



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### City Council

---

Monday, December 3, 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, December 3, 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 RUFFIN (left the meeting at approximately 9:33 p.m.), TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, and TREECE were present. The Interim City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of November 5, 2018 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Ruffin.

Mayor Treece asked that B297-18 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

Mr. Pitzer asked that B310-18 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B297-18 and B310-18 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

None.

#### III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mayor Treece appointed Malcolm Bragg to the Mayor's Task Force on Climate Action and Adaptation Planning, and explained he was the Manager at the Schneider Electric - Square D plant.

#### IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC69-18

Missouri Faith Voices - The importance of community policing and problems that may arise with a dismantling/severe overhaul of the current system.

Brad Bryan explained he was the Pastor at Wilkes Boulevard United Methodist Church and noted he was representing Faith Voices of Columbia, which was a part of Missouri Faith Voices, which was a part of Faith in Action. He stated they were an interfaith multiracial community organizing group that represented two dozen congregations and faith organizations in Columbia. Their commitment was to economic dignity and racial equity, and they envisioned a community where all people were safe, respected, and able to thrive based on their faith traditions. He commented that systems of oppositional policing made everyone less safe, and lamented the systemic racism in the country and in institutions that created a reality where people of color were statistically far more likely than their white counterparts to experience violations of due process, injury, or death.

during encounters with the police. He noted this reality existed despite the best intentions and values of law enforcement and professionals. Faith Voices of Columbia saw a wholesale transformation in the mindset, culture, and policing methodology in Columbia, Missouri, as the only way to adjust the system to one that was truly just. They appreciated the fact this work would be difficult, but believed that true community policing was the only way to ensure the dignity of all people proclaimed by their faith traditions were safeguarded. He understood the Council had affirmed its agreement with this again and again, but they still seemed to be miles away. He thought it was time for Columbia to go all in for community-oriented policing, and noted it was a matter of morality and dignity. He commented that at end of the prior council meeting, Police Chief Burton had kindly answered questions about the effective disbanding of Columbia's extremely successful community outreach unit, and they applauded the Council's mandate to halt all changes to that unit. He explained they had been disturbed by the language used by Chief Burton, and felt he had showed a failure to understand the principles, policy, and purposes of community-oriented policing. He noted Chief Burton had indicated it was difficult to recruit to the community outreach unit because they were so good at reducing crime that there was no longer enough actual police work for them to do. That statement was evidence of a chilling understanding of actual police work. If reducing crime before it happened through positive community relationships, engagement, and the allocation of resources was not police work, one could assume, at the very least, police work for Chief Burton was reactionary to the moment, and at the very worst, it was shorthand for exactly the kind of race-tinged oppositional and violent model that was killing communities figuratively and literally. The fact that Chief Burton did not understand this was a disqualifying factor in a city where the Council and citizens had mandated a move toward community-oriented policing. He noted he had personally been terrified by the comments. He pointed out he relied on a positive collaborative relationship with the Columbia Police Department to do his work at Wilkes Boulevard, and that work was at its best when connections had already been made. He reiterated he was scared to hear that was not real police work. He commented that the culture of oppositional policing came from the top-down, and not from the officers-up, and Faith Voices of Columbia urged the Council to take actions toward new leadership in the Columbia Police Department. Reducing crime through positive relationships and resource allocation to community-oriented policing was literally the whole point, and reducing crime should be the priority of the Police Department. It would make them all safer and could help build a system with less racial bias and more constructive encounters. Chief Burton had been given a chance and had shown again and again that he failed to understand. In order for Columbia to fully embrace community-oriented policing, it was time for Chief Burton to move on and for the City to find a police chief that truly understood the principles and reason for community-oriented policing.

**SPC70-18 Dawn Zeterberg - Public transit.**

Ms. Zeterberg explained she was a member of Missouri Disability Empowerment (MoDE) and stated they needed to think about the buses as a service because it would not be profitable with the way it was now. She thought Columbia should be able to support the buses with three colleges in town. Currently, people could not depend on buses. She noted a gentleman that had come to a Public Transit Advisory Commission (PTAC) meeting had indicated he could not ride the bus because it made him late. If it would arrive ten minutes earlier, he would be able to ride the bus. She wondered how many people were in a similar situation. She commented that if they continued to cut the bus service, they would no longer have bus service. The Saturday service was already being cut and everyone did everything on Saturdays. It would hurt many people. In addition, Saturdays included special events like football games, the Roots and Blues Festival, and the True/False Film Festival. She noted they kept talking about social equity and these cuts impacted that effort.

Mayor Treece stated he understood Ms. Zeterberg had to leave the council meeting early

the last time she was in attendance and asked if a bus was waiting for her now. Ms. Zeterberg replied yes. She pointed out it was too cold to wheel home. She provided a handout of her comments.

SPC71-18

Timothy Love - The importance of forming a continuous bond between Columbia police and the community via empirical data.

Mr. Love commented that he knew his words would most likely not bring about any real policy changes, but was hopeful the Council could hear what was happening and realize how important it was to them. He believed racism, police bias, overt policing, and community outreach were extremely important issues, particularly to those of color, like himself. He thought the problem might be that they were trying to talk to a predominantly white council, white mayor and white chief of police as they might be unable or unwilling to empathize with black residents of the City since they had not experienced the things he experienced every day. He wondered if they were indifferent, hesitant, or unwilling to aggressively address racism within policing because they were either not individuals of color or not directly affected by racial profiling, overpolicing, or oppositional policing. He commented that, for him, talking about racism in his city of residence was a matter of life and death and required more than only five minutes. As societal leaders, he felt they should all examine the effectiveness of their job descriptions, the potency of their work habits, and the influence of their on-the-job decisions, especially if they, as employed public leaders, actually held the power to curb racial profiling, decrease police bias, and create very strong bonds between the police and the community. He stated that if they, as public leaders, mothers, fathers, teachers, students, politicians, and cops, failed to build proper relationships with people and racial groups, they became susceptible to an indifference to implicit bias and believing in racial stereotypes. He felt that was what leaders did when they did not know too much about groups of people who did not look like them, and noted leaders were often vulnerable to stereotyping those that were foreign to them. He commented that failing to build sound relationships with people in the community often caused local leaders to not care as much for those people. If they were not socially and emotionally invested in their place of residence and community, they ran the risk of preventing themselves from caring enough about local residents to passionately bring about aggressive, consistent, and unorthodox changes. He explained his job was to teach English composition at Mizzou and he did not have to go above and beyond in order to keep his job, but he found it absolutely necessary to get to know his students. Getting to know them helped him discover unique ways to make education effective and compelled him to care for them and work harder for them. He could not be indifferent to their future since he had created a strong bond with them. He stated he asked his students about their weekend, childhood, past and present experiences, mood, likes and dislikes, suggestions, thoughts, etc. until there was nothing in him that wished to assume or stereotype them. He commented that he could not stereotype that which he knew from aggressive bonding. If most Columbia police officers made consistent and aggressive efforts to get to know black people, black neighborhoods, and individuals within those neighborhoods, he believed they would not be so swift to profile blacks on a regular basis. He noted they needed something much more effective and prolific than the community outreach unit. They needed more regular police officers to participate in outreach habits, such as foot patrols, in order to engage in conversations with people. If cops primarily rode in their cars all day, even during inactive periods, they tended to contribute to further community disconnection. They isolated themselves from the community, i.e., the very people they were hired to protect and serve. He commented that there were many success stories across the nation due to this type of aggressive outreach policing. Various police departments had seen a dramatic decrease in crime after implementing aggressive community outreach programs that directed officers to engage more in foot patrols, conversations with individuals of high crime areas, and relationships with individuals of color. He provided Camden, New Jersey, as an example

whereby they now participated in foot patrols and talked to people. The face to face interaction allowed the police to better know the people they served, and the people also had the opportunity to know the police that protected them. He understood the crime rate in Camden had fallen from 10-19 percent depending on the data analyzed. He reiterated effective community outreach was more effective and stable than the traditional overpolicing of high crime areas. Studies showed traditional overpolicing in high crime areas often did little to perpetually reduce crime and often led to higher tensions between the police and the community resulting in higher crime rates. He commented that transparency was vital to any community outreach program. One study had noted that in Charlotte, North Carolina, when police were much more transparent, internal misconduct complaints had decreased while external complaints had also decreased dramatically. In Columbia, the lack of transparency often exacerbated the rift between the police and communities of color. He provided an incident involving the Boone County Sheriff's Department four days after the shooting and killing of Ahmonta Harris as an example as the Sheriff's Department had alleged Mr. Harris had been killed while trying to rob a home at gunpoint. He noted the Sheriff's Department had made a statement via a press release and had refused to answer any further questions or provide pertinent proof to reinforce the allegations. He pointed out the family of Mr. Harris vehemently denied the Sheriff's version of the events. He stated he had talked to Mr. Harris' family and friends, and everyone had refuted those allegations. He explained his point was that the community that knew Mr. Harris knew more pertinent information about him in relation to the community than the Sheriff's Department. The Sheriff's Department did not know the community because if they had known the community, they would have considered what Mr. Harris had done for the community and his reputation. He believed Mr. Harris had been a pillar of the community and a community activist, and felt it was irresponsible, uncomprehensive, and a shame that the Sheriff's Department allegations did not consider the fact Mr. Harris had been a highly respected leader because the Sheriff's Department like the Columbia Police Department did not vigilantly and pervasively try to get to know the community. As a result, he believed they had been relegated to trampling on a man's grave. He reiterated that they knew both crime and police misconduct decreased in the areas of the country where cops built stronger relationships with people and were transparent about their actions. He suggested Columbia use this proven model and stop being hesitant to aggressively curbing aggregating problems like high crime and police bias.

## V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH47-18 Consider adoption of the Columbia Wastewater and Stormwater Integrated Management Plan Final Report.

Discussion shown with R198-18.

R198-18 Adopting the Columbia Wastewater and Stormwater Integrated Management Plan Final Report.

PH47-18 and R198-18 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen, Mr. Sorrell, and Trent Stober of HDR, a consultant, provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece referred to a diagram in the presentation and asked if Total Level 1 was where they were now. Mr. Stober replied no, and explained the level of investment with current rates would start at 2017 or 2018. Mayor Treece understood the "optimized" level was what was being proposed with this plan. Mr. Stober stated that was correct. He commented that wastewater utilities nationally were experiencing about a six percent rate increase on average each year. He thought that line would project fairly well or a little below the Level 1 investment. The blue represented Level 1, which was what they deemed to be the lowest level of funding to meet customer and regulatory expectations. Level 3 would create an extreme burden for the community. He noted this would allow

them to work with regulators to potentially move some projects out to meet the requirements. He explained they had a large amount of flexibility on when they needed to meet regulatory expectations. It was not a matter of if they met regulatory expectations, and through this planning process, the City could inform the regulators of when they could make the additional investments. Mayor Treece asked if Level 3 would be an EPA consent decree or if that would be well above Level 3. Mr. Stober replied typical approaches seen in other communities under a federal consent decree could look like Level 3 as long the City also invested in the renewal of the system. Commitments, a lot of times, were made to address regulatory-driven issues, but resources were not left to address other important infrastructure needs. Across the country, utilities had taken a step back and asked for time to meet some wet weather-type issues so they could meet other important investment needs.

Mr. Skala understood the band being recommended was at two percent MHI, and asked what optimization meant and how they had gotten there. Mr. Stober replied that band represented 1-2 percent of the median household income. He explained 1-2 percent was likely the level of affordability under the EPA's typical affordability framework depending on the strength of the community. For a community with Columbia's economic strength, it would likely be at the upper limit of that band. He stated he thought the remainder of the presentation might address the other questions Mr. Skala had.

Mr. Stober continued the staff report.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Stober how he thought their miles of stormwater and wastewater pipes per capita compared to other cities. Mr. Stober replied he thought they were pretty well in line. He commented that he worked a lot with Johnson County Wastewater, which was a metropolitan area in Kansas, and they had 2,200 miles of pipe serving about 500,000 people.

Mayor Treece stated he appreciated what they did with the targeted neighborhoods with respect to their water usage and ability to bear these costs. He commented that the Council heard the most complaints due to sewer backups and wet weather-related events, and thought inflow and infiltration was the biggest culprit in those events. He asked Mr. Stober how he thought that fit within the recommended prioritization. Mr. Stober replied he believed each council member had included that as one of the top issues when they had initially discussed this with them. Mr. Sorrell explained the reimbursement program for a grinder pump or backflow preventer had been approved early on with this planning process. The interim storage facility at the Wastewater Plant was already underway. In addition, the system rehabilitation, which involved inflow and infiltration reduction citywide, was in process. The entire County House Branch watershed was complete, and they were working now to complete the entire Flat Branch watershed with system renewal and inflow and infiltration reduction. He thought those were high priorities in the initial five year implementation. Mr. Stober agreed and pointed out the other piece was to refine the model of the collection system, which gave better insight as to where the restrictions within the system were located to ensure those issues were addressed. It was an early step in the process that would help inform the ultimate cost of addressing wet weather issues. It, along with asset management, was a higher priority issue identified.

Mr. Skala asked Mr. Stober if he would agree that one of the biggest problems was the interaction between stormwater and sewer in the context of aging infrastructure and developmental pressure. He asked if it was fair to say the aging infrastructure was allowing the inflow and infiltration to overwhelm their ability to deal with development. Mr. Stober replied he would look at it as though the impervious area was more of an impact on the separate stormwater system because they hopefully did not have a lot of impervious area that was finding its way into the sewer system. Mr. Skala commented that the City had quite a bit of runoff from large rain events. Mr. Stober agreed, and pointed out the City had found some areas of impervious area that had been connected to the wastewater system. He explained they would have to find another place for it to go

once it was corrected, and that was where it would put a stress on the stormwater system. He stated the challenge was that the fees associated with stormwater were considered a tax in Missouri versus a fee like they had with wastewater, which was based on the cost of service. As a result, on the out years, they really needed to inform the public of their stormwater needs to ensure they received a positive vote to make some of the investments possible.

Mr. Skala asked what the optimization curve signified amongst the other three levels. Mr. Stober displayed a diagram, and explained it represented the different projects categories they had in both wastewater and stormwater. He stated they had gone through a process to evaluate how each project category and level of funding would line up with respect to a score against community priorities. As a result, they had come up with an overall benefit score for each box, and had then identified which one gave them the biggest bang for their buck, i.e., how much benefit they received for the operational and capital costs for that box. Mr. Skala understood it was based on the criteria. Mr. Stober displayed another diagram and explained it included the different criteria and subcriteria that had been developed from the community input based on the environmental, economic, and social aspects of the priorities of the community. It identified which criteria the public gave them input on, how they would define them, and they then scored each level of investment to come up with an overall benefit score. The other diagram had the existing level of investment, i.e., Level 1 which involved a significant increase, Level 2 which still showed an increased benefit per dollar spent, and Level 3 where it dropped off. This made them look to a solution in between where they might be able to optimize each aspect of the program to make the best decision for the community's investment.

Mayor Treece asked how they would know a balance had been struck between what was necessary and what might be overengineering. Mr. Stober replied he thought all of the investments were necessary. In terms of engineering, they had a lot of knowns and a lot of unknowns. For the unknowns, they had taken a conservative best estimate and had also identified the study needs necessary to ensure it was in line with an ideal solution to address the issue. He provided the wet weather program as an example as they needed to evaluate the system and the restrictions within the system to ensure they identified the most cost-effective way to manage those wet weather flows.

Mayor Treece asked about the checks and balance in terms of overengineering or overoptimization. Mr. Stober reiterated he believed all of the investments were needed. It was a matter of the level of investment and the order of investment. He commented that he did not believe there were a lot of "nice to haves" in this program. These were needs the community had, and the programs would ensure the resources were spent most efficiently.

Mr. Thomas stated there had been a number of references to developing a hydraulic model of the area, and asked for a description of it. Mr. Stober replied the model was a depiction of the sewer system within a computer system whereby they had the size and slopes of the pipes along with how they connected together and the amount of flow observed going into the system. Mr. Thomas understood it involved actual data collected. Mr. Stober stated that was correct, and explained they collected data in order to calibrate the model so it simulated real world situations. They could then go back to evaluate the different solutions that could be used, i.e., whether the pipe size needed to be increased, whether inflow and infiltration needed to be reduced, etc. It was sometimes cheaper to increase the size of a pipe than to chase every bit of stormwater that got into the system. He commented that the model was a useful tool to right-size the program. Mr. Thomas understood it was a model of the sewer system rather than the landscape, watershed, etc. Mr. Stober stated that was correct. He explained the stormwater piece included an evaluation of developing watershed master plans in the later years, and that would involve models developed for the catchments to understand flooding issues and potential water quality improvements that could be made. Mr. Thomas understood they were not really creating an entire system to take everything to one lowest point in terms of stormwater.

They were trying to guide stormwater to existing natural waterways. Mr. Stober agreed and noted they needed to ensure they did not put too much water in a natural waterway causing the banks to widen and erode, etc. Mr. Thomas understood the model would look at the natural shape of the landscape. Mr. Stober stated that was correct, and explained it would connect the surface of a parking lot to the stormwater conveyance line that would end up daylighting to a natural channel on down to the Missouri River. Mr. Thomas understood it was a significant amount of work to develop the models. Mr. Stober commented that on the wastewater side they had to collect enough data to ensure they had an accurate model and depiction of the system. That was one piece. The development of the model was another piece that took about as long or longer. He pointed out it was all about what they did with the model in terms of how they evaluated the improvements needed to address the objectives they had.

Mr. Thomas commented that there had been several references to the fact that the plan did not really address the financing options recommended by the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure because that was outside of the scope, and asked if there would be another process to determine when and how much rates would be increased or what other financing options would be considered. Mr. Stober replied he thought they had the resources to implement the five-year plan through rate increases. Mr. Sorrell explained that as they began to implement this, each piece of the plan would be brought to the Council. If it was a capital improvement project, it would go through the standard process with an interested parties meeting, public hearing, and Council decision with regard to whether to move forward. As they moved forward with things like how to fund the continued rehabilitation of the sewer system, which had been bond funded, or how they funded private common collector elimination, they would bring proposals back to the Council on the estimated costs and rate impacts of the various programs. Mr. Thomas understood they did not have a good estimate on what rate increases would be needed at the moment, even with regard to funding the first five-year tactical plan. Mr. Sorrell stated it was correct that they did not have details, but noted he did not believe it would take long to finish the details. He thought the estimates had an annual cost of around \$3 million for system rehabilitation, which was a little more than they were currently spending annually so they could easily calculate the rate increase that would be necessary to fund that.

Mr. Thomas understood one way to look at this was that it would not be an entirely new program. It was a ramping up or an adjustment of things they were already doing in many cases. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. He explained they had already started on many of the things in the five-year action plan, such as the digester rehabilitation work, the reimbursement program for backup prevention, and the wet weather improvements at the wastewater plant. There were a lot of things already in place that they were doing, and this was expanding what they were actually doing. Mr. Stober commented that the bill projections had been done using the current rate structure and current proprietary rate model that had been provided by the Finance Department. It also included assumptions of the type of investments that would be bond funded, etc. He reiterated it was done by the Finance Department, and that engineering companies could not provide financing recommendations. Those would come from the City's financial advisor.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Water Infrastructure Finance and Innovation Act (WIFIA) was a potential source of financing. Mr. Sorrell replied it could be potentially. He explained that recently their experience was that the bond funding rates provided a better value for the City than state revolving loan or WIFIA funds, but that could change if interest rates changed. Mr. Stober commented that WIFIA was usually for large capital projects that were fairly near term, and its benefit was in flexibility of payments made over time. For example, they might be able to mitigate rates today with more rate increases on the back end to get a large capital project done today.

Mr. Thomas referred to page 24 of report, which included breakdowns of the investments

in wastewater treatment, wastewater collection, and stormwater management, and noted the two biggest parts involved with wastewater collection were renewal and capacity and asked if inflow and infiltration mitigation would be included in renewal. Mr. Stober replied some renewal would eliminate inflow and infiltration reduction, but a component of the capacity would be in private inflow and infiltration reduction. Mr. Thomas clarified he meant the lining project. Mr. Stober stated that would be renewal. Mr. Thomas understood capacity would be replacing pipes with bigger pipes. Mr. Stober stated it might also include eliminating inflow and infiltration from private sources.

Mr. Thomas referred to the last page of the report, which included the estimated cost of the City taking ownership of service laterals and lateral connections in the public right-of-way and easements, and asked for the City's responsibility now and what this analysis assumed would change. Mr. Sorrell replied this was a recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure, which suggested they look into taking over the service connections and laterals within an easement or right-of-way. Mr. Thomas understood the service connection would always be in the public right-of-way because that was where the sewer main was located. Mr. Sorrell stated it would either be in the right-of-way or an easement. Mr. Thomas asked if they were talking about taking over the portion of the lateral that was within the right-of-way or easement. Mr. Sorrell replied that was what had been recommended. He explained the City was not currently responsible for the connection or the lateral. Mr. Thomas understood that included the part that was in the public right-of-way or easement. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. He commented that it was not a bad idea to consider it, but they had estimated it would cost about \$240 million for the City to take them over in terms of maintenance over a 20-year period of time. Mr. Thomas understood this included taking them over and repairing them. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. He pointed out the City was already behind in maintaining the approximate 700 miles of sewer it had, and this would add another 250 miles of pipe at a cost of almost \$250 million. It might be a good idea to look into, but not within the initial five-year period. Mr. Thomas agreed it might not be best to look into it for the five-year period, but it might be something they wanted to consider in the 20-year period. Mr. Sorrell commented that as they moved further and updated the plan every five years by filling in data gaps, it might be appropriate. At this time, he believed it would be a big impact to the utility to take it on. Mr. Thomas understood it was \$250 million, which sounded like a lot of money, but the total increase involved costs over \$1 billion. He asked if doing this would eliminate some of the costs in the billion dollar plan. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not believe it would. He thought it would increase the City's operational costs and liabilities, and did not believe it would reduce the costs in the other portions of the plan. Mr. Thomas thought the liability had been estimated. Mr. Sorrell stated there were a lot of things that would come with it. He explained if they took those over and someone called Dig-rite, they would have to go out and find those laterals even though they did not know where they were located. It would take personnel to do it. He reiterated there would be a lot involved, and the City was not currently set up to do that type of work.

Mr. Thomas asked about Bill Weitkemper's suggestion of taking them over as they failed rather than taking them all over at one time. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought that would put them in a very reactionary mode with their workforce. He felt the crews would then only be responding to laterals that failed. He thought it would result in the need for contracts with local plumbers because they would not be able to use the workforce to maintain the public system if they were taking on laterals as they failed.

Mr. Trapp asked about looking at just Flat Branch-B in terms of taking over laterals or in those areas where they had done the lining and it had not reduced the inflow and infiltration enough to alleviate wet weather events. Mr. Sorrell replied they had not considered anything beyond what was in the report as far as service laterals and taking them over. He noted it was something that could be looked into if they wanted and suggested it come in the form of a report that would include costs and impacts. Mr.



Trapp stated that would be great.

Ms. Peters understood the City was currently responsible for the public sewer line along with the easements and rights-of-way, but the laterals from there to the house were the responsibility of the homeowner. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. Ms. Peters asked for the reasons they thought the City should take those over because she felt that was the responsibility of the homeowner, and not the City. Mr. Sorrell commented that the inflow and infiltration reduction reimbursement program addressed a bad service lateral that allowed inflow and infiltration into the sewer system by paying a per foot dollar amount to replace it. Ms. Peters asked if it was a percentage of the cost. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not recall the exact amount, but it was a price per foot replacement. He explained if someone had a service lateral that was cracked and deteriorated and 30 feet of it was letting stormwater in when it rained, the City would pay a certain dollar per foot to have that piece replaced. Ms. Peters understood the City was already doing some of this. Mr. Sorrell stated that was the case if it allowed inflow and infiltration into the system, and pointed out they would only pay for the portion creating the problem with inflow and infiltration. They would not pay for the remainder of the lateral needing to be replaced.

Mr. Pitzer asked if having this plan made the City eligible for any additional financing options at either the state or federal level, or if it just potentially helped to avoid punitive actions. Mr. Sorrell replied having this plan did not make them eligible for any additional financial funding sources. It allowed the City to establish a timeline for meeting the regulatory obligations, and it had been spread out in the plan in such a manner that the obligations did not overlap in an effort to keep the rates as low as possible while still meeting all the regulatory requirements.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the stormwater utility was able to issue bonds. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not know.

Mr. Skala commented that he was glad to know of the programs in place to deal with inflow and infiltration. He asked what happened when the City serviced sewers in the public right-of-way and saw an issue with a service lateral. He wondered if the City was obligated to approach the homeowner to suggest the issue be resolved. Mr. Sorrell replied if the City was replacing a part of a sewer line and saw a service lateral that was busted to pieces and they had to remove the connection to install the sewer line, they would go ahead and fix it. He provided an example of a yard inlet connected directly into the sewer system in a subdivision that was less than fifteen years old whereby they had contacted the property owner and the property owner had removed the inlet with their own funds. He stated they interacted with property owners on a regular basis to try to remove those sources. He pointed out they also had a meeting with the West Ash Neighborhood Association to discuss the reimbursement programs to get the word out for better participation from residents in the use of the programs.

Mr. Glascock pointed out the City could issue bonds for the stormwater utility. It just had not been done in the past.

Mr. Stober thanked the City for the opportunity to help in this planning effort. He commented that he had the good fortune to work with utilities within the region, and nothing was more fulfilling than to be able to work in his home town to help guide them through this process. Mayor Treece stated his appreciation for Mr. Stober's involvement. He noted the two of them had met at least three times over the last 2 ½ years, and he assumed that had been the same for the other the council members. There had been four town hall community events and other engagement efforts as well, and that was reflected in the plan.

Mr. Sorrell asked Mr. Stober to go over the regulatory timeline. Mr. Stober displayed a diagram and explained there were past, present, and future regulatory drivers. This provided an opportunity to look at all of the different issues that might have happened in the past, but they had not yet seen the impacts of those. There could also be something coming in the future that they needed to account for in a 20-year strategic plan. He

explained they had tried to outline all of the known regulatory issues that were here or evolving. He pointed out they tended to be reactionary with the current issue of the day, and as a result, they might miss an opportunity for greater water quality improvements by an issue that was in the future. This provided an opportunity for balance and to think about the future in an effort to prioritize and be efficient in terms of funding since they could likely only spend those resources once. They needed to ensure the greatest benefit to the community and the environment.

Mayor Treece asked how much of this plan was currently funded or anticipated to be funded. Mr. Sorrell replied if they had the current level of funding through the 20-year timeframe, it would result in about \$550 million through both the stormwater and sewer utilities. If they went with the optimized level, about \$450 million of additional funding would be necessary throughout the 20-year timeframe. Mayor Treece stated he thought that helped with the perception of the billion dollar price tag. The City was already looking at a \$550 million investment over the next 20 years not including any of the other regulatory impacts that might come before them. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece understood that by adopting this resolution they were not raising rates by \$1 billion over the next 20 years. They were simply submitting a plan to the Department of Natural Resources (DNR) for approval. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. He explained this was a plan that outlined what the City anticipated doing in the future, and it did not change any rates. Mayor Treece asked if the City was insulated from other regulatory impacts or punitive impacts once the plan was approved by DNR or if it simply ameliorated the 2011 precipitating factor that had led to this. Mr. Sorrell replied the City had agreed to do this plan through the memorandum of agreement they had with DNR. The City had also developed the timeframe for implementation. He noted the draft permit for the plant had a suggestion for disinfection within four years at an estimated cost of \$42 million. That disinfection would come in the last quarter of the 20-year plan, and if approved, DNR would agree to push that requirement out allowing them to address higher priority items for the community, such as backups and wet weather overflows. He commented that they would move the regulatory compliance schedule back and forth with this plan, and DNR would agree to use that schedule if they approved the plan once it was submitted. Mr. Stober pointed out they did their best to anticipate the future, but were not 100 percent confident they had captured everything. He noted there were compounds he could not pronounce that were constantly coming before them. This was a strategic long-range plan, and if there was another driver that came up, they could discuss when they could afford to address that issue and decide what items were the higher priorities.

Mayor Treece asked about future technology opportunities, and provided an example. He wondered if there would be an opportunity to incorporate something like that into the plan. Mr. Stober replied yes. He explained communities across the country were trying to determine where there might be public/private partnerships or investments that could be leveraged to extend to the utility for a benefit while also providing meaningful community benefits. He pointed out that could potentially offset some costs of the program now.

Mayor Treece referred to the documentary about Eagle Bluffs and what the Council had gone through over 30 years ago, and stated he was proud the community had been a leader in new technology in treating wastewater. What would otherwise have been dumped into the Missouri River was now a multi-jurisdictional asset. Mr. Stober agreed.

Mr. Glascock pointed out this was a work plan and new technology could be incorporated. He thought DNR would allow them to work within the plan, and as long as they were moving forward with the plan, they would be insulated from an order of consent decree.

Mayor Treece asked if a vote would be necessary to raise rates for this, and if it was possible to raise rates incrementally to balance out the impact to ratepayers prior to repair and replacement or for an infrastructure system replacement surcharge to help finance it. Mr. Sorrell replied the stormwater rates had to be approved by the voters. If

they decided to bond fund a portion related to sewer, an election would be needed to approve the sale of the bond. Mayor Treece understood it would be similar to what they had recently done with regard to the water bond. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. He pointed out operational rate increases for the sewer utility could be done by the Council. Mayor Treece understood that would be the case if it was a pure cost recovery situation. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. He explained the system rehabilitations they had been doing every year had been bond funded through the 2013 sewer bonds at a level of \$2.7 million per year. The City needed to continue to renew the system forever, and it was probably something that needed to be incorporated into the rate. He stated they needed to decide whether to borrow money, which involved paying interest, or to just pay for it as they went along. He commented that he had some scenarios in mind that he would likely bring to Council in the future to review and discuss.

Mr. Skala pointed out a significant part of the last bond had been related to inflow and infiltration. Mr. Sorrell agreed.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Ms. Peters thanked staff for an impressive and long report, and hoped they could move forward with it.

Mr. Trapp commented that he believed this entire process had been excellent and appreciated the federal government allowing it as it could otherwise be onerous. He noted regulatory and cost burdens were associated with the important processes of ensuring they had clean water. There was a long history of everyone not investing enough in this. He stated he liked the optimized approach that highlighted the Level 2 improvements in wet weather impacts in the stormwater system as they aligned with the community's priorities and did not believe there would likely be any great technological advancement in stormwater treatment to help bail them out. He understood every community with rainfall had these same regulatory pressures and there were rapid advances with regard to sewage treatment so there might be some technological breakthroughs in the later phases that would make it cheaper and more effective. He stated it aligned with the community and made sense. Although it was a very big number, they were already paying big numbers as had been noted by Mayor Treece. He noted this also moved them closer to where they needed to be as a community.

Mr. Thomas stated he believed this had involved a great process and strong report. He thought the community and stakeholder engagement piece had been done well and he liked the way the community's priorities had been incorporated in the decision of how to develop the plan. He commented that he believed there was also a lesson here as they had not adequately kept up with maintenance or their rates in the past so they would now have to catch up in the order of about \$500 million to \$1 billion. He felt one of the places they had lost a lot of revenue in the past was in subsidizing new infrastructure for new development. He thought it was good that they had increased the sewer connection fee recently so they were capturing a much larger proportion of it, but prior to then, a lot of ratepayer money had not been used for maintenance. He noted an impact of growth study would be completed and was interested in the results to determine if they needed to increase the sewer fee further to help fund rehabilitation projects.

Mr. Skala commented that the history of this went back quite a while, and some might remember they had been faced with an estimate of hundreds of billions of dollars for large rain gardens as that had been the first reaction to the issue of inflow and infiltration. He understood the federal and state government had agreed to some flexibility and was appreciative. He pointed out the Collaborative Adaptive Management (CAM) group had started out due to the total maximum daily load (TMDL) for Hinkson Creek, which was still under study, and noted he was on a Board related to it. He stated he was appreciative of how long it had taken to develop this plan along with the process used in terms of outreach, etc. It was a complicated document, but the issue was quite simple, i.e., overwhelming the capacity of the system, and it would need to be paid for in some

manner. The plan provided some flexibility in that realm. He pointed out he thought they were making tremendous progress.

**The vote on R198-18 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:**

PH48-18 Proposed construction of improvements at the Oakwood Hills Park to include replacement of the existing playground structure, park benches, retaining wall, and the Lynnwood Drive park sign and entry gate, installation of a climbing structure and swings, renovation of the basketball court and hiking trail, and extension of the existing ADA walkway from Burrwood Drive to the basketball court and playground structure.

Discussion shown with B302-18.

B302-18 Authorizing construction of improvements at the Oakwood Hills Park to include replacement of the existing playground structure, park benches, retaining wall, and the Lynnwood Drive park sign and entry gate, installation of a climbing structure and swings, renovation of the basketball court and hiking trail, and extension of the existing ADA walkway from Burrwood Drive to the basketball court and playground structure; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.

PH43-18 was read by the Clerk, and B302-18 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer asked for clarification regarding the ADA access off of Burrwood Drive as he understood there was a sidewalk there that just kind of stopped. Mr. Griggs agreed, and explained it picked up as a gravel trail the rest of the way. Mr. Pitzer understood there was not any other ADA access to the interior of the park. Mr. Griggs described other accesses using a diagram, but explained they were steep. He stated they had to come off of Burrwood Drive to really have the correct grade.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Thomas stated it was a shame that there was not public access off of Vistaview Terrace, and asked if they had looked at a strategy of purchasing a home when it was on the market and subdividing it or negotiating with a homeowner to allow access. Mr. Griggs replied they had not. He explained this park had been there for a long time, and there was not really a group of people clamoring for access from that side. If this had been a new development, they would have tried to accommodate access from all of the major streets with some sort of easement.

Mr. Pitzer thanked staff for taking care of this park as it was a nice little hidden gem that needed some improvements.

**B302-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

## VI. OLD BUSINESS

R185-18 Authorizing an agreement with Nora Stewart Early Learning Center for the Creating Lasting Family Connections program; transferring funds.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece understood the applicant had asked for this to be withdrawn.

**B296-18**      Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code to establish a Tree Board.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp asked who would staff the Tree Board. Mr. Teddy replied it would be the City Arborist within the Community Development Department, and pointed out that position had been filled last month.

Mr. Trapp asked if additional resources would be needed to fulfill the responsibilities of the Tree Board as outlined in the draft ordinance. Mr. Teddy replied it would depend on how active the Board was, but he assumed there would be some general costs, such as office supplies. He pointed out the main cost was allocating time, particularly if they met in the evenings. He commented that the prior task force had been quite active in producing educational materials and was he uncertain as to the cost of that or whether it had been pro-bono. It was something that might generate some costs.

Mr. Skala commented that one of the members of the prior task force had been Darwin Hindman, a former mayor, and this had been his idea many years ago. He noted former Mayor Hindman had mentioned a tree canopy around the same time they were discussing a natural resources inventory. He stated one of the major recommendations of that task force had been for a permanent tree board, and he endorsed that idea.

Mayor Treece asked if they should direct the City Clerk to advertise for these vacancies if they passed this ordinance. Mr. Skala replied he thought that was perfectly reasonable.

**B296-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

**B301-18**      Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to a renewable energy standard.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Johnsen and Ms. Buffaloe provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he had asked for this to come forward and noted the intent was to measure the total renewable energy that was being used in the community versus simply the amount that was being purchased by the utility. He understood Mr. Johnsen had indicated they would have to estimate the amount that was used behind the meter, and asked if they had a method to do that. Mr. Johnsen replied the City contracted for and owned photovoltaic facilities so they had used those as a surrogate for the capacity of net-metered solar they believed was behind the meter. Most installations behind the meter were done through a City rebate so they had an idea of how much capacity was behind the meter. He pointed out that did not really tell them how it would perform because it could be shaded. He emphasized it was an estimate since they did not meter it directly.

Mr. Pitzer asked if other communities had a way to measure that amount. Mr. Johnsen replied he thought Boone Electric Cooperative metered the load and the production separately, and netted the amount to generate the bill. Mr. Pitzer understood that would require a change in process for the City of Columbia. Mr. Johnsen replied yes. He explained he believed the reason the City had done it this way years ago was to try to make it as easy as possible for the customer by minimizing the amount of overhead that was involved for installation. As a result, they had not required the generation facility to be metered on its own, so all they saw was the amount of energy coming to the utility or going to the customer from the utility.

Mr. Pitzer understood the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) vote had been 3 to 1 with one abstention, and asked for the reason for the vote against it as it had not been clear in the minutes. Mr. Johnsen replied he thought the members of the WLAB that were present could talk to that issue.

Jay Hasheider, 1812 Cliff Drive, explained he was on the WLAB and they had voted 3 to 1

with one abstention for this change to occur. They had not voted against this change. Mr. Pitzer stated he understood, and only wondered about the reason the one member voted against it. Mr. Hasheider replied Scott Fines had been the member that had voted against it, and his recollection was that he was concerned that the voters had not voted for this in 2004. He noted there were likely other reasons, but that was the one he remembered.

Mr. Hasheider commented that, as a society, they were in the infancy of learning how to deal with renewable energy. He explained a renewable energy credit was an attribute indicating the energy was renewable. When a renewable energy credit was purchased, it separated the energy from that component. A customer who put a facility on its roof owned the renewable energy credits that came off of those solar panels, and the utility made a contract with them to buy those via in-kind service through an annual true-up. It was not required by the State, but the utility offered it, and every customer had agreed to give the utility the renewable energy credits, which allowed the utility those energy credits for the renewable energy ordinance. Until about two years ago, the utility had used all of those renewable energy credits for the ordinance. Due to an objection on the rate impact the utility was assessing against it, the utility had decided it would not use them even though they still owned them. As a result, they were getting less renewable energy credits from solar customers and had to purchase those credits elsewhere. What they had been getting for free was now an extra expense for all of the ratepayers. The amount of the rate increase this was causing was hard to say, but it was likely around \$10,000. He urged the Council to pass this tonight. He thought all of the solar customers expected it to be used. He commented that he had talked to some people that had caused the 2004 referendum on this issue, to include Chris Hayday, John Coffman, Win Colwill, Ryan Kind, and Mark Haim, and they all wanted to see renewable energy produced locally and agreed it was proper to use that renewable energy for the purposes of the ordinance.

Jim Windsor, 200 Manor Drive, stated he was concerned about the unintended consequences, and explained he thought the voters wanted the City to purchase more renewable energy. The effect of this proposal would require the utility to purchase less renewable energy because they would be counting renewable energy that was being used by buildings already. It was not being metered and was used by the utilities. He believed it would be the same as if they were counting energy conservation because the building was not using that energy, but this was being produced and used by the building. If they included that in the calculation, the utility did not have to purchase that renewable energy by extension, so from an environmental and sustainability standpoint, it was a bad idea. He commented that the recognition of the benefit of that production could be done simply by adding a paragraph under netmetering that did the calculation, and suggested it not be put in the calculation of crediting the utility with renewable energy that had not been purchased. From an environmental standpoint, he believed they wanted to purchase more, and not less. He encouraged the Council to defeat this proposal.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, understood there was a business that charged fees to install solar and wondered if that was an issue if they wanted more renewable energy. He stated he did not recall the name of the firm.

Mr. Thomas stated he would support this proposal. He commented that he was a part of the solar program that had given his renewable energy credits to the City and wanted that renewable energy to be counted in the calculation. Although he had not been able to vote in 2004, he thought the goal was to reach certain targets of total renewable energy as a percentage of total energy consumption whether it was from private rooftops, generated, or purchased by the utility. He understood the point of Mr. Windsor in that this would essentially reduce the target for the utility, but thought that could be corrected by increasing the goals. He believed this proposal would make it easier to understand and it seemed to be popular with most of the people with which he had spoken.

Mr. Skala explained he had been involved in drafting some of this renewable energy

portfolio along with Ken Midkiff and others, and asked for the nature of the contract between the homeowner and the utility. He wondered if the utility had the prerogative to not do anything with the credits. Mr. Johnsen replied he thought the agreement was written in such a way that the utility had the rights to the attributes off of the load. From the perspective of establishing credits, he believed they had to have metered data that went through an agency for verification. The City did not have metered data to verify credits and did not sell credits against the renewable standard compliance as it was based on energy. He noted they received credits for the energy purchased and generated by the utility, but they did not have metered data to generate renewable energy credits off of the netmetered installations on the side of the customer. He pointed out they could not see the load either.

Mr. Skala asked if there would be some movement in measuring this directly if this were to pass. Mr. Johnsen replied he thought they might want to look at how they supported the customer installations and if they were doing it the right way. He suggested they look at the metering philosophy as it pertained to these things to determine if they should be doing it differently. It was a conversation they could have if directed by Council.

Mr. Pitzer stated he thought this change would help measure the amount of renewable energy as an amount of the total consumption, and agreed they could change the target if they were concerned about nonrenewable energy being purchased. In 2004, he did not think the idea of rooftop solar had been contemplated, but technology had obviously changed.

Mr. Trapp commented that this had been discussed for a number of years, and to him it had made sense to not meter it to keep costs low. When he had installed his system, he did not have a big budget and had been looking to do it as cheaply as possible. Since it was not metered, they had two choices. The status quo had been to not account for it, and that had provided a better integrity of the data, but it had not provided an accurate reflection of how much they were generating. He stated he could understand the reluctance of some to include an estimate due to the desire to protect the integrity of the data. He commented that although the data was pure, he did not believe it was very accurate, and felt the estimation model was a good accommodation. He reiterated he thought an estimate was fine, and noted there would be a lot of estimates when they started measuring the carbon footprint and other complex items. He felt they should have as good of data as possible to inform the models, but had come around to being more comfortable with an estimated model that accounted for what was really happening versus not accounting for it all. He stated he would support this ordinance.

Mayor Treece commented that he thought voters had contemplated the renewable energy used would be homegrown and more organic than it had been. He did not believe they had contemplated buying wind power from a different state. He pointed out that nothing prevented the utility from exceeding those goals, and at this time it was cheaper to buy renewable energy than it was to produce their own.

**B301-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

B297-18

Authorizing construction of the Police Precinct/Municipal Service Center North facility to be located on the south side of International Drive in the Auburn Hills Subdivision; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece explained he wanted to amend the bill in order to name the facility the Molly Bowden Neighborhood Policing Center. He believed this was a great opportunity to recognize the only Columbia Police Officer that had been killed in the line of duty, and

noted January 10, 2019 would be the fourteenth anniversary of her fatal shooting. He felt naming the facility would enhance moral and recruitment. By deemphasizing and removing the word "north," it eliminated the suggestion that geographic policing was being done here. He also believed the name change would deemphasize the perception of the overmilitarization of the police. He stated he had reached out to Ms. Bowden's parents to ensure this was not a difficult reminder for them, and they had been humbled and honored by it. He hoped the Council would join him in the recognition.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B297-18 per the amendment sheet handed out that evening. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought this was an appropriate name for a much needed facility that would bring a lot of confidence to those in the area. He looked forward to the actual construction of the facility.

Mayor Treece commented that he felt this had the potential to be a regenerator in north Columbia. Center Pointe Hospital was located across International Drive along with other developments. He thought it was a good anchor for the neighborhood.

Mr. Skala stated this would not only be a memorial to Ms. Bowden but it would also be a reminder of neighborhood policing. He noted he was fully in support.

**The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend B297-18 per the amendment sheet handed out that evening was approved unanimously by voice vote.**

**B297-18, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:**

**VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE.**

**VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

B310-18

Authorizing a grant of easement for gas pipeline purposes with Union Electric Company, d/b/a Ameren Missouri, for the installation of a natural gas line to be located parallel to Schwabe Road on the east and I-70 Drive Southwest on the south within Columbia Cosmopolitan Recreation Area; appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer noted the memo had indicated the money would be used to create a new real estate fund and asked for clarification as to that fund. Mr. Griggs replied that normally any funds from parks would help with parks, but it was ultimately at the discretion of Council. He thought there had been some discussion for a real estate fund for Council use if a desired property had become available that could not be purchased with parks sales tax funds or some utility fund. Mr. Pitzer understood this was not a Parks and Recreation Department real estate fund. Mr. Griggs agreed it was not.

Mayor Treece commented that the Council had held a work session involving stale property the City owned, and that might have occurred prior to Mr. Pitzer being elected to the Council. It had also occurred prior to the purchase of the McAdams property, and in retrospect, having a real estate fund for strategic acquisitions such as that might have been a more appropriate funding source. The thought had been to begin looking at the City's real estate portfolio similar to that of a private enterprise by putting proceeds on the sale of properties or easements into that newly created real estate fund. He thought the donation of the property on Strawn Road was another opportunity as the basis cost was zero. If they sold a portion, this newly created real estate fund would be an excellent destination for those funds. He commented that they would then have this pool of real estate-related funds if they saw opportunities for acquiring properties.

Mr. Pitzer wondered if they should have a separate policy discussion on that idea and



establish the fund then rather than establishing it and placing the initial funding into it from the granting of this easement. Mayor Treece stated he did not believe this legislation created the fund. Ms. Thompson noted there was an appropriation of funds to a new real estate fund account and the funding would go into that particular account.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to amend B310-18 so the funds were placed in the general fund reserve at this time. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters.

Mr. Skala asked if they could tag this for this particular purpose if they placed it in the general fund so it was there when they had the discussion as to whether or not they wanted to establish the fund. Ms. Thompson replied only through Council direction to the City Manager to ensure those funds were preserved and not allocated or spent in a different manner. Mr. Glascock commented that the only way to spend it was to appropriate it. The Council would not appropriate it and would only put it into the general fund through Mr. Pitzer's motion. It would stay there until it was appropriated to something else.

Mayor Treece stated he was opposed to this amendment. He explained that Ameren had wanted the easement to go through the City park and also had vacant property in downtown Columbia. He noted he saw the proceeds of the easement going into this account to purchase that property as they became closer to that amount or as other sources of funds became available. He thought it was useful to have a real estate fund to make strategic acquisitions without creating the perception that they were raiding the general revenue fund for a real estate purchase.

Mr. Pitzer stated he understood and agreed it was worth talking about, but felt that should be a separate discussion and that they might want to consider a policy resolution with parameters and objectives to memorialize it for future Councils as well. Mayor Treece asked if anything would prevent that from happening with the account that had been created. He thought another barrier the Council confronted was the feeling that there was not a need to proceed because there was not any money in the account. He reiterated he could see the Strawn Road property as the next potential contribution to that fund.

Mr. Skala agreed they should have a discussion on the parameters of this fund.

Mr. Pitzer explained he did not like the idea of putting proceeds from this easement into a fund that had not yet been defined and would not even be created unless they passed this ordinance.

Mayor Treece asked how that section would read without a real estate fund. He wondered if it would be silent. He thought this might provide greater protection since it was specific to that fund.

Mr. Pitzer stated he thought they had made their desires known to the Interim City Manager and could bring forward this policy discussion about the real estate fund as soon as feasible with the understanding that this \$200,000 would be seed money after the fund was approved and created.

Ms. Thompson commented that the \$200,000 would go into the real estate fund miscellaneous revenue account listed in the legislation rather than just going into the general fund and funds would then be appropriated out of the revenue fund and into the newly created account. She understood the Finance Department had determined that those funds would go into the real estate fund miscellaneous revenue account as part of the transaction. If the Council deleted Section 3, she thought the funds would sit in that account until they were appropriated out of that account for another purpose, and asked if anyone knew if that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer withdrew his previous motion, and Ms. Peters who seconded it was agreeable to its withdrawal.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to amend B310-18 by deleting Section 3 and renumbering Section 4 to Section 3. The motion died for the lack of a second.

Mr. Trapp stated he was glad they were facilitating the ability for Ameren to increase its connectivity and reliability for gas service. He understood they tended to and should

focus heavily on their own utilities, but noted many of them relied on Ameren for gas as well. He thought it was appropriate to cooperate. He commented that he believed Mr. Pitzer had made some points, but designating it as a fund would allow them to decide how to use that fund in the future. He stated he did not have a problem with it as written. Mayor Treece explained he was not opposed to having parameters and thought they should have a discussion on how often they used those funds, whether it should have a minimum balance, etc.

**B310-18 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

## VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B293-18 Approving the Final Plat of "Nanny's Neighborhood Plat 1" located on the east side of McBaine Avenue and south of Lincoln Drive (Case No. 18-191).
- B294-18 Approving a major amendment to the Lake George PD Plan located on the south side of Richland Road approximately 700 feet west of Bay Hills Drive (5000 E. Richland Road); approving a revised statement of intent; granting a design adjustment relating to entry door placement (Case No. 18-185).
- B295-18 Vacating a sidewalk easement on Lot 108A within Copperstone Plat 7 located north of Copperstone Creek Drive, and vacating sidewalk easements on Lots 415A, 416A and 418A within Copperstone Plat 7 located east of Granite Springs Drive; accepting conveyances for sidewalk purposes (Case No. 18-156).
- B298-18 Accepting conveyances for sidewalk purposes.
- B299-18 Accepting a stormwater management/BMP facilities covenant.
- B300-18 Appropriating Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant funds for the purchase of six (6) replacement paratransit vans and miscellaneous related equipment and services.
- B303-18 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for child care health consultation services.
- B304-18 Authorizing Amendment No. 3 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for HIV Prevention services.

- B305-18 Authorizing and ratifying a service agreement with PeopleAdmin, Inc. for hosted software and related services to automate human resources administrative functions; authorizing an amendment to the agreement.
- B306-18 Adopting the City of Columbia, Missouri Choice Plus \$750 Plan, Choice Plus \$1,500 Plan and Choice Plus \$2,700 High Deductible Health Plan for 2019.
- B307-18 Accepting a donation from United HealthCare for wellness promotion and programs for City employees; appropriating funds.
- B308-18 Authorizing application to the United States Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration and the Missouri Department of Transportation for airport capital assistance grants.
- B309-18 Appropriating funds from the 2018 Celebration for the Arts event.
- R190-18 Setting a public hearing: proposed extension of two 13.8 kilovolt electrical feeder circuits from the Rebel Hill Substation to the proposed ten (10) mega watt Truman Solar Facility located east of Burnside Drive.
- R191-18 Authorizing a parking citation management system services agreement with Clancy Systems International, Inc.
- R192-18 Authorizing a contract with the Central Missouri Humane Society for 2019 animal control and municipal shelter services.
- R193-18 Appointing associate municipal judges.
- R194-18 Consenting to an assignment of the airport car rental concession agreement at Columbia Regional Airport with EAN Holdings, LLC to Enterprise Leasing Company of STL, LLC.
- R195-18 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Allstate Consultants for the landfill fuel station improvement project.

- R196-18      Updating the authorized signatories at U.S. Bank and providing for administrative authority to amend the master services agreement and account signers.
- R197-18      Updating the current authorized signatories at UBS Financial Services, Inc. and providing for administrative authority to adopt and execute the Corporate Resolutions form.
- The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: **VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:**

#### **VIII. NEW BUSINESS**

None.

#### **IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING**

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

- B311-18      Vacating a portion of a sewer easement on Lot 53 within Westmount Addition located south of Westmount Avenue (Case No. 18-188).
- B312-18      Accepting certain streets that were constructed in FY 2014, FY 2015 and FY 2016 for public use and maintenance.
- B313-18      Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of the Bingham Road and Ridgeley Road PCCE #16, Phase 2 sanitary sewer improvement project.
- B314-18      Authorizing a first amendment to the solar power purchase agreement with Truman Solar, LLC.
- B315-18      Authorizing an agreement with the United States of America Transportation Security Administration to lease 896 square feet of office and related space in the North Terminal Building at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- Mr. Ruffin left the meeting.

#### **X. REPORTS**

- REP102-18      Revisions to the sidewalk cafe ordinance.
- Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.
- Mayor Treece asked Mr. Teddy if he thought this needed to go to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). Mr. Teddy replied he did not believe they had sent the original through the PZC as it had been in Chapter 24 of the City Code, which involved

streets, sidewalks, and public places. Chapter 4 involved alcohol, and the PZC had never weighed in on anything in that chapter. It was not necessary unless the Council wanted feedback from the PZC. He noted he could also talk to the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council (DLC) about the changes although he believed Ms. Essing had discussed initiatives of the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) with them informally previously.

Mayor Treece stated he would not mind allowing the Downtown CID and the DLC to weigh in on this. It could then come before the Council after the first of the year for discussion and public input. He asked if anyone objected, and no one objected.

REP103-18 Board of Adjustment correspondence regarding Greek Town.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked Ms. Thompson to comment on the idea of having one group and excluding another group. Ms. Thompson replied she thought it was appropriate given the density in the area. There were really two different densities established within those boundaries. Those that were toward the East Campus side did not have the same density as those in the area Mr. Teddy had described.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought looking at the underlying ordinance made sense if they were seeing a steady stream of variances

**Mr. Trapp made a motion directing the Planning and Zoning Commission to review this issue and provide a recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.**

REP104-18 UDC text amendment involving churches and commercial kitchens.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if it would be for pay, for hire, or on volunteer basis. Mr. Teddy replied in this particular instance the Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA) would have a training program and he was not certain if they would pay any fee.

Mayor Treece stated he thought the issue could be vetted if it came back to them, but he was concerned about the neighborhood expectation. He did not believe there was an expectation of commercial activity in a church in a neighborhood, and if a large commercial kitchen was then rented out throughout the week it would generate traffic. He noted he did not want to discourage the benevolent use of the asset, but thought that issue should be considered. Mr. Teddy agreed the discussion should probably include how often the activity would be allowed. Mr. Skala agreed and thought it was something the PZC could discuss.

Mr. Pitzer asked if CMCA had gone to the Board of Adjustment (BOA). Mr. Teddy replied no, and explained this involved the use of the property and not any kind of dimensional standard. The issue was whether the use of a kitchen would be an allowed accessory use. Mr. Pitzer commented that he agreed with the concern about the expectation of the neighborhood, and thought a Board of Adjustment type process might be more appropriate to allow for single use exceptions.

Mayor Treece asked if a commercial kitchen in a church facility had the same inspection as a commercial kitchen for hire. Mr. Teddy replied the term "commercial kitchen" was not used in the building code, but "kitchen" was used in various definitions. He thought commercial kitchen appliances were referenced along with other things requiring ventilation, and were regulated.

Mayor Treece commented that there was a commercial catering kitchen for hire in the Peachtree Plaza for food trucks and other caterers to use as their home, and asked if it was inspected. Mr. Teddy replied he thought the Health Department handled any ongoing use of a kitchen if food was distributed offsite. He explained he had been referring to the actual installation of the appliances as they were subject to the mechanical code and fire code. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Teddy if he thought the kitchen in the religious facility had the same inspection and licensing requirements. Mr. Teddy

replied he thought they would have to carry that license if they were handling food.

Mr. Trapp stated he would support bringing forward something expeditiously. There was a lot of underutilization of house of worship facilities, and in Columbia, they were a robust part of the social service network as they housed the homeless and did other things. He thought it was a good partnership role to facilitate this through ordinance changes. The job market did not capture everyone, and Columbia still had a lot of poverty and low unemployment. He believed supporting entrepreneurial efforts was important. He stated he would like to see the City do what it could to facilitate this.

Mr. Trapp made a motion directing the Planning and Zoning Commission to review this issue and provide a recommendation. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Pitzer stated he would support it, but noted he was worried about unintended consequences. He thought it was worth reviewing.

**The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Mr. Skala directing the Planning and Zoning Commission to review this issue and provide a recommendation was approved unanimously by voice vote.**

REP105-18     Downtown Community Improvement District - End of Fiscal Year Report.

Mayor Treece asked Bob Hohenstein, the representative of the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID), if he had anything he wanted to add. Mr. Hohenstein replied no.

REP106-18     Business Loop Community Improvement District - End of Fiscal Year Report.

Mayor Treece asked Carrie Gartner, the representative of the Business Loop Community Improvement District (CID), if she had anything she wanted to add. Ms. Gartner replied no.

REP107-18     Request to revise the waste hauler ordinances.

Mr. Johnsen provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked if it was fair to say staff was opposed to the licensing of private haulers to collect food waste. Mr. Sorrell replied he would not say they were opposed to it. He explained they wanted to determine the best disposal method for food waste for the community in terms of cost, environmental impact, etc. He pointed out there were different methods, such as composting, the bioreactor, anaerobic digestion, and incineration. Once they knew the best and most appropriate disposal method, they could provide a recommendation, which might include private haulers. Mr. Thomas stated he had asked because in the past staff had indicated opposition to this idea due to concerns regarding disease prevention strategies with inadequately regulated haulers and the inefficiency of a number of different private vehicles collecting in the same area, and asked if they were still concerned about those two items. Mr. Sorrell replied the idea here was to determine the best way to dispose of food waste, and those other items were still a concern. He noted they could have a situation of a company not picking up the food waste due to a bill not being paid or another issue, and they would have to determine how to deal with that if they went in that direction. Mr. Thomas assumed they would have a licensing system and audit licensees. Mr. Sorrell stated there were other questions that would have to be addressed in the ordinances if they were to be modified to allow other haulers to haul food waste. He noted they could have a situation of multiple garbage trucks going down streets in every subdivision every week. Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Sorrell if they could pick up nonfood items as well. Mr. Sorrell replied yes, depending on how the ordinance was written. He thought the draft would allow other garbage companies to pick up garbage within residential subdivisions. He pointed out that could be fixed. He reiterated that he felt that before the ordinances were revised to allow this they should determine what was best for the community. Mr. Thomas understood Mr. Sorrell did not feel like he already knew even though this was a standard in other

communities. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not believe they knew at this time and that it was worth having Burns and McDonnell conduct a study. He commented that everything had a benefit and a drawback.

Mr. Thomas understood less than one percent of the food waste produced in the City was composted through the City's program, and the other 99 percent, which was over 30,000 tons per year went to the landfill where there were pipes that collected the methane. He asked how efficient that was and noted methane was a much more serious greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide. Mr. Sorrell replied there was not a way he was aware of to measure how much escaped. He stated there was a regulatory requirement of an assumption of 70 percent being captured for greenhouse gas reporting, and noted he had a feeling it was higher than that. Mr. Thomas felt the capturing of 70 percent was terrible because methane was 20 times more damaging of a greenhouse gas than carbon dioxide. Mr. Sorrell reiterated that was just the regulatory reporting requirement. He was not sure how much actually escaped. Mr. Thomas asked if the Burns and McDonnell study would answer that question. Mr. Sorrell replied it would be looked at as part the study. Mr. Thomas asked what they would do. He wondered if they would do an experiment at the landfill. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not know how they actually intended to determine it, but they would look at the impact of emissions from the different methods of disposal.

Mr. Thomas asked if the long term strategic vision for the solid waste utility was a three-cart system of trash, single-stream recycling, and compost. Mr. Sorrell replied they had considered that, but now that this had come up, they felt they needed to determine the best method of disposal. Columbia had the only bioreactor landfill in the State where they were allowed to include yard waste and liquids. Mr. Johnsen explained that was the wet cell as opposed to the dry cells. Mr. Sorrell commented that it might be a situation whereby it would not make sense to burn all of the additional diesel fuel or natural gas from trucks running around town to collect food waste separately because it was more of a benefit to the community for it to be in the landfill to generate electricity. He reiterated they did not know.

Mr. Thomas stated he was not sure he supported this proposal to spend \$32,000 on this study.

Mr. Trapp understood composting would collect all of the methane. Mr. Thomas did not believe there was any methane with composting. Mr. Sorrell stated there was some methane generated with composting because there would be some anaerobic digestion, but it would have more carbon dioxide.

Mr. Trapp understood there was not a lot of local supply of high quality compost and asked if the proposed study would look at that. Mr. Sorrell replied it would be looked into because one of the benefits of composting was a good soil amendment. The landfill would not allow for a good soil amendment. Composting had a higher chance of having stormwater compliance issues, which was minimized at the landfill due to leachate collection. Each had its benefits.

Mr. Thomas asked if this had been discussed with the Sustainability Manager. Mr. Sorrell replied he had not personally talked to Ms. Buffaloe and did not know if Mr. Hunt had, but noted he would follow up with her.

Mr. Pitzer stated his suggestion would be for Ms. Buffaloe and the Mayor's Task Force on Climate Action and Adaptation Planning to look into the issue, and if they wanted to do something, it could then be a part of those recommendations.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Pitzer what he thought about the study being recommended. Mr. Pitzer replied they needed to know what they did not know.

Mr. Thomas explained he was concerned they might not actually learn much. He asked Mr. Sorrell if he really thought they would know more than they knew now by doing this. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought they would know what the best method of disposal for food waste was for this community based on the volumes generated, how much they could collect, etc. so when they moved forward they would be doing what was best for the

community from an environmental and cost perspective. Mr. Thomas understood he thought it was good to invest \$32,000 to do that. Mr. Sorrell explained the City had an annual contract with Burns and McDonnell so this would not require an appropriation in addition to what had already been included in the operating budget.

Mr. Thomas stated he thought this was an important issue because there was a high potential that food waste was generating a high carbon footprint at the moment. He agreed with following the staff recommendation.

**Mr. Thomas made a motion to proceed with the recommendation of staff for a study by Burns and McDonnell. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece and approved unanimously by voice vote.**

REP108-18 City rental enforcement and problem properties.

Ms. Kottwitz provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala explained he had asked for this and it had been driven by a crime summit that had been held in a particular area as some rental properties had been identified as having absentee landlords and being managed by a company. He noted the responsiveness of the management company and landlords had been lacking and felt it was time to take a closer look as to whether they needed to bulk up the inspection regimes or how they might effectively encourage rental property owners to screen tenants properly. He commented that this report had a lot of good information and provided a better understanding of how they approached inspections. He believed a three-year program with an automatic extension of another three years if there were no violations seemed to be a little lax and too long. He stated he felt this was a public safety issue.

Mr. Trapp stated he thought they had a nice balance with their rental inspections by not having unnecessary costs while still having high quality rental properties. He stated it was shocking to see some of the properties in the lower income neighborhoods in the County, which did not have a rental inspection law. He commented that he appreciated the report by Phil Steinhaus in terms of housing choice vouchers. He believed it was important for City leadership to push back on racism and discrimination in terms of vouchers and Section 8 housing. In looking at the map, there were not any areas that had majority housing choice vouchers. Some people had vouchers and others did not. He agreed there were concerns, but they tended to get caught into a larger cultural context and needed to provide education and facts. He thought Mr. Steinhaus' response helped to add to the facts. He stated people had to live somewhere. He commented that the Housing Authority had a lower barrier to entry and a zero tolerance policy so it put the onus on what someone did in the future instead of the past. In addition, they acted on that information quickly. He agreed it still resulted in some tragedies because it was often not the leaseholder that was engaged in criminal activity and was instead a grandchild or live-together partner. He noted he had walked home from council meetings and had cut through public housing walkways while feeling totally safe. He thought it was challenging to have these conversations with constituents, but they were worth having.

Mr. Skala stated he was in no way trying to repudiate public housing. He was trying to get at some of the responsibility of the private sector for rental properties in terms of screening tenants, following up, and responding to the concerns of neighbors. He agreed they were well ahead of the County since they did not have these kinds of programs and ordinances to protect tenants and landlords.

Ms. Peters understood 7.5 percent did not have an owner, operator, or agent with a Columbia address, and wondered if they might want to require a contact with a Columbia address to assist with any problems. She asked if that might be helpful. Ms. Kottwitz replied it was an option, and there were a few communities in the country that required a local agent. In some instances, the tenant had been allowed to serve as the local agent, but she was not sure that was beneficial due to the turnover of tenants. She commented that she had been surprised when looking at the data as the percentage of properties that did not have someone in Columbia as a contact had been a much smaller than she had



anticipated. Ms. Peters understood that looking at the data might be more helpful than just considering the situation of an absentee landlord.

Mr. Skala commented that the issue was responsiveness in his view as some of the management companies tended to filibuster some of the complaints received. He noted it was hard to change behavior. Ms. Peters thought it might be beneficial to know who to contact versus more regulations.

Mr. Skala thanked staff for the report.

**REP109-18 Annual report of volunteer service to the City.**

Ms. Kottwitz provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece commented that several of them had the opportunity to attend the volunteer appreciation picnic and noted he had been impressed with how much the volunteers loved their job. He felt staff had done great with regard to recruiting, motivating, and retaining them.

**REP110-18 Intra-departmental transfer of funds request.**

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

## **XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF**

Gail Plemmons, 17 Aldeah Avenue, asked the Council to support the motion Mr. Thomas planned to propose tonight. She noted she lived in a floodplain, and since moving to her home on Aldeah Avenue, they had experienced sewage backup and stormwater of up to two feet in the basement. Many of their neighbors had experienced similar problems and other neighborhoods had the same or worse issues. She commented that sewage backups in their homes endangered their health, and sewage that had escaped the sanitary sewer system contaminated their yards and creeks. Through work by the City, there had been a reduction of stormwater entering the sanitary sewer system, but more measures were needed to help alleviate the load on the entire system. In addition, the stormwater mitigation ordinance needed to be revised and all development and redevelopment, including those under an acre, should be considered in those revisions. She felt a way to regulate stormwater treatment for each site was to look at the ratio of pervious and impervious surfaces, and believed the Climate Action Plan, the Integrated Management Plan, and the Collaborative Adaptive Management Plan would be supported by these changes. She urged the City to establish an income means test for providing sewer backflow prevention reimbursement of up to 100 percent for homeowners for whom the improvements would create an economic hardship, and for additional funding to be allocated for the program. She suggested the money previously budgeted for the Henderson Branch sewer project be used. She also believed additional options were needed to prevent wastewater from flooding basements, such as overflow basins. She stated she believed an expansion of the existing inflow and infiltration program was needed as well, and that funds for the program should be increased as it was an investment that would create savings in terms of wastewater treatment. She believed the stormwater management and mitigation practices should include sump pumps, dirt banking, swales, French drains, rain gardens, catchment basins, and the rerouting of driveway grates from the sewer system to the stormwater system. She provided a handout of her comments along with pictures.

Chad McLaurin suggested a re-energization of the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB) and the Human Rights Commission (HRC) as their duties implied a more active working relationship with the Police Department. He felt policies should go to them for oversight before being established. He understood the CPRB met in the Council Chamber and suggested those meetings be recorded. He also recommended the minutes be more detailed. He questioned why they had two oversight committees that were being shackled and believed they were a resource that would benefit citizens.

Mr. McLaurin thanked the Council for taking a leadership role. He understood the situation with the City Manager had not been easy. He was not sure how they would get the organization where it needed to be, but he was happy to see the Council had stepped up even though it had not been done as quickly as he had hoped.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, thanked the Council and noted the City needed to move on under less stress.

Mr. Elkin stated he had mentioned solar earlier in the evening and thought the gentleman that he had referred to had come from the State of Missouri. He asked the Council to look into it.

Mr. Elkin suggested they call food waste a new source of fertilizer. He explained he composted and had used it in his garden, which had been successful this year. He thought what the City could do with food waste had the potential to be amazing.

Mr. Elkin understood there had been a fire at City Hall, and noted he had recognized the gentleman's face that had started the fire as he had been homeless. He wondered what the fire had cost the City and suggested empathy for the homeless. He commented that shelters were needed as they would help many people, and he believed they would help reduce costs in terms of public safety as well.

Mr. Trapp wondered if the CPRB meetings could be aired on the City Channel since they met in the Council Chamber. Mayor Treece thought it was televised. Ms. Thompson stated it was not. She explained it used to be televised, but they had difficulty with the interpreters at that time. She was not sure if they could go back to televising them or not with the new technology being used for closed captioning. She recalled it being an issue of being able to provide the accessibility necessary to televise it, but noted she could check into again.

Mr. Trapp commented that he had served on the Columbia Community Land Trust Board as a liaison since its inception and indicated he would be happy to continue to serve unless someone else wanted to fill that position. He thought they should formally appoint someone.

Mayor Treece asked if the Council had 30 days from the time they were notified by the Board. Ms. Amin replied that per the Land Trust bylaws, the Board is supposed to notify the Council within 30 days of their annual meeting, and she believed the annual meeting would be held on either December 11 or 12. The ordinance that had established the Land Trust had included a position for a Council liaison, but had not had a term associated with that position. She noted Mr. Trapp had been serving as that person.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone else was interested in serving as that liaison or if Mr. Trapp would like to continue to serve. Mr. Trapp replied he would be happy to continue to serve. Mayor Treece asked if there was any objection to that. No one objected.

Mr. Trapp understood Mr. Elkin had mentioned something about utilities and wondered if he was referring to the entrepreneur that had discussed battery storage. He noted the Council had made an ordinance change to allow for battery storage although he was not sure any entrepreneurs had utilized that opportunity.

Mr. Thomas asked for a report or multiple reports related to specific proposals involving the inflow and infiltration problem. These had come out of a meeting involving a large number of residents, him, and staff. The first proposal was to expand the cost reimbursement programs for backflow preventers and grinder pumps to include additional private side inventions such as overflow basins in basements that would direct the water away from the basement drain and into the stormwater system. Another was to expand the inflow and infiltration mitigation program to include stormwater management practices, such as banking swales, French drains, rain gardens, catchment basins,

sump pumps, and rerouting driveway grates away from sewer system and into the stormwater system, and to increase funding for the program. A third proposal was to make all City residents eligible for a 50 percent reimbursement for approved backup prevention costs, and to have a means test to potentially provide additional reimbursement of up to 100 percent for homeowners that would otherwise be impacted by an economic hardship. He also suggested a Code change for new stormwater management laws that would apply to the development or redevelopment of property that was less than one acre in size. He thought this might prevent landowners from subdividing lots to avoid existing stormwater regulations. He stated he would send this to Ms. Weidemann and noted it would be helpful to receive the report in a couple of months.

Mr. Skala commented that these were very worthy goals as many of the strategies appeared to address issues for people that had been waiting on relief for a long time. He asked Mr. Thomas if he could provide the Council contextual background before they received the report. Mr. Thomas replied he did not have a lot of detail, but had the wording of what he had just stated. He also suggested Mr. Skala speak with Ms. Plemmons and Mr. Page, who were implementing some of these strategies.

Mr. Skala stated the prior request for transcripts of the CPRB was interesting as he had attended a course on parliamentary procedures at the National League of Cities conference. He commented that this Council was a unique body in that it did not have to conform to Robert's Rules of Order. They conformed to the City Charter, and generally followed those rules. He pointed out the recommendation of the person teaching the course was that they should not have transcripts of everything said at the council meetings. The minutes should just include the motions and actions. He noted Columbia had a tradition of more detailed council meeting minutes, which he was supportive of and would likely not go away as it was institutionalized, but he wondered if they really wanted to expand that as it took an enormous amount of time to produce. He pointed out Columbia was unusual in this regard and it took a lot more labor to produce what was being produced. In addition, it was unnecessary per the parliamentary procedure rules.

Mayor Treece noted City Management Fellow Chris Clubine had accepted a position in Lee's Summit and the next council meeting would be his last for the City of Columbia. He thanked Mr. Clubine for his time and expertise as he had served the Council well. He wished Mr. Clubine the best in his new position.

Mayor Treece understood transition was always hard and noted he was proud of all of the City staff in terms of what they did day in and day out to continue the great service they delivered to the public every day. He thanked them.

## **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 10:28 p.m.