humps was the best solution for Sexton Road.

Mr. Thomas understood they usually did 3-4 projects per year, and asked Mr. Ray if he was a full-time engineer working on the traffic calming program. Mr. Ray replied it was a portion of what he did. Mr. Thomas asked if he was right in that they did 3-4 projects per year. Mr. Ray replied yes based on the current staffing.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked the data driven approach to the program in terms of the evaluations and rankings. He also liked the fact they included before and after speed and volume measurements in this report as it certainly seemed to be an effective program in reducing speeds by 5-10 and sometimes 15 mph. In addition, it appeared volume was slightly reduced in most cases indicating some cut-through drivers would stay on the main roads, which was beneficial to the neighborhood. He stated his appreciation for the program.

Mayor Treece asked if these were petitioned by the neighborhood. He wondered how

they had been identified. Mr. Ray replied the current program requires initiation by a petition of the neighborhood. This particular project was a carryover from the previous program, which had projects identified by Council. Staff had followed through in identifying the need for traffic calming. Mayor Treece asked if the neighbors had been notified. Mr. Ray replied yes. He explained they had gone through the interested parties process, which had been extensive.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Jeremy Root, 2417 Beachview Drive, stated he thought this was an interesting project and wanted to know more about its history. He noted there was often demand for traffic calming in various neighborhoods throughout the City that had arisen from the neighborhood petition process and the carryover process from a prior time. In his neighborhood there had been efforts around traffic calming on both sides of Hulen Lake to try to minimize cut-through type behavior that could result in higher speed traffic. He felt this was a nice residential neighborhood with lot of families of modest means, and he was sure the City had gone through its ordinance notice and interested parties meeting, and had notified the affected landowners. He stated he had not followed this particular project carefully, but as Council thought about this, he believed the way projects were prioritized was important. It was something all citizens should understand. He appreciated the Council's attention to the issue.

Traci Wilson-Kleekamp commented that this went to the Missouri Quality Award application in terms of how they systemically communicate what was going on so people understood why things happened and when they happened, and how things were prioritized. She thought there tended to be confusion on how things were prioritized in some of the decisions made.

Mr. Thomas explained there was a very data-driven process for the prioritization of projects. He understood speeds were measured on a particular street segment in response to a petition from local residents. The volumes of traffic were also measured, and each received a score. He noted an analysis was also done on the surrounding environment in terms of schools, parks, shops, and other destinations with each item receiving a score. He stated he could provide Mr. Root and Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp a link to the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program. He explained it produced a ranked order, and the general proposal was to complete traffic calming on the top 3-4 rated projects each year. It was provided to Council for approval at the beginning of the fiscal year each year. He believed it was one of the best programs they had. The only problem was that it was not adequately funded as they had many projects on the list. Mr. Ray noted 85 projects had been on the list in 2017. Mr. Thomas thought it was growing by about 5-10 streets per year even though they were only doing 3-4 per year.

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

Ms. Peters asked how staff had decided on six speed humps. She also understood speed tables could not be done due to water issues and asked why that was not an issue with the speed humps since the street would still be obstructed. Mr. Ray replied each location had a different reason as to why there was a water issue with the speed tables. Sometimes it was because it was at the low point of the road so the tables would create a damming effect whereby water would not drain. The speed hump could be designed away from the low point of the road. In addition, there was space on the side in the gutter for water to run down with speed humps. They had decided on six due to the comments received at the interested parties meeting in terms of where the residents felt the speeds were the worse and based on the availability of a natural location. He provided west of Mikel Street as an example as it was a transition area between commercial and residential portions of Sexton Road. It would slow traffic coming from the Business Loop. Each location was similarly thought out. On the east end, there was one on each end of the existing crosswalk for the elementary school, and the thought was to slow traffic before it got to the crosswalk. He explained they tried to space them out at roughly 800 feet or so. As a result, they were not too close whereby they were a

total deterrent to people using the route, but they were also not too far apart that they lost their effectiveness.

Mr. Trapp explained he walked Sexton Road through that area and felt there was a need for traffic calming. There was a lot of speeding and some poor sight lines due to the curviness of the road. He thought it was great that there was a data-driven process in adding traffic calming to streets. He was pleased they had tested these citizen interests because they were controversial by site. He noted Mr. Ruffin would soon find out if there were any Corvette owners residing in the neighborhood. He explained he had gotten yelled at for the Derby Ridge Drive speed humps this last campaign season, and the clear data of it driving down speeds had allowed him to confidently defend them as being effective in making the street safer. He had notice more people in their front yard on Derby Ridge Drive since then, and pointed out Sexton Road was blessed with a lot of front porches so he thought it would enhance the amenability of the neighborhood in addition to slowing down traffic. He believed traffic calming was more about neighborhood life than a transportation policy.

Mr. Skala wanted to reinforce the message sent by Mr. Thomas and Mr. Trapp, and to reassure Mr. Root and Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp that this program had been crafted to be data-driven and that had dictated the priorities. He concurred with the fact they did not have enough funding to keep up with demand. He reiterated it had a history of being a sound program. He thought the best they could do about complaints with regard to speed humps was to have a comprehensive interested parties process and bring that to the attention of those who would benefit from the traffic calming.

Mr. Ruffin commended staff for their consistent, conscientious, and sensitive engagement with the residents of the affected areas. He noted he had attended all of the interested parties meetings, and staff had taken the time to explain the benefits and challenges of speed humps, speed tables, stop signs, reduced speeds, etc. As a community, they had come together to endorse this final proposal. He again thanked staff for their work in engaging the neighborhood as he thought everyone would be pleased with the impact.

Mr. Ruffin made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans and specifications for the installation of traffic calming devices on Sexton Road between Business Loop 70 and Providence Road. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH26-18 Consider reversing prior voluntary reductions in the property tax rate ceiling used to calculate the 2018 property tax rate.

Discussion shown with PR108-18.

PR108-18 Reversing prior voluntary reductions to the property tax rate ceiling used to calculate the property tax rate.

PH26-18 and PR108-18 were read by the Clerk.

Ms. Nix, Mr. Matthes, and Fire Chief White provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked how often there were multiple simultaneous calls to the Fire Department that involved engines from different stations being deployed at the same time. Chief White replied simultaneous calls was one of the things they were looking at through their accreditation process. He could not provide an exact number at this time, but thought it was in the 10-12 percent range when at least one other company was on a call, so one time out of ten, they would have a situation where two stations were being tied up at the same time. Mr. Thomas understood that occurred several times every day. Chief White explained there could also be situations that took multiple stations out of service, and those were not figured into the percentage he had provided.

Mr. Thomas asked how long it would take until enough money was accrued to build the fire station if this was to be approved and the money went toward a fire station. Mr. Matthes replied it depended on the desire of Council. If they took the most conservative

course, which was recommended in the budget, it would take about six years to save up enough to build and staff the fire station. He noted the Council could choose to accelerate it by borrowing the money. Mr. Thomas asked if money was borrowed if it would be bonded against that incremental property tax revenue in future years. Mr. Matthes replied that could be done, but pointed out it would likely be a loan instead of a bond. He did not feel it was enough money to go through the bond process. He explained they also had some funds in other projects they could pay back. He stated he would likely recommend using the cash they had in other projects scheduled for future years for this project, and to pay it back over time. Mr. Thomas understood that theoretically it could be completed sooner. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas understood \$0.4329 would be used to start the calculation, and asked for the parameters that went into that calculation to come up with a final number that would be the highest the property tax could be raised. Ms. Nix replied they compared the assessed value from last year and the assessed values that had come from the County for this year to determine the growth rate. They then compared the growth rate to the consumer price index (CPI) and another factor, which she could not recall. The lowest of the three could be applied to the calculation to allow an increase or decrease to the ceiling. Mr. Thomas asked if that was done every year. Ms. Nix replied they were only allowed to reverse a voluntary reduction in an even numbered year so it would be the same in odd numbered years. She clarified they did the calculation annually, but it did not affect the rate in the odd numbered years. Mr. Thomas asked if that series of calculations was done on the \$0.4100 and if it came out to that regardless. Ms. Nix replied it did not. Mr. Thomas asked if the actual rate charged each year was not \$0.4100. Ms. Nix replied it was \$0.4100 because, as a City, they had chosen to set the rate at \$0.4100 each year when setting the tax rate. Mr. Thomas asked if they did the calculation based on \$0.4329, if the rate they were allowed could be higher or if it would always be below that amount. Ms. Nix replied she thought it could, but did not think it would because it would be restricted at five percent, the CPI, or the growth in the assessed value. It was limited based on the Hancock amendment. Mr. Thomas asked if there was any logic to the state law that indicated this calculation could only be done in even numbered years, and asked if it could be done any time from January to December in the even numbered years. Ms. Nix replied the rate needed to be set by September 1st. Mr. Thomas asked if there was logic as to why they could only do this during even numbered years. Ms. Thompson replied she thought it was because it was a non-reassessment year. She noted reassessments were done every other year, and reiterated she thought it was done on either the non-reassessment or reassessment years.

Mr. Pitzer commented that some of these areas had overlapping coverage with the Boone County Fire Protection District (BCFPD) and some feedback he had received questioned why the City could not work something out with the BCFPD. He asked why that was or was not a realistic solution. Chief White replied the simple answer was that the level of service was different. The volunteer agency did not have the ability and was not geared to provide a level of service at this call volume because they relied on volunteers to man the stations. When they got to a certain level of population density, there was a need to have a fully staffed 24/7 hour operation. The City had been putting quite a burden on the BCFPD, and as a result, the BCFPD felt they needed to pull out of the agreement that had been worked out for some coverage arrangements. It put a tremendous strain on their resources to be able to cover something that in all reality was the City's responsibility. He reiterated the level of service was different. The Columbia Fire Department (CFD) depended on knowing what was coming and with what they had to work, and they did not have that ability with a volunteer agency. They did not know if there would be one, three, or ten volunteers, and it added a lot of uncertainty to a situation they tried to resolve within the first 2-3 minutes of arrival. He stated that was the problem with a joint coverage area, and they would have that issue as they moved forward

in other areas. He believed that was the biggest challenge.

Mr. Matthes asked Chief White to describe the difference in the training required for staffing. Chief White replied every firefighter in the City of Columbia was trained to the EMT level at a minimum and many were paramedics. They participated in a 15-week recruit school in order to receive Firefighter 1 and 2 certifications along with other certifications. He stated they came on to the trucks under the tutelage of an officer that had been officer with at least fifteen years or so of experience, and the average experience on the crew would be much higher than was available at a volunteer organization. The level of training, expectations, the fact they were always with a truck or at the station, etc. provided a security of being able to respond and to utilize that training and experience.

Mr. Pitzer recalled a report on the ISO rating earlier this year, and thought they had barely stayed at the ISO rating of 2. He understood one of the weaknesses was a lack of coverage in all parts of the City. Chief White stated the lack of coverage in these areas of the City where they were outside of a 4-minute travel time was hindering them the most, so it was essentially the number of stations in terms of distribution and number of firefighters they had on duty each day that was heavily affecting the rating. The proposals for Stations 10 and 11 would not necessarily address having additional firefighters on staff, but this was his best plan for expanding coverage even though it would spread them a little thinner. The hope was that as they moved forward and the economic conditions changed, they would be able to add staff in order to build back depth. That was how they would be able to open two stations with the addition of only three personnel. The thought was that it was more effective to catch the heart attack or the fire in the initial stages than to bring in more people to the scene later.

Mr. Pitzer asked Chief White where he was in identifying locations for the stations. Chief White replied the locations were technically dots on the map at the moment and were subject to change since land had not been purchased in either location yet. He explained he had identified the areas the maximum amount of coverage could be obtained with the hope they could purchase land in those areas.

Mr. Pitzer asked for a realistic estimate for when the stations would be open if this moved forward. Chief White replied it depended on funding. He noted he had reviewed how he could staff the locations and get the necessary apparatus in them, and how fast he could make it happen. He stated he could staff one of the stations immediately by splitting the two crews as Station 2 and by moving apparatus. He explained there was also a two-person rescue squad, and could move those two people to the second new station and operate it as light attack situation until they obtained three additional personnel. Once they were able to obtain the three additional personnel, they would also extend the life of a truck and other reserves for that site until they were able to get an additional truck into the normal rotation cycle. He thought they could technically open both stations when built with one having a full crew and the other with a two-person crew until they could hire three additional people. Mr. Pitzer understood a second station could be opened as a light attack station without the three additional personnel. Chief White stated that was correct, and explained a fast-attack type vehicle was a smaller vehicle, such as an F-350 that had minimum water on it, but had all of the medical equipment a crew would need to initiate the fire command, medically assist, and attend to smaller fires, like car fires. He pointed out they would not receive any ISO credit for the fast attack since it was not the same as a full engine crew.

Mr. Pitzer understood Ms. Nix referenced a date of September 1, and asked for clarification as to whether that was to determine the ceiling or to set the actual rate. Ms. Nix replied it was to set the actual rate. Mr. Pitzer noted that did not align with the City's fiscal year, and asked if there was an opportunity to adjust it between September 1 and October 1, which was the start of the City's fiscal year. Ms. Nix replied no. The rate would need to be set in August to get it to the State by September 1.

Mr. Skala stated there had been a long history of need and growth areas, and one was on

the east side of Columbia and had been complicated by land acquisition issues. He also understood there was a need on the southwest side of Columbia. He asked if there a question with regard priority for the best fit and who was in line first. Ms. Peters replied she understood the east station was in line first. Mr. Skala stated that had been his understanding. Chief White explained he had been involved in station planning and where stations should be located since he started working for the CFD, and noted he had seen the same areas come up in importance and then fade based on the growth of the City. He noted there was very little they could do to predict it. While some of the northwest still had areas that needed to be addressed, it had been one of the top priorities when Station 8 was built. The same thing had occurred with Station 9 as the area of growth north of I-70 had overtaken the need in the northwest when reviewing call volumes and distances. He pointed out they had a lot of needs. Mr. Skala stated he appreciated the thoughtful answer. He understood there was some prioritization and there were tremendous needs in the east and southwest.

Mr. Skala understood there was not a proscription in using the funds for capital projects when it came to revenue streams, and particularly property tax streams, but it was unusual, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Matthes replied no. It was general revenue of the City so the Council had the authority to spend it on all of the expenses the City had. The beauty of property tax was that it was incredibly stable compared to sales tax. He noted he would recommend that its highest and best use was for recurring expenses over time, i.e. operating costs, but pointed out many cities used it for capital projects.

Mayor Treece stated he appreciated the presentation tonight, and did not deny there were real needs in the fire service. He asked Chief White if the Fire Department or taxpayers would receive any immediate benefit from this. Chief White replied the difficulty in responding to that question was that it was dependent on how quickly the station was built. Mayor Treece asked for the cost of a fire station. Chief White replied roughly \$2.5 million, depending on the acquisition of the land. Mayor Treece understood this would provide \$496,000, so they would have to save for 5 ½ years. He asked what a \$2.5 million fire station would cost in six years. Chief White replied they built Station 9 in 2009 had spent about \$2 million on it. Mayor Treece asked Chief White if the Fire Department had other needs beyond what this \$469,000 could meet. Chief White replied yes, and explained it would be helpful for their training budget to be restored to pre-2009 levels. He noted there were always needs. Stations 4, 5, and 6 were being remodeled now thanks to the capital improvement sales tax, and the training academy was being refurbished. Mayor Treece understood those were voter approved capital improvements. Chief White stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood they had fulfilled all of their promises. Chief White stated they were on the path of fulfilling them. Mayor Treece understood the City would have to go back to voters eventually asking for additional help. Chief White stated they would after this ten-year period was over.

Mr. Trapp asked about the impacts of moving from an ISO rating of 2 to an ISO rating of 3 on people's insurance bills. Chief White replied it was difficult for him to quantify because it would make a difference in both homeowners rates and commercial rates. The effect on commercial rates was likely higher and more substantial than on homeowner rates. Each insurance company looked at things differently, and a lot of them relied on ISO to determine where to start, but many property casualty insurance companies conducted reviews based on zip codes. As a result, it would be difficult for him to quantify the impact.

Mr. Ruffin asked if there was a way to move forward with these projects without this modest property tax increase. Mr. Matthes replied no, and explained the reason for the use of the property tax was primarily for staffing. They could shuffle funds to build the stations, but would need to staff it, and the purpose of the ongoing revenue was to pay for the ongoing cost of personnel.

Ms. Peters asked how often the City received an ISO rating. Chief White replied historically it had been every ten years, but ISO was now looking at a 4-5 year renewal.

He pointed out they could also ask ISO to come in at any time for a reevaluation. Ms. Peters asked when the City was last rated. Chief White replied they had last been rated in February of this year. Ms. Peters understood they had barely kept their rating then. Chief White stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he had been the cause of this, and over the last 5-6 years, City staff and some of the Council had been saying there was not enough revenue to keep up with public capital infrastructure facilities. This was largely because they had not charged development the amount of money necessary over the past 25 years when the City had grown by 60 percent. He understood some felt they could not raise the ceiling because it had not gone to the voters, and that the \$0.4100 was being deemed as the choice of the voters by everyone to include the State Auditor's Office. Equally clear was the fact they were not already dealing with a ceiling of \$0.4329 because the Council had voluntarily reduced it. He pointed out he had not heard Council ever discussing the issue since at least 2002, so he did not believe they had been aware of the fact they were voluntarily restricting it to \$0.4100. He thought it was time to make the decision to increase the ceiling. The City was crippled, and Mr. Matthes had indicated lines of services would need to be cut. He thought they needed to take advantage of raising the ceiling, which was a separate vote from actually setting the rate.

Mr. Clark asked if the land acquisition, construction, and equipment for the fire stations had been included in the recent capital improvement sales tax projects. Mr. Matthes replied the capital improvement sales tax included replacement of apparatus at about one a year. Mr. Clark asked about the new buildings. Mr. Matthes replied it also included the purchase of land in the southwest. He commented that he felt this decision on raising the ceiling and the decision to potentially raise the rate to \$0.4329 had been poisoned with a potential contentious political issue, and that it had been deliberately done to create division between the Council. He did not feel this proposal should have been included as part of the discussion about the ceiling. He believed the ceiling should have been its own discussion as it was to raise more money for the general fund. The decision about what to do with it should not have been mentioned yet. He stated he was appalled by the process used by staff, and asked the Council to discount that discussion. He recommended the Council vote to increase the ceiling and then hold a hearing about whether to go to that ceiling given the fact they were short on funds. The use should be taken up later, after those other decisions were made.

Dan Hemmelgarn, 412 Thilly Avenue, explained he had retired from the CFD as an Emergency Services Division Chief, and about 22 years ago, he had participated in a fire station needs assessment. At that time, the findings of that needs assessment was that they needed three stations in addition to the seven they had to meet the minimum requirements established by ISO. Since then, only two stations had been added. As a result, there was no doubt additional fire stations were needed. He commented that he generally supported property taxes as a way of funding operations and maintenance of infrastructure. At the groundbreaking of Fire Station No. 8, both the city manager and mayor at that time had shared their perspectives with him that building and equipping the station was a one-time expense, and the bigger concern was the cost of operating the new station. He thought that was an astute observation in viewing the cost of construction and equipping the station as being different than operations costs. The first was funding new infrastructure needed to accommodate growth, and the second was funding operations and maintenance to support that infrastructure. He commented that it was this distinction that had brought him to the podium this evening. As a taxpaying resident of Columbia for the last 40 years, he believed a portion of their tax dollars were being misappropriated to fund new infrastructure to accommodate growth. Before moving to Columbia, he was real estate broker and had witnessed a different funding model whereby new growth paid its own way. New infrastructure was a part of the cost of development and had been paid for by developers. Once the new infrastructure was built,

City taxpayers assumed the role of maintaining it. The initial cost of the infrastructure had been built into the value of the developed property, and that value remained a part of the property. Columbia's current model caused taxpayers to pay for the new infrastructure while the value was realized by the developer, and there were insufficient funds to maintain the existing infrastructure. He hoped the Council would consider adopting a model where developers paid their fair share prior to raising property taxes. He commented that it had always puzzled him as to how the population and area of Columbia could grow by 20-30 percent without what they were spending for services growing with it. He assumed the tax revenue was growing with that growth at least in terms of property taxes. Mr. Thomas commented that a lot of that revenue was being siphoned off to build the infrastructure for growth instead of charging the new development that cost of new infrastructures. Mr. Matthes pointed out property taxes were growing, but sales taxes were not, and those were the two main funding sources of the City. Mr. Hemmelgarn stated he had realized internet sales had cut into the City's sales taxes, but thought sales tax should grow by some amount due to the population growth.

Traci Wilson-Kleekamp commented that she was not yet convinced that growth paid for itself, and had not seen any documentation that growth paid for itself. She stated they kept having this circular logic conversation about growth, and tended to stop at about the halfway point and go backwards. She noted they still did not have an answer as to how they were benefitting from growth. The City's infrastructure was being squeezed by new growth. She pointed out she had participated on a committee with regard to infrastructure about ten years ago with Mr. Skala, and thought they needed to have a conversation to determine how they were benefitting from growth. She felt the taxpayers were paying well more than their fair share, and it needed to come to an end.

Julie Ryan, 5301 Regal Way, wondered how this initiative right now corresponded with the BCFPD ending service within the City this year in part due to the City Manager missing a meeting to discuss the agreement and the BCFPD only receiving \$350,000 in 2015 to cover 2014 costs. She stated it seemed peculiar to her that this was coming up now after this agreement had been eradicated. She commented that the growth in the southwest was not new, and had been predicted. She believed it was evident the City was now saying this fire station was needed because of the BCFPD agreement not being fulfilled. She understood the City Manager had indicated residents should expect less service from City government in future years, and felt that carried with it a tone of a threat for not approving what was in front of the Council tonight. She did not believe it was the need for more revenue, but the lack of effective communication, planning, and confidence that the money was being spent wisely for its supposed intention and in full transparency for citizens.

Rebecca Shaw, 2615 Vail Drive, commented that if the Council was asking for \$500,000 now and sneaking their hand in the cookie jar to get it, the citizens would later come to them wanting to discuss the situation. She thought the City needed to be transparent with the citizens. The citizens needed to know where the money would go. She thanked Chief White for making his presentation because that was the first time they had heard how the money would be used. She cautioned that people would say no if they continued to be asked.

Chris Martin, 4304 Mesa Drive, stated he was speaking on behalf of the Columbia Board of Realtors and noted they were opposed to this proposal for a property tax increase or the modification of the ceiling without the approval of the voters. He referenced a letter that was sent to the Council on Friday, and noted Board President Sean Moore had indicated they were concerned with the mechanism being used to reverse any voluntary reduction from previous years when setting the 2018 property tax without voter approval. The letter went on to state they recognized the City of Columbia's need to additional general revenue as the amount of sales tax collected continued to decline, but they strongly urged that an increase in taxes was something that should be voted on by the people of the City. He commented that they were also concerned with the

shortsightedness of this proposal in the wake of waning public trust with regard to upcoming measures, such as Proposition 1, which they publically supported. The backlash that might occur as a result of tonight's proposal could have a negative effect on the ability to pass the proposal. He reiterated the Columbia Board of Realtors felt any type of increase, including this proposal, should be one approved by the vote of the people.

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

Mr. Pitzer commented that there were two parts to this discussion, the fire part and the tax part, and noted he would speak on the fire part first. He believed it was a critical civic responsibility to provide emergency service and emergency response to the entire City so there was an obvious need to build, open, staff, and operate two additional stations. There were large parts of the City that were not receiving the same level of service in emergency response that other parts were receiving. It was clear in many of the reports received and the ISO report that the lack of coverage was a big weakness. He commented that the investment of where to build fire stations was a long-term decision. He understood there had been discussions in the past as to where to build stations when it seemed they would be built far outside the City or that there was an irrational decision to locate a station, but in hindsight, those proved to be wise decisions based on where the stations were located. He stated he understood the point Mr. Thomas had made repeatedly with regard to growth not paying for itself and that this cost should be put on development, and that was a reasonable discussion to have, but they were talking about citizens of the City now that were not receiving that service. They were already at this point, and could not go back and reverse the situation that had got them there. He believed it was a clear and obvious need. He noted they would ask voters to vote on a water bond tomorrow, and one of the components of that funding would go towards improving fire flow in certain parts of the City. He thought it would be nice to be able to have firefighters be able to access that fire flow and use it if that bond was approved. He commented that the tax part was a bit thorny, and had talked to a lot of people over the past couple of weeks in that regard. The tax increase would be one third of one percent of the entire property tax bill, or 75 cents per month or \$9.00 per year for a median home, and some people felt that was a reasonable proposition for the service that would be delivered. If this were to advance, he thought it would be critical for the funds to be used specifically for the operation and staffing of those stations. He did not think they could stockpile the money and then build it. He felt there needed to be an immediate impact that people could see. If this were to move forward, they would need to find ways to move expeditiously to build and open the stations. Related to this was whether this would undermine confidence in government and voter trust. He believed a lot of that lack of confidence came from a belief the City would not follow through on what it said the money would be used. As a result, if this advanced, it was critical that it be used specifically to operate and staff those stations. He also asked that they consider the other side with regard to a lack of voter confidence. This was a relatively modest proposal in terms of total dollar amount that could be used for a very specific project and could be executed over the next year or two years, and if there ever was a more comprehensive public safety solution proposed, it could be a case study they pointed to showing they had delivered on the plan. He agreed it was a tricky situation in which they found themselves. He thought they should move ahead with calculating the ceiling as mentioned by Mr. Clark. They could then continue to have a conversation with regard to setting the actual rate and what those dollars would be used for if they were to change the rate. He noted they were also involved in the budget process, and although the timing did not sync up, they would have a work session before setting the rate. As a result, there was an opportunity to review the budget for other solutions to operating and staffing those stations. He commented that earlier this year the Supreme Court opened a possible path to recouping some online sales taxes. If this idea moved forward and the State acted on the online sales, they could include in the proposal to roll back any property tax increase. He stated he

thought the need was critical, and they should review their options on achieving the goal, and leave this option on the table by approving the calculation of the ceiling and separating it from the decision about where they would set the tax rate in a couple of weeks.

Mr. Thomas stated he had surveyed those that received his constituent newsletter yesterday, and had explained it was a small increase of about \$10 for the average house per year along with the fact it was a two-stage process, one to raise the ceiling and a separate public hearing and vote at the next meeting with regard to whether to actually change the tax rate from what it was now. About 50 percent of the people were okay with the increase, but several of those thought the City should be careful because it could be perceived as a lack of transparency with backlash as the result. The other 50 percent were people that were very unhappy with the idea the Council would raise property taxes without the vote of the people. He commented that he also felt they would eventually have to raise the property tax rate by more than two cents in order to properly fund the Police Department along with meeting the needs of the Fire Department. He stated he was very wary of poisoning the well by doing a small increase now as he felt it would make it harder to get what they really needed in terms of making the Police Department a desirable place for people to work, and implementing the community policing strategy, which he knew was a philosophy, but felt more officers would be needed to meet people in the community as a part of the strategy.

Mr. Thomas understood they would receive a new authority from the voters if they went to the voters in November of next year for a property tax rate increase above the ceiling they were discussing now and it passed. Ms. Nix stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas stated he did not see the point of further engendering distrust and anger by making this small and somewhat chaotic move. He was not sure why they did not have both fire stations built into the 10-year CIP Plan or at least had that discussion then. As one speaker had mentioned, the growth had been ongoing and they had been talking about it for many years. He felt this was a desperate move and stated he did not want to be a part of it. He noted he would much rather start planning for a public safety property tax increase next year, which would involve good community conversations to build support and consensus. He preferred to do it properly and understood that would take time. He noted they would receive a community policing plan at the next meeting, and understood the needs of the Fire Department. He thought they might get the fire stations quicker if they went in that direction than with this strategy alone. He reiterated he thought they needed 12-15 months to try to get that property tax increase, and also needed to address the cost of growth. He commented that he planned to ask for money to be set aside to find a responsible consultant to do a proper study of the cost of growth. He noted a lot of the consultants the Utility Department had utilized were not telling them the truth, and did not have confidence in City staff or those consultants as they tended to feel the City would get a bigger benefit in the long term from growth, and he did not agree. He understood Mr. Clark had indicated it was about \$100 million over 25 years, and he believed it was more as he had estimated about \$10-\$20 million per year of subsidies in infrastructure for new development. Growth resulted in the need for fire stations, police precincts, sewer, electric, water systems, roads, etc. In addition, they were paying a large amount in subsidies in property taxes for schools. He thought there needed to be a schools development impact fee. If they went from 120,000 to 150,000 in population in the next ten years, they would need new schools, and he wondered who should pay to build them. He agreed they would all pay their share for operating them, but felt the building of them was a different issue. He hoped the Council would support him in a serious analysis of the cost of growth and a community conversation in that regard. He reiterated he did not see the point in a small property tax, and felt they would receive better support if they did this in a calmer and more long-term way. He also believed they would get the fire stations just as quickly if doing that.

Mr. Trapp commented that he would be more persuaded by the argument that this small

increase would poison the well with regard to a future increase if there was consistent support for it, but he was not confident in that. He noted they would first need to reach a consensus at the Council level on the amount of the increase. They did not have a proposal on the table, but had real and immediate needs. He stated they had taken a big risk by funding essential services with sales tax, and there were problems with that outside of just the decline in sales tax production due to online sales as sales tax was a very regressive tax. This on the other hand was a progressive tax. Rarely did they get the opportunity to rebalance the tax structure of the City they had inherited from decisions made in the 1980s. This was a chance to rebalance and bring in a more stable source of revenue. It was in the statutory authority and not counter to the Hancock amendment. It had been a part of the Hancock amendment because the designers of that model knew this would occur and had created those calculations. It did not violate the spirit of the law to make those calculations to set the rate. It was not a new proposal as Mr. Clark had been mentioning it as long as he had been on the Council. They had a fundamental need to increase their sources of stable revenue, and this was one way to do it. He agreed it did not solve all of their problems, but it solved a problem and started to move the ball forward.

Mr. Skala stated he was glad they had ironed out some of the controversy surrounding this at the last council meeting when this had been placed on the consent agenda, which he thought had been a mistake. He noted Mayor Treece has asked that it be removed from the consent agenda, and his late decision to vote in favor of that had been cast to hold this public hearing. It had not been for any increase in this property tax. He commented that there were compelling needs for the Fire Department, and they were usually driven by growth. He agreed with Mr. Thomas and other speakers tonight, and noted he would advocate for revisiting the development fee. The last time they had discussed a development fee, it had been too complicated. He pointed out he had acted on the advice of a consultant at that time. He commented that he believed they had an answer to the cost of growth. He explained he had served on an infrastructure task force years ago when a member had asked about the cost of growth, and the response was that it might pay for itself on a commercial basis, but residential growth was always subsidized. He stated that just because they could do this did not mean they should. It was a toxic political environment, and raising the property tax rate in the short term could jeopardize the capacity and trust in the community in the long term. He noted he was not willing to take that chance. He stated he planned to vote against it. He also pointed out there had been a lot of incendiary communication on Facebook with a lot of misconceptions as to whether they would raise taxes, whether they had already raised taxes, etc. He believed this was a toxic political environment and would not support this resolution.

Mayor Treece stated he believed Chief White had made some valid points, but did not feel they should raise taxes for something like this without the vote of the people. In addition, they had important needs this tax did not solve. It was an immediate tax increase with no immediate benefit to those paying it. He felt it would be a shame if they forfeited the opportunity to engage with the public and eroded the fidelity of taxpayers by adopting this without asking them to weigh in on it. He thought they were missing the opportunity to have a larger conversation about the needs of the City and to hear from the voters as to their priorities and how they wanted the City to spend the money. The Columbia Tribune, the Columbia Board of Realtors, the CPOA, and the City Manager had all indicated this would not sit well with voters. He felt the backlash would be swift, and noted he was opposed to it. He believed they needed to reject this proposal.

The vote on PR108-18 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, PITZER. VOTING NO: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, SKALA, THOMAS. Policy resolution declared defeated.

PH27-18 Voluntary annexation of property located on the north side of Mexico Gravel Road and east of Spring Cress Drive (5705 E. Mexico Gravel Road) (Case No. 18-131).

PH27-18 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Thomas commented that as they thought more and more about the cost of growth, they should be very skeptical of annexations until they had put into place adequate cost recovery mechanisms to recover the cost of growth from additional development. Annexation almost inevitably led to additional development within the City connecting to all of the public infrastructure systems and creating additional costs. He understood they were not voting on this tonight, but pointed out he was unlikely to support it because it was essentially hamstringing the City in the future with additional expansion costs for which they did not have a way to pay those costs.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B169-18 Authorizing a storage lease agreement with Ishams Ordinary, LLC for the use of a City-owned storage building on Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT) right-of-way near 700 Fay Street.

B169-18 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked for the lease rate. Mr. Johnsen replied \$750 per year. Mayor Treece understood this involved 1,700 square feet so the rate was \$62 per month and three cents per square foot per month.

Mayor Treece explained he had asked for this to be pulled off of the consent agenda, and noted he had asked about this three weeks ago, had reminded someone ten days ago of his request, and had asked about it a third time an hour before the meeting. He thought this was way under market. The area had seen millions of dollars of investment. Under the introduction and first reading section of the agenda was a replat for someone that wanted to construct a three-story building next door to this. He did not feel they should let this go for \$62 per month. He commented that he had always been an advocate for treating the City's assets like the real estate market. He suggested they put a "for lease" sign on the building to see what the market generated. He did not feel they should enter into a lease for only \$750 per year for a storage unit. He noted a food truck yard or something else could be placed there, and pointed out so much was happening in the area. It was on the same side of the street as Woodruff Sweitzer, across the street from Logboat Brewing and Division-D, and catty corner from a proposed plat. There was a lot of investment happening there. At a minimum, he believed this was unimaginative and at worse a loss for taxpayers.

Mr. Johnsen stated they had not solicited offers to rent the property. The City had been approached by someone across the road. He pointed out this was an old storage shed that was on railroad right-of-way.

Mayor Treece noted he had been approached by someone else after he had initially inquired about it that had indicated they had asked the City if it was for lease and had been told it had already been leased. He thought there was extra demand in this area and people were looking for opportunities in this neighborhood. He suggested the Council vote this down and ask staff to put a "for lease" sign on it at a minimum. He thought they should be getting \$18 per square foot for the property even with leaseholder improvements.

Mr. Skala asked how staff had arrived at \$750. Mr. Johnsen replied he believed staff had reviewed a lease down the road and reduced the price since the building was smaller and because the lessee would make improvements. Mr. Skala understood there was another space on down the road that had been comparable. Mr. Johnsen stated that was correct. He explained it was the same type of lease arrangement, but had been done 25 years ago.

Mr. Ruffin understood another building had been rented for approximately \$750 per year 25 years ago. Mr. Johnsen stated he thought it had an escalator in it similar to this one and that it had started out at about the \$600 range in 1993. It was now in the \$800 range. The price for this one was reduced because it was smaller and in worse shape.

Mr. Pitzer asked about the condition of the building. Mr. Johnsen replied it was not very good. He noted he did not think it was water tight at the moment. He understood a door and flooring would need to be installed. It was essentially a shed that had stored some equipment to somewhat shelter the equipment from the outside. Mr. Pitzer understood the City did not have any plans for it. Mr. Johnsen stated the City was just storing railroad equipment in it. They did not have much use on that part of the rail track now so they were able to store it elsewhere to accommodate leasing it.

Mr. Pitzer asked if it was in the railroad right-of-way. Mr. Johnsen replied yes. Mr. Pitzer asked if it could be redeveloped. He wondered if something else could go on the land. Mr. Johnsen stated he did not know if the land could be sold since it was railroad right-of-way. Mr. Pitzer asked if the building could be demolished for an apartment building or restaurant. Ms. Thompson replied the railroad right-of-way was more complicated for the City to divest its interest.

Mayor Treece stated he would encourage everyone to drive down Fay Street to look at this building and everything around it, and decide whether it was worth \$750 per year or more. Mr. Pitzer questioned whether it could be used. Mayor Treece stated he thought it could be used and that it was being used. Mr. Pitzer wondered if it could be used for anything other than storage. Mayor Treece pointed out all of the development at Koonse Glass and Logboat Brewing. Mr. Pitzer understood the issue was that it was in the right-of-way. Mayor Treece noted they owned the railroad, and there was one customer for the railroad. Mr. Pitzer wondered if there was a market for it. Mayor Treece stated if they received only one bid at \$750 per year, he would be happy. He did not believe they should allow this to go below market without the opportunity.

Mr. Skala thought it might be appropriate to ask for a report at the end of the meeting with regard to how to evaluate things of this nature. He commented that this reminded him of efforts in years past when attempting to deal with stale zonings. He felt they should look at the potential for some of these things and evaluate them. He did not feel it was sound to set a rate on the basis on something down the road.

Mr. Johnsen stated the terms on the agreement were fairly short. He thought it was a 30- or 60-day notice on a year-to-year lease.

Ms. Peters asked what they planned to store in the building. Mr. Johnsen replied he was not sure if they planned to store product, raw materials, equipment, or something else. If they were allowed to use it, they would have to go through the processes needed to be able to store the materials. He commented that the City had only stored right-of-way equipment, such as mowers. Mr. Pitzer understood someone could open a distillery on the other side of the road and use this as storage for it.

Mr. Thomas stated he believed they should have a systematic procedure in these cases of testing the market and going through a process of advertising. As a result, he noted he would support holding off on the lease to allow them to go through that process to see if they received any better bids.

Mr. Matthes noted this was one of the methods outlined in the ordinances so the rules had been followed. People were allowed to pitch an idea to which the City could respond. He agreed there was nothing wrong with testing the market either.

Mr. Skala asked if this should be tabled. Mayor Treece suggested defeating it. Ms.

Peters agreed they should defeat it and put a "for lease" sign up for about three months or so. If no one else showed interest, and this person was still interested, they could lease it to him. Mr. Matthes agreed with that suggestion.

B169-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NO ONE. VOTING NO: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. Bill declared defeated.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B165-18 Approving the Major Replat of Auburn Hills Plat 16 located on the south side of International Drive and approximately 300 feet east of Rangeline Street (Case No. 18-82).
- B166-18 Approving the Final Plat of Woodstrail Ridge Subdivision located on the south side of Blue Ridge Road, south of the terminus of Derby Ridge Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case #18-123).
- B167-18 Authorizing an agreement with Forum Boulevard Christian Church of Columbia, Missouri to partially vacate an access restriction to Nifong Boulevard and impose new limited access to Nifong Boulevard; appropriating funds.
- B168-18 Authorizing a right of use license permit with Gamma Kappa Zeta of the Lambda Chi Alpha Fraternity for construction, installation, maintenance and operation of a private retaining wall and storm water infrastructure within a portion of the Stewart Road right-of-way.
- B170-18 Accepting conveyances for drainage, temporary construction, sewer and utility purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B171-18 Accepting conveyances for utility and water utility purposes.
- B172-18 Appropriating funds for the Share the Light Program for the purchase of smoke alarms and carbon monoxide alarms to be distributed to low income residents.
- R109-18 Setting a public hearing: setting property tax rates for 2018 for the City of Columbia.

- R110-18 Setting a public hearing: FY 2019 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
- R111-18 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of improvements at the Gans Creek Recreation area to include a cross country course, starting and finishing line structures, a parking lot and ADA walkways.
- R112-18 Transferring funds for future improvements, renovations and security upgrades to the Sanford-Kimpton Building.
- R113-18 Authorizing tolling agreements with telephone companies operating within the City of Columbia during the pendency of any review or audit of payment of gross receipts license taxes and granting further authority.
- R114-18 Authorizing an artist's contract with Beth Nybeck for the Police Precinct/Municipal Service Center North facility Percent for Art project.
- R115-18 Authorizing an agreement with Job Point for vocational skills training.
- R116-18 Authorizing the installation of street lights on Hillsboro Drive and Payson Street, and authorizing the upgrade of street lights in the Rothwell Heights neighborhood.
- R117-18 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. to provide an update to the Passenger Facility Charges (PFC) Program for the Columbia Regional Airport.
- R118-18 Approving the Bank Prospectus for the Hinkson - Perche Creek Proposed Wetland & Stream Mitigation Bank; authorizing submittal of the document to the United States Army Corps of Engineers to obtain regulatory approval for establishment of the mitigation bank.
- 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

- R119-18 Adopting amendments to the City of Columbia, Missouri Strategic Plan - 2016-2019.
- The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Rhodes provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters stated it appeared straightforward to her.

Mayor Treece asked if everyone felt this was consistent with their discussion at the work session. Mr. Skala replied yes.

The vote on R119-18 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.

- B173-18 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code relating to conflicts of interest and financial disclosure procedures.
- B174-18 Setting property tax rates for 2018.
- B175-18 Adopting the FY 2019 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
- B176-18 Amending Chapter 12A of the City Code as it relates to stormwater utility charges.
- B177-18 Amending Chapter 13 of the City Code as it relates to hauled liquid waste rates.
- B178-18 Amending Chapter 17 of the City Code as it relates to Parks and Recreation Fees.
- B179-18 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to the fare for paratransit service.
- B180-18 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to solid waste rates and services.
- B181-18 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to sanitary sewer utility rates.
- B182-18 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to water rates.
- B183-18 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to electric rates.

- B184-18 Authorizing 2018 amendments to the collective bargaining agreement with Laborers' International Union of North America, Local 773.
- B185-18 Voluntary annexation of property located on the north side of Mexico Gravel Road and east of Spring Cress Drive (5705 E. Mexico Gravel Road); establishing permanent R-1 (One-Family Dwelling District) zoning (Case No. 18-131).
- B186-18 Amending the Regulating Plan for the M-DT (Mixed Use-Downtown) District for property located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Fifth Street and Locust Street (205 S. Fifth Street) to designate a proposed school addition as a civic structure; approving a design facade and development parameters (Case No. 18-121).
- B187-18 Approving the Final Plat of Central Missouri Islamic Subdivision Plat 1, a Replat of all of Lots 14, 15, 52 & 53 and the East 30 Feet of Lots 13 and 54 (and the Vacated Alley in Deed Book 483, Page 693) of the Original Town, located on the southwest corner of the intersection of Fifth Street and Locust Street (205 S. Fifth Street); authorizing a performance contract; granting design adjustments relating to utility easement dedication and corner truncations (Case No. 18-122).
- B188-18 Rezoning property located on the west side of Fay Street, between Wilkes Boulevard and Hinkson Avenue, from District IG (Industrial) to District M-N (Mixed Use - Neighborhood) (Case No. 18-132).
- B189-18 Approving the Final Plat of OTA Subdivision - Plat 1 located on the west side of Fay Street, between Wilkes Boulevard and Hinkson Avenue; authorizing a performance contract; granting design adjustments relating to street right-of way width and utility easement dedication (Case No. 18-133).
- B190-18 Approving the Final Plat of The Brooks, Plat No. 1-A located south of Hoylake Drive, approximately 1,700 feet west of Rolling Hills Road; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 18-114).
- B191-18 Accepting conveyances for sidewalk and street purposes.

- B192-18 Accepting conveyances for underground utility, electric utility and water utility purposes.
- B193-18 Approving a revised Gans Creek Recreation Area Master Plan; authorizing construction of improvements at the Gans Creek Recreation area to include a cross country course, starting and finishing line structures, a parking lot and ADA walkways.
- B194-18 Authorizing an amendment to the agreement with Tyler Technologies, Inc. for the Columbia Financial Enterprise Resource System (COFERS) project to replace the Adobe software license agreement with DocOrigin software license agreement.
- B195-18 Authorizing a school resource officer agreement with the Columbia School District.
- B196-18 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for public health emergency preparedness services.
- B197-18 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the 1-2-3-4-5 Fit-Tastic! Early Childhood Education project; appropriating funds.
- B198-18 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Missouri State Emergency Management Agency, in association with the Medical Reserve Corps program, to establish and maintain a registry of volunteer health professionals known as Show-Me Response.

X. REPORTS

- REP68-18 Correspondence from the Finance Advisory And Audit Committee.
- Mayor Treece noted they would return to this when Diane Suhler, a member of the FAAC, returned to the meeting room.
- REP69-18 Correspondence from the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council requesting completion of the Downtown Charrette.
- Mayor Treece commented that he had been on the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DCLC) when the first charrette had been produced, and it had really been to guide Elm Street and the North Village Arts District. He thought they had seen some significant growth and orderly planning in those locations. He understood the DCLC was asking for additional funds to complete the original downtown charrette. He pointed out

he had received an e-mail from the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) indicating they would be willing to contribute \$5,000 from their budget for that effort. He stated he was inclined to hold off on this since they were going through the budget process and could decide whether to move money toward it. In addition, they could determine whether there might be any Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) participation. He recalled the City, the University, and maybe the Downtown CID had split the cost of the Sasaki Plan.

Mr. Thomas stated he supported the completion of the charrette process. He thought it had been an excellent process. They had not implemented it exactly as envisioned, but it had guided them in the right direction.

Mayor Treece thought they had all been enthused by what the Business Loop Community Improvement District (CID) had done, and some of the imaginative spaces there. He stated that had been his takeaway from the first charrette process. He believed there might some benefit for competing the charrette given the built environment they had now, ten years later.

Mr. Skala commented that charrette exercises were often pretty useful and referred to the corridor charrette processes on the east and west sides of town. He thought it had even driven some ideas for which the DCLC was responsible.

Mayor Treece stated he appreciated the DCLC bringing this up and thought they should start moving some funds towards it.

REP68-18

Correspondence from the Finance Advisory And Audit Committee.

Mayor Treece noted he had seen Ms. Suhler enter the room, and asked if she wanted to speak on this topic.

Diane Suhler, a member of the FAAC, explained the FAAC was proposing that the Council appoint a citizens revenue task force to look at options and ideas that would increase revenues for the City. She thought the discussions tonight were a good prelude to that idea. She noted the City was very reliant on sales taxes, property taxes, and fees for its revenues, and sales taxes had been decreasing while property taxes and developer fees had been static or stable. She believed they were at a point where they really needed to revisit the issue of revenues for the City and identify new ideas and paths they should pursue. The FAAC was proposing the Council appoint a citizens task force and suggested it be made up of people from a wide variety of backgrounds, such as business, academia, staff, council, state legislature, etc. to obtain a broad perspective on different possibilities. She thought the proposal outlined some of the constituents they would be interested in having on the task force. She referenced a Brookings Institution study that had been published about a month ago called *City Budgets in an Era of Increased Uncertainty*, and pointed out what they were dealing with in Columbia was not any different than other municipalities. She explained that study looked at ways to address the issue of revenues, and quoted it as saying "municipal budgets are strongest when they have diversified revenue streams and when cities' taxation systems aligned with their economies." She thought this was needed in Columbia as the economy had changed a lot in the last 20-30 years, but the revenue base had not changed to keep up with the economy. She believed they needed to revisit the whole issue of the intersection of revenue streams and economic viability.

Mayor Treece commented that he appreciated the thoroughness of the recommendations, and noted he was intrigued by adding state lawmakers to it because he thought the online sales tax remedy was a potential solution. He felt this was something they should probably explore. He explained he wanted to get through more of the budget process so they understood what that shortfall might be. He viewed that as an early indicator of what some of that could look like, and agreed a broad-based task force would be required given their needs in terms of workforce, public safety, infrastructure, etc.

Mr. Thomas stated he also supported the proposal and liked the fact they had suggested development impact fees as one of the things that should be studied. He believed the

cost of growth study he had mentioned might fit nicely under the umbrella of this task force as a way to oversee an analysis process and public engagement process at the same time.

Mr. Pitzer stated he appreciated comments about looking at the mix of revenues sources, but was not sure he agreed with a task force whose charge was increasing revenues. He felt if they gave a task force that charge, they would come back with some fairly obvious conclusions. He thought examining the revenue base and how that should look going forward for the next 10-20 years would be valuable. He reiterated he would not want the focus to be on increasing revenues. Ms. Suhler thought a better term might be to match revenues with demand, and felt the other side of this task force's charge would be to look at the demand for services and the funding needed to meet those demands. Once they knew the demand, they could determine if revenues needed to be increased or if they were adequate and just needed to be rearranged in terms of how they were received.

Mr. Trapp commented that he was not against the formation of this task force, but did not feel it was a substitute for acting on where they were now. He noted task forces were sometimes a way to not make hard decisions or to push off decisions. He stated there had been problematic budgets almost every year he had been on the Council. There had been a couple years where they had been able to catch up a little after the recession and before the sales tax decline started to accelerate. He commented that this lack of revenue was warping all kinds of things, and it would just accelerate. As the City leadership, he thought they needed to take accountability for it to get them moving in the right direction.

REP70-18 Correspondence from the Disabilities Commission.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas thought they should look at this in the same context as the grants they were giving to private taxi firms to make their vehicles accessible or to purchase new vehicles. He wondered if there was a way to build into that contract a requirement that they provide service on council meeting nights as another option to extending paratransit service.

Mayor Treece thought that was a great idea, and noted he wanted to ensure their meetings were accessible. There were lots of modes of transportation that could work.

Ms. Thompson pointed out the Council would see the grants for the taxis on a future agenda. The original contracts that had been put together had been very specific as to the vehicles the grantee would purchase, but when the grantee attempted to purchase them, they had found out the delay between the Council approval of the contracts and obtaining the specifications of those vehicles had caused them to not be available. They would give the grantee more flexibility in the acquisitions of those vehicles. She noted the result was a little delay in getting the program up and started.

REP71-18 Response from Environment and Energy Commission on B83-18.

Mr. Skala commented that he had been the Chair of the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) when steep slopes had first come up. It had been referred to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) even though it had originated by the EEC. He noted it had been around a long time, and thought they had made some progress on it in terms of 25 percent versus the 3 to 1 grade or 4 to 1 grade. He felt the issue should be retired if it had not been already.

REP72-18 Old 63 Mural.

Ms. Dresser provided a staff report.

Mr. Ruffin asked if a schematic of the design would be available for public view. Ms. Dresser replied she had not talked to Resident Arts about that, but noted she could bring up that topic as possibly an online component of the community feedback session. Mr. Ruffin thought it would be nice to see what was being planned. Ms. Dresser agreed, and pointed out they could reach a wide group of people and not just those that lived in that

corridor that way.

Ms. Peters stated she had heard about this when flyers were distributed to inform people of the information meeting on Wednesday, and asked what special interest groups had been engaged in this discussion that had not included the City. Ms. Dresser replied she was not sure, and noted she would have to follow up with Resident Arts in that regard. Ms. Peters commented that she had heard from one person who was really unhappy with this idea, but had not heard from anyone else. She noted she had tried to send information out to the neighborhoods because she was not sure anyone knew about it. She felt they had put the cart before the horse by deciding to put up a mural with less than two weeks of notice if they planned to paint it on August 18. Mr. Ruffin pointed out it had already started as they had already painted the wall white. Ms. Peters felt it was a rush job with not as much public input than people expected.

Ms. Dresser explained Resident Arts had completed at least three mural projects with the Parks and Recreation Department, and they had followed the same procedure. She thought the meetings with special interest groups were to obtain design input for the targeted groups with which they were partnering. In this case, it would have been related to science and the Hinkson Creek restoration groups. She noted each one of the designs along the MKT Trail had a theme. She reiterated she believed they met with special interest parties with regard to the design, and then brought it to the community and surrounding residents for their general input.

Mr. Ruffin commented that he felt the difference was that the murals on the MKT Trail were not in a residential area. This was similar, but on a more grandeur scale, to the mural that was in the Optimist Park, which had significant input from the people that lived in the area. This would really impact those living near there in terms of whether or not they liked it.

Mr. Matthes stated they had a process outlined here to have public input, and asked if the Council would like it to come back to them before it was painted. Mayor Treece replied yes. Mr. Ruffin commented that if he lived in that area, he would want to see the design and have the opportunity to say yes or no. Mr. Matthes stated this was envisioned to have that community process as there was a meeting on Wednesday to do just that. Mr. Ruffin pointed out they had already started painting the wall. Mayor Treece noted the community painting was scheduled for ten days after the community input meeting. He was not sure how they would make design accommodations. Mr. Matthes explained it would not make that schedule if it were to come back to Council.

Mayor Treece asked for the process for the utility box art. He wondered how that design was approved, how the artist was selected, and how they determined what the appropriate message was for public art. Ms. Dresser replied that was a little different as the City actually commissioned those pieces of art. They were now seeing an interest from outside groups wanting to propose painting an available public surface. She stated they were trying to figure out the best way to process those requests. With traffic boxes, the City would actually put a call out to artists, and it went through the Standing Committee on Public Art. In this situation, the City was asked if that wall was available, and the group was asked to submit a detailed plan for materials to be used, timeline, etc. For the traffic boxes, the design was selected by the Standing Committee on Public Art, and a contract was entered into and accepted by the City for the artist to be commissioned for the design. There was not a public hearing or public comment opportunity on the design unless they were attending a Standing Committee on Public Art meeting. They do allow that opportunity for the larger Percent for Art projects. She did not believe that had been done for the MKT Trail murals either.

Mayor Treece commented that on the consent agenda tonight was a right of use permit for a retaining wall on Stewart Road where the owner wanted to install a brick veneer, and the City had gone through a very public process for it. He stated he might agree with what it looked like and the message, but thought they should retain some control over what was allowed to go there since it was still a public asset. He felt it needed more

process.

Ms. Peters asked if they should ask Resident Arts to delay the painting until they had the interested parties meeting and the issue was brought back to the City Council at the August 20 meeting. She commented that it was impressive that they had received a \$10,000 grant to do this, and she did not want to mess up the timeline completely, but there seemed to be a lack of public input even though there had been special interest group input. She stated she wanted to allow for public input and for it to come back at the August 20 meeting. Mayor Treece agreed that needed to be done at a minimum, and asked if anyone objected. No one objected.

Mr. Matthes stated staff would try to meet that deadline depending on the work of the group in terms of if they were ready by then or not. He noted that if they were not ready, City staff would not let them proceed until the Council had seen it.

REP73-18

Solid Waste Residential Curbside Collection Status.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked that they receive a report discussing how this problem could be solved. She wondered if they needed to go to automated trash pick-up, what that would cost, if it was something the City would be able to do, or if it would need to be outsourced. She wanted to know how to address this issue as it appeared it had been going on for a long time. Mr. Matthes replied it had been going on for a long time, and like every service the City provided, they were struggling right now. This service was a particularly difficult job. It was more dangerous than policing statistically. It was similar to sewer work statistically speaking. It was a physically dangerous job, and the method the City used was the least efficient, most expensive, and the hardest on the employees. He noted they had gone through a process a few years ago that had resulted in a ballot, and they had honored the results of that ballot, which said not to change anything. It was, however, getting harder and harder to attract people to the job, so they were at a point where they would have to do something out of the ordinary to continue in the long term. He commented that they were struggling with an incredibly low unemployment rate and did not compete well in the hiring process, especially since the job was hard and had to be done in extreme weather conditions. He praised the Solid Waste Division for getting the work done in these conditions, and noted managers were out driving trucks and picking up trash. They all pitched in, and they pulled from other parts of the organization to get the work done along with hiring temporary employees. He commented that they had gone through temporary employment agencies because the workers compensation was just too great. He explained they were paying more to get through the current crisis, but in the long term, the economy would have to change so people were attracted to the job or they would have to make it more attractive by improving the quality of the job or paying significantly more than they did now.

Ms. Peters understood this was an enterprise fund, and asked why they could not pay the employees at the median or higher. She wondered what they would have to raise the solid waste rates to in order to retain employees. She noted she also wanted to know the cost of switching to a different system or if they needed to outsource the work. Mr. Matthes replied it was easy to compare themselves to cities that provided trash service in the same way to work in terms of the pay scale, but the number of those cities was dwindling. He noted the surrounding cities all used a different method, i.e. roll carts, so it was difficult for comparison purposes. He stated they could do a pay comparison and chose a number.

Mr. Thomas understood that if they went to roll carts, it would completely change the pricing structure.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he felt this was similar to the electric utility in terms of pay equity across all City employees. Ms. Peters stated she had just asked about trash, but thought it could be expanded to all of the enterprise funds. Mr. Pitzer understood there had been a reluctance to do that historically because it created disparities.

Mr. Matthes explained the policy resolution the Council had adopted in 2013 for the pay

philosophy of the City had an emphasis on internal equity as well as external competitiveness. It had created the pay system they had and had accounted for almost anything, but they had not had the ability to fund it entirely on a citywide basis since its adoption. He noted they were trying to not leave one group behind. They did not want to create the situation they had previously when someone doing the same job in a different department was being paid significantly more because that department could afford it. It was an equity issue internally. The overhaul of the system was to be fair across job descriptions. They recognized different jobs were different, but if one was doing the same job in a different department, it should be at the same pay scale. He reiterated that had been fixed, but there was now a bit of drag on the entire group because they had limitations in certain departments due to revenues. He noted the Council had the ability to raise utility rates for operating and maintenance if it involved an enterprise fund to provide raises, but there needed to be a balance because there were other departments that did not have that option.

Mr. Skala commented that the testimony given had been distressing in terms of the differential in pay of the permanent sanitation workers versus the temporary employees. It made one think everyone would quit and work for the temporary employment agency. He noted he was not sure how much that agency was making, but the differential was significant. He wondered how much money was being spent contracting out the work, similar to the situation with the line workers. He commented that he wanted reports showing what they were actually spending for temp and contract work. Mr. Matthes explained the use of contract workers and temporary employment agencies was a last ditch effort because it was more expensive, but it was hard to compare because it was that company's fully-loaded rate, which included their human resources time, training time, etc. It was their total cost to the City's hourly rate. They really needed to compare the totals against one another. He reiterated the use of contract workers was not the preferred solution in solving service needs.

Mr. Thomas stated he believed the pay policy was well intentioned, but wondered if they should consider tweaking it. If people in different departments were essentially doing the same job and one was funded through the general fund and the other funded through an enterprise fund, there should not be an advantage of having a more available funding source for pay raises. He pointed out no other employees in other departments were doing the job those in the trash trucks were doing, only the Police Department was sending people to dangerous areas to risk their lives, and only the electric line workers were stringing electric lines. He suggested the policy be adapted to allow individual departments, including general fund departments, to negotiate separate pay raises for particular classes of employees that were not represented in other departments. Mr. Matthes suggested a work session about this issue as it was complicated. He explained a counterpoint was by addressing the issue for one group of employees in the department, the other employee groups in that department would be justifiably upset. He commented that the point of Mr. Thomas was correct in that whether they only move as fast as the slowest boat they had or if there was a way to mix efforts to come up with a solution, and it was something that needed to be discussed.

Mayor Treece commented that there had been City employees that had received raises in the past five years. Mr. Matthes agreed, and noted every City employee had. Mayor Treece understood some had received more than others, and not all employees were treated the same. Mr. Matthes stated that was true. Mayor Treece understood unclassified employees had been given dramatic raises, much more than the hard working solid waste employees had.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Sorrell if he had a cost of what it would take to move all of the refuse collectors to the midpoint. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not have that off of the top of his head. Mayor Treece asked if it could be made available by Monday. Mr. Sorrell replied yes. He commented that the cost to move all 116 full-time equivalent positions in the Solid Waste Division up by \$1 an hour would be about 60 cents per month on every

customer's bill. Mayor Treece asked how many of those 116 total employees were above the midpoint. Mr. Sorrell replied he could provide that information on Monday as he did not have that information tonight. Mayor Treece commented that he did not believe they needed to raise the pay for everyone, but if they were to talk about equity, he thought some of these employees should be moved to the midpoint. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Sorrell for the budget surplus in the Solid Waste Division last year. Mr. Sorrell replied he could provide that on Monday as well. Mayor Treece also asked for the percentage of the budget this year that had been spent or encumbered based on the third quarter report.

Mayor Treece explained for the Monday, August 13 budget work session, he wanted to know the cost to move those employees that were not at midpoint to the midpoint for every department and division they had heard were having these types of issues, i.e. electric utility, refuse collectors, police, firefighters, etc.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding the midpoint. Mayor Treece replied it was a part of the City's pay plan. There was a low, mid, and high end of that range. As they had heard from the lieutenants, there were people that made their deal going in above midpoint. Others look at the salary range and felt if they worked hard, played by the rules, etc., they would receive raises up to that midpoint. Mr. Thomas commented that if they moved everyone to midpoint, it would not be the midpoint anymore. Mayor Treece explained it was the midpoint of that pay range for that job. Mr. Thomas understood these were defined in City policy. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Mayor Treece commented that according to ABC17, 78 percent of City employees were below their midpoint. The 22 percent that were above the midpoint were the supervisors, managers, and directors. He thought they needed to prioritize employees to get them to the midpoint, or at least have a path. Mr. Thomas understood they had discussed the fact people should be able to get to the midpoint within five years of service or something similar. Mayor Treece asked about those people that had been here seven years, and were not at midpoint. Mr. Thomas agreed they should be the top priority.

Mayor Treece commented that on Monday, he would like to make a motion that they create a bucket for employee raises, and they could ask directors how they would like to fill that bucket. If they could not help to fill that bucket, he would suggest they start making cuts to put money in that bucket that could then be used to reward some of these employees for their work. Mr. Matthes pointed out cuts had been made to provide the 25 cent an hour raise. It did not, however, go as far as the need.

Mayor Treece understood Mr. Trapp had a great idea to renew the one time performance payment for a second time. He noted he did not like doing it as a one-time action, and suggested they challenge themselves to provide a meaningful raise and to continue to provide it into the future. The consequence of that was if they could not fund it at some point in the future, there would have to be pay cuts. He thought they were seeing sufficient budget surpluses. In addition, he understood Mr. Thomas had a question about sales tax collection and whether they were higher than anticipated. He wanted to put some of those dollars in that bucket to address some very compelling needs.

Mr. Skala asked if the range was established by the Human Resources Department in comparison to benchmark cities. Mr. Matthes replied yes. Mr. Thomas understood it was the midpoint of a national metric for that job. Mr. Matthes stated it was national sometimes as each job had a different comparison base. Some jobs were only provided by cities so they compared themselves to only cities in the Midwest. Depending on the job description, there were different benchmark cities, companies, or industries checked to calculate the pay range. He pointed out the City had not had the money to move those ranges the last few years. Mr. Thomas understood part of that was because of adherence to the Council policy about raising everyone the same. Mr. Matthes stated it was not necessarily about treating everyone the same, but they had run out of money before they could fund the other parts of the pay plan. The pay plan accommodated the fact that jobs were different. They had not had the funds to fully fund it so they emphasis was on those that made the least, which was why they had proposed a flat rate increase

because it maximized the funds to those that made the least. He noted the department directors had felt passionately about that when going through the budget process.

Mr. Thomas understood the City could consider raising the utility rates in the enterprise funds to provide more substantial increases in those areas. They would then have to discuss how they could replenish the general fund. Mr. Matthes felt that was the issue. They had to determine how to create a sustainable source of revenue to pay those raises as they were permanent increases. Mr. Thomas commented that one source could come from the cost of growth study by adequately recouping the cost of expanding infrastructure instead of allowing sales tax and property tax dollars to go to those expansion costs. Mr. Matthes explained that if they wanted to take this as a whole system issue, there were things that could create a domino effect. If they fixed something in one place, it could address an issue in another area even though it was not a direct funding scenario.

Mr. Trapp commented that he felt the issue with the solid waste workers had more to do with inadequate comparisons even though a few were tenured enough for the move to midpoint. He was not sure they had compared apples to apples. He pointed out the City had a particularly dangerous and difficult way to do trash collection, and thought they might have based the comparisons on automated systems. He did not feel they necessarily had to abandon their pay philosophy or how they budgeted in order to set that right. He believed they had to deal with the salary issue to determine if that might help with recruitment and retention before looking at reexamining automated systems. He thought they had to take that off of the table otherwise there would be another petition and referendum election. He understood what Mayor Treece was attempting to do, but was concerned with raising expenses or getting into the reserves as it provided a strong bond rating and some financial stability.

Mr. Pitzer asked for a report or analysis with regard to what would be involved in privatizing trash collection. As it became more and more difficult for the City to provide that service, he believed it was an option that should be considered. He was not sure of the pros, cons, ins, and outs of it, which was why he wanted expert analysis of it. He thought they were outsourcing a lot of the service now anyway, but they were doing it in the most expensive and least efficient way possible. If this was truly a long-term structural problem, it would behoove them to at least consider it. He commented that trash collection was the most commonly privatized city service around the country, and private companies were very good and very efficient in doing it. He explained he was not sure how it would be structured, which was why he wanted more information. He wondered how contracts would be done, how rates would be set, whether it was legal, the effect on the landfill, recycling efforts, power generated at the landfill, hazardous waste collection, etc. He noted he would not be able to speak intelligently about whether it was a good idea or not until they had these answers and had a public discussion. He asked that this information be included in any report that came back to them on this subject.

Mr. Skala commented that he had been around for the last trash war in terms of roll carts versus trash bags. He recalled about 90 percent of those attending the information session in the Third Ward had not wanted them to abandon the bags in spite of the information and the potential of a hybrid system. He was glad the issue had been decided by initiative petition. He noted the concern some had with contractors was that the City would lose control with the ability to set rates. In addition, the concern with roll carts was that they would blow down the street, would not be taken care of, and were hard to clean. The beauty of the bag was that it could be placed at the end of the driveway, and then it was gone. No one had to come back for a roll cart, find a place to store it, etc. He commented that he was not saying the issue should not be revisited, but those were some of the conversations had the last time.

Mr. Pitzer clarified he was not speaking solely with regard to roll carts. He was talking about the entire operation.

Ms. Peters explained she had been involved as well as she had run for the City Council

for the first time when roll carts were being discussed, and Mr. Skala was correct in that there had been an incredible amount of angst about roll carts in terms of how dangerous, smelly, and poorly they worked, the fact they had to be pulled back to the house, how ugly they were, the fact there was not a place to store them, etc. What had not been addressed was the fact they needed the trash picked up, and that it needed to be picked up in a safe fashion. She felt it was a problem to say it was okay to allow employees to be injured while doing this dangerous work because some people did not want to roll a roll cart back up to the house. She noted the option previously was for three different sizes, and there was not any reason they had to be ugly. She thought the roll carts could be painted so they were more interesting to view. She believed they needed to address the issue, and at this point they were only asking for more information to help address the issue.

Mayor Treece commented that if they were going to discuss roll carts, he thought staff should meet with Local 773 about it to obtain the input from employees. Mr. Trapp understood they had not been in support of it last time. Ms. Peters asked if that was because they would go down to one person per truck versus two people per truck. Mr. Trapp replied he thought their representative had indicated some job loss concerns. Ms. Peters pointed out they only had half as many people as they needed now. Mr. Matthes commented that it was the highest turnover job in the City.

REP74-18

Solid Waste Utility Compost Operation and Food Waste Collection Programs.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood there was the potential expansion of food waste collection and composting programs, and asked for clarification. Mr. Hunt replied they were proposing to purchase some equipment and food waste roll carts so they could begin collecting food waste in the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) as part of the fiscal year 2019 budget. Thus far, fifteen businesses had indicated an interest in participating in the program. He assumed that number would go up as they continued discussions with businesses. Mr. Thomas asked if they would pay for this service. Mr. Hunt replied yes. Currently, all of the solid waste rates for the businesses and residences in the Downtown CID came specifically from the cost they incurred to provide them service, which included trash and recycling, and the food waste would be included. Mr. Thomas asked if it was one contract with the Downtown CID or individual customer relations with each individual property owner. Mr. Hunt replied it was solid waste billing all of the customers within the Downtown CID. They had identified all of the customers within the Downtown CID for a portion of the solid waste budget, which involved tracking revenues and expenses specifically for those customers and basing the rates for those customers on that cost relationship.

Mr. Thomas asked how those rates compared to residential and commercial rates in other parts of the City. Mr. Hunt replied solid waste rates were rather complicated. They had different rates for different types of dumpsters. Those outside the Downtown CID paid a different rate based upon the type of dumpster, size of the dumpster, and the number of times the dumpster was emptied per week. In the Downtown CID, the rate was based on the type of business and the size of the business. A bank would pay a rate specific to that type of business while a restaurant would pay a rate specific to that type of business. The reason was because all of the customers in the downtown shared containers. He noted there was a compactor behind City Hall, and any customer in the downtown could use that compactor.

Mr. Thomas understood the food waste program would be a little different because it was an opt-in program, and asked what would be the incentive beyond wanting to see food waste be composted versus it going to the landfill. Mr. Hunt replied the incentive they were pitching to the businesses was that it would be an improvement of service. Currently, complaints with regard to solid waste issues in the downtown were primarily

food waste related. The bulk of the issues they had in the downtown involved the odors of the dumpsters, which were food waste related, and the fact the food waste was rather heavy so some food waste ended up on the ground on the way to or next to the dumpster instead of into the dumpster. Mr. Thomas understood 15 downtown businesses were willing to pay extra in order to have this service. Mr. Hunt explained that if the fiscal year 2019 budget was approved, it would be January or February before the truck and roll carts would be ordered, and they would only have the last six months of fiscal year 2019 to do the program and determine a cost. Mr. Thomas understood it would be a free pilot program for about six months. Mr. Hunt explained the City was currently picking up the trash regardless of whether the customer put it in a roll cart for them to pick up or in a bag taken to the dumpster. They were trying to determine if picking up the food waste separately would be more or less expensive, and would adjust the Downtown CID rates as needed in the future.

Mr. Thomas asked about the rest of the City. Mr. Hunt replied 25 businesses outside of the Downtown CID participated, and they had a Tuesday/Thursday route around town to pick up food waste. Mr. Thomas asked if they paid extra for it. Mr. Hunt replied it was 85 percent of the trash rate. They received a 15 percent reduction in the rate for putting their food waste in the food waste dumpster versus the trash dumpster. The reason was that the food waste did not go into the landfill, and was used for a compost operation. The City was not paying the State the \$2.11 tip fee, and it was not taking up landfill space. Mr. Thomas asked if there were plans to expand that program to more businesses. Mr. Hunt replied they could. He commented that they provided service to those wanting service, but with the staffing shortages it would be difficult to say they would start doing that four days per week or something more. If they could solve the staffing issue, they would be more than happy to provide additional days of the week for food waste collection.

Mr. Thomas asked why the City was opposed to licensing private haulers to collect food waste and regulating them appropriately to mitigate any public health or other concern. Mr. Hunt replied that specific ordinance had been put into place originally because of a general health concern. He noted the service was privately contracted and openly competitive to anyone that wanted to provide those hauling services in the City of Springfield. He explained he had been told it was fairly common to see five or six different companies coming through a neighborhood every week. It was a lot more trucks on the road, which would result in more wear and tear of the streets and emissions. Mr. Thomas thought it could be bid more on a franchise basis by allowing only one or two companies to provide the service. Mr. Hunt agreed. He explained the City collected food waste and composted it, and currently, they were not seeing a big demand for the compost. He noted they spent about \$400,000 per year on the yard waste/compost operation, which involved running the two yard waste drop off sites and the site at the landfill to grind up all of the yard waste into mulch and compost that material with the food waste and other organics collected. In return, they sold about \$15,000 per year. Mr. Thomas understood it was a losing proposition financially.

REP75-18

Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

Mayor Treece commented that he had noticed \$1.9 million had been transferred from the non-motorized transportation grant to the Shepard to Rollins trail, but the staff report to Council for that portion of the project had only been \$1.55 million, and asked for clarification about the difference. Mr. Nichols replied this was the last of the GetAbout funds so they were transferring all remaining funds into the project. At this time, they still estimated project construction at \$1.55 million, but they were in right-of-way negotiations now, and there could be legal right-of-way issues. He reiterated they had just placed all remaining funds in the project. Once the project was done, any remaining funds would transfer back to another project or a report would come to Council with suggestions on how to use the remaining funds, which might include marketing, wayfinding, signage, etc. Mr. Thomas understood they were closing down the GetAbout funds. Mr. Nichols stated

it was the last project. He pointed out there was a concern that the longer it took to construct would mean higher costs for steel, etc. due to the tariffs, but right now they still anticipated \$1.55 million for construction.

Mayor Treece thought it was too bad they could not build a sewer line with a bike path on it. Mr. Thomas understood they were putting the bike path on the sewer line. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct in a lot of cases.

Mayor Treece understood there was a transfer of personnel dollars into capital and asked for clarification. Mr. Nichols explained they had not had the ability to make fleet replacements recently. Mayor Treece asked if the personnel dollars were related to this fiscal year. Mr. Nichols replied they were down a couple staff members in Engineering Division, and 13 out of 44 people in the Street Division. He pointed out this was the first time in his 13 years that they had to contract out chip seal work. He commented that they had to maintain the streets and this was their way of getting around the shortage of not having enough people to do the work. Mayor Treece asked about the maintenance trucks and a paint striper. Mr. Nichols stated they needed a new paint striper. Mayor Treece asked if that work was done in-house. Mr. Nichols replied yes. The current paint striper was old. It had been the right purchase years ago, but was now obsolete. They needed new equipment so both sprayers would work. They currently had to paint the yellow stripe, change out the container, and then paint the white stripe. It was very inefficient. They were in need of replacements and had not had the ability for fleet purchases in several years. These savings allowed them to upgrade that one critical piece of equipment.

Mayor Treece understood the Public Works Department had empty positions, and on the other hand, they had solid waste workers showing up doing their job. He wondered how they moved some of those personnel dollars. Mr. Thomas understood the Public Works Department was funded from the general fund for the most part while the Solid Waste Division was funded from the utility fee.

Mayor Treece noted he had asked about \$215,000 of Information Technology Department money at the meeting three weeks ago. Mr. Matthes replied that they were preparing a response.

Mayor Treece asked if the money had been transferred. Mr. Matthes replied yes, and explained the report reported on transfers that had occurred.

Mayor Treece thought they should look very carefully at those departments that continued to have unused personnel dollars during the budget process.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the funding for the paint striper was from prior year savings. Mr. Nichols replied they had some funding from prior year savings, but needed a little more to make the final purchase from this year's budget. He noted it was a very expensive piece of equipment.

Mr. Pitzer asked how it was decided within a current year to transfer personnel money to capital. Mr. Matthes replied it was a common practice. If they were through half of the year or three-fourths of the year and in this situation of being unable to fill some jobs due to a low unemployment rate, there would be savings even if they were able to fill the positions later. Because they had ten years of cuts, there had been four years without a fleet replacement. This allowed them to solve a problem they had. Mr. Pitzer understood they typically did that through the incentive based budgeting program with savings, but within the current year, the Council had appropriated a certain amount of money to spend on personnel, and asked for the threshold for coming to Council and asking to spend that money on something other than for what it had been appropriated. Mr. Matthes replied it was an internal to the department transfer. The current policy was this method, and reporting that transfer to the Council. Mr. Pitzer commented that they had not approved spending the money on a paint striper. Mr. Matthes explained the budget was a spending limit by service line where they tried to accommodate the expenses they believed would occur almost two years in advance, and the practice was to transfer throughout the year to provide the service as necessary.

Mr. Pitzer commented that some departments consistently underspent personnel dollars and believed that money should be available for other services. He knew it could not be predicted to the dollar, but they could go back and review a long period of time to determine a percentage because they were hamstrung in budgeting by allocating those dollars strictly to personnel. Mr. Matthes explained the complication was that it changed every year. It would be an easy decision if the same jobs were open each year, but they were not, and they were jobs that were eventually filled whereby they were not open the following year. He noted the department with the largest unspent budget was the Police Department. Mr. Pitzer pointed out it was that way year after year after year. Mr. Matthes reiterated they were different jobs. He commented that once they reached a certain size organization, there would be a carrying cost for getting through the year. In every department, there would be people that retired, quit, etc. He noted there would always be a personnel savings since they budgeted for the maximum spend because not all jobs were filled for the entire year. In addition, they could not predict which ones would come open and at what times. Mr. Pitzer stated he would not belabor the issue tonight, but thought it was worth discussing further on Monday.

Mayor Treece stated he agreed with Mr. Pitzer. The budget presented to the Council had line items for personnel, equipment, operations, etc., which were approved. To move them around without the approval of Council was not an acceptable appropriation authority. Mr. Matthes stated that was something they should discuss as it would be a change in policy, and was in the purview of Council to change. Mayor Treece asked for the policy. Mr. Matthes replied staff would provide it to Council. Mayor Treece asked if there was a written policy. Mr. Matthes replied there were a lot of things staff needed to get to the Council in that regard.

Mr. Skala noted the Council could refuse this transfer of funds. Mr. Matthes stated they would need to change the policy as this was a report of something that had occurred. He thought they would want to create a policy indicating the Council would do all of the transfers. Mr. Matthes explained these were considered administrative because they were within the same departmental budget, and was usually for the same service provision. He pointed out they also had "holding" accounts for certain fund sources and grants where the money was held, and that money was later transferred to specific projects as needed. If money was left over, it was transferred back. This report was where they saw that activity.

Mayor Treece reiterated his request to see the policy, and asked if more than what had been appropriated could be spent. Mr. Matthes replied no. He stated the budget was the limit of spend. Within it, there was some room to maneuver as they administered programs, but they could not go above the ceiling set. Mr. Pitzer clarified that was by department. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer noted they had gone above what the Council had authorized for equipment or capital for the Public Works Department in this case. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. He explained they had the administrative decision making now to transfer funds when there was an opportunity.

Mr. Ruffin asked if that transfer process happened within each department. Mr. Matthes replied yes. He commented that small departments did not really have this opportunity. If they had three people and went through the year with them, they would not have any savings in personnel, or if they had projects that did not come in under budget, money could not be moved to other projects. This tended to occur in the larger departments in terms of projects and staffing. Mr. Ruffin asked Mr. Matthes if he trusted the department heads to make these intra-departmental transfers as they saw the need arise. Mr. Matthes replied yes.

Mayor Treece asked how they preserved integrity in the budgeting process if the budget request presented to Council with dollar amounts down to the nearest dollar for personnel, operating, and non-operating expenses could just be changed the day after the Council approved the budget. Mr. Matthes replied the budget was the best guess when it was established. It was a spending plan, and they would never be able to follow

the plan exactly because events would occur that were different than envisioned when developing it. It was the reason it was done at a level that did not require coming back to Council. It was an administrative role in the current approach they had.

Mr. Ruffin stated he certainly did not want to have to approve every single intra-departmental transfer for all departments. He thought they had to provide department heads some authority to make those transfers. Mr. Matthes stated that was the current approach. He pointed out it was different if it was between departments because that was taking money from one service line to another.

Mayor Treece commented that if a department was saying they needed 100 people to do the job and were given 100 people, and then determined they could do it with 85 people instead while buying new equipment, he was not sure why the Council was needed. He pointed out they were elected to make those decisions. Mr. Matthes explained that was not the thought process that occurred. They needed the 100 people and the equipment budget, but they had cut the equipment budget because it was what could be cut. These were unique circumstances that resulted in these reports.

Mr. Ruffin commented that this was one example, but if they made that a policy that applied to all departments, it would become overwhelming for the Council to make all of those administrative decisions with regard to transferring funds.

Ms. Peters stated she felt they had competent staff that could take care of this. She explained her frustration was the fact they needed 100 people and only had 85. She was not sure if it was low salaries or the unemployment rate, but they could not hire the other 15 people needed, and they did not have the necessary equipment. In addition, the incentive based budgeting process was asking them to continue to be mindful of how much money was spent and where they could corners. She stated she had a problem with this approach because it was only good for a year or two. Doing this every year over and over meant they would continue without the proper personnel needed. She agreed with Mr. Ruffin in that she did not want to micromanage them, but also thought it was frustrating to see these transfers from personnel to equipment when they were short-staffed. Mr. Nichols pointed out they would prefer to have the staff. He reiterated they had never contracted out some of the services they had this year, and it was a result of the number of staff and the expertise needed to do the work. He referred to the chip seal operation, and explained they still had a commitment to improve the roads to the condition needed. He reiterated they would prefer to have the staff.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, encouraged the Council to think about the control the legislative body had, and did not feel the Council was getting information about the budget. He thought they wanted to approve a budget that had a relationship of personnel costs with equipment, product, etc., and for that to be within certain ranges. He did not feel they should continue doing things how they had been done in the past just because it had already been done that way. He suggested they rethink the budget categories and what they would approve. In order for the Council to have meaningful oversight and control when setting the budget, they would likely have to deal with intra-departmental transfers. He commented that it was extremely disappointing that Ms. Nix was leaving as she had the knowledge and ethical compass to lead them through rethinking the process. He was not sure the person that would replace her would be able to do it. He congratulated and encouraged the Council to not let go of this one whit.

Mr. Clark felt the request for a report on the surplus in the Solid Waste Division would be meaningless. He suggested they look at the cost of service study from 2015 as there were multiple units within the Solid Waste Division. He noted there was a massive surplus in residential trash collection while the other units had not shown any meaningful profit or loss. He suggested they get the revenue flows and costs for all of the units to a point where they were paying their fair share. He stated he did not trust staff and felt the roll cart issue had been a gimmick to fund the \$7.5 million investment in the landfill with

excess money from residential trash collection. It had been bad faith on their part. He believed adequate salaries could be paid to have a full complement of trash collectors, and it was not done due to other agendas. He asked the Council to rein those types of things in through the budgeting process this year.

Traci Wilson-Kleekamp commented that she was with Race Matters, Friends, and stated she was noticing a common theme. As layperson, she expected to be able to understand this stuff clearly. She did not feel she should have to draw a map to try to understand how the pieces worked together. She explained one issue was whether growth paid for itself and another was how the money moved, and the public did not trust what was happening. She commented that they had a morale problem in that they did not have enough people, the people were overworked, and the people were not being paid properly. She stated something was really wrong. There was not internal organizational justice or external organizational justice. She believed part of the problem was communication, and another part of the problem was deception by Mr. Matthes. She explained she did not feel he was transparent. She commented that people were frustrated and a meeting in the middle was needed to resolve these issues so employees were happy and the things needed were being funded. She stated she did not have the answers, but felt trying to determine what was going on was very confusing. She felt it was up to the Council to figure it out and make it presentable and easy for the public to follow. They had to do a better job of managing Mr. Matthes and the information, and communicating that to the public.

Steve Callis, 6304 W. Normandy Lane, explained over half of the food waste generated nationwide was from residential sources according to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), and the City currently had no effort in place other than composting workshops to divert residential food waste from the landfill. He understood REP74-18 had indicated that since 2013, there had been a decrease in the tonnage of food waste collected due in part to the cost of collection. If private carriers were allowed to collect food waste, subject to free market competition, they would be likely to offer collection service at competitive prices. REP74-18 had also outlined plans to expand food waste collection only in the Downtown CID to five days per week. He understood there was also a plan to purchase a larger compost turner. All of that was contingent on approval of the FY19 budget request. There was not any mention of additional greenhouse gases or wear and tear on City roadways from this expansion of service or any other plan if the FY19 budget request was not approved. Any increased collection and processing cost with a private carrier would be covered by subscriber payments. He noted REP74-18 had referred to a waste composition survey that had been conducted by the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (DNR) in 2016 that had showed over 31,000 tons of food waste was in the waste stream. During that time period, the solid waste utility had collected 255 tons of food waste. He reiterated the tonnage collected had been in steady decline since 2013 and projections for an increase in tonnage collected in FY19 was contingent upon the budget request being approved for expansion of services. He commented that the prohibition of private hauling of garbage, including food waste was prohibited by ordinances that had been passed 50 years ago because private haulers were not properly collecting and disposing of garbage. He thought it was important to note private haulers were allowed to carry liquid waste, and noted he had not been aware of any major spill problems with those liquid waste haulers and there was not any reason to assume private haulers carrying food waste would have that issue either. He stated the food waste collected by private haulers would be removed to composting facilities and diverted from the landfill, which was consistent with the National Mayor's Challenge and the direction of the Mayor's Task Force on Climate Action and Adaptation Planning. He urged the Council to move forward in approving ordinance changes to allow private carriers to collect food waste.

Julie Ryan stated she was representing the COMO Safe Water Coalition and explained that after nearly two years of involvement, they joined citizens in doubt of the City's intention to follow through with necessary timely decisions for the best interest of the community. They needed to know Council would hold the Water and Light Department and the City Manager accountable for the planned projects and future upgrades moving forward. They hoped to see the City hold the utility accountable for the chosen strategy, knowing the 2016 Black and Veatch condition assessment pointed out the risk of failure with this proposed plan. She noted citizens needed to know developer impact fees should cover their fair share of expansion to the infrastructure moving forward, and current ratepayers would instead see benefits that would translate to improve water quality that met specific goals. She stated the bond could not be voted on by line item so voters could not pick and choose which projects to endorse and which to vote down. They had an all or nothing option. She did not feel it was acceptable for ratepayers to be threatened with higher rates by voting down this bond when it represented years of neglected repairs, especially without any specific water quality goals, without the promise of solid accountability, and not offering true transparency and a planned short term strategy to improve water quality. She commented that a recent research study completed by the University of Missouri and published on March 26, 2018 had found in a nationwide survey that members of the public were more willing to pay for improved water quality than other ecosystem services. She wondered what it said for a water bond, which was an investment in infrastructure that protected the City's drinking water, to be questioned by residents, and what it said to the elected and appointed City leaders that the citizens had lost so much confidence in the operation of the utilities that they were willing to use a water bond as a teaching moment. If citizens voted the bond down, she questioned what it would say to potential future investors. She stated they might vote yes to allow needed funding for these projects, but would vote no on this type of continued treatment as customers of the water utility.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, thanked the Council for getting into the transfer of funds. He commented that Mr. Matthes could not help what he was doing, and thought he might need to be encouraged to change his ways, and that the Council was in charge of him.

Mr. Elkin stated he would think the Department of Public Health and Human Services would take a lot of interest in the subject of food waste, and wondered if they were growing mosquitos, which would lead to the West Nile disease, in the downtown due to dirty trash cans.

Mr. Elkin commented that he received a \$25 increase for living in his mobile home around the first of the year. He noted he was on fixed income, and that increase had resulted in \$300 per year, and he had only received an increase of \$1 per month from social security. He understood the mobile home park had new silent owners, and that water meters would be installed. In addition, they would likely have a trash and sewer discussion again. He wondered if that would result in another \$50 per month.

Mr. Skala asked that information regarding the sanitation workers be added to the report they would receive with regard to the line workers as both were utilizing contract services. He wanted that information to determine the potential for salary increases across the board.

Mr. Skala noted there had been an interesting discussion about recording minutes for certain City boards and commissions. He asked for cost estimates for first and second tier boards and commissions. The two that had been mentioned were the FAAC and the CPRB. He wanted an idea of costs or any necessary guidelines to at least bulk up the information in the minutes so people were better able to understand it. He noted he was

not suggesting complete transcripts.

Mr. Skala commented that he wanted to lend his endorsement for a task force on new revenues. He thought they could use all of the help they could get. He stated he would be an advocate with Mr. Thomas to revisit the idea of development fees as an option, and felt it would be beneficial to obtain input from a task force such as that one. He noted he agreed with Mr. Trapp in that they had to conduct business in the interim, and believed the information the boards and commissions provided Council was invaluable. That information along with the information staff provided helped them make decisions.

Mr. Skala stated he had been prepared to give a debriefing with regard to his experience with the Racial Equity and Leadership (REAL) Council as part of the pre-council meeting, but they had run out of time. He requested time on a future pre-council meeting or work session.

Mr. Trapp commented that there was a metal structure on the roof of the ARTlandish Art Gallery in the North Village Arts District, and understood John Ott wanted to put a North Village Arts District sign on it to highlight the area. He passed around a proposed rendering. He understood the Unified Development Code (UDC) did not allow that type of signage, and thought a legislative fix might be needed.

Mayor Treece asked if the box was already there. Mr. Trapp replied yes. Mayor Treece asked if it was an HVAC screen. Mr. Trapp replied yes. He commented that it was not particularly unattractive, but thought it could be a nice location for a sign. It would not be for any particular business or advertising. It would be for wayfinding and to designate that district and the idea of an arts district. He felt it was appropriate. He noted the law was difficult in that it was appropriate and fine for most situations, but sometimes there was a need to use their legislative authority for a quicker fix. He stated it was something he would support. He asked for an ordinance that would allow this sign.

Mayor Treece asked if this could go to the Board of Adjustment. Mr. Trapp replied it could, but there was expense and uncertainty with it. In addition, it was something beneficial to the Arts District versus any particular property owner.

Mr. Thomas explained he planned to ask the Council to support him on three items for one-time expenses from the surplus funds when they started addressing the budget next Monday. One was the cost of growth study he had mentioned earlier tonight. He understood Mr. Clubine had done some research and noted he planned to research it himself as well to determine a reasonable amount that should be set aside. Another item was an elasticity study to determine whether charging a \$5 per night fee to park a vehicle would actually affect usage at the Columbia Regional Airport. If it would not, he felt that would be a reasonable way to augment the revenue of the Airport and shift some of the transportation sales tax subsidy going to the Airport to the bus system, which would suffer mightily in the new budget. The last item was to increase the grant the City provided Columbia Access Television (CAT), a valuable partner in the community dialogue, as it provided a voice to people on civic issues. He understood they had received \$200,000 per year for five years as part of a comprehensive public, education, and government broadcasting system structure that funded the City Channel and CAT, the public channel. That amount had been aggressively reduced, and at the moment, they were only receiving \$35,000 per year, which was a struggle for them even though they had a lot of community support. He wanted to see a longer term vision to raise the amount back up to about \$100,000 per year. He understood that was unlikely within the regular budget this year, but thought they could provide them some one-time funds while developing a plan for a permanent increase in the future.

Ms. Peters asked for a report on the barriers they needed to address in terms of the

internet sales tax. She understood one was the use tax that had failed and likely needed to come back with more robust education. She wondered what needed to be done at the state and federal level as well as the local level. She understood the Supreme Court felt they should be able to collect sales tax, but she was not sure that impacted the legislative branch of government. She reiterated she wanted a detailed report on what they needed to address to try to recoup the sales taxes they were losing due to internet sales.

Mr. Thomas stated he strongly supported that strategy. He thought they had to be aggressive in figuring out how to recoup the sales taxes they were losing from internet sales.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 11:38 p.m.