



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### City Council

---

Monday, July 20, 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, July 20, 2020, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri.

Mayor Treece explained a number of the chairs had been removed in order to maintain social distancing. As a courtesy, he asked those waiting for a specific item later in the meeting to step into the lobby, and for others to step out after the agenda item they were present for had been addressed. He pointed out monitors were available in the lobby so those in that area could follow along with the meeting.

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

The minutes of the special and regular meetings of June 15, 2020 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and Mayor Treece.

The July 6, 2020 meeting minutes were not yet complete.

Upon her request, Mayor Treece made a motion to allow Ms. Fowler to abstain from voting on B161-20. Ms. Fowler noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that the proposed North Central Survey Phase 3 included her house and lot. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pitzer and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Pitzer asked that B162-20 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B162-20 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Skala.

#### II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

#### III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC6-20 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

Beavers, Jenelle, 4715 Valhalla Court, Ward 5, Term to expire December 1, 2021

BICYCLE/PEDESTRIAN COMMISSION

Larrick, Hannah, 11 N. Glenwood Avenue, Ward 1, Term to expire July 31, 2023

Love, Carly, 1314 White Oak Lane, Apt. 202, Ward 4, Term to expire July 31, 2023

Schmidt, Robert, 1806 N. Garth Avenue, Ward 2, Term to expire July 31, 2023

BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT

Lechner, Jessica, 5101 Geetha Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire November 1, 2021

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION CODES COMMISSION

Connell, Brian, 2311 E. Walnut Street, Suite B (Business), Ward 4, Term to expire August 1, 2023

Barrett, Amy, 1011 Hulen Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire August 1, 2023

Howe, Christopher, 1710 Cliff Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire August 1, 2023

Roark-Gruender, James, 2995 W. Gruender Lane, Boone County, Term to expire August 1, 2022

Shanker, Richard, 1829 Cliff Drive, Ward 6, Term to expire August 1, 2023

Trunk, Jonathan, 4713 Emeribrook Court, Ward 2, Term to expire August 1, 2023

CITIZENS POLICE REVIEW BOARD

Boykin-Rudolph, Wayne, 101 E. Green Meadows Road, Apt. 14, Ward 5, Term to expire November 1, 2020

Mayor Treece stated he wanted to continue advertising the vacancies to the Columbia Housing Authority Board.

DISABILITIES COMMISSION

Asher, Jonathan, 313 N. William Street, Ward 3, Term to expire June 15, 2023

Olmsted, Lydia, 4506 Kirkdale Court, Ward 5, Term to expire June 15, 2022

DOWNTOWN COLUMBIA LEADERSHIP COUNCIL

Pierson, Greg, 127 S. Eighth Street, Ward 1, Term to expire May 1, 2023

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Roark-Gruender, James, 2995 W. Gruender Lane, Boone County, Term to expire September 1, 2022

HOUSING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT COMMISSION

Jefferson, Barbara, 305 N. Fifth Street, Ward 1, Term to expire November 1, 2020

PUBLIC TRANSIT ADVISORY COMMISSION

Shahin, Mohamed, 618 Armitage Drive, Ward 2, Term to expire March 1, 2023

Mayor Treece stated he would like to readvertise the Tax Increment Financing Commission vacancy.

YOUTH ADVISORY COMMISSION

Becker, Thomas, Ward 5, Term to expire June 1, 2023

Cohen, Benjamin, Ward 4, Term to expire June 1, 2021

Hinnant-Root, Helen, Ward 4, Term to expire June 1, 2023

MacLeod, Kaya, Ward 4, Term to expire June 1, 2021

Snodgrass, Hannah, Ward 1, Term to expire June 1, 2021

Tolly, Charlotte, Ward 5, Term to expire June 1, 2021

**IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT**

SPC32-20 James C. McLaurin, Race Matters, Friends - Re-prioritizing community investment into social services.

James McLaurin, 1807 Jackson Street, provided a handout and stated he thought it was important to know exactly what was being discussed when the activist community spoke

about defunding the police. He explained they were asking for a reallocation of resources, which required a major reorganization of the existing capabilities of the City. He noted the police were shackled with a lot of things that had nothing or very little to do with actual public safety. It was extraneous to the mindset of the organization. He commented that those that went into policing were likely not doing so to be a counselor. If they wanted to be a counselor, they likely would have trained to be a counselor, social worker, or a number of other things. As a result, he felt it was unfair to place many of those responsibilities on the police. He reiterated that when they were speaking about defunding the police, they meant vastly redefining and scaling down the scope of the police within the entire public safety network, and investing the excess funds that would normally be budgeted for police to go toward those specialty items that were needed. He explained he was focusing on policing, but that was only one aspect, and pointed out there were some things that were problematic about the police that they had not addressed consistently. When discussing public safety as a whole in terms of the health of the community, policing was a reactionary response. It was not something that increased public safety or dismantled it from the inside. Policing did not stop rapes, domestic violence, or murder, but police officers were dispatched to those scenes, and there needed to be a trauma informed victim advocate that was dispatched as well. He stated social workers were needed. Armed police officers trying to do the best they could were not needed, and it was unfair to ask that of them. He noted other venues were needed to address the issues. He commented that there were also problems with the court system as there was an incarceration addiction in the country and in Boone County. By reducing some of the things police activity entailed, they could also reduce the incarceration numbers. He pointed out they also had a school to prison pipeline. When a student was in an altercation, police officers were called to pick them up, which meant they were placed in a juvenile facility. It encouraged the flight into incarceration, which was something they needed to get away from. He noted police reform would be tricky unless they completely redefined what was being discussed. It would be difficult to work within the existing models. He understood policing had been scaled back dramatically in terms of enforcement due to COVID, and believed that showed the things they were choosing not to enforce were not essential functions. They were minor transgressions that had very little to do with enforcing public safety. He thought they should look at what had been scaled back to help determine the essential items for which they needed the police and to then redefine their roles. He suggested joint centers or a public response department instead of a police department. He felt social workers should be embedded with police officers, first responders, EMTs, etc., and believed that would break up the insular mentality of policing, creating a more community engaged response. He understood a listening tour would be occurring, and noted he was disappointed to hear that as there had been many listening tours previously. In addition, the information was out there, and Columbia was not much different. They could look at the resources, do the research, choose plans, etc. and implement the plan. They could then determine the impact. Until then, the issues would continue to be kicked down the road, and that was not doing anyone any good.

SPC33-20 Adrienne Mann - Racism in policing.

Adrienne Mann explained she was a resident of the Third Ward and a member of the People's Defense. She quoted Robin Diangelo's *White Fragility* as saying "I believe white progressives cause the most daily damage to people of color. I define a white progressive as any white person who thinks he or she is not racist, or is less racist, in the 'choir,' or already 'gets it.' White progressives can be the most difficult for people of color because, to the degree that we think we have arrived, we will put our energy into making sure that others see us as having arrived. None of our energy will go into what we need to be doing for the rest of our lives: engaging in ongoing self-awareness, continuing education, relationship building, and actual antiracist practice. White progressives do indeed uphold and perpetuate racism, but our defensiveness and certitude make it

virtually impossible to explain to us how we do so.” Ms. Mann stated she believed Columbia, Missouri embodied that quote. They congratulated themselves on how they were progressive and saw themselves as a blue dot in Missouri. She noted the politicians were the worst example of this. She commented that she had watched or attended every council meeting since George Floyd was murdered by the police, and quoted Mayor Treece as saying “that our police department had thankfully already implemented many of the best practices recommended by the 8 Can’t Wait campaign.” They had implemented a chokehold ban with a big, gaping loophole and their use of force data reporting consistently showed huge racial disparities. They had extended the ban on pretextual stops until the end of 2020 due to the threat of COVID-19 as if the terrorization of black and brown communities was not a good enough reason to end them forever. She stated she was a public health nurse and a small business owner so, like many of them, she made decisions based off of data. In Columbia, 11 percent of the population was black. Of all of the vehicle stops in the last five years, 30 percent were on black residents, of all of the searches done in the last five years, 16 percent were on black residents, and of all of the uses of force in the last five years, 54 percent were perpetrated on black residents. She pointed out that when an officer reported in the last five years that they suspected a person had a weapon, 63 percent of the time, it was a black resident. This was over five times their population. With regard to schools, the vast majority of children suspended, expelled, or placed in quiet rooms were children of color. She commented that the data had gotten worse, not better, each year. She stated she was not a betting woman, but if she were, she would bet a member of the Council had planned to say something like they had made great strides toward racial justice and that they needed to build on it in response to the palpable outrage of people like her. She asked whoever had planned to say that today to look at the crowd to see the diversity and to look at each other to see the diversity, and suggested the Council not insult her, the protestors’, or the community’s intelligence by saying progress had been made. She noted People’s Defense would be submitting policies to the Council in the coming weeks and months, and expected their support.

SPC34-20

Doug Mann - Rethinking policing and public safety.

Doug Mann, 1407 Court Street, thanked the Council for passing the mask ordinance at the prior council meeting as it had shown a commitment by this body with regard to public health. They had put their faith in data and had voted to keep the people of Columbia safe. He explained he had spoken to the Council about a month ago about the budget in terms of how it was a moral document as it showed the values of the governments. At that same meeting, he had also spoken of the inadequate police response to a suicidal man and the fact that the police were ill-equipped to handle mental health crises. He commented that about a year ago, a friend of his had committed suicide. Since they had not received a response when knocking on the door, their only option was to call the police as they were the ones that responded to wellness checks. After the officer was able to access the apartment, he came out and said “This is not easy, but your friend is dead. I’m sorry.” He stated he felt that type of response was inadequate. He explained that being told a friend that was young and healthy had killed themselves was a very traumatic event, and he had been lucky in that he had a support network that was able to help him through that traumatic experience. He pointed out not everyone had that kind of support, and believed a trained mental health counselor could have provided the trauma relief and services that were needed. He stated this was an important topic to him for another reason as well, and explained he struggled with depression and had a history of suicidal ideation. He noted he had been medicated for several years and went to therapy, and although he had never attempted suicide, he had planned for it. He commented that he was lucky his wife was highly supportive and understanding of his mental health issues, but there would likely be situations whereby she would not be able to handle him. He was concerned that if she needed assistance, her only option was to call the police. He was also concerned that because he was a

larger human being, it was reasonable to think a police officer might see him as a threat if he were in an agitated state, which could have a disastrous result as officers were trained in specific ways to handle threats or situations where they might be afraid. This was a fear both he and his wife had even though he was a white man who did not have to deal with the fact that race could be an extra component in that situation. He suggested something similar to the CAHOOTS program in Eugene, Oregon, where 911 dispatchers dispatched trained mental health professionals to mental health crises. If it was a criminal action, the police would go with them, but the police would not be the initial contact. He noted Dallas, Texas had a similar program whereby they had partnered with the local hospital so a trained mental health professional went with the officer when there was a mental health call. Since the institution of that program, Dallas hospitals had seen a 20 percent reduction in psychiatric visits to their emergency rooms. It saved the City and the hospitals time and money, and also saved lives. He asked the Council to make changes to take the burden of mental health care off of the police, which in turn would help improve the mental health response in the community. He stated he was asking the Council to show the same commitment to public health that they had displayed at the prior meeting for mental health situations.

SPC35-20 Jacquelyn Watts - Columbia police department their misconduct, lack of transparency, and not placing them in public schools.

Jacquelyn Watts commented that she believed the Columbia Police Department (CPD) needed to be more transparent with officer misconduct situations within the community. She felt citizens should know which officers had complaints of excessive force, abuses of power, harassments, etc., because officers had power over their lives and lives of those they loved. She pointed out her name could be searched on case.net to determine when she might have been in trouble. As someone that had power and control over the lives of citizens, she believed they were entitled to know that information and to be able to push for those officers to no longer work for the CPD as they were part of the problem versus part of the solution. She understood CPD would not place officers in schools for the upcoming year, and noted she hoped that was a permanent decision. As had been mentioned in the past, it contributed to the school to prison pipeline. She commented that interaction with an officer usually occurred after a crime had been committed or when one was in prison, and felt schools were built similar to prisons with offices in the center and classrooms in the wings. She stated it was a form of mental conditioning. If one was programmed to believe this was how life was supposed to be, it was how life would turn out. She understood when police were in schools there were complaints of them targeting kids or becoming involved with school yard bullying situations when they should be there as a barrier for an active shooter, bombing, etc. She felt there were others that were just as qualified that could deal with situations and those could be people that looked like the kids. She believed many of the officers had not had adequate training in dealing with mental health issues. They had only been trained to deal with terrorists, and she did not feel that was appropriate in schools and the community. She reiterated she thought officers needed training to deal with other issues as that would be more beneficial to them and the community.

SPC36-20 Susan Carter - Response to needed changes in city for ending racism.

Susan Carter, 2105 Hillsboro Drive, stated she would be speaking about how they could become more anti-racist, and believed the first step was to look at things like transparency. Many times, they double-spoke or hid things from people, and as white people, they were very good at doing that. They pretended to do things or did things on pretense in the hope that people would buy into it and allow them to put off actually addressing the issue. She commented that there were also a lot of excuses as to why things could not be done, such as the money that had been allocated needing to remain allocated in that manner or policies, laws, and procedures needing to be followed, which

kept them from taking the next step. She stated she believed they needed to change budget allocations and policies so they could address the issues. She did not feel those things should continue to be used as excuses for not moving forward. She understood another excuse was that this was how they did things, and thought they needed to change how they had done things if they ever wanted to reach the goal of being anti-racist. She felt that instead of seeing the people involved in violence as the problem, they should realize that they all contributed to it. She stated she believed the expectation was for all citizens of Columbia to be anti-racist. It was not a choice, a matter of politics, or a right to treat others the way they had been treating them in the past. By holding high expectations, she thought Columbia citizens would live up to those expectations. She commented that they had the opportunity right now to not put police officers back into their public schools. Her research had indicated more contact, earlier contact, and disciplinary issues being handled by the police rather than by the schools or counselors led to more students being arrested. In addition, the more times students were arrested, suspended, restrained, or put into isolation, the higher the probability that they would end up in prisons, jails, or mental institutions. She pointed out slavery was the institution before prisons for black people. She stated the students that were being arrested, suspended, or dealing with police at a younger age were future adult citizens, and they brought the trauma they had suffered at school from contact with police, jails, and juvenile officers to the streets as adults. She felt it was their responsibility to treat students in a way that was respectful when they were young, and to use other methods. She asked the Council to consider making permanent the removal of the police from schools and to work with the schools to determine ways to solve their disciplinary issues other than incarceration.

SPC37-20

Amy Belcher, Columbia Mo Citizens For Roll Carts - Transitioning to roll carts for city solid waste removal.

Amy Belcher thanked those with the City that had taken the time out of their busy schedules to speak with her over the past few weeks. She stated the knowledge she had gained had been eye opening and it had solidified her belief of the need for change within the solid waste utility. She explained she was a Second Ward concerned citizen, and both she and her husband had been born and raised in Columbia. In addition, both of their fathers had been employed by the City for more than 30 years until their retirements. Growing up they had been taught the pride of the City was with its employees, and her brief living experience in Tucson, Arizona had highlighted an area in which Columbia could improve while also making life much less dangerous for their wonderful employees. She believed the recent stop in curbside recycling services due to staffing shortages was only the tip of the iceberg for a struggling refuse and recycling system, and the current City Code was written so no other solution was possible. She suggested the City rescind or amend Sections 22-159(f) and (g) and Sections 22-159.1(d) and (e) of the City Code, and implement the use of roll carts. She pointed out hundreds of thousands of municipalities used automated refuse and recycling trucks with carts, and that system had several benefits. Roll carts were significantly safer for the sanitation workers as most of the labor was done by an automated arm on the truck. It had the potential to save the City hundreds of thousands of dollars per year in worker's compensation claims along with making the positions easier to fill while increasing employee retention. She noted it would also save the City hundreds of thousands of dollars per year in temporary employee and human resources costs. She stated that the City of Columbia had spent almost \$1.5 million last year on those two items alone. She commented that studies of other cities that had implemented roll carts had shown that citizens recycled more and disposed of less trash. As a result, she felt the City would save money in terms of the cost of disposing of refuse as well. She pointed out roll carts also prevented animals from tearing into trash bags and kept the litter contained, which made the City cleaner, healthier, and safer for all citizens. She asked the Council to work together and with

other necessary parties to rescind or amend the City Code by altering those sections that specifically banned roll carts and/or automated trucks to reflect this proposed solution. She felt the time to act was now.

## V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

### PH25-20 Consider the FY 2021 Capital Improvement Project Plan for the City of Columbia, Missouri.

PH25-20 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Lue provided a staff report.

Ms. Fowler commented that projects assigned to the First Ward often benefited the City government or the City as a whole, and not necessarily the residents of the First Ward. She asked if there was another way to categorize those projects that were improvements to City Hall or any of the physical plant so they were able to differentiate between the two. She explained that would allow the amount spent in the First Ward to accurately reflect what was spent on those that resided in the First Ward. She asked staff to look at a way to re-categorize the list, and suggested two lists. She commented that she wanted to go backwards in time since comparisons over time were being used to determine how much had been invested in each of the wards. Mr. Glascock indicated that could be done.

Mr. Trapp stated Roy Dudark, a former planner with the City, had emailed a recommendation for a capital cost recovery charge to be applied to property along the new Discovery Ridge area. He asked if that was a possibility. Mr. Glascock asked for clarification as he wondered if they were talking about the portion that was along the University of Missouri property. Mr. Trapp replied he was asking if they could regain some of the money from those that would benefit from development along the road with a fee to help pay for some of the cost of the extension. Mr. Glascock stated he thought it mostly involved University of Missouri property, and noted the University had given the City the right-of-way for it. He thought it would be difficult to require a fee from them because they would not develop the property. He understood it would remain farmland. He explained that was the situation for that particular project, but a fee system could be something they looked at for other future projects.

Mr. Thomas understood \$2.2 million was proposed to be tied to the Discovery Parkway project in the CIP budget for FY21, and asked for the total cost of that project. Mr. Nichols replied \$6.8 million. Mr. Thomas understood the City had lost a \$3 million grant from MoDOT that they had expected to help pay for close to half of the project, and asked if there was a plan for replacing that lost grant money. Mr. Lue replied a few other projects would be pushed back and CIP funds would be reallocated. Mr. Glascock noted they would push back improvements to the Grissum Building, which was a City facility. Mr. Thomas commented that he had opposed the Discovery Parkway project when it had been previously discussed, and pointed out he would continue to oppose it. He asked when the appropriate time would be to make a motion to take this item off of the CIP budget. Mr. Glascock replied probably now as they would be bidding the project soon.

Mr. Skala understood they were discussing next year's budget with regard to the CIP Plan. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mr. Skala asked if the budget work session was the appropriate time to discuss future projects, i.e. those 3-5 years out. Mr. Glascock replied yes. He pointed out this was the 1-2 year list, so it was more appropriate to discuss 3-5 years at that work session.

Ms. Peters understood they had already delayed improvements to the Grissum Building either last year or the year before, and that it would not be completed in FY21 either. Mr. Nichols stated they would do the project in phases as money became available. In addition, he thought they might be able to use the CARES funding received for transit for the bus area. He noted they would be going out for an RFP for the design this year, and projects would be completed as money became available.

Ms. Peters asked what the Grissum Building housed. Mr. Nichols replied it was used for

street, transit, and fleet operations.

Ms. Peters asked if buses would need to be replaced even though they had cut the transit routes. Mr. Nichols replied yes. He noted they had some 2001 and 2002 buses that needed to be replaced. Ms. Peters asked how many buses were needed and how many buses the City had. Mr. Nichols replied there were six for the routes, which needed replacements, and at least eight for the University shuttle. Ms. Peters asked how many the City had. Mr. Nichols replied he thought they had 26 buses.

Mr. Pitzer asked if there was a list of projects for this and last year's CIP along with the status of those projects. Mr. Lue replied staff could put something together for the Council. Mr. Pitzer stated it would be helpful to see the progress or completion of past projects. Mr. Lue reiterated they could put a document together for Council if desired. Mr. Glascock explained that information was supposed to be placed on the website, but he was not sure whether that had been completed yet or not. Mr. Lue thought that information was on the website.

Mr. Pitzer understood there had been discussions with the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) in terms of how to budget for annual maintenance, capital projects, etc., and asked if that discussion was still ongoing and whether it affected what was on the FY21 CIP Plan list. Mr. Lue replied he thought the discussion was still ongoing. Mr. Sorrell explained the replacement of items had been moved from the CIP budget into the operating budget for FY21. Mr. Pitzer understood that was the replacement of equipment or assets. Mr. Sorrell stated it involved replacements, such as the distribution transformers that needed to be replaced as they aged. New transformers for new subdivisions that were built would remain in the CIP Plan. He noted the same had been done for the water utility in terms of valve replacements, etc. Mr. Pitzer asked about upgrades. Mr. Sorrell replied upgrades and improvements had remained in the CIP Plan. Maintenance type items or replacing like with like items had been moved to operations. Mr. Pitzer asked if the funding source for the replacements or improvements had affected what was on the CIP Plan list. Mr. Sorrell replied the funding source for the items moved was enterprise revenue. Any of the replacements that were identified in a ballot issue for bond funding remained in the CIP Plan. He explained the last water ballot issue had included water main replacements, and those remained in the CIP Plan. Other like replacements had been moved to operations. Mr. Pitzer understood this was a different approach than what they had done previously. Mr. Sorrell stated he thought that was correct.

Mayor Treece referred to three sewer utility private common collector elimination (PCCE) projects on the list, and asked for the status of PCCE #3, which was the Medavista project. Ms. Keys replied they had just completed Phase 2 of the PCCE #3 project, and were currently acquiring easements for Phase 3 and working on describing easements for Phase 4. Mayor Treece asked about the timing for Phases 3 and 4 and for the number of other phases. He wondered when they would reach West Boulevard. Ms. Keys replied she thought there would be five phases. She believed only 1-2 easements were left to acquire in Phase 3, and they were working with the property owners to obtain those so they could move forward with construction. She hoped they could do Phase 4 next year with Phase 5 following soon afterward. Mayor Treece asked Ms. Keys when they might get to West Boulevard. Ms. Keys replied that would be Phase 5. Mayor Treece asked what he should tell constituents that had indicated they had been waiting 10 years for a sewer. Ms. Keys replied easements were the hold up as they expected the property owners to donate the easements for private common collector elimination projects. They did not have the condemnation process to move forward more quickly with easement acquisitions. She stated they were at the mercy of the property owners to return the paperwork to them. She pointed out staff offered to meet with the property owners with a notary public, but it was still unfortunately a slow process. Mayor Treece asked if they wanted to put other projects in the pipeline while waiting on those. Ms. Keys replied yes. She noted some projects moved more quickly than others. Mayor Treece stated he did



not feel it was fair for those in Phase 5 to have to depend on those moving slowly in Phase 4. Ms. Keys understood. She pointed out they had other private common collector projects, such as the one in the Wilson Avenue and Ross Street area, they could no longer work on because the property owners would not cooperate.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a way to improve that easement acquisition process. It seemed as though it was in the best interest of the property owners. Ms. Keys agreed it was in their best interest. Mr. Glascock explained they tried to obtain the easements for free since the project would benefit the property. If they utilized the condemnation process, the City would have to pay for all of the easements. He pointed out the property owners were the ones that petitioned the City to address the sewer situation that would only benefit them.

Ms. Fowler presumed a project that was broken up in phases was all interconnected in terms of the sewer pipe, and stated she was troubled by the idea they did not have it all in place before starting because they then could be in a situation where they had to abandon the project and not see any value for that expenditure. She asked why they were not seeking all of the easements in advance so everyone along the line knew it was coming and they did not put into jeopardy the money that had already been spent. Ms. Keys replied about 10 years ago, they had been involved with a common collector project similar in size to this whereby they had acquired all of the easements and put it out for bid so it was constructed at the same time. The contractor had installed the pipe, but yards were left in disarray and other aspects of the project had been impacted. In addition, the City had little control over the situation with the contractor. As a result, they decided to start phasing the larger projects. It allowed for more control over each aspect of the project, and for them to get one piece of the project done completely before moving on to the next piece. In addition, it allowed the first pieces of the project to not be held up for the easements at the end. Ms. Fowler stated she understood why staff phased in the actual dirt disturbance, but did not understand why they were not acquiring all of the easements ahead of time so they were then in place ensuring the property owners the project would be completed. Ms. Keys explained they had the same theory with the design. They could design the project in phases, and get the first piece done more quickly than if they had designed the entire the project. She noted they tended to find things out when meeting with properties owners to design the project and acquire easements, such as a favorite tree, and could potentially adjust the alignment. If they were doing that for all 50 properties within a project, it would take considerably more time than just working with 10 properties at a time. Mr. Glascock commented that if they tried to acquire all easements at the same time, one person could hold up the entire project. Breaking it down in phases allowed them to at least complete a portion of it. If the project continued for 2-4 years and the property changed ownership, the new owners might not even realize there was an easement. Ms. Fowler wondered why that was since the easement was recorded. Mr. Glascock stated some still did not realize it. Ms. Fowler commented that when a property was acquired, a title company would provide a report with that information. Mr. Glascock understood some properties might involve temporary easements that were not recorded. He noted he was only trying to explain why they did what they did. Ms. Fowler stated she understood, but also understood the frustration of the property owners that were in a later phase. In addition, she was concerned about having to abandon a project in which money had already been invested. She commented that she shared the concerns of the neighbors.

Ms. Peters stated she had thought they had started from the top of where the sewage might roll downhill to the main collector, but now understood they did it in reverse. Ms. Keys explained that was correct. They typically started on the downstream portion of sewer and stormwater projects and worked their way upstream to the top, and West Boulevard was at the top of this particular project. Ms. Peters stated that made her feel better in terms of the investment.

Mayor Treece recalled \$300,000 being invested last year to replace downtown street

lights and asked for clarification. Mr. Sorrell replied he understood a project had been approved by the Council to replace 94 street lights in the downtown area with LEDs that could be controlled in terms of brightness. After they had gotten further into the design, there had been an issue with the system because the current system was a 480 volt system and the LEDs were not made to work with a 480 volt system. As a result, they needed to replace the feed supply to all of the lights, which would increase the cost of the project and was the reason for the request for additional funds in the CIP budget.

Mayor Treece understood none of the downtown street lights had been replaced. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct, and explained it was being designed at this time. Mayor Treece understood none had been replaced. Mr. Sorrell stated none had other than those that had been within the pilot project.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Sorrell if he thought his department was capable of getting the project done. He understood this project had started in 2014, and questioned why they were now realizing the power supply was inadequate. Mr. Sorrell stated that was being addressed with the design. He explained he did not know why this project was taking so long. Mayor Treece commented that this was a real public safety issue. They had a bad month in September and those lights would have been very helpful for law enforcement. He was concerned that no lights had been replaced and that they now needed to put more money into it.

Mayor Treece asked what the project looked like in terms of finishing the design, build out, etc. He wondered how many lights could be changed in the next fiscal year in the downtown. Mr. Sorrell replied he understood 94 existing lights would be replaced with radio-controlled dimmable LED fixtures, but he was not sure they could replace all 94 lights within the next fiscal year. Mayor Treece asked how many total lights were in the downtown. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not know, but understood 94 had been identified to be replaced as part of this project. Mayor Treece asked if the department was capable of doing the work or if they needed to contract it out. Mr. Sorrell replied the work would be done with a combination of City crews and contract crews that were already under contract. He thought they could get it all done within a year.

Mr. Skala commented that he agreed with the suggestion of Ms. Fowler of not including citywide projects within the list of First Ward projects and asked that the same philosophy be extended to the Third Ward. Mr. Glascock stated it would be done for all wards. He noted they would have a category for City projects.

Mr. Skala understood the CIP Plan included \$1.7 million in transit for replacement costs and asked what type of buses this would involve. Mr. Nichols replied the LoNo grant would provide for four electric buses. They would apply for CNG buses via a grant as they had been having trouble with the existing electric buses they had been leasing and would likely return those and terminate the lease. He pointed out there was now competition in terms of electric buses so they would review their options moving forward.

Mr. Skala asked for a status regarding the CNG station. Mr. Nichols replied the City was meeting its goal, but that was not the case with the private side due to fuel prices being so low.

Ms. Fowler stated a constituent had contacted her regarding the City's position on having local people do local projects. She understood the City would soon begin the alley project in the Ridgeway neighborhood and that there were a number of construction training programs within Columbia. She wondered if they had a policy and if the contracts with outside contractors included language about hiring local people, i.e., those that had been trained with federal and local dollars. Mr. Glascock replied the only hiring requirement they had involved disadvantaged business enterprises (DBEs). Ms. Fowler asked if it was possible for that to be considered as it would encourage workforce development and ensure people had jobs and an upward promotional path even during the time of COVID. She wondered if that could be done under Missouri law and/or the City's Charter and Code of Ordinances. Mr. Glascock replied he understood they had to go with the lowest bidder, and could not arbitrarily pick a local company if they had a higher

bid. Ms. Thompson commented that it was something they would need to look into based on the parameters of the program that was being suggested. She noted she was not prepared to opine on that tonight, and that a few more details were needed.

Mayor Treece asked for the status of the Third Street Alley project. Ms. Fowler replied she thought they were beginning that process. Mr. Nichols stated that alley project had been completed.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Mayor Treece stated three written comments had been received.

Roger Caffrey, 1005 Audubon Drive, indicated he was opposed to the proposal to install a sidewalk on the western side of Audubon Drive.

Mayor Treece stated he had not seen this project on the list. He had only seen a traffic calming project for Audubon Drive. Mr. Nichols commented that they would have money to start the design with construction in 2022. He noted they had received a lot of concerns about children walking to Shepard Elementary School. Ms. Peters asked if it would be designed in 2021 to be constructed in 2022. Mr. Nichols replied that was correct.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, stated he felt discussion regarding the financial appropriateness of moving projects from the CIP budget to the operating and maintenance (O&M) budget was needed. He wondered if there needed to be an assessment of the current inventory of materials that related to the project work and how much inventory was normal. He also wondered if the formal approval of the CIP Plan should be tabled until the rates were considered and asked if the CIP for the water and electric utilities were being evaluated through the performance audit.

Tim Kridel, 3612 Lansing Avenue, objected to the proposal to use \$1.3 million for parks and recreation projects as he felt those projects should be funded entirely with revenue from the parks and recreation tax.

Mayor Treece stated that from what he could tell, he thought all of the parks and recreation projects in the CIP would be funded by the parks sales tax.

Those written comments were filed with this agenda item.

Carrie Davis-Hansson, 704 Morningside Drive, asked if she had heard correctly in that some of the CARES money would go toward the Discovery Parkway project. Mayor Treece replied no. Ms. Davis-Hansson stated she must have misunderstood as she wanted to voice her opposition to that if that had been the case.

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

Mayor Treece understood the Audubon sidewalk project they had spoken of earlier was not the same as the Audubon Drive Traffic Calming project on the FY21 CIP Plan, and that the project on the CIP Plan was something else. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas asked when might be an appropriate time to make a motion regarding the Discovery Parkway project. Mayor Treece replied he assumed they would consider this list as a part of the budget so they could amend it then, but that they could discuss it now if he wanted to obtain some sense of the Council in that regard.

Mr. Thomas commented that the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) in their review of these projects and the CIP budget as a whole had indicated they should be emphasizing maintenance projects and replacement projects while de-emphasizing new construction for expansion for capacity. Mayor Treece understood Mr. Thomas was talking about the water and electric utilities. Mr. Thomas stated he believed this should be done with the entire engineering spectrum, i.e. with all engineering projects. He felt that made a lot of sense, especially during a time of tight budgets. He commented that what he heard from the public in terms of transportation projects wanted were traffic calming in the neighborhoods and more funding for a more robust transit system. They had a wonderful traffic calming program, but it was desperately underfunded. They had money to do about 3-4 projects annually, but they added about 5-10 projects to the list during that same time. He thought well over 100 had been approved for construction, but

it would be decades before staff would be able to get through them all. He stated they had heard very compelling public testimony with regard to the need to invest more into transit in order to serve those that did not own a car, had a disability, etc. The Discovery Parkway project, on the other hand, was a very short stretch of highway that would cost \$6.8 million. He understood it was part of a decades-long, almost unstoppable process that was driven by a technocratic machine that had started with the CATSO Long Range Transportation Plan, which was a very non-transparent process, and had eventually made its way to the 10-Year CIP Plan, the 5-Year CIP Plan, the 2-Year CIP Plan, and the building of another 4-lane highway at a farther radius from the center of Columbia. It drove low-density, car-oriented suburban sprawl, and the low-density housing did nothing to assist with the affordable housing problem. It in fact undermined it. The business development that usually occurred in those areas involved almost exclusively nationally-owned chain businesses that extracted profit from the community while undermining local businesses. It made it almost impossible to live in Columbia without owning a car, which had financial implications to many people, and increased the number of traffic deaths and serious injuries along with greenhouse gas emissions. He commented that he had been strongly opposed to the Discovery Parkway project even before they had found out that some of the money that had been allocated for it had been taken away from them as MoDOT would now not give them that \$3 million. They would, as a result, deprive the Grissum Building of its badly needed improvements. He was not aware of any public desire or demonstrated need to build it, and stated he felt they should be investing in the core of the community and in existing residents, particularly those in the central city area. He noted he planned to make a motion at the appropriate time to remove the project from the CIP Plan. He understood money for the widening of Forum Boulevard had been included, and stated he would be making a motion to remove that project from the CIP Plan as well.

Mayor Treece understood the City had always intended to fund the \$6-\$6.5 million. He stated the MoDOT funding that had been withheld would have liberated \$3 million for something else, and noted it could come back. He pointed out that project had not been dependent on MoDOT funding. Since the project had been ready to proceed, it had put it higher on the list to be funded as part of a cost-share agreement.

Mr. Thomas stated he had seen a memo from MoDOT that had indicated they were reducing the funding for that program from \$50 million to \$25 million and that the Discovery Parkway project had not been included within the list of projects that would still be funded. Mayor Treece agreed, but pointed out the City had already budgeted for the full amount.

Mr. Thomas commented that he believed they could not continue to build these great big highways farther and farther out from the central core as it did not make any town planning sense. Mayor Treece stated he felt it made sense to build them now as they continued to grow to move people to jobs, schools, etc. efficiently. Mr. Thomas noted he disagreed.

## VI. OLD BUSINESS

B151-20

Repealing Section 4 of Ordinance No. 024211 to lift the temporary waiver relating to the payment of transportation fares.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece understood staff had asked for this item to be withdrawn. Mr. Glascock explained this bill had been drafted prior to them finalizing the budget, and they had since decided to provide transit for free through FY21. He did not see the need to start the fares again for the remainder of FY20 when they had planned to stop charging the fees in the next fiscal year should that be approved by the Council.

Mayor Treece asked if they were measuring the impact of the potential free fare in terms of ridership as they re-envisioned the public transit system. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know what that might do to ridership since people were not getting out like they used

to due to COVID, but felt it would increase rides. Mr. Nichols explained the numbers had remained fairly steady. The only reduction in ridership had been with paratransit, which had resulted in fewer expenses. Due to the CARES Act, the City did not have to provide a match for the operating grant this year. Mayor Treece asked if that liberated the match, and how much that might involve. Mr. Nichols replied the transportation sales tax match money was around \$2 million.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Nichols if he had seen an uptick that he could attribute to free fares. Mr. Nichols replied he was not sure ridership had grown, but it had not declined. Mr. Glascock explained the only concern with the free fare involved paratransit because it was where they lost the most money. If that rose really fast, they would have an issue at the end of FY21. Mr. Nichols stated he felt the steadiness of the routes had helped and noted they would try to improve the timing of the headways.

Mr. Skala commented that the steadiness of ridership was positive, especially during this time of COVID when travel in general had decreased.

Mayor Treece made a motion to withdraw B151-20. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Thomas stated he supported this move. In non-COVID or normal times, fare-free transit in others cities had created an increase in ridership. He pointed out it tended to cost money to collect fares and it reduced the level of service by slowing down the on-boarding and off-boarding processes. He thought they could improve service while not losing much money. He also hoped they would be able to effectively market this to the bus-riding community and the potential bus-riding community.

**The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Skala to withdraw B151-20 was approved unanimously by voice vote.**

B162-20

Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking on portions of Bradington Drive, Bristol Lake Drive, Bristol Lake Parkway and Gans Road.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer asked where people were supposed to park when they had events that filled up the parking lots at the Gans Creek Recreation Area. Mr. Nichols replied parking would be allowed on certain sides of the streets. They were not restricting parking on both sides of all roads. He pointed out Gans Road was an unimproved 24-foot wide road and parking on it was dangerous. Mr. Griggs explained people were shuttled in for large events. In addition, they rented private parking areas for a nominal fee if available. Mr. Glascock understood parking lots would be built in the future as well. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer understood a future project included a pavilion or event space at Philips Park. Mr. Griggs stated that was correct, and noted there would be parking associated with that project.

Mr. Pitzer stated he understood the need to restrict parking on Gans Road and Bristol Lake Drive, but asked about Bradington Drive and Bristol Lake Parkway as those were two recently constructed roads. He wondered if they had been built to the City's street standards. Mr. Nichols replied yes, and noted Bristol Lake Parkway was 28 feet wide so parking could be accommodated on both sides. Mr. Pitzer understood the point of the standard was to design a street whereby people could park on both sides. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. He explained he understood people tended to rogue park, which meant they parked in a manner that made the road narrower. As a result, staff thought it would be best to limit parking on one side of the street. He pointed out Bradington Drive was 31 feet wide so it could accommodate parking on both sides as well. By restricting parking to one side, it would eliminate the need to set up temporary parking restrictions and remove those restrictions after each event.

Mr. Pitzer asked what would happen if a neighborhood submitted a petition to prohibit

parking on streets due to a neighbor having a very large party a couple of times a year. Mr. Nichols replied staff would review the request. He pointed out justification, such as a public safety issue, would be needed. It could not be solely a social issue as many people did not like others parking on the street in front of their homes. They would review the request from an engineering standpoint in terms of safety and site distance, and make a recommendation to Council as to whether or not staff would support it, but it was ultimately the decision of Council.

Mr. Pitzer wondered if they would be forced to build another parking lot elsewhere by taking this parking away when it was available and could be accommodated since the streets were built to the City's street standards. He reiterated that he understood the need to restrict parking on Gans Road and Bristol Lake Drive from a safety standpoint, but questioned it for the other streets. He noted he was not sure how his colleagues felt and that he might make a motion to remove those from the ordinance.

Mr. Nichols stated there were not houses along either street so it would not inconvenience any homeowner in terms of parking further down the street. He commented that he also believed both were on common lots so houses would not be built there. Mr. Pitzer felt that was more of a reason to encourage the use of that available parking space.

Ms. Fowler asked if the parking lots mentioned by Mr. Griggs were included in this year's budget. Mr. Griggs replied no, and noted it would be a while before they were built. He commented that people rarely parked on these roads because it was far away from anything else. It was really only utilized when they held events. He explained that when they built the pavilion, it would need some basic parking. They would build the minimum needed to open the facility. They would also have some overflow parking areas which would be phased in. He stated most of the events were run by the Missouri State High School Activities Association, the University of Missouri, and the City of Columbia, and none of them wanted people parking in the area because it would restrict a lot of the public safety aspects of the events in terms of vehicles they needed to be able to get in and out of the area. He noted one car that parked badly could block the entire road.

Ms. Fowler understood parking lots had their own climate impacts so she was hoping to have an opportunity to discuss the composition and quality of the parking lots at a future time before they were constructed.

Ms. Peters commented that she was in favor of restricting parking on the roads recommended by staff. She noted they could always revisit the issue if it seemed to be unreasonable. She stated she appreciated Mr. Pitzer's questions, but reiterated she would be supportive of the permanent no parking so they did not have to address it on a temporary basis. Mr. Pitzer noted he would defer to Ms. Peters since this was in her ward.

**B162-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

## VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B152-20 Rezoning property located on the southeast corner of Coats Street and North Boulevard (1206 Coats Street) from District PD (Planned Development) to District M-C (Mixed Use Commercial) (Case No. 99-2020).
- B153-20 Rezoning the A. Perry Philips Park property located on the northeast corner of Gans Road and Bristol Lake Parkway from District PD (Planned Development) to District O (Open Space) (Case No. 113-2020).

- B154-20 Granting a design adjustment relating to the proposed PD Plan Major Amendment #2 for Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 4 located on the northwest corner of Nocona Parkway and Briarmont Avenue to allow a lot line to bisect an existing structure (i.e., parking lot) (Case No. 114-2020).
- B155-20 Approving PD Plan Major Amendment #2 for "Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 4" located on the northwest corner of Nocona Parkway and Briarmont Avenue (Case No. 114-2020).
- B156-20 Granting a design adjustment relating to the proposed Final Plat of Battle Crossing - Plat 1 located on the southwest corner of Clark Lane and Lake of the Wood Road to allow a lot line to bisect an existing structure (i.e., parking lot) (Case No. 85-2020).
- B157-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Battle Crossing - Plat 1" located on the southwest corner of Clark Lane and Lake of the Woods Road; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 85-2020).
- B158-20 Approving the Final Plat of "On The Ninth At Old Hawthorne, Plat No. 2" located on the east side of Old Hawthorne Drive West and approximately 1,300 feet north of Route WW; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 107-2020).
- B159-20 Vacating a sanitary sewer easement on Lot D2 within On the Ninth at Old Hawthorne Plat No. 1 located on the east side of Old Hawthorne Drive West and approximately 1,300 feet north of Route WW (Case No. 115-2020).
- B160-20 Approving the Final Plat of "The Gates, Plat No. 5" located south of Old Plank Road and west of Rivington Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 108-2020).
- B161-20 Authorizing a financial assistance agreement with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources for the North Central Columbia Historic Survey - Phase III; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B163-20 Authorizing an agreement for professional architectural services with Simon Oswald Associates, Inc. for proposed building modifications of publicly accessed services within the City Hall Building to create a "Customer Experience Center" and recycling chute; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B164-20 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with Boone County Family Resources for additional funding for the Parks and Recreation Department's Career Awareness Related Experience (CARE) Program for youth employment placement and mentoring services.
- B165-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds received from miscellaneous revenue, donations and a grant to provide funding for various Parks and Recreation Department projects.
- B166-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for the purchase of replacement communications equipment.
- B167-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating Share the Light

- Program funds for the purchase of smoke alarms and carbon monoxide alarms to be distributed to low income residents.
- R87-20 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of structural improvements to the Walnut Street bridge as part of the Hinkson Creek Trail improvement project, from Stephens Lake Park to Clark Lane.
- R88-20 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of improvements at the A. Perry Philips Park to include construction of an indoor pavilion, parking lots and entry drive and the installation of landscaping.
- R89-20 Setting a public hearing: proposed replacement and rehabilitation of a portion of storm drain pipe on Aldeah Avenue, south of Ash Street.
- R90-20 Authorizing a contract with North East Community Action Corporation for the provision of Title X family planning services.
- R91-20 Authorizing the temporary closure of a portion of sidewalk on the west side of Fifth Street between Elm Street and Stewart Road to facilitate masonry restoration and repairs on the Gas Turbine Building located at 417 S. Fifth Street.

**The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER (except for B161-20 on which she abstained), TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS. 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.

- B169-20 Amending Chapter 12 of the City Code to establish employee nondiscrimination policy requirements for city contracts and contractors.
- B170-20 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; approving a revised statement of intent (Case No. 121-2020).
- B171-20 Rezoning property located on the south side of Oakland Gravel Road and east of Teresa Drive (6114 N. Oakland Gravel Road) from District R-1 (One-family Dwelling) to District A (Agriculture) (Case No. 116-2020).
- B172-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 5" located west of the intersection of Nocona Parkway and Endeavor Avenue; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 47-2020).
- B173-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 4-A" located northwest of the intersection of Nocona Parkway and Briarmont Avenue (Case No. 89-2020).
- B174-20 Vacating drainage and utility easements located within Discovery Park Plat



- 4 and Discovery Park Plat 5 located on the west side of Nocona Parkway and approximately 1,500 feet south of Ponderosa Street (Case No. 88-2020).
- B175-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Garth's Addition, Plat No. 1A" located on the south side of Ash Street and west of West Boulevard North (906 W. Ash Street); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 222-2019).
- B176-20 Authorizing construction of a sidewalk along the north side of St. Charles Road between Demaret Drive and Battle Avenue; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B177-20 Authorizing construction of a single-lane roundabout with splitter islands and sidewalk at the intersections of Sinclair Road, Route K and Old Plank Road; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B178-20 Authorizing the acquisition of an easement for construction of a single-lane roundabout with splitter islands and sidewalk at the intersections of Sinclair Road, Route K and Old Plank Road.
- B179-20 Authorizing the City Manager to execute a grant of easement for water utility purposes to Consolidated Public Water Supply District No. 1 of Boone County, Missouri for the relocation of a water line at the intersection of Sinclair Road, Route K and Old Plank Road to facilitate the construction of a roundabout.
- B180-20 Authorizing construction of structural improvements to the Walnut Street bridge as part of the Hinkson Creek Trail improvement project, from Stephens Lake Park to Clark Lane; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division or authorizing a contract for the work using a term and supply contract.
- B181-20 Authorizing construction of improvements at the A. Perry Philips Park to include construction of an indoor pavilion, parking lots and entry drive and the installation of landscaping; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division for a portion of the project.
- B182-20 Authorizing an agreement for the donation of real estate with THD-REB Properties, LLC for property located on the west side of Dumas Drive in The Vineyards, Plat No. 7 Subdivision to be used for open space and park purposes.
- B183-20 Authorizing an amendment to the agreement with Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture, Inc. for the development and operation of an agriculture park at Clary-Shy Community Park to allow the installation of a temporary office on the west side of the park property.
- B184-20 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with HDR Engineering, Inc. for the McBaine Water Treatment Plant Upgrades - Phase 1 project.
- B185-20 Authorizing an agreement with Christian Fellowship Church of Columbia, MO, Inc. for payment of differential costs for construction of a water main serving Chapel Hill Meadows - Plat 2.

- B186-20 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B187-20 Accepting conveyances for sewer and drainage and utility purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B188-20 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Show Me Healthy Women program.
- B189-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds from the sale of a 2003 Sutphen SP95 ladder truck for the purchase of fire apparatus equipment.
- B190-20 Authorizing a non-federal reimbursable agreement with the Department of Transportation - Federal Aviation Administration for Navigational Aid (NAVAID) relocation and replacement, and flight inspection support for the Runway 2-20 extension project at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B191-20 Authorizing an airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission relating to the reconstruction of Taxiway C2 and the apron expansion project at the Columbia Regional Airport; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B192-20 Authorizing acceptance of a small community air service development program grant from the U.S. Department of Transportation to recruit, initiate and support new daily air service to the Charlotte-Douglas International Airport; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B193-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating tourism development funds for the Gans Creek Cross Country Course improvement project.

## X. REPORTS

- REP38-20 Boone County COVID-19 Long-Term Recovery Plan, Emergency Support Function 14.

Mr. Cole and Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece commented that he thought this presented some policy considerations for them. He felt it was a little forward looking in terms of when the pandemic ended and when the real economic crisis and recovery began along with the resources that were available at this time. He understood Boone County had not released any of the CARES Act money and had not set a process by which it would do so.

Ms. Fowler explained that what she saw in City reports time and again was new construction when discussing housing needs, and noted she was a fan of renovating and restoring the existing housing stock because affordability had everything to do with size and there were quite a few properties with small footprints on small lots. She commented that she had read the email that had come from the Columbia Board of Realtors regarding the inventory of available homes, but when driving through the First Ward, she saw "for lease" signs everywhere. As they went through the process of talking about the highest and best use of these dollars, she wanted them to think about where it was that they cajoled or encouraged those properties into the market so they could become owner-occupied as there seemed to be a high amount of rental property that was vacant.

Mr. Pitzer understood top priorities included support for small retail and restaurants and support for childcare providers, and asked how that support might look. Mr. Cole replied a good model would be the small business recovery loan program they would roll out in

mid-August. It would also provide a good tool to learn from in terms of the impact. Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Cole what he envisioned for childcare providers. Mr. Cole understood St. Louis County had what he thought might be a good program. They had looked at the different levels of capacity requirements and had provided a tiered approach to providing financial assistance based on the number of children assisted. It seemed as though they had put a lot of thought into how to propel the childcare providers, and pointed out it was a financial resource. He explained a lot of businesses had gone a couple of months with zero revenues, and that was the main problem. Mr. Pitzer stated he thought that was a good framework if this would be with them for a while as businesses could go 6-12 months with reduced revenues. They would need that assistance in order to keep the doors open.

Mr. Pitzer asked if this group would be spearheading applying for CARES Act funding when it became available, known, or identified, particularly with regard to the money Boone County had received. He wondered how the process would look. Mr. Cole replied he had not had any discussions with the County Commission. He had presented some preliminary findings to them, but had not discussed process. He noted he had provided a framework in terms of how the funds could be allocated based on what other counties were doing, but there had not been discussions beyond that. Mr. Pitzer stated he appreciated the work of Mr. Cole and hoped it would get the process started at the County level.

Mr. Thomas understood there was some concern that the churches that helped run Room at the Inn would not have the capacity to do so this winter, and asked Mr. Cole if he was planning to provide assistance for emergency sheltering. Mr. Cole replied he would speak in terms of CDBG funds since that was his direct responsibility. They had released an RFP of about \$70,000 that would go toward that activity, and had received a couple of letters of intent, to include one from Room at the Inn. He stated he was optimistic they would start putting resources there. As additional rounds of funding were made available, he hoped the initial rounds of resources would help determine how they could use more funding. He noted they had included in the report that potential County funds could be used for that project as well. He understood Dallas had utilized County resources to purchase a couple of older hotels and CDBG funds to address some of the operating costs. Mr. Thomas asked if the City would own title to a building in that scenario. Mr. Cole replied no, and explained he had been operating from the standpoint that they would fund Room at the Inn so Room at the Inn would be responsible for procuring and/or leasing a site. He wanted to ensure they were looking for a space that worked for them instead of it coming from the City to them. He noted he had talked with Debby Graham since he knew they needed support, and as he heard of properties that were available, he forwarded that information to her as Room at the Inn would be the negotiating entity. The City would only be acting as the funder. Mr. Thomas understood they had submitted a proposal on the RFP. Mr. Cole stated that was correct. Mr. Thomas understood they were expecting to be able to provide services this winter. Mr. Cole noted they seemed very determined and pointed out they had recently hired an executive director. In addition, Debby Graham, who he thought was the Board President, had been very proactive in communicating with him.

Mr. Skala commented that the Broadband Business Planning Task Force had been reinvigorated recently and noted he was interested in the internet access and technology aspects. He stated he would like to communicate with him later about speaking to that Task Force about some of these ideas.

Mr. Trapp asked if there had been plans to address issues of evictions. Mr. Cole replied this Thursday they planned to hold an informational meeting along with Mid-Missouri Legal Services to address the rights of tenants and homeowners that were late on payments. It would be held via Zoom on Thursday evening. He thought that might be a catalyst for getting information out with regard to people's rights and any resources that might be available. The session would be posted on the website so the information would be available for people to access it when needed.

REP39-20 Amendment to the FY 2020 Annual Budget - Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds.

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

Ms. Peters stated a lot of transfers had been listed and asked if it was due to cleaning things up. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

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

Mayor Treece commented that fifteen written comments had been received regarding roll carts, and those comments would be filed with the items associated with this meeting.

Jeanine Pagan indicated that if the economic downturn was not the time to consider safer roll carts in 2021, it should be included in the master plan for 2022, and that she was in favor of roll carts.

Hannah Klatchko stated citizens should be able to analyze data with regard to the cost effectiveness prior to any changes to the present solid waste system.

Barbara Barrett commented that she was not in favor of roll carts based on what she had seen in her extensive work travel and from friend and family experiences.

Candice Kundert stated she was in favor of roll carts for garbage and recycling as she had always had them prior to moving to Columbia. She noted she was over 65 years old and they made life easier while also helping to keep the City clean.

Lena Ajans, 2204 Corona Road, indicated she had spent the summer in Iowa City, a college town that had roll carts, and felt it was a brilliant idea. She hoped they could be as up to date as Iowa City, Iowa.

Elizabeth Heidt, 5160 Sockeye Court, stated she had been shocked that roll carts were not used when she first moved to Columbia seven years ago. They kept animals out of the trash, kept trash from blowing all over, protected the workers, and were simple and easy to use.

Jonathan Heidt, 5160 Sockeye Court, commented that he was strongly in favor of transitioning to roll carts. Despite the upfront investment, the long term savings would be significant.

Robert Churchill, 1119 Northshore Drive, stated he was opposed to the use of roll carts.

Mary Ann Beahon, 5001 Aspen Ridge Drive, indicated she was in support of roll carts.

George and Nancy Rahner stated they were in favor of roll carts.

Heather Guess noted she was in support of implementing an automated trash and recycling collection system.

Alexander Otis indicated he was supportive of utilizing roll carts in Boone County.

Anita Bruzzes, 4209 Fall River Drive, stated the current system of curbside pickup was unsustainable, cost too much, and led to injuries. She noted she would rather her taxpayer dollars go toward supporting a more efficient and safe option.

Bill Easley commented that he was completely against roll carts.

Kacey asked for common sense to be used with regard to roll carts as she felt it would only be an eyesore and not provide any benefit.

Rachel Proffitt commented that she resided in the First Ward and was in strong support of the proposal of Amy Belcher to repeal the ordinances prohibiting the use of roll carts. The City's current waste management system was no longer a viable option financially or from a safety perspective. The City would no longer be able to provide trash and recycling services in less than five years. It was unfortunate that it had taken a pandemic to reveal the fatal flaws in the system and the dire financial situation. She believed the Council had the power to improve the system while still keeping it within the purview of Columbia and its citizens. She noted the Council was the representative for those that received waste and recycling services as well as those that provided the services, i.e., the sanitation workers. She stated the City's sanitation workers put their health and lives at risk to the tune of nearly \$800,000 per year in worker's compensation. She noted she

was an occupational therapist that had treated such individuals receiving worker's compensation. She had seen them struggle with what would be a lifetime of treatment, potential surgeries, and inescapable pain that would plague happy moments like a child's third birthday party. Automated trucks and roll carts were safer. She asked the Council to serve its constituents and its sanitation workers in the best way possible by repealing the necessary ordinances. They could then continue the conversation as to how to build a safer, more cost effective waste management system for Columbia.

Carrie Davis-Hansson stated she resided in the Sixth Ward and thanked the Council for passing the very politicized mask ordinance. She noted she had hers on because she had immunocompromised family members. She also wanted to thank the Council and City Manager for making the first small step toward a holistic public safety approach. She had learned that the City Manager was putting aside \$500,000 for an unarmed crisis response team. Obviously, she would need to see the details before praising it, but noted she really wanted it to happen. She understood the Public Health and Human Resources Department had released a report in 2019 that stated "the City of Columbia has recognized that in addition to physical infrastructure and public safety, it must also make an investment in our community's social infrastructure." She wanted to remind the Council that the social infrastructure was the public safety issue. The very same report had indicated that black residents had an average lifespan that was six years less than white residents, and the rate of infant mortality for black babies was almost twice that of white babies. This meant that without exaggeration it could be a death sentence to be black in Columbia. She noted the inequalities continued as four times as many black families in Columbia were in poverty than white families and the median income for black families was \$19,000 less than white families. Despite these injustices, in 2019, they had only invested 0.018 percent of total funding for social services. She commented that Ibram X. Kendi, who had written *How to Be an Antiracist*, had indicated that when one learned about the inequalities of black people, they could believe one of two things, i.e., something was wrong with black people or something was wrong with the system. She assumed none on the Council were biological, behavioral, or cultural racists, so they did not think the inequalities reported by City officials were the fault of black residents. This meant something was wrong with the system, and it was time to change the system. She believed the only option was to redistribute a large portion of the CPD budget to the social infrastructure. There was no evidence suggesting increased spending on police decreased violence, but crime would increase due to the unavailability of resources. If they could invest \$6.8 million on the Discovery Parkway project, which would not benefit everyone, she felt they could invest more into the social infrastructure as it would help people obtain needed jobs and education.

James McLaurin commented that he viewed serving the needs of constituents as the obligation of government. Policies, rules, and procedures were all contracts with the public, and they should all be for the social good. Right now, however, there was a great deal of inequality as not everyone was benefiting from the same systems, and some were being penalized by the systems. He explained the CPD was only one aspect of the many social problems. He felt there needed to be some definition or boundary, and the decisions of Council going forward needed to fall within that definition or boundary. He believed a checklist was needed in terms of every single policy, appropriation of money, or development. If this was not done, it would be business as usual, i.e., those with the loudest voices at the moment or those with the most money and influence would benefit, and that was not ethical, nor was it in the best interest of everyone to operate in that manner. He pointed out economically depressed communities lacked access to the internet. He understood CPS had provided an option to receive online training during COVID, but a large number of households had reported problems. Those without internet could not participate in online training or stay current in terms of communications for job

opportunities or other basic items. He asked the Council to attempt to go two days without any connectivity to see the impact. He suggested something be done to provide moderate bandwidth for the basic necessities as it would be very beneficial. He commented that he believed community centers were vastly underutilized, and suggested a physical presence, especially in communities without online access. He suggested housing some services, such as medical, emergency, and police services, in a common community center. It could also provide a safe place for kids to go after school. He stated he also believed action items were needed and for those items to make it onto agendas in the future. He asked what the Council needed from the community to move things forward as it was past due.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, thanked the Council for its response to the coronavirus. He understood the City was hurting for money, but did not feel that meant rates should be increased. He also understood this could go on for a couple of more years.

Mr. Elkin stated a new issue was that masks were causing human damage. They needed the ability to remove their masks when possible to access fresh air. He understood masks needed to be worn when around other people.

Mr. Elkin believed the police and firefighters could use a social worker among them.

Mr. Elkin thanked the Council for continuing to discuss the homeless and hoped someone would eventually help. He also thanked Mr. Trapp for his work with the homeless.

Mr. Elkin commented that he was not in favor of roll carts as he was concerned about mosquitos.

Ms. Fowler stated the consent agenda had included legislation for architectural services for the lobby of the Daniel Boone Tavern Building, and every time they did anything to that building, they triggered 100 years of history. She asked if a conversation could be arranged with the Historic Preservation Commission for photographs or whatever was available prior to making changes. Mr. Glascock replied he thought that could be done.

Mr. Thomas commented that he would be absent from the August 17, 2020 Council Meeting.

Mr. Pitzer stated he thought they should talk about the solid waste system as it was clear the system was broken and falling apart. He noted they had tried to patch it up to keep it working, but believed they needed to look into something different. Since residential curbside recycling had been canceled, it was clear that people were still interested in recycling as all of the collection sites around town were overflowing. He understood staff was out there every day emptying the containers, but felt there would be limited patience for that type of system. He noted he would have limited patience for it. He stated he had been at a site last night in the rain trying to stuff items into one of the overflowing bins and could only think about the people that had to go out the next morning to clean up all of the broken glass, etc. He believed trash collection was a basic, elementary municipal responsibility, and they were not able to do it well. In addition, it was getting worse by the day. He commented that the Director of Utilities had indicated to them he was afraid he would have to pull back even further on other services to ensure they were able to pick up the trash on a regular basis. In looking back at some of the reports in 2015 when the issue had initially been brought up, they had indicated the trends of staffing would be impossible to maintain and the system they had would be overwhelmed. He understood there would be some discussion at the August 13 budget work session in terms of how they might be able to proceed, but the main obstacle in attempting to enact any of those ideas or proposals was the prohibition of roll carts or any sort of automated collection system in the ordinances. Even if they had a great

session on August 13, it would all be moot as long as that prohibition existed. He pointed out that removing that prohibition did not mandate an entirely new system immediately, but having it in place impeded the ability to put together any type of long term plan that would actually solve this crisis. He understood there were likely other patches they could utilize, but they would only be temporary. He commented that he would love to see the political will from this body to enact changes on their own since that was the most efficient path, but the other path was to put the prohibition on the ballot to allow the voters to have their say. He explained that if legislation was introduced at the first meeting in August, they could consider it at their second meeting in August, which would be a few days after the budget work session, and if approved, it could be placed on the November ballot. He felt it would enable them to get a better handle on the situation. He noted that if the citizens voted no, it would provide an answer so they would know how to proceed. If the citizens agreed, it would allow for a range of ideas and ways to transition into a much more efficient and effective system.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion directing staff to draft an ordinance that would place language on the November 2020 ballot to remove the prohibition of roll carts and automated collection systems for trash and recycling pick up for introduction and first reading at the next council meeting. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Ms. Peters commented that she was okay with it, but would much rather utilize their political will to remove the prohibition without placing it on the ballot. She was concerned about placing it on the ballot and the result being that the citizens supported the prohibition. She wondered what they would do then. They could privatize trash collection, which she understood many municipalities had done, but the companies would likely utilize roll carts. She was not sure about placing it on a ballot to provide people an option because she did not feel there was really an option. They either privatized it or kept it as a City-owned utility so they did not have miscellaneous roll carts showing up on different days of the week depending on the trash collection company utilized by the resident. She stated she did not mind asking people what they thought, but did not feel they had much of an option. She reiterated she was supportive of removing the prohibition.

Mayor Treece stated he believed the current frustration with curbside recycling being suspended indefinitely was a sign of contentment by the voters and ratepayers. People liked curbside recycling. He commented that the citizen survey indicated the current trash collection system had one of the highest satisfaction rates of any service the City provided. He noted he was reluctant to put it on the ballot due to the bandwidth for the community's ability for more division between now and the November election as it was about maxed out. He believed the real issue was the desire to reinstate curbside pickup. He explained they had an ordinance that indicated it shall be weekly, and as a result, he did not feel it could be suspended indefinitely. He thought they needed to let management work through the issues to resume the service they all expected and for which they had been paying.

Mayor Treece asked how the prohibition had gotten into the Code of Ordinances. Ms. Thompson replied it was the result of an initiative petition.

Mayor Treece stated he was reluctant to override a citizen-led initiative when there was a counter mechanism in place, i.e., another citizen-led initiative petition to repeal it.

Mayor Treece asked if a yes vote would be to repeal the prohibition against roll carts. If the Council wanted to seek the input of the voters on this issue, Ms. Thompson suggested it be phrased in a way that was more understandable as to roll carts. She explained that when an initiative came forward, it was placed on the ballot in terms of whether the voter wanted to adopt the initiative or not. The initiative had been to ban roll carts so it was a yes vote to ban roll carts, and it had been very confusing to the voters as they had heard many voters indicate that confusion. Mayor Treece understood in this situation the affirmative vote would be a yes to repeal the prohibition. Ms. Thompson stated she would suggest phrasing it differently. She thought Council could take the

legislative action after the fact in this particular instance since it would be a Council-led ballot. The problem with an initiative item was that it was always a vote to adopt the initiative. This would not necessarily be a vote to adopt specific language or repeal specific language.

Mr. Skala understood the reason the language had been relatively confusing was because of the language of the initiative petition, and if there was another initiative petition, it could be worded in a very different way. Given the fact, there had been a referendum and a split of eight points, he suspected there would still be a split in the community and was uncomfortable moving forward without an initiative petition or some other vehicle for evaluation to determine if the split had now changed. He wondered if it was an issue for the citizen survey. He understood people were anxious to move this along, but was reluctant about putting it on the November ballot without citizen input and evaluation.

Ms. Fowler commented that in her day job, she supervised the CDL driver that drove their US Department of Transportation (DOT) truck, and understood there was a layer of administration that went along with it. She also understood the City trained its own CDL drivers and participated in that layer of administration. She noted she would oppose the motion at this time because she felt there was a financial discussion yet to have as to whether they appropriately compensated CDL drivers to keep them, what the costs would be for an automated system in terms of trucks, canisters, etc., and what the costs would be of any contract with an outside vendor. She suggested that discussion occur and for citizens to provide input based on that information. She noted she also wanted to hear from the drivers as she cared a lot about what they thought. She wondered if they wanted to convert to being a CDL driver, if they were already a CDL driver, what they thought about compensation, etc. Mr. Glascock noted they used to all be CDL drivers, but they now had temporary employees that were not CDL drivers. The City supplied the drivers and the temporary employees rode on the back of the truck collecting the waste. Ms. Fowler reiterated there were layers they needed to explore in terms of costs.

Mr. Thomas commented that he did not feel there would be any good resolution until they could move to a single-operated, automated trash collection system, and that could not be done until the prohibition was overturned. He thought more people were in favor of moving to a single-operated, automated system based on emails he had received than there had been 4-5 years ago. He noted some people had even indicated they had been opposed to it previously, but were now in favor of it. He stated he was not comfortable with being a part of a City Council that repealed the prohibition. He thought they had to go to the vote of the people. He also did not think they could wait until the spring to do a citizen survey to obtain feedback. He stated he would support the motion of Mr. Pitzer so they could hopefully move in what he thought they all agreed was the right direction.

Mr. Trapp commented that he agreed with Mr. Pitzer and Mr. Thomas. He noted he would rescind the ordinance, and pointed out the reports had predicted they would have the problems they were now seeing. It was an antiquated system and work that people that had other options did not want to do. They would need some stop gap solutions and encouraged management to continuing working on that. He did not feel abandoning curbside recycling was an option as it did not get them toward their climate goals. He understood progressive communities were looking at waste zero, and Columbia fell out at the first step. He noted Columbia had an 18 percent recycling diversion rate, which was similar to what they had in the 1970s. Jefferson City had a 40 percent diversion rate because they had an automated system. He pointed out the situation had changed since they had the election and felt the public understood that. He explained the presidential primary voters had made the decision, and they would have a much better electorate with the November election. They also had the chance to make the language clear. He thought they should support the motion by Mr. Pitzer to bring the issue to the voters as they would likely see that the people supported it.

Mr. Pitzer stated he agreed with Ms. Fowler regarding looking at it in more detail, but



pointed out an issue was the timing. He explained that if they went this route, they could have a discussion at the August 13 budget work session as this ordinance would be considered after that meeting. He commented that he also agreed with Ms. Peters philosophically, but was concerned about there being another petition if the Council just chose to overturn it.

Ms. Peters stated Mr. Pitzer could be right. She noted she would support his motion, but was only wondering what they would do if the citizens voted to continue prohibiting roll carts. Mr. Pitzer understood, and said they would at least have an answer.

Mr. Glascock asked when an ordinance would have to be passed in order to place it on the November ballot. Ms. Amin replied the second meeting in August. Ms. Peters understood it could be placed on the November ballot if approved by the second meeting in August. Ms. Amin replied yes, and explained she had to notify the County Clerk's Office by August 25, 2020 for any November ballot item.

Ms. Thompson understood the Council with this motion would grant staff the flexibility to draft something that was clear. Mr. Pitzer stated the intent was to repeal those sections in the Code of Ordinances, but he wanted to provide staff the flexibility needed for the ballot language. Ms. Peters asked for clarification. Ms. Thompson replied the ballot language did not necessarily need to reference the repeal.

Mayor Treece understood they would not be asking for a nonbinding referendum. Ms. Thompson replied it would be binding, but she would figure out a way to draft it so a yes vote was a vote in favor of roll carts. Mayor Treece stated the public vote would be to repeal a City ordinance. It was not whether they wanted roll carts or not. Ms. Thompson understood, and explained it could be drafted in a way that was more understandable to the voters.

Ms. Peters stated she was now confused, and asked if they would be asking the voters to repeal the ordinances that said the City could not use roll carts. Mr. Pitzer replied the City had an existing ordinance that indicated the City could not use roll carts or automated collection for trash or recycling. As a result, the legal question would be to repeal those sections. Ms. Peters understood that was what they would ask the voters, but it would be written in a manner that was clearer. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

Mr. Thomas asked why they could not ask voters if they favored roll carts or not. If they received a strong vote in favor of them, he would be comfortable with being a part of a Council that repealed the prohibition. Mayor Treece replied he was not interested in a nonbinding referendum.

Mayor Treece stated he was very uncomfortable moving forward with this since it had been less than four years since the prior vote prohibiting roll carts that had been the result of a citizen-led initiative petition when there was an equally available mechanism in place for the proponents of roll carts to put it on the ballot. He did not feel it was any different than the Missouri General Assembly repealing every statewide initiative petition. Ms. Peters thought the item Mayor Treece was referring to was being placed on the ballot for the voters to consider again. Mr. Pitzer pointed out the facts on the ground had changed and the system was falling apart as evidenced by this indefinite suspension of a service people clearly wanted. He felt they might be able to patch it up for a while, but it would break again.

**The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Mr. Trapp directing staff to draft an ordinance that would place language on the November 2020 ballot to remove the prohibition of roll carts and automated collection systems for trash and recycling pick up for introduction and first reading at the next council meeting was approved by voice vote with only Mayor Treece, Ms. Fowler, and Mr. Skala voting no.**

**XII. ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 9:58 p.m.