



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, April 20, 2020
7:00 PM

Regular

Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway

(One or more council
members may
participate via
videoconference.)

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, April 20, 2020, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri.

Mayor Treece explained some council members were participating by videoconference and that public comment would be limited per an emergency ordinance passed at the prior meeting. He pointed out that written public comment that had been received by the City Clerk by 4 p.m. had been distributed to the Council.

The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members PETERS (via videoconference), TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA (via videoconference), THOMAS (via videoconference), and PITZER were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

Mr. Trapp asked that "First" be added so the minutes reflected "...in close collaboration with Mr. Hollis since 2008 in terms of cutting edge Housing First before it was in vogue..." during the discussion regarding the COVID-19 Update under special items.

The minutes of the regular meeting of April 6, 2020 with the change requested by Mr. Trapp were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Pitzer and a second by Mr. Ruffin.

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

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI6-20

COVID-19 Update.

Ms. Browning provided an update.

Mr. Trapp asked about the availability of testing within the region and the State of Missouri. Ms. Browning replied she wanted it to be more widespread than it was currently. She explained there were limitations in obtaining the swabs, which was a nationwide issue. In addition, there was some limitation to obtaining the viral media. They were fortunate in Boone County due to some creative solutions, and understood nine counties within the region had some sort of drive-through testing. She commented that they had seen the numbers declining the last few days. Mr. Trapp asked if the number of tests were declining. Ms. Browning replied the number of people. She explained they had seen the first spike when testing first started. She noted the University of Missouri Hospital had likely tested about 135 people and they had the capacity to test about 150 people. In the last few days that had dropped to the 50-60

count. She pointed out she thought Jefferson City had only tested seven people on Friday.

Mr. Trapp asked if they would have a more robust dataset to understand the progression of the disease if they had more testing. He wondered if it would be beneficial to use the 100 test capacity currently being underutilized on nonsymptomatic individuals. Ms. Browning replied the system was ready to test as they had the ability. They were only lacking the demand. She thought they would have to work with their partners on that issue within the next few weeks. She stated there had been talk at the State level about surveillance-type testing to obtain a better understanding of what was happening in the population.

Mr. Ruffin understood the City was tracking positive cases by age and asked if they were also tracking them by race like other communities. Ms. Browning replied yes. She noted it was on the daily report, and currently they were not seeing the disparities that existed in other places within the United States.

Mr. Pitzer asked what she meant by a sustained reduction in the number of cases. Ms. Browning replied they were seeing one or two a day so she was not sure they would ever be able to say they did not have any cases. She felt they wanted to keep that number down as low as possible. She believed their reduction would be to keep that going and to not have any big spikes.

Mr. Pitzer asked Ms. Browning for her thoughts regarding the stay at home order if they were still at this level around April 24. Ms. Browning replied the Governor had issued an order that went through May 3, 2020. She thought they would likely do something in parallel with that. Mr. Pitzer asked what would happen if they were still at this level on May 3. He wondered if there would be a partial reopening. Ms. Browning replied there were lots of conversations happening at varying levels for a phased approach. She envisioned them stepping back slowly, i.e. beginning to open up and watch how things were going, step back a little more, etc. Her hope was that they could keep the curve flat during that time. Mr. Pitzer asked if she envisioned statewide collaboration, regional collaboration, or something else. Ms. Browning replied she did not know yet.

Mr. Pitzer asked Ms. Browning if she had any insight on testing supplies. He pointed out they continued to hear from the State that testing supplies were coming and that they would be in much better shape in a week. Ms. Browning replied she understood there was work in terms of manufacturing for increasing the amounts of swabs in particular. She thought they were in pretty good shape in Boone County, but she was not sure that was the case statewide. She believed it would take some time for testing to catch up.

Mr. Pitzer asked Ms. Browning if they had started to look at antibody testing. Ms. Browning replied she had been on a call with regard to that at the State level in terms of how that could be used for surveillance testing. She understood they had been measuring capacity and trying to determine who might have a certain type of testing machine. She stated they were gathering information and she hoped there would be a plan in the future. Mr. Pitzer asked if the City and County would have a role in developing how the testing would be implemented if there was a reliable test for the antibodies and enough supply available. He wondered if it would affect making recommendations or requirements for certain businesses or certain types of gatherings. Ms. Browning replied antibody testing was not as good as the testing happening now. She pointed out it was a moment in time. She explained one could be tested today and be asymptomatic, but could later start showing symptoms so it might not be accurate. She stated they needed to know more, and noted that was the reason they spoke of antibody testing as a surveillance tool. In places where it had been deployed, it had provided mixed results. It was not a bad test, but it was not the best test either, and was not as good as the one they had now.

Mr. Pitzer understood they might be able to phase back into some things and asked what some of the early phases might include. Ms. Browning thought small nonessential businesses could be provided opportunities for curbside retail as it would allow small

businesses to come back while still maintaining social distancing within those environments. They could eventually increase the number of people gathering from ten to another number.

Mr. Skala referred to the last slide which had included four conditions that needed to be satisfied in order to reduce the restrictions of the stay at home order, and asked if any of those had been satisfied. Ms. Browning replied that if they were looking at Boone County right now, they had reached a sustained reduction, the hospitals could serve everyone in the region, testing was available here and growing in other places although supplies needed to continually be monitored, and they had an outstanding Public Health and Human Services Department in terms of contact tracing.

Mr. Skala thanked staff for all of their work and noted he endorsed the gradual withdrawal approach and the alignment with the dates of the Governor.

Mr. Thomas referred to the slide that had showed the projected growth in cases if there had not been a stay at home order and understood 1.8 had been the doubling factor based on the increase in cases they were seeing before the stay at home order had gone into effect. Ms. Browning stated the red curve showed what could have been the result had they not done anything. Mr. Thomas understood the red curve was what they had predicted could have occurred had there not been a stay at home order issued beginning March 25, 2020. Ms. Browning stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas understood this did not just mean there would have been 200 cases on March 31 because it also meant there would have been 400 cases on April 2 and 800 cases on April 4. Ms. Browning stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas thought it was important to really appreciate the actions of Ms. Browning. He commented that while the stay at home order was very hard and very difficult for a lot of people, it had reduced the number of cases tremendously and had saved lives.

Mr. Thomas asked Ms. Browning what the daily testing capacity was and what it needed to be for her to feel comfortable relaxing some of the rules. Ms. Browning replied they had the capacity with the supplies they had now. She pointed out it would be nice to have more, but she did not have an exact number. She believed they needed to speak with their healthcare partners and the State to determine where they might need to be. She explained she would have liked it if they would have kept with the high numbers they had in the first few weeks. It would have made her feel much better.

Mr. Thomas asked if all of the staff and residents of nursing homes were being tested. He understood there had been a case at one nursing home and asked about increasing testing in areas where there was likely to be infection. Ms. Browning replied that would be a good strategy. There had been one case in an assisted living facility and that facility had been very responsive by testing all staff and patients with the exception of one that had refused testing and had not been allowed to work since. There had not been any positive results in that instance. She stated she was not sure of the other nursing homes but understood they had all been shut down to visitors. In addition, they were all checking for symptoms every day. She noted they were following the guidance. Mr. Thomas understood someone that had a fever or a fever and a cough would be tested. Ms. Browning stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas commented that there was presumably a degree of testing capacity that would be nice to have in order to allow schools and businesses to open back up so they could ensure they were able to know about it quickly and could take appropriate measures of isolation, restrictions, etc. to prevent an uncontrollable outbreak. Ms. Browning stated both hospitals had the capacity to do more, but did not have the demand so they were able to build up some supply. She thought they had a system that was robust enough to have the capacity to bring it back if there was an increase.

Mr. Thomas asked if there had been any thought to requiring masks to be worn by customer service representatives and customers in retail establishments that were currently open and those that might possibly open later as a result of the relaxation of the rules. Ms. Browning replied the infectious disease specialists were indicating a mask

could not substitute for the social distancing of at least six feet. Mr. Thomas commented that his thought was for that in addition to the six feet of distancing. Ms. Browning understood that those that wore masks often did not wear them correctly or fidgeted with their face even more. Ms. Peters commented that she was under the impression that the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) was recommending masks now. Ms. Browning stated it was recommended in instances where people were unable to socially distance. Ms. Peters felt it would be helpful to do both, but noted she had worn masks for years due to her profession.

Mr. Thomas understood the current order would expire on April 24, which was Friday, and asked Ms. Browning for her recommendation at that point. Ms. Browning replied she was working with the Law Departments in both the City and the County to create an order that was in line with the order by the Governor. Mr. Thomas understood the City's order was more restrictive than that of the Governor. Mayor Treece understood both orders had been set to expire on April 24, but the Governor had extended his to May 3, 2020.

Ms. Peters understood there was discussion as to whether employees of grocery stores should be wearing masks as they were at the highest risk, and asked if there had been discussion in that regard. Ms. Browning replied she had not been in many stores, but those she had spoken with had indicated there was a lot of mask-wearing happening. Ms. Peters stated that was not the case for the grocery store in which she shopped, and noted only about 10 percent of the people working there had been wearing masks. Ms. Browning commented that it was something to consider.

Mr. Thomas thought they should consider requiring customers to wear masks as well in order to protect the workers, and understood that was not something Ms. Browning was considering at the moment. Ms. Browning replied she would consider the best guidance and what the science said.

Mayor Treece commented that he thought the data showed the aggressive steps the City had taken two weeks before the State stay at home order was showing results here. He hoped they would see the same results statewide in the next two weeks. He stated he agreed with Ms. Browning's plan to gradually reopen at a time in the future when they met the thresholds that had been outlined. He wondered if they should use the next week or next two weeks to put the protections in place mentioned by Ms. Peters and Mr. Thomas so they could lift the restrictions later and ensure businesses, especially those nonessential businesses that had not been operating recently, had safety procedures and plans in place to protect their employees and consumers. He thought they should specify the expectations of consumers when going into stores and other businesses. He also felt having some of those items in place within another stay at home order would level the playing field to help them continue reaching the results they wanted. When both orders expired in some point in the future, he thought some of those practices might continue to preserve and sustain the results they were seeing today. He felt there were additional protections or best practices they could require. Ms. Browning explained they had established guidance for all kinds of different organizations and it had been well received. She believed they could do the same thing then and refer to the guidance.

Mr. Pitzer felt it was a good idea to provide the guidance and recommendations, and to make it available ahead of the May 3, 2020 date if they were still trending the same they were now. He thought most people were aware that extra precautions needed to be taken and were willing to do that if they knew the plan and strategy. He believed they would get community buy-in by providing that information in as much detail as possible.

Mayor Treece stated he believed the public would be willing to trade some measured baby steps with these additional protections to obtain the desired results.

Mr. Trapp asked for an update regarding the safety-net services the Public Health and Human Services Department had been providing but was no longer providing since they were focused on contact tracing. He understood pharmaceutical assistance had been eliminated. Ms. Browning replied they were providing some meds assistance. She noted the social services items were still ongoing. They were providing some utility assistance

and meds assistance. Mr. Trapp asked how services like birth certificates were accessed with social distancing. Ms. Browning replied applications for birth certificates were located outside of the building and people were allowed to scan their identification and put a check in the mail. Once the check was received, the birth certificate would be mailed. In addition, they were taking payment via a credit card. She noted processes had been changed. She explained they had a system with funeral homes regarding death certificates in that the funeral homes were billed once a month. In terms of social services, much of it was being case-managed by phone or a video visit if the person had that capability. Mr. Trapp understood people could call and make requests. Ms. Browning stated that was correct. She commented that on Wednesdays they had very limited clinical services because they did not want children to fall behind on immunizations, etc. so people were allowed to come in on an appointment basis. She noted they were also doing some virtual visits for STD screenings, etc. She stated the way they did business had changed, but they were providing services. She explained they were able to do a lot with regard to WIC remotely as well. Mr. Trapp understood people needing services should just call the social services number and the processes would be explained. Ms. Browning stated that was correct. Mr. Trapp asked if the connection could be made via 573-874-CITY phone number. Ms. Browning replied yes. Mr. Trapp commented that rumor was the first child born of disaster and this was better than what he had heard via the grapevine.

Mr. Skala stated he felt requiring masks at grocery stores was a good idea. He understood some had instituted that policy and had a pretty good behavioral rate. He understood another novel concept of some grocery stores was to make the first hour of the day available to at-risk populations, and thought that might need to be considered. Ms. Browning commented that many stores were doing the special time for people with an underlying condition or those that were older. In addition, some were now starting to not allow people to bring in reusable bags. An exception was Aldi since the customers packed up their own goods. She stated many were doing some of those good recommendations and thought they might be able to standardize it in the guidance.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

None.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH15-20 TEFRA Public Hearing - Special Obligation Bonds (Airport Project), Series 2020A.

Discussion shown with B88-20.

B88-20 Authorizing the issuance of Special Obligation Bonds (Airport Project), Series 2020A; prescribing the form and details of the bonds and the covenants and agreements to provide for the payment and security thereof; and authorizing certain actions and documents and prescribing other matters relating thereto.

PH15-20 was read by the Clerk, and B88-20 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece understood there was an amendment sheet associated with this and that there was a new Exhibit B to that amendment sheet, which was the Federal Tax Certificate and had been distributed to the Council prior to the meeting.

Ms. Thompson provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

John Conway provided written comments asking about the source of revenue that would repay the bonds, and those comments were filed with B88-20. Mayor Treece stated he understood it would be the hotel and lodging tax approved by voters in August of 2016 and the passenger facility charges. Ms. Thompson pointed out they always added the caveat that any other funds that were lawfully available or appropriate could be used. Given today's environment, they did not know what other funds might become available to assist them with this particular project, and they would be pleased to use any funds that came their way.

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

Mr. Thomas asked how reasonable the projections were that the hotel tax and the passenger facility fees would be sufficient to repay the loan and that passenger demand would warrant the proposed scope and scale of the terminal expansion project in the long term. Ms. Thompson replied the City had quite a period of time to collect the hotel tax in order to repay the bonds. She thought they had about \$2 million collected via the hotel tax already so they only had another \$8 million to collect. Ms. Button stated Ms. Thompson was correct as the hotel/motel tax had a 23-year sunset period so they would continue to collect that in the long term. The passenger facility charges would also continue to be collected as passengers purchased tickets. At this point, the flights had been greatly reduced, but she anticipated it would increase over time. Ms. Thompson noted those funds could be used for any period of time to reimburse themselves the cost of the bonds, so if the City had to use other funds, such as general revenue or the designated loan fund, in order to make payment on the bonds, they could still be reimbursed via those charges. Mr. Glascock commented that the City's track record was pretty good, and although they were going through a lull, he expected everything to pick back up next year. Ms. Button stated she agreed with Mr. Glascock and noted the airlines had indicated they had a lot of confidence in Columbia Regional Airport.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was any analysis or discussion with regard to whether demand for flights would return to where it had been before the virus, whether business meetings conducted by videoconference might take a big share of that travel, or whether the confidence to travel for leisure or a vacation might decline. Ms. Button replied she did not have any data at this time, and pointed out they were in continued conversation with United Airlines and American Airlines and both continued to express confidence in the Columbia Regional Airport and the resurgence of growth in service as time allowed.

Mr. Thomas asked if there would be any negative consequence in delaying this decision for six or twelve months when they had a better assessment on which to base a decision. Ms. Thompson replied one of the reasons this had been brought to Council in the current environment was the 1.9 percent interest rate. It made the project very doable and made the financing very attractive to move forward with the project in a more expedited fashion. Mayor Treece commented that he believed a delay would result in costs increasing. If they were worried now about having sufficient funds to pay the bonds, the costs would only increase in six months in terms of higher construction costs, higher interest rates, etc. He pointed out the Columbia Regional Airport was an obsolete airport that was not compliant in terms of ADA and TSA and it had not been built for Homeland Security. As a result, they would still need a new terminal whether or not they met the same number of enplanements. He thought they would bounce back to where they had been previously.

Mr. Glascock stated Ms. Schneider had indicated to him that tournaments and conferences were rescheduling and not just cancelling, so they expected to bounce back next year.

Mr. Skala commented that in addition to the phenomenal rate they were receiving, this project might provide for an economic development opportunity to help them come out of this period of lower expectations.

Ms. Peters asked why they had been so fortunate to receive this great interest rate. Ms.

Thompson replied she thought there had just been a lot of competition in the market. There were not many people financing projects. Bond counsel had indicated to her that five particular issuances had been canceled. She thought lenders were looking for opportunities to get into the market and the market was at historically low rates. Mayor Treece commented that he thought tax-free bonds were a good place to put money given the uncertainty in the other market. Ms. Thompson noted this was a \$26 million project, which was a significant construction project in terms of surcharging the local economy.

Mr. Trapp commented that he agreed with the points of Mayor Treece and Mr. Skala. He also thought they would receive good bids on the project. He noted the great thing about government was that they had the capacity to move forward decisively, even in turbulent and uncertain times, because they had large reserves via steady revenues. It made Columbia a good investment for bond investors. He stated he believed people would be hungry for work so it would be a good thing for the community. He thought they should move forward in spite of the intrinsic downsides of airports as had been illustrated by this pandemic. He did not believe there would be such a behavioral change that people would not fly, and if anyone was going to have a regional airport, he felt it should be Columbia.

Mr. Thomas asked if selling these bonds locked them into a particular airport design. He wondered at what point that would be locked in if air travel demand was significantly down. He commented that he tended to agree they could not continue with the current terminal. He only wondered whether the design they had now was appropriate for the future. Ms. Thompson replied the bonds did not lock the City into a particular design. She believed they were in the middle of an open house process with regard to the design. Ms. Button stated three RFPs had been received on Friday. They were now in the process of putting together a virtual open house for public comment on those three designs. She believed the open house would begin at noon on Thursday and extend through Monday at noon. The public would have the opportunity to weigh in on the three designs. She confirmed the comment of Ms. Thompson in that the bonds were not tied to the designs. Ms. Thompson pointed out the City was required to build a terminal and related improvements. The funds could not be used for a totally unrelated project.

Mayor Treece understood the designs would come to Council at the first meeting in June. Ms. Button stated that was correct. She understood it would take the selection team most of May to review the submittals. Staff would then be ready to bring a recommendation to the Council at the June 1, 2020 meeting. Mayor Treece pointed out the current financing scheme anticipated the terminal being completed in phases. Ms. Button stated that was correct. There would be the opportunity to expand screening lanes, gating, etc. to accommodate continued growth. Mr. Glascock pointed out Council would have the opportunity to see all three designs at the June 1, 2020 meeting. Ms. Button stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer understood the decision to award the design-build contract could come before Council in June. Ms. Button stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked when construction would begin. Ms. Button replied design-build allowed them to build to a certain percentage and begin construction while completing the rest of the design. Mr. Glascock explained there would be a footprint so the contractor would start on the footings and foundation while completing the design of the total project inside and out. Mr. Pitzer asked if that would happen over the summer. Mr. Glascock replied he thought dirt would not be turned until the fall.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B88-20 per the amendment sheet substituting Exhibit B that had been included with the amendment sheet with the one that had been provided prior to the meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B88-20, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER.
VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B73-20 Granting a design adjustment relating to the proposed major amendment to the Preliminary Plat and PD Plan for On the Ninth located on the east side of Old Hawthorne Drive West and approximately 1,300 feet north of Route WW for sidewalk construction on the west side of Bunker Loop (Case No. 61-2020).

Discussion shown with B74-20.

B74-20 Approving a major amendment to the Preliminary Plat and PD Plan for "On the Ninth" located on the east side of Old Hawthorne Drive West and approximately 1,300 feet north of Route WW (Case No. 61-2020).

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer understood that if the developer had stuck with the original design they would not have needed to build a sidewalk and it would not have required additional approval. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the reasons for asking for the waiver. Mr. Teddy replied he thought the applicant felt the design had originally called for a sidewalk only on the one side and that this was a good design for their purposes. He also thought they wanted more greenspace for the single-family lots. In addition, there was a cost to the sidewalk as there would be over 500 feet of sidewalk length.

Mr. Pitzer asked if a waiver had been granted originally. Mr. Teddy replied yes, in a manner of speaking. It had been done through the approval of a PD Plan subject to the old rules in 2014, and there had not been much discussion with regard to it at the staff level or at the Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. It had been on the consent agenda when approved by Council. It had been considered design flexibility at the time. Mr. Pitzer understood the PD rules in 2014 had not required the sidewalk on the private street. Mr. Teddy stated not explicitly. There were sidewalks on both sides of private streets in some cases. He explained they had not been required to identify it as a design waiver in 2014. They had requested approval of a plan that had only showed a sidewalk on the one side. It had not been enumerated as an exception to the Code of Ordinances.

Ms. Peters asked if the property owner was responsible for repairs since it was a private street. Mr. Teddy replied yes, and explained the street was owned by the limited liability company making the request. A lot contained the street and it would be maintained by the condo association.

Mr. Thomas asked for the recommendation of staff in response to the request. Mr. Teddy replied the recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission was to provide the sidewalk. He pointed out that since it was an amendment to the plan, it was subject to the current Code. In addition, nearly all of the single-family detached lots within Old Hawthorne had sidewalks on both sides of the street. There were some planned districts within Old Hawthorne where the sidewalks had been waived. He referred to The Residences, which involved a dead-end street near the clubhouse, and Linkside, which involved only one side of the street in front of the clubhouse area. Across Old Hawthorne Drive West, one could find sidewalks on both sides of the street.

Mr. Trapp asked if there were sidewalks on Old Hawthorne Drive West. Mr. Teddy replied yes, and noted they were on both sides. He stated the development was generally well-served with sidewalks, but there were some small exceptional areas.

Mayor Treece recalled a waiver of a sidewalk on a previous development and asked how close that was to this development. Mr. Teddy replied he thought that was The Residences and involved a cul-de-sac that came off of a private drive that served as an entryway to the parking area to the clubhouse. A waiver had been provided on both sides

and a contribution had been put into escrow in 2017.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a sidewalk at all for this street and whether there was one across the street. Mr. Teddy replied there were two sidewalks. One was on Old Hawthorne Drive West, which would be at the rear of the proposed lots. In addition, the loop street had sidewalks on only the east side. He stated they were proposing a waiver for the inside of the curve.

Mr. Pitzer thought the waiver had been requested after construction for the one in 2017. Ms. Peters stated that was correct. Mayor Treece recalled the driveways being too short causing vehicles to hang over where the sidewalk would be located.

Mr. Trapp asked if there had been any plans for those funds or if there were any nexus sidewalks for which those funds in escrow could be used. He understood they rolled back to the developer, and asked if that was after three years. Mr. Teddy replied he thought it had been a seven-year arrangement.

Mayor Treece stated he really did not like them using the previous project as a precedent for a waiver now.

Mr. Trapp commented that he thought they should deny this. As had been pointed out, the precedent was entirely different. In addition, they did not have a clear idea as to whether there would be a nexus project nor was the applicant in attendance for a fee in lieu of a waiver. He stated sidewalks were a mixed bag. He noted he loved them, but understood some did not like to shovel them or replace them in 20 years. He commented that he could see the grandkids of residents riding the loop and Old Hawthorne Drive, and that would not happen if there was not a sidewalk. He pointed out sidewalks put eyes on the street and promoted a front porch culture instead of a back deck culture. He thought they had downgraded their lifestyle when they quit being front porch people and became back deck people. He reiterated he planned to oppose it as he felt they should build the sidewalk.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification as to where the sidewalk would be located. Mr. Teddy replied it was within the inside of the curve on the diagram to which he was referencing. He also pointed out the small stormwater management area on a common lot. Ms. Peters understood the sidewalk would only change the amount of greenspace in the front yards. Mr. Teddy stated it would be a five-foot wide sidewalk along with a green strip within the curb and the sidewalk. He noted the street was not a standard 50-foot street right-of-way. He thought the lot that contained the private street was about 36 feet wide and was likely offset to accommodate the sidewalk that was there. He felt they would probably place it within an easement along those lots. In addition, they would have to amend the plan if the Council denied the modification.

Ms. Thompson understood that if the Council wanted to vote against the design adjustment, the choice was to continue B74-20 to allow the applicant to redraw the plan or to defeat the plan. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. Ms. Thompson pointed out that most recently they had been continuing the legislation approving the plan so the applicant had the opportunity to redraw the plan without going back through the process.

Mayor Treece asked if the developer had changed the layout of what was happening in the inner loop. He understood there were now five pie-shaped lots when previously there had been two four-plex attached homes. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a sidewalk across the street. Mr. Teddy replied yes if the street was Old Hawthorne Drive West. Mayor Treece stated he was asking about Bunker Loop. Mr. Teddy commented that there was sidewalk everywhere there was an existing dwelling. It was being placed on the east side as the buildings were constructed. He noted they were mostly installed.

Mr. Thomas commented that he would vote to deny the request. They clearly had a vision for a walkable city as it was in the Columbia Imagined Plan and the resolution that required sidewalks to be placed on both sides of all streets as the standard. He stated he wanted to support staff in their recommendation to the Planning and Zoning Commission. He noted comments had been made at the Planning and Zoning

Commission meeting indicating there were sidewalks across the road and on another street nearby, but he felt a system of sidewalks was needed. He pointed out they would not say they did not need to build a road in front of a house if there was a road nearby. He thought they should think about the sidewalk system in the same way.

Mr. Skala stated he would support the recommendation of staff. He noted there was a model when deciding whether sidewalk variances were justified. In addition to the recommendation of staff, various council members had provided further justification for not granting the design adjustment. He explained he was inclined to vote against the design adjustment as well.

B73-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: NO ONE. VOTING NO: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. Bill declared defeated.

Mayor Treece asked Council what they wanted to do regarding the plan. He wondered if they wanted to continue it to the second meeting in May to give the applicant a chance to amend it. He understood they would have to reject it if they did not table it.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to table B74-20 to the May 18, 2020 Council Meeting. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece and approved unanimously by voice vote.

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B75-20 Approving a major amendment to the "The Taylor House" PD Plan located on the south side of Broadway (716 W. Broadway); approving a revised statement of intent (Case No. 62-2020).
- B76-20 Approving the "Jackson-Sexton Artisan Industries" PD Plan located on the west side of Jackson Street and the east side of Sexton Road, north of Mikel Street; approving a revised statement of intent (Case No. 63-2020).
- B77-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Mikel's Subdivision Plat 4" located on the west side of Jackson Street and the east side of Sexton Road, north of Mikel Street; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 64-2020).
- B78-20 Approving the Final Plat of "East Pointe, Plat No. 2-E" located on the southeast corner of East Pointe Drive and Bluff Creek Boulevard (Case No. 107-2019).
- B79-20 Authorizing construction of a sidewalk on the north side of Leslie Lane between Garth Avenue and Newton Drive.
- B80-20 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of a sidewalk on the north side of Leslie Lane between Garth Avenue and Newton Drive.
- B81-20 Authorizing construction of the Leslie Lane storm water improvement project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division or authorizing a contract for the work using a term and supply contractor; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B82-20 Authorizing the acquisition of an easement for construction of the Leslie Lane storm water improvement project.
- B83-20 Authorizing an intergovernmental cooperative agreement with Boone County, Missouri and The Curators of the University of Missouri for a

synoptic sampling project as it relates to the Hinkson Creek collaborative adaptive management (CAM) implementation process; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

- B84-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Community Relations Department, Parks and Recreation Department, and Information Technology Department.
- B85-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for litigation expenses.
- B86-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for the purchase of Light Detection and Ranging (LiDAR) data to update topographic information for mapping purposes.
- B87-20 Authorizing an aviation project consultant agreement with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. relating to the construction of new Hangar 730 at the Columbia Regional Airport; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- R55-20 Setting a public hearing: declaring the necessity for the proposed Phase II construction of four (4) pickleball courts, a prefabricated concrete restroom facility, small shelter, parking lot and ADA compliant walkways at A. Perry Philips Park.

The bills were given third reading and the resolution was read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

None.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B94-20 Authorizing a temporary deviation from certain City Code provisions relating to the renewal or term of licenses or permits for liquor, businesses, solicitors and canvassers, cigarettes, vehicles for hire, junk dealers and junkyards, and tobacco retail sales.
- B95-20 Authorizing a temporary deviation from certain City Code provisions within Chapter 19 related to utilization of employee vacation leave and employee eligibility for vacation donation for a COVID-19 qualifying event.
- B96-20 Approving the Final Plat of "The Gates, Plat No. 4A" located at the terminus of Rivington Drive and approximately 1,200 feet east of Abbotsbury Lane (2901 Rivington Drive); authorizing a performance contract.
- B97-20 Authorizing 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; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division or authorizing a contract for the work using a term and supply contractor; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget

- by appropriating funds.
- B98-20 Authorizing an intergovernmental cooperative agreement with Boone County, Missouri and The Curators of the University of Missouri for a chemical analysis project as it relates to the Hinkson Creek collaborative adaptive management (CAM) implementation process; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B99-20 Authorizing a contract of obligation with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources to satisfy financial assurance requirements for proper closure and post-closure care with respect to a permit for operation of a solid waste disposal area.
- B100-20 Authorizing a contract for transfer of real estate with Boone County, Missouri related to the County Fairgrounds Property located east of Highway 63 and Oakland Gravel Road.
- B101-20 Authorizing a first supplemental agreement to an airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission relating to air service promotion for the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B102-20 Authorizing Phase II construction of a tennis and pickleball complex at A. Perry Philips Park to include the construction of four (4) pickleball courts, a prefabricated concrete restroom facility, small shelter, parking lot and ADA compliant walkways; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division; authorizing a financial assistance agreement with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

X. REPORTS

None.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Mr. Trapp commented that early in Mr. Glascock's tenure as City Manager, he had asked him to reflect upon the role of civilian control of the police force, which he believed was one of the sacred pillars of civil society. He explained he had recently heard about a disturbing incident in the community and wanted to hear Mr. Glascock's thoughts on how he, as the City Manager, provided vital civilian oversight of the Police Department they all entrusted in him as a sacred duty. Mr. Glascock stated, in this instance, he had reached out to Chief Jones directly to hear his side of the story and had asked that it be communicated back to Mr. Trapp directly so he could hear it in an unfiltered manner. If he disagreed, he would try to correct it and provide direction on how to proceed. Mr. Trapp commented that he felt that was an excellent answer. He explained he had not had a clear idea of an issue when he had raised it initially as he had viewed it as a matter of reflection and could tell Mr. Glascock had taken the solemnity appropriate with that duty. He commented that he believed they should all continue to enhance what they knew and understood. He pointed out community policing, racial disparities in traffic stops, historical racism, etc. all came to a head in the most direct way through policing. He referred to *Pulled Over*, and read "Police stops matter. No form of direct government control comes close to those stops in sheer numbers, frequency, proportion of the population affected, and, in many instances, the degree of coercive intrusion." He noted they put a great deal of trust in the police in terms of the power of life and death, heavy armaments, APC vehicles, etc., and continued reading "Police stops convey powerful

messages about citizenship and equality. Across millions of stops, these experiences were translated into common stories about who is an equal member of a rule-governed society and who is subjected to arbitrary surveillance and inquiry.” He commented that one of the points of *Pulled Over* was that the frequent response of policing, i.e. when the community who felt they were overpoliced and subject to the coercive power of police interventions, was that the officers were unfailingly polite. He pointed out he had been out in the community in solidarity with unsheltered neighbors and folks who often and readily felt the coercive power of police action. He noted folks that did not have shelter had been rousted out of places, and the police were not able to identify a place where people could legally take shelter in any form. He stated there had been deaths in the community. He understood one individual had been rousted out of his camp on April 6 and had passed away under a bridge some weeks later. He reiterated the Columbia police were unfailingly polite, but Columbia also had a disproportionate impact racially and by socio-economic status. He commented that, recently, he had almost daily contact with the police as a witness or observer in the presence of the most extreme forms of police intervention. He noted he understood the incredible difficulty of their jobs, i.e., their sacred duty of protecting the community while putting their lives on the line. He stated he had been faced with many of those same challenges. It was difficult work to engage with struggling folks and to try to solve the terrible problems of domestic violence, substance use disorder, and the result of trauma. He reiterated he thought they should all continue to learn and grow. He suggested they find ways to protect the community without full-throated, shouted commands and guns drawn. He commented that he had a Masters in Sociology with a specialty in society and equality and had undergraduate and graduate courses on policing. In addition, he had read 10-20 books on policing, had been a long time therapist with two law enforcement officers as clients, and had been a part of and witness to police action in a number of communities. He stated he had even had power pain techniques applied to him in another community as a young radical activist and still had some numbness associated with it. He pointed out there had been long-time community cry for changes. The report of the Mayor’s Task Force on Community Violence was a salient document that they had not been able to fully or even partially implement. He commented that they had to be able to find ways to address long-standing grievances in certain aspects of the community. He stated what had happened to his friend had been a terrible thing. He understood the issue of mistaken identity in that the police had to go by what people said, but what people said was tinged by racism. He felt someone did not need to be harassed solely because someone called to say an African-American had done something or if the person was someone in an entirely different vehicle, with entirely different skin tones, or in a different age group. He noted these were difficult times for the police and the community, and stated he had the utmost respect for all of the officers on the force, the command staff, the City Manager, and his colleagues on the Council, but believed they needed to do better and needed to do better right now. He felt they all needed to take their role as citizen legislators more seriously. He commented that he had kind of gone along with the process for eight years while watching, learning, and trying to bring about changes, and pointed out he was proud of the modest changes he had made. He explained that in his final year he would present more as a citizen legislator and the idea of Cincinnatus, someone that had laid down his plow and had stepped into governance. He stated he was very serious about constitutional principles, the reform of the police department, and moving the community toward racial justice, and asked them all to stand with him. He commented that he did not have any specific request or demand beyond looking at the world with eyes wide open and an open heart while doing their utmost to make this community the beloved community it could and should be.

Mr. Skala expressed his appreciation to the entire community along with the Public Health and Human Services Department staff for doing what they had done, which

essentially blunted the effect of the COVID-19 exigency. He referred to Facebook posts and conversations with friends regarding the doubling and tripling of cases in some places within the United States. He commended staff and the citizens of the community for cooperating with the orders, and thanked everyone for keeping him and others safe.

Mr. Thomas stated his appreciation for Mr. Trapp's statement and commitment to racial and social justice.

Mr. Thomas thanked staff for letting the RFP for a supervised camp for unsheltered residents a week and one-half ago. He stated he was sad to see no proposals had been received by the Friday deadline, and asked if staff had talked to any of the potential bidders, such as the Voluntary Action Center, Room at the Inn, Love Inc., etc. as to the barriers of the RFP and if modification would allow them to submit a proposal. He noted he also wondered what the plan was now. He asked if staff would be willing to modify the proposal and let it again. He wondered what the plan was to address a problem that still existed. Mr. Glascock replied he could not address the question of whether Ms. Browning or Mr. Hollis had spoken with potential non-profit bidders about modifications. He commented that he assumed a new order would be issued by Ms. Browning in the near future, and pointed out he wanted to know what that new order might look like before proceeding down this path. He understood the isolation and quarantine shelter had been a priority and was being worked on, and he wanted to see the result of it prior to doing anything further.

Mr. Thomas understood a proposal was received for the second RFP and assumed Mr. Glascock could not provide details regarding it at this time. Mr. Glascock stated he could not. He agreed there had been one bidder for the isolation and quarantine issue.

Mr. Thomas commented that he did not think the need for supervision services in excess of what was normally done would go away even if the stay at home order was relaxed at some point. He asked staff to consider renewing the RFP or modifying it. He understood leaving homeless residents in their existing camps was better than disrupting them, but wondered if the City could provide sanitation stations and training in the existing homeless camps. He noted they knew where a lot of the homeless residents spent their nights, and asked if they could make sure they had tents and sleeping bags. He also wondered if a daily meal service could be arranged to those camps along with medical services so people could be moved to the quarantine location if they tested positive for COVID-19 to ensure they did not have a terrible outbreak in an existing camp. He pointed out another option might be to let an RFP to one of the organizations to provide some of these services. Mr. Glascock replied an RFP had been let and no one had bid on it. He explained the items the City could offer had been offered and provided handwashing stations and porta-potties as examples. He stated he did not believe they could provide food and they did not have enough staff to check on them every day. He noted the RFP had been issued to determine if someone else could do those things for them. Mr. Thomas understood the RFP was for a pretty intensive operation to staff the camp in a public space for a period of weeks or months, and it might have been more than any organization could do. He wondered if they could take on a lesser role of providing services to the existing camps where homeless residents were living. He asked that Mr. Glascock discuss that with staff. Mr. Glascock replied he would discuss the issue with Ms. Browning.

Mayor Treece stated general written comments had been submitted to the City Clerk.

Kat Merriman had provided written comments asking the City to not extend the stay at home order, and those comments were filed with other items associated with this meeting.

Terry Robb had provided written comments asking when guidelines for hairstylists would be in place and where they would be located so they could view it. The comments were

filed with items associated with this meeting.

Rob Wolverton had provided written comments thanking the City for its leadership and suggesting that it was now time to reopen Columbia's economy. The comments were filed with items associated with this meeting.

Lori Martin had provided written comments asking for the stay at home order to be extended, and those comments were filed with items associated with this meeting.

Rebecca Shaw had provided written comments suggesting they listen to local health officials and doctors/nurses that were seeing the effects of the disease and that the City not completely reopen businesses as it could create a second peak. The written comments were filed with items associated with this meeting.

Peggy Placier had provided written comments regarding the RFP for homeless services and the need to do something. She had also suggested they follow guidelines for a phased opening and consider improvements to the microloan program as some people had not been aware of it. The written comments were filed with items associated with this meeting.

Rachel Jokerst had provided written comments stating it was time to go back to work and indicating they could ease back into it with caution and the tools of good hygiene and social distancing. The written comments were filed with items associated with this meeting.

Caroline Carñas had provided written comments asking for the stay at home order to be extended, and those comments were filed with items associated with this meeting.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Ruffin to adjourn the meeting was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The meeting adjourned at 8:32 p.m.