



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, August 3, 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, August 3, 2020, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri.

Mayor Treece encouraged the public to maintain social distancing and to wear a mask when that could not be maintained. He also encouraged those in attendance for a specific meeting agenda item to step out of the room after that item was discussed to allow others to participate.

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

The minutes of the regular meeting of July 6, 2020 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mayor Treece.

The July 20, 2020 regular meeting minutes were not yet complete.

Mr. Pitzer asked that B184-20 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B184-20 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Trapp.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC38-20 Grady Harrington - Rethinking the City budget.

Grady Harrington, who had also emailed his comments, noted he was a Third Ward resident and a member of the People's Defense, which was a group of activists and community organizers. He quoted the late economist Milton Friedman who said, "Only a crisis, actual or perceived, produces real change. When that crisis occurs, the actions that are taken depend on the ideas that are lying around. That, I believe, is our basic function: to develop alternatives to existing policies, to keep them alive and available until the politically impossible becomes politically inevitable." He commented that with the joint crises of COVID-19 and police brutality, they were in that moment of the politically impossible becoming the inevitable. He stated his friend, Mr. Mesfin, would be speaking on one such policy proposed by the People's Defense while he would discuss why the past, present, and proposed future budgets had been inadequate in addressing the crises

at hand. He referred to a recent KBIA report by Sebastian Martinez Valdivia which indicated the City had cut the Public Health and Human Services Department budget five times in ten years, and that the reduced investment had left them stretched in their response to COVID-19 as had been illustrated by the need to seek volunteers for contact tracing and the pleas for donations to non-profits. He understood CoMoHelps had received over \$2.5 million in funding requests to meet the rising needs in the wake of the pandemic. During those same ten years, the budget of the Police Department had been raised by \$6.6 million. When hearing the budget for a certain department had increased year after year, one would think that department was successful, but this had not been the case for the Columbia Police Department (CPD). There had been a failure to implement community policing, national attention toward the abuse of civil asset forfeiture, the shooting of family dogs, the fallout of the Ryan Ferguson case, and recent allegations of allowing sex trafficking in Columbia. He understood these events had occurred under different leadership, but wondered at what point the pattern would be forced to change. He asked how they could keep giving more and more money to a department that continued to make mistakes and the national news while funding for other departments had been neglected. He noted the response he predicted to hear was that the annual citizen's survey indicated public safety was the most important core service provided by the City, but pointed out he was not sure the public's feeling of safety had increased along with the budget of the Police Department during the last ten years. He commented that the money allocated by the City was not even CPD's sole source of resources. In the most recent meeting of the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB), Police Chief Geoff Jones had been asked a series of questions, and one of those questions was how much the CPD was funded by federal grants. Chief Jones could unfortunately not answer that question, which Mr. Harrington felt was important because money from federal grants tended to place incentives on the local police force. The kind of police work that was done was based upon the amount of resources the CPD received in return. He stated information obtained by other local police departments showed a clear pattern of federal funds pushing local departments toward increased drug arrests. A 2001 report from the *Capitol Times* in Madison, Wisconsin, had indicated that each year the Wisconsin Office of Justice Assistance had disbursed millions of dollars in federal funds to Wisconsin drug task force units, and a fifth of that money was calculated on the basis of arrests for drug sales, which created a powerful incentive to focus on the aggressive pursuit of drug activity. He further explained that process and pointed out one Wisconsin county had quadrupled its drug arrests between 1999 and 2000, which also led to the quadrupling of its federal subsidy. He wondered how much in federal grants was given to the CPD and noted had asked for that information via a Freedom of Information Act request.

SPC39-20 Lexie Irvin - Mask ordinance.

Lexie Irvin rescheduled to another meeting.

SPC40-20 Bill Easley - Ambulance drivers and health.

Bill Easley, 705 Cook Avenue, commented that he would like to see the ambulance drivers fired as he did not believe they should have let people die while they had remained down the street recently. He stated he hoped the families involved sued the City of Columbia and others involved.

Mr. Easley stated many people could not push garbage carts for their garbage, and believed the City had paid the woman that had stated her support for carts to speak. He felt that was mean and that it would cost the City a lot of money. He reiterated he did not believe roll carts were needed.

Mr. Easley understood the Health Department closed down restaurants and bars due to them being dirty and wondered why the Health Department did not close down restaurants and bars to assist with containing the virus. He felt someone was being paid

off by the merchants. He pointed out everyone could wear a mask, and people had to be silly to not wear one.

Mr. Easley stated Columbia had rough streets and suggested paying those that were being laid off to address the streets.

Mr. Easley commented that he also believed some police officers needed to be discharged.

SPC41-20

Nikki Evers - Outside construction workers with mask mandates.

Nikki Evers explained her husband worked in and around Columbia running gas to commercial and residential buildings, and stated evidence suggested the mask mandate would put him at a higher risk for a number of health related issues. She wondered what might happen if his lungs collapsed while working in the heat or if he became dizzy or confused due to lacking sufficient oxygen. She noted he worked with high pressure gas so it was not the safest job in the first place, but adding the requirement to wear a mask could cause him to become dizzy or confused, and could result in an error that could potentially blow up a block of the City. She wondered who would be held accountable for her husband's health or the negative responses from wearing a mask, and asked if those that had voted in favor of the mandate would take responsibility. She stated he was constantly saturated in sweat, and the ability to screen out any virus was diminished with a wet mask, which could occur within seconds of him putting it on. She believed it almost created a waterboarding effect. She felt a mask mandate for people outside defeated the purpose of the safety they were trying to implement. She noted she could provide multiple studies about the associated health risks, which had been done prior to 2020, meaning they had been vetted. She did not believe the studies from 2020 were fair and accurate as the science was not yet settled. She also did not understand how anyone in a position of power could mandate something based on unsettled science. She stated the mask mandate was reckless and a danger to those the Council was supposed to serve. She asked the Council to repeal the requirement to wear a mask outdoors at the very least.

Mayor Treece stated Ms. Evers could provide the studies she had referenced to the City Clerk to pass on to the Council.

SPC42-20

Brian Page - Fiscal management by the Council.

Brian Page provided a handout, and asked Ms. Fowler and Ms. Peters to team up with each other as the City needed healing and he supported both of them for leaning into that. He commented that there was ongoing dysfunction that was keeping the City broke, and the refrain of having no money had become the adopted motto. He stated prudent fiscal management had been displaced by the addiction to gambling, and solvency was the promised reward. He believed self-justification and denial through the lens of addiction supported the ongoing hemorrhaging of money they did not have to become solvent, and that this reasoning lacked merit. The belief the City would die if it stopped growing was false. He felt the City was dying because they were hemorrhaging money they did not have to finance infrastructure. He commented that the City was footing the bill so others were able to prosper, and this stinking thinking of addiction kept them at a steep nose dive into bankruptcy. He stated nature was where they lived and it continued to demonstrate healing following destruction, and today that healing had to include diversity. Over 200 years of slavery, land grabs, and other oppressions had not beaten down the indigenous and black people in Columbia, and he instead heard the resiliency and readiness to be a part of something devoid of oppression. He commented that the City should have purchased the property at 1005 Cherry Street as it had been 85 years old and had retained the same structural integrity throughout the years. He pointed out the permit to demolish it falsely claimed it was under 50 years old, and felt it could have been used to train young indigenous and black women and men to operate gourmet restaurants instead of taking orders at burger joints. He believed the City had blown the opportunity because they were broke financially, and it was the caring black women

working at local fast food restaurants that were impacted. He believed Ms. Peters and Ms. Fowler represented the sacred feminine, and supported their joint work to guide Columbia in healing. He commented that the City needed to admit to being powerless over the addiction to growth and needed to understand that prudent fiscal management could lead to sanity and salvation. He suggested surrendering their will to prudent fiscal management, and to not say they were already practicing sound fiscal management. He recommended the Council hire a soil hydrologist or knowledgeable family farmer to inform their risky plans and impulses in order to save money and prevent environmental and financial disasters, and noted the City's resistance to sound solid hydrology baffled him because ignoring sound solid hydrology meant ignoring the sound nature, and ignoring nature would negatively impact them.

SPC43-20

Kirubel Mesfin - Chokehold ban policy.

Kirubel Mesfin explained he was with the People's Defense and noted they had marched and rallied with regard to the chokehold policy twice in the last two weeks. He commented that James Thompson, Allen Simpson, Rodney Lynch, Dustin Boone, Roger Owensby, Jr., Carl Glen, Gerald Arthur, Torris Harris, Eric Garner, and George Floyd were names of people that had died as a result of a police chokehold since he had been born, and he felt he was fairly young. He assumed they could all agree that the officers had handled the situation involving George Floyd incorrectly after seeing the video, and noted the *Oxford Dictionary* defined a chokehold as a tight grip around a person's neck used to restrain them by restricting their breathing. He pointed out if one could not breathe, one could not live. He stated that even before death, there was a risk of short-term memory loss, harm to the retina, permanent damage to the trachea, damage to arteries, the tearing of neck muscles, a concussion from falling when unconscious, a stroke, seizures, and permanent brain damage from being placed in a chokehold. CPD policy 300.11.4 indicated "choke, strangles, or similar holds that restricted the flow of blood to the brain or a person's ability to breathe were prohibited except when an officer reasonably believed there was imminent threat of death or serious physical injury to him or herself or a third party and the action was the only reasonable mean at the time to stop that threat." He felt a policy with a loophole that big created a situation where the exception swallowed the rule. He commented that they either utilized chokeholds or they did not. The problem was that the definition of imminent threat by an officer was influenced by inherent racial bias. In addition, there was not a standard definition of imminent threat, and in most cases, courts deferred to the police to decide what might be reasonable action. He pointed out that one wrongly interpreted situation would result in the person not being able to breathe. He stated there were many ways to de-escalate situations without having to go to the most vulnerable point of a person's body, and noted LEED, which stood for listen and explain with equity and dignity, was a tool. Empathetic listening, verbal communication, shielding, etc. were other de-escalation techniques. He emphasized that there were many ways to de-escalate situations without violence, and in situations where violence might be necessary, there were methods outside of chokeholds. He pointed out healthcare workers in psychiatric wards and mental health facilities did this every day, and reiterated that a person that could not breathe would not be able to survive. He commented that he brought this up because out of everyone in the room he was most likely to be a victim of this dangerous and unnecessary tactic as a young black man. He stated the job of a police officer was to serve and protect the community, and it was hard for them to protect a community that did not trust them. He noted Art Acevedo, the Houston Police Chief, had indicated they could not afford another man dying at the hands of a police officer without justification or any other violations of the public trust after fully banning chokeholds. He hoped for a similar determination by this Council and Police Chief Jones in the near future.

Mr. Mesfin explained he had participated in the listening tour this past week, and felt it was a great idea in theory, but wondered what might come from it in terms of direct action. He feared those meetings would only result in lip service, which he did not want.

In addition, he understood this was not the first listening tour and wondered how it might be different this time. He questioned whether the Council would respond to the voices of the people.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH26-20 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.

Discussion shown with B180-20.

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.

PH26-20 was read by the Clerk, and B180-20 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked what would be done with the old bridge. Mr. Griggs replied he thought it would eventually be removed.

Mayor Treece understood there was currently two-way traffic on the bridge, and asked for the width of the bridge. Mr. Nichols replied he thought it was 24 feet wide. Mayor Treece understood Walnut Street was a City street, and not a highway. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct. Mayor Treece asked about a typical lane width. He wondered if it was 8 feet or 10 feet. Mr. Nichols replied it could be as short as 11 feet. Mayor Treece asked if they ever went down to 10 feet. Mr. Nichols replied rarely. He noted they preferred not going much less than 11 feet.

Mayor Treece asked how the bridge was constructed. He wondered if it was concrete. Mr. Nichols replied he thought it had a concrete deck and steel girders on concrete abutments, and noted the abutments were falling out. Mayor Treece asked if there was any way to add steel ears to the side of it and build a cantilevered bike or pedestrian structure. Mr. Nichols replied that would involve significant engineering and costs. He pointed out any bridge could be widened.

Mayor Treece stated he was concerned about adding pedestrian traffic to an already narrow bridge. Mr. Nichols understood the traffic count was 280 so it involved very localized traffic.

Mr. Skala commented that he liked the suggestion of a cantilevered bridge as he shared the concerns of Mayor Treece with regard to pedestrians without sufficient separation. He noted he planned to ask for East Walnut Street to be evaluated for a reduction in its speed limit. Mr. Nichols stated staff could look at that. He pointed out this particular project would include speed humps to slow traffic down as it approached the bridge and that signage would be included as well.

Ms. Peters understood a pedestrian and bike lane or area would be added, but staff did not plan to separate that area from vehicle traffic until the cars had gotten used to going over the bridge. She thought it should be separated. Mr. Nichols understood it would be striped, but could not recall whether they planned to use delineators as well. Ms. Peters stated she did not think they were planning to utilize those. Mr. Nichols noted they were not planning to include a hard structure, but could look at delineators. Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding the look of the delineators. Mr. Nichols replied they were similar to those on Broadway that were used to keep people from going into Walgreens. He explained he thought the idea was that there would be space on the bridge if there was not a hard barrier if there happened to be a head-on accident. Ms. Peters thought there needed to be a sign indicating that traffic needed to take turns crossing the bridge. Mr.

Nichols noted there would be signage for that.

Mr. Stone explained the concept was to not build another structure the City would have to maintain. He noted they had tried to come up with a solution that utilized the existing structure the best way possible. The structure was in pretty good shape. It had one problem on the wing wall below it that could be fixed relatively cheaply prior to building the sidewalk on top of it. He stated they felt usage was really localized since it was a dead end roadway. Essentially, only people that were in the area traveled on the roadway. He pointed out they would likely not have suggested this for any other structure within the City. It was a use of space that seemed to be better than building a whole new structure. He commented that the 85th percentile was a little higher than they would have liked, which was why they had included speed humps prior to yield signs on either side when making it a one-way bridge. He noted they would monitor all of the markings and signage to determine if people understood the concept. They could also install delineators if needed. He explained they had been a little concerned about having a divider due to snow removal and emergency vehicle access on the bridge and beyond. He reiterated that was the reason they had not suggested a barrier at the beginning.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the cost of delineators. Mr. Stone replied it was about \$100 for each. Mr. Pitzer understood it would cost a few thousand dollars to install them in this area. Mr. Stone stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer asked if snow removal would be taken care of by the Public Works staff on the street side and if the Parks and Recreation staff would address it on the other side. Mr. Stone replied it would likely fall to whoever was able to get there first if delineators were not utilized. If delineators were utilized, it would depend on the type of equipment that was in the area. Mr. Pitzer understood the Parks and Recreation staff would handle the trail on both sides of the bridge. Mr. Stone stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer asked for the disadvantages of the delineators. Mr. Stone replied the need to replace them if they were hit was one. Another was that it would create a narrower path for emergency response, but it was a better option than something hard like a physical barrier. Mr. Pitzer asked how much room emergency vehicles needed. Mr. Stone replied they liked 20 feet of open area. The concern with a hard barrier or curb was that it would be difficult to get past the accident if there was a collision near the bridge while someone was having a medical issue or if there was a fire beyond it. He pointed out it could be done, but minutes mattered in those types of situations. Mr. Pitzer asked how much width would remain on the roadway. Mr. Stone replied 12 feet if there was any kind barrier so about two feet of shy distance and 10-11 feet of space.

Mr. Skala commented that the City had spent a lot of money on significant bridges around town to ensure pedestrian and bicycle traffic was safe, and pointed out this was adjacent to Stephens Lake Park. He understood it might be cost prohibitive, but wanted to look into the possibility of cantilevering the bridge to know how much it would cost. Mr. Stone stated it was a Parks and Recreation Department project so he would defer to them.

Mayor Treece noted he had received some emails regarding stray truck traffic trying to access the back of Lowes and other stores there, and asked if staff had thought about banning trucks from that stretch. Mr. Stone replied that could be done, but there could be issues if a truck was trying to deliver to a home.

Mayor Treece stated he did not believe this solution was ideal and was trying to evaluate whether it was unsafe. He asked if there was a scenario with a 24-foot bridge deck and striping of two lanes plus the minimum needed for the trail. Mr. Stone replied no. He explained they had tried to figure out a way to accommodate it all, but they were uncomfortable with having two-way traffic on there. Mayor Treece asked what the problem was with bicycles sharing the road with the flow of traffic on both sides. Mr. Stone replied bicycles were fine, but purposely putting pedestrians on that bridge with two-way traffic was the issue due to sight distance problems. Mayor Treece understood.

Ms. Fowler commented that she had seen "contract labor" a lot on tonight's agenda, and

asked if the City would consider a policy for contract labor that included employing their own citizens. She noted Columbia was a community that was suffering from a lack of employment and had job training programs that taught people how to do construction trades, including flatwork and concrete work. Mr. Glascock replied they were bound by State Law. It might be something that could be included in the request for proposals, but they would have to go with the lowest bid, and local entities might not have provided the lowest bid. Ms. Fowler understood. She only wanted to think in the long term in terms of how they might sustain themselves and the community along with strategic equity as a City. She reiterated she understood they had current constraints, but wanted it to be looked at in the long term to change it so their own people benefited.

Mr. Thomas asked if an amendment would be needed if they wanted to include delineators, rubber curbing, or some other measure. Mr. Nichols replied no, and pointed out that was a detail they could address later.

Mayor Treece asked for the length of the bridge. Mr. Nichols replied he thought it was likely about 120 feet.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Annette Triplett, 201 W. Broadway, stated she was the CEO of the PedNet Coalition and explained the PedNet Coalition supported the Hinkson Creek Trail extension project and the overall route modifications in the area. It would have been pleasant to have the trail cross the creek on a separate bridge, but given the condition of the abandoned bridge, it made sense to instead route the trail across the Walnut Street bridge. In addition, the use of a two-way bike lane in the short section was an ideal application. She noted they would recommend that the two-way bike lane on the Walnut Street bridge have a vertical street element, such as bollards or concrete curbs, to create a protected bike lane. It was best practice for two-way bike lanes to be physically separated from motor vehicles with vertical elements. This particular area was a case in point of why ensuring the bike lane was protected was best practice since it was the only way to ensure people driving did not cross the paint into the bike lane. The bridge crossed the street at the bottom of a valley, and people driving from both directions would be heading downhill as they approached the bridge. Even with the addition of speed humps, it might be easy for drivers to veer across the paint and into the bike lane. In addition, people using the two-way bike lane and heading west along Walnut Street toward Stephens Lake Park would be biking against traffic, which was atypical in comparison to general traffic law so it might be confusing to drivers without a visual protected barrier. It would also feel unsafe for people riding bikes toward oncoming traffic. She commented that by adding a hard surface protected barrier to the bike lanes, the new route might even be safer than the original design since people were not required to walk or bike to cross Walnut Street to the abandoned bridge. She pointed out trails were built to give people the option to walk, bike, and run in the safest and most comfortable setting possible, and trails were ideal for families. Protected bike lanes extended the sense of safety and the appeal of trails into a street setting. As the trail route change required the use of a street bridge and the layout allowed for two-way walking and biking traffic, she felt making the bike lane protected was critical to the continuity of the trail function through the corridor. She asked that the Council continue to support the project by directing staff to amend the design to include a short, protected bike lane over the Walnut Street bridge.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Triplett if she felt a divided or protected bike lane included delineators or if something more structural, like bollards were needed. Ms. Triplett replied delineators would be the minimum she would be satisfied with because one could still drive through them. She noted one could see broken delineators at the crossing of the Bike Boulevard on College Avenue all of the time. She pointed out they provided a visual barrier even though fairly easy to drive through.

Mayor Treece asked about a situation whereby two bikes met each other on that portion. He wondered how they might accommodate two bike/pedestrian lanes and oncoming traffic. Ms. Triplett replied she thought the proposed design had a two-way bike lane of

10 feet and an 11-foot driving lane along with 1-2 feet of buffer. She suggested placing this protection within the 1-2 feet of buffer.

Mayor Treece asked how the driver of an automobile would know the bridge would become one lane. Ms. Triplett replied she understood the design had signage and paint included. She agreed it would be unexpected, but felt signage was likely the best they could have in that situation. Mayor Treece asked Ms. Triplett if she agreed it was not ideal. Mr. Triplett replied it was not ideal, but noted her impression of cantilever bridges was that they were very expensive. She would not be convinced that would be the highest priority use of those funds.

Mayor Treece asked for the length of the existing Walnut Street bridge. Ms. Triplett asked for clarification. Mayor Treece replied he wondered about the length of the old train trestle. Ms. Triplett stated she did not know. It crossed the same creek so she would expect it to be about the same distance as the street bridge.

Brian Page commented that he had bicycled on that bridge on his way to the Conley Road shopping center, and it was indeed a cul-de-sac with limited car traffic on it. He explained he had spent some time photographing the creek and had been wary of traffic smashing him into the guardrail. He pointed out this was the historic Stephens College dumpsite, and as a result, many years of waste had been dumped over the bank.

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

Ms. Peters asked for the point of going over the bridge to the cul-de-sac. She asked if the trail continued on past the cul-de-sac. Mr. Griggs replied yes, and described its route utilizing the diagram on the overhead. He pointed out it connected everything on the north side of I-70 to the trail system. He explained the reason they were before the Council was that the original route, which was to use the old bridge, did not work. They needed to be on the south side of East Walnut Street instead of the north side.

Mayor Treece referred to a diagram and asked why the new guardrail was needed if they were going to direct pedestrian and bicycle traffic on the bridge. Mr. Griggs replied they would be along the edge of the creek and wanted people to feel comfortable while riding through there. Mayor Treece asked why that traffic would not just be kept along Walnut Street. Mr. Griggs replied that would be a pedestrian issue. He agreed the limited traffic would allow them to place traffic on Walnut Street to cross over and go about 95 percent of the time, but there would be other times when someone who walked slowly would not be able to clear it quickly.

Mr. Thomas suggested they direct staff to design a vertical barrier element, which might be delineator posts as he agreed with Ms. Triplett in that delineators should be the bare minimum. He commented that bolted curbing and firmer vertical structures would be preferable. He pointed out the signage needed to be clear also. He recommended that eastbound traffic going into the cul-de-sac be directed to stop or yield to oncoming traffic. He did not feel there would be many times that two vehicles would be crossing the bridge at the same time. There were only 280 vehicles per day, which was an average of about one every five minutes. He thought it should be clear which one had to yield to the other. He commented that this was quite a good design for neighborhoods. In England, they often saw the narrowing to one lane at the entrance to a neighborhood and traffic going into the neighborhood had to yield to traffic exiting. He felt it was a great traffic calming device. From the point of view of pedestrians and cyclists, it was a trail. He believed there would be far more than 280 pedestrians and bicyclists going across the bridge so they should be given adequate protection. He explained this would be a part of the trail system, which tended to be very protective in nature. He did not feel there was logic in spending tens or hundreds of thousands of dollars to build another bridge or a cantilever, but since this little section would expose them to vehicles, he felt it was important to have a vertical element and the same feel of riding the trail over this part of the bridge.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Glascock if he had a suggestion. Mr. Glascock replied he would recommend looking at Windsor Street in terms of how the Bike Boulevard was constructed. He understood they had narrowed it from both sides to create a single track

across the bridge so pedestrians were protected on each side as they were walking across. He thought it could be looked at as a Bike Boulevard. They did not just need to stop at the bridge. It could be carried on through the neighborhood.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed with Mr. Thomas in that they had to protect pedestrians at the minimum. This was a situation whereby there were not many good options other than relatively expensive ones. He noted he wanted to see if a permanent cantilever could be done to satisfy his curiosity, but in the meantime a vertical delineation was necessary. He stated he also wanted to renew his request for a traffic study to determine if they could lower the speed limit on East Walnut Street in general. To some degree, when they started to mingle pedestrians and cars, they were open to an accident, and referred to an incident on Clark Lane as an example. He thought they needed to ensure separation at a minimum. He reiterated he wanted the numbers associated with a cantilever bridge and wanted to know whether that type of bridge was feasible.

Ms. Peters understood traffic calming would be included in the design, and asked Mr. Skala if he wanted a traffic study prior to that. Mr. Skala replied he wanted an evaluation of the speed on East Walnut Street as he understood some cars traveled 40-50 mph on it. He thought they should consider reducing the speed limit to 25-30 mph, and noted he wanted the entire roadway evaluated. Ms. Peters understood he was concerned with speed limits and lowering the speed limit along the roadway. Mr. Skala stated that was correct. Ms. Peters understood this was separate from the speed humps that would be installed. Mr. Skala stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece asked if there was any objection to Mr. Thomas' suggestion to have some type of vertical delineator. Mr. Trapp replied it would make sense to include delineators right away if this was a brand new build. Since people already drove on the bridge and were used to it, he thought staff was wise to stripe it and allow people to get used to the one-lane bridge prior to adding the delineators. He stated he preferred bollards as it was a more attractive and park-like look. In addition, it was more substantial than plastic delineators, which were knocked around quite a bit. He commented that two cars hitting each other was a legitimate concern and believed allowing time to get used to the one-lane bridge idea prior to installing the vertical element would be wise.

Mr. Thomas stated he disagreed with Mr. Trapp because he believed people would get used to driving where they should not be driving if it was not made clear. He thought there needed to be absolutely clear signage that cars were not permitted on the south side of the bridge over a certain distance. He believed solely utilizing paint would create the wrong habit. He thought they should do the project properly from the start.

Mayor Treece stated he tended to agree with Mr. Thomas. If they were building a new bridge, he felt they could train people to do this, but since it was an existing bridge and people were used to driving to oncoming traffic, he believed some type of protection was needed for the pedestrians. He asked if anyone felt strongly otherwise.

Ms. Peters stated she agreed with Mr. Thomas as well.

Mayor Treece noted they would vote on B180-20 with that caveat.

B180-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH27-20 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.

Discussion shown with B181-20.

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.

PH27-20 was read by the Clerk, and B181-20 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked about the exterior finish that was contemplated for the pavilion. Mr. Huffington replied it would be a wood framed building with concrete board as the siding for the outside of the building. Mayor Treece asked if it would be more like a hardie plank. Mr. Huffington replied yes.

Ms. Fowler asked what kind of runoff was expected off of the hard surfaces and whether alternatives to paving had been considered. Mr. Huffington replied they would be asphalt parking lots that were designed to catch all of the water runoff so the water could be treated prior to traveling into the lake. He explained that was why they usually had a divider cell between the parking lots. He commented that all of the water collected at Philips Park would be used to irrigate property. He noted the water they treated would go through the detention basins to Philips Lake, and would be pumped back out for irrigation. He commented that they had not yet evaluated other types of surfaces, such as porous pavers. It would be something they would have to discuss with engineers due to the amount of traffic the lots would endure. He explained they tended to use those at locations with minimal traffic like Fairview Park.

Ms. Fowler asked what was done to take out any of the oil, gas, etc. that came off of the lot. Mr. Huffington replied they utilized heavy plantings, and the runoff would catch two treatment basins before ending up in the lake. He stated they did their best in terms of what they could gather, hold on to, and then treat through the plantings in the basins. Ms. Fowler understood it was essentially a wetlands cleansing. Mr. Huffington stated that was correct.

Ms. Fowler commented that she saw a lot of green on the diagram and asked if that would be grass or if that was just color for the illustration. Mr. Huffington replied there would be a mix of grass that was mowed and prairie habitat. He noted everything south of the building on the diagram displayed could be areas that were not mowed. He pointed out it was cost prohibitive to mow everything. He stated they would also plant some different native vegetation to cut down on mowing. Ms. Fowler understood the native vegetation would not have anything that would feed the bloom in the lake. Mr. Huffington stated that was the hope all of the time.

Ms. Fowler asked if there was anything around the lake that would feed the bloom of the lake. Mr. Huffington replied a good portion of the water on the north side of lake where the Columbia Sports Fieldhouse was located was collected in its own water detention cell so it would not actually go back into Philips Lake. As they approached different projects, they would need to look at how the water was caught, detained, and treated before it went back into the lake. Ms. Fowler stated she was not only concerned about the water as she was also concerned about what would be used to feed the landscaping because it would end up in the lake as rain runoff creating a different water quality issue. Mr. Huffington explained pesticides were minimally used. He noted they also worked closely with the Missouri Department of Conservation (MDC) with regard to the water quality of the lake as the MDC managed the lake for the City. He stated they would handle it similarly to Stephens Lake Park.

Ms. Fowler asked Mr. Huffington if he was comfortable in terms of having the precautions in place to keep items from other surrounding development from running into the lake and degrading the water quality and fish stock. Mr. Huffington replied other departments would help them in that regard. He explained that as development happened on the east side of the lake, it would go through the public process to ensure there were detention basins and treatment cells. He commented that they actually had a pretty extensive treatment system on the east side of the lake that had been installed when they first acquired the property. He stated they worked fairly closely with developers to ensure contaminants were cleaned out, and noted they had already regraded and reestablished one of the cells.

Mr. Pitzer asked what types of events the Missouri State High School Activities Association (MSHAA) and others had planned to hold here. Mr. Huffington replied he understood the NCAA Cross Country Championships had to have an external facility for staff for drug testing of athletes. As a result, without a facility of this nature, a tent would have to be utilized causing them to incur a rental cost. In terms of MSHAA, they would utilize the building as a staging area and a place for officials that was separate from the athletes and coaches. He commented that the facility was a big selling point in bringing larger events to Columbia.

Mr. Pitzer asked if events at the Fieldhouse would use it as a secondary facility. Mr. Huffington replied they could. He pointed out the Fieldhouse had been designed to already have some spaces inside for a director or referees, but if an overflow space was needed, the other building could be used. He noted MSHAA usually had a fundraiser associated with cross country that occurred a day or two before the race, and this facility could be utilized for that event.

Mr. Pitzer understood they had started out with a bigger facility and had then downsized, and asked what size of facility they had started with. Mr. Huffington replied the original target had been to allow for banquet seating for 300, but it had come in well over what they had wanted to spend. In addition, it would not have fit the site as well based on the topography. He noted they then looked at the Riechmann Pavilion, which could accommodate 125-150 people, and had talked to staff that helped program events, such as weddings, showers, parties, etc., and had determined a need to accommodate about 200 people in a seated capacity. A building that would accommodate 300 people would just cost too much in materials.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Brian Page stated he hoped the groups that were benefitting from this would help pay for it, and that it was not solely City sponsored. He commented that there was history of the north bank being storage for the City's power pole transformers and other materials, and wondered if a soil analysis might be useful when doing excavation work. He stated he had considered fishing at the lake, but noted there was not anything appealing about the water to him as the lake appeared to be strangled by algae.

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

B181-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH28-20 Proposed replacement and rehabilitation of a portion of storm drain pipe on Aldeah Avenue, south of Ash Street.

PH28-20 was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

Christine Gardener, 112 Anderson Avenue, explained she was speaking on behalf of North Central Residents Alliance as they had storm and sewer water issues throughout the area. She referred to the 2015 West Central Neighborhood Action Plan, which said "as West Central is a developed neighborhood, most infrastructure challenges relate to aging infrastructure and capacity issues. The City is working to address private common collector sewers and stormwater issues through annual budgeting and capital processes; however, funding continues to be a concern and a limitation." She understood the City had maintained over one million linear feet in storm drain system in 2012, and over half of it had exceeded its lifespan and much of it was beginning to fail causing sinkholes in streets and yards. She wondered how much of the one million linear feet of the system was within the downtown and north central area. She commented that they were within the most dense and smallest ward and wondered how much of the system in their area was failing. She further quoted the Action Plan as saying "The Capital Improvement Program (CIP) is the City's primary budget and scheduling tool for capital needs. The

CIP addresses needs ranging from the current year to ten plus years in the future. Since the CIP is not a fiscally constrained document, it is not uncommon for most of its listed projects to be unfunded with the exception of those scheduled for construction in the one- to two-year planning period...Many projects are planned for out years beyond the one to two-year timeframe. These projects are often unfunded or planned to be funded with anticipated future funding sources. These projects may be subject to reprioritization as funding becomes available. Overall, needs within the neighborhood are diverse and extensive and include projects of every type-streets and sidewalks, parks and greenspace, sewer and stormwater, and electric." She believed none of their requested improvements had been moved up after this document was approved by the Council, and thus far, the only one planned was the inadequate fix University of Missouri-Columbia students produced in 2019 that the Council was now considering. They had been tasked with mediating a serious problem in the West Ash watershed as excess stormwater caused problems within homes in their neighborhood and downstream across Broadway and into Stewart Park. She passed around a diagram that showed the increase in stormwater runoff due to increased impervious surfaces from development, parking, etc. since the neighborhood action plan had been approved and development had picked up. The plan the students had designed had acknowledged it would fail to address even the pre-development level of water. As a result, their problems would continue to worsen. Meanwhile, many stormwater and sewer projects south of Broadway and around the new student housing apartments had moved forward. She pointed out there would be more storms and the associated water that would come due to climate change. She asked the Council to address their issues with sewage, which was a serious health concern, correctly as she did not believe what was currently proposed was a fix. She noted she did not want to hear any complaints regarding money until a performance audit was completed. She invited the Council to begin to build trust with them by fixing the problem adequately and correctly.

Brian Page commented that he and Ms. Gardener were West Ash stormwater volunteers. They had formed the Gardener and Page stormwater solutions design group and were visiting their neighbors to help them determine how to deal with stormwater in a passive way, not a mechanical way. He stated the pipe was an ancient vitrified pipe that had failed, and noted there were numerous yards on the east side of Aldeah Avenue that had collapsed. The system provided collection for Alexander Avenue, Aldeah Avenue, and the duplexes on Ash Street. He provided a wall of water came their way, even with a 1-inch rain. He noted the original City of Columbia had been at the intersection of McBaine Avenue and Broadway, but the citizens had decided to move east to Flat Branch due to flooding. He understood in 2015, when Anderson Avenue had its streets redone, the private common collector for sewage had failed, and the City had chosen a contractor that had not known anything about residential work, which resulted in butchered yards. The contractors had been advised to leave flowers and other growth alone, but they had not complied. That type of disrespect was unwelcomed as the citizens expected contractors to treat them in a professional manner. He asked that the West Ash neighborhood not be disrespected. He pointed out they had welcomed Tom Wellman into the neighborhood as he was a good guy that was working on stormwater issues in the area. He reiterated residents should be treated with respect.

Ms. Fowler commented that she heard Mr. Page loud and clear with regard to how older neighborhoods in the central city area had been treated by contractors who failed to provide information and had behaved badly on their properties, and noted she would pay attention. She understood this fix was not very long in terms of its overall length, and asked if the fix was helpful to the overall plan even though it was limited. Mr. Page replied he thought the issue might be bigger than imagined with the cavities that had developed. He believed they would find numerous cavities, and it was a larger issue than fixing a little section of pipe or blowing in a plastic liner. He commented that they did not want the yards left with cavities when the yards were put back. They wanted everything

to be put back in a professional manner. Ms. Fowler understood Mr. Page wanted the cavities to be refilled. Mr. Page stated the equipment could fall into the cavities and noted he was not sure what they would find, but felt it would be extensive. He commented that they should be filled back properly to support the system as it would fail again with anything less. Ms. Fowler stated she understood.

Annette Triplett commented that she was the property owner of 114 Aldeah Avenue and referred to a diagram with a red and yellow line. She understood the red line depicted the portion of the pipe that would be dug up while the yellow line depicted the portion of the pipe that would be lined, and explained her property was at the intersection of the two. She stated she supported the project and noted she had found staff to be very helpful in providing information and responding to questions. She explained she had a private connection to the storm sewer pipe in her backyard so it was obvious where the pipe would go. She noted stormwater management was outside of her area of expertise, but while clearing brush along her fence lines, she had seen sinkholes very close to her property, which was very scary since she knew where the pipe was located. She stated the project was needed as the pipe was failing, and asked the Council to support the project.

Ms. Fowler understood they were discussing stormwater, but wondered about the sewer. She asked Ms. Triplett if her property was on a common collector to the sewer line. Ms. Triplett replied she did not know.

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

Mayor Treece asked if staff could respond to some of the questions and concerns raised. He wondered if they would have to dig up the pipe. Mr. Sorrell replied they would prefer to dig up only the portion depicted in red on the diagram since it was difficult to get the rehabilitation liner through the bends in the pipes. They planned to do the portion depicted in yellow via the rehabilitation method to minimize the disturbance to landscaping, etc. He stated they would fix any cavities they encountered along the way. He pointed out he did not believe Ms. Triplett's property was connected to a private common collector if he recalled correctly.

Ms. Peters asked what happened past the failed area and the yellow area they would reline. She wondered if staff had looked at the pipe further down. Mr. Sorrell replied the pipe further down was not in as much of a deteriorated condition at this time. It was not failing like this portion. Ms. Peters asked if it was newer. Mr. Sorrell replied no. He explained some portions of pipe just held up better for longer than others. He commented that they had video of pipe that was almost 100 years old that looked almost new and video of pipe that was almost 50 years old that was close to collapse. He thought much of it had to do with how it was bedded when it had been originally constructed.

Ms. Peters asked about the plans for the sewer lines in that area of town. Mr. Sorrell replied the majority of the previous private common collector on Aldeah Avenue had been replaced with the major stormwater project that had been done about 15 years ago. He noted there were some properties further to the south on Aldeah Avenue that he did not believe had submitted a petition for elimination of the private common collector. Ms. Peters asked if that meant it was in good shape. Mr. Sorrell replied no. He explained it only meant the property owners had not yet requested that they replace it as was the process for private common collectors.

Ms. Fowler asked if easements were needed from the property owners to trench the portion depicted in red and for any of the portion in yellow. Mr. Sorrell replied they needed easements to access the pipe and do the work. Ms. Fowler asked if the easements had already been obtained. Mr. Sorrell replied no. He explained that if the Council directed them to proceed with the project, they would develop the plans and then come back to Council for authority to acquire the easements. Ms. Fowler asked if the strategy for moving forward with the project was to obtain all of the easements for the project in total before starting. Mr. Sorrell replied yes. Ms. Fowler understood they

needed easements for the portion of Aldeah Avenue between Ash Street and Broadway. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct.

Ms. Fowler asked to be provided the address for the property where the common collector began for those houses on Aldeah Avenue. Mr. Sorrell replied he would provide a map that showed the location of it. Ms. Fowler stated she would appreciate it.

Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to proceed with the replacement and rehabilitation of a portion of the storm drainage pipe on Aldeah Avenue south of West Ash Street. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B184-20

Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with HDR Engineering, Inc. for the McBaine Water Treatment Plant Upgrades - Phase 1 project.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer asked how many proposals had been received. Mr. Sorrell replied four. Mr. Pitzer asked if they had all been responsive to the RFP or RFQ that had been put out. Mr. Sorrell replied all four had been interviewed. Mr. Pitzer asked if the scope of work had been the same for all of them. Mr. Sorrell replied each had provided a response to what was requested in the RFP, but each might have a different approach, different method of public outreach, etc. Each response was evaluated along with their background, ability to be available for public meetings, etc. The different portions were scored and the one with the highest total score was who they had begun negotiations with.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Sorrell if he recalled what had stood out about this particular proposal. Mr. Sorrell replied there had been several people on the committee who had each provided their own score. He had his own personal thoughts, and for this firm, he had liked their public outreach piece and the possibility of early bid packages. Mr. Pitzer asked for clarification regarding the early bid package. Mr. Sorrell replied it meant they might bid a portion of a project earlier if that part was completely designed so they could start the process earlier. He pointed out it was an option, and was not something they had to do. It would depend on whether it made sense as the project moved forward.

Mr. Pitzer asked who had been on the interview committee. Mr. Sorrell replied it had included him, the water engineering supervisor, the electric engineering supervisor, the water and electric engineering manager, the sewer and stormwater engineering manager, the water production superintendent, and the purchasing agent. Mr. Pitzer understood some interview committees had members from boards and commissions or outside members that had subject matter expertise, and asked if that had been considered. Mr. Sorrell replied no, and explained he had never been on an interview committee that had outside members. Mr. Pitzer noted the airport bid project a few months ago had involved a lot of external parties in review of the proposals. Mr. Sorrell stated this process had not involved external parties.

Mr. Pitzer asked for clarification regarding the change in the scope the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) had requested. Mr. Sorrell replied they had wanted to ensure that the temperature was accounted for in the model when the evaluation of the distribution system occurred for disinfection byproducts.

Mr. Pitzer asked about the schedule and time table expected from here. Mr. Sorrell suggested a representative of HDR respond.

Ryan Saffles of HDR Engineering explained he thought a year and one-half had been identified in the preliminary schedule. Once they received a notice to proceed, they would refine and potentially shorten the schedule.

Mr. Pitzer asked how long it took to get the executed contract in place. Mr. Sorrell

replied if approved tonight, the executed contract would typically show up on his desk within 2-3 days. They would then send an executed copy to HDR along with a notice to proceed to begin work.

Mr. Pitzer understood 18 months would take them into early 2022. Mr. Sorrell stated the end of the contract as currently written would be in February of 2022. This meant it would be designed, the bid documents would be prepared, and the project would be bid and awarded.

Mr. Pitzer commented that when the water bond had been approved a couple years ago, the proposal was that \$10 million would be spent on the upgrade construction process in fiscal year 2021, and asked if that would happen. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought they would be ready to bid the project by the end of fiscal year 2021. Mr. Pitzer asked how long construction would take. Mr. Saffles replied they had estimated two years conservatively. Mr. Pitzer understood the \$10 million for fiscal year 2021 and the \$10 million for fiscal year 2022 in the water bond would be pushed back. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. It would mostly be in fiscal year 2022 and they could have some in fiscal year 2023.

Mr. Pitzer understood \$3 million had been identified for storage in the southwest, and asked if any of that money had been spent. Mr. Sorrell replied a closed session had been proposed for the future to discuss property for that project.

Mr. Pitzer noted \$3 million had been identified for the West Ash upgrade project and asked about the status of it. Mr. Sorrell replied they would be taking an engineering services agreement to the WLAB next Wednesday for their review and recommendation along with one for the Southeast Booster Pump Station project. If they endorsed those, they would be introduced at the following council meeting.

Mr. Pitzer understood those three projects had been identified for spending in fiscal year 2019, and this \$20 million had been for fiscal years 2021 and 2022, and asked Mr. Sorrell how that influenced his recommendations on the water rate increases that were associated with the bond spending. Mr. Sorrell replied they would not have the \$20 million until they sold bonds in the future, and they did not anticipate selling those bonds until they needed the money to award a contract. He stated he could not provide a reason for all of the delays and pointed out he was trying to get the projects moving. He understood there would be discussion related to the water rate increase that had been proposed with the bonds that had already been sold. Mr. Pitzer noted the increase was three percent a year for three years. Mr. Sorrell stated they would need to look at the year-end financials before determining what they might do with the rates. He noted delaying the other portion of the bonds until they were needed made sense as there was not any reason to sell them today and pay interest on that money.

Mr. Pitzer understood aerators would be included in this and asked for clarification as to what would be included in this project. Mr. Sorrell replied they had moved the evaluation of aerator replacement to be included with the design of this project so they could obtain an aerator that best fit the upgrade to the plant instead of just replacing what was there. He explained they were in the process of getting the pipe fixed that went into it so that all four aerators could be used, and they would then replace them with the upgrades. This would help to ensure they would not have to relocate them or replace them again due to this project. Mr. Pitzer asked if this contract would evaluate what was needed or if it would actually do it. Mr. Sorrell replied it would evaluate it and do it.

Mr. Pitzer referred to the scope of services and understood it indicated an anticipated pilot testing duration of six months with scenarios of post-filtration GAC, ozone/biofiltration, and filter column testing, and asked how those items had been selected. Mr. Carrico replied those were essentially the outcomes of the Drinking Water Planning Work Group. They had been the highest ranking alternatives. He commented that they had an additional allowance to evaluate some other technologies if those did not prove to be as viable as they thought although they were confident in those technologies.

Mr. Pitzer understood one of the earlier tasks was to establish the draft water quality

goals, and wondered what would happen if the water quality goals required different testing or different mechanisms. Mr. Carrico explained there was an allowance for supplemental services as a part of this contract to evaluate other technologies should they be needed. He stated the biggest part of the water quality goals was to thoroughly evaluate the technologies along with the cost-benefit thereof so they could let the customers know the cost. These things were not currently regulated, but they knew one day they likely would be so they wanted to be proactive. He noted they were designing upgrades to a plant that would be in place for several decades and wanted to be prepared when it was required or when the customers asked for it. The purpose of that exercise was to further refine what they had already established through the Planning Work Group and various other studies and have a hard costs associated with those technologies for the Council and customers to review to determine what they might want.

Mr. Pitzer asked when the studying of the water quality goals would happen in this 18-month process. Mr. Carrico replied it would be a very concurrent process, and asked the HDR representative to respond in more detail.

Jessica Adams-Weber of HDR Engineering stated they would evaluate the water quality goals at the initiation of the project. The goal was to start off with the initial design, but also engage in the alternative three at the very beginning so they could align it with public engagement.

Mr. Pitzer asked how the Council would be aware of what was happening in this process. He wondered when they would hear from staff again in this regard. Mr. Sorrell replied there would be a webpage devoted to this project to show how it was progressing. In addition, there would be some social media campaigns to keep people informed. They would also have more than an interested parties meeting as they would have several workshops with the public. He commented that he would be happy to provide a report on any frequency the Council wanted. Mr. Pitzer asked if staff would be reporting back to the WLAB regularly. Mr. Sorrell replied yes. He noted the WLAB would receive an update every month, and stated he could put that same report on future council meeting agendas. He commented that the goal was to keep the entire community informed along with garnering participation as it was important.

Mayor Treece commented that safe, clean, and affordable drinking water had to be one of the top priorities of city government, and they were now at about two years from the date voters approved a bond issue to repair and renovate the water treatment plant. He asked Mr. Sorrell to walk them through the last 24 months in terms of what had been done to date to bring them to this RFP process. Mr. Sorrell replied he did not know how this project had not been let prior to when it had. The RFP was put on the street the week before he taken the position as the Director of the Utilities Department or the day he was hired, and he was not sure why it had stagnated between then and now. He assured them it would keep moving now.

Mayor Treece understood this was a 550 day contract, which put them around December 31, 2022. Mr. Sorrell stated it would put them toward the end of February of 2022 as it was 550 calendar days, not working days. He thought it would be about a year for the design, which would put them into next September, and they would then put the contract documents together, bid it, and award it. He pointed out they needed a permit prior to bidding and this would provide a couple months for any issues in that regard. If they did not have a permit, it could result in a massive change order. As a result, he felt this time line was fairly reasonable.

Mayor Treece understood one of the first actions of HDR would be to create a specific project schedule, and asked if that project schedule with firm deadlines could be shared with the Council and if they could be provided with regular updates to show they were either meeting or exceeding those deadlines. Mr. Sorrell replied they could do that, and noted they could also place that information on the website. Mayor Treece noted this would allow them to see specific project activities with a deadline for each activity.

Mayor Treece commented that there had been a lot of studies in the past and asked how

the Council would know that work was not being recreated. He asked about the responsibility of HDR to review and incorporate those studies in their recommendations and design plans. Mr. Sorrell replied the intent was not to re-perform that work, and asked the HDR representative to comment. Mr. Saffles stated they had spent some extensive time during the proposal development in reviewing prior studies. He explained those were essentially a baseline for them. As those had built upon each other in the past, they built upon those. A part of the early kick-off for this project would be workshops with City staff to further evaluate what minor improvements had been conducted since those studies were completed, how things were operating today relative to how they were operating when the studies were completed, and ultimately compile a set of recommendations for the construction projects to develop a design based on those refined recommendations. They would not rework the studies. They would expand on them or update them with additional detail for the purpose of building construction documents that could be competitively bid.

Mayor Treece asked for clarification regarding the alternative treatment analysis deliverable in the proposal. Mr. Saffles replied it would basically be a report. Building on prior work, they would provide an enhanced water quality analysis. He explained they would conduct some bench scale testing to develop or refine an approach to the pilot testing, conduct the pilot testing, which would be small in scale, evaluate and validate the level of treatment they could achieve with the different technologies for the capacities of the plant, determine what the technologies would cost to purchase and install along with lifecycle costs, and ultimately select the best treatment alternative for water quality.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Saffles for his philosophy on how he would position the plant as they began to re-engineer it to its original capacity without taking the plant down and while continuing to maintain safe, clean, and affordable water throughout the process. Mr. Saffles replied there were two phases they had envisioned to initiate the project. One was to evaluate the existing facility to determine comprehensively where the hydraulic chokes were located and outline a very strategic replacement plan to implement. He noted they would try to take facilities offline with consideration to demand and the season of the year so they could maintain capacity to meet demand. He stated they would systematically improve pieces of the puzzle to improve the water quality and restore the 32 million gallons per day capacity. Parallel with that was the alternative analysis that further evaluated the enhanced treatment alternative that might or might not be able to be implemented as part of the initial project and some of which or all of which that might be deferred to a future project.

Mayor Treece asked if there was a scenario whereby they might develop a completely separate process train, maybe even as a pilot, or evaluate some of those alternative treatment methods while they were taking down the original plant to restore its original capacity. Mr. Saffles replied that got to the potential, different bid packages discussed. He thought they had kind of honed in on an approach that would evaluate improvements to the existing facility while they were analyzing alternative technologies and would ultimately merge the two toward the later or mid-part of the design to refine an approach that maximized the budget during this initial project, while also planning for future improvements that might provide enhanced treatment or enhanced water quality maximizing the budget, the capacity, and water quality now and in a next phase. They wanted to ensure they were not designing things now that would be stranded in lost investment during the next phase.

Mayor Treece asked for clarification if Council approved this tonight. Mr. Sorrell replied he would receive the signed contract from Mr. Glascock within 2-3 days. Mayor Treece asked Mr. Sorrell when he would expect to deliver a project schedule to Council. Mr. Sorrell replied it would be two weeks after the consultant was provided a notice to proceed. He stated he should be able to provide a notice to proceed to them next week, and the City would receive the project schedule two weeks after that. Mayor Treece understood they would have it by the end of the month. Mr. Sorrell stated that was

correct.

Mayor Treece commented that he felt this was important, not only because it was the right thing to do and a priority in being good stewards of taxpayer money, but also because they had to guarantee the water they were providing was safe and affordable. He noted in Flint, Michigan, last week, a judge had approved a lawsuit against the public officials individually that had created the problem there. As a result, he would do everything he could to be responsible, which included asking questions in terms of whether they were doing everything as a city to ensure the water they provided was safe. Mr. Sorrell stated he understood.

Mr. Skala noted he had served on the Drinking Water Planning Work Group, which had provided recommendations based on priorities and contingencies for water quality, and could vouch for Carollo Engineers in terms of their education and assistance in that work. He believed that had provided a basis for HDR Engineering. He stated he had great confidence in how they had gotten here with respect to the recommendations provided in terms of an approach that educated them based on what was possible, anticipated for the future, etc. He reiterated it had been organized in terms of priorities and contingencies if the priorities proved to be too expensive or unworkable. He suspected that basis would provide a pretty good foundation for where they were going. He agreed there should be concern about how long it was taking, but pointed out it involved a large amount of taxpayer money, which he felt should be dealt with responsibly.

Mayor Treece stated written comment had been received by John Conway, which he had passed on to staff for a response. He noted it had to do with the length of the contract, the contract amount, the contingency allowance, the contract documents requiring local subcontractors, the manpower takeoff for the fee, the lack of a project schedule, a review of the procurement process, and the fact it had included aerators. The comment was filed with this agenda item.

Julie Ryan, 5031 Regal Way, explained she was with the COMO Safe Water Coalition and noted some of what she had intended to say had already been said. The bond issue had been voted on two years ago, and they were still revisiting it. She commented that while they believed HDR had an excellent reputation and commitment to this project, the evaluation of the proposals without outside input left them in a position of not understanding or knowing what other consultants had proposed so they were left to comment solely on this proposal. To reiterate past statements, they were supportive of building a new treatment train that accounted for the average daily flow of the plant. With new process units, there would be more freedom to implement advance treatment technologies without regard for the existing footprint. As the need arose to expand, the existing process units could be rehabilitated to meet increasing demand and be done with a new treatment train in place and no needed processes taken offline to complete work. She stated a significant portion of ratepayer and voter approved funding was being used to bring the plant back to its rated capacity with the current approach. It was not the fault of ratepayers that the plant was allowed to fall into such disrepair that it could no longer operate at the maximum rate of capacity for which it was built. Bringing the plant back to that capacity, while necessary, took funding away from advanced treatment technologies that would provide a higher quality drinking water for Columbia citizens. As this approach was undertaken, she implored staff and HDR to provide a contingency plan, including a funding mechanism for any failures that occurred from process units as repairs were made to the existing plant. Warnings were given in the Black and Veatch condition assessment for these risks as it had indicated public health could be jeopardized if the plant and its ability to produce drinking water were compromised in the process. She explained they were concerned about the Phase 1 and Phase 2 decision making processes. They wondered if decisions incurring considerable costs would be made in Phase 1 that were then reversed in Phase 2, if the ammonia feed would be repaired in Phase 1 when they were striving to remove chloramine disinfection, and if the new filter beds would be filled with anthracite because the footprint did not allow beds that

would give them the opportunity to use GAC, an advanced treatment technology. She believed it would show a lack of stewardship of funding if decisions were made in Phase 1 that did not help achieve the goals the City had for the water treatment plant. She noted the Drinking Water Planning Work Group had endorsed a return to free-chlorine disinfection, process units that treated water to meet the groundwater under direct influence characteristics, and consideration of advance treatment technologies that would assist in removal of contaminants of emerging concern. The recommendations had already been given and should be incorporated into the vision of what decisions were made. She stated they advocated for transparent water quality goals and timelines for the community, and felt too many consultant studies had been shelved after tremendous costs with zero implementation. As a result, they were asking the Council to ensure this did not happen again. She believed it was critical that HDR utilized data and information that had been incorporated in the reports as much as possible as those studies had been funded by ratepayers with zero water quality improvements to show for it. She noted they also believed the prior reports provided sufficient warnings and guidance for future decisions. If they had learned anything from the current pandemic, it was that public health was critical to the stability and economy of the community. She stated this was not the time for shortcuts. It was time for prudent use of resources with an eye for protecting their most vulnerable citizens. She commented that the COMO Safe Water Coalition hoped to have input throughout the process, and while they might not have the same expertise as the consultants and staff members, they had four years invested in improving water quality for Columbia, which included many hours of talking to experts and reading studies. She pointed out the COMO Safe Water Coalition had been started to help families that could not afford to buy filtered water, but wanted better water quality. Over ten years ago, Columbia had been given the recommendation to make chloramine a temporary fix. She believed the time to be visionary and proactive was now.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Ryan if she had any suggestions on ways to improve communication, and whether she was comfortable with their idea of a project schedule and timelines that were made public for accountability. Ms. Ryan replied she felt the accountability piece was what they had been lacking, and noted her appreciation for the questions of why this had taken two years too long. She pointed out the City of Hannibal had removed chloramine on a ballot, and they had a brand new GAC treatment plant in operation right now. She stated it was hard for her to see that since that had not occurred in Columbia. She felt any piece of accountability and transparency would help to show them they were being good stewards of the rates being paid and that they would not continue to allow the plant to fall into disrepair. As a result, any dashboard with timelines and transparency would be desired.

B184-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. 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.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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.
- R92-20 Setting a public hearing: setting property tax rates for 2020 for the City of Columbia.
- R93-20 Setting a public hearing: FY 2021 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
- R94-20 Authorizing a partnership agreement with Columbia College to provide City employees with certain benefits associated with advanced educational opportunities.
- R95-20 Authorizing an artist's commission agreement with Roy F. Fox for Traffic Signal Cabinet Art to be located at the corner of Eighth Street and Ash Street.
- R96-20 Authorizing various Adopt a Spot agreements.
- R97-20 Consenting to the issuance of a state license for the sale of intoxicating liquor to Sagua La Grande Cuban Café, LLC located at 114 S. Ninth Street.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSENT: FOWLER (Ms. Fowler stepped out during the vote of these items). Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

- R98-20 Authorizing the public sale of Special Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2020B.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.
Mr. Lue provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer asked how many bonds would be refunded with this. Mr. Lue replied three. Mr. Pitzer understood they would be rolled into one. Mr. Lue stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer asked if there was a way they could see what had been refinanced, what the savings were, etc. for all of the bonds over the last few years. He noted refinancing had been done a few times in the past, and he did not have a holistic picture on what they were actually saving through these refinancings. In terms of process, he felt it might be helpful to have some understanding of what might be coming. He suggested a report be provided once a year indicating what they were doing or thinking about doing so they knew what was happening. He felt that was something they should know. Mr. Lue understood, and pointed out a sewer bond refunding would be coming forward next month.

Mayor Treece asked how much was paid in fees when refinancing a bond. Mr. Lue replied that had not been set yet. It would be known when it was put to the market. Mayor Treece asked if the bond counsel did the work for free. Mr. Lue replied no, and explained that cost was usually built into the issuance cost. Depending on how it was put together, the City could issue a check for it or it could come out of the actual funding.

Mr. Skala stated he liked saving money. Mayor Treece agreed, especially if it avoided a future rate increase.

Mayor Treece asked how the savings was reflected in terms of the need for future rate increases or in terms of what the Council had projected when the original rate increase had passed. Mr. Lue replied that was something they could look at going forward. He explained they would present the savings. He stated he would not recommend decreasing the rates, but thought it might allow them to reduce the amount of an increase in later years.

The vote on R98-20 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B194-20 Calling a special election on November 3, 2020 to consider an ordinance authorizing the use of automated residential refuse and recycling collection, including the use of residential roll carts.
- B195-20 Authorizing the issuance of Special Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2020B.
- B196-20 Approving the Final Plat of "McKee Place, Plat No. 1" located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Clark Lane and McKee Street; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 112-2020).
- B197-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Boone Prairie Village, Plat No. 1" located on the east side of Brown Station Road and south of U.S. Highway 63; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 110-2020).
- B198-20 Vacating a utility easement located on the north side of Switzler Street and approximately 100 feet west of Providence Road (201 Switzler Street) (Case No. 134-2020).
- B199-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating architectural salvage sale revenue funds to the New Century Fund to be used for investment purposes and as a future revolving loan fund for private historic preservation activities.

- B200-20 Authorizing an agreement for the transfer of real estate and homeownership assistance neighborhood development funding with Columbia Community Land Trust, Inc. for the Cullimore Cottages project located on the west side of Eighth Street and north of Fairview Avenue.
- B201-20 Authorizing an intergovernmental cooperation agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for integrated shuttle bus service on campus.
- B202-20 Authorizing a refund agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri due to the partial suspension of the integrated shuttle bus service (Tiger Line) on campus related to the COVID-19 pandemic.
- B203-20 Authorizing a joint funding agreement with the U.S. Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior for operation and maintenance of a streamgage on Hinkson Creek to provide historical stream flow data and flood stage information.
- B204-20 Authorizing an agreement for CARES (Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security Act) funding with Boone County, Missouri to hire temporary staff in the Department of Public Health and Human Services to assist with disease investigations, contact tracing, communicable disease investigation, data entry and analysis, and community health education; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B205-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating park sales tax funds and donated funds for various Parks and Recreation Department projects.
- B206-20 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for public health emergency preparedness services.
- B207-20 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code relating to conflicts of interest and financial disclosure procedures.
- B208-20 Authorizing a subrecipient monitoring agreement with Boone County, Missouri relating to acceptance of the FY 2019 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program Award to purchase equipment for the Police Department; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B209-20 Setting property tax rates for 2020.
- B210-20 Adopting the FY 2021 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
- B211-20 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to eliminate transportation fares in FY 2021 for users of the GoCOMO Public Transit System.
- B212-20 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to eliminate the requirement of the City to provide bags for curbside collection of residential refuse and recycling and to eliminate residential curbside recycling collection.

X. REPORTS

- REP40-20 Boone County CARES Act Funding and Potential Business Assistance Request.
- Mr. Cole provided a staff report.

Ms. Fowler asked if the City was foreclosed from asking for funds through the County to meet their needs regarding the unsheltered homeless. Mr. Cole replied he thought there were a variety of needs for which they could ask for funding through the County, and listed homelessness, rent assistance, utility assistance, etc. He explained his approach with this report was to look at his own internal operations. He noted they already operated a rehabilitation program, a downpayment assistance program, and small business loan programs, and felt it would be a good fit to provide services based on their existing infrastructure. It would also assist in not duplicating or crossing wires with someone that might be applying for funds for homelessness efforts, rent assistance, etc.

Ms. Fowler asked about the timeline if the City wanted to ask for money from the County to help meet some unsheltered homeless needs. Mr. Cole replied he understood entities were approaching the County now, so that could be done. He also understood there was a potential that the County would release an RFP in August, but he was not aware of specific dates.

Ms. Fowler commented that a portion of time would be designated for discussion regarding the unsheltered homeless at the August 13 budget work session, and asked if they would miss the County deadline if they mobilized into action after that date. Mr. Cole replied he was not certain, but did not feel it sounded as though the deadline would be before August 13. He thought it would be later in August, but reiterated he was not certain.

Mayor Treece commented that if Mr. Cole was looking for Council direction as to whether to submit a request to the County, he thought the Council needed to have more discussion. He felt there needed to be a global settlement of all issues with the County with respect to the CARES Act funding. They had just cracked the door tonight with money for contact tracing for the City/County Health Department, which was clearly a joint venture that had been managed effectively between the City and County over the last 50 years. He stated he was not comfortable with Mr. Cole asking for money for small business expenses as legitimate as it was because the CDBG requirements for that expenditure were much different than the federal CARES Act funding requirements. The CARES Act money had to be tied to a COVID related expense, such as PPEs for employees, masks for customers, or business interruption if it could be documented. He noted it was a much different process. He reiterated the Council likely needed to have a conversation, and pointed out the Council had sent a letter to the County Commission in June asking them to consider a prorated per capita distribution of that money like many other first class counties had done, and they had not received a response. He understood the County was setting up an elaborate website and dashboard similar to what the City had done two months ago. He thought they needed to have a conversation about the priorities of Council for COVID related expenses in the City of Columbia that had been incurred and would continue to be incurred through the end of the year. He felt they needed to address their issues first before helping others with their issues.

Mr. Cole stated he had not intended to circumvent that process or any discussion with this proposal. This report had only transmitted the needs they saw and had included the suggestion of obtaining funds for those needs.

Mayor Treece noted there were a lot of needs, and stated he was glad the City Manager was able to reach an agreement on contact tracing. He felt that was one of the most effective things they could do to help curb the spread. He believed they needed to look at other initiatives like that and the expenses they had already incurred.

Mr. Skala asked if renewing the request with the County would be a part of the discussion at the August 13 work session. Mayor Treece replied the City and County were on different fiscal years, and the Council needed to make appropriations decisions by October. It would be helpful to have some sort of representation as to what type of funding would be distributed. He commented that he was not sure the County would be ready to distribute funds until the end of September, and if they had to be spent for expenses incurred by December 31, it did not provide a lot of time to spend a lot of

money that should have been distributed in June.

Mr. Pitzer agreed it had taken too long, but wondered what else they could do. He stated he was open to doing something, but he was not sure what that might be.

Ms. Peters agreed a more global conversation was needed and asked when they might want to do that. Mayor Treece replied he thought they would have a better sense on August 13 as to the expenses that had been incurred, what they expected to continue to incur, etc. He commented that 85 percent of the population of Boone County resided within the City of Columbia, and the City had been bearing the brunt in terms of essential support functions. He stated he did not want to undermine the very real expenses of the community, small business owners, and individual and families, and understood they had been using CDBG funds to address some of those unmet needs, but pointed out the City had suspended parking enforcement, utility disconnects, etc., which were items in support of them. He believed the City needed to do what was necessary to begin to recover and consider ongoing expenses related to this pandemic so they could budget appropriately.

Ms. Peters asked if they had time for this discussion on August 13. She noted this did not sound like a short discussion. Mr. Glascock understood the Council wanted an update on COVID and the associated expenses. He noted they could also talk about Mr. Cole's proposal or any other proposal the Council might want to submit when the County portal opened.

Mr. Skala wondered if that might be a propitious time to renew the request via a letter from Mayor Treece or the body as a whole as it was something tangible they could direct to the County Commission.

Mr. Glascock asked if they had a preference on when they wanted to have this discussion, and if not, he would suggest they start with it. Mayor Treece stated he was agreeable. He thought it would be helpful to have a look back on what they had spent and what they might need to spend moving forward.

Mr. Glascock asked if the discussion on the unsheltered homeless should be then or afterward. Ms. Fowler replied she believed the circumstances of unsheltered homeless had intensified in the First Ward due to COVID. She was not sure of the right timing and would rely upon the guidance of the Council, but pointed out she did not want to miss out on the opportunity to talk about this because there was clearly an intensity of circumstances as a result of COVID as there were additional people suffering. Mr. Trapp stated he felt the two were related. He understood there had been an RFP with regard to isolation and quarantine facilities for the homeless, but was unaware as to whether anyone submitted a proposal or if any proposal had been accepted. He pointed out he had heard there were now cases within the homeless community, and as a result, it was no longer a hypothetical.

REP41-20 Update regarding City Representatives to the Board of Equalization.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Pitzer if he was willing to continue serving on the Board of Equalization. Mr. Pitzer replied yes. He explained they were in the middle of it for this year, and it usually wrapped up by the end of September.

Mayor Treece asked if Council direction was needed. Mr. Glascock replied no, and explained they would continue moving forward with the current representatives and would bring it back for discussion in January so it could be addressed on a yearly basis.

Mayor Treece asked about the process. Mr. Pitzer replied it was good, and noted he thought it was good to have representation from the City as about 85 percent of the cases were likely within the City. He pointed out all three of the County Commissioners were on the Board so having one City elected official helped along with the appointee from the Finance Department. Mayor Treece asked how many cases were involved and for the percentage that were upheld on appeal. Mr. Pitzer replied 95 percent were likely upheld on appeal.

Mayor Treece thanked Mr. Pitzer for serving on that Board.

REP42-20 Amendment to the FY 2020 Annual Budget - Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Mayor Treece noted written comments had been received and listed those.

Phillip Rhode stated his support for the roll cart initiative, especially in light of recent storms that had blown and washed trash up and down the streets and lawns.

Christine Barrett indicated she resided in Ward 6 and would be in favor of roll carts for trash collection.

Leigh Lockhart noted she was in support of putting the issue of roll carts on the November ballot.

N. Worley was in favor of roll carts and asked that ordinances prohibiting it be repealed.

Connie and Michelle Carmichael stated their support for roll carts.

Reng Winters asked the Council to once again decline blue roll-around trash carts as the City had voted to not use them in the past.

Christopher Lee stated his support for roll carts.

Tiffany Horton indicated support for the roll cart initiative.

Jimmy Hart stated he believed it was a good idea to have a roll cart system. Mr. Pitzer understood Mr. Hart was a solid waste driver. Mayor Treece stated he was a refuse collector.

Marsha MacIntire applauded the mandate to wear masks, but suggested changes as a majority of those walking downtown were not wearing masks, and since those eating outside were not required to wear one, it posed a threat to those walking by.

Dusty Vines-Mudd voiced his support to add the rescission of prohibiting roll carts to the November 2020 ballot.

Kathleen Matecki asked about the plan in terms of enforcement at overcrowded bars and fraternity parties when the students returned as they tended to not socially distance or wear a mask.

Sarah Younger expressed her support for roll carts. She did not feel there was any excuse to not modernize the refuse collection system.

These written comments were filled with items associated with this meeting.

Kristin Hill provided a handout and explained she was with the Columbia Missouri Citizens for Roll Carts. She noted exposed bags of trash were apt to be rummaged through by local wildlife and insects which then resulted in trash being disbursed all over neighborhoods. In 2019, the Office of Neighborhood Services had reported 354 solid waste issues, many involving loose and scattered trash from torn bags or bags that were not picked up by the refuse collectors, and that trash could be left for hours or even days before it was hopefully picked up and bagged again. She displayed a picture of her trash about 20 minutes prior to pick up and pointed out the crows sitting on the roof of her neighbor's home waiting for the trash to be placed there.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Hill if she utilized the black trash bags the City provided. Ms. Hill replied they tended to save them for the bigger items, and pointed out the crows were still able rip those open.

Ms. Hill noted the trash made its way into the creeks, streams, storm drains, waterways, etc. She thought they all understood the detriment caused to wildlife by human trash so she would not get into those details. She commented that much of what she had heard from the opposition was that people just needed to be more responsible by not putting their trash out the night before or allowing it to sit all day waiting for the trash truck. She pointed out that many residents did not have another choice due to work or other essential tasks. She stated she had heard the opposition indicate that people needed to be more responsible and immediately pick up scattered trash, and felt that was

impractical at times. Practically speaking, it was most beneficial to utilize roll carts as it would drastically reduce the amount of trash readily available for wildlife and insects to feast upon since it was very difficult for them to get into the carts if they could even smell the trash. She commented that she would rather have that bin than what she had in her garage now in terms of the smell. She understood the goal, environmentally, was to reduce the amount of trash within the current system, and felt that if they had the chance to change that, they should do so. She believed they owed it to themselves and the planet to take the opportunity to "roll" with it. She noted the City's website had a section dedicated to its Columbia Litter Cleanup Team since it was such a huge problem with which they needed help. She understood that in 2019, the Columbia Litter Cleanup Team had totaled 580.75 volunteer hours and had removed 412 bags of trash from just their neighborhood area operations. She pointed out the Missouri Department of Conservation Stream Team Coordination indicated that within the past five years, the teams had collected 121.5 tons of trash from non-site activities in Boone County alone, meaning local streams and neighborhood collections. Of the 121.5 tons, Columbia's own volunteer group, the City of Columbia Crawdads had collected 108.5 tons. In 2019 alone, the Crawdads had collected 44.74 tons on non-site activities. She did not feel there was a need to take this to a vote as those that were opposed had been given the opportunity to show the current system was the safest for employees, the environment, and their money, and had failed. She believed their time for say in the matter was done. She felt it was time to make a move for the greater good and to begin the more beneficial system as soon as possible. For the betterment of the City, employees, residents, and environment, she implored the Council to skip the vote and to instead rescind the ordinance prohibiting roll carts. She commented that sometimes stepping back from what was comfortable was the only way to move forward to success.

Dani Perez stated she had only resided in Columbia for five years, but had been surprised the City did not utilize roll carts for trash collection, especially since Columbia was known to be progressive. She commented that she had seen a lot of trash in her five years here, and felt a lot of it had to do with the fact Columbia was a college town. She referenced move-in day and noted trash was everywhere. She thought it might be time to try the roll cart system. It was likely the safer solution due to COVID. She commented that she was tired of them saying they were progressive when they were still dealing with trash, and hoped the Council would do something to address the issues.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, thanked the Council for discussing homelessness. He noted the homeless were overwhelming Car Camp. If there was constant turnover at facilities, the chances were greatly increasing for total strangers to come together exposing them to COVID.

Mr. Elkin commented that he hoped they would continue to use their blue and black bags. He understood the safety concerns with black bags, and wondered if they should hire a safety official to help the solid waste workers warm up before starting the day.

Mr. Elkin stated he had the opportunity to meet a veteran recently that was only one of 62 agent-orange exposed persons at Pearl Harbor, and noted the government would not recognize him a for settlement.

Grady Harrington commented that he was present to continue his discussion from earlier in the evening. He commended the City Manager for proposing an increase to the Health and Human Services Department by over \$300,000. He also thought it was great that they would develop collaboration between public safety and mental health professionals, but the proposed \$600,000 budget was not enough. If the City could set aside over \$9 million for a new police building and \$2 million for a new park, an idea that would save lives and confirm the City's stated vision of being the best place for everyone, and not just neurotypical and white people, should receive more funding. He understood the parking

and traffic enforcement budget was being deleted from the transportation division and that the CPD would take over parking enforcement with the money for the change coming from the City's parking fund. While the budget indicated this was meant to bring about increased community policing, it ultimately added another unnecessary responsibility to the CPD. Setting aside the idea of building a positive relationship with someone while writing them parking ticket, some of the fundamental problems with policing they saw stemmed from too much being asked of police officers that were paid far too little. Forcing officers to be the sole City employees responsible for writing parking tickets along with everything else expected would only compound the issue. He commented that most of them, whether a member of the People's Defense, the Council, the police, or a concerned citizen, likely had the same goal in mind as they all wanted to establish and maintain a community where everyone felt safe and could thrive. While their philosophies and backgrounds varied, they could not forget they were all working toward the same goal. He believed they all needed to maintain a dialogue and work together, even if the ideas seemed too radical or politically impossible. He stated the People's Defense would continue to take their message throughout the community with daily direct actions, speaking at council meetings, and continuing to hope the City would work with them.

Mr. Thomas commented that he would be absent from the August 17, 2020 Council Meeting, which meant he would not be able to vote on the proposal to place on the ballot a reversal of a prior action. He stated he strongly supported putting that question on the ballot in November. He thought they all agreed that they wanted to get to automated trash collection, including roll carts, as it was the only way to address the worker safety issue they had. He noted they had heard from one of those workers today. He explained there were other benefits to making the transition. In terms of whether this was disrespectful to the voters that had worked hard to develop the petition 4-5 years ago and who had voted in favor of it, he pointed out that was a long time for public opinion to change. He believed it was reasonable to ask the voters again. If public opinion had not changed, they would see that in the vote, but he really believed it had. The vast majority of the input he had received seemed to be in favor of moving toward automated trash collection. He noted he did not believe they should move toward automated trash collection with roll carts without going back to the voters again, but he thought they should go back to the voters as quickly as possible. He commented that he had heard from a 93 year old constituent on Sunday night that had indicated that if the City instituted a program by which older people and those with disabilities could sign up to receive assistance from a City worker in terms of rolling the cart to the curb and back, she would be supportive, and noted she felt a lot of older people felt similarly. Mr. Thomas pointed out they would likely do that because they already did it with the bag collection system. He did not feel they had communicated the issue well previously and he believed public opinion had changed. As a result, he suggested they put it on the ballot in November, and hoped they would find four votes amongst themselves to do so at the August 17, 2020 Council Meeting.

Mr. Thomas stated he would be in town on August 13, but would much prefer to attend the budget work session by home from Zoom. He explained he would be traveling with an elderly relative and wanted to isolate prior to making the trip. He noted he had spoken with Mr. Glascock who had indicated there was not a problem from a technology point of view for him to attend the August 13 budget work session from home. He asked if the Council had any concerns about that.

Mr. Skala commented that he felt only the person participating by Zoom was impacted as it was more difficult to seek recognition and really become a part of the conversation, and believed it was perfectly legitimate in terms of quarantining and other prophylactic measures.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Thomas if he would also be gone when the Council voted on the

budget. Mr. Thomas replied no. He stated he would be present for both meetings in September. He was only missing the August 17, 2020 Council Meeting. Mayor Treece stated he was not sure it was a good precedent to set because he and those in attendance, to a lesser extent, were at a disadvantage when interacting and inquiring of staff. He was not sure how Mr. Thomas quarantining was any different than someone not being able to attend due to a conflict or being sick. He felt it was a slippery slope.

Mr. Pitzer understood they would not be taking any action at the August 13 budget work session. Mayor Treece agreed. Mr. Pitzer noted that was a difference. Mr. Thomas pointed out they had taken votes by Zoom for a couple of months. Mr. Skala agreed they had, but noted he did not like that idea as it had been an exigency. Mr. Thomas stated there was a chance they would have to go back to that depending on what happened with the spread of the virus over the next few months.

Mr. Thomas commented that he did not hear strong opposition to him participating in the budget work session by Zoom.

Mr. Trapp stated he was supportive as it had been done in the past, and any one of them could have to quarantine or isolate while being well enough to participate remotely. He noted they had already set that precedent, and this was not any different than what they had done in the spring when several of them had participated via Zoom. He pointed out he preferred the in-person experience, but if he had to quarantine at home, he would much rather participate via Zoom than forgo his responsibilities to represent his constituents. He thought they should acknowledge and allow for any safety concerns.

Mr. Thomas understood there were 20-30 new cases per day, and there had been 60 new cases on Saturday. He thought the numbers were likely to get a lot higher when 30,000 students arrived and when the Columbia Public Schools began their school year. He felt benchmarks were needed for a rise in cases or a sustained rise in cases day-by-day that triggered additional measures to reduce the amount of spread. He pointed out they had done it brilliantly for six weeks in April and May, but sadly, they had let it get away, as had occurred everywhere in the country. He commented that they knew they could do it. He stated he did not believe they needed to go back to the level of lockdown they had gone to in April and May, but thought they needed to have a discussion about the options they would take. It was hard to tell if the mask ordinance was having an impact. He assumed it was, but believed more would likely be needed when the students returned. He suggested returning restaurants and bars to outdoor service only and curbside pick-up and delivery and closing gyms. He reiterated he believed triggers should be developed. Otherwise, they were only stumbling forward without really doing anything, and that would likely allow things to get much worse. He proposed a plan with triggers for increasing and reducing restrictions.

Mayor Treece commented that the discussion was happening. He noted he had participated in a phone call on Friday with representatives of the University, Columbia Public Schools, and Moberly Area Community College along with the City Manager and the Director of Public Health. He pointed out there had been benchmarks with respect to hospital capacity, the availability of PPEs, the ability to contact trace, etc., and with tonight's action, the Department of Public Health and Human Services would be able to get back on top of its contact tracing ability. He stated cases would rise, and they needed to determine if they were manageable. If they were manageable, he thought they should continue with the holding pattern they were on. At the same time, he thought they should look at the definition of hot spot, which involved 100 cases per 100,000 per day. For Columbia, that meant 108-124 cases per day, and at that point, he felt they needed to communicate with the guidance of their public health professionals as to what would happen to include consequences. He commented that he also believed they needed to consider tertiary impacts, such as what would happen if Columbia Public Schools was unable to have in-person classes as businesses would have problems with employees showing up for work since they needed to be home watching their elementary

and secondary aged students. Childcare would be impacted by the crunch. If they closed bars and restaurants, it would force employees to be home without employment for 14 days or more. He thought they needed to be clear and with the backdrop and support of the higher education and public school communities. He asked Mr. Thomas for his patience as he believed that was where they were headed.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked the benchmarks of one case per thousand per day as that was a quantitative and transparent benchmark. He understood they had benchmarks previously, but they had been vague as the Director of Public Health had indicated they were looking at hospital capacity, contract tracing capacity, etc., but it had not been clear. He thought it would be much better to be transparent and clear as to the triggers and a checklist of potential things. He agreed with Mayor Treece in that they had to plan for the hardship that any restrictions would create.

Mayor Treece noted he had phone call with 38 downtown bars, restaurants, and student apartments about two weeks ago with the help of the University of Missouri, the Chamber of Commerce, and others, and the message was clear that they could have one good back to school bash causing a spike in cases and resulting in closures. He felt if the University closed in October, it would likely not open back up in the spring. They could instead have a managed new normal environment where they respected the mask ordinance, took care of their employees, did voluntary contact tracing, etc. He noted they needed buy-in from the entire community. He commented that the stay at home order had been designed to flatten the curve and to give the Department of Public Health and Human Services and the hospitals the time to prepare, which he believed had been worthwhile and essential. He was not sure they could go back there, which meant they had to do other things like the mask ordinance, improving their social distancing, continuing to monitor the situation, etc. He agreed the public needed to know the numbers they were looking at to maintain the current path along with the triggers that generated additional consequences and impacts to the community.

Ms. Peters wondered if they might be able to receive a public health report in two weeks. Mayor Treece agreed that would be beneficial. He noted he was concerned about some of the changes in protocols in contact tracing in terms of what was defined as an exposure. He thought the keys were increased testing, improved contact tracing, self-isolating, etc.

Ms. Fowler commented that there was increasing medical evidence of the long term effects for a population that contracted COVID and was concerned as to what that meant going forward as to their human capacity, their ability to recover, a healthcare system that was already overburdened, etc. to provide continuing care. She pointed out they also had an aging population. She stated she was not skilled enough to suggest how they incorporated that into their thinking, but felt they needed to consider the fact that a certain number of people would contract the disease and not recover fully. The fact it would have a long term impact on the community, economy, families, etc. was weighing on her heavily.

Mr. Skala understood the Department of Public Health and Human Services was in pretty good shape these days for contact tracing, but noted they should anticipate a spike. He was glad people were getting ready for something he believed was likely a certainty. He understood there was some machinery in the background getting ready to accommodate it and agreed with Mr. Thomas in terms of providing clarity for benchmarks as that would be useful.

Ms. Fowler asked about the community engagement process that was currently underway and what the report that came out of it would look like in both form and format. Mr. Glascock replied minutes were being taken of those meetings. He hoped to provide it to the Council in its entirety and then make recommendations based on what they had heard in terms of global actions or more meetings with certain groups to flush out certain issues.

Ms. Fowler asked if it could also include a recitation and running list of comments made by the participants because a summary sometimes was not as good as reading the actual remarks. Mr. Glascock replied they had recordings and minutes. Ms. Fowler asked if the recordings would be available to Council to listen to at their discretion. Mr. Glascock replied yes. Ms. Fowler understood there would still be a transcribed list as well without names. Mr. Glascock stated he was not sure they were doing verbatim minutes, but they had recordings of the meetings. Ms. Fowler pointed out it was easier to read a report than to listen to hours of recordings. Ms. Pate explained they were sending the comments to a qualitative analyst so all of the meetings would be transcribed, and they could provide Council the same transcription they provided the analyst.

Mr. Trapp reminded everyone of the election tomorrow, and pointed out this body had endorsed Medicaid expansion as being important for their most struggling citizens and an economic boost for Columbia. He hoped people went out to vote.
Mr. Skala agreed everyone should get out and vote tomorrow.

Mr. Skala asked staff to look at the speed of traffic on East Walnut Street.

Mr. Skala noted there would be an interested parties meeting regarding traffic calming on William Street and Hinkson Avenue on September 2, 2020, which was long overdue and welcomed news. He asked those in the area to participate.

Ms. Peters stated she had received calls from two industrial companies in her ward regarding utility issues. One had been closed since March and had recently opened. They had turned off their electricity and water so they would not have any water leaks, but had still received a \$369 bill. She understood that had to do with large general electric service and summer rates. She asked how the utility bill amount had been determined, why it was the way it was, and what, if anything, could be done about it. Mr. Sorrell replied the electric rates were dependent upon the classification of user and demand, and involved a minimum charge per month. He understood they had likely gone to their breaker box to turn the electricity off, but the minimum charge would still apply. If they wanted a zero charge, they could have called to have their electric shut off. Ms. Peters asked how they would know to do that. Mr. Sorrell replied it was not something that was well publicized because they had not been in this type of situation before whereby businesses had closed for months due to a pandemic. He pointed out there was a provision in the ordinance for unusual circumstances allowing for customers to make a request and for staff to reduce the demand charge by 50 percent. He noted they had approved all of them to date that had made that request. Unfortunately, it would not apply in this situation, but Council could ask staff to prepare something which would allow them to use reasonable judgement to waive the fees for the situation since they had zero usage.

Ms. Peters asked Mr. Sorrell if he knew how other cities were handling these situations. Mr. Sorrell replied no.

Ms. Peters stated this did not sound reasonable to her. Mr. Sorrell asked for clarification. Ms. Peters replied it was the fact they were charged a minimal fee. Mr. Glascock pointed out they had to build the infrastructure to serve that facility, and as a result, it had to be paid for whether the electricity was used or not. Even if a large user shut everything off, the infrastructure to get the electric service to them had to be built, and as a result, there had to be some payment. He noted the demand charge paid for the extra infrastructure it took to allow the business to run. If everyone shut off their electricity, the City still had to pay for the infrastructure in terms of maintenance.

Ms. Peters asked who they needed to send a letter to with regard to this situation. Mr. Sorrell replied they could send the request for the 50 percent reduction to him as he

could review that situation.

Ms. Peters commented that Linen King, a company that provided laundry service for hospitals, had doubled its workload, which impacted its water usage. It had been half as much in January, February, and March. She understood they did not want a different rate, but wondered what assistance they might receive since they had doubled the amount of laundry they did by picking up laundry services in the St. Louis area due to COVID-19. She noted they were using more water, but it was not frivolous water use. It just happened to be during the summer. Mr. Sorrell replied they had asked to have their winter quarter average adjusted because they had received a contract to expand business. When he had last looked at their usage, it had not doubled and they had not yet reached Tier 3. Regardless, the ordinances with water did not provide staff any ability to waive or modifies fees. As a result, he had told them to contact their council member if it was something they wanted to pursue, which they had done. He stated he would provide Ms. Peters the information regarding usage and the impacts it would have on their bill. At the time the request had come in, he did not believe the numbers would result in a significant difference. If they ended up getting way into Tier 3, it would make a significant difference.

Ms. Peters asked if staff could look into it. Mr. Sorrell replied he would. Mr. Glascock noted he thought they could look at the sewer fees. He understood they tended to burn off some of the water with steam. Mr. Sorrell stated they had put in a meter to measure the water that was actually discharged into the sewer so the sewer bill was based on what was actually put into the sewer and not the amount they purchased.

Ms. Peters understood with COVID-19, CPD officers had reduced the number of vehicles they stopped, and wondered if they could be provided a monthly report for March, April, and months moving forward. Currently, they were receiving a yearly report with three months of really reviewing the data. She stated it would be nice to receive something more frequently. Chief Jones understood Ms. Peters had asked for this a couple of meetings ago, and the analyst was working on it. In addition, he was hoping to get something set up in the RMS system so the information could be provided more easily and on a monthly basis. He was hoping to have some information next month, but could not promise it. Currently, officers were not required to enter traffic stop data roadside so it might be a couple of days before it was entered. They were now trying to force that so the officers could not clear out of the call until the data had been entered. Ms. Peters hoped they would receive the March, April, May, and June data soon. She stated she would ask about this again in a month.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 10:27 p.m.