



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, August 19, 2019
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 approximately 7:00 p.m. on Monday, August 19, 2019, 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 THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, and SKALA 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 August 5, 2019 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mr. Ruffin.

Upon his request, Mayor Treece made a motion to allow Mr. Trapp to abstain from voting on B219-19 and B230-19. Mr. Trapp noted on the Disclosure of Interest forms that he was the owner of a limited liability company that had a contract with the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) to perform outreach activities to individuals who were homeless or panhandling and that he was the partner in a limited liability company that was applying to the State for licensure of a marijuana-related business. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

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

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC9-19 Board and Commission Applicants.

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

BOARD OF HEALTH

McKinney, Kathleen, 5003 Geetha Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire August 31, 2022

Williams, Paula, 605 Rhino Court, Ward 2, Term to expire August 31, 2022

Mayor Treece explained there was a discrepancy with the Commission on Cultural Affairs as the ordinance required the appointment of an individual from a business/professional community with an office in the old Special Business District (SBD), but that had gone away, and they now had a Downtown Community Improvement District (CID). The SBD had a smaller area than the CID, and Lisa Driskel Hawxby was within the CID, but not the SBD. He asked if there was any objection to appointing her and then correcting that reference. He understood there were other references to the SBD in the Code that could also be corrected. Ms. Amin stated there were a couple of other references and noted

she had informed Ms. Thompson of those.

Mayor Treece asked for feedback from Council as to how they wanted to proceed. Ms. Peters wondered if they could even proceed with the appointment. Ms. Thompson stated she thought the Code needed to be changed prior to the appointment being made.

Mayor Treece asked if anyone objected to a delay in making the appointment and if they wanted to readvertise. Ms. Peters suggested they readvertise. Mr. Skala agreed.

Mayor Treece explained they had two vacancies on the Community Land Trust Organization Board and the City's ordinance had indicated the people for these vacancies had to be occupants of a Community Land Trust home, but the bylaws of the Board had indicated they had to be homeowners. The person applying was an occupant, but his name was not on the paperwork, and the issue needed to be reconciled.

Mr. Trapp stated he had missed the last meeting, but recommended they refer this to the Land Trust Board for a change to the bylaws. He noted they needed more than one owner representative because if that person missed the meeting, they would not have a quorum.

Mayor Treece thought it might be easier for the Board to change their bylaws than the Council to change the ordinance.

Mayor Treece asked if they should hold off on this appointment. Mr. Trapp understood the City ordinance said resident. Ms. Amin replied it said home occupant. Ms. Thompson stated the ordinance was broader than the bylaws. Mr. Trapp commented that he did not believe the ordinance needed to be changed. He thought the bylaws should be changed by the Land Trust Board. Ms. Amin explained Mr. Cole had stated the Board had indicated interest in changing the bylaws to be consistent with the City's ordinance. Mayor Treece suggested they hold off on the appointment to allow time for the bylaws to be changed.

Ms. Amin asked if the vacancy should be readvertised. Mayor Treece replied yes.

DISABILITIES COMMISSION

Bono, Stephanie, 2107 Tadley Street, Ward 4, Term to expire June 15, 2021

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Ohnersorgen, Michael, 1228 Ridge Road, Ward 4, Term to expire September 1, 2022

Staley Harrison, Amanda, 6875 S. Brookhaven Court, Boone County, Term to expire September 1, 2022

INTEGRATED ELECTRIC RESOURCE AND MASTER PLAN TASK FORCE

Antal, Alexander, 3206 Kohler Circle, Ward 4

Mayor Treece asked that the vacancies for the Tax Increment Financing Commission be readvertised for a more robust pool of applicants.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC53-19 Eric Scott - Labor & Columbia Performance Audit.

Mr. Scott stated he was speaking on behalf of the Public Works Department employees represented by LIUNA Local 773. He thanked the Council and City Administration as they had concluded bargaining for wages for the upcoming year. He noted this year's bargaining process had been a marked improvement from the way it had been in the recent past. There had been some real willingness to meet and confer and hold discussions in good faith. He thought the result had been a pretty good start for the employees as they had been able to address some of the issues that had been neglected for a long time. He commented that one of the major points of contention with the current pay plan was the midpoint raise, which was the most significant source of a wage increase for most employees after five years, as it was being based on time in a

particular job classification as opposed to the years of actually working for the City. Most of the raises and adjustments provided this year were meant to help retain employees, but since it was based on years within a classification instead of years of service, it missed the mark. He noted they had employees that had worked for the City for 11 years while maintaining relatively consistent job titles and job duties that would miss out on almost all of the raises that would be provided this year because they had been reclassified or because of a change in a job title at some point. He explained the issue had been discussed with the City's bargaining team and they had been told this was the way it had been laid out in the current plan that had been approved by Council in 2008. As they concluded this year's process, he recommended this portion of the pay plan be re-examined. When Mr. Glascock had provided an explanation of the raise increases to City staff, he understood quite a few employees outside of Local 773 had similar concerns in terms of time in service over time in class. He believed this was an important issue to look at going forward. He commented that the change of the minimum wage to \$15 per hour last year had resulted in equipment operators in the Streets Division being reclassified even though their jobs had not changed, and it had reset their clocks. Some of them would have hit the midpoint this year, but would now not hit it for another five years. It had not been their fault, and they had not received a promotion. He stated he felt some of this was the result of a set of older policy decisions that were still in place and believed it should be reviewed via a performance audit. He asked those in the audience that were in support of a performance audit to stand, and approximately 35 people stood. He commented that he thought an audit would be a good step toward improving the working conditions of City employees and for improving the quality of life and services for the residents of Columbia.

SPC54-19

Jana Stephens - Request for moratorium on development on Gillespie Bridge Road west of Perche Creek until a West Area Plan is agreed upon by City, County, and stakeholder-citizens.

Ms. Stephens, 6401 W. Druid Lane, stated she represented the Perche Hills Neighborhood Coalition and that they strongly supported a West Area Plan. The 73 members of the Coalition represented 35 households, shown in green on the diagram and lived along Gillespie Bridge Road from Coats Lane west to Highway UU and south along Coats Lane from Gillespie Bridge Road to Grocery Branch Road, which was the road that went by the Burr Oak tree. She displayed a diagram showing the future Overton development and the 100-year floodplain. The 34 lots and streets of that development would occupy about two-thirds of the 17 acres. The small lake in the northeast would be filled and become a street. The land along the eastern border would be filled, raising seven of the lots that would lie within the floodplain. She commented that runoff from the raised land would surely cause increased flooding on Gillespie Bridge Road impacting both current and new residents. She displayed another diagram identifying the Overton tract and Gillespie Bridge Road. She noted Mr. Overton had presented six letters of support to the Boone County Planning and Zoning Commission, all from ostensibly local landowners, and stated their properties were outlined in orange. Moving east to west, the landowner adjacent to Mr. Overton's development had provided the first letter. The second had come from a developer that lived on Johnmeyer Lane and the third from a family that had sold their land to Kanco LLC. The fourth letter had come from the owner of Kanco LLC. She commented that moving toward the west, the fifth and sixth letters had come from members of the same family that owned adjoining acreage and made no secret of their wish to sell their farmland for development. Pending approval of the final plat, Mr. Overton would have jumped the natural Perche Creek barrier to create the first high density subdivision west of Perche Creek, and the dominos were in line and poised to fall. She displayed another map that extended further south and showed all 654 acres that were awaiting development, and noted the orange boundaries defined the acreage of owners that had written letters of support along with the land owned by corporations and

the blue represented the 100-year floodplain. She stated there had been unprecedented growth since the current Boone County Master Plan had been written in 1973 and explained they were calling for a new guiding document and one that would allow the Boone County Commissioners due discretion in reaching development decisions. The Coalition thought it was imperative for the City and County to immediately proceed with creating a West Area Plan to guide development, and in the meantime, until the West Area Plan was in place, they asked the City Council to work with the Boone County Commission to ensure a tabling of the final approval of the Overton plat. In addition, they asked for a temporary suspension of action on any pending application for development in the Gillespie Bridge Road and Coats Lane corridor until the West Area Plan was in place. She commented that quality of life enhanced the economic marketability of a community and that the U.S. News and World Report had named accessibility to generous outdoor spaces in the selection of 9 out of 10 of their top desirable cities. She asked the Council to not allow the Overton development to become an irreversible and influential precedent due to a 46 year old development plan. She requested the Council and County Commission take unified action in order to prevent a hurried and unplanned development of 654 acres. She believed losing the rural corridor of the lands surrounding Gillespie Bridge Road to unplanned large scale development would be a loss for all citizens.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH35-19 Setting property tax rates for 2019 for the City of Columbia.

See discussion with B232-19.

B232-19 Setting property tax rates for 2019.

PH35-19 was read by the Clerk, and B232-19 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece understood they were actually reducing the tax rate so as to not create a tax increase based on the increased assessed valuation of property. Mr. Glascock stated that was what he understood.

Mr. Thomas asked if this meant the City's budgeted revenues from property taxes for Fiscal Year 2020 would be less than it would have been had they not taken this action. He wondered if the property value increase and the rate decrease balanced out. Ms. Thompson replied that under the Hancock Amendment, the City was allowed some natural growth, but they were capped at either the consumer price index (CPI) or five percent, whichever was less. She stated the City would continue to receive the same revenue, but would not see the benefit of the significant increase in assessed valuation that had occurred during the reassessment year. She commented that this did not mean individual property owners would not see an increase. She explained the Hancock Amendment was based on the equalized assessed valuation of the City as a whole. They might have some property owners that had some increase based on assessed valuation while others had a decrease. Overall, the City as whole would not have any more of an increase than what the CPI provided.

Mr. Pitzer asked which rate had been used to prepare the budget. Ms. Peveler replied \$0.41 and explained it had been based on the information they had at the time. She noted they would have to do a budget amendment. Mr. Pitzer asked about the impact. Ms. Peveler replied she thought it would be about \$229,000.

Mr. Thomas commented that this seemed to contradict the response of Ms. Thompson. Ms. Thompson explained that was the difference between the budgetary calculations and the actual revenues. Mr. Thomas stated he was actually asking whether the projected revenues would be down. Ms. Thompson noted revenues would not be down, but there would not be as much growth as had been predicted in the budget so the budget would have to be amended since it had used the \$0.41 rate.

Mr. Pitzer commented that last year they had discussed potentially increasing the property tax rate to the maximum allowed ceiling by a couple of cents and asked if this

affected that ceiling. He wondered if there was any linkage between the two amounts. Ms. Thompson replied no. She stated the City still had its ceiling that was calculated under the Hancock Amendment for future reference. Last year, when the City chose not to take the natural increase, there had been an effect because they were tied to that \$0.41 as the tax rate ceiling at the beginning of this tax year. Had they had the higher rate, the rollback would have been from the higher amount so they might not have landed at this rate. She explained it was affected by last year, but would not be affected next year. Next year, they would have the opportunity to use the maximum allowed under the Hancock Amendment because it was an every other year analysis. Mr. Pitzer understood this did not roll back the maximum allowed amount. Ms. Thompson replied she did not believe it did, but noted they would have to review it next year.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

B232-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

- PH36-19 FY 2020 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
See discussion with B237-19.
- B233-19 Adopting the FY 2020 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
See discussion with B237-19.
- B234-19 Amending Chapter 5 and Chapter 11 of the City Code as it relates to Public Health and Human Services Department fees.
See discussion with B237-19.
- B235-19 Amending Chapter 12A of the City Code as it relates to stormwater utility charges.
See discussion with B237-19.
- B236-19 Amending Chapter 17 of the City Code as it relates to Parks and Recreation fees.
See discussion with B237-19.
- B237-19 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to planning and zoning processing fees.

PH36-19 was read by the Clerk, and B233-19, B234-19, B235-19, B236-19, and B237-19 were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock and Ms. Peveler provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood \$4.8 million was the total of all of the pay increases the City Manager wanted to apply in Fiscal Year 2020, which they would have to find again for Fiscal Year 2021, and that the departmental cuts had contributed toward finding that \$4.8 million, but had fallen about \$2.5 million short. Ms. Peveler explained the general fund had about \$3,092,000 in payroll costs and they had been able to cover \$1.1 million with cuts. She noted they had been unable to cover police and fire increases along with fleet replacement causing the need to use \$3.4 million in appropriated fund balance. Mr. Glascock pointed out fleet replacement was a one-time cost, but the salaries would be ongoing. Mr. Thomas understood they needed to replace fleet periodically. Ms. Peveler stated they should replace \$1-2 million in fleet every year.

Mr. Thomas understood they were depleting \$3 million of the general fund reserves this year for this and that another \$3 million would come back from surplus funding. Ms.

Peveler explained there was more than \$3 million of general fund savings that had been allocated but not spent over the years. The idea was to discontinue that and to put the money back into the general fund. If there were needs in the future, the Council could approve it.

Mr. Thomas commented that he did not think the \$35,000 would be cut for the media resource center from the budget of the Office of Cultural Affairs. He thought they were going to issue an RFP and provide that as an annual contract to an organization to run a community media center. Mr. Glascock asked Mr. Thomas if he was referring to CAT-TV. Mr. Thomas replied yes. Mr. Glascock explained that would be done in this year's budget, but would not be available going forward. He would try to address it this fiscal year with savings so it would be able to move forward for one year. The Council would then have to decide if it would move forward in future years. He noted it would come to the Council and would have to be approved by the Council. Mr. Thomas understood Mr. Glascock was implementing the cut from the Office of Cultural Affairs and would obtain the \$35,000 from another source to allow the RFP to go out for this one year. They would then have to figure out how to fund it for future years. Ms. Peveler explained they would utilize general fund savings before they expired.

Mr. Thomas stated he thought they were leaving \$10-20 million on the table by not charging adequate public infrastructure development impact fees. He understood an RFP was expected to be received from the Community Development Department to hire a consultant to review that issue. He believed it was a very important source of revenue that would address a lot of the problems they had. He commented that they were subsidizing growth and the current taxpayers and ratepayers were paying for it. Mr. Glascock pointed out the number of building permits issued were down, and noted he was afraid that if they continued to add fees of that nature, the number of permits would continue to fall. They then might not have development at all and it paid for a lot of things. Mr. Thomas stated he did not feel they needed to get into a philosophical debate, but thought they needed to charge correctly for it.

Mayor Treece asked where they were on that RFP. Mr. Teddy replied he was drafting it and was currently working on getting it into an appropriate format. Mr. Thomas asked if there was any expectation in terms of timing. Mr. Teddy replied he would chat with Mr. Glascock about when they might be able to get it to the Council. Mr. Thomas thanked Mr. Teddy and understood he was very busy.

Mr. Skala understood a lot of the cuts that were necessary to minimize the amount of money taken from the general fund reserve involved contingency funds, and any unexpected expense would have to be addressed on a case-by-case basis. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala thought they would obviously need some long-term solutions with regard to increased revenue streams. He felt they could avoid a little bit of that with fee increases associated with development costs, but believed they would likely need additional referendums with voter involvement to really balance the budget without getting into reserves.

Ms. Peters understood a lot of the \$3 million from incentive-based budgeting had been saved by the departments, sometimes fairly painfully, in order to pay for something in the future. She asked if they were now taking their future plans away from them. Ms. Peveler replied she thought any department that could use it was using it. She explained the Finance Department had used it to augment their training budget since training budgets had been cut by 50 percent a number of years ago as they had CPAs and others that needed training, but they had been using it down very slowly so it would have taken a long time to use down all of that money. She pointed out they had incorporated an increase in their training budget to offset the impact. She noted they had also eliminated two positions so their overall budget had not increased. Mr. Glascock commented that he viewed this as just shifting money and placing the funds where they needed to be, which in this instance was training.

Ms. Peters asked if this was true for the other departments regardless of whether it was training or something else. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Ms. Peters understood they were straightening it out instead of allowing it to be used as a slush fund. Mr. Glascock stated that was what he was trying to do.

Mr. Pitzer understood they were discussing the savings from the departments and not the savings that had been appropriated by Council for specific projects, and asked if that was correct or if they were talking about both. Ms. Peveler replied they were talking about all of it. Mr. Glascock stated they would ask Council which projects they wanted to continue with as a priority. Ms. Peters asked if there was a list of those projects. Mr. Glascock replied the list would be provided for the Monday work session. Ms. Peveler commented that if the Council decided to continue with some of the projects, the money would need to be placed in the operating budget of certain departments or be identified as a capital project. It would not be able to stay as it was now.

Mr. Pitzer noted the pay package had involved a number of different elements including a half-percent increase for every year above five years in service, and asked if there was a maximum to that. Mr. Glascock replied no. Everyone was treated the same. Ms. Peveler stated they would have slides on Monday showing how many people would receive how much in increases.

Mr. Pitzer asked if a vacancy factor had been utilized when calculating the personnel costs. Ms. Peveler replied they had included that factor for some departments like the Police Department. As part of the budget cuts, they had included a turnover factor in some departments that had not had them previously. Mr. Glascock commented that it was included if it appeared to be a trend versus a one-time situation.

Mayor Treece commented that he would challenge the Council and the public that wanted to increase investments in certain categories to also identify cuts or a revenue source to pay for that increase. If it was suggested by Council, he suggested addressing the cut first to see if it would pass so they could then decide where to spend the money. He pointed out they could just round down budgets as well.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Lili Vianello, 1005 Wayne Road, stated she was the Chair of the Commission on Cultural Affairs and described the annual arts and cultural funding process. She explained applicants had to be an arts or cultural organization with a 501(c)(3) status and the maximum request was \$7,500 and could not exceed 25 percent of the organization's prior fiscal year total revenue. She noted funds were utilized to assist with local exhibitions, performances, workshops, classes, and special events. The awards were contracts for services provided for the City. She commented that the Commission had held a public work session in June to jointly review 28 applications after individually reviewing and scoring them. Comments were shared with applicants who were given the opportunity to clarify details or provide answers in writing prior to that June meeting when they had discussed the applications and finalized scores. She stated the Commission had held a second public meeting in July to obtain feedback from applicants and other individuals with regard to the process, and in total the members of the Commission had logged more than 250 hours on the process. She explained the 28 applications had involved requests of over \$178,500. In Fiscal Year 2020, depending on the Council approval of the budget, they would distribute \$100,000 along with another \$3,000 in small requests. In addition, they would augment City funds with \$4,890 from the Columbia Arts fund. This would bring the total funding distribution to \$104,890 plus the \$3,000 for small requests. She commented that the impacts these funds made were crucial to the operation of these organizations that did so much to improve the quality of life within the community. In 2016, Columbia had participated in the Arts and Economic Prosperity Study conducted by Americans for the Arts, and it had been determined that Columbia's nonprofit arts and cultural industry had generated \$14.7 million in economic activity in 2015. Of that, \$1.3 million in revenue had gone directly to local and state government in the form of sales and other taxes. She explained many studies had determined the arts were a sound

investment for increasing tourism, contributing to the community vitality and livability, enhancing education, encouraging economic activity, improving public safety, and making a city a retirement destination. She pointed out funding from the City of Columbia encouraged all of that and was truly about providing greater access to arts and cultural activities for the entire population and visitors. They estimated more than 270,000 citizens and visitors would participate in City funded arts activities and events in Fiscal Year 2019 making the City's investment a little less than \$0.39 per participant. She thanked the Council for recognizing the importance of actively supporting the arts.

Blaine Regan, 1419 Wilson Avenue, stated he was the Chair of the Housing and Community Development Commission and thanked the Council for approving their name change as it had allowed them the opportunity to highlight the affordable housing need and the work completed by the Housing Programs Division. It also further ratified the Commission's role in providing funding and policy recommendations to Council in addressing homelessness and rental and homeownership needs in the community. He commented that Fiscal Year 2020 would be the first year of the City's 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan, and public hearings on that Plan would be held on September 3 and October 7. For Fiscal Year 2020, the City had received \$2.675 million in requests, but had only been allocated \$1.47 million in federal funds. The recommendations of the Commission were based on the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan public engagement process, the Fair Housing Task Force report, and the annual housing and community development needs survey along with applicant presentations. He listed some of the projects recommended for funding, which included the Columbia Housing Authority Providence Walkway and Rental Assistance programs, the City's Homeownership Assistance program, the City's Rehabilitation and Energy Assistance programs, the Job Point Vocational Training program, and the Services for Independent Living Home Repair program among other programs and projects.

Amy Camp, 1308 Willowcreek Lane, noted she was the Vice Chair of the Human Services Commission and commented that the social services provided and purchased by the City addressed some of the community's most challenging issues, many of which were rooted in poverty and inequity and identified as priority issues in the City's current Strategic Plan. Detailed information about these issues and the social services funding process had been provided in their report to the Council, which had been included as an attachment to the budget documents. She explained the goal of the City's purchase of social services was to ensure basic needs were met so they all had the opportunity to achieve their full potential. Across the country, they had seen poverty rates rise over the last four decades, and currently, nearly 23 percent of Columbians lived below the poverty level. She noted the City's poverty rate was affected by the large college student population so they used the child poverty rate as a key proxy measure of the level of poverty within the community, and currently 16 percent of children in Columbia were living in poverty. She stated 8 percent of their neighbors had reported that they were unable to meet their basic needs. In addition to those living below the poverty level, they closely monitored the number of people in households below 200 percent of the poverty level, which was a proxy for the level of income at which people could regularly meet their basic needs. People living in 100-200 percent of the poverty level were often referred to as the working poor. She pointed out the income of single parent working full time at the minimum wage would actually be below the poverty level, and one in ten Columbia residents consistently reported they did not earn a wage that allowed them to meet their basic needs. Despite low unemployment rates, growing income inequality had placed more people in or near poverty and was keeping them there. The household income for middle and low income households had been very flat over the last 50 years, and as a result, the share of household income had become increasingly unequal with all gains since 1967 going to the top 20 percent. She noted one of the key drivers of growing income inequality was the lack of gains in hourly earnings, which had been flat over the past decade. She explained Columbia's rate of income inequality was significantly higher

than the state and national rates. Social, economic, health, and educational disparities continued to be a significant issue in the community. African-Americans in Columbia experienced disproportionately high rates of poverty, unemployment, morbidity, and mortality and disproportionately low rates of educational and economic attainment. She noted Columbia had significant levels of poverty and rising income inequality and they knew those issues disproportionately affected people of color. Unfortunately for persons born into poverty in Columbia, economic mobility was highly limited. The Columbia area was in the bottom half of communities in the nation when it came to income mobility from low income households. Since it was particularly challenging to escape poverty in Columbia, the City's funding was positively impacting the child poverty rate, which was lower than the state and national rates and the rates of many peer communities by creating opportunities for their neighbors to achieve their full potential. The City's funding was also helping low income residents meet their basic needs as only 23 percent of Columbians living in low income households had indicated they could not meet their basic needs. She commented that unfortunately the City's investment in social services had not kept pace with the growing rate of low income residents in the community, and they were concerned about dwindling federal and state resources along with private donations for social services. Giving to nonprofits, including the United Way, had diminished significantly in the past decade, and increasingly local governments were left as the last line of defense in the war on poverty. While they were making progress, the issues of poverty and inequity still conspired to keep too many of their community members from realizing their true potential. She stated the Human Services Commission applauded the City's Strategic Plan, which sought to better address these issues, and they continued to hope it would result in an increased investment in social services, which not only assisted people in meeting basic needs but also built the skills and assets people needed to move up and out of poverty. She noted the Commission also wanted to thank the City Council for the longstanding support it had given to the City's investment to the social infrastructure of the community, and commented that they looked forward to presenting the Fiscal Year 2020 contract recommendations to them in December.

Pat Fowler, 606 N. Sixth Street, explained she was the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission and thanked the Council for their funding year after year in the amount of \$10,000. She asked that the Council continue to fund their work with a similar sum next year. She stated they matched grants provided by the State Historic Preservation Office (SHPO) to conduct historic surveys looking for cultural assets and potential buildings that represented their cultural heritage. Underway was Phase II of a survey of the North Central Columbia Neighborhood, which was bounded by Business Loop 70, College Avenue, Wilkes Boulevard, and Providence Road and contained approximately 200 structures. She noted she lived in that neighborhood and had abstained from discussing and voting on that topic. She stated the Commission had hosted a "Repair Your Own Plaster" workshop in October with a plaster artisan, and their registration fees had covered 28 percent of the cost of hosting that artisan. This past March, they had voted to fund the plaque to be placed where the founding Smithton had been determined to have taken place in November 1818 for an amount up to \$2,500. She understood that plaque design had been determined in cooperation with the CoMo 200 Task Force. Through their Vice Chair, Amanda Staley Harrison, the Commission enthusiastically participated in the work of the CoMo 200 Task Force. She noted Ms. Staley Harrison chaired the history working group, which included members of the Task Force and community volunteers. She commented that planning was underway for a series of walking tours highlighting Columbia from 1819 through 1821 for next summer. She stated the Historic Preservation Commission fully embraced their ordinance responsibilities for writing and presenting a preservation plan to the Council, which would work its way through the approval process and to the Comprehensive Plan. Between now and November, the Commission intended to hold a citywide meeting to gather specific information regarding how to create

increased opportunities for historic preservation that were compatible with accessibility for those with disabilities, affordable housing, building construction codes, climate action and adaptation strategies, cultural heritage site protection, economic development, energy efficiency, fiscal responsibility, indoor air quality, heritage tourism, inclusive communities, social equity, infill development, building restoration, parks and trail planning, needed sanitary and stormwater capacity, growth of the colleges and university along with places for their students to live, and scenic roadways and transportation planning. She explained those were all important qualities which either enabled or disabled the historic preservation of buildings and areas. At their most recent meeting, the Commission had discussed the possibility of asking the Council to expand their membership as they did not feel they were very diverse. They wanted a young person from one of the City's boards and commissions for young person input along with a person of color from a City board or commission that worked on issues of social equity and sought input from persons of color to be designated as representatives of the Historic Preservation Commission so their actions might reflect the views and energies of a wider group of Columbians. She understood there was a report on the agenda about the configuration of a working group to track the success of the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) for the City, and suggested one of their Commission members be included in its membership given the close relationship between preservation as an alternative to demolition in terms of the reduction of landfill space, transportation impacts, and the carbon emissions from preserving and using what they already had. She commented that the Commission had been waiting for a transfer into the New Century Fund of \$2,056 that had been raised by volunteers in July of 2018 at their last salvage sale. It represented the work of donated materials from the community and 42 hours of volunteer labor from 10 different people. They would soon cross their second fiscal year demarcation and that money had not been moved to the New Century Fund account. She noted the Parks and Recreation Department was holding \$785 in its accounts from when they had assisted with registration for the plaster workshop and they wanted to ensure that money was moved to offset the cost of the workshop before the end of the fiscal year.

Mayor Treece asked what the barrier was with those issues. Ms. Fowler replied she understood the barrier for the money to go to the New Century Fund was that because they had not had ordinance permission to hold a salvage operation or a salvage sale, they did not have ordinance permission to request a transfer of funds. Mayor Treece asked who had the money. Ms. Fowler replied she did not know. She thought it might be sitting in a general fund account. Mayor Treece asked whoever had the money to make a contribution to the New Century Fund. Ms. Fowler replied she thought they would need to ask the Community Development Department and the Law Department for assistance. Mayor Treece commented that since he sat on the New Century Fund Board, he wanted to see that happen. Ms. Fowler thanked Mayor Treece. She noted the Parks and Recreation Department had always been willing to move the money they had, but she was not sure the rest of City staff was ready to move the money due to the same reluctance.

Ms. Fowler thanked the Council for the opportunity to volunteer in concert with other citizens to expand the culture of preservation in the community. She thought there was a lot of important work to do, not only due to the bicentennial, but also in terms of addressing important needs in the community.

Beth Hastings, 105 Russell Boulevard, stated she was representing CoMo Transit Justice, a coalition of several Columbia area groups and advocates that had joined together last fall when bus service was cut so drastically. She commented that she had never driven due to epilepsy so public transit was crucial to her. She noted she was also a strong transit advocate because she used to work retail and understood the struggle of living paycheck to paycheck. Even if she could drive, she would not have been able to afford a car. She stated public transit was truly a lifeline to staying employed,

independent, and connected. The recent cuts to bus service had been a hardship to their most vulnerable residents that relied on the bus. She understood the reason given for cutting bus service was the result of less taxes being collected since people shopped online, but noted they had removed the last hour of service, which was during a time of day when many people were free to shop. She pointed out the cuts had also eliminated routes going to stores, and stated it was an unsustainable downward spiral. She suggested rethinking how transit was funded as it was essential, and noted she liked the proposals she had heard the Council discuss, such as a reallocation of transportation sales taxes, combining parking with transit, charging for airport parking, and a use tax. Even if they enacted all of those changes, it appeared as though transit would still just be bargaining for scraps. She noted their group had circulated a petition asking Columbians whether they agreed there needed to be an increase in the transit operating budget, and thus far they had 280 signatures supporting a 20 percent increase. Those signatures had been collected at the Wabash Station, on buses, at churches, at the Boone County Family Resources facility, and online. She commented that the City's own public transit surveys consistently showed the majority of residents, even non-riders, felt there was a need to increase transit service and were even willing to pay for it. The 2014 survey showed a majority of respondents supported a 10 percent increase in transit funding to boost Go COMO's service capacity. For years the City had seen studies and plans that demonstrated the importance of improving transit in Columbia. The 2012 Health Impact Assessment by the Department of Public Health and Human Services, Columbia Imagined, the City's Strategic Plan, the CAAP, the Fair Housing Task Force report, and the CATSO Plan all showed a robust transportation system was an essential part of achieving their goals. She suggested the formation of a City sponsored task force, similar to the Mayor's Task Force on Climate Action and Adaptation Planning, be established. She also asked the Council to reinstate the last route of the day. Stabilization of the transit budget was not enough when people that had no other option could not get to their jobs or go shopping. She provided the Council with a copy of her comments.

Dawn Zeterberg explained she continued to come before the Council every year with regard to transit. She thanked the Council for not making more cuts like last year. She thought they needed to look at the bus system as a service because it would never make a profit. She believed Columbia needed a good bus system, and one that started earlier and ended later for employees of the hospitals. She asked the Council to reduce the airport subsidy and to move that money to the bus service.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Zeterberg if she had utilized paratransit services this evening. Ms. Zeterberg replied yes. Mayor Treece asked if it would be there when she went home tonight. Ms. Zeterberg replied yes. Mayor Treece understood it was only available tonight. Ms. Zeterberg stated that was correct.

Ms. Zeterberg provided the Council with a copy of her comments.

Sarah Klaassen, 108 Ripley Street, explained she was the Pastor at Rock Bridge Christian Church at 301 W. Green Meadows, and was one of the leaders of Faith Voices of Columbia, an interfaith multi-racial group working for economic and racial justice. She commented that last year she had stood in the same spot protesting the proposed budget and the drastic cuts to transit, including paratransit, as they had been unacceptable and unjust. Together, they had mitigated some of the damage that had been proposed. This year's transit budget had stabilized service, but it stabilized a stripped down service with reduced hours that affected people that needed transit for food, healthcare, work, etc. The Faith Voices' moral agenda that had been released earlier this year had called for a 20 percent increase to the transit budget because the way they allocated resources said something about their truest values. A reduced transit was not acceptable in a community that said it values equity. She understood budget decisions were difficult and had listened to the sobering litany of cuts discussed earlier this evening, but also understood the Council had the power to determine which tradeoffs were made.

History had showed them over and over that the poor had been treated as expendable currency when those tradeoffs were decided. She believed the transit budget revealed that in Columbia. She commented that there was a Christian theological tradition called liberation theology with a core tenet that God had a preferential option for the poor. It was not just a spiritual statement. It had political and material implications. She wondered what would happen if they shaped the budget with a preferential option for the poor. It would create a different kind of liberation than they were seeing now. On behalf of Faith Voices of Columbia and the 280 people that had signed the petition, she asked the Council to increase transit funding to restore the hour of service that had been cut in last year's budget. She quoted a civil rights leader, Fannie Lou Hamer, who said "Nobody was free until everyone was free." She commented that a huge declaration about their common humanity showed up in smaller things, like municipal budget decisions, and that this action could bring them closer to being free.

Cynthia Gardner, 3707 Teakwood Drive, commented that the Council had heard testimony several times from residents of Columbia who were in need of a better transit system. She understood many had an image of those individuals, and asked everyone to expand their imaginations to include more stakeholders. She suggested they be mindful of business owners that needed workers to arrive reliably and on time, and of students that needed to experience the City as an affordable, vibrant place to live so they decided to remain in Columbia with the important skills they had attained after graduating. She asked that they imagine the patients and families that were in town to access world-class medical services and those that came to attend festival and events. She suggested they not forget those deplaning at the Columbia Regional Airport who wanted to conduct business without renting a car and to consider downtown businesses that could boom with customers not concerned about locating handy parking spaces along with citizens that sought evening entertainment at their many venues that could use a safe ride home. She noted transit funding had been stabilized by cutting back on services. The status quo was not the level of service needed to meet the needs of all stakeholders. The system needed to be efficient, economically sustainable, and meet the needs of all of Columbia's residents and visitors, and there was work to be done to achieve those goals. She stated there were citizens ready to work with the Council to make a robust public transit system a reality, and asked the Council to begin by finding the resources to restore the hour of evening service that had been cut last year.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, asked the Council to consider a few items associated with the water utility between now and January. He noted the Council ended up adopting a water rate that did not follow the cost of service study and wondered how they would move forward with the cost of service study since they had deviated from it. He wondered if they would try to get back on track so they were portraying rates that were reflected by the cost of service. He commented that if the cost of service was to be used, it had not considered water storage costs when it should have included those costs. He noted he did not believe the cost of \$1.68 associated with fire was accurate based on an ISO rating of 2. He referred to the fire at the Brookside development in 2014 and noted the costs of all of the facilities needed to fight a fire was more than only fire hydrants, which was the only cost reflected in the cost of service study. He asked for that issue to be addressed. He commented that the bond election had increases of 3 percent, 3 percent, 3 percent, and 2 percent for the debt, but understood they might not need a 3 percent rate increase this year after all, and suggested that be reconciled. He stated the enterprise revenue funding in the CIP Plan was projected at \$1,675,000 and the bond fund projections had been \$350,000. He suggested that issue be reconciled as it appeared they had changed their mind as the \$350,000 had been projected for five years previously. He reiterated his request for those issues to be addressed before now and January. He believed training was important for the members of the Water and Light Advisory Board and suggested canvassing the Board as to their recommendations for training and working those costs into the budget.

Martha Brownlee, 701 S. Greenwood Avenue, commented that she wanted to speak in support of those that had already spoken about the transit system in terms of the cuts it had experienced last year and the pain it had caused the members of the community that were most vulnerable in terms of disability and poverty. Since her retirement, she thought more about senior citizens and increases in costs when one's income had been lowered and set. She understood there had been discussion last year in terms of a fee for parking at the airport, and did not believe many people would choose to drive to St. Louis or Kansas City to fly due to a nominal parking fee. She also understood Mayor Treece thought there was concerns on the part of some, likely stakeholders for the success of the airport, and noted she wanted the airport to be successful as well. She felt it was an empirical question, and believed she and others would be happy to use their skills of social scientists to do a study in terms of interviewing and collecting information from people that actually traveled as to whether a parking fee would deter them from using the airport. She suggested a commission be established to look more empirically at funding and where people needed to go to and from along with timing.

Grace Vega, 3008 Middlebush Drive, commented that as she thought about the slides she had seen and the dreadful disparities they had in Columbia, she knew it was a wealthy city as there were a lot of 1, 2, 3, and 10 percenters. She explained they looked at those in poverty as a cost or drain and were cutting transport for those that needed to get to work. She wondered what would happen if they started funding things like transportation and making it a priority for everyone, and not just those that flew into the airport that might not want to pay \$5 per day to park. She asked who could go anywhere in the country and not pay something to park at an airport. She felt it was absurd and wrong if they thought about where they put their money and associated that money with their values. She pointed out people who were able to get to work would also buy things in the community since they were able to get to work. She believed it was a horrible commentary on Columbia when looking at the social services budget and felt money provided in social services would come back to the community. She commented that they could not be afraid of people that said they would not pay for poor people to get what they needed. She begged the Council to look at the budget differently this year as it would likely make them all richer in a lot of ways.

There being no further comment, Mayor Treece continued the public hearing to the September 3, 2019 Council Meeting.

Mr. Thomas thanked for staff for working on the transit budget and creating a sustainable future. They now had a baseline expense budget and an existing revenue budget, which continued to fall, but they were in a position to build a foundation. He thought they had heard tonight from many speakers about the importance of providing a robust public transportation system in Columbia, and did not believe it was only for those without access to a vehicle due to poverty, disability, etc. There were lots of reasons to have a robust public transit service, such as reaching the goals of the CAAP and Vision Zero. If they increased the level of service to the point it was convenient to catch a bus and be delivered where they wanted to go, people would use it. As a result, everyone could potentially benefit. He hoped they could discuss and agree on assembling a task force to create a vision to grow the transit system to achieve their goals during this budget cycle. He was not sure it needed a budget item attached, although it would be helpful to task that group with bringing in best practices and creating a plan. He also believed it would be helpful to hold a symposium similar to the affordable housing symposium they had a few years ago and bring in speakers from communities that had gone through the process of improving transit service, which he understood might require a budget. He felt if they could double the transit budget over the next five years, they could get it to a point of providing such a convenient service that many people would use it. He noted a doubling over five years was equivalent to a 20 percent increase each year for five years. He commented that he supported the calls from the community to make it a goal. He did not think they would increase the revenues going into the Transit Division by 20 percent

this year, but felt they could average that over the next five years. He pointed out there were a number of different ways they could do that as well. For this year he planned to ask for a budget amendment for the next meeting. He explained people that utilized the airport had an unjustifiable benefit of free parking, which was unheard of at an airport that had the kind of air traffic they had. He thought it would be very inexpensive to create a pay and display parking fee system in the paved lot directly in front of the airport as had been suggested by Mr. Skala this past year. He understood the lot held about 240 vehicles and that there were about 700-800 vehicles most nights when including all of the other gravel areas. He commented that his recommendation would be to institute a \$3 per day parking fee for the area with a pay and display machine as it would generate about \$250,000 per year, and to then adjust the transportation sales tax distributions so the airport received about \$250,000 less allowing the transit budget to build up its reserves for future expansion. He noted the airport would then recover that lost revenue through the parking fee.

Mr. Thomas stated he had concerns with regard to cuts to the C.A.R.E. program and understood that would be further discussed on Monday at the work session. He commented that he appreciated the report from the Human Services Commission, which showed the City's real support of human and social services had been declining in terms of what it actually achieved, and noted that was a concern. He stated he wanted to discuss setting a long-term goal over multiple years to increase that funding. He suggested treating it like the renewable energy goals and finding a way to do it each year to create a community where everyone could thrive as was reflected in their social equity plan.

Ms. Peters thought there had been a commission or task force that had recommended moving to the loop system for the bus service and asked for clarification. She wondered how the circular system of not utilizing the Wabash Station had been developed. Mr. Thomas stated that had been a staff initiative. He explained the Public Transit Advisory Commission had been in existence for 8-10 years, and they provided advice, recommendations, and advocacy with regard to ongoing general transit issues. He noted the loop system had been proposed by staff, and they had later hired Olsson and Associates who had recommended going back to a more centralized system. The portion of their recommendation that had not yet been implemented, which he wished would be implemented, was to create a flex zone service for the areas not covered by the very limited routes. He believed that should be an important goal in the next couple of years. He commented that he also supported the request to reinstate the hour of service in the evening as it sounded as though that could make a positive difference. He asked Mr. Glascock if he could provide an estimated cost to add back that hour of service. Mr. Glascock replied they would provide that information. He explained the City had a hub and spoke system prior to the loop system and people did not like it. As a result, they had tried to change it to accommodate what some had requested, but people had not liked it any better. They had now gone back to the hub and spoke system. Ms. Peters asked if it was the citizens that had not liked it. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

PH37-19 Proposed construction of the Kiwanis Park improvement project to include renovating the Talbert Thurston Shelter, resurfacing the parking lot and driveway, constructing an ADA walkway from the parking lot to the shelter, replacing existing lighting with LED lights and other miscellaneous improvements.

See discussion with B218-19.

B218-19 Approving a revised Kiwanis Park Master Plan; authorizing construction of the Kiwanis Park improvement project to include renovating the Talbert Thurston Shelter, resurfacing the parking lot and driveway, constructing an ADA walkway from the parking lot to the shelter, replacing existing lighting

with LED lights and other miscellaneous improvements; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division for a portion of the project.

PH37-19 was read by the Clerk, and B218-19 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked if there were plans to fund the unfunded shelter later. Mr. Griggs replied yes. He explained they would do those improvements if they had funds left after bidding this project. If they did not have the funding, they would likely include it as a project on the next park sales tax ballot issue.

Mayor Pro Tem Skala opened the public hearing.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, stated he had been a member of the Boonslick Kiwanis for 42 years and had been in and out of Kiwanis Park quite a bit over those years. He commented that children had been the priority in the 53 year history of the Boonslick Kiwanis and listed some of the programs they had involving children. They wanted children to be lifelong learners because they would then become good problem solvers and be able to build their human capacity so they were prepared to lead the community to a better tomorrow. He explained the Park would be used to facilitate those initiatives with children. He noted the Parks and Recreation Department staff had met with the Boonslick Kiwanis and had explained the project, and it had been well received. He pointed out a young lady who was pursuing to be an Eagle Scout had met with Boonslick Kiwanis with regard to her project of providing signage among other things at the Park and had requested a posthole digger to facilitate the project. He stated he was present to support this improvement project and was looking forward to its completion.

Rebekah Robertson, 204 E. Worley Street, expressed her appreciation for improvements at the Kiwanis Park as they were needed. She noted she also appreciated the fact it was one of the few natural parks and explained the Eagle Scout project would delineate the paths so it could remain a natural park. As had been expressed at the interested parties meeting and at the Kiwanis Clubs meetings, they were interested in seeing it remain a place for natural growth. She suggested the money that would be spent on the playground might be better utilized if it was spent on those natural resources and keeping the old forest intact.

William Tucker, 204 E. Worley Street, understood there was a structure next to the proposed playground with rebar and assumed it had housed the original restrooms, and asked if there was a plan for it. Mr. Griggs replied that would be cleaned up as part of the project. Mr. Tucker stated he was happy to hear that as it appeared to be a dangerous spot for children.

There being no further comment, Mayor Pro Tem Skala closed the public hearing.

Mr. Ruffin asked Mr. Griggs how they would be able to integrate the work of the young woman that wanted to be an Eagle Scout in their plans. Mr. Griggs replied she would develop a trail map and signage for all of the trails at the Park. It was not really a part of this capital project. He explained they worked with eagle scouts on different projects on a regular basis, and that these projects would occur concurrently. Mr. Ruffin asked if staff would be responsible for installing the signage. Mr. Griggs replied the young lady would do all of that as part of her project. He noted they would find her a posthole digger if she needed one.

Ms. Peters stated this sounded like a good project.

B218-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH38-19 Proposed construction of improvements to the solid waste collection site located at 912 E. Walnut Street.

PH38-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp understood staff had tried to only obtain the parking lot portion of the site because that was all that had been needed, but they had obtained the entire property because a reasonable deal could not otherwise be attained. He also understood the Downtown CID waste district would ultimately pay for the property and that it would not be all citywide solid waste customers. He asked if that was correct. Mr. Sorrell replied yes. He explained staff was proposing to do a cost of service study during the next fiscal year. As part of the study, the cost of that property would be allocated to the CID. Mr. Trapp understood the Solid Waste Division owned it, but was essentially floating it until they could address the first part. He noted a lot of people had great ideas for what they could do with the buildings on the property, but pointed out they could not fund that at the cost of the CID wastepayers. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece asked if someone from the Downtown CID had been at the interested parties meeting. Mr. Sorrell replied yes. Mayor Treece asked if they were onboard with this plan. Mr. Sorrell replied yes. He noted they had received letters of support for the proposed facility.

Mayor Treece assumed they would discuss what would be done with the front part of the property later. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. He explained at this time he was only asking for authorization to proceed with improvements that would help with operational efficiencies.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a tenant in the front building. Mr. Sorrell replied three spaces were available. He noted they had contracted with a management company to oversee those spaces and thought at least two were currently occupied.

Mayor Treece asked if the plan staff was asking for permission to proceed with tonight anticipated dividing the plat so there were two separate lots. Mr. Sorrell replied that was yet to be determined, but was a possibility.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the current plat included both buildings. Mayor Treece understood the plat included the entire lot at this time. Mr. Sorrell stated the highlighted lot was the entire property the solid waste utility had purchased. They only needed a portion on the south half. Mr. Pitzer asked if the south half was used for parking for the apartments now. Mr. Sorrell replied no. He explained it was used only for solid waste collections and it was not used for parking currently. Mr. Pitzer asked if staff had thought about any configuration that might preserve a parking spot or two. Mr. Sorrell replied there was not an opportunity for vehicular access with both the compactor and the roll-off on the property. One would likely have to be removed.

Mr. Skala noted it appeared as though there was a vehicle in the diagram displayed and asked if that was on the property to the west. Mr. Sorrell replied it was on the property to the west.

Mayor Treece asked what the property was zoned. Mr. Sorrell replied whatever C-2 had become with the new Code.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Pat Fowler provided a handout and noted she was the Chair of the Historic Preservation Commission. She explained they had toured the building last April at the request of the Council and asked to be notified of any future work session with regard to this property and to have a role within that work session. She noted she had some concerns with regard to the placement of the fence. She understood there were three tenants as each apartment was occupied and that they loved the building due to its proximity to where they worked downtown and the modest amount of money they were paid. She stated the location of the fence would effectively cut off parking for the building, and this was of a concern to her because it would limit the likelihood of success the building would survive this process. Anyone purchasing the building would want to park adjacent to it. She asked the Council to consider some alternative configurations to allow some parking to continue with the building. It appeared as though it was being platted right down the middle. Immediately prior to the purchase of the building, she thought there had been more than six parking spaces there and believed there had been nine. This parking

ended when the City had taken title to the property. She noted one of the tenants had indicated to her that she had been told she could park there and that she had been provided a space in a garage as an accommodation with the management company when that could not be worked out. She asked that something be done to ensure some kind of parking stayed with the building because it increased the chances of the building surviving. As much as they would like all of their residents to consider walking to work and giving up their automobiles, it might doom the future of that structure. She stated she had written a letter of the history of some of the occupants along with the interior design elements, which Council had previously seen, and noted she wanted to be included on any tour by the Council and Mr. Sorrell of that building so she could show them the features she felt were indicative of that time. She pointed out that in May of 1925, a tornado had touched down on Walnut Street and that building had survived. She asked that they not accelerate its demise unnecessarily.

Mr. Ruffin asked if this building had always been residential. Ms. Fowler replied it had started out as residential, and at times of economic downturn, it had turned into a boarding house. There was some discrepancy due to a potential address change as to whether or not it had become an insurance agency at one point. That might have occurred on the first floor of the adjacent structure that had been built in the late 1940s. She thought the City could hire someone to conduct research at a greater depth than she had been able to do on a series of Saturday afternoons.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Fowler if the parking in the back had been available to the tenants of the building or if it was being leased to other downtown businesses. Ms. Fowler replied it had been leased by the Waigandt family. Mayor Treece asked if the parking had been available as part of the rent for those units. Ms. Fowler replied she assumed it could have been as it had all been under the same ownership.

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

Mayor Treece stated he was looking forward to discussing the potential of the building.

Mr. Pitzer thought that preserving even one spot would greatly enhance the value of the property, but understood that might not be possible. Mr. Sorrell stated he would look into the potential of shifting everything to the west to preserve one parking space. He pointed out it would only be one space because access would otherwise be blocked. Mr. Pitzer understood the problem involved the onsite electrical. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. The transformer location was the challenge with keeping a parking space open.

Mr. Trapp commented that this was part of a larger process of planning for a compactor due to issues with the dumpsters. He noted he had received a lot of calls from downtown business owners about dumpster leakage. He understood this was one piece of a fairly well thought out plan for how they dealt with solid waste. They had not planned on the kind of solid waste problems they had now and had not required its planning when the City was built two hundred years ago. He thought this was a necessary step. He noted there was a lot of potential with the building, but if they did anything other than what might immediately benefit the downtown solid waste users, they would have to buy it themselves because that was who would ultimately pay for the property. It was only a solid waste asset as they were holding it until they could sell off a portion and knew the cost for solid waste purposes. He suggested they not lose sight of that.

Mr. Ruffin made a motion directing staff to proceed with the construction of improvements to the solid waste collection site located at 912 E. Walnut Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

PR118-19 Establishing revised guidelines for the City of Columbia Police and Fire Pension Statement of Investment Policy.

The policy resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he was glad this had come before Council because when he had been on the Police Retirement Board this document had been amended annually, but it had not been provided to the Council. He felt this was the right process and thanked staff. Mayor Treece stated he agreed.

The vote on PR118-19 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Policy resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

B211-19 Authorizing the issuance of Sewerage System Refunding Revenue Bonds, Series 2019; and prescribing other matters relating thereto.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Thompson provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked how taxpayers realized the savings over the life of the bonds due to refinancing. He wondered how it was figured into the budget and whether they had been able to accomplish more or the same amount with less money. Ms. Thompson replied she thought it was seen by ratepayers not having as large of an increase for capital improvements to the system. Mayor Treece asked how they had confidence that the savings that had been achieved were reflected in the rates. He wondered if they saw that at the end of the year through net cash. Ms. Thompson explained it was seen through projects being accomplished without rate increases or the savings they were able to have without increasing rates for personnel costs. She noted it freed up funds for projects. Overall it was a lower increase to the system because there was less of a debt load that had to be covered by the system ratepayers.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B211-19 per the amendment sheet, which replaced the ordinance along with the exhibits. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B211-19, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B212-19 Changing the uses allowed within the "Shapira Clinic" O-P Development Plan located southwest of the intersection of College Avenue and Rogers Street (411 N. College Avenue); approving a revised statement of intent (Case No. 153-2019).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece understood the deadline to apply for state licenses was 4:30 p.m. today and the applicant needed to include an address for the potential business, and asked if this site had been the subject of a potential application. Mr. Teddy replied staff could not do anything on the local side other than verify that a location was zoned for a medical marijuana dispensary so he was fairly confident they had not sent a letter indicating whether it was compliant or not.

Mayor Treece asked if this request was based on speculation. Mr. Teddy replied he had not had any contact with any prospective individual looking at this site. He noted some of his staff might have taken calls on it.

Mayor Treece understood they had allowed something similar on the Broadway Bluffs site by amending the statement of intent to allow the use, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Teddy replied yes, and explained that was more similar to a mixed use-corridor. It had been a planned district as well, but in what he would describe as a regional retail center. Mayor Treece asked about their zoning as compared to this. Mr. Teddy replied both were planned districts, but it had been what they used to call C-P planned business.

Tim Crockett, 1000 Nifong Boulevard, commented that the site was 0.3 acre and noted they were requesting the addition of a new use involving medical marijuana. He pointed out they were not asking for new construction. It was an existing office building with a medical/dental facility. He stated they were also not asking to raze the building or reconstruct the site. They planned to use the site as it sat today. He explained the site was located at the intersection of a major collector and major arterial roadway and was adjacent to other commercial uses in the area. He thought there was a convenience store and gas station adjacent to the property and commercial/retail uses cattycorner to the property to the north. In addition, there were industrial uses to the west. He did not feel this was out of character to what was in the area, and believed it would fit in to some degree. In review of the current permitted uses of the O-P zoning, some higher intense uses were allowed so the addition of a medical marijuana dispensary at this location would not change the characteristics of what could be placed on the property. He reiterated they were not asking to expand the existing building. They only wanted to repurpose the existing building with a new additional use. They were not asking for open zoning. It would stay in the planned district with the added allowed use. He understood M-C was the allowed zoning district for a medical marijuana dispensary, but they were not asking for that because it would allow for other uses that might not be appropriate for the site. They wanted to expand the PD zoning for this additional use. He pointed out anything that would take place there would be permitted through state and local requirements.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Crockett if the owner of this property had submitted an application for a license. Mr. Crockett replied he did not know.

Mayor Treece understood the tenants of the property over the last 10-12 years had included dental business and a mobility lift business. Mr. Crockett thought there might have been a laboratory use upstairs as well.

Ms. Peters asked Mr. Crockett if he was involved because the interior of the building would be changed. Mr. Crockett replied no, and explained he was involved due to the rezoning process. Any change of the interior use would be handled by an architectural firm.

Mayor Treece thought this was fairly straightforward in that it was a medical use and no one had anticipated medical marijuana when considering potential uses. Mr. Skala agreed. He noted there had been some discussion with regard to parking and access during the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) meeting, but there had not been much discussion with regard to use.

B212-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

SI10-19

Presentation by Mayor Carrie Tergin of Jefferson City.

Mayor Treece asked the Council to indulge him on a point of personal privilege due to the presence of the Mayor of Jefferson City, Carrie Turgin, who was present for a special item.

Mayor Turgin explained she wanted to recognize and thank Columbia on behalf of Jefferson City. She noted May 22 had been a difficult day in Jefferson City as an F-3 tornado had traveled through the heart of the community. They had been very blessed and thankful to not have any fatalities. She wanted to express her thanks to the City of Columbia for helping them. When she had arrived at the emergency operations center, which was located within the police department in City Hall, at 2:00 a.m., she recalled seeing a table with about 20 or so Columbia Police Officers dressed in uniform and ready to go. It had been incredible and she had been overwhelmed by the show of support. She noted Mayor Treece had reached out to her several times as well, and fundraisers had been held at various locations in Columbia. She presented a plaque to the City of Columbia in recognition of the outstanding service to the people of the City of Jefferson

impacted by the tornado and flooding in May of 2019. She explained it included #JCStrong and a City coin, and noted the hashtag had come to mean how strong the community had been after the tornado. She stated they had taken this opportunity to show that they were strong enough to get through this. She commented that she had learned to always heed the warnings and to have an emergency operations plan in place whether at work or at home. She noted it would take years of growth and recovery as a lot of areas had been hit. She reiterated her thanks to Columbia in serving Jefferson City. Mayor Treece thanked Mayor Turgin for this recognition. He commented that he had received a call from John Glascock at 12:45 a.m. indicating a catastrophic tornado had hit Jefferson City and that firefighters, first responders, and police officers were being sent to assist. He had immediately contacted Mayor Turgin to let her know help was on the way. In addition, staff had gotten the airport runway open early in case a military plane needed a place to land. He noted Columbia continued to stand with Jefferson City as they rebuilt. He thought this had been a great example of two cities and the entire region working together, and he hoped it would continue.

B215-19

Authorizing a first amendment to development agreement with THM Construction, LLC to permit the relocation of a 69 kV electric transmission line on Lot 3 within the Final Plat of Westbury Village located on the northwest corner of Scott Boulevard and the southwest corner of Smith Drive (Case No. 177-2019).

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy and Ms. Thompson provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece understood this involved an existing corridor, right-of-way, and power line, and that the applicant would upgrade the poles at their expense. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. They were paying for it 100 percent. Mayor Treece understood they would also provide the new easements. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct, and explained that was why it should have been included with the original development agreement. It had been an oversight on the part of staff. Mayor Treece asked if that process had been corrected. Ms. Thompson replied yes.

Mr. Skala understood the distribution lines would be placed underground and that the transmission lines would be placed in a better position next to the road in terms of access for maintenance, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Williams replied yes.

Matthew Kriete explained he was the civil engineer for the project and noted Smith Drive used to extend along the alignment of the transmission line. When Smith Drive was realigned, which he thought was in 1995, all of the utilities had been moved except for the transmission line. They would now be moved and the project would involve some new poles. The distribution lines would go underground along with some telecom lines. Only the transmission lines would remain above ground. He agreed it should have been in the development agreement from the beginning and that it was an oversight.

Ms. Peters understood Building 3 was on that section of the land. Mr. Kriete stated Lot 3 was through where it traversed. He pointed out they were only showing a concept on the diagram. It was only conceptual, but the transmission line really made it difficult to develop the lot. Moving it against the road corridor opened it up for a higher and better use. Ms. Peters stated her memory of this development was that there was supposed to be a retention basin or some use involving stormwater in that area and asked for clarification. Mr. Kriete replied that was not the case any longer. He explained the detention basin was moved when the property was rezoned, and described its location utilizing the diagram shown. He agreed the detention basin had been located in that area with the original Westbury development that had been approved in 2000. He described the location of the detention basin that would now be constructed and noted it was much larger than what it would have been.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, commented that it was common for the City to pay for increased pipe sizes in terms of the water utility for future development and to

improve flows. He wondered if there was any consideration to upgrading the 69kV line to a 161kV line for this project and using some of the bond funds for the transmission line.

B215-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B217-19 Establishing an administrative delay in the requirement to obtain a permit to operate a sidewalk café in the Downtown Community Improvement District.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece explained he had asked for this at the request of the Downtown CID. The City had passed a new licensure requirement that required a \$100 fee and there was some consternation with regard to paying the fee and enforcement. He thought it might be easier if staff took a soft approach in educating those that might have already had a sidewalk café along with those that might be establishing one. He commented that this would allow the proper authority for staff to do that.

Ms. Peters asked what the businesses were supposed to learn from this. She understood this delay would be in effect until January and wondered if this would allow sidewalk cafés to multiply without paying a fee. She also wondered if they would then not have to pay a fee in January because they were grandfathered.

Mr. Teddy explained he and the Building and Site Division Manager had accepted an invitation from the Executive Director of the Downtown CID to attend an operations committee meeting, and this matter had been discussed. They had listened to several business owners that had been quite put out by the ordinance provisions because they were light users of the sidewalk, i.e., only had a couple of bistro tables. He noted they had been quite bothered by the fee and the annual registration. He stated staff intended to have a dialogue with the Downtown CID and the business owners and would then come back to Council with some suggestions. In the meantime, they had placed a stay on issuing new permits and would allow all cafés as long as they were in conformance with the ordinance standards.

Ms. Peters asked if new sidewalk cafés would be allowed. Mr. Teddy replied yes as long as they complied with the standards, i.e., leaving a pathway unobstructed and not violating any of the other terms of the ordinance.

Ms. Peters asked if Council could expect staff to come back to them in January with more information. Mr. Teddy replied he suspected they would have a number of recommended changes.

B217-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: PETERS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Trapp left the meeting room.

B219-19 Authorizing a downtown street lighting replacement agreement with the Downtown Community Improvement District; amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Williams provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked for the time frame if Council approved this. Mr. Williams replied they were currently working on some engineering issues they had recently discovered. Most of the street lights in the downtown area were currently controlled by centralized photocontrol stations so the engineers were trying to figure out how to separate those so they could power the lights proposed for this project separately from the photocontrol

centralized stations. He explained these lights would require power 24 hours per day and not just when it was dark out. He noted they would have to come back to Council with the authority to construct and for a bid call, and imagined that would occur this fall. Ms. Peters asked why these lights needed power 24 hours per day. Mr. Williams replied the advanced photocell controllers would establish a communication network, and if they were turned off for long periods of time, the mesh network would breakdown causing them to lose the ability to control and establish that network. He explained that was one of the issues they had discovered with the pilot project. They could not get them to work until they were powered essentially 24 hours per day. They were experiencing a similar issue for the remaining 94 they were proposing be done.

Ms. Peters asked where these lights would be placed. Mr. Williams replied they had targeted 94 street lights at the public hearing held in May, and they were located along the Broadway corridor but also along some of the areas where bar districts were located just off of Broadway.

Mayor Treece asked if they had done this initiative in partnership with the Downtown CID in the previous fiscal year as well or if that was just a pilot. Mr. Williams replied there had been City funding for four fiscal years at a level of approximately \$100,000 per year for a total of \$400,000. Mayor Treece asked how many street lights had been replaced in those last four years. Mr. Williams replied the initial project was to cover three areas, the undergrounding of the existing overhead streetlight circuits that had been in the downtown area, installation of lighting in some alleyways, and replacing some of the lighting in the downtown area with lights with advanced photocell controllers that allowed them the ability to dim and raise the lighting levels. Mayor Treece asked how many of those had been replaced. Mr. Williams replied six had been done as part of the pilot project. Mayor Treece asked for clarification as he was surprised it had only been six during four years at a cost of \$400,000. Mr. Williams replied they had initially started with an undergrounding project and then had completed an alleyway lighting project. The focus now was to utilize remaining funds on the streetlights. Mayor Treece asked for the total cost for the remaining 94 streetlights. He understood the Downtown CID was contributing \$30,000. Mr. Williams replied they had currently spent roughly \$25,000 on the six pilot project lights. The goal was to replace the remaining 94 and with the \$30,000 from the Downtown CID, there should be roughly \$300,000 available to replace the lights. He pointed out the \$30,000 was to cover the advanced photocell controllers as the cost was roughly \$300 per light. Mayor Treece asked how long it would take to replace the 94 lights. Mr. Williams replied he thought it would take several months. He reiterated they had some engineering work that needed to be done in addition to bringing forward the authority to construct and a bid call ordinance.

Mayor Treece asked how many streetlights total were in the downtown. Mr. Williams replied over 400. Mayor Treece asked how long it would take to do the 94 streetlights. Mr. Williams replied it would take less than a year to physically replace them. Mayor Treece asked if there was money to do the other 300 streetlights. Mr. Williams replied they did not have any additional funding for downtown streetlights. Mayor Treece asked how many streetlights there were citywide. Mr. Williams replied about 15,000.

Mayor Treece commented that there was a Smart Cities initiative that accelerated the replacement of streetlights by converting the existing lights to LED lights. He understood companies also tended to come in with wayfinding boards, maps, digital signage, wifi, etc., and that they did all of the replacement upfront and recovered their costs later. He asked if that was something Council would want to pursue. It had taken four years to do six and it would take another year to do another 94. In addition, it did not appear as if they could do the additional 300 any time soon. He asked Mr. Glascock if something like this had ever been done. Mr. Glascock replied he thought the City had replaced its traffic signals with LEDs and had provided them the cost of the savings in electricity over three years as payment. Mayor Treece understood they had made the investment upfront and their costs had been recovered through the energy savings gained. Mr.

Glascock stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer asked for clarification regarding the electric signs. Mayor Treece replied it included digital wayfinding signs. Mr. Pitzer asked if it would involve advertising. Mayor Treece replied it could and provided the North Village Arts District and Alley A as examples.

Mr. Skala thought that was topic of conversation they should consider. He noted they had struggled over the years and there had been several pilot projects. He reiterated he thought it might be worth a discussion.

Mayor Treece explained they had a hodgepodge of streetlight heads in the downtown and noted he had not started paying attention to them until Deb Sheals had pointed them out to him. Mr. Skala recalled other issues to include the painting of the standards. Mayor Treece felt it could be a way to have a thoughtful comprehensive replacement plan and have someone else invest the money instead of talking about it every year. Mr. Skala stated he was not sure where the conversation would go, but believed it would be worth having.

B219-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSTAINING: TRAPP. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B230-19

Amending Chapter 13 of the City Code to add a new Article XIII establishing medical marijuana business licensing regulations.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Caldera and Ms. Thompson provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Thompson if she had a sense of how many of the 2,100 applications submitted to the State were from Boone County. Ms. Thompson replied no. She stated the State had indicated they would have better statistics in the days to come.

Mayor Treece noted the Council had capped the number of dispensaries at seven, but had not capped the number of cultivation facilities or infused manufacturing facilities. Mr. Caldera stated that was correct and pointed out they had also not capped the number of testing facilities. For the purposes of the seven dispensaries, Mayor Treece understood this was an attempt by staff to address how the City could select the best seven if more than seven State licensed applicants wanted to have a dispensary within the city limits of Columbia based on input from that process. Mr. Caldera stated that was correct and noted it was also based on Council feedback during the discussions regarding the Chapter 29 changes.

Mr. Skala referred to Section 13-430(3), which involved the licensing scoring criteria and the locating of a dispensary two miles or more when measured from City Hall for ten points or the locating of it one and one-half miles or more from City Hall for five points, and asked about the rationale behind that language. Mr. Caldera replied the goal was to try to ensure dispersion of dispensaries throughout the City. They had discussed a variety of ideas by which to achieve that goal. Doing something short of having an anchor location to measure from became very complicated. Some of the ideas had involved distance requirements between themselves, but that opened up a host of questions such as determining the first dispensary from which everything would be measured. This was what staff thought would be the simplest and cleanest way to incentivize dispersion throughout the City. He pointed out it brought with it some questions as they could still have clustering just over two miles away, but it did incentivize trying to find locations beyond the Business Loop and Paris Road, which were locations it appeared people were considering at this time.

Mr. Skala assumed staff believed there would not be a shortage of applications for the downtown area where a lot of commerce was conducted since it had created this scoring system. Mr. Caldera stated he did not know. The last time he checked there had been a little over 30 zoning review requests submitted to the Community Development Department and only four properties were looking to locate downtown at that time. He

noted it could have expanded significantly since then. He reiterated that the goal was to avoid clustering in certain areas.

Ms. Peters understood Columbia was in the Fourth Congressional District and the State had indicated 24 dispensaries could be licensed in this District. Mr. Caldera explained the State would award 24 dispensary licenses for the Fourth Congressional District, which included 24 different counties. At some point, they might expand that, but at this point they had not shown any signs of going beyond the 24. Ms. Peters understood the expectation was that those licenses would then be distributed within the District by population. Ms. Thompson commented that in terms of zoning, the Council had adopted an ordinance to allow one per 20,000 in population to ensure the remainder of the Congressional District had support through medical marijuana and it would not all be clustered in Columbia. Mr. Caldera explained that if the State were to issue a dispensary license per population, the ratio would be one for every 31,192 people. Staff had decided to make that breakdown a little friendlier and to incorporate that into the local ordinances.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the State was required to distribute dispensaries throughout the Congressional District. Mr. Caldera replied the State provided bonus points for locating in certain areas, but other than that, they were not distributing the dispensaries. Mr. Pitzer understood the State could provide 24 licenses for the Columbia area. Mr. Caldera stated they could theoretically do that.

Mr. Pitzer referred to Section 13-444, which discussed ownership changes and indicated that if more than five percent of the business was conveyed to an individual not listed on the initial application, the license was automatically forfeited, and asked what they were trying to accomplish with that language. Mr. Caldera replied the goal was to know who owned these businesses since it was a heavily regulated industry, and this was a way to ensure people were not just meeting the initial thresholds, obtaining a business license, and then selling their portion of the business to other entities that had interests outside of the State of Missouri. He commented that the goal was to retain oversight with regard to who owned the business and for them to have to go through the process again if they were not complying with the priorities of the Council. Ms. Thompson explained these business licenses were not intended to be a commodity that could be bought and sold by the licensee or transferred by the licensee. It was a City license that was issued based upon the evaluation criteria. As a result, transferring the ownership interest did not mean the license would transfer with it. The business would have to go through a brand new review process.

Mr. Pitzer asked if any other businesses were subject to that restriction. Ms. Thompson replied it depended on the type of business, but she did not believe there was a five percent requirement in general. She pointed out they also had not limited the number of licenses for other businesses. In this particular instance, the limitation on the number of licenses within the zoning code actually created a supply and demand situation. It was a bit more complicated than the other business licenses.

Mr. Pitzer understood a family business could not be passed from one generation to the next if the younger generation was not on the initial application. Ms. Thompson stated that was true for medical marijuana. Mr. Caldera commented that he would have to double check, but believed that applied to State licenses as well.

Mr. Pitzer asked if staff had thought about a forfeiture of the license and a requirement to go through the process again if the applicant at some point did not comply with the other prerequisites for an application, such as residency of more than a year. Mr. Skala thought any change in ownership would require them to go through the process again regardless of whether they met the requirements or not. Mr. Pitzer understood what it said and noted he was only thinking about potential unintended consequences.

Mr. Pitzer understood the State was required to issue licenses by the end of the year and this proposed ordinance had a two week window from October 1 to October 15 for dispensaries unless the State had not issued the licenses by then, and asked for clarification. Ms. Thompson replied the City had an application window of two weeks and

then the business services administrator was allowed 60 days to review the application. If the State had not awarded licenses yet, it would extend the review period of the business services administrator to 30 days beyond the period of time in which the State issued its licenses. Mr. Pitzer understood anyone that applied in the first window would receive first priority. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. She explained staff had spoken with Dan Viets, and he had an interest in suggesting to the Council that the window be expanded to a period of time greater than two weeks. She commented that there was not any magic from the perspective of staff for the two week time frame. They only felt a period of time was needed, such as 30 days, between October 1 and October 31, and that the applications needed to be filed before the State issued its licenses. She explained staff did not want to be hit with all of the applications at once on the very last date. She noted they also wanted to allow people the opportunity to be operating on January 1 if the State was timely in issuing its licenses.

Mr. Pitzer asked Ms. Thompson if she thought the State would issue all of its licenses at once or if they would trickle them out. Ms. Thompson replied she thought it would be one time. Mr. Caldera stated he believed the Director of the Department of Health and Senior Services (DHSS) at the State had indicated the desire to try to get the licenses for the cultivation and manufacturers out quickly to allow production to begin. As a result, he believed the dispensaries would be the last priority. He commented that based on discussions with counterparts throughout the country, licenses were usually issued at the last minute. He thought they should expect it to take the full time.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the City was required to issue a license on January 1. He wondered if there was a problem with waiting until February 1 or March 1. Ms. Thompson replied if the State had their licenses issued, she believed the City would have the obligation to try to issue licenses, but they would have a reasonable time after the State issued their licenses to issue their licenses. She did not believe there was any expectation that if the State issued theirs on January 1, the City had to have its licenses issued by January 5. She reiterated the City would have a reasonable period of time to process applications. She commented that the City's definition of reasonable time and Mr. Viets' definition of reasonable time might be different. She noted staff understood residents wanted access to medical marijuana and pointed out it would likely take a successful applicant some time to start operating after being issued a license. She reiterated that they were cognizant of this and wanted to put the infrastructure in place in order to be responsive.

Mayor Treece asked if the ownership of a limited liability company would trigger a change of ownership under this ordinance since the limited liability company would still maintain ownership. Mr. Caldera replied he believed it would as it was something he had anticipated. Mayor Treece asked if that would be triggered by a majority of owners or a minority of owners. Ms. Thompson referred to Section 13-424 and noted the officers, directors, or stockholders that owned at least ten percent of the corporation and the manager who was in charge of the facility was considered the applicant. If it was an application on behalf of a limited liability company, the applicant was all members and managers. She noted they could not shield themselves behind a limited liability company as a separate entity. All members and managers were the applicant for the purposes of meeting the criteria. If there was more than a five percent change in the ownership percentage of the members, even of the limited liability company, it would trigger the clause in Section 13-444.

Mayor Treece asked if the ordinance contemplated the insertion of a management company. Ms. Thompson replied it did not if it was a contractual relationship. Mayor Treece stated he was agnostic on the result, but noted they had scoring criteria that incentivized or awarded preference to local owners and residents. He wondered what would happen if a year into the business, the owners did not feel it was what they had anticipated or if the business was highly lucrative and owners wanted to convert it to passive income by converting the operation of the business to a national company. Mr. Caldera explained Section 13-440 required licensees to update the City on any changes

to the information provided in the application, and that would include the applicants, the ownership structure, etc. If anything about the applicant's status changed, the City would know about it and the business services administrator would have the authority to potentially revoke the license. Mayor Treece understood they had to do it in real time and not at the renewal of their license. Mr. Caldera stated any change in the application information must occur at the time of the change, but as part of the renewal process, a notarized affidavit was required showing the current ownership structure even if it had not changed. They were also required to update the City if there was a five percent ownership change.

Mayor Treece commented that a concern he had was how the City's process overlapped with the State process. They were asking applicants to apply for a local license before they knew if they were awarded a State license. He asked for help in justifying that other than the City's interest in processing the applications in a timely manner after they were awarded a license by the State. Ms. Thompson replied that was really the crux of it. The State had closed its application period so no one else would apply for a dispensary or other license at the State level. Staff felt most of the information requested within the City's licensing provisions were very similar to what the State had required. The City had some additional requirements, but the vast majority was similar. As a result, they did not feel it would be an undue burden on the applicant to go ahead and apply for the local license as well so City staff could begin the review process and not be the delay. Staff felt the worse thing they could do was to be the delay. She noted she understood Mr. Viets had a concern with regard to those that might apply but did not receive a license awarded by the State as they would be required to pay the \$2,000 application fee. Mayor Treece understood the City would be incurring staff time to review the application to meet their time line. Ms. Thompson thought Mr. Viets would request that the fee be returned to those that were not awarded a State license. She commented that she felt that was the only downside to the City requiring applications to be filed early.

Dan Viets explained he had met with Ms. Thompson and Mr. Caldera last week to discuss several of the points in the proposal. He commented that he did not believe it was likely that applicants would know by October 1 whether or not they had a license. The leaders of DHSS had made it clear they were not likely to issue licenses until very close to the end of the year. He understood it was possible the cultivation and manufacturing licenses might be issued sooner, but that was not being discussed here. For the most part, they were discussing the dispensary applicants. If the proportion of applicants in Columbia was similar to what it was statewide, there would likely be 40-50 people that had filed an application to locate in Columbia. Making those 40-50 people pay \$2,000-plus an unknown additional fee was unreasonable in his opinion. He believed the window should be widened or eliminated. He thought they should allow people to apply early if they wished, but did not agree with forcing them to apply during any certain window. He understood the consequence of not applying for a City business license sooner was that one might not get to open as quickly as one hoped, but that was not the City's role to dictate. He commented that he thought it had been a mistake to limit the number of business licenses in Columbia to seven dispensaries. He did not think it was likely that more than that number would be awarded or that it would be an issue, but if more were awarded, he felt there could be a very strong argument that it would be unconstitutional to deny a City business license to someone who received a State license. He stated Article XIV of the Constitution said that any undue burden on an operator was unconstitutional and denying a business license to an operator would likely be unconstitutional. He pointed out that many of these requirements duplicated what the State already required. It was only placing unneeded additional burden on people trying to operate in Columbia. He commented that the additional costs incurred by dispensary operators would inevitably be passed along to patients. He explained that there might not be a competitive process for business licenses, but if there were, awarding extra points for being two miles from City Hall would not ensure any dispersal whatsoever. It would

only ensure there would not be any dispensaries downtown. He did not believe there was any reason to deny any dispensary downtown as that was where most people were located and the support for Article XIV had been the greatest. He pointed out that Section 13-423(b)(1)(v) of the proposed ordinance would allow the Columbia Police Department to add security requirements from time to time, which he believed likely meant any time. It introduced an element of uncertainty and potentially great expense for business operators. One assumption he knew to be unwarranted was that crime would increase around dispensaries as research and the published science indicated precisely the opposite. He respectfully suggested delaying the final passage of the proposed ordinance and allowing a bit more time to consider it. He thought the reason more people were not present tonight was because they were all exhausted from going through the State application process, which had ended at 4:30 p.m. today, and there had not been the opportunity for many of the people that would directly be affected to be aware of what was contained in the proposed ordinance.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Viets if he was an applicant, an investor, or the representative of any applicant. Mr. Viets replied he was advising some applicants. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Viets if he was providing legal services to them. Mr. Viets replied yes. Mayor Treece understood Mr. Viets was acting as their attorney. Mr. Viets stated that was correct in the sense that he was providing suggestions for their applications. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Viets if he was advocating for them or if he was representing them as an attorney. Mr. Viets replied he did not know as that seemed to be a fine line. He stated he was not present tonight advocating for any specific applicant. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Viets if he was asking the Council to vote yes or no. Mr. Viets replied he was asking the Council to delay action on the proposed ordinance. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Viets if he was registered as a lobbyist for the clients he was representing on this issue. Mr. Viets replied he was not being paid to do this. Mayor Treece understood Mr. Viets was not getting paid to represent their interest. Mr. Viets explained he was not getting paid to speak here this evening. He reiterated he was not speaking on behalf of anyone he was advising or representing. He was speaking as a citizen and as one who was concerned for the welfare of the patients that Article XIV was designed to serve.

Mayor Treece recalled Mr. Viets also asking the Council to delay a decision on the zoning requirements and asked if that was correct. Mr. Viets replied yes. Mayor Treece understood the State required applicants to submit an address indicating where they were legally allowed to conduct business and they would not have been able to do so without the action of Council. Mr. Viets pointed out that was required by 4:30 p.m. today, and he believed there would have been plenty of time to give more consideration to the zoning requirements and not disadvantage any applicant.

Mayor Treece commented that assuming time was money and the desire of an applicant to begin business as soon as possible, he wondered how the City would best go about expediting the local license if awarded a license by the State. Mr. Viets replied by issuing a business license to each one that received a State license. Mayor Treece pointed out the Council had capped that at seven. Mr. Viets stated he thought that was a mistake. Mayor Treece noted he did not believe the Council would make an amendment to change that and felt that capping the number would make each more profitable and eligible to make a larger investment. Mr. Viets explained he thought that was a mistake as he believed patients should be their greatest concern, not making applicant licensees more profitable. He reiterated the welfare of patients should be their greatest concern and they were better served when there was competition.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Viets what he would suggest the Council do with the application window. Mr. Viets replied he would recommend eliminating it or extending it to a time past the end of this year so people knew whether or not they had a license from the State. Mayor Treece felt a cutoff of some type was needed. Mr. Viets asked if that was done with any other business license. Mayor Treece commented that the reality was that they would not want a first come, first served business license process. Mr. Viets

thought they would want those that had a State license to be served, and not the ones that came first. The others would not need a City license.

Mr. Pitzer noted a deadline was needed because the City had capped the number. Mayor Treece agreed. Ms. Peters asked if a deadline was really necessary and wondered if they could just accept the first seven. Mayor Treece replied he was not sure the first seven were the best seven. Mr. Pitzer agreed. Ms. Peters agreed they might not be the best seven.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Viets if he wanted the first seven or the best seven. Mr. Viets replied they did not get to pick them. The State would make the decision as to the best seven or whatever other number they chose. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Viets if he thought the City should take the seven highest scoring State applicants. Mr. Viets replied the City would have to take those that the DHSS licensed as they were the ones that would be able to do business within Columbia. Mayor Treece understood that was the case with regard to the criteria of the State, but noted the City had its own interests in ensuring they had acceptable business operators. Mr. Viets stated he believed the Constitution mandated the City, within reason, to grant a business license to those that had a license from the State. There was not any point in granting a business license to people that did not have a license from the State as they would not be conducting business.

Mayor Treece commented that he had heard Mr. Viets indicate concern with regard to the application fee, the application window, and when the window was opened, and asked him if he had any concerns with regard to scoring criteria proposed. Mr. Viets replied the scoring criteria in the proposed ordinance would only come into play if the State licensed more, and that was not likely. As a result, he had not focused on that or objected loudly to the limit of seven because it was unlikely the State would issue more than seven licenses within the City. In addition, he understood the scoring would only come into play if the State issued more than seven licenses. Mayor Treece commented that if Mr. Viets was right, there was nothing to fight about. Mr. Viets agreed they did not have anything to fight about on that point. Mayor Treece stated the City would take the seven awarded. Mr. Viets commented that he thought the City had to issue a business license to the seven or so the State would license within Columbia. The scoring criteria would be irrelevant unless the State licensed more than seven within Columbia, and then there would likely be litigation.

Mr. Viets thought there were valid points to consider with regard to the \$2,000-plus dollar every applicant of a City license would have to pay and the time in which they would have to apply for a City business license in the proposed ordinance. Mayor Treece asked what applicants were doing between now and the time their applications were awarded. Mr. Viets thought they should leave when the applicant chose to apply for a City business license up to the applicant as they did with other business licenses. He did not feel it should be limited to two weeks or any other time frame.

Mayor Treece asked about the criteria for liquor licenses. Mr. Caldera replied he was not an expert with regard to liquor licenses. Mayor Treece asked if they waived application fees for the local license. Mr. Caldera replied he did not know.

Ms. Peters understood Mr. Viets thought most of the patients that would need medical marijuana would live downtown. Mr. Viets explained there were more people in the downtown so for that reason yes when compared to any comparable geographic area of the City. Ms. Peters understood Mr. Viets was assuming that since there were more people downtown they had a higher need for medical marijuana. She explained she had been excited to have the split throughout the City. She noted the location they approved earlier in the evening would involve a building with parking nearby, which was likely more convenient than a downtown location where one would have to park a few blocks away. Mr. Viets stated he did not believe this proposal accomplished that as was acknowledged by staff. They might all be grouped in another area of town. It did not ensure dispersal. He commented that one could mandate that one be located in each ward or some other geographic disbursement, but the proposed ordinance did not do that. It simply

discouraged any of them from operating downtown or anywhere near downtown if there was a competitive situation, which they did not know would even evolve.

Ms. Peters understood Mr. Viets did not believe the State would get around to providing licenses until the end of December and, as a result, a better solution was for the City to wait until then and allow people to apply to the City in January knowing they might not receive a license until February. Mr. Viets replied he thought the solution was to allow the business owners to decide when they wanted to apply for a business license as they did with other businesses. He pointed out the only medical marijuana that would be sold was that which was grown in Missouri and it took about four months to grow a crop of marijuana. Unless DHSS licensed cultivators quickly, there was not any way anyone would be selling marijuana medically until at least early spring so it would not keep anyone from opening if they decided to wait until the end of the year. He reiterated it should be left to them to decide when to apply.

Mr. Ruffin stated a compromise between the proposed ordinance and what Mr. Viets was suggesting would be to have the two week window in January as opposed to October. Mr. Viets commented that he thought that would make more sense. He wondered why they would want to waste the time of staff in reviewing applications from people that would not receive a license. He pointed out he was not sure a narrow window of any kind was needed. Mr. Ruffin explained for him it would concentrate the time of staff to allow them to go through the process and get it done since it was a new initiative. It was different than a liquor license that was ongoing. Mr. Viets understood and reiterated he questioned having staff review 50 licenses when only 6-7 would receive a State license. Mr. Ruffin commented that a two week window in January would allow them to better focus staff time. Mr. Viets thought that would make more sense.

Mayor Treece asked Council if they wanted to pass something tonight. Mr. Pitzer replied he did not feel they needed to as he did not believe there was any urgency unless there was something of which he was not aware. He agreed in concept to allowing them to take their time in terms of applying for a business license like they did with other businesses, but noted the problem was that they had constrained the number of licenses they would grant. As a result, he felt there had to be some window or deadline.

Mayor Treece asked if everyone agreed they had to have some process. Mr. Ruffin replied yes. Ms. Peters asked if the process needed to include a 2-4 week window. Mayor Treece replied not necessarily. Ms. Peters stated she thought the City should wait until the State licenses were issued. She did not feel there was any reason the staff needed to review an application from anyone that had not received a State license. Ms. Thompson pointed out the business services administrator was only one person, and staff was a bit overwhelmed with tobacco retailing licensing, business licensing, etc. The staff liked to do their homework ahead of time. She commented that October 1 might be too soon, but thought staff wanted something in advance to begin the review process because it had to be reviewed by multiple departments.

Mayor Treece commented that he believed this was like a modern day gold rush. There were 2,100 people who thought they had the best application, financing, and location, and all but 192 would be disappointed. He wondered if it would not be in the City's best interest to wait until the State awarded licenses. If there were seven within Columbia, they knew there would be seven licenses assuming they met the City's criteria. If there were 30, they would then only be dealing with 30 applications or some fraction thereof. He felt they were adding to the burden of staff by opening the window before the State had issued licenses. He pointed out staff would do \$2,000 worth of work on every application, and if there were 100 applications, all but seven would have their money refunded, and they would then not be able to recover the City's costs. Mr. Thomas stated he did not believe the money would be refunded per the current version of the proposed ordinance, but agreed it was a waste of work. He wondered why they would want to process 90 applications for no reason. Mayor Treece thought it might be worth addressing the application window and then passing the ordinance.

Ms. Peters asked if the State would issue all licenses at the same time. Mr. Caldera replied he assumed they would. Ms. Peters asked if they could pass an ordinance indicating the applicant had two weeks after receiving the State license to apply as that would limit the number of applicants without establishing a date of October 1 or December 1. They would then also not have people applying without a State license. Mr. Caldera replied it could be done in that manner. He commented that as soon as something was passed, staff would create the application forms and all of the internal documents needed to begin the review process when necessary. He stated there were internal things the staff had to do and they needed a regulatory framework in order to get it done. Ms. Thompson commented that they needed something that was definitive as it would take staff some time to organize the paperwork when submitted.

Mayor Treece wondered if those that had filed applications would rather have the predictability of knowing they had a State license and not losing the \$2,000 application fee even if it meant the potential of being delayed four months into 2020 before starting their business.

Ms. Thompson suggested the Council amend the ordinance so it was December 1 through December 30 tonight, and as they received more clarity, the Council could amend the ordinance to January or some other time in the future. This would allow for middle ground in that they would not be rushing it with the October time frame, but would still have something in place prior to January 1. She noted Mr. Caldera and the business services administrator had been receiving and fielding phone calls and the main question was when the City would begin accepting applications and issuing licenses. She explained people wanted to begin submitting security plans for a pre-review. This was the reason the ordinance was drafted in this manner, but they could definitely use the additional time to get the paperwork in order.

Ms. Peters suggested saying they would accept the application only after one received a State license. Mr. Thomas agreed as it would be more efficient. Ms. Thompson noted they could indicate the application period would close 21 days after the date the State issued their licenses. She pointed out they did not know if the State would do them all at the same time, but believed they would all be done at the same time based upon other locations. Cultivation, manufacturing and testing licenses would likely occur first. She thought it would likely be a rolling 21-day period.

Mr. Pitzer understood cultivation, manufacturing, and testing facilities were not limited and asked why they would not allow for application of a business license. Mr. Caldera replied they could submit one right away after receiving a State issued license. There was not a constraint or time period for those types of facilities. Ms. Thompson pointed out if there were not more than seven licenses issued in Columbia for dispensaries, those would not be issues either.

Ms. Peters asked if this should be delayed so the change could be made. Ms. Thompson replied she thought that amendment could be made tonight.

Mr. Skala understood this would allow staff the opportunity to prepare in terms of forms, etc. Mr. Caldera agreed. He pointed out multiple departments would be involved and they all had to develop processes and procedures related to this.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a firm date within the ordinance by which they would contemplate the City issuing the license. If they were required to submit a local license application within 21 days of the award of the State license, he wondered how many days they had to process it. Mr. Caldera replied as it was currently proposed, the City had 60 days with the provision of an additional 30 days if the State had not issued all of its dispensary licenses. He imagined that given the small staff that was coordinating all of this that it would probably be a good idea to provide that same amount of time.

Ms. Peters stated she did not believe that was an issue since someone could not legally grow marijuana until January 1 and it would take four months to grow. As a result, there would not be anything to sell until April, which was 120 days from the end of the year. A 60-day approval process would allow one to receive a license and still have two months to

open their business.

Mr. Skala stated he liked the idea of waiting for the State to issue licenses and of the 21-day period along with 60 days for the City to process the application. Mr. Caldera pointed out that would be a 21-day period for dispensary licenses. Mr. Skala understood.

Mayor Treece asked how the ordinance as drafted contemplated cultivation, testing, etc. Mr. Caldera replied there was not a window for those facilities. Mayor Treece understood those were State license dependent because they were not capped. Mr. Caldera explained a person could theoretically receive a State issued license for cultivation and sit on it for seven months before applying for a local business license, and as long as they met all of the local requirements under this ordinance, they would receive a business license.

Ms. Thompson stated the Council could amend Section 13-428 so it would read "The business services administrator will accept applications for the initial issuance of medical marijuana dispensary facility licenses under this article for a period of twenty-one (21) days after DHSS has issued its licenses for medical marijuana dispensary facilities. An applicant for consideration of issuance of an initial medical marijuana dispensary facility license issued by the city must submit a complete application during the identified twenty-one (21) day period. An application must satisfy the requirements of this article to be considered complete. The business services administrator shall review all applications within sixty (60) days after the close of the initial application filing period. For good cause shown, the business services administrator may extend the review period for issuance of initial medical marijuana dispensary licenses for up to an additional thirty (30) days. Applications filed after the close of the initial application filing period will be based on availability of licenses and will only be processed after all of the applications filed during the initial application filing period have been either issued or denied."

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B230-19 by changing Section 13-428 so it read "The business services administrator will accept applications for the initial issuance of medical marijuana dispensary facility licenses under this article for a period of twenty-one (21) days after DHSS has issued its licenses for medical marijuana dispensary facilities. An applicant for consideration of issuance of an initial medical marijuana dispensary facility license issued by the city must submit a complete application during the identified twenty-one (21) day period. An application must satisfy the requirements of this article to be considered complete. The business services administrator shall review all applications within sixty (60) days after the close of the initial application filing period. For good cause shown, the business services administrator may extend the review period for issuance of initial medical marijuana dispensary licenses for up to an additional thirty (30) days. Applications filed after the close of the initial application filing period will be based on availability of licenses and will only be processed after all of the applications filed during the initial application filing period have been either issued or denied." The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters and approved unanimously by voice vote with Mr. Trapp abstaining.

Mr. Skala wondered if they wanted to make any changes to the scoring criteria in lieu of some of the testimony they had heard.

Ms. Peters stated she had initially thought the idea of wards might be good, but then realized three wards came together at Broadway and College Avenue. Mr. Thomas noted they would then have to determine who would be the first to be awarded a license in a given ward.

Mr. Skala commented that he was not convinced that what they had in the proposed framework was not serviceable, but understood they might want to make some changes. Ms. Peters understood that if only seven dispensaries received State licenses, it would not matter except to say they could not all be on a particular street. Mr. Pitzer pointed

out the proposed ordinance would not prevent that. Ms. Peters agreed.

Mr. Pitzer understood what staff was trying to do and believed it was laudable but pointed out he believed the buffer zones in the downtown accomplished the desire to disperse outside of the downtown, and that had been done via the zoning code. Mayor Treece agreed.

Mayor Treece explained that one of his preferences would have been to incentivize having a physician because he did not believe a physician would do anything to jeopardize a license as opposed to someone else that might not have that same rigor of professional licensure. The only other concern that he had was that they might be asking an applicant to provide additional information that might be inconsistent with the criteria used to obtain a State license. He understood the interest in local investment, cultural competency, diversity, etc., but wondered if they were forfeiting an otherwise good State licensure.

Mr. Ruffin pointed out they were not requiring the applicant to be two miles away from City Hall. It was optional. Mayor Treece commented that they were also not requiring them to be locally owned, etc., and if there were only seven applicants, it was not an issue. Mr. Ruffin agreed. Mayor Treece noted if there were more than seven, this was how the City was choosing to prioritize.

Mr. Ruffin asked if someone had said four properties in the downtown area had been identified. Mr. Caldera replied staff had received four requests for downtown properties, but thought only two of them had potentially complied with the 500-foot buffer. He pointed out he did not know how many might be the same applicant or if multiple applicants were asking. Mr. Ruffin stated that in all likelihood there would be a dispensary in the downtown area. Mr. Caldera agreed. Ms. Peters noted there could be four because they were not requiring the dispensaries to be certain distances apart from one another. She understood they could all be located next to each other as well. Mr. Caldera stated that was correct. He also clarified that two of the four he had been aware of had been within 500 feet of a school, daycare, or church so they were not qualifying properties.

Ms. Peters understood the City's ordinances did not really do anything to try to spread the dispensaries out throughout the City. If seven qualifying buildings in the downtown were found, they could all be located in the downtown. Mayor Treece agreed it only incentivized locations outside of the downtown. Ms. Thompson noted if they received nine applications, those that were not located in the center of the City would receive more points. Mr. Caldera explained the thought process was to make places like Keene Street more appealing.

Mr. Pitzer understood they could have nine applications and the two in the downtown could be eliminated because of this clause. Ms. Peters agreed, but noted she was also not sure how to make it any better. Mr. Pitzer stated he was not sure how to make it any better, but was not sure the 1.5-2 mile radiuses made the entire process any better. He suggested it be removed completely because they had already limited the number that could be placed downtown through the zoning code. He did not believe they needed to limit the number of dispensaries downtown any further. Ms. Peters thought seven of them could be located in the downtown and they would then not have anything that would spread them out. Mr. Pitzer pointed out this would only get them out of the downtown. It did not spread them out.

Mr. Thomas asked why they wanted them to be spread out. They did not do this with any other kind of business. He noted the marketplace tended to self-regulate. Mayor Treece pointed out the result would be similar to the agglomeration of payday loans and vaping shops. He did not believe they wanted to create that type of atmosphere. Mr. Thomas understood they thought that if this was not regulated, medical marijuana places would congregate in low-income areas like payday loans. Mayor Treece stated he thought given Mr. Viets' testimony that they would see them in the downtown due to the population. Nothing they would do would regulate them away from the downtown. It would simply incentivize them to be outside of the downtown. Mr. Thomas asked Mayor

Treece if he was putting medical marijuana in the same category as payday loans. Mayor Treece replied no. Ms. Peters stated they could be put in the same category as bars like they had along Broadway. Mr. Thomas commented that he did not view that as bad. Ms. Peters explained that if the expectation was for patients with medical needs for marijuana to obtain it, some of those patients would have trouble getting to the downtown. Mr. Thomas thought business owners would place their businesses where it was most convenient for their patients or customers, like bars, payday loans, etc., and if there was a negative aspect to it, he felt they might want to regulate it, but he was not convinced there was a negative aspect.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought it was a bit too complicated to have criteria split into two different categories, i.e., one that was beyond two miles and the other that was beyond 1.5 miles. If they were after an incentive to not congregate downtown, he felt 1.5 miles and five points was sufficient. In terms of the bonus points for minorities, women, and veterans, he thought it was a laudable goal that should remain at ten points. He suggested simplifying the criteria in terms of distances, but to leave the other criteria in place.

Mayor Treece stated he thought leaving the two-mile limit provided another path to obtain bonus points while at the same time achieving the goal of the City. Mr. Skala commented that he was not wed to the 1.5 mile criteria. He only thought it was overengineered to have the tiered system for the distance. He was agreeable to the two miles if that was preferred.

Mr. Ruffin felt the distance criteria would allow people to be outside of the high rent district of the downtown as a matter of equity.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B230-19 by changing Section 13-430(3) so the distance criteria was only two miles and five bonus points. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mayor Treece asked what that did to the total points. Ms. Thompson replied there would be a total of 45 points with that change. Mayor Treece asked if that would create a problem in terms of calculations. Mr. Caldera replied no.

Mayor Treece stated he would oppose the amendment because he liked the graduated scale the one and one-half miles and two miles provided. He thought it also provided the further dispersion they were attempting to gain and allowed for the prevention of the economic tendency to locate next to one's competitor. While competition was good, it allowed people to cut corners, pay staff less, invest less in the building, etc. He believed they were trying to do the opposite of vape shops and payday loans by creating facilities that served everyone. For some, that might be downtown, and for others, it might be on Keene Street when leaving the medical complex. Mr. Skala noted Keene Street would fit the two mile radius and receive the bonus points. Mayor Treece commented that the Boone Hospital corridor would then not receive bonus points. Mr. Skala explained he was only trying to simplify the criteria.

Mr. Pitzer stated he would oppose this amendment because he did not believe there should be any criteria.

The motion made by Mr. Skala and seconded by Mr. Thomas to amend B230-19 by changing Section 13-430(3) so the distance criteria was only two miles and five bonus points was defeated by voice vote with Mr. Trapp abstaining and only Mr. Thomas, Ms. Peters, and Mr. Skala voting yes.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to amend B230-19 by striking Section 13-430(3) to remove all distance criteria. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas and defeated by voice vote with Mr. Trapp abstaining and only Mr. Thomas and Mr. Pitzer voting yes.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Pitzer if he was feeling rushed. Mr. Pitzer replied yes. He

understood staff had spent a lot of time working on this, which he appreciated. He also understood this was the great unknown for all of them, but felt this had been overengineered.

Mr. Skala pointed out the ordinance could be amended at a later date if necessary if they were worried about the great unknown. He also felt a reason to proceed was to provide guidelines to staff so they were prepared.

Mayor Treece commented that if the State blindly awarded licenses within the City of Columbia limits to seven national for-profit corporations, all of this would be moot because the bonus points would not be necessary. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct and noted the bonus points were only used as a tiebreaker in the event there were more than seven applications and they were weighted toward trying to achieve the City's Strategic Plan of social equity and health equity within the community. Staff had tried to tie it to the Council's goals and priorities. If everyone received the same number of points, they would then go back to the State's scoring criteria. The first level was the priorities of the Council, the next level was to go back to the State's scoring criteria, and the final level was a random lottery.

**B230-19, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: THOMAS, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, SKALA. VOTING NO: PITZER.
ABSTAINING: TRAPP. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

Mr. Thomas declared an ex-parte conversation with the developer associated with B213-19.

Mr. Trapp returned to the meeting room.

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

- B210-19 Appointing John Glascock as City Manager for the City of Columbia; authorizing an employment agreement.
- B213-19 Rezoning property located on the south side of Ash Street and west of Greenwood Avenue (906 W. Ash Street) from District R-2 (Two-Family Dwelling District) to District PD (Planned District); approving a statement of intent; approving the PD Plan for "Ash Street Community" (Case No. 154-2019).
- B214-19 Approving a major amendment to the "Spring Creek - Phase 2" C-P Development Plan located on the north side of Vawter School Road and east of Scott Boulevard; changing the uses allowed within the Spring Creek - Phase 2 C-P Development Plan; authorizing a revised statement of intent (Case No. 158-2019).
- B216-19 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to establish permit parking in the municipal lot located on the south side of Walnut Street, between Tenth Street and Short Street.
- B220-19 Accepting conveyances for drainage and sewer purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B221-19 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with the Missouri Department of Conservation for financial support of the community conservationist position within the Office of Sustainability.
- B222-19 Authorizing an airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission relating to air service promotion for the Columbia Regional Airport; amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by

- appropriating funds.
- B223-19 Authorizing an airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for aircraft rescue and firefighting training assistance at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B224-19 Authorizing a road relinquishment agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the conveyance of a portion of the relocated Route H as part of the project to extend Runway 2-20 at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B225-19 Authorizing an environmental child care sanitation inspections participation agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services.
- B226-19 Authorizing Addendum #1 to the agreement with the Boone County Fire Protection District.
- B227-19 Accepting a donation from United HealthCare as part of the “Well Deserved Award” program in recognition of the City’s demonstrated commitment to employee worksite wellness; amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B228-19 Amending Ordinance No. 023721 to rename the Molly Bowden Neighborhood Policing Center to the “Molly Thomas-Bowden Neighborhood Policing Center.”
- B229-19 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code relating to conflicts of interest and financial disclosure procedures.
- B231-19 Amending Chapter 18 of the City Code as it relates to the investment committee of the police and firefighter retirement boards.
- R119-19 Setting a public hearing: proposed safety improvements to the Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT) crossing at Route B to include the installation of new concrete crossing surface panels, ties, rail and related track materials, roadway approach pavement and pavement markings.
- R120-19 Setting a public hearing: consider the 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan and FY 2020 Annual Action Plan for CDBG and HOME funds; establishing a comment period.
- R121-19 Granting a temporary waiver from the requirements of Section 16-185 of the City Code to allow possession and consumption of alcoholic beverages for the area along a portion of Park Avenue between Tenth Street and St. James Street, and the area along a portion of Orr Street between Park Avenue and Ash Street, for the annual Mid-Mo PrideFest event.
- R122-19 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the professional services agreement with Intuition & Logic Engineering, Inc. to perform a floodplain analysis of Mill Creek east of Bethel Street and manage the process of revising the official Flood Insurance Rate Map (FIRM) through the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA).

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN,

TRAPP, SKALA. 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.

- B238-19 Amending Chapter 18 of the City Code to restore coverage for the chief of police under the Police Retirement Plan; amending Chapter 19 of the City Code to eliminate special deferred compensation provisions for the chief of police.
- B239-19 Authorizing a first supplemental agreement to the airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the reconstruction of Runway 13-31 and Taxiway C projects at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B240-19 Authoring a cost apportionment agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission relating to the City's financial commitment of participation in the replacement of the I-70 Missouri River Bridge at Rocheport; amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B241-19 Accepting a conveyance for street purposes.
- B242-19 Authorizing construction of safety improvements to the Columbia Terminal Railroad (COLT) crossing at Route B to include the installation of new concrete crossing surface panels, ties, rail and related track materials, roadway approach pavement and pavement markings; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; authorizing a supplemental agreement for highway/rail crossing improvements with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission.
- B243-19 Authorizing agreements for professional services with Horizons Energy LLC and Siemens Industry, Inc. for the development of an Integrated Electric Resource Plan, an Electric Master Plan and an Electric Cost of Service Study; amending the FY 2019 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B244-19 Authorizing a second addendum to agreement for professional engineering services with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. for the More's Lake remediation and site restoration project at the Municipal Power Plant.
- B245-19 Authorizing an agreement for the donation of real estate with Ridgemont Development LLC for property in Ridgemont Park, Plat No. 1 Subdivision located southeast of the intersection of Ridgemont Road and College Park Drive to be used for open space and park purposes.
- B246-19 Authorizing an airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the Route H relocation project at the Columbia Regional Airport.

- B247-19 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the issuance of birth and death certificates and associated information technology activities.
- B248-19 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for WIC local agency nutrition services.
- B249-19 Authorizing Amendment No. 3 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for public health emergency preparedness services.
- B250-19 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the 1-2-3-4-5 Fit-Tastic! Early Childhood Education project; amending the FY 2019 annual budget by appropriating funds.
- B251-19 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services relating to the Teen Outreach Program (TOP).
- B252-19 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri to provide for the services of an assistant fire marshal for fire inspections of University facilities, and to assist in the development of construction drawings, emergency operations procedures and fire safety training.
- B253-19 Repealing Article II of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the International Building Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article II of Chapter 6 of the City Code adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Building Code.
- B254-19 Repealing Article III of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2006 Edition of the International Code Council Electrical Code Administrative Provisions referencing the 2014 National Electrical Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article III adopting the 2006 Edition of the International Code Council Electrical Code Administrative Provisions and the 2017 Edition of the National Electric Code NFPA 70.
- B255-19 Repealing Article IV of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the International Plumbing Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article IV adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Plumbing Code.
- B256-19 Repealing Article V of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the International Mechanical Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article V adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Mechanical Code.
- B257-19 Repealing Article VI of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the International Residential Code for One- and Two-Family Dwellings and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article VI adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Residential Code for One- and Two-Family Dwellings.

- B258-19 Repealing Article VII of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the International Property Maintenance Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article VII adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Property Maintenance Code.
- B259-19 Repealing Article IX of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the International Fuel Gas Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article IX adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Fuel Gas Code.
- B260-19 Repealing Article X of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the Energy Conservation Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article X adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Energy Conservation Code.
- B261-19 Repealing Article XI of Chapter 6 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the Existing Building Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article XI adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Existing Building Code.
- B262-19 Repealing Article II of Chapter 9 of the City Code relating to the 2015 Edition of the International Fire Code and enacting in lieu thereof a new Article II adopting the 2018 Edition of the International Fire Code.

X. REPORTS

- REP72-19 Proposed commission monitoring implementation of Climate Action and Adaptation Plan.

Ms. Buffaloe provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if the members of the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) were willing to be disbanded and reapply for this. Ms. Buffaloe replied there were multiple pieces and some had asked if they would be automatically included. She noted the City of Dubuque had gone through something similar recently whereby they had repealed their original sustainability commission and then reinstated one, but they had also invited the existing members to apply. She pointed out the application form would allow the Council to see if the person applying was on another board or commission. Mayor Treece asked if the EEC members had been okay with that. Ms. Buffaloe replied some of the EEC members would like to continue, but other members of the EEC had indicated they would be open to giving up their spot in order to allow for other voices. She noted there had not been a consensus.

Mayor Treece asked how many members were on the EEC. Ms. Buffaloe replied there were currently ten members on the EEC. Six were appointed by the Columbia City Council and four were appointed by the Boone County Commission. Mayor Treece asked Ms. Buffaloe if she had participated in any conversations with Boone County. Ms. Buffaloe replied she had participated in a couple of conversations with the Boone County Commissioners. She believed Commissioner Thompson understood they could make recommendations and liked the idea that anyone within the County could be appointed. In addition, she was more interested in plans for an internal staff team as she wanted to explore ensuring the City and County staffs were working together. As a result, she planned to come back with proposals for an internal team after the budget season along with what they could do with the County.

Mr. Skala commented that the EEC had dealt with planning and zoning issues, building code issues, land disturbance issues, etc. in the past, and was not sure those types of issues would be covered by this new group. He thought he could go along with this if he

was assured those pieces were in the mix as he did not want that type of advice to be lost. Ms. Buffaloe explained the second to last duty proposed was to advise the City Council on environmental issues as directed. She understood the current chair of the EEC had been concerned about something coming up that might not be in the CAAP in terms of who the Council would ask to provide feedback. She noted they had reviewed the topics discussed by the EEC over the last year, and all of them could be factored within a goal of the CAAP. She stated environmental and equity issues were also within the CAAP.

Mr. Pitzer asked if they would need an odd number of members. Ms. Buffaloe replied she was hoping for consensus voting. She commented that the EEC members had indicated it was easier if they had a larger number to pull from in order to do work in subcommittees. She understood 12-15 was an ideal number for these types of group. Mr. Skala noted the odd number was needed only to break a tie.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Buffaloe to bring back an ordinance roughly reflecting their thoughts.

Ms. Buffaloe asked the Council if they wanted any liaison relationships with other boards and commissions like the Historic Preservation Commission. Mayor Treece replied he thought they benefited from multidimensional people and noted he would prefer to leave it fairly broad similar to how they had structured the Mayor's Task Force on Climate Action and Adaptation Planning.

REP73-19 Commission on Human Rights correspondence regarding public transportation.

Mayor Treece understood this was informational and encouraged the Council to keep the thoughts of the Commission on Human Rights in mind throughout the budget process.

REP74-19 Operational cost comparison of existing and potential transit vehicles.

Mr. Thomas stated he appreciated the study as it was helpful to have a sense of how much more it tended to cost to run a bigger bus than a smaller bus. He understood paratransit vans could hold a maximum of two people in wheelchairs and asked how many regular seats were in those vans. Mr. Nichols replied he thought there were 12 seats. Mr. Thomas noted he thought it was either 12 or 8. He explained he was interested in trying to combine paratransit with flex zone service as he felt that would be efficient.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Thomas if there were any takeaways he wanted to point out. Mr. Thomas replied he thought the takeaway was that it was more expensive to run a bigger bus, but it was not overwhelmingly more expensive. He believed they should right-size the buses for the maximum number of riders, which he thought was already being done by staff.

Mr. Trapp asked if their guidance of avoiding the 40-foot buses would get in the way of maintaining their stock associated with the contract with the University. Mr. Nichols replied he thought they had enough at this time. Mr. Trapp stated he wanted to revisit the issue if it became problematic. Mr. Nichols explained the contract with the University had been renewed for one year and staff would work with the University with regard to either increasing their rates or reducing their service. He thought they would know more before the next budget cycle. Mr. Thomas commented that there was actually an interesting analysis of the contract with the University in that by providing that service, even if they were recovering 100 percent of the cost, which they were not, they were supporting a car-reliant culture because all of the people using those buses had driven to a parking lot. It was an infuriatingly inefficient system to have people drive to a parking lot to get on a bus to get to their location. He believed they could do better as a community. He stated he was not sure it was in the interest of the City of Columbia to even continue with that contract, and hoped they could have some honest conversations with the University before signing anything else.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, referred to B243-19, which involved contracts with Horizons Energy and Siemens Industry for a cost of service study, an integrated electric resource plan, and a master plan. He suggested that "Missouri" be added in Section 3.2. of the Horizons Energy contract so it said "Missouri Professional Engineer." It would then be in accordance with State Law if there were any engineering determinations made. He thought it might be good to notify Horizons Energy or Prime Group that if they made any engineering determinations in the cost of service study that they would need a certificate of authority to practice engineering in the State of Missouri. When he had checked this afternoon, they had not had that certificate. He believed it would be awkward to be in the middle of the contract or for the contract to be completed if they had engineering determinations made as part of the cost of service study without those being stamped by a Missouri licensed professional engineer. With regard to the Siemens Industry contract, there had not been a project team listed, which he had found interesting for a contract of \$720,000. He suggested "Missouri" be inserted in Section 3.2. of that contract as well. He understood the Siemens Industry proposal indicated the work described could be completed in approximately 48 months after receiving the notice to proceed and understood that was equivalent to four years, which was a long time. He pointed out the contract amounts totaled \$790,548, but the appropriation being requested was for \$900,000. He wondered why there was a difference in those amounts.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, stated he knew of an individual that had his bike stolen multiple times and had lost his job. He felt there needed to be a lock that could not be cut and stolen.

Mr. Elkin commented that a neighbor had recently had a heart attack and wondered why fire engines were dispatched to emergency situations. Mr. Glascock replied they were trained emergency services personnel. Mr. Trapp explained they arrived on average one minute quicker than an ambulance. Ms. Peters stated they were also helpful if a patient was heavy and if extra help was required in maneuvering the patient. Mr. Trapp noted they partnered excellently with the ambulance service. Mr. Elkin explained he had brought it up because the neighbor had complained since fire engines had problems getting in and out of smaller areas like mobile home parks and due to the costs involved with dispatching them. He wondered if there were ways to save money.

Mr. Elkin stated there was a major water leak behind Lee's Fried Chicken near Vandiver Drive and Paris Road. He noted water had continually run in that area for years and suggested it be addressed.

Mayor Treece commented that he thought Jana Stephens had presented a compelling argument about the West Area Plan and the need for a moratorium, but he had not voted on the prevailing side of that issue. The domino effect she had described was something he had not fully contemplated when they had voted on the Overton project, but there were 1,600 acres that could now connect because they were contiguous to that property.

Mr. Trapp stated the Council had not annexed that property. Mayor Treece understood the Council had only approved a sewer agreement and a pre-annexation agreement. Mr. Thomas noted they had paved the way for it to develop.

Mr. Trapp thought Ms. Stephens wanted them to speak to the Boone County Commission to reconsider their decision.

Mr. Skala stated he believed this was a Boone County issue. Mr. Pitzer agreed.

Mr. Glascock commented that he thought the County had already voted on the issue. Mr. Skala agreed.

Mr. Skala noted they had been told in the work session that one of the things they needed to do was to thank staff when the staff did good work. He stated he was thankful

for the improvements on Ballenger Lane as it looked terrific, and thanked the staff.

Mr. Skala explained he had been on a conference call this morning with the National League of Cities Racial Equity and Leadership (REAL) group and noted the City had sent an RFP to them along with a couple of other groups. He noted they were in the process of considering the RFPs and encouraged staff to ensure they try to divide the \$50,000 set aside between the local groups and REAL. He hoped they could enhance that during the next budget cycle given the information received via the RFP. In terms of the conference call, he noted he would distribute the information he had received to the Council via the City Clerk. He pointed out anyone interested could contact him at ward3@como.gov for that information as well. He stated it would include a report involving affordable housing, minutes from a prior meeting, and bills at the federal level to consider a commission to study reparations.

Mr. Pitzer commented that there had been a series of power outages in the Fifth Ward dating back to the spring and continuing throughout the summer. He thought it would be beneficial to understand what the electric utility did via a report in terms of preventive maintenance, tree-trimming, undergrounding, how they identified problem areas or areas that might need some preventative work, opportunities for improvement, how they determined if they were doing a good job, metrics that might be used, etc.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 12:08 a.m.