



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### City Council

---

Monday, November 18, 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 7:00 p.m. on Monday, November 18, 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 SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, and TRAPP were present. The Interim City Manager, Deputy City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

Mayor Treece explained the minutes for the November 4, 2019 Council Meeting were not yet complete.

Upon his request, Mayor Treece made a motion to allow Mr. Thomas to abstain from voting on the Community Land Trust Organization Board appointments. Mr. Thomas noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that there might be a possible appearance of a conflict of interest. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Upon his request, Mayor Treece made a motion to allow Mr. Trapp to abstain from voting on the Marijuana Facility License Review Board appointment. Mr. Trapp noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that he was a partner in a limited liability company that had pending applications for marijuana related businesses that might be subject to the Board. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala asked that R165-19 be moved from the consent agenda to new business.

Mr. Pitzer asked that R161-19 be moved from the consent agenda to new business.

Upon his request, Mayor Treece made a motion to allow Mr. Pitzer to abstain from voting on B347-19. Mr. Pitzer noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that he had a professional conflict of interest with one of the parties. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with R161-19 and R165-19 being moved to new business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Skala.

#### II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI15-19

Swearing in of De'Carlton Seewood as Deputy City Manager of the City of Columbia.

Mayor Treece asked De'Carlton Seewood to join Mr. Glascock, Interim City Manager, and Ms. Amin, City Clerk, at the podium.

The City Clerk administered the oath of office to Mr. Seewood as Deputy City Manager for the City of Columbia.

### III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

#### BC14-19 Board and Commission Applicants.

Upon receiving the majority vote of the Council, the following individuals were appointed to the following Boards and Commissions. In addition, Mr. Thomas abstained from voting on the Community Land Trust Organization Board appointments and Mr. Trapp abstained from voting on the Marijuana Facility License Review Board appointment.

#### AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD

Drury, Tom, 4603 Slocumb Court, Ward 2, Term to expire December 1, 2022

#### CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION

Amparan, Carolyn, 4804 Shales Oak Avenue, Ward 4, Term to expire November 30, 2022

Ascani, Erica, 1725 Cliff Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire November 30, 2022

Callis, Steven, 6304 W. Normandy Lane, Boone County, Term to expire November 30, 2022

Godwin, Linda, 3801 Eagle View Court, Ward 5, Term to expire November 30, 2022

Hall, Damon, 103 Anheuser-Busch Natural Resources Building (business), Ward 5, Term to expire November 30, 2020

Hutchinson, Andrew, 607 Washington Avenue, Ward 1, Term to expire November 30, 2021

Kaufmann, John, 1908 Park DeVillie Place, Ward 1, Term to expire November 30, 2021

Ludden, Matthew, 1905 Newton Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire November 30, 2021

Navarrete-Tindall, Nadia, 2116 Grant Lane, Ward 4, Term to expire November 30, 2021

Pingelton, Tim, 2500 Kyle Court, Ward 4, Term to expire November 30, 2020

Raghavan, Rhagu, 815 Boulder Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire November 30, 2020

Taylor, Jaquayah, 1502 Citadel Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire November 30, 2021

Thompson, Hallie, 2110 Lovejoy Lane, Ward 2, Term to expire November 30, 2020

Tippett Mosby, Leanne, 2605 E. Nichols Road, Boone County, Term to expire November 30, 2020

Triplett, Annette, 201 W. Broadway, Building 3, Suite B (business), Ward 1, Term to expire November 30, 2022

#### COLUMBIA VISION COMMISSION

Corbin, Megan, 3709 Prescott Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire December 15, 2022

D'Agostino Wilkerson, Anna, 2812 Burrwood Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire December 15, 2022

Hackworth, Alex, 1404 Wilson Avenue, Ward 6, Term to expire December 15, 2022

Hoagenson, Suzanne, 2305 Maricopa Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire December 15, 2022

Pass, Sasha, 2665 Alfalfa Drive, Boone County, Term to expire December 15, 2022

#### COMMISSION ON CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Roulier, Sharon, 4007 Blue Hollow Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire October 31, 2022

Mayor Treece explained they had referred the issue of the home occupant member to the Community Land Trust Organization Board and asked if everyone was agreeable to the City Clerk advertising the home occupant vacancies again. Everyone was agreeable.

#### COMMUNITY LAND TRUST ORGANIZATION BOARD

Cristal, Scott, 2205 N. Country Club Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire December 1, 2023

Maze, Susan, 902 N. Seventh Street, Ward 1, Term to expire December 1, 2023

#### CONVENTION AND VISITORS ADVISORY BOARD

Lawson, Eric, 61739 W. Business Highway 50, Moniteau County, Term to expire

September 30, 2020

MARIJUANA FACILITY LICENSE REVIEW BOARD

Boehm, Randall, 4158 Juniper Place, Ward 6, Term to expire September 30, 2022

MAYOR'S COUNCIL ON PHYSICAL FITNESS AND HEALTH

Doctor, Elena, 3001 S. Providence Road, #22F, Ward 5, Term to expire November 30, 2022

Harrison, Elizabeth, 3009 W. Rollins Road, Ward 4, Term to expire November 30, 2022

Pass, Sasha, 2665 E. Alfalfa Drive, Boone County, Term to expire November 30, 2022

PARKS AND RECREATION COMMISSION

Morrison, Paul, 2714 Squire Circle, Ward 3, Term to expire May 31, 2022

#### IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

#### V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH45-19 Proposed construction of a new terminal building at the Columbia Regional Airport; providing for construction of the proposed improvement using a design/build contract.

PH45-19 was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Button provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood some of the parking lots were darker on the diagram than the others and asked if that was indicative of a phased approach. Ms. Button replied a couple of them were bolder than others, but she did not believe anything had been meant by it.

Mayor Treece asked what would be included in the first phase. Ms. Button replied the first phase was intended to be roughly \$20 million and would involve an operational terminal. Specifically, it would include a shell, three of the four boarding bridges, the inbound baggage, mechanical, electrical, and plumbing work, TSA screening, the gates, and the secure areas.

Mayor Treece asked what would be included in the second phase. Ms. Button replied office space, administration, rental car agencies, airline offices, some of the other lobby, concourse, etc. items, and the outbound baggage.

Mayor Treece asked what would be done for outbound baggage during the first phase. Ms. Button replied they intended to use the baggage area in the existing terminal for outbound baggage. Passengers would come from the parking area, go into the existing terminal to hand off their luggage, and would then walk to the new terminal where they would go through screening, on to the gate, and board the plane. Depending on the bid responses, there might be opportunity to incorporate additional aspects into the first phase. Mayor Treece asked if they would anticipate a change in design that would not have the connectivity between the two buildings if they did not have the outbound baggage dependent on the existing terminal. Ms. Button replied the entire shell or the footprint of the building would be constructed for that. Mayor Treece understood passengers would have to enter through the existing terminal, drop off their luggage, and walk to the new terminal. He asked Ms. Button if she would anticipate the building design being different if the City had money for the outbound baggage in the first phase.

Dave Hadel of Burns & McDonnell, a consultant for the project, explained a passenger would walk into the existing terminal building and check their bags at the ticket counter. The passenger would then be asked to walk the length of the existing terminal building and through a corridor that would be constructed from the existing building to the new facility. The passenger would then go through TSA and board the plane through the new

facility. He did not believe the outbound baggage could be included in the new facility in the first phase unless they had another infusion of money. It was the next largest expense. Other items were likely more palatable to fit inside the current first phase. Mayor Treece asked for the cost of the outbound baggage. Mr. Hadel replied off of his memory, he thought it was \$2.5-\$3 million.

Mayor Treece commented that it appeared to be counterintuitive to construct a building that was four times as big the existing terminal and then require all of the enplanements to enter through that existing terminal building and walk to the new building. Mr. Hadel agreed it created an inconvenience. The entire program was estimated to cost \$35.3 million, and they had to coordinate that with the FAA based on the money that was available. Since they only had \$20 million, there would be some discomforts as they went through phase one into phase two. Mayor Treece asked what the diagram would look like if they had the \$35 million up front. Mr. Hadel replied that if they had all \$35.3 million, the construction in purple would be completely independent of what went on in the existing terminal, and when they had completed the \$35.3 million project, they would just close the doors to the existing terminal and open the doors to the brand new terminal. They would also then have four parking positions available for all passengers instead of three.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Hadel about the escalation costs. Mr. Hadel replied the escalation costs had been factored into the \$35.3 million. Mayor Treece asked for the number. Ms. Button replied the escalation costs were roughly \$3 million, and the total project cost if it had been built all at once was \$32 million. The cost for the outbound baggage was \$920,000.

Mayor Treece asked if anything could be cut from the first phase to get the outbound baggage in phase one. He also wondered how much it would cost to connect to the terminals and make it a secure space. Mr. Hadel replied the walkway was relatively cheap, but he did not have that cost with him this evening. It was intended to be a temporary enclosed corridor.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a reason they would preserve connectivity to the existing terminal, and if so, whether there was a way to reroute the traffic so everyone was going into and out of the same door of the main terminal. Mr. Hadel replied there might be a reason to do so when all of the facility movements were inside the new terminal building. It would be their intention to consider a repurposing of the existing structure and make a determination on that temporary corridor.

Ms. Peters asked where the money would come from for this phase. Ms. Button replied phase one, which was \$20 million, would be financed with local sources. Approximately \$14.2 million would come from the special obligation bond, and about \$9 million that would be backed by the temporary hotel/motel tax and \$5 million would be backed by PFCs, \$2 million would come from the City's designated loan fund, \$3 million would come from the transportation sales tax, and about \$800,000 would come from hotel/motel taxes already collected. She pointed out the numbers might shift a bit, but they were intending to utilize those four sources for the first phase.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the subsequent phases were all financed with local sources as well. Ms. Button replied no, and explained phase two would include both local and federal sources, i.e. FAA funds and other revenue sources, such as parking and tenant improvements. The third phase, if necessary, would be locally sourced through airport revenue operation increases. Mr. Pitzer understood the City would not be eligible for the FAA grant until later in the process. Ms. Button replied the FAA had indicated that their participation would come in phase two.

Mr. Pitzer referred to the schematic shown and asked if there would also be a reconfiguring of the drop off and pick up lanes when the new building was fully functional. Mr. Hadel replied yes. He explained the diagram was a conceptual layout and was still in progress. The idea was to try to inconvenience the passengers as little as possible understanding that there would be some nuances from start to finish. Mr. Pitzer stated

he wondered if it would create an additional cost if they had to do it twice instead of just once in the first phase. Mr. Hadel commented that if they had the money available it would be best to do it all once from a construction and convenience standpoint, but they had been challenged to work with the funds that were available now, the participation of the FAA in phase two, and the balance of work in phase three. He pointed out there had been four phases at one time due to the FAA programming monies, but they had since been able to consolidate it to three phases.

Mr. Pitzer understood tonight they were only asking for approval to use the design/build process. Ms. Button stated they were asking for approval to construct the terminal utilizing design/build.

Mr. Pitzer thought they had discussed design/build in July when they had contracted with Burns & McDonnell as the owner's representative. Ms. Button replied they had discussed the three different methodologies at the work session and the direction from Council at that time was for design/build. She thought this formalized that approach.

Mr. Pitzer asked where they were in terms of starting on the hanger project. Mr. Hadel replied they had received bids on Hanger 730 on Thursday of last week, and they were being evaluated by the selection committee. Mr. Pitzer asked if work here could begin concurrently with that project. Mr. Hadel replied yes. Mr. Pitzer asked where that left them in terms of taking that building down and being able to break ground. Mr. Hadel replied that would only require coordination between the Hanger 730 program, the existing Hanger 350, and terminal building program. Since they were all tied together, they had to carefully synchronize the projects. Mr. Pitzer asked if there were dates for any of those projects. Mr. Hadel replied they had approximate dates. The intent with regard to Hanger 730 was to have a recommendation presented to Council in January or February at the very latest, and they anticipated completion near the end of October 2020. They would be in the process with the design/build contractor in the summer since the selection would occur in the spring. The anticipated completion date for that would be 2022. The existing Hanger 350 would be coordinated with it as it would be demolished inside of those windows. He pointed out there was a fourth project involving the taxiing lane and apron area that was adjacent to the Hanger 730 project that was currently under design and anticipated to be funded in part with MoDOT financing. He thought that would be completed in late summer of 2020.

Mayor Treece asked what happened in October of 2020. Mr. Hadel replied Hanger 730 would be completed then and they would receive either a temporary certificate of occupancy or a certificate of occupancy. It would be dependent on the add-ons that were chosen to be done by others, and not paid for by the City.

Mayor Treece asked to be walked through the process for design/build. Mr. Hadel replied a four-step process would be initiated, which had been approved by the FAA and the Council. He explained they had completed the letter of interest stage by which they advertised publically for anyone interested in participating. They had received ten responses, and were now in the request for qualifications stage. The qualifications were due on December 11. From there, they would shorten the list down to 3-5 candidates, who would qualify for the request for proposals stage. Mayor Treece asked when the short list would be determined. Mr. Hadel replied they expected that to be done after the first of the year. Mayor Treece asked if that was the decision of Mr. Hadel or the Council. Mr. Hadel replied a selection committee would be created. He noted the request for proposals would have two components. It would have a qualifications based selection process and a price proposal, and points would be awarded for each of those categories. The total points created the perceived winner of the design/build competition. Mayor Treece asked if the design rendering was a part of the RFP process. Mr. Hadel replied yes. He explained that the technical narratives of the design builders would be made available for public viewing at some time shortly after the short list selection, and they expected the public to participate in that portion of the evaluation process as those comments would be provided to the selection committee as a part of the overall

evaluation. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Hadel when he expected those to come to Council for approval. Mr. Hadel replied they were still working on an exact date, but anticipated an April/May timeframe pending the review times of the FAA.

Mayor Treece asked for the last possible date they would expect an infusion of additional capital to have an impact on the design. Mr. Hadel replied by the end of December 2019 or the first of January 2020, but if they were to receive an infusion of a substantial amount of money, it would be reasonable to expect the process to be elongated to put that money into the program and make the changes that would be most affordable to the City and most advantageous to the overall program.

Mayor Treece asked if there were modules in phase two that could be plugged into phase one. Mr. Hadel replied yes. Mayor Treece asked if it could be done without affecting the shell of the building. Mr. Hadel replied the shell would be able to encompass the entire program. Mayor Treece understood that if they had knowledge of additional money earlier, it could change the design of that shell. Mr. Hadel clarified it would impact the interior of the building, but not the exterior.

Mayor Treece asked if they were married to the existing terminal being connected to the new terminal facility. He stated he did not want the new terminal to look like an addition to the old terminal. Mr. Hadel explained it would not. It would be standalone and far from the existing terminal building. Mayor Treece pointed out that would not be the case when they asked people to walk into the old terminal. Mr. Hadel agreed.

Mr. Glascock stated he thought the intent was to always enter through the new terminal. The piece he saw connected to the old terminal was temporary in nature and would be removed once everything was moved. Mayor Treece explained he had been told earlier that inbound passengers would enter through the existing terminal to drop off their luggage and then walk to the new terminal. Mr. Glascock stated he would want them to walk through the new terminal in terms of the flow of traffic and understood that would have to be reviewed in terms of the design so it was efficient. When they had a short list of contractors and were able to view the renderings, they would have interested parties meetings on those designs, which would then come back to the Council with a recommendation from staff.

Mayor Treece asked if he would walk into the existing terminal to drop off his luggage or walk into the new terminal at the end of phase one. Mr. Hadel replied he would have the choice of coming into either entrance. One could come through the drive lane adjacent to the existing facility or the new facility. If someone had everything to check in, they could go to the kiosk for a ticket and then straight through security in the new facility. If one chose to go through the ticket counter to check bags, they could go to the new facility or the existing terminal.

Mr. Glascock stated it would be signed for the new terminal. They would not sign it like they were running two terminals. Mr. Hadel noted the ultimate goal was to get everyone into the new facility as quickly as possible.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Matt McCormick, 300 S. Providence Road, explained he was the President of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce and stated he was present to speak in favor of the proposed construction of the new terminal building at the Columbia Regional Airport. He noted the airport continued to prove its value to the community and region by serving approximately 250,000 people. He thanked the City and airport staff for the success of the airport and the ability to make the best use of the current facilities to create such a wonderful asset for the region. Due to the continued growth of airline partners, destinations, and passengers, the current facility no longer served the needs of passengers in an efficient and effective manner. As a result, the Columbia Chamber of Commerce was asking the Council to support the construction of a new airport terminal and to move this issue forward.

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

Mr. Pitzer asked how the extension of the runway would factor into the schedule and if it

would be done before the terminal building. Mr. Parks replied it was in design now and construction would be completed by 2021. Mr. Pitzer understood that would be before the new terminal. Mr. Parks stated that was correct.

Mr. Skala stated he could appreciate the temporary accommodations and the phasing of the work. He recalled from prior discussions that the old building when disconnected from the new building would be available to be repurposed, and asked if it would be repurposed as a City asset. He understood everything would be totally self-contained in the new facility and there was no real purpose for the old building. Ms. Button explained the new terminal would be for the purpose of the new terminal, and the existing terminal would be independent of it and could be repurposed. It could be leased or utilized for a number of things. Mr. Glascock noted it could be used for general aviation or anything else.

Mr. Skala asked if any kind of eatery was anticipated in the new terminal. Ms. Button replied yes, and explained concessions were a part of the programming.

**Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to proceed with the design/build method of construction of the new terminal at the Columbia Regional Airport. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.**

PH46-19 Proposed construction of the Tupelo Place and Larch Court sanitary sewer improvement project.

PH46-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

**Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to proceed with the Tupelo Place and Larch Court sanitary sewer improvement project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin and approved unanimously by voice vote.**

PH47-19 Proposed construction of the Quail Drive storm water improvement project.

PH47-19 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if any easements were required. Mr. Sorrell replied yes. He explained they would need some temporary construction easements and possibly some permanent easements. Mayor Treece asked if staff had spoken with the property owners. Mr. Sorrell replied they had with those they had spoken with some. Mayor Treece asked if they were amenable. Mr. Sorrell replied they seemed to be thus far.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Jennifer Luchau, 2607 Quail Drive, explained she had resided in this location for ten years, and as a long-time resident of this neighborhood, she believed these improvements were overdue and quite necessary. She noted she had some questions and concerns regarding the start and end dates of the project as that had not been communicated. She also wondered about the hours the construction would take place. She understood access to driveways would be limited by the sewer work and wanted to know what would be done to ensure they had access to off-street parking since they paid for it as part of their rent. She noted there was also a large community mailbox at the end of the driveway at 2611 Quail Drive and wondered if that would be temporarily or permanently relocated, and if so, when that would take place.

Mayor Treece stated the crews that worked on these types of projects did a very good job of keeping the street open on both ends by phasing the work. He asked Mr. Sorrell how long he anticipated it would take to get the easements and when he thought construction might start assuming Council approved moving forward. Mr. Sorrell replied he could not provide a definite timeframe at this point. He explained they would have to go through

negotiations with property owners for the necessary construction easements and work out the phasing so they did not prohibit access to the properties. He noted they would also allow the mailboxes to be accessed by the post office. He stated he would have a better idea when they came back later asking for authorization for construction assuming Council allowed them to move forward tonight. Mayor Treece asked if he expected this to happen next year. Mr. Sorrell replied yes. Mayor Treece asked if it would be a 6-9 month project. Mr. Sorrell replied at the most. Mayor Treece understood the street would be covered back up. Mr. Sorrell stated they would patch the street where necessary.

Mayor Treece commented that he wished they could be more helpful. He noted, from personal experience, they did a good job of keeping the streets open and making sure it was accessible. He thought work would start around 7:00 a.m. Mr. Sorrell stated they had hours they had to work by ordinance. He thought those hours were 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., but pointed out most contractors worked from about 7:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. They did not typically work overnight or late into the evening. He explained staff would work with the property owners to address concerns when discussing easements that might be needed or any impacts so that they were as inconvenienced as little as possible.

Ms. Luchau asked for the name of a contact person if problems arose. Mr. Sorrell replied staff would provide the name of a person who could be contacted any time during the design and construction phase of the project.

Ms. Luchau asked when the City thought it might have more details about the project. She wondered if they would know more after the first of the year. Mr. Sorrell explained they would have more details after the first of the year assuming they received approval tonight to move forward.

Ms. Luchau asked when the City expected to inform the residents of the details. Mr. Sorrell replied it would probably be early next year.

Mr. Skala understood staff would provide the residents more information when it became available, and that he could be contacted as well.

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

**Mr. Skala made a motion directing staff to proceed with the proposed construction of the Quail Drive storm water improvement project. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece and approved unanimously by voice vote.**

PH48-19 Proposed construction of the Magnolia Falls Park improvement project to include construction of a playground structure and small shelter, renovation of the existing gravel perimeter trail, grading improvements to create an open playfield and expansion of the existing pond, construction of a small parking lot and an ADA walkway, and installation of signage, bike racks, fencing and landscaping.

Discussion shown with B338-19.

B338-19 Authorizing construction of the Magnolia Falls Park improvement project to include construction of a playground structure and small shelter, renovation of the existing gravel perimeter trail, grading improvements to create an open playfield and expansion of the existing pond, construction of a small parking lot and an ADA walkway, and installation of signage, bike racks, fencing and landscaping; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division for a portion of the project.

PH48-19 was read by the Clerk and B338-19 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer understood they initially had two plans, and one had more elements to it while the other had more features near the neighborhood access. He recalled a lot of feedback

seemed to indicate people liked parts of each, but did not really like either one. He asked if the staff had worked through that to determine which elements had more universal approval to come up with this compromise plan. Mr. Griggs replied yes.

Mr. Pitzer asked if there was anything other than the low water crossing they would not be able to fund during this phase. Mr. Griggs replied no, and stated he thought they could do everything else. He explained they would improve the existing trail by regrading it and adding rock to bring it up to standards. He commented that they would look into enlarging the pond and that there might be a few trees on the side of the dam that would need to be removed. In talking to those that were opposed to any tree removal, they had understood those were non-native trees so he thought they could be removed and some aggressive planting could then be done there.

Mr. Pitzer understood Mr. Griggs did not expect another phase of improvements to this park. Mr. Griggs stated not unless there was a demand.

Mr. Pitzer understood most of this would be done with in-house staff. Mr. Griggs replied the parking lot and playground would be done by contract labor and the rest would be done by staff.

Mr. Pitzer asked if construction would be expected in 2020 if approved. Mr. Griggs replied yes. The plan was to start this spring if weather allowed with the goal of being done by the next spring if not sooner. Mr. Pitzer understood it would take about twelve months.

Mayor Treece asked for the length of the connector trail as he understood that would be preserved. Mr. Griggs replied it would be preserved and explained there would be a concrete walkway to where there was existing concrete. He noted they would get rid of the portion on private property as had been requested by the property owner and would shift it over and make it more ADA accessible. Mayor Treece asked for the length. Mr. Griggs replied he did not know, but thought it was less than 100 feet.

Mayor Treece asked how often Parks and Recreation Commission members attended interested parties meetings. Mr. Griggs replied they usually attended the ones in their wards. Mayor Treece stated he had been surprised and happy to see that.

Mr. Ruffin asked about the concerns with regard to having a place to play basketball in this park. Mr. Griggs replied the neighbors felt it should be a neighborhood park and were afraid a basketball court would attract people from outside of the neighborhoods.

Mr. Thomas asked if this property was inside the city limits of Columbia. Mr. Griggs replied yes. Mr. Thomas noted Google Maps showed it as being outside of the city limits.

Mr. Thomas asked if staff planned to eventually build the low water bridge. Mr. Griggs replied they would likely look at that for another phase in the future once the neighbors were more comfortable with the park. He thought it could be a part of the next ballot issue along with potentially a basketball court if supported by the neighborhood because it was a good amenity for neighborhood parks. He noted he did not believe a half-court would attract people from outside of the neighborhood like a full court. He understood a lot of the residences had basketball goals in the driveways, which was a reason for not wanting it in the park.

Mr. Thomas asked if something would need to be done to the tree when they built the low water bridge or if the cement, etc. could be brought in through the park. Mr. Griggs replied it would have to be a bigger bridge, such as a low span bridge going bank to bank. Mr. Thomas understood they would not rebuild the low water bridge. Mr. Griggs replied he did not believe they would because it was in pretty bad shape. Mr. Thomas understood they could not just drill it out and reconstruct it. Mr. Griggs stated it was a possibility. Mr. Thomas asked if the tree would have to be removed then regardless. Mr. Griggs replied he hoped not.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked the fact they had the neighborhood trail connector so kids could walk there from the neighborhood.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Pitzer thanked staff for working through the feedback they had received as they had been provided a lot of input and there had been a lot of disagreement within that input. They had been able to work through it and come up with something that was more agreeable to everyone.

**B338-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

## VI. OLD BUSINESS

B337-19

Authorizing a power purchase agreement with Boone Stephens Solar I, LLC.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Williams provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) had been provided the opportunity to provide input. He noted he also appreciated the report as it had been detailed.

Mayor Treece asked how much of the 142,000 MWHs this plant would produce in a year the City was obligated to buy. Mr. Williams replied all of it. Mayor Treece asked if the \$0.31 per MWH was about \$3 per KWH. Mr. Williams replied it was about \$0.03 per KWH. Mayor Treece asked what the City's voided cost was for non-renewable energy. Mr. Williams displayed another slide and noted the Boone Stephens Solar project, which was the last one, had a resource cost of \$31.65. It received a capacity credit of \$15.82 per MWH leaving an overall net energy component of \$15.83 that was \$6.68 less than the combined aggregate of the average non-renewable energy resources for the energy component alone. The \$6.68 times the 142,000 MWHs created a roughly \$1 million benefit when comparing it to non-renewable resources.

Mayor Treece asked if it would avoid a potential rate increase in the future or necessitate a decrease given its negative impact on rates. Mr. Williams replied they would be in a position where they were actually contracted for more energy than they had the load for, so depending on the load, they might break even, save some money, or be impacted by around \$500,000 per year initially. He explained they would be operating within that range until their load significantly grew.

Mr. Pitzer asked what happened when they had more power than needed. Mr. Williams replied they would take a merchant position with some of the power they had. He explained all of the power they either contracted for or generated themselves was offered into the Midcontinent Independent System Operator (MISO) market. They were dispatched on a day-ahead basis and it was offered at a very favorable price. When comparing it directly to the local marginal price, the staff had come up with a price that was the difference between what they had to pay and the average locational marginal price over the course of the year, which was the \$492,162. They had The Energy Authority (TEA) look at that same particular set of scenarios and they had a stochastic model, which was actually predictive of what they believed regional forecasts would be for energy and the impact of the locational marginal price, so they had a slightly less conservative figure of \$139,990. At least in the first few years, if the City's load stayed where it was, they would have slightly more energy than they had load to serve so they would have to take that market position. Moving forward as the City's load grew and with other things they were looking at in terms of the Integrated Electric Resource and Master Plan Task Force, such as the electrification of certain sectors like transportation and the heating of water and spaces, the amount of time they actually had where they had purchased more energy than needed was expected to be relatively short. He pointed out this would also not come into line until 2024 so they had roughly four years of load growth to achieve between now and then.

Mr. Pitzer asked if this was based on the projected load in 2024. Mr. Williams replied no. He thought the analysis had been done as if it had been purchased today.

Mr. Pitzer understood the \$492,000 cost was due to the fact they would be selling it at less than the \$31.65 per MWH. Mr. Williams stated that was correct. It was the difference between that and the average locational marginal price for the times it would be sold.

Mr. Pitzer asked for an explanation of the capacity component of the resource cost on one of the charts shown. Mr. Williams replied capacity for solar energy was credited at a 50 percent capacity factor at this time, and locational marginal price during peak would be around \$30 because it would be about twice the \$15.82 since there was a 50 percent capacity factor credit for solar facilities and it closely matched the peak of the City compared to some of the other dollar per MWH components in the chart. Mr. Johnsen explained the Annual Renewable Energy Report include the study done to do this work, and it had been applied to all of the resources in an effort to derive a capacity value for the different resources within the renewable energy mix. Mr. Pitzer understood it reflected the value of having an asset that produced power at a time when power in the market was the most expensive. Mr. Williams clarified during the peak, so it provided that value when the City needed it the most. Mr. Johnsen stated it took the resource cost and divided out how much of the resource provided a capacity benefit, and then that was subtracted from the energy side of the equation and an incremental cost analysis was done to come up with the impact. He pointed out it was pivotal on the fact it was used to serve the load and was the reason the capacity resource had a value. If it was all market, the value would change.

Mr. Pitzer referred to the \$6.68 negative impact and asked for clarification. Mr. Williams replied the \$31.65 less the \$15.82 equaled \$15.83, and the \$15.83 was \$6.68 less than the average non-renewable energy component for the City's non-renewable energy sources. Mr. Pitzer asked if that was the total cost of those non-renewable sources. Mr. Johnsen replied those were the incremental costs as this was an incremental model. It was the amount saved when the non-renewable resource was dispatched.

Mr. Pitzer asked where the developer was in terms of the approval process and acquiring the land. Mr. Williams replied he thought they had contracts in place should this agreement be approved to acquire rights to the properties shown on the drawing. In terms of regulatory approval, he understood they had entered into the MISO queue with regard to obtaining approval for construction, but did not believe they had started any permitting process to date.

Mayor Treece understood the information in the chart associated with MJMEUC Wind was based on the City's existing contract with them. Mr. Williams stated it was based on the existing contract, but it was contingent upon the greenline being constructed. Mayor Treece understood that was associated with the greenbelt. Mr. Williams stated that was correct. Mayor Treece did not think that had been on line yet because he did not believe they had wind. Mr. Williams explained that was contingent upon that particular line being constructed.

Jay Schoenberger, 191 University Boulevard, #667, Denver, Colorado, explained he was with Dakota Power Partners and they were excited about the solar farm. They believed it was a great opportunity and appreciated the City's leadership with regard to the environment and climate change. He noted Dakota Power Partners was based in Denver, Colorado and developed clean energy projects. The team had combined experience of over 80 years and had developed over 3,000 MWs of renewable energy projects that were operating today with zero emissions power production or in construction. It represented an aggregate capital investment in communities like Columbia in excess of \$4 billion. He stated the Boone Stephens Solar Farm would be located north of Columbia and would include 64 MWs generating 142 million KWHs or 142,000 MWHs, which was enough to power on average 12,500 homes each year. He commented that this was a low cost clean energy product that produced no air pollution and consumed no water. It would not

cause any ongoing increase in traffic or ambient sound levels. He pointed out it would produce power at a time when people were consuming the most electricity in the middle of the summer. He noted it produced power year round, but produced in the middle of the day and in the middle of the summer in particular, which was reflected in the capacity numbers that had been shown earlier. He stated targeted commercial operations was anticipated for 2024, but depending on how quickly they were able to get an interconnection agreement with MISO and local permit approvals, they could start construction as early as 2021 producing power in 2022. He explained the project would create hundreds of construction jobs, several permanent operations and maintenance jobs, and millions of dollars from incremental spending at local businesses. He reiterated this was a low cost, local, green energy product. The energy produced would be the equivalent of taking more than 21,000 passenger vehicles off of the road every year, and in terms of greenhouse gas, it would be the equivalent of avoiding the burning of \$109 million pounds of coal each year. Unlike a traditional power plant, this would not consume fresh water or discharge wastewater into local streams. In addition, it would not require any new public roads or sewers, and would help diversify the City's energy mix at a cost that would not fluctuate. He believed it would be an important contributor to the City's renewable portfolio standard and climate action goals.

Mayor Treece asked if the land for the project was already under contract. Mr. Schoenberger replied yes. Mayor Treece asked about the easements that would connect them to the Bolsted substation. Mr. Schoenberger replied they had several options to connect from the solar farm to the Bolsted substation, and they were determining which was the most viable. Mayor Treece asked if the neighborhood response had been positive. Mr. Schoenberger replied it had been positive to not a lot of response thus far.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Schoenberger if the entire project would be built out from the beginning. Mr. Schoenberger replied yes. Mr. Pitzer asked if the model for the project worked with the step down in the federal tax credit. Mr. Schoenberger replied yes, and explained part of the reason they were moving at the speed they were was to take advantage of the full 30 percent investment tax credit. Mr. Pitzer asked if that meant they had to be under contract this year or next year. Mr. Schoenberger replied this year. They had to safe harbor the equipment this year and start generating power within a certain number of years afterward. Mr. Pitzer asked how many years. Mr. Schoenberger replied they would have to have the entire project operational by 2024. Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Schoenberger if they had the equipment. Mr. Schoenberger replied that was why they were here. They were trying to get this done in order to allocate equipment that would allow them to safe harbor for the 30 percent investment tax credit. Mr. Pitzer asked if there was a shortage of equipment now. Mr. Schoenberger replied not now, but pointed out it was all getting allocated.

Tom Jensen, 2461 Wild Oak Court, explained he had been designated by the WLAB to inform the Council that they endorsed the project. He stated they had been given the opportunity to review the contract, ask questions, and make comments. Staff had conveyed their comments to the Law Department, and the Law Department had produced an additional draft, which had taken into consideration some of their comments and concerns and had also been agreeable to Dakota Power Partners. The WLAB felt there had been a lot of transparency and openness to engage them in the process, and looked forward to that for future contracts.

James Owen, 2628 Ridgefield Road, stated he was the Executive Director of Renew Missouri, a Columbia based 501(c)(3) that worked on renewable energy and energy efficiency policy within the State of Missouri. He explained he was there to express support for this project and for what the Council had done in the past and continued to do in terms of renewable energy standards. It was a great benefit to the people of Columbia, and to the business economy of the community and region. They felt it was important to support renewable energy that was regional and local for its impact on the grid and so they were able to have solar technicians in the area. It also allowed people to see from

where their power was coming. He stated they wanted to encourage the Council to move forward with this purchase power agreement and with future renewable energy efforts.

Mr. Skala commented that the continuation of a rather aggressive approach this and other Councils had taken with respect to the renewable energy portfolio was of utmost importance. He also thought it was nice to see this on a local and regional level. He pointed out this complimented both the renewable energy portfolio and the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan. He stated he was looking forward to this project satisfying 11.33 percent of the portfolio.

Mr. Pitzer explained this was a fairly substantial project as it would provide 11 percent of the total load at a cost that would potentially be cheaper than a non-renewable source, which would lead to savings. He was glad the City was taking advantage of this opportunity to lock in substantial projects that would benefit ratepayers for a long time.

Mayor Treece thought Dakota Power Partners had chosen Columbia because of their leadership and the renewable energy mandate, and felt they might have done it even without the mandate. Mr. Pitzer pointed out they could also fly to Columbia nonstop from Denver. Mayor Treece agreed.

**B337-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

**B345-19** Amending Chapters 4 and 24 of the City Code relating to the regulation of sidewalk cafes.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Teddy if he felt the paper permit was adequate to be able to withhold if there was some sort of abuse. Mr. Teddy replied since there would not be a permit to withhold, they would simply ask for corrections to be made. If they could not gain cooperation, they would escalate it. He explained the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) leadership had offered to assist, and he thought they would be able to get businesses to cooperate by just asking them to correct any issues. He noted the Police Department would have to monitor the serving of alcohol, which was why there was a barrier that was typically a chain with bollards. In order to meet the open container regulations, alcohol had to be served within a physically marked area.

Mr. Skala understood some complaints had been registered with regard to tables and chairs abutting parking places which made it difficult to open car doors, and asked how that would be handled. Mr. Teddy replied it would be complaint driven. If someone was in the area and saw that type of arrangement, they could contact the business manager about moving the table and chairs. If the City received a complaint, they would ask for the situation to be corrected. Mr. Skala understood a citizen could contact the business directly or contact the City. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He explained the City had a right-of-way technician that worked with various types of uses within the public way, and that person would go out and take a look or dispatch an inspector to address the situation. Since furniture was somewhat portable, it should not be an issue to resolve.

Nickie Davis, 11 S. Tenth Street, explained she was the Executive Director of the Downtown CID and expressed her gratitude for the City working with them on this issue when business owners had come to them with concerns. She stated she was available to answer any questions.

Mr. Ruffin asked Ms. Davis if they were a resource for complaints as well. Ms. Davis replied yes. She noted they had expressed to Mr. Teddy that if the City received a complaint, they would like it to be passed on to them as they wanted to be the first contact with the business to explain there would be a fee or violation in the future if the situation was not corrected.

Mayor Treece thought some businesses downtown would self-regulate other businesses.

Ms. Davis stated she hoped that happened.

**B345-19 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

## VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B330-19 Approving the Final Plat of "Northwest Highlands Second Addition, Plat No. 2" located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Mikel Street and Hardin Street; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 223-2019).
- B331-19 Vacating street right-of-way at the east terminus of Jacobs Place located between East Broadway (State Route WW) and Broadway East Terrace Subdivision (Case No. 183-2019).
- B332-19 Authorizing an annexation agreement with Old Hawthorne Development LLC for property located on the south side of Highway WW (4172 E. Highway WW) (Case No. 175-19).
- B333-19 Authorizing a motor vehicle crash data license agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the purpose of analyzing data for potential safety enhancement improvement projects.
- B334-19 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with the Missouri Department of Conservation for a Tree Resource Improvement and Maintenance (TRIM) grant for the Emerald Ash Borer (EAB) management plan; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B335-19 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds received from the University of Missouri and the Economic Development Administration associated with construction of the Discovery Drive Roadway and Sewer Extension Project.
- B336-19 Accepting conveyances for street and sidewalk purposes.
- B339-19 Authorizing a tax credit agreement with the Missouri Development Finance Board and Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture relating to construction of the Clary-Shy Community Park - Agriculture Park - Phase II improvement project.
- B340-19 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for the 2021 Columbia Bicentennial (CoMo200) planning efforts.
- B341-19 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Highway Safety and Traffic Division for acceptance of a grant for a DWI traffic enforcement unit; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B342-19 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Highway Safety and Traffic Division for acceptance of a grant for DWI enforcement relating to sobriety checkpoints and saturation patrols; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B343-19 Authorizing a contract with the Missouri Department of Transportation - Highway Safety and Traffic Division for acceptance of a grant to conduct

- special traffic enforcement of hazardous moving violations; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B344-19 Authorizing a fire service cooperative agreement with the Boone County Fire Protection District relating to primary service responsibility and automatic aid where service boundaries overlap in areas along Interstate 70 and Highway 63.
- B346-19 Changing the uses allowed within Lot 1 of Centerstate Plat 6 (also known as “Ruby Tuesday PD Plan”) located on the south side of Vandiver Drive and north of Bass Pro Drive (3310 Vandiver Drive) to allow a medical marijuana dispensary as an allowed use; approving a statement of intent (Case No. 190-2019).
- B347-19 Approving the Final Plat of “Truman Solar” located on the south side of I-70 Drive SE and approximately 2,000 feet east of St. Charles Road; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 202-2019).
- R162-19 Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Basketball Coaches Association for sports development funding under the Tourism Development Program for the FY 2020 Norm Stewart Classic “48 Hours of High School Basketball” event.
- R163-19 Authorizing agreements for FY 2020 Signature Series Funding under the Tourism Development Program.
- R164-19 Authorizing the installation of a street light on the west side of Apple Tree Court.
- R166-19 Authorizing a software license agreement with Foundant Technologies, Inc. for hosting, maintenance and support services for the Office of Cultural Affairs’ funding program to local nonprofit arts organizations.

**The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER (except for B347-19 on which he abstained), PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:**

## VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R167-19 Approving the Rock Quarry Road Corridor Plan; adopting the Stakeholder Recommendation and Implementation Matrix to serve as a guide for future policy and regulatory change applicable to the Rock Quarry Road corridor (Case No. 231-2019).

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Julie Youmans explained she was one of the Co-Chairs of the Rock Quarry Road Scenic Roadway Stakeholder Advisory Group and was happy this had finally come forward as some of them had worked on many iterations of committees and had provided input to the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC). She stated the Advisory Group had learned a lot from the PZC and felt the PZC had learned a lot about the road they had not known. She commented that in 1998 the Council had established the scenic road overlay, but that ordinance had not done what had been intended. She explained the early committees felt their work was more general, and this time, they had realized they had to be more specific about what exactly they were trying to preserve so they spent a lot of

time outlining the unique scenic, geologic, and historic characteristics of the roadway. She noted they had also recognized the importance of having naturalists on board. The purpose of this was not to make a more beautiful roadway. It was to enhance the scenic characteristics of what was already there, and that was where professional naturalists, biologists, botanists, etc. could play an important part as they could bring forth the various habitats and ecosystems that made the road distinctive. She commented that Columbia had a vibrant downtown, a wonderful trail system, and beautiful parks along with this wonderful road. She explained that as time went on the Advisory Group realized they had new priorities. She also pointed out that not everyone had agreed upon certain details within the report, but all had agreed on the priorities, which were compliance and enforcement, and replanting and restoration. Unless they found a way to supervise, monitor, inform, and enforce the details of the guidance document, there would not be a scenic roadway. Trees came down as a result of natural causes and intentional changes, and the restoration of things that were gone was just as important as replanting. She commented that they had not been able to save all of Rock Quarry Road, but believed this document provided a good blueprint and concrete suggestions for how to save what was left. She urged the Council to accept it as guidance for future change and development.

Vicky Wilson, the other Co-Chair of the Rock Quarry Road Scenic Roadway Stakeholder Advisory Group, thanked everyone that had worked on this over the last 22 years. With this resolution accepting this report, they hoped this would be the beginning of a new phase and not the end of the process. It was critical for this report to not just be placed on a shelf and for the matrix that had been prepared to become a working document as time and funding allowed. Ordinances could be developed by Council, and staff could receive direction from the Council in order to maintain this treasure for the community. She urged the Council to immediately give special attention to the preservation, restoration, and enhancement of the qualities that had resulted in the initial designation in the 1998 ordinance and to the dangerous ditches on the side of the road so people could safely continue to use it and appreciate it. She also asked that staff give attention to the enforcement of what was already within many documents so degeneration would not unintentionally happen as that could not be retrieved or replaced.

Ms. Peters stated she had been on the Rock Quarry Road Scenic Roadway Stakeholder Advisory Group and it had taken three years to actually get through the information and specify what the group wanted. She thanked everyone that had worked on it along with the PZC. She noted she was pleased to see the document and hoped they would vote to move it forward.

**The vote on R167-19 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:**

R161-19 Expressing support for a grant application by the University of Missouri-Columbia for an analytical safety study of electric-assist scooters as part of the Behavioral Traffic Safety Cooperative Research Program.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Stone provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer understood representatives of the Civil Engineering Department at the University of Missouri would request permission to mount cameras at select intersections to capture scooters if the study was funded and that most of the intersections would be near the Downtown CID or University campus. He asked if the University would be required to come back to the City to request permission to mount the cameras. Mr. Stone replied yes if it was within the City's right-of-way. Mr. Glascock explained anything that was within the public right-of-way would require a right of use permit from the City.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Stone if he knew what they were talking about in terms of numbers

or locations. Mr. Stone replied the idea was to record the movements as they were trying to get into predictive analysis, risky behavior, and things that could lead to a collision. He was not sure what form it would take at this time, but that was the purpose. If they could record the information, it would provide an analysis on risky behavior, which could then be used to create a computerized algorithm. They would watch a lot of video of people on scooters interacting with cars, bikes, motorcycles, etc.

Mr. Pitzer understood the need for wanting to know more about the safety element of the scooters. He stated he did not have a problem with the letter, but would be interested in learning more specifics with regard to the mounting of cameras and capturing behavior outside of strictly the scooter operation to predict interaction. He pointed out he was not sure he would be totally comfortable with all of those answers, but did not object to this letter supporting the idea.

Mayor Treece asked how long the cameras would be in place. Mr. Stone replied he thought it would depend on the level of funding received from the grant. He thought the Council could set parameters. He commented that they could analyze things on campus themselves, but had wanted to expand to more interactions on the street for better data. He thought a discussion could take place as to the level of comfort of the Council.

Mayor Treece asked if the City had an attachment policy for poles for things of this nature. Mr. Glascock replied the Utilities handled pole attachment agreements. Mayor Treece asked if that would be operable here. Mr. Glascock replied he thought it would.

**The vote on R161-19 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:**

R165-19

Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with Ring LLC for access to the "Neighbors by Ring" portal application to assist in law enforcement operations and investigations.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Skala understood this was for direct communication between the Police Department and people in the neighborhood who might have seen something that had occurred, and asked if there would be coordination with Neighborhood Watch or other neighborhood apps, such as Nextdoor. Chief Jones replied this would be similar to the Nextdoor app. The difficulty was that they had to be invited into the group. The MOU for this particular product would provide the opportunity for each neighborhood to opt in to something the Police Department had access to already. They had full control as to whether or not they participated, but as they participated, it provided a coordination they had not had previously.

Mr. Skala understood there had been a change in policy to accommodate community policing citywide, and in that process, they had removed the attention that had been given to some underserved areas and some of the people in those areas felt abandoned. He suggested they consider the need in certain neighborhoods, and hoped this would help to plug that gap to some degree so they were able to more readily communicate with the Police Department. Chief Jones stated it was somewhat of a blessing to be able to communicate in this way to help fill a gap.

Mayor Treece asked if neighborhoods opted in per incident or as a neighborhood. If as a neighborhood, he wondered if the Police Department would be able to access the information whenever they wanted. Chief Jones replied it was actually done per user so each user would opt in, but they would be able to communicate with different areas fairly readily through the app.

Mr. Trapp commented that, in general, he did not like cameras or surveillance as there was a creepiness aspect that was unsettling, but he also represented the community, and like Mr. Skala, he had neighbors that were rightfully distressed by crime and violence in their neighborhood. He noted he had brought that concern forward and had requested cameras for a particular area, and this would serve that function. He found himself being

an unlikely supporter of this. In spite of his philosophical objections and concerns, he was a pragmatist and thought it was a concrete measure that could make people's lives safer and bring criminals to justice.

Mr. Skala asked for information with regard to participation rates, etc. if this were approved. Chief Jones replied that information would be provided.

**The vote on R165-19 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:**

## IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B348-19 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code to establish use-specific standards governing the operation of short-term rentals (Case No. 31-2019).
- B349-19 Authorizing a municipal agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for maintenance responsibilities associated with the construction of intersection improvements at Sinclair Road, Route K and Old Plank Road.
- B350-19 Authorizing a municipal agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for maintenance responsibilities associated with the construction of intersection improvements at Keene Street and I-70 Drive Southeast.
- B351-19 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for upgrades to equipment and the elevator cars in the Eighth and Walnut (Plaza) and Tenth and Cherry municipal parking garages.
- B352-19 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of a storm drain replacement project on a portion of South Greenwood Avenue.
- B353-19 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for certain private common collector elimination (PCCE) sewer improvement projects.
- B354-19 Repealing Ordinance No. 024057 which authorized a sponsorship agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri, on behalf of University of Missouri Health Care, for the use of its logo and signage in Court 3 within the Columbia Sports Fieldhouse located in A. Perry Philips Park; authorizing a revised agreement.
- B355-19 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds from the 2019 Celebration of the Arts event.
- B356-19 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for child care health consultation services.
- B357-19 Authorizing an equitable sharing agreement and certification with the U.S. Department of Justice and U.S. Department of the Treasury detailing FY 2019 receipts and expenditures of shared funds by the Police Department.
- B358-19 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds in the Police Department to hire temporary part-time employees to assist with municipal warrant entries and evidence purging.

**X. REPORTS**

## REP103-19 Short Term Rentals.

Mayor Treece noted the short term rental ordinance had just been introduced, and stated he would be inclined to table it at the next meeting to the second meeting in January. They could then use the first meeting in January for a two-hour work session where staff would provide a presentation and they could then flush out any amendments they might want staff to draft. At the second meeting in January, they could then obtain public input and offer amendments. He suggested voting on the issue at the first meeting in February. If they did not like where it was going in January or at the first meeting in February, they could then make adjustments to the time frame or send it back to the PZC. He understood that did not address the short term rentals that might be operating now without the benefit of a rental inspection.

Mr. Skala commented that this had generated enough controversy that they wanted to make sure they got it right. He thought they needed to ensure the public could take part in the discussions and they themselves needed to be fully briefed before they could render a decision.

Mayor Treece stated he was inclined to take public testimony at the December 2, 2019 Council Meeting. They would also allow it at the second meeting in January, and time permitting, they could allow it at the work session as well. He understood there were a number of impacted neighbors and operators.

Mayor Treece asked if complaint was made to the Office of Neighborhood Services about someone operating a rental unit without a rental permit if it would be investigated. Mr. Glascock replied yes. If they were not complying with the ordinances, those ordinances would be enforced.

Mayor Treece asked if everyone was okay with the process outlined. Everyone was agreeable.

## REP104-19 Potential Update to R188-81 - Rules for public hearings and comments before the City Council.

Mayor Treece suggested codifying their current practice, some of which was at odds with the 1981 resolution, and included the three-minute time limits for individuals and five minutes for organizations if requested. He stated he wanted to remove the requirement that a person speaking state their address as technology today allowed people to see where someone lived and know they were not home. He thought a form could be filled out at the time the speaker spoke or after providing public comment with a name and address to assist the City Clerk in identifying the speaker for the purposes of the minutes. If they were paid to represent an organization, he suggested that be included as well. They could also address other decorum issues, such as signs, demonstrations of support or opposition, profanity, etc. or leave that at the discretion of the chair now. Mr. Skala understood it was at the discretion of the chair, but noted it would not be a bad idea to have some rules codified. He also felt signs and demonstrations were appropriate outside of the Council Chamber. Mayor Treece did not feel they should obstruct someone's vision.

Mayor Treece thought having a hard cap on the adjournment of meetings would be manipulated.

Mr. Skala stated he thought things had improved a great deal as they had not gone terribly late recently. He felt the Interim City Manager had contributed to that positive outcome.

Mr. Trapp thought the approach suggested by Mayor Treece made sense. He noted he was unsure about the five minutes for organizations because that was elastic. He suggested they try to define it. He wondered if they wanted to limit it to one speaker for and one speaker against because it was sometimes nice to allow an applicant with a complex project with five minutes instead of three. He pointed out almost everyone

represented an organization. It was not a huge problem, but if they were going to codify it, he suggested limiting it. Mayor Treece asked if he wanted it to be three minutes for everyone. Mr. Trapp stated he would be okay with that or one for and one against. Mayor Treece pointed out they did not always have people speak in order of in favor or against as everyone seemed to want the last word.

Mayor Treece commented that he thought it had worked well for people to sign up ahead of time when the Unified Development Code (UDC) had been addressed, but people had tended to wait until the end to sign up then too.

Mr. Skala thought three minutes for everyone was fine, and if someone wanted to announce they were with an organization or ask people to stand in support, they had that option within the three minute period. Mayor Treece commented that he would rather not contract anything at this time. He would prefer to codify what they were currently doing.

Mr. Trapp understood they would drop the item referencing smoking. Mayor Treece stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas suggested they include a prohibition on personal attacks as there had been a few of those, and it was hard to stop without a written rule. Mr. Pitzer pointed out it was actually already included and read that portion of the resolution. Mr. Thomas thought that might be good enough and asked Mayor Treece to refer to it if he detected someone was making a personal attack.

Mr. Pitzer pointed out he agreed with Mr. Thomas as there had been a political candidate that had launched a campaign via his comments, which he did not feel was appropriate.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he agreed with the justification for not requiring an address, but felt it was helpful to know if someone was a resident of the City and directly affected or impacted by a particular project. He was not sure how to balance that. If it was provided on the form mentioned, it was not something they would have in real time.

Mayor Treece thought from an advocacy perspective, it would be more compelling for the person providing public comment to actually state where in proximity to the project they lived.

Mr. Skala understood people could provide the ward in which they resided, but a lot of people really did not know their ward.

Mr. Pitzer commented that one of the ideas he thought was interesting was limiting the total amount of speaking time for single speakers. He felt it could be something more than three minutes and could be allocated however the person chose throughout the course of the meeting. He also believed all comments should be directed to Council and not to staff. He noted one of them could choose to ask staff to respond if they wanted. He pointed out there had been some awkward interactions with speakers questioning staff members, which he did not feel was appropriate.

Mayor Treece stated he agreed in terms of comments being directed toward the Council. With regard to the clock, he felt the chair should be in control of it and was not sure someone should yield their time to someone else in the audience. He also did not want to cap the number of times someone spoke as Columbia had an active and engaged citizenry that was interested in more than one issue. Mr. Thomas thought it would be difficult to track as well.

Mayor Treece asked for a draft resolution to come back to Council incorporating the comments heard tonight. Ms. Amin understood the Council wanted the draft to come back as a report. Mayor Treece stated that was correct. Mr. Skala suggested a template be provided for a sign in form as well.

#### REP105-19 Overview of CDBG and HOME Funding Policy Resolution.

Mr. Cole provided a staff report.

Mr. Trapp asked for clarification regarding the creation of a citizen body for an event. Mr. Cole replied the City and the Board of Realtors had applied for the New Housing Opportunity Grant together to put on an event in the spring. It was not a policy group. The goal was to bring in an affordable housing speaker.

## REP106-19 North 763 Community Improvement District - End of Fiscal Year Report.

Mayor Treece understood this had been provided for informational purposes.

## REP107-19 Correspondence from the Business Loop Community Improvement District.

Mayor Treece understood this had been provided for informational purposes.

## REP108-19 Applying Late Fees to Past Due Utility Account Balances.

Mayor Treece asked staff if they felt the issues in the bill processing software had been resolved. Mr. Sapp replied yes. He explained they had a team that had worked hard on it over the last couple of years to find all of the issues, test the system, and request and receive modifications to ensure the bills were being produced correctly. They wanted to ensure everything was working as designed prior to implementing the late fees that had been suspended in 2016 during implementation of the new software.

Mayor Treece asked about the number of complaints. Mr. Sapp replied the number of complaints had continuously dropped as had the number of supervisory referrals. He hoped they had become more customer experience oriented, i.e., treating people as customers and humans. The staff had tried very hard to implement creative ways for customers to be able pay their utility bills within the rules. It was dramatic to see the number of people that struggled with their bills, and trying to ensure they kept the power on for them was important because it contributed to their quality of life and them being able to be productive members of the community.

Mr. Thomas stated he appreciated staff working with individual residents to help people avoid late fees and disconnections. He was not sure if there was an official policy with that goal, but it seemed as though that was the mode of operation. He noted it was counterproductive to apply late fees, disconnect utilities, and charge reconnection fees when people were already struggling to pay the bill. He understood they had to have a harder approach if they felt they were never going to get paid, and thought they were handling things well.

Mr. Thomas understood the report indicated the annual collection of late fees had totaled about \$360,000 prior to when they had interrupted assessing those late fees, but the actual cost to the City of imposing the late fees was only \$100,000, and asked if that was correct. Ms. Brown replied that was the estimated cost of what it took to collect on past due amounts and delinquent accounts, and the money had gone towards funding the utility customer service operations. Mr. Thomas wondered if it might be worth reducing the late fees if they wanted to be cost neutral. Mr. Sapp stated he thought that was an area they were still exploring. He noted they had asked for information from the utility as to the actual costs. He explained two people typically went to the property when disconnecting a service, and they tried to provide some notice. Oftentimes, they would allow the person some time by completing the rest of their other work processes and then going back. He stated they needed a handle on that particular cost as well to ensure they were covering the cost for the utility to perform those tasks.

Mr. Thomas asked about the trigger for disconnection. He wondered if it was nonpayment 30 days after the original date. Ms. Brown replied that was correct. Once they hit the 30-day mark, they might be subject to disconnect. It included a 20-day time period to pay and an additional 10 days from the time they received a notice of subject to disconnect. Mr. Thomas asked if they could negotiate an extension within those 30 days. Ms. Brown replied yes. She explained any amounts covered under a payment arrangement would not be subject to penalties according to ordinance. Mr. Thomas understood the 30 days really only applied if they did not receive payment and did not hear anything back after sending a notice. Ms. Brown stated that was correct.

Mr. Ruffin stated he wanted to acknowledge the fact they had not lost sight of the human connection with the new technology. He noted there had been an issue with a First Ward

resident last week, and they had tested the system to see if her issue could be resolved and it was resolved. He thanked staff.

REP109-19 Amendment to the FY 2020 Annual Budget - Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds.

Mayor Treece understood this had been provided for informational purposes.

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

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, commented that this semester he was teaching a senior level infrastructure project development course in the Civil Engineering Department at the University and they had reached the part of the course where they discussed public finance. As a part of that, he had developed a water utility financing problem. He explained he had a handout with four attachments that could be used to solve the problem, and listed them. The problem he wanted the students to solve was whether, given the financial data, the recent water bond issue could be supported without a water rate increase if there were no other bonds prior to FY 2025. He noted it was a multiple choice answer, but they had to show their work. He stated the students wanted him to pass this on to the Council for their consideration. He provided a copy of the handout to the Council and noted he would collect their answers at the January council meeting when water rates for FY 2020 were discussed.

Sutu Forte displayed a video of an area near her residence before and after work on the Shepard to Rollins Trail had begun.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, thought the situation with the Shepard to Rollins Trail was sad. He understood the person that had done the work did not do what had been indicated in terms of width and asked the Council to look into it. He wondered if more had been removed than should have been removed. Mayor Treece pointed out they had actually removed fewer trees.

Mr. Elkin appreciated the detailed questions asked by Mayor Treece with regard to the airport project.

Mr. Elkin commented that anyone that was a drug user was contributing to the violence in Columbia.

Mr. Elkin noted lead had been a problem in the past as vaping was now, and G5 would be approaching Columbia soon. He understood G5, which was associated with cell service, changed the cells of the body and suggested someone look into it.

Mr. Thomas handed out a draft letter and explained it seemed as though there was still a communications breakdown between the City and the County regarding the West Area Plan process. He noted Janet Thompson, a Boone County Commissioner, had indicated they would appreciate having an affirmative letter from the City Council or a vote on a resolution to confirm the City wanted to proceed with a West Area Plan. He understood the Council was all in support so he had drafted the letter he had handed out and noted he was open to any edits. He stated they could also take the extra step of voting on a resolution, but that would take longer. He hoped to do something so they could get the process started.

Mr. Skala thought there had been some discussion. Mr. Glascock stated Mr. Teddy had sent a letter to Stan Shawver. Mr. Skala asked if they were unsure as to whether the City wanted to proceed in any particular way. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know. They normally interacted with Boone County through staff.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Glascock if he agreed that something seemed to be breaking down at the moment. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know from where the Boone County Commission was coming.

Mayor Treece stated he saw the email correspondence between Mr. Thomas and Ms.

Thompson and it seemed as though she had asked for it. He noted he had heard the same from other stakeholders. He asked if there was any objection to the letter.

Mr. Skala stated that if clarification was needed, they should do it, but noted he thought it had been reasonably clear in the first place. Mayor Treece stated he agreed and had even asked the Clerk to go back and look at the minutes to ensure they had asked for it and understood Mr. Teddy had reported he was proceeding.

Mr. Thomas commented that there had been at least two hiccups in the last 3-6 months where they thought this was moving ahead, but nothing had happened for a couple of months and they had to prod it along again.

Mayor Treece stated that if the Community Development Department would benefit from correspondence from the Council, he would make a motion to send the letter to the County Commission with regard to moving forward with the West Area Plan. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Glascock asked if the Council wanted to include the staff letter with their letter. Mr. Thomas replied yes.

Ms. Amin asked if each of the Council Members planned to sign the letter or if it would be signed by Mayor Treece on behalf of the Council. Mayor Treece asked the Council what they preferred. Mr. Trapp noted several of them were going out of town this week so it might be easier for Mayor Treece to just sign it. Mr. Skala agreed.

Mr. Thomas suggested adding a line to the letter indicating there had been a roll call vote.

Mr. Skala asked that the letter from staff be included as well.

Mayor Treece asked if he could edit the letter. Mr. Thomas replied yes.

**The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Thomas to send a letter to the Boone County Commission with regard to moving forward with the West Area Plan was approved unanimously by roll call vote with Mr. Skala, Mr. Thomas, Mr. Pitzer, Ms. Peters, Mayor Treece, Mr. Ruffin, and Mr. Trapp voting yes.**

Mr. Thomas commented that the CATSO Coordinating Committee would be presented with the 2050 update to the CATSO Long Range Transportation Plan on December 5. He noted he had been following the CATSO Long Range Transportation process for about a decade and had some severe concerns with regard to the process and content. He explained the process was extremely nontransparent. The committees met on Thursday afternoons and there was not adequate outreach to the public or to the elected officials in the primary jurisdictions the CATSO covered. A big effort by PedNet over the last couple of months had led to a public input meeting that 40 people had attended. It had been the first time a public input meeting had been held for the Plan. He thanked the CATSO staff for making some changes based on the comments received. He noted he still had problems with the content of the Plan as it was almost identical to the version from at least ten years ago and was completely grounded in 1960s and 1970s transportation planning values. He believed it was out of touch and out of alignment with the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan, the Vision Zero Plan, and the Social Equity Plan. He urged the Council to take a look at it and to decide whether they wanted to cast their vote in support of the Plan update. He stated the City of Columbia had four out of nine seats on the CATSO Coordinating Committee, and those were for the mayor, city manager, director of public works, and director of community development. He thought those four should vote no to accepting this particular update. He also felt a much more engaged public process was needed so they could align the Plan with other key plans. The other five seats were occupied by Boone County and MoDOT. He stated he would provide links to the Plan and other documents to Council in hopes they could discuss it at the next council meeting, which would be before the Coordinating Committee voted on the proposed update on December 5.

Mr. Skala stated he would appreciate receiving the link so he could look into it. If there were issues that could be resolved, he thought it was incumbent upon them to do so, and

in that effort, they needed to inform themselves.

Mr. Trapp asked if they wanted reevaluate their policy decision with regard to when to open an overnight warming center. He explained Veterans Day ended up being pretty rough weather-wise and fell below their level, but had not been predicted to fall so low. He appreciated the detailed implementation process staff had put forward, but understood there had been at least three negative stories and an editorial in the Columbia Daily Tribune. He agreed they had to set a limit as it was a police overtime issue. He did not want to extend limited resources, and wondered if they could explore another way to staff an overnight warming center that did not tap into police resources. He noted the Room at the Inn opened on December 6. He also understood the Harbor House had not ran out of cold-cot beds as they had 15 that were lower barrier to entry, but a person that had called his house looking for a place to stay had been banned from Harbor House. He stated there were people that had burned a lot of bridges and had barriers, but they did not want to see them freeze to death. With Room at the Inn starting up, they had an acceptable plan, and it was more robust than what they had had last year. He thought it was funny they were being criticized when they had offered more support to the community than they had historically, and had not done it the one time. If they had not done what they had last year, he was not sure anyone would have expected it. He understood Room at the Inn was looking at extending its schedule, but thought having a higher temperature for the rare occurrences when it was very cold before Room at the Inn opened or after it closed might be something they wanted to look at in terms of policy.

Mayor Treece stated he was not sure there was an easy answer to this and noted he had trust that staff had looked at the likelihood of inclement weather for the Columbia area. If they bumped it up to 13 degrees, but it was 14 degrees, he wondered if they would they have this discussion again. Also, if it was 14 degrees and the wind chill was 9 degrees, he wondered if that would matter. He reiterated there was not an easy answer and noted he had to trust that staff reached the balance for the resources available. He thought they had made the best decision possible, and absent new information, he was not sure he wanted to revisit the policy.

Ms. Peters commented that she had contacted Mr. Glascock that morning asking if they would open the Wabash Station, and he had checked the weather using the protocol they had and it was not anticipated to get to 9 degrees. She noted he had checked on other beds available within the City, which she appreciated, and understood there were 15 beds available and that only seven beds had been used the night before. She explained that in addition to the temperature, they had looked at the availability of other shelters. She understood they might need to look at something different, but Room at the Inn was opening, and it required staff being available to staff it overnight. Even on that Monday night, the Harbor House had not been at capacity.

Mr. Trapp agreed they had not sold out all of the cold-cots, but pointed out not everyone was eligible for one. Ms. Peters understood that was the problem. She also wondered if they would want to open it up for one person and how many staff people would be needed. Mr. Glascock thought at least two would be needed.

Mr. Trapp stated he did not want anyone to feel bad as he understood the City had limited resources, and the comments of Mayor Treece made sense. He had just wondered about having a higher threshold when they did not have a lower barrier to entry shelter available. He stated he was not sure one could blow numbers to get a cold-cot as they tested for alcohol consumption. He understood there was not an easy answer. He did not think they had to do anything now since Room at the Inn opened on December 6 and would be in effect until March. He suspected Room at the Inn would continue to expand its calendar in future years as that was their strategic direction and he believed their Board of Directors could make that happen.

Mr. Trapp stated he also wanted to thank the people at Operation Safe Winter who had distributed donated warm weather gear earlier than had been planned. He noted they had

a great community and the City was not the only actor in this space. He also did not think they wanted to duplicate efforts. As people did more and as they became a more compassionate community, he thought they should look for those opportunities.

Mayor Treece commented that there had been a lot of discussion regarding eminent domain recently, and his sense was that over the last five years, the use of condemnation had decreased. He wondered if they could get a report on how many times they had used eminent domain, condemnation, when something had gone to trial, when there had been a settlement, etc. He wanted to measure the incidents of it. He noted another comment he had heard was why people were waiting on sewers when eminent domain could be used for bike trails. As a result, he wanted to know how condemnations and easements played into that issue as well. He thought that would be informative to the Council and the public.

## **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 10:25 p.m.