



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, February 17, 2020
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, February 17, 2020, 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 TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, and RUFFIN were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of January 21, 2020 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mayor Treece. Mayor Treece explained the February 3, 2020 minutes were not yet complete.

Upon his request, Mayor Treece made a motion to allow Mr. Trapp to abstain from voting on REP6-20. Mr. Trapp noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that he was a partner in a limited liability company that had a contract with the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) to do outreach and coaching to individuals who were homeless or panhandling. 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

BC2-20 Board and Commission Applicants.

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

AIRPORT ADVISORY BOARD

Chambers, Jean, 799 Cutters Corner Lane, Ward 6, Term to expire December 1, 2022

CITIZENS POLICE REVIEW BOARD

Heckman-McKenna, Heather, 813 W. Worley Street, Ward 1, Term to expire November 1, 2022

COLUMBIA SPORTS COMMISSION

Gray, Rodney, 4501 S. Harvest Road, Ward 5, Term to expire December 31, 2021

Weise, Teri, 3007 S. Rodeo Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire December 31, 2021

COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS

Gomez, Carley, 1025 Ashland Road, #205, Ward 6, Term to expire March 1, 2023
Hinnant, Amanda, 2417 Beachview Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire March 1, 2023
Waner, Andrea, 2104 Sunflower Street, Ward 2, Term to expire March 1, 2023

Mayor Treece suggested the vacancy on the Convention and Visitors Advisory Board be readvertised to allow for a larger pool of applicants. Mr. Trapp stated he agreed. Mr. Pitzer noted he did not have any objection. Mayor Treece asked if anyone else objected, and no one objected.

PUBLIC TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMISSION

Powell, Rene, 1201 Paquin Street, Apt. 202, Ward 1, Term to expire March 1, 2023

Mayor Treece asked for the consent of Council in appointing Paul Prevo to the Tax Increment Financing (TIF) Commission. The Council consented with the exception of Mr. Skala.

TAX INCREMENT FINANCING COMMISSION

Prevo, Paul, 15451 N. Tucker School Road, Boone County, Term to expire September 1, 2023

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC6-20 Jan Weaver - Bus Transit.

Ms. Weaver, 412 ½ W. Walnut Street, explained she could walk or bike to most of the places she wanted to go to in town, but had wanted to see if the bus could take her to the places for which she utilized her car. In the last month, she had ridden all six routes to see where they travelled and had used to bus to take care of specific errands. She noted the buses were clean and on-time and the bus drivers were consistently kind and helpful on all of the routes. She stated she found those that took the bus regularly were a community, and the drivers greeted a lot of them by name. In addition, those on the bus caught up with each other and shared news about their acquaintances. She pointed out it had been a safe and cheerful environment. With planning, she could get to her doctor, the grocery store, and the mall without the hassle of driving in busy traffic or locating a parking space. She thought Columbia had a pretty good bus system for its size. If they were really going to be a full-service city, however, they needed more frequent service and more service on the weekends. She understood none of this was news to the Council and that better transit would address equity issues, address climate change, and make Columbia a real city. The problem was that they could not have a more comprehensive and convenient bus system without more riders and they could not get more riders without a more comprehensive and convenient bus system. She believed part of the problem with low ridership was perception, which ranged from complete ignorance that Columbia had a bus system to ideas that buses were dirty and unsafe. This was the reason she had taken the time to describe how positive her experience on the bus had been. It had been clean, safe, and friendly. She commented that changing perception was trickier than adding more buses and more drivers, but it was a lot cheaper. She suggested better signage. She pointed out there were 270 points of sale for the bus system counting all of the bus stops. She felt the signs should be larger, and noted she had walked by many stops without being aware of them. She suggested every sign have a route map, a table of time point stops, the regular fare, and a notice to have the exact change. She thought the signs could also list major stops like Walmart, Boone Hospital, the Health Department, or Wabash as the bus station. She also recommended signage at the Wabash Station indicating it was the bus station. She did not feel they could drive web traffic to the information on the website unless people knew something about their product. She listed some comments made by the Council at the transit service meeting in 2017, which included the need to generate interest so transit priority increased, the

suggestion that the only way to sell transit was to get people to use it, and the need for riders. She recommended the Council be the change they wanted to see by riding the bus. She felt council members riding the bus on a regular basis, even if only once a month, would generate interest. It would send the message that the buses were clean, safe, and an appropriate mode of transit even for people in positions of authority, set an example for colleagues, friends, and family, and increase the number of people taking transit. In order to help with her proposal, she provided each council member with a map of the routes and two bus passes to get them started. If any of them were already a regular bus rider, she suggested they invite someone to ride with them. She asked the Council to use this opportunity to increase awareness about their buses and to post about it.

SPC7-20

Shaunda Hamilton, Boone County Community Against Violence - Crime Prevention through Environmental Design.

Ms. Hamilton, 3109 Jenne Hill Drive, asked the Council to adopt and utilize crime prevention through environmental design (CPTED) standards. She explained it was a philosophy that attempted to apply physical design, citizen participation, and law enforcement strategies in a comprehensive way to protect neighborhoods and facilities. She noted it was also defined as a multidisciplinary approach to reducing crime through urban and environmental design and the management and use of built environments. The concept included designing, renovating, and updating the physical environment in ways that positively influenced human behavior via four principles, one of which was natural surveillance. She explained criminals did not like to be seen or recognized so keeping areas well-lit and providing clear lines of sight from inside and outside were helpful. She noted natural access control was another principle, and stated criminals wanted to feel like they were in control so if approaches to buildings and properties were clearly marked, it would make them feel as though they were in less control. She commented that another principle was territorial reinforcement, and its purpose was to make a clear distinction between public and private property by using physical attributes, such as fencing, pavement treatments, signage, and landscaping. She explained this was important because legitimate occupants would have a sense of ownership and would notice or even challenge people that did not belong. In addition, intruders had a harder time blending into the area. She stated maintenance was the fourth principle and it was related to territorial reinforcement. An example included keeping well-maintained areas since it sent the message that people cared about what happened in the area. She reiterated her request for the Council to adopt and utilize CPTED strategies and to create a task force for environmental design. She commented that CPTED was an action to design the physical environment in ways that reduced and removed identifiable crime risks. Steps and key components included organizing a small group representing planning, zoning, building, and crime prevention to develop CPTED initiatives, providing training to planning groups, the police department, community groups, business leaders, and economic development officials, and developing a list of CPTED initiatives to incorporate into zoning, redevelopment, and economic development, which might involve lighting, security, hardware, street and building access control, visibility, and landscaping. She understood Mayor Treece was working with the mayors of Kansas City, St. Louis, and Springfield to curb violence, and noted they had already adopted and started utilizing CPTED. She pointed out they had a lot of supporters, and listed Transparency Matters, the Columbia Neighborhood Watch, Chief Geoff Jones, and Mayor Brian Treece as examples of supporters. She asked the City to create a task force to move this effort, and noted the Boone County Community Against Violence (BCCAV) was willing to have someone sit on the task force to help with implementation. They only wanted to get the process moving forward. They did not want to control it so they would ultimately step back. She explained one of the reasons this was important to her was because her daughter, Nadria Wright, had been a victim of violence in September. She

stated she thought Columbia did a great job with safety, but felt more could be done. She noted the person that was responsible for the death of her daughter had followed the vehicle she had been in from Columbia College to McDonald's, and had found an opportunity when he was in an area that did not have good lighting. She believed CPTED would help to create safer environments. She commented that they had taken a lot of steps in their home and in other places like school and work in terms of safety, and it was disappointing this had happened elsewhere in the community.

Mayor Treece thanked Ms. Hamilton for sharing her experience and ideas. He was proud and grateful that she had poured her energy and grief into this effort to try to have something positive come out of it. He noted he planned to make comments at the end of the meeting. He explained every year they updated their building and construction codes and ordinances and felt environmental design included more than just building codes as it involved landscaping features, lighting, and other components. He felt referring this issue to the Building Construction Codes Commission (BCCC) would be good in terms of exterior soffit lighting, front porch lights, low barrier-free landscaping, etc.

Ms. Hamilton pointed out a barrier for existing buildings was the cost. She understood some of these techniques were used for newer construction. She explained there had been changes where she lived in terms of environmental crime prevention. She had seven exterior lights and the bushes had been trimmed so they were not in front of the windows. There was not any place for anyone to hide where she lived. In addition, cameras were surveilling those on the roadway coming into and out of her subdivision. She reiterated there were things that could be done.

Mayor Treece stated he was sorry for Ms. Hamilton's loss and reiterated he was grateful she was present to share these ideas with them.

James Gray commented that BCCAV would continue be there and hoped they would all work together in creating solutions. He pleaded with the Council to consider CPTED and the establishment of a task force to make things happen.

SPC8-20

Jeffrey Bittle - Why Columbia should adopt Ranked-Choice Voting at the municipal level.

Mr. Bittle explained he was a student at the University of Missouri that had been fascinated by elections, and felt there was a flaw in Columbia's election system and in most election systems, but believed Columbia was uniquely positioned by having active quality policies to address the issues. He commented that most American elections, especially those at the local level, suffered from the lack of representativeness in that there were many more candidates than there needed to be in order to allow one to win with over the majority of the vote. In Columbia, it had been the case in recent years that candidates often won with less than a majority vote, and sometimes by as low of a percentage as the mid-20s and low-30s. This was not the fault of the candidates. It was due to the election system. His solution was ranked-choice voting. He explained he had emailed some on the Council and had heard from a few of them. He described the system as being one whereby the candidate that received more than half of the first choice votes would win, but voters would be allowed to vote for as many candidates as they wanted by ranking them first, second, third, etc. If there was not a majority winner after counting the first choices, the race would then enter an automatic runoff. The candidate with the fewest votes would be eliminated and the voters that had chosen that candidate as their personal first choice would have their vote count for the next choice. The process continued until a candidate won with more than half of the votes. Upon emailing the Council, he had received a list of criticisms, but had solutions to every criticism. He had been told it was not suitable for local elections and that the preference was for the encouragement of more positive campaigns. He commented that in actuality it was primarily used in localities, famously in Minneapolis, Santa Fe, Cambridge, and San Francisco. He understood New York City had adopted it last fall. He stated it was also used in the State of Maine as well as in many presidential primaries. It was not

untested ground. In addition, it was statistically proven to cause more positive campaigns because candidates had to campaign for themselves as the second choice if not the first choice. He understood another criticism was that it would violate the City Charter, and noted he did not believe it would. The Charter stated the candidate receiving the highest number of votes for each office shall be elected and inducted into office at the first meeting of the Council following certification of the election authority in accordance with State Law. Ranked-choice voting as a method of counting votes produced the same kind of numerical order of results and had the same effect in the long run. If other cities did not have to modify a conflict with State Law, he thought it was unlikely Columbia would have to in order to move forward. He explained another criticism was that there had not been enough choices in Columbia to make this relevant, but he believed it encouraged more candidates to run because the campaigns would be friendlier. In addition, more women and people of color were encouraged to run under the ranked-choice voting system statistically. He stated another criticism involved whether the top two candidates deserved the votes of the other candidates and pointed out those that voted did not have to rank past their first choice. As a result, he did not feel that was a relevant criticism. The positives of the system included a winner always having a majority and allowing people more freedom of choice in marking as many candidates as they wanted. In a community with a history of advanced, progressive, and knowledgeable policy, there was not a reason to not move forward with ranked-choice voting. He felt it was a call for action because representativeness of a legislative body should be the main facet of any legislative body. If there was a way for the function to be performed better, it should always be the natural solution. He provided a handout that summarized his comments.

Mr. Thomas asked if any of the council members had indicated support for the idea. Mr. Bittle replied he had. Mr. Thomas understood he had been the only one. Mr. Bittle stated that was correct.

SPC9-20

Tyree Paladon Byndom - Speaking in favor of the Boone County Community Against Violence to have the city of Columbia adopt the CPTED and could include increased lighting and surveillance cameras.

Mr. Byndom commented that he had spent three years in Dallas and had returned to Columbia in July. Since his return, he had met with at least 200 people in an effort to try to move the community forward. He explained he had been doing this since he was 16, and he was 48 now. He noted he had been in Columbia since the age of 11, and had left at the age of 16 or 17 to join the Marine Corps. Upon his return, he had been fighting to serve the community as a protector. Since his most recent return in July, he had met with representatives of institutions to try to do more, specifically in terms of community violence. He explained he had previously served on the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence (MTFCV), which had spent 1-2 years obtaining proof and consensus for a document to provide the wherewithal and blueprint for dealing with community violence. Since 2014, a few individuals had implemented a few things along with a couple of institutions, but of the 13-14 different recommendations, only three had been done on a consistent basis. He commented that upon returning to Columbia he had applied for the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council to serve in that capacity while also taking care of his nine kids and his businesses. He noted he always gave back to the community averaging 20-30 hours a week even with a 60-70 hour a week job because he believed that should be done. He stated he felt they needed to try to implement things before people died, and noted essentially everyone he had spoken with had said no to his suggestions. He listed some of the recommendations of the MTFCV to include approaching violence as a public health issue, coordinating job programs, creating and updating communication tools, and hosting annual forums. He commented that 20 years prior, there had been a Race Relations Task Force, and many of the recommendations of that Task Force had not been implemented either. He wondered if they really wanted to

make change or if they were okay with the chaos. He explained that any time something happened in the community, people reached out to him to let him know what was happening. He commented that he had always been an eternal optimist, but was losing faith. He understood there were only five minority businesses in the downtown. In addition, about 4,500 African-American men in the community between the ages of 16-60, which was less than 10 percent, did not have a conviction. He noted Columbia had the reputation of locking people up and funneling them into the Department of Corrections. He felt the CPTED program would allow them to look at the community as a whole. It would allow them to look at all communities, and not just white communities. Everyone throughout the community was taking care of their families, going to the same schools, drinking the same water, etc., and they each wanted access to happiness. Columbia appeared to be a tale of two cities. He commented that in listening to people while serving on certain boards, he was not sure what city they lived in as it did not reflect the city he lived in. He asked the Council to adopt CPTED. He stated he and others in the community that were protectors had tried to determine ways to build trust and work together to collaborate instead of to agitate, but he was concerned it was moving in that direction. He hoped the Council would work toward the recommendations of MTFCV and adopt CPTED so the reset button could be pushed and they were able to start over.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH3-20 Proposed construction of the L.A. Nickell Golf Course driving range improvement project to include expansion of the natural grass driving range tee box and artificial turf tee box, rerouting the cart path to Hole 15, and repositioning certain poles and netting adjacent to the driving range tee box.

Discussion shown with B30-20.

B30-20 Authorizing construction of the L.A. Nickell Golf Course driving range improvement project to include expansion of the natural grass driving range tee box and artificial turf tee box, rerouting the cart path to Hole 15, and repositioning certain poles and netting adjacent to the driving range tee box; authorizing the Purchasing Agent to call for bids or utilize a duly authorized term and supply contractor; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

PH3-20 was read by the Clerk, and B30-20 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked if the \$55,000 was only associated with the golf course fees at the L.A. Nickell Golf Course or if it included fees from the Lake of the Woods Golf Course as well.

Mr. Griggs replied it involved the fees from both golf courses.

Ms. Peters asked if most golfers played at both golf courses. Mr. Griggs replied the passes did not limit golfers to a particular course. Anyone that purchased an annual pass was allowed to play at both courses. Ms. Peters asked if golfers tended to play at both courses. Mr. Griggs replied certain groups tended to play at one or the other, but there was a mixture. Ms. Peters commented that people that played at the Lake of the Woods Golf Course had mentioned to her that the golf cart paths were bad. She wondered if there were plans to improve those as it appeared as if they were shifting all of the money towards the improvements at L.A. Nickell Golf Course. Mr. Griggs stated all of the money was not being shifted. He explained they liked to keep a balance of about \$50,000 in the golf course improvement fee (GCIF) fund in case there was an emergency like a drought or the HVAC in the clubhouse breaking. He pointed out they were also already doing some basic maintenance on those cart paths. He stated they were either going to do cart paths or irrigation, and all of the golfers had asked that the cart paths be

done first while staff wanted to do irrigation because it was easier to trench for irrigation when cart paths were not in the way, but they had ended up installing the cart paths first and the irrigation later in order to make the golfers happy.

Mr. Skala asked how long the Lake of the Woods Golf Course project would be delayed and for the estimated cost of that improvement. Mr. Griggs replied it involved about the same amount of money and would be delayed for about a year. Mr. Griggs noted the Lake of the Woods Golf Course had a great driving range while the L.A. Nickell Golf Course did not. He commented that he considered the Lake of the Woods Golf Course as the premium golf course since it had sand traps and other challenging features. He felt this proposed project at the L.A. Nickell Golf Course would have a greater impact on all of the golfers. The project at the Lake of the Woods Golf Course would have only consisted of minor improvements to the sand traps and other areas. Mr. Skala stated he appreciated the sensitivity of Mr. Griggs to what the golfers wanted, and was glad to hear the improvements at Lake of the Woods Golf Course would only be delayed.

Mr. Pitzer asked what the money from the driving range funded. Mr. Griggs replied those funds were placed in the operating budget to help recover costs. Mr. Pitzer asked if it was placed in the operating budget of the Parks and Recreation Department or the golf courses. Mr. Griggs replied the golf courses. He explained the plan was to recover 100 percent of golf course operations. By adding this driving range, they were hoping to increase revenues so they could continue to meet the goal of 100 percent recovery.

Mr. Pitzer understood the GCIF fund was restricted for capital projects. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked who tracked the money going into and out of that fund. He wondered if it was the Parks and Recreation Department or the Finance Department. Mr. Griggs replied the Parks and Recreation Department staff tracked it, but it was also within the Tyler/Munis system so it was tracked by the Finance Department as well. He stated he had looked at it about a week ago and the balance would be roughly \$53,000 once this \$50,000 was taken out. He commented that it was an enterprise fund, which they tracked to the penny because they needed every dollar to which they were entitled.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

B30-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH4-20

Proposed construction of the Leslie Lane storm water improvement project.

PH4-20 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked where the stormwater went once it traveled through this culvert. Mr. Sorrell replied it ran into Bear Creek.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Trapp commended staff for taking on this extra project. He noted it made sense since this area would already be ripped up due to the sidewalk project. He explained he had spoken with Henry Johnson, the most affected property owner, and he was very supportive and pleased it was moving forward.

Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to proceed with the Leslie Lane storm water improvement project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH5-20 Proposed construction of the College Avenue, Court Street and Hickory Street sanitary sewer improvement project.

PH5-20 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if the City had the easements associated with this project yet. Mr. Sorrell replied no. Mayor Treece asked if staff anticipated a problem getting the easements. Mr. Sorrell replied they would need a few temporary construction easements and maybe a permanent easement on the property on the north side of the railroad and the east side of College Avenue.

Mr. Pitzer understood the first interested parties meeting had been held four years ago. Mr. Sorrell explained the project had been identified four years ago and they had held an interested parties meeting. He did not recall the specific issue, but money had been needed for a different project so it had been transferred out delaying this for four years.

Mr. Pitzer understood these were enterprise funds. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Sorrell how long he thought it would take to complete the project. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not have a good estimate at this time. Mr. Pitzer understood staff had to acquire the easements. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. He explained they had to complete the final design and then acquire easements, and that could delay the project considerably if the property owners were not willing to dedicate the easements. He noted they would also have to work with the railroad and MoDOT to schedule when they would allow the City to go through their rights-of-way. Mr. Pitzer understood it could be a few more years before the project was completed.

Ms. Peters asked if sidewalk replacement work was still being done on College Avenue in that area. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not know the extent of the sidewalk replacement project, but noted the City would bore under the right-of-way so they did not destroy the sidewalks being constructed now.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mayor Treece commented that he had constituents on Stewart Road and Medavista Drive that had been waiting ten years for their sewer improvement, and part of the problem was the acquisition of easements. He felt public confidence was impaired as people saw how quickly bike trails were able to move with the use of eminent domain while sewer improvements took ten years. He understood a decision had been made by a previous Council or City Manager that the City not use eminent domain for sewer improvements because the property owner was receiving a benefit and should give the easement more freely, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Glascock replied that had been the decision for private common collector elimination projects, but not necessarily all projects, and those tended to involve situations where the sewer was functioning, but was not in an easement or the easement needed to be obtained in order to move the sewer. Mayor Treece wondered if that should be the point of a discussion. He noted he had asked for a report on the use of eminent domain during a period of unrest, and they might want to have this conversation when that report came back to the Council. He stated he was sympathetic to those on the downside of a sewer improvement when one property owner on the upside was refusing to grant an easement as it stopped the entire project for those that needed it. Mr. Glascock pointed out, in the past, they had moved along with the smaller pieces of the project when possible. He referenced a project in East Campus as an example of that.

Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to proceed with the College Avenue, Court Street, and Hickory Street sanitary sewer improvement project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH6-20 Proposed construction of the Stanford Drive PCCE #21 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project.

PH6-20 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 Stanford Drive PCCE #21 sanitary sewer improvement project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH7-20 Proposed construction of the Glenwood Avenue PCCE #25 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project.

PH7-20 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer commented that all of these projects seemed to have different timelines. On addition, they were holding three public hearings involving sewers in one night when they had not had one in a while. He asked about the process in terms of bringing them to Council. Ms. Keys replied some of it was related to staffing. She explained they were now fully staffed in terms of sewer engineers so they were able to bring the projects forward in a more timely manner. She hoped to get the design and construct in a more timely manner as well.

Mr. Pitzer asked for a general timeline for these types of projects. Ms. Keys replied it depended on the size of the project. She explained the timeline for this one was likely longer than the Stanford Drive project because it was more difficult to come up with an alignment that could meet the needs of the property owners since it involved some backyard areas. It generally took longer to talk to the property owners and negotiate the alignment for a project like this than the Stanford Drive project that only affected two property owners. She noted a lot of variables were involved.

Mr. Pitzer asked what the backlog looked like now. Ms. Keys replied she thought they were up to PCCE #40.

Ms. Peters asked if there was a grand scheme for looking at all of the sewers to determine the problem areas as it appeared as though they were doing some small projects. Mr. Sorrell replied the private common collector projects were initiated by the property owners as they were requesting the sewer be constructed. A property owner with a sewer they were maintaining that was not causing any problems would likely not submit a petition requesting the City get involved to help resolve any issue. Prior to when the policy was changed in 2008 to not taxbill for sewers, a lot of property owners would not petition to have a sewer replaced. He reiterated projects like this involving private common collectors were identified solely by a petition from the property owners to request it be done. Others, like the College Avenue, Court Street and Hickory Street sanitary sewer improvement project, were projects staff had identified through routine maintenance operations for reasons such as having a lot of inflow and infiltration. Ms. Peters understood there were two different programs. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. He reiterated the private common collector projects involved private sewer lines and property owners requesting City involvement to provide public sewers to their properties. He noted staff was working on other projects as well, and explained they were developing a hydraulic model of the collection system, which might identify other issues that they would need to address in the future. They also had a routine maintenance and inspection program that identified bad portions of the system. Ms. Peters stated it felt as though it was piecemeal, but understood the staff had an overall plan. Mr. Glascock agreed it was piecemeal. He referred to the diagram shown and explained the brown lines were private common collectors that only served 2-3 lots. The City did not take care of those sewers. The property owners were responsible for them, but had the issue of not being able to

correct a problem if it was not on their own property. They had to depend on their neighbors to address the problem. He pointed out most of these types of sewers were in the Old Southwest. Ms. Keys explained most of the work with private common collectors involved upgrading the system because the pipes were very old. She noted that once the hydraulic model was completed, they would have more information regarding the different capacity issues around town and would be able to provide plans for improving capacity in the different locations where there were issues. She reiterated that staff had bigger plans. There were just different parts to the sewer capital improvement project plan. They had the PCCEs, regular improvement, capacity improvements, and sewer rehabilitation.

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 Glenwood Avenue PCCE #25 sanitary sewer improvement project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B35-20

Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code to establish water conservation incentives to water utility customers; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Talbert and Mr. Renaud provided a staff report.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification on the amounts. Mr. Renaud replied the \$75 amount had been recommended by the Integrated Water Resource Plan. They had found that was still a level below the lowest point to get into the market to purchase a high efficiency fixture.

Mr. Renaud continued the staff report.

Ms. Peters asked about funding for the program. Ms. Talbert replied it would be funded from the retained earnings within the water enterprise revenue fund.

Mayor Treece understood the policy objective of this proposal was water conservation. Mr. Renaud stated that was correct. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Renaud if he knew what the policy objectives had been of the rate study that had been completed by Raftelis. Mr. Renaud understood there had been three items within the study. One had been the reduced expansion of the water treatment facility including a focus on water conservation, and this would be the second half of that to bring peak usage and average usage down so they could do a smaller expansion of the water treatment facility. Mayor Treece asked if the rate study by Raftelis had recommended any type of water rebate. Mr. Renaud replied yes. He explained it had recommended a host of rebates with one of the larger ones being the toilet rebate. It had also included rebates for shower heads and faucet aerators. He noted staff had gone through the list to identify the best opportunities for savings based on what they had seen in homes and the least amount of cost.

Mayor Treece understood the low to moderate income program recommended families at 200 percent of the federal poverty level and asked Mr. Renaud if he had a sense of that amount. Mr. Renaud replied it was approximately \$26,000 for a family of four. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Renaud what he thought the take home pay might be for that family of four after taxes, paying the rent, etc. Mr. Renaud replied it was likely close to \$0. Mayor Treece asked how many of those people owned their homes. Mr. Renaud replied he did not have that statistic. Mayor Treece thought it was likely only a few. He asked if they would receive a voucher to purchase the toilet or if they would have to purchase and install the toilet prior to applying for the rebate. Mr. Renaud replied in a rental situation the landlord would be the primary focus as they had to be involved in any upgrade. Mayor Treece understood they would only qualify for the \$75 toilet rebate. Mr. Renaud stated if the tenants in the home qualified financially, the home could qualify for the \$200. The

tenants would have to be willing to go through the process of income verification. Mayor Treece understood the landlord would have to hire the plumber to install the toilet. He asked for an estimated cost to install a new toilet. Mr. Renaud replied \$200-\$400. Mayor Treece asked if that was in addition to the toilet. Mr. Renaud replied it included the cost of the toilet depending on the quality of toilet the person chose. Mayor Treece commented that he thought it was unlikely a family at 200 percent of federal poverty level would be able to save the money necessary to make that upgrade. Mr. Renaud stated he agreed, and that was one of the reasons they would partner with area needs based organizations. Those organizations had a history of working with occupants of rental housing with regard to providing services to help make ends meet. Mayor Treece asked if those organizations were compensated. Mr. Renaud replied not through this program. He explained staff would reach out to partner with existing programs. A lot of the programs on the energy side involved the partnering of City funds with outside funds for a multiplier impact, and they would look at pairing the water programming within those programs as well.

Mayor Treece asked where the City was with respect to the RFP involving the water treatment plant. Mr. Renaud replied that RFP had been delivered to Purchasing. Mayor Treece asked if it was on the street yet. Mr. Renaud replied he thought so. Mayor Treece asked about the status of the water aerators. Mr. Williams replied the aeration project had not yet reached the Purchasing Division, but it was scheduled to be there soon. Mayor Treece asked about the West Ash Pump Station. Mr. Williams replied that was on the street. Mayor Treece asked about the new Southeast Pump Station. Mr. Williams replied he did not believe that was on the street yet per his recollection from checking the website earlier today.

Mr. Ruffin asked if these adjustments had been made to City-owned properties. Mr. Renaud replied he was not aware of any made. He explained they planned to look at City facilities as a part of this process.

Mr. Ruffin stated there was a sprinkler system at the Blind Boone Home and he wondered if it had been adjusted to conserve water. Mr. Renaud commented that he would be happy to take a look at that for him.

Mr. Ruffin asked if these rebates would apply to new installations. Mr. Renaud replied yes on irrigation systems.

Mr. Skala commented that they needed to be aware of how large a program this was for those that did not have much, and asked if the study by Raftelis included income levels or if that had been decided by staff based on capacity, etc. Mr. Renaud replied it had been decided by staff.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Williams if he anticipated the aerator project being completed by spring or summer. Mr. Williams replied the goal would be to have the new aerators in service for peak season.

Mr. Pitzer noted the report had mentioned a water systems assessment and asked for clarification along with where the City was in that process. Mr. Renaud replied the City would not be undertaking that process initially because it would require additional staffing, which they were not requesting at this time. They wanted to show there was a demand for these programs prior to requesting that staffing. If the programs were successful, the additional staff would have the responsibility to look at the system loss assessment as well. The City currently estimated a 10 percent system loss, and any staff that would be hired would be used to verify that information and identify the location of the system leaks. Mr. Pitzer asked for clarification on the relationship. He wondered why they needed to see the effectiveness of a rebate plan to start on a water systems assessment. Mr. Renaud replied they could not do both with current staffing. The water system loss survey had been recommended by Raftelis, which staff believed had a lot of value and merit. It was included in the build out of this plan, but would not be undertaken due to the lack of resources at this time. Mr. Pitzer understood staff was not waiting to see the effectiveness of the rebate plan. They were only waiting until they had time to do

it. Mr. Renaud stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer understood one of the goals of the water rate structure that was passed a year ago and increased water system revenue was to encourage water conservation as it raised the prices on the highest users, and asked if staff had been able to look at the effectiveness of that. Mr. Renaud replied they were currently tracking the impacts of that on both the residential and commercial/industrial sides. The weather over the irrigation season last year had been fairly mild so it had been difficult to determine the impacts of the rate change. It was something they would continue to monitor. Mr. Pitzer understood the water usage had been down a fair amount in the summer months last year. Ms. Talbert stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer commented that per his research of the various water studies over the years, it appeared the projections for the peak system usage were always higher than the reality, and asked if that was a fair statement. Mr. Williams replied yes for that kind of planning as they were fairly conservative to ensure the City had enough water to supply its needs. He explained there were some conservative estimates to ensure the plant and the system were both capable of meeting the demands of the customers.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Williams if he would say water usage overall had been relatively flat for a period of years. Mr. Williams replied it had been extremely flat. He commented that some of the values mentioned by Mr. Renaud earlier this evening with regard to the potential need to expand the plant as early as 2025 were likely no longer true because the water demand had been very flat. He stated they had seen a stagnant growth in water demand, but year after year, the system continued to add new water users. As the number of people utilizing the system continued to grow, the amount of water they needed to provide on annual basis would have to grow at a similar rate at some point when the conservation efforts caught up with the demand curve for growth. He did not feel they could continue to add customers and not increase the amount of water that would be demanded by those customers. Mr. Pitzer thought they could continue to become more and more efficient like they had on the electric side as users had been added there without growth in demand, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Williams replied yes, but pointed out that unless there were newer and more innovative ways to impact conservation, at some point in time, the growth curve would revert back to the growth curve of customers. Mr. Pitzer stated he was not sure he agreed with that, but understood what Mr. Williams was saying.

Mr. Skala commented that he believed some of the conservation efforts would result in money in the bank regardless of the number of customers and the water usage. He felt the primary variable was the weather as they were liable to hit a summer where the peak demand exceeded some of the conservative numbers. He appreciated the perspective of not wanting to overbuild or promise too much, but believed they would take advantage of the money saved via the conservation efforts in the long run.

Mr. Thomas stated he thought the key metric was water usage per capita, and asked staff if they had looked at other communities that were implementing a lot of conservation programs to see what might be a reasonable number to aspire to for a good low water usage per capita. Mr. Renaud replied he did not have any per capita reduction data. He noted they had looked at similar municipal utilities that were implementing these types of programs. At this threshold, he viewed this as an initial starting point. Some of the other municipalities were doing hundreds and close to a thousand toilets per year. The City's funding would not be able to handle that, and it would take time to grow to those numbers. He commented that he anticipated a lot of opportunity for savings and a significant potential for water reduction. Mr. Thomas stated those programs would continue to drive the water usage per capita.

Mayor Treece commented that he had reviewed the study by Raftelis and could not find any reference to rebates. He noted he had found one reference under the affordability issue, but it had been clear the stakeholders had not chosen affordability. They had chosen water conservation. In addition, none of the projections used on the rates had

included any type of rebate. He stated he would be interested in knowing where that reference was within the study. Mr. Renaud commented that he did not have a page citation, but recalled a specific area where it recommended rebate amounts under the conservation section. He noted the toilet had stood out to him at \$75 per eligible rebate. He recalled a chart that recommended different programs, rate amounts, and potential savings for whichever programs were implemented.

Jay Hasheider explained he was the Chair of the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) and noted the WLAB had endorsed these programs and the package that had been delivered to Council tonight. He agreed they were seeing a very flat growth of water consumption during the winter, but understood there was an increase in the summer. The message they had received from the consultant of the water study was that they were justified in trying to recover the cost of the expanded needs when they were generated, which was in the summer, and that had provided the impetus for the rate restructuring that had been proposed. The rate restructuring that had been done in 2019 had been incomplete and had only gotten half of the job done. He believed the money involved in conservation and rebates was more like an investment than a cost because if they did not invest in this conservation now, they would be faced with a need to expand the plant again and the need for another bond issue. If they could delay that need for a year, it would result in millions of dollars of cost savings. Delaying it for multiple years via prudent conservation, would result in even more savings. In addition, it went hand in hand with the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP). He stated he felt this program was a sound idea at this time for all of those reasons.

Mr. Skala commented that the suggestion of Mr. Hasheider was similar to a virtual water plant as conversation was utilized instead of having to build to accommodate larger capacities. Mr. Hasheider stated that was correct. He noted the depth of conservation had not been plumbed in this arena, and there was the potential to do more at home and with outdoor landscaping.

Mr. Trapp stated he was supportive of this measure. It seemed like a good starting place and it appeared as though it hit a variety of rate groups. He explained he was in the 200 percent of the poverty level group and would have to think seriously about upgrading his toilets. He noted the rebate made it a possibility. There were some people in that poverty level that were homeowners and had some amount of discretionary income. He believed combining the water kits with the air conditioner exchange was a good move as people would already be there showing their eligibility and it was a program known by low income individuals. He thought piggybacking on existing efforts for outreach was good as there were a lot of potential nonprofit partners. He stated he was interested in seeing how this would work out in the long run.

Mayor Treece commented that he appreciated the perspective of Mr. Trapp, but noted he felt their priorities were inconsistent. He stated they had raised rates on everyone, and renters were disproportionately affected by it and would not receive a huge benefit from this program. In addition, they would be subsidizing property owners that could afford an in-ground sprinkler system. Before considering any type of rebate, he thought they should look at the financial reports and provide a more comprehensive rebate or refund to consumers if they had raised rates too much.

Mr. Skala stated he appreciated the perspective of Mayor Treece, but viewed this as an investment and believed a lot of people benefited even if they benefited indirectly. He explained they had taken measures to increase rates for irrigation, which was what really placed a heavy load factor on their capacity and costs. He commented that he liked the idea of conservation even beyond what they had in front of them as there was the possibility of gaining even more ground as implied by Mr. Hasheider. The more conservation efforts they were able to do along with those efforts becoming the cultural norm, the more they would save in terms of potential higher rates and bond issues in the future. He stated he was supportive of this idea. He pointed out if the program did not generate interest, they could adjust accordingly.

Ms. Peters asked how many people took advantage of the air conditioner exchange or any of the other rebates the City had. She wanted to ensure it was not a waste of the time of staff. Mr. Renaud replied there were a suite of income qualifying programs. Some were aimed at landlords while others were aimed at tenants, and some were advertised through the income qualifying organizations with which they partnered. He commented that they did about 50 air conditioners per year. He pointed out there was likely a limited market of window air conditioners, and the more they did, the harder it was to find them. Ms. Peters understood the City had many programs and asked if they were used. Mr. Renaud replied yes, and explained hundreds of projects were done annually. Ms. Peters asked if a report was generated every year. Mr. Renaud replied a demand side management report was provided to the WLAB each year and those numbers were also reported through the climate initiatives.

Mr. Thomas stated he believed this was a well-researched and well-designed conservation program for a very small amount of money. Like Mr. Skala, he viewed it as an investment for the future. He explained he had concerns about the rate structure on a number of levels, but did not feel it made sense to vote against a progressive program like this because of that. He thought they needed to address the rates through a separate process.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he had similar thoughts as he did not believe the revenue increase associated with the rates had been necessary. Strictly on its own, he felt the conservation program was well intentioned and involved a relatively small amount of money. As indicated by Mr. Hasheider, if they were able to delay plant expansion by a year or two, they would more than make up for it easily. In the context of looking at it with the rates, it did give him some discomfort. He was not sure he could completely separate those two items as had been suggested.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B35-20 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B35-20, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, RUFFIN. VOTING NO:
TREECE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B24-20 Voluntary annexation of property located on the south side of I-70 Drive SE and east of Upland Creek Road (5300 I-70 Drive SE); establishing permanent District M-C zoning (Case No. 34-2020).
- B25-20 Rezoning property located on the south side of I-70 Drive SE and approximately 750 feet east of Upland Creek Road (5300 I-70 Drive SE) from District A to District M-C (Case No. 37-2020).
- B26-20 Approving the PD Plan for "Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 5, Lot 501" located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Nocona Parkway and Endeavor Avenue; granting a design adjustment relating to entry door placement (Case No. 24-2020).
- B27-20 Approving PD Plan Major Amendment #1 for "Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 4" located on the west side of Nocona Parkway and approximately 1,500 feet south of Ponderosa Street (Case No. 38-2020).
- B28-20 Rezoning property located on the northeast corner of the intersection of Switzler Street and Trinity Place (201 and 209 Switzler Street) from District

- PD and District R-MF to District M-OF (Case No. 39-2020).
- B29-20 Authorizing a right of use permit with Boone County, Missouri, on behalf of its Office of Emergency Management, for the construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of a warning siren with supporting infrastructure within a portion of the Vandiver Drive right-of-way.
- B31-20 Authorizing a first amendment to the redevelopment agreement with Broadway Lodging Two, LLC and Columbia TIF Corporation Two in connection with the Broadway Hotel Phase Two TIF Redevelopment Plan and Project on property located at 1104 E. Walnut Street.
- B32-20 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for HIV Prevention services.
- B33-20 Authorizing Amendment No. 2 to the 2017 Master Services Agreement with N. Harris Computer Corporation, on behalf of its division Advanced Utility Systems, for the implementation of the community solar program module as part of the utility billing software; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B34-20 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of the Grace Ellen Drive PCCE #27 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project.
- R23-20 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of Phase I of the Fifth to Wilkes Sewer Improvement Project to include sanitary sewer improvements from the intersection of Fifth Street and Rogers Street to Sixth Street.
- R24-20 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of the Runway 2-20 extension project at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- R25-20 Setting a public hearing: consider the FY 2019 Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER).
- R26-20 Authorizing a sponsorship agreement with Columbia Book Festival, Inc. for tourism development funding under the Tourism Development Program for the 2020 Unbound Book Festival event.
- R27-20 Authorizing a services partnership agreement with Burrell, Inc. to provide behavioral health assessments, consultations, interventions and education for families participating in the WIC program.
- R28-20 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Leidos Engineering, LLC for local and regional dynamic system modeling and transient analysis of the stability of the City's electric transmission system.
- R29-20 Accepting the Neighborhood Traffic Management Program 2019 Year End Report Summary; authorizing staff to complete the public improvement process for the proposed installation of traffic calming devices on Smith Drive, North William Street, Hinkson Avenue and Holly Avenue; authorizing staff to pursue traffic calming projects on Bray Avenue, Louisville Drive and Maplewood Drive.

The bills were given third reading and the resolution was read with the vote

recorded as follows: **VOTING YES: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. VOTING NO: NO ONE.** Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

R30-20

Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. for a Renewable Natural Gas (RNG) feasibility study for the Columbia Sanitary Landfill.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Williams provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Williams if he had an estimate as to how much methane generated at the landfill escaped to the atmosphere and did not get captured by the bioreactor system. Mr. Williams replied the current production levels at the landfill allowed them to run various levels of generations, but there were times all three units were running and they were flaring off gas so there was additional gas that was produced and flared off. Mr. Thomas clarified he was not asking about the flared off gas. He stated he was asking about gas that might not have ever gone into the system. Mr. Sorrell commented that he did not recall the amount, but noted it had been included as part of the organic waste study that had been provided in the fall. Mr. Thomas stated he was not sure about the City's plant, but in general, up to 80 percent of the methane escaped into the atmosphere. He asked for the amount of methane generated in the landfill that could be reduced by diverting food and organic waste to a composting facility and not allowing any of those items to enter the landfill. Mr. Sorrell replied the organic waste management study that had been presented in the fall had indicated diverting food waste and organic material for composting would involve more emissions than utilizing it at the landfill to capture methane and generate electricity or even possibly doing this renewable natural gas project. It was more environmentally friendly to take it to the landfill than to run separate collection routes due to the emissions from the vehicles collecting the material. He thought it had calculated the emissions from the energy production facility in the landfill versus composting.

Mr. Thomas asked what the investment would likely be to upgrade the system to create the renewable natural gas. Mr. Williams replied there were several different scenarios. An investigation would need to be done to determine the location within the pipeline. He stated the payback scenarios ranged from less than two years to more than ten years based upon the type of equipment utilized. He thought they had analyzed at least three different technologies that might be possible in at least two different locations where they might be able to inject the renewable natural gas into the pipeline. The purpose of this particular study was to determine those costs so they could evaluate whether or not it was more feasible to upgrade the landfill gas generation project to add landfill gas generator #4 or if it would be more prudent to utilize the funds to invest in a renewable natural gas conversion station if that opportunity truly existed. He reiterated the main purpose of the study was to come up with those cost figures and projections moving forward.

Mr. Skala stated he was surprised by the 80 percent number as he did not think it was quite that high. He asked staff to make that study available again so he could refresh his memory. He also asked if the WLAB had access to it and if they had taken it under consideration when making their recommendation to proceed. Mr. Williams replied he did not believe the WLAB had been given a copy of the study referred to by Mr. Sorrell, but he could make sure they received a copy. Mr. Sorrell stated he was able to locate the study and it had an estimate of 75 percent methane recovery. He noted it had also indicated that efficiency rates could be as high as 90-95 percent with well-maintained covered operations and system maintenance. The methane oxidation rate with soil cover was 10 percent, which meant 10 percent of the methane migrating through the cover

would be oxidized before it was released. Mr. Skala commented that he would have been shocked with the number suggested by Mr. Thomas of recovering only 20 percent versus 80 percent if that had been indicated when they had considered the methane recovery system a number of years ago. Mr. Sorrell clarified the studied indicated 75 percent.

Mayor Treece asked if 100 percent of the landfill gas went to the bioreactor. Mr. Sorrell replied all of the gas collected went to the electric generating station and any excess was flared. The gas came from the bioreactor and the original landfill.

Mayor Treece asked how that reactor would be fueled if they monetized, capitalized, and marketed this. Mr. Sorrell replied it would still be fueled by the material that was being placed in it that they collected everyday on the garbage routes.

Mr. Trapp asked for the cost of the power generation they had now. Mr. Williams replied the current estimate for the landfill gas generator #4 was about \$1.6 million.

Carolyn Amparan, 4804 Shale Oaks Avenue, explained she was speaking for herself as a member of the Climate and Environment Commission (CEC) and on behalf of the 6,500 members and supporters of the Sierra Club Osage Group. She stated the CEC did not have a position on this because they had not learned about it in time to have a discussion at one of their meetings. She noted they would try to stay up on these types of issues in the future. She commented that the Sierra Club was opposed to the approval of this feasibility study to evaluate renewable natural gas. They were primarily concerned because this proposal did not address the overall picture of the climate crisis they were facing as a community, country, and global population. In addition, it did not seem to be in line with the CAAP. She asked the Council to consider those factors when making a decision on the study and on the future renewal natural gas project if it was to move forward. She reiterated that they were in a climate crisis now, and noted they had to think differently than they had in the past. Scientists had indicated they needed to reduce global greenhouse gas emissions 45 percent by 2030. As a result, they no longer had time for half-steps and small measures. She pointed out the CAAP asked the City to begin evaluating all projects that met a certain threshold related to greenhouse gas emissions and certain financial expenditures based on factors such as the cost burden, the vulnerability to the increase in net emissions, and the effect it would have on future emissions. Although the CEC had not been in place long enough to actually get the process going, she believed it was obvious a project of this nature would affect emissions and would potentially meet some kind of financial threshold. She asked the Council to encourage staff to move forward rapidly in putting that process in place because the sooner they started evaluating decisions based upon all factors, not just financial factors, the better off they would be. It would ensure they were spending money wisely and in accordance with all objectives. She commented that the Sierra Club thought it would be good to evaluation the composting decision before moving forward with placing more yard waste in the landfill. If the Council approved the study, she asked that they consider adding questions related to the total overall impact of emissions and a lifecycle assessment of emissions to actually get the gas clean.

Mark Haim, 1402 Richardson Street, stated he was representing Mid-Missouri Peaceworks and noted he agreed with the comments of Ms. Amparan. He commented that the decisions made today would affect them for decades to come. Investing in the sort of equipment suggested to collect and utilize methane from the landfill meant they would likely use it for a long time because it would otherwise be a waste of money. Power Magazine indicated a well-built combustion turbine should have a minimum operating life of 160,000 hours or 20 years. He thought they should only produce and burn landfill methane if they had to, and not only if they chose to do so. If methane was generated, he believed it should be burned rather than going into the atmosphere. He pointed out it was best to avoid producing the methane gas by composting and recycling. They should recycle as much paper, cardboard and fiber as possible, and compost yard waste and food waste in people's yards so it did not have to be transported. For the compost that had to be transported, he thought they should be placed in composting

facilities of a community scale to produce usable compost. Investing in more of this capacity would create an incentive to send yard waste, compostable materials, and recyclable materials to the landfill. He suggested restoring the prohibition that had previously been in effect of sending yard waste to the landfill and to compost it as much as possible. With recycling, they would reduce the number of trees that would have to be cut down, and trees were very important for sequestering carbon. By sending more paper to the landfill, they were sending more trees to the pulp mill, which did not make sense. Composting created a valuable soil amendment that increased the ability of soil to serve as a carbon sink and to retain water. He commented that when European settlers had arrived in this part of the world, they had found prairies with many feet deep of rich, dark black, living soil that retained huge amounts of carbon. The clearcutting of the forest, plowing, etc. had allowed erosion to take place causing the carbon sink to be depleted. They had really exacerbated the climate crisis. It was not just an issue of fossil fuels. It was also the way they had handle the biological environment. Composting would help rebuild the soils. He reiterated that if they looked to collect and burn landfill methane and invested in technology to do that, they were removing an incentive to reduce waste by recycling and composting. While burning methane that was in the landfill made sense, reducing methane production and minimizing the amount of recyclable and compostable materials made far more sense. He asked the Council to reject this proposal and do more research before deciding to even explore the issue. He suggested investing in recycling and composting efforts in the community.

Jay Hasheider, 1812 Cliff Drive, stated he was the Chair of the WLAB and noted the WLAB vote on this issue had been 3-1 in December to endorse the proposal. He pointed out he was the dissenting vote and would now speak for himself as to why he felt this was not a good idea. He commented that the electric utility did not own the landfill gas. The electric utility had a contract with whoever owned the landfill to purchase the gas in order to make electricity from it. In addition, the utility was not a gas company, and they would be putting electric utility money into a study for the benefit of whoever owned the landfill. He noted he also felt there was a great risk involved with the project. The value of renewable natural gas was based on three things. One was the value of the natural gas itself, which was extremely cheap. Another involved the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) requirement for renewable natural gas for mobile fuels, i.e., the requirement of things other than ethanol. As a result, there was value for it because the EPA said there was a value. California also impacted the value because it had a mandate to make everything renewable by a certain date so Columbia would get money from people from California when they purchased the renewable natural gas here. He felt it was risky to rely on requirements of the EPA and California because those requirements could change. In addition, this product was only a couple of years old. He understood it would cost \$16-\$30 million for a plant, and if it was as lucrative as anticipated, he thought others would become involved making it less valuable since there would be more potential suppliers. He also wondered what they would do with the stranded assets they had in terms of the current generation system, and noted this would not do anything for climate action in Columbia. It would take away the little bit they were doing with landfill gas generation. He commented that there were tasks in the CAAP, and two related to finances and risk. If they wanted to spend money on this hot topic, he suggested they evaluate the finances and risk and include the stranded asset costs that had been ignored to this point. He stated he was particularly riled by the fact money that was dedicated for the fourth generator would be taken for the study.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Hasheider if he knew how this concept had originated. Mr. Hasheider replied his understanding was that The Energy Authority (TEA), the company the electric utility conducted business with to help negotiate the buying and selling of power on the grid, had developed this new idea. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Williams if that was a fair statement. Mr. Williams replied the City had become aware of the possibility of a renewable natural gas product through TEA as had been mentioned by Mr.

Hasheider, but both TEA and Burns & McDonnell had presented a case that there was an established market for renewable natural gas and quite possibly an opportunity financially. From the perspective of staff, he thought they wanted to investigate the possibility before investing the money in landfill gas generator #4 so they were not accused of spending \$1.6 million when they could have made potentially millions more by converting the gas to a renewable product and marketing it in other areas. Mayor Treece asked if TEA also marketed low carbon fuel credits. Mr. Williams replied TEA was also the City's natural gas marketing participant. They not only helped market energy, but they also helped the City to procure natural gas as a resource. He stated the City had made purchases of renewable energy through them and thought they could help in facilitating renewable fuel purchases as well, but that had not been done to date.

Mr. Pitzer asked if TEA would be involved in the sale of those credits. Mr. Williams replied the marketing had not yet been determined. He explained an initial feasibility analysis had been conducted indicated there was a market for this particular product and that the market appeared to be stable. It had also suggested that depending on how or where they connected the equipment, the capital costs would be \$16-\$32 million and could potentially be recovered within 2-10 years depending on the cost. It varied greatly based on the technology utilized. He noted three technologies had been included to explore along with two locations for injection into the pipeline. The number of variables was the reason for the 2-10 year payback range. The point of this particular study was to obtain the figures to determine if it was a prudent project for the City to do from a financial perspective.

Mr. Pitzer understood the low carbon credit had been priced at \$193 per ton in the study by Burns & McDonnell, and asked about the history of that price. He wondered how long it had been at the level. Mr. Williams replied he did not have a history of that particular price.

Mr. Pitzer asked about the sale of the renewable identification numbers. He wondered how that process would work. Mr. Williams replied they did not have a market participant in that particular market. It was possible TEA could help market it, but they had not explored how to actually market it at this point in time. They were trying to determine if it was even feasible to consider building a project.

Mr. Skala assumed there were not too many players in this market, and asked if this would be a pilot project. Mr. Williams replied it was a budding, burgeoning market so there were risks. One of the tasks was to present and evaluate those risks. They needed to determine if the market would be stable in the future, etc. It was a component of the overall project. He explained they needed to know the real world costs of a connection to the pipeline, the technology that would be best suited for the type of gas they had, and the equipment necessary for it.

Mr. Trapp asked if this would be a replacement for the existing electric they were generating or if it would involve the excess gas they were not using. Mr. Williams replied it could be both. It depended on the cost of the project. He did not believe they would abandon or strand the three engines there, but they might place them in a long-term layup condition whereby they could use them at a later date as it became less feasible to inject into the natural gas market. He explained they needed to know if making an investment in a capital project could actually payoff. The perspective of staff was to obtain that information before moving forward with the fourth landfill gas generator project. He pointed out the funds for this particular study would come from that project.

Mayor Treece referred to the Burns & McDonnell feasibility study memo, which indicated that using the fuel in Missouri or other states without incentive programs removed the significant low carbon fuel standard (LCFS) credit and other potential state credit revenue streams. It also indicated the California LCFS credit prices had been on a steady incline over the last two years, and although no indications pointed to changes, credits were likely susceptible to be impacted by government policy and market forces. He felt they would cannibalize their own renewable source for an uncertain revenue stream.

Mr. Hasheider stated it would be one thing for a speculator, but he did not feel a city should invest \$16-\$30 million on such a risky proposition.

Mr. Pitzer understood the fourth generator had been on hold while they were looking at this, but \$1.6 million had been appropriated so funding was available to move forward with it. Mr. Williams commented that if the Council chose not to move forward, staff would want direction as to whether to move forward with that fourth generator. Mr. Pitzer asked if they were generating enough gas to utilize a fourth generator. Mr. Williams replied excess gas was being generated at the plant when all three generators were running, but that did not occur 100 percent of the time. In addition, the gas production was not the only limiting factor. They were also limited by the amount of NOx emissions at the plant. The amount of renewable energy increase by adding this fourth generator would not be significant, but it would increase reliability and serve as an additional engine set to run while one of the other three were out for maintenance.

Steve Callis, 6304 W. Normandy Lane, stated he was a member of the Climate and Environment Commission and noted he agreed with the comments made tonight. He suggested this proposal be denied. He thought resources would be better utilized in finding ways to divert organic waste from the landfill in the first place. He felt that would be best solution.

Jake Schneider, 2413 Thornberry Drive, commented that he wanted to see all of the resources available to the Utilities Department utilized to fix the trash collection problem, which was a major problem at the moment. He stated it appeared as though the Council was failing to act. It had been an issue for years, and yet the City was allocating resources toward other items. He asked the Council to allocate resources to fix the problem from the start.

Mr. Pitzer commented that when the idea had first been proposed he had found it intriguing, but noted he was now planning to vote against it. He explained he was struck by the idea it should be done because it might be financially viable. He pointed out his job professionally was to make as much money as possible, but that was not the goal of city government. In addition, just because doing something might make money did not mean it was the right thing to do. He stated he planned to vote against this and thought they should move forward with the fourth generator that had been planned for and funded since 2015. He commented that they had a valuable resource in the landfill and should maximize what they could from it. He understood one way to do that was to turn the landfill gas into electricity, and noted a more reliable mechanism with potentially more generation capacity would provide a benefit to all ratepayers in addition to meeting some of the renewable energy goals. He felt that was a far better use of City resources than entering into what might be a speculative, burgeoning market. He commented that he had looked at the price of the credit, and in 2014 and 2015, it had been as low as \$25 per ton because there had been speculation that California was going to do away with the program and institute a cap and trade program, which would negate the value of the credit altogether. Likewise, the renewable identification numbers were driven solely by the EPA, and over the last couple of years, its value had also declined precipitously due to certain EPA policies. He reiterated he did not feel it was appropriate for a municipality to take on this kind of speculative risk when they had an asset that was providing a benefit to the citizens already.

Mr. Skala stated he was tempted not to support this. Like Mr. Pitzer, he had been intrigued by the idea, but believed it was too significant an amount of money to consider for an investment. He commented that he was concerned by the lack of information and the competing information in terms of the amount of methane released and captured. He noted he wanted to see that data before making a decision about closing off an opportunity for reliability via the landfill generators. He also felt they should look at the financial risk versus the investment. He thought they could better spend the money at this point by investing it in the fourth generator. He reiterated he still wanted clarification on the disparate numbers.

Mr. Thomas explained he would vote against the funding of the study for the reasons cited. He stated he also wanted another close look at the financial cost of diversion along with the climate cost of diversion. He found it hard to believe the climate impact of a good composting program would be greater than what they were doing now. He stated he wanted that information before making a final decision on a fourth generator.

Mr. Trapp commented that he was supportive with moving ahead with the fourth generator as it had intrinsic value as well as a more ephemeral value of renewable credits. He pointed out the value of the natural gas produced was actually very small. He thought it was better to stick to the course they knew was providing value for their customers right now.

The vote on R30-20 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NO ONE. VOTING NO: TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN. Resolution declared defeated.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B36-20 Granting design adjustments relating to the proposed Final Plat of Providence Walkway Plat 1 located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Providence Road and Park Avenue to allow reduced right-of-way dedication, reduced sidewalk construction, allowing a lot line to bisect an existing structure, and eliminate the installation of street trees (Case No. 12-2020).
- B37-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Providence Walkway Plat 1" located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Providence Road and Park Avenue; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 12-2020).
- B38-20 Rezoning property located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Providence Road and Third Avenue (1001 N. Providence Road) from District PD (Planned Development) to District M-N (Mixed-use Neighborhood) (Case No. 28-2020).
- B39-20 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code relating to the calculation of monthly volume charges for residential sewer service.
- B40-20 Authorizing an amendment to the agreement with Tyler Technologies, Inc. relating to the Columbia Financial Enterprise Resource System (COFERS) project to replace Transparency software with the Socrata Open Finance module.
- B41-20 Authorizing an amendment to the master services agreement with N. Harris Computer Corporation for the implementation of the Software as a Service (SaaS) LINK Enterprise solution to create a citizen portal for management of utility billing accounts; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B42-20 Authorizing a low income home energy assistance program supplier agreement with the Missouri Department of Social Services, on behalf of its Family Support Division.
- B43-20 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for Hepatitis A Outbreak response services.

- B44-20 Authorizing a subaward agreement with the National Environmental Health Association to support food safety program initiatives; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B45-20 Authorizing an amendment and consent to assignment with The Curators of the University of Missouri, on behalf of the School of Medicine Department of Family and Community Medicine, and Columbia Family Medical Services, Inc. for physician services.

X. REPORTS

- REP6-20 Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) Board of Directors - Annual Membership and Membership Change due to a Resignation.

Mayor Treece stated he wanted to appoint Deb Sheals to a partial term. He explained she was the current chair and had served for a long time. She wanted to continue to serve, but did not want to commit to a three-year term. He noted he also wanted to reappoint Deb Rust and Kenny Greene to full terms, and appoint Heather McGee, Mikel Fields, and Josh Safranski to full terms. He pointed out he had spoken with each of them regarding the expectation of Council for community improvement districts. He asked for the consent of Council to make these appointments to the Downtown CID Board, and asked if there was any objection. The Council consented without objection with the exception of Mr. Trapp who abstained.

Mayor Treece asked the City Clerk to communicate the appointments to the Downtown CID.

- REP8-20 Proposed amendments to ordinances relating to short-term rentals (B348-19, B22-20, B23-20); proposed administrative delay in the enforcement of short-term rental regulations.

Mayor Treece explained this report was a compilation from the previous meeting with respect to the amendments and the harmonization of the ordinances for short-term rentals. It was mostly for the information and transparency to the public. He noted the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) was holding a hearing for additional public comment and understood this would come back to the Council at the March 16, 2020 Council Meeting.

Mr. Skala stated he thought it had been a useful exercise to go through some of the amendments at the last meeting, but noted he would have preferred to have categorized them into groups and to wait for the advice to come back to them before discussing specific amendments. He commented that he anticipated an amendment or two after receiving advice from the PZC prior to making a final decision. He reiterated he thought it had been a useful discussion to inform the groups involved in making the recommendations.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he had asked for a plan for implementation. He understood staff had provided a draft ordinance for an administrative delay, but noted he was also interested in looking at whether the City had the resources and a plan in place to go through the inspection and licensing processes, how they might handle nuisances and nuisance complaints, what agreements they might have to enter into with the operators, etc.

Mr. Trapp asked if a potential impact on affordable housing would be one of the factors considered when granting a conditional use permit. Mr. Teddy replied he did not believe that criterion had been written into the legislation. Ms. Thompson stated it was not one of the criteria. She felt that was a broader policy discussion at the Council level as opposed to staff implementation. She explained it would need to be something in this particular ordinance and not something applied on the back end. Mr. Trapp asked if an amendment would be needed to create the mechanism to have that as a consideration for

the conditional use permit process. Ms. Thompson replied staff would need to know what criteria the Council would want to incorporate into the conditional use permit process, such as density of short-term rentals in a particular area, etc.

Mayor Treece stated he would be concerned that would invite exposure to the City as they would be asking staff to document the affordability of a property that was in jeopardy, and by failing to grant the conditional use permit, they would be jeopardizing the ability of a property owner to make more money via a short-term rental than a traditional long-term rental.

Mr. Trapp commented that he wanted the Housing and Community Development Commission (HCDC) to take a look at the short-term rental ordinance from the lens of its impact on affordable housing and to obtain a recommendation from that body in addition to the PZC.

Mr. Thomas stated he was supportive of the suggestion of Mr. Trapp as he had planned to ask for that as well.

Mr. Teddy explained each conditional use permit request would be reviewed as an individual case, and they might be able to analyze neighborhoods as they gained experience with it. They could try to determine the trend within the neighborhood. He understood cities that had concerns about the impact on affordable housing had classified it as a form of gentrification because they were replacing residents with relatively well-to-do tourists. Some neighborhoods might lend themselves to that pattern while others might not. He reiterated it would take experience and would require the need to look at it in the aggregate and not via an individual case.

Mayor Treece commented that two of them had recommended this be referred to the HCDC. At the previous meeting, they had struggled with approving a motion to refer it to the PZC. He asked if they wanted to discuss it further.

Mr. Skala stated he was always open to advice from any board or commission if it could be accommodated, but they also needed to consider the timing of it. He pointed out they had previously struggled with timing when considering the referral to the PZC.

Mr. Thomas noted he was comfortable with the extra time it would take to get a review from the HCDC.

Mayor Treece explained his concern with referring it to another commission was that it was really a zoning ordinance. It was a creature of the PZC and it was not the role of the HCDC. If they were going to entertain other non-zoning related issues, the ordinance did not belong in the zoning code.

Mr. Skala suggested a middle approach by just soliciting the advice of the HCDC without formally giving them the role of making some determination. He noted the public was free to give advice on amendments.

Mr. Thomas pointed out zoning rules massively impacted community development, and the two were completely intertwined.

Mr. Trapp stated a statement of purpose of the HCDC was to advise the Council with regard to issues impacting affordable housing.

Ms. Peters commented that she would like to hear from the HCDC regarding the impact of this on affordable housing because she struggled with that issue.

Mr. Pitzer asked if they knew what a schedule might look like or if it would be open ended again. Ms. Peters asked if there was a need to get this done aside from the fact they did not want it to drag on forever. She wondered if there was a deadline that had to be met.

Mr. Teddy stated the PZC was scheduled to hold a hearing on March 5, and the ordinance had already been delivered to them for their work session briefing on Thursday.

Mr. Pitzer noted that technically any commission could have discussed it over the last 18 months and could have brought something to the Council.

Mayor Treece commented that at this point it was not very helpful for him to hear whether there was an impact on affordable housing or not unless they were willing to make some concrete and specific suggestions as to how they could make the ordinances better.

Mr. Teddy stated the next regular meeting of the HCDC would be March 11. They had a March 4 meeting as well, but it was a pre-application workshop for would be applicants of federal funds. Ms. Amin pointed out they also had a meeting on February 19, which was only two days away, but she was not sure they could add this to their agenda since it was already posted.

Mr. Skala thought they should solicit the input of the HCDC if they were willing to give it. He did not believe they had to stipulate a formal task. He thought it would be nice if they had specific recommendations, but did not feel that was necessary as their perspective alone would be useful. He commented that he had always been of the opinion that boards and commissions could act relatively independently. He felt they should pay attention to what Council might ask of them, but that did not mean they should not be open to some opinion a board or commission might have.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Peters if she agreed with the comment of Mr. Skala about the ability to provide an opinion whenever. Ms. Peters replied yes. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Trapp and Mr. Thomas if they were good with that. They both replied yes.

Ms. Thompson asked if staff could receive feedback on whether the Council wanted the administrative delay ordinance brought forward along with the other short-term rental ordinances. She also asked for any modifications they might want included in it. Mayor Treece replied his sense was that they wanted staff to bring it forward. Ms. Peters agreed. Mr. Pitzer agreed as well. He explained his motivation was to not disrupt plans people had made for a long time, such as graduation. Ms. Thompson stated it was drafted so that short-term rental operators would have to show the property was unavailable for additional rentals until they were compliant with the new ordinance. They would be able to continue to meet their existing obligations. Mr. Pitzer asked if it would apply if the ordinance was defeated. Ms. Thompson replied no. It would not apply if the ordinance was defeated. Mr. Pitzer asked if there was a way to craft another version of this that would. Ms. Thompson replied if the ordinance was defeated there would be no delay.

REP9-20 Subdivision of two-family dwellings (duplexes).

Mr. Trapp asked if this item could be continued so they could discuss it at the next meeting as he was not as prepared as he would have liked to have been tonight, and no one objected to his request.

REP10-20 FY 2019 Utility Financials.

Ms. Talbert provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer asked how the debt coverage ratio was calculated in the bond covenants. Ms. Talbert replied the utility calculated it based on the operating revenues plus interest income minus the operating expenses. The difference was divided into the total principal and interest payments. Mr. Pitzer understood the operating expenses included PILOT. Ms. Talbert stated the utility included that transfer in as an operating expense because they knew it was an expense that would occur every year. Only the Council could decide to not make that happen. Since they felt that was unlikely, they included it. Generally, the bond rating agencies did not include it because they did not consider it an operating expense as it was an option since the Council could take it away at any time. Mr. Pitzer understood it would not violate the bond covenant if they dipped below the 1.1 shown on the slide. It would only violate an internal policy for conservative budgeting. Ms. Talbert stated she thought they would be below the bond covenants in the bonding documents if they went below the 1.1. Mr. Pitzer pointed out the PILOT had not been taken out in the bond. Ms. Talbert agreed, but thought the 1.1 was the minimum based on the wording of the bond covenants. She noted that was a question for the Finance Director. Mr. Pitzer thought that should be looked into a bit further in the bond documents where they project out the debt service coverage. For 2019 for water and electric combined, it was projected to be 2.7 in the water bond that was issued in May, and their own CAFER that was recently published for fiscal year 2019 had indicated the actual debt service coverage to

be 3.05 for the entire utility, not just water or electric. He thought they wanted to stay clear of violating a bond covenant as that was serious, but also felt they should be certain as to that actual definition. Ms. Talbert pointed out the transfer was not included in the CAFER either. The utility did it on its end because that was what they considered to be worse case since it was going to happen. Mr. Pitzer understood and agreed that should be taken into account, but felt they should be careful about the language they were using if that was not actually violating the bond covenants.

Ms. Talbert continued the staff report.

Mr. Skala commented that a theme within this presentation had been that personnel expenses had been significantly under what had been budgeted, and understood that was the result of not being able to fill positions. He asked if that was an acute problem in terms of recruitment or a retirement problem. He wondered what the reason was for this significant across the board issue with personnel. Ms. Talbert replied she felt it was the ability to hire and retain employees. As Mr. Sorrell had mentioned earlier in the pre-council meeting that the City was having issues hiring CDL operators in the solid waste utility, and that applied to the water utility as well. Mr. Glascock noted the City was at about a 10 percent vacancy rate. Mr. Sorrell pointed out the sewer utility had an equivalent number of vacancies for CDL operators as the solid waste utility. He thought there were 11 of 14 positions vacant. In the stormwater utility, all of the CDL operator positions were currently vacant. He explained the personnel money that was not expended due to vacancies was over \$700,000 each for both the solid waste utility and the sewer utility. Mr. Williams stated the electric utility and water utility were experiencing similar personnel shortages with front line staff. He thought the majority of their water distribution operator positions were currently vacant as those positions required a CDL. He commented that, last year, the budget had been amended to include a program for the line personnel, and he believed the efforts allowed by Council had improved the situation, but they still had a long way to go before they were able to fill all of the vacant positions in the electric utility. Mr. Skala understood the problem was likely exacerbated by reduced capital expenditures because some of the projects could not be completed causing delays in capital projects. Mr. Williams stated it was systemic and touched everything they did from design through construction. It impacted their ability to do projects.

Mr. Glascock pointed out these discussions normally occurred during the budget season, and asked Council if they were agreeable to being provided this information for discussion at the beginning of the calendar year or if they wanted it included as part of the budget as had been done historically.

Ms. Peters stated she preferred to see it in January or February every year. She felt it was a mess to include it as part of the budget due to the number of other items within the budget and because it was difficult to make decisions in August when they did not know the income results from the summer months.

Mayor Treece explained he thought it was better to do it after they knew the results of the preceding fiscal year. He commented that had they had this information in 2018, they might have reached a different conclusion.

Mr. Skala stated he liked the idea of a preview being available during the regular budget session for discussion. Mr. Glascock explained they could discuss what they foresaw as rate increases during the budget cycle, but not establish the rate increases until they were at this point.

Mayor Treece asked why with sophisticated financial software it took over four months to obtain unaudited financials for the previous fiscal year. Mr. Glascock replied he was not sure unaudited financials could not be provided earlier. He thought they tried to provide audited documents, and could likely provide unaudited information. He stated he did not believe it was a problem, but pointed out he thought there had been hesitation in past because the audited numbers could be different. Mayor Treece understood unaudited numbers had been provided tonight. Mr. Glascock stated staff had tried to not provide

unaudited numbers in past. Mr. Pitzer understood the City had audited numbers now. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Ms. Peters asked how long it normally took to get audited numbers. Mr. Glascock replied the City had just published the CAFER so it took over three months.

Mr. Pitzer stated he felt this was a constantly evolving and moving target. With the budget, they were actually approving a budget for the utilities in September, and that part of it still needed to be up for discussion.

REP11-20 Amendment to the FY 2020 Annual Budget - Intra-Department Transfer of Funds.

Mayor Treece understood this report was provided for informational purposes.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Jay Hasheider, Chair of the WLAB, explained the WLAB was interested in helping provide financial advice to the Council. He understood there had been recent controversy within the water utility in terms of the financial numbers and noted the WLAB would be open for direction from the Council as to what they expected with regard to issues of that nature. He provided a history of the things that were happening when the discoveries were made with regard to the restricted accounts. He explained a new financial officer had come on board with the Utility Department in 2018, and that person had to help manage five different utilities. In addition, they had been extremely sensitive to the fact that the water utility had very little cash reserve, and the idea of finding money that only had to be unrestricted had been quite comforting. The WLAB had been made aware of the restricted account that had been discovered in the spring of 2018, but they had not reported it to the Council. He commented that during that time, there had also been a lack of financial data due to the change from HTE to Munis. It had been difficult for the consultant to obtain all of the information needed to prepare the documentation for the bond issue in a manner with which everyone was comfortable. He reiterated to let the WLAB know if there was anything they could do to help Council identify and bring the issue to resolution.

Mr. Pitzer commented that there was a suggestion that it was the responsibility of the WLAB to bring that disclosure to the Council and he did not feel that was true. He did not feel it was the responsibility of the WLAB. Going forward, if there were things the WLAB was aware of that the Council had not been notified of, he would encourage them to bring those items to their attention or to ensure they were aware of things of that nature. He asked Mr. Hasheider if he felt the financial training session the WLAB had a month or two ago had been helpful and if they planned to utilize any of that feedback going forward in their work. Mr. Hasheider replied they would try to be more aware and more communicative with the Council on financial matters and noted it was their intent to become more acutely aware of how the financial metrics could be identified so they had a much better grasp as to the information they could receive and use. He pointed out the WLAB had created a financial subcommittee at their last meeting to determine what they could do to rearrange the reports they were provided so they had a better understanding of those matters. He noted the financials were fluid due to the transactions that occurred on a monthly basis, and they would try to make sense of them, especially when some months, like October, were very erratic.

Mr. Skala understood the concept of a perfect storm with regard to the recent controversy in terms of computer system problems in sharing reliable information and personnel problems, and asked if that situation was now better. Mr. Hasheider replied they still had yet to see the audited statements, but the situation had gotten better. He believed the system of looking at the prior year summer months before setting the rate for the following summer was appropriate. It seemed to be a practical step forward. He commented that personnel changes at the financial level had made things more stable so they were able to interact to obtain the information requested. He commented that the

software system was now more reliable as well. He reiterated things were better, but felt some improvements could be made.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Hasheider if he felt the WLAB was receiving consistent and accurate financial data on a regular basis. Mr. Hasheider replied yes. He explained he thought they could improve on the financial information they received, but the consistency was there in terms of the reports. The APPA training they had participated in had helped them identify ways to look at the reports. He reiterated the consistency in the reporting was there, but it needed improvement so they and future WLAB members could easily assimilate an understanding.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Hasheider if he felt staff at all levels were responsive to their requests for more information. Mr. Hasheider replied yes, but noted it was not unreservedly. The WLAB always had questions so it was an ongoing evolution and staff seemed to be appropriately diligent in providing the information requested.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Hasheider if he thought it was unusual that \$500,000 was unassigned as restricted for four prior fiscal years after the books had been closed on those fiscal years. Mr. Hasheider replied he could not say as he had not had prior experience or exposure in looking at financials of this nature. It did not seem to be completely off the charts in his view. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Hasheider who would have the authority to authorize that. Mr. Hasheider asked if he was speaking about the restricted or unrestricted account. Mayor Treece replied yes. Mr. Hasheider stated it was the responsibility of the Finance Department. He was not sure if it was the person that handled the utility accounts or a combination of the Finance Department Director and that person. He understood all of those responsibilities were within the Finance Department. The reports and all of the account management was basically given to the Utility Department, which meant when they had questions, the Utility Department staff had to go back to the Finance Department staff to provide the answers.

Mayor Treece commented that he found it curious that despite all of this expensive software, they still relied on a human to make the transfer. He found it odd that it was not automated and that there was not some kind of policy in place. He pointed out he still did not have a clear answer on who had restricted it in the first place, and did not believe Mr. Hasheider knew either. Mr. Hasheider stated he did not. He had been told it was a person that was no longer with the City. In terms of trying to resolve the situation, he believed a performance audit would get to the heart of principles of that nature, like who was responsible for the management of the funds, etc.

Dee Dokken, 804 Again Street, noted 802 Again Street had just sold after being on the market for a short time. The woman that had lived there for over 20 years had to move out, and it appeared as though it would be an unhosted short-term rental. She stated she would bet the home, which had two bedrooms and had been built in the 1940s, had sold for \$100,000 or less. She pointed out a young couple or a single person would likely not be able to move into the home at 802 Again Street and wanted to add that situation to the conversation.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that, as a disabled individual, he would be asking for more assistance soon. He explained he was on social security and tremendous things that had occurred within the last 30-60 days were leading him to ask for help. He stated the water, trash, etc. rates were a cause of him having to pay another \$50 per month now. He asked the Council to take that into consideration as they discussed low income housing and ensuring the poor did not need more handouts.

Mr. Elkin asked if the City hired felons. Mr. Glascock replied he thought felons had been hired before. It depended on the job and department.

Mr. Elkin stated there were a number of dangerous potholes around town, and noted one was at Fifth Street and Ash Street.

Mr. Elkin understood something called silver solution involving a Brazilian pepper tree

could help address the virus that had started recently in China. He also understood the United States was out of face masks.

Mr. Thomas wanted everyone to be aware that there would be an Affordable Housing Summit on Thursday, February 27 at 6:00 p.m. at the Atrium in the downtown. He understood the speaker would be Tony Perez and the topic of his presentation would be the missing middle, which referred to housing that fit within the spectrum of single-family detached housing and large apartment buildings. He noted it involved a range of different types of housing that were difficult to build under traditional zoning laws, but could incentivize the private market to produce more affordable housing by allowing it. He encouraged everyone to attend.

Mr. Thomas noted he and Mr. Trapp had convened an affordable housing policy study group last fall to look at different affordable housing policy strategies. The group had met a couple of times and would be making some recommendations on an affordable housing policy within a few months.

Mr. Trapp commented that he had met with a member of the Tree Board with regard to the emerald ash borer and asked for a report from the Tree Board as to any additional things the City could be doing to address the situation. He pointed out there were a number of ash trees throughout the City's tree canopy, but in the First Ward, there were a lot of low income homeowners that might not have the means to manage a large dying tree. He stated they knew the emerald ash borer was in Boone County now, and thought they should make sure they were doing everything they could.

Mr. Skala understood the concept of CPTED had been around since the late 1960s and early 1970s. He explained he had been involved in it in the early 2000s when Columbia was crafting its outdoor lighting ordinance. He believed there was a lot to be said about CPTED and some of it involved common sense ideas like keeping the bushes trimmed around the windows. He wanted to caution the public about lighting. Many tended to think the more light the better, but even those in the Police Department would say there could be such an abundance of light that it interfered with witness identification. He provided the example of a convenience store and someone looking out of the convenience store into the ambient light and for those that might be passing by. He understood that people tended to not see as well when within a very well-lit area when things became dark again. He suggested caution in terms of surveillance as well. He explained mobile surveillance cameras had not been approved by the Council previously. He noted the City had cameras in the parking garages and other buildings it owned, and thought their role might be best served to help the private sector with some of their surveillance needs. He commented that CPTED was a rich environment, and he believed they could move forward with it and maybe reconsider some things. He pointed out they now had LEDs along with different types and sources of lighting, and suggested that policy be revisited. He encouraged the public to do its own research regarding CPTED by just googling it.

Mayor Treece stated that what had immediately come to mind when he had met with Shaunda Hamilton was the building construction codes. He understood it was more intersectional than just that, but wondered if a good first step would be to have the Building Construction Codes Commission, the Climate and Environment Commission, the Housing and Community Development Commission, and others to look into CPTED.

Mr. Trapp commented that the City had an interdepartmental work group that looked at lighting issues and suggested that body as well.

Mayor Treece thought there might be some best practices and suggested looking at the Springfield, Missouri ordinance as they had a portion of this in their urban design code. He reiterated he thought the annual update of the building construction codes might be a good place to start with at least new housing.

Mr. Thomas understood a lot of the focus was on the public space versus private spaces, and they did not really have a commission or board that looked into how the public space was designed.

Mr. Skala stating the lighting ordinance had captured public spaces.

Mayor Treece pointed out there were also spaces that were not public like private surface parking lots as they tended to become gathering points and locations for crime. There was the issue of whether police should go onto the private property, and conversely, whether they should ask private property owners to restrict access to their private parking lots. He stated he believed there were a whole host of issues, and if it could prevent a crime or tragedy, he thought they should pursue it.

Mr. Pitzer stated he wanted to highlight the work of a few City employees that were recently recognized. He understood a Parks and Recreation Department employee had used existing equipment to create yardage markers at the Lake of the Woods Golf Course saving the City \$2,300. An employee of the Information Technologies Department had initiated an additional level of review of invoices to ensure they were accurate had saved the City \$37,900, and another employee of the Information Technologies Department had worked with an employee of the Public Works Department to connect the emergency call boxes in the parking garages to the City's existing phone lines saving the City \$27,000. He wanted to recognize the positive work that was being done, and to encourage the City Manager to continue encouraging front line employees to come up with common sense ideas that could generate meaningful savings for the City.

Ms. Peters commented that she had met with members of the Utilities Department regarding the water utility and the treatment plant, and thanked them for their time. She noted they had reviewed the work being done, the bond issues, and how the water plant worked.

Ms. Peters stated she needed someone to explain the CAFER to her now that it had been published. She asked if anyone else felt that way, and if not, she would be happy to just ask for a meeting with staff herself. Mr. Trapp replied he would be willing to participate in a tutorial if Ms. Peters set one up.

Mayor Treece suggested waiting until after the April election since they would have a new member, and thought it might be helpful for that review in early May outside of the budget process or as part of the budget process. He noted he did not want to be spoon-fed information about priorities or non-budget related issues, and felt this might be a good place to start before getting into departmental requests.

Mr. Glascock thought they could start the budget discussions with that piece since it would lead into the next year.

Mr. Trapp noted Mr. Byndom had brought up the MTFCV earlier in the evening. Although they had done some updates, it had been a while. He felt the dashboard idea suggested was worth a follow up.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 10:38 p.m.