



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Tuesday, July 6, 2021
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 approximately 7:00 p.m. on Tuesday, July 6, 2021, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Mayor BRIAN TREECE, Council Member PAT FOWLER, Council Member ANDREA WANER, Council Member KARL SKALA, Council Member IAN THOMAS, Council Member MATT PITZER, and Council Member BETSY PETERS were present. City Manager John Glascock, City Counselor Nancy Thompson, City Clerk Sheela Amin, and various Department Heads and Staff Members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of May 17, 2021 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Skala and a second by Treece.

Treece explained the minutes were not yet complete for the June 7 and June 21 regular meetings.

Thomas asked that B197-21 be moved from the consent agenda to old business. The agenda, including the consent agenda with B197-21 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Treece and a second by Skala.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI15-21

COVID-19 Update.

Public Health and Human Services Director Stephanie Browning provided an update. Waner understood Browning had indicated that the best way to protect kids was to get vaccinated because those with higher vaccination rates had lower numbers of new cases, and asked if there was any model that incentivized vaccines. Waner understood there were incentives at the State level, but noted she had not seen anything specific to municipalities. Browning replied she was not aware of anything at the local level. Waner stated she thought it could be beneficial to incentivize the behaviors they wanted people to take part in, and felt there was a potential for partnerships.

Treece wondered if it was worth the investment of the City or the Chamber of Commerce for some incentive such as a coupon book that might provide a free beer at Logboat or a free slice of pizza at Shakespeare's. Treece pointed out they wanted to stay open this fall, and asked if it was worth the effort and if it would bridge that plateau of the 40 years old and under groups they were seeing most at risk of hospitalizations now. Browning replied she thought incentives were a good idea in general. Browning understood Mothers in Springfield where the vaccination rate was low was hosting vaccinations clinics and providing a free beer. It had not driven up their vaccinations numbers much, but it might be something worth considering. Browning commented that the reason the State of Ohio had been so successful was that they had given \$1 million five times, college tuition, etc.

Treece asked if the public awareness ads were still running. Browning replied yes.

Thomas noted Browning was wearing a mask even though she was fully vaccinated, and

asked about the community benefits and/or individual benefits of fully vaccinated people continuing to wear masks. Browning replied the recommendation of the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) was that those that were fully vaccinated did not need to wear a mask. Browning commented that she had seen enough cases of people that were fully vaccinated testing positive. In addition, the World Health Organization (WHO) had recently recommended that even fully vaccinated people wear masks when they were not certain of the vaccine status of all of the people in the room. Browning stated she was taking that recommendation to heart, and it was why they would see her in a mask when in a group. Thomas understood Browning's personal rule was to wear a mask indoors when she was not certain of the vaccination status of everyone in the room. Browning stated that was correct, and pointed out her experience during COVID was that people sometimes lied.

Fowler asked if the University of Missouri, Stephens College, and Columbia College had established a policy for their students to be vaccinated upon return to campus. Browning replied she knew it had been a subject of discussion, but she did not believe any of them had taken that step. Browning commented that she did not believe any higher education institutions other than Washington University and St. Louis University within the State of Missouri had taken that step. Browning noted she also did not think that was happening among public institutions in the Midwest.

Pitzer asked Browning if there were any cases involving children under the age of 12 years old or of clusters or outbreaks at schools or camps. Browning replied they had seen an increase in the number of cases for children that were not vaccinated or in the age group that were largely in summer school, attending camps, etc. They were seeing cases transmitted amongst them. In the past, it had been something like a teacher and student or a parent and student, which resulted in quarantining for close contacts, etc., but they were now seeing more spread in those age groups. Pitzer asked about the severity of those cases. Browning replied some younger people had been hospitalized, but she did not feel she could speak confidently as to whether they were severe situations or not. Browning noted she would have to talk to the case investigators.

Pitzer understood the majority of hospitalizations involved unvaccinated individuals, and asked about the percentage. Browning replied that in a meeting last week, one hospital had indicated they had one that had been unvaccinated and immunocompromised and another hospital had said they had 1-2 that had underlying conditions that were fairly severe whereby the vaccine might not have taken. Browning stated the rest were unvaccinated.

Pitzer asked if the cases involving those on ventilators were people that had been vaccinated. Browning replied not to her knowledge.

Skala asked how the City was doing in terms of its employees being vaccinated. Browning replied she did not believe the vaccination rate was high. Browning stated she had read something recently indicating public sector employees had a higher rate as an employer group than others in the population, but thought the City was at a rate of less than 50 percent. Skala commented that he was surprised to hear that. Browning explained they had offered to send nurses to worksites to make it easier, but no one other than the Airport had taken her up on that offer. Browning noted they had been at City Hall a couple of times as well.

Treece wondered if they should offer hazard pay to those that were vaccinated. Pitzer understood the City had offered time off. Browning stated that was correct as vaccinated employees were given a day of vacation.

Waner understood Browning had mentioned the need for an additional appropriation for the trained contact tracers to continue working, and asked how much might be needed to make that possible. Browning replied it was within the budget that the City Manager would bring forward to Council.

Treece asked Browning if she anticipated another update in a couple of weeks. Browning replied she would have to wait to see the data before making that decision.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC35-21 Christy A. Moten (speaker), Ronnie Moten, Betty Duddley - Celebrity of Life for Our Community.

Christy Moten commented that she was with the Greater Purpose Community within the Columbia community. It involved a group of churches that worked within the City to help provide free enterprise for kids in the afternoons. It was a once a month activity they wanted to broaden. At first it had been a celebration of life because she had lost three nephews to gun violence after they had graduated. Moten felt Columbia was so small that kids had to be taken outside of Columbia in order for them to have fun, and some people were unable to do that due to not having a car, income, etc. Moten asked the Council to back them as they provided their programs out of the goodness of their heart, and pointed out everything they did was free for the participants. Moten stated she wanted to ensure people knew about them, and that they helped with clothing, kids' nights, back to school nights, etc. to help take the stress off of parenting. Moten explained she had raised four kids on her own for a long time, and it was difficult to be able to pay for after school programs or to be with the kids when working. Moten commented that she thanked the Lord every day that her kids were still walking this Earth. During COVID, the number of gun violence cases had decreased, but this year, there were already 11 cases through June. Moten believed their programs allowed for kids to have the opportunity to shine. Moten felt they needed to stop glorifying deaths and to focus on those that were alive. Moten asked the Council to help them give back and to help them raise their kids. Moten stated she was willing to work with anyone in the community that was willing to work with her, and noted she would knock on doors and beg for handouts if she had to. Moten commented that if they were doing something big, promoting it or allowing them to use the parks once in a while would help.

Treece asked how many kids they served. Moten replied 200 at this time, and explained they wanted to serve more. Moten pointed out the group consisted of four churches at this present moment, and they were located in the area of Sexton Road, Garth Avenue, Ash Street, Worley Street, and Madison Street. Treece stated he appreciated the work they did in the community.

Skala asked how many volunteers they had. Moten replied they had about 30 volunteers at this time. Moten pointed out she would ask small businesses to provide donations, which they usually received because they saw the work being done.

SPC36-21 Travis Nelson - Compliment to the Fire Department of the City of Columbia.

Travis Nelson was not in attendance.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH23-21 Proposed installation of traffic calming devices on Maplewood Drive between West Broadway and Stanford Drive.

PH23-21 was read by the City Clerk.

Public Works Director David Nichols provided a staff report.

Thomas understood the speed limit was 25 mph and that 85 percent of the vehicles were traveling at 42 mph, and thought it might be helpful if staff could provide them the percentage of vehicles going above the speed limit for future similar presentations. Thomas assumed it was well over 50 percent if the 85th percentile was at 42 mph and the speed limit was 25 mph, and thought that information would help people understand the seriousness of the problem.

Thomas understood there had been public comment indicating that speeding had become a problem here after traffic calming had been installed on Manor Drive, and asked if there was any evidence of that. Nichols replied he did not think they had evidence to know whether the issue had shifted, but it was very possible if people found another route to travel. Thomas felt it was very likely as well.

Thomas asked if there was a particular situation or data indicator that suggested the use of speed humps as opposed to chokers or central islands. Thomas wondered if there were general approaches to how they decided what particular type of traffic calming to use. Nichols replied he thought people had gotten used to speed humps. In addition, the amount of driveways made it difficult to utilize other tools. Thomas understood humps were the simplest. Nichols stated that was correct. Thomas understood there would be seven humps for about \$30,000, which was about \$4,000 each. Nichols explained they would utilize in-house staff to do the work, which helped to reduce the cost. Thomas asked if a choker was more expensive. Nichols replied those types of projects generally involved concrete work while humps were essentially just milled asphalt. Thomas understood choker-type projects were generally more expensive. Nichols stated that was correct.

Skala thought speed tables were more successful than speed humps. Nichols explained speed tables were generally located near intersection crossings.

Treece opened the public hearing.

Martha Echols commented that she lived on Maplewood Drive, and believed it was a good idea to install the speed humps. Echols noted there was not a lot of signage on the road making the speed limit clear as signs were only located at the end of each part of the road. In addition, there was not a sign asking people to watch for pedestrians even though there were a lot of pedestrians on the road. Echols encouraged more signage to make the expectations clear.

Treece understood there were not any sidewalks on the street, and asked if many people walked on the street. Echols replied yes.

Jenny Hawkins explained she and James Hawkins were Echols' neighbors and agreed speeding was a problem. They liked to get out and walk their dog, and there were not any sidewalks. In addition, people parked along the street. James Hawkins stated the majority of the homes on Maplewood Drive had single car garages, which forced people to park cars on the street and created a narrower margin for cars to pass each other.

Treece understood they were okay with the plan and where the speed humps were located. Jenny Hawkins stated that was correct.

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

Thomas made a motion directing staff to move forward with the plans and specifications for the installation of traffic calming devices on Maplewood Drive between West Broadway and Stanford Drive. The motion was seconded by Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH24-21

Proposed construction of the Lakeshore Drive and Edgewood Avenue PCCE #23 sanitary sewer improvement project.

PH24-21 was read by the City Clerk.

Utilities Director Dave Sorrell provided a staff report.

Pitzer asked if the easements had already been obtained or if that was done after this. Sorrell replied they would have to do it after the Council authorized the design of the project as the design included easement descriptions. Pitzer asked how long it typically took to obtain an easement that they could not pay for. Sorrell replied that could vary greatly, and pointed out some projects had been put on hold indefinitely because a property owner would not grant an easement.

Pitzer asked about the process for reaching out to property owners. Pitzer wondered how long they waited if they did not receive a response initially. Sorrell replied a right-of-way agent that was housed in the Public Works Department assisted them, and

they had a process. Pitzer asked for the length of the process, especially in the instance when they were not receiving a response. Sorrell replied they did not have a written policy with regard to how long they would continue to negotiate with someone to try to obtain an easement. Glascock explained that when staff thought they were at an impasse, he would reach out to the appropriate council member for them to talk to the property owners. That sometimes worked, but not always.

Pitzer asked how often it was a problem. Glascock replied he was only aware of two whereby they could not move forward. They had broken another one up into parts in order to do those they could. Glascock pointed out they could sometimes not do that, and provided an instance in which it was the very first piece as an example.

Treece stated he was not aware of a formal policy. A previous Council had approved a motion indicating they should not pursue eminent domain or condemnation against a property that was receiving a public benefit of that new sewer. If they wanted to revisit that policy, they could, but the general philosophy of that Council was that the owners were getting a new sewer so the City should not have to pay for the associated easement or go through the legal proceedings to acquire it. This was fine and good for that particular property owner, but in some instances, there were four houses or more downhill on a gravity flow sewer who were impacted by that impasse. Treece commented that he was not eager to use condemnation, but was eager to complete the sewer improvements ratepayers had been paying for and had been promised.

Peters understood there was a sixth property that was already serviced by the public sewer. Sorrell stated that was correct. Peters asked how that had happened. Sorrell replied a public sewer ran up the street on Lakeshore Drive, and some of the homes were connected directly to the public sewer. When looking at the five properties outlined in red, there was a private sewer that came off of the public sewer so those five houses were connected to the common line. Sorrell explained it was a relic of how things were done years ago, and pointed out private sewers were still allowed by the City's Code.

Treece opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Treece closed the public hearing.

Treece made a motion directing staff to proceed with the final design for the proposed construction of the PCCE #23 Lakeshore Drive and Edgewood Avenue sanitary sewer improvement project. The motion was seconded by Peters and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH25-21 Proposed construction of storm water improvements on Capri Drive.

PH25-21 was read by the City Clerk.

Sorrell provided a staff report.

Treece opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Treece closed the public hearing.

Peters made a motion directing staff to proceed with the final design for the proposed construction of the stormwater improvements on Capri Drive. The motion was seconded by Treece and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH26-21 Consider the Water and Light 2021 Renewable Energy Plan.

PH26-21 was read by the City Clerk.

Sorrell provided a staff report.

Treece understood three percent was \$3.729 million and the City had actually spent \$2.621 million. Sorrell stated they were at 70.29 percent of what would be allowed by ordinance.

Sorrell continued the staff report.

Treece commented that the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP) had a stated goal of being 100 percent renewable by 2035, and the graphic that was displayed put the City at just over 42 percent at 2030, which only provided five years to close the gap. Treece asked Sorrell if he thought they should be making more progress beginning in

year 2026 to meet that goal. Sorrell replied that if they wanted to meet the goals of the CAAP and the Integrated Electric Resource Master Plan (IERMP), they would need to start reacting as soon as that IERMP was finished to get purchase power agreements in place to achieve those goals.

Treece commented that he believed the voters that had initiated this renewable energy mandate had thought the City would originate more of its own renewable energy, i.e., it would be grown here instead of being purchased, and asked if it was possible to be more aggressive on their own generated renewable energy or if they would always rely on power purchase agreements. Sorrell replied they could have a blend of both, but he believed they would always be reliant on power purchase agreements for the amount of energy being discussed. Sorrell noted they had programs to incentivize people installing solar on their homes and net metering agreements with businesses that had installed solar. Sorrell thought they would see several industries that would focus on home grown energy.

Treece asked if the Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission (MJMEUC) Grain Belt Express project was reflected. Sorrell replied yes. Treece asked for clarification. Sorrell replied it was referred to as Iron Star which would start in 2025. Treece asked for the potential capacity there. Sorrell replied the contract indicated a purchase of 35 megawatts. Treece asked if more was available. Electric Utility Services Manager Brandon Renaud replied maybe, and explained the numbers were unknown at this point.

Skala commented that a recent news report had indicated there would be a failure to reach one of these goals, and it might have been for 2023, which had been cited by staff, and asked if that was correct. Sorrell replied that with the plan they had now along with the timeframes of their agreements, they thought they would be a little short in 2023. This was not set in stone because some industry might decide to do a project that might be enough to meet the requirement. Sorrell explained the projections were based on load forecasts and existing purchase power agreements.

Skala noted there had always been this undercurrent with homegrown renewable energy, whether net metering or a City project. Skala understood they would likely need both and need to become more aggressive with both. Sorrell commented that he thought they might have been below the requirement in 2007 and 2008 when it had first started. They then had climbed up drastically. Each time the bar was raised, they were at a point of almost not achieving. Sorrell felt they would exceed the goal even if they might not exceed it initially every year.

Skala understood renewables were getting cheaper. Sorrell agreed. Skala noted the City was tied into some long-term coal-fired power plant contracts.

Pitzer asked if staff had modeled the impact to the three percent limit if they did everything on the chart. Sorrell replied he did not believe they had done that model. Pitzer asked if it was accurate that renewables they brought online today would have a smaller impact than renewables brought online ten years ago. Sorrell replied that was true financially as renewables were getting cheaper and closer to the non-renewable prices. Sorrell noted they were still a little higher.

Pitzer referred to page 8 of the report and understood almost half of the \$2.6 million came from the first Crystal Lake wind contract. Sorrell commented that they had recently entered into a third Crystal Lake contract, and the contract price for the first contract would go down to be more in line with the second contract. They would see a benefit of both additional energy and reduced costs.

Pitzer asked what would happen if the Grain Belt Express project did not happen. Sorrell replied they would do an RFP for a different project to obtain renewable energy. Sorrell noted MJMEUC might come up with something else as well. Pitzer asked if they were obligated to deliver that amount of energy. Sorrell replied he did not know, and explained he would have to read through that agreement. Sorrell understood there were two upcoming relatively close in proximity wind contracts from which they might be able to purchase power.

Pitzer asked if there were plans to purchase renewable energy credits this year or in future years to meet the goals. Sorrell replied the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) was working with others to look into that situation. Sorrell pointed out his personal feeling was that they would be better off to not purchase it, but it would up to the community. Pitzer commented that he tended to agree with Sorrell.

Thomas asked if they had a reliable way to measure net measured solar energy. Renaud replied it was still an estimate based on the Bernadette field, and that they would soon use Truman Solar as another metric. Renaud explained they also continued to use customers that were willing to provide that information to them in an effort to obtain an accurate representation. Thomas understood they looked at the amount of energy generated at the Bernadette field and knew how many panels were installed on private rooftops. Renaud stated that was correct.

Thomas understood there was a CAAP goal to place solar panels on City buildings, and asked if there was a specific plan or time frame for that. Sorrell replied he was not aware of a plan or timeframe at this point. Thomas stated he wanted to see that move forward quickly because it seemed to be a no cost project as the payback time was about five years after which they would get free energy. In addition, a public communication campaign might motivate a lot of people in the community to do the same thing. Thomas suggested using the general fund excess balance for the project since the money would essentially be paid back in 5-7 years.

Skala commented that a green roof had been discussed for this building, but it had ended up being a reflective roof with the proviso that there would be a framework for solar panels or other renewable energy appliances. After the building was retrofitted and built, the engineers had indicated there was not enough capacity in terms of the strength of building beyond some solar panels for water, heating, etc. As a result, there might be some complications in terms of structural capacity.

Treece opened the public hearing.

Treece noted they had received written comment from John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, who had suggested a graph be developed to capture the historic annual percent of renewable energy versus the annual cost since the first report was completed by staff to identify when the three percent would be reached. If the line crossed the three percent limitation before 2035, the Council would need to determine how to proceed. Conway stated the Council could eliminate the three percent requirement legislatively and proceed to 100 percent renewable, and thought they might want to do that regardless based on the completion of the IERMP. Treece explained this comment would be filed with this agenda item.

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

Treece stated he thought Pitzer and Conway had made good points, and suggested a graph with the costs related to the three percent threshold be incorporated as part of this plan. At the time this had gone to the voters, renewable energy was perceived to be more costly than regular energy so it had included the three percent factor. They had not been reaching that threshold, and in some cases, the renewable energy cost less than producing their own energy.

Thomas understood the Council could take that limitation out of the ordinance if they wanted. Treece agreed, but noted he would like to know the answer to the question first.

Pitzer suggested they go ahead and approve the report while asking for that information to be provided to them.

Treece made a motion to accept the 2021 Renewable Energy Plan. The motion was seconded by Pitzer and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH27-21 Voluntary annexation of property located on the south side of Richland Road and approximately 4,000 feet east of Rolling Hills Road (Case No. 201-2021).

PH27-21 was read by the City Clerk.

Community Development Director Tim Teddy provided a staff report.

Peters asked for clarification regarding the comment made by Teddy indicating Richland Road in Boone County was a cross section roadway. Teddy replied it had a rural cross section as it was two lanes, and it did not have any curbs and gutters. It was rural style road. Peters asked if that would be adequate to maintain this development with Old Hawthorne to the south. Teddy replied it had relatively low traffic now and two lanes would handle a fair amount of traffic. Some improvements might be necessary at the intersection and possibly the downstream intersections.

Peters asked where Grace Lane was in relationship to this. Teddy showed its location using a diagram that had been displayed. Peters understood Discovery Parkway would connect to Rolling Hills Road and Grace Lane. Teddy stated that was correct.

Fowler understood the memo had referred to additional information involving the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) that was forthcoming, and her interpretation was that the PZC had agreed to the annexation and R-1 zoning, but had other issues with the plat. Fowler asked why that information had not been attached to this. Teddy replied staff had attached a copy of the plat for informational purposes. Teddy explained they normally attached the PZC report when they introduced the zoning ordinance, the preliminary plat, and the ordinance granting certain design adjustments. The Council would receive the complete the report, but it was lagging in this instance. Normally, it was included on the agenda at the same time they did the public hearing, but since they did not have a 14-day interval between today and the next meeting, the ordinances could not be introduced on tonight's agenda. Fowler asked if it would put under introduction and first reading at the next meeting with those attachments so they could read it ahead of time. Teddy replied he thought it was the desire of the applicant to delay this until August. Fowler understood they would see the plat and the information from the PZC at that time when it was first read. Teddy stated that was correct.

Treece opened the public hearing.

There being no comment, Treece closed the public hearing.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

PR115-21 Revising the City of Columbia Police & Fire Pension Statement of Investment Policy.

The policy resolution was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Finance Director Matthew Lue provided a staff report.

Treece noted this had been discussed at a past work session. Lue stated that was correct.

Pitzer understood they were funding 100 percent of the required amount every year, and asked to be provided the cost if they funded 105 percent or 110 percent at the budget work session. Pitzer commented that a few years ago, they had lowered the assumed rate of return, which had increased the cost, i.e., the dollar amount they put in each year, and asked for that information to be provided as well since, at that time, they had also talked about doing that the following year. Pitzer thought it would be helpful to have that information so they could understand what some of those dollar amounts might be. Lue stated that could be provided.

Treece asked Pitzer if he was asking for information or suggesting they make up-front investments to the police and fire pension fund to stabilize it above the liquidity warning or solvency rating to avoid having to make annual contributions. Treece wondered if putting one-time money in the police and fire pension fund would avoid future annual contributions

at a rate that made that a smart investment. Pitzer replied that could potentially happen if they did that, and explained he was asking for information to determine if slightly increasing the amount would accelerate the progress toward stabilization. Pitzer noted they were on a path where they were making 100 percent of the contribution, which meant in 25-30 years they would be good depending on how things developed. They had also discussed changing some assumptions a year from now because the actuarial report had suggested there could be some changes that could further increase the cost to the City. Pitzer explained he was asking for information to put some dollar amount to that in case it was something they wanted to entertain.

Peters commented that she wanted to hear more of what Treece had described in terms of the effect of one-time money impacting the stabilization of the pensions.

Treece assumed the pension contributions they were making to the police and fire pension fund were general revenue dollars. Treece wondered if it made sense to invest something like a large settlement in order to make that fund more solvent because that would free up future general revenue dollars they could invest in more police officers and firefighters.

Lue commented that UBS had warned them about putting large amounts in at one time. Smaller amounts over a period of time tended to work better. Peters asked why it would be a problem to put in a large amount at one time. Lue noted UBS had provided an example of a municipality that had been 100 percent funded, but had only been at 60 percent the following year due to market conditions. Lue thought they would want to avoid that type of situation.

Pitzer explained that if they put the money in, they would have to invest it. It was a matter of whether they wanted to do that all at once or incrementally. Treece understood they would want to dollar cost average it over a period of time. Peters commented that she would prefer to dollar cost average it over five years versus 25 years.

Treece suggested staff ask UBS to run the calculations. Lue stated he would.

PR115-21 was read by the City Clerk, and the vote was recorded as follows:

VOTING YES: TREECE, FOWLER, WANER, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS.

VOTING NO: NO ONE. Policy Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

PR116-21 Adopting the City of Columbia, Missouri 2021 Strategic Plan Report - Performance Measures, Objectives & Action Items.

The policy resolution was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Assistant City Manager Carol Rhodes, Convention and Visitors Tourism Operations Analyst Megan McConachie, Community Development Neighborhood Services Manager Leigh Kottwitz, Parks and Recreation Director Mike Griggs, Public Health and Human Services Senior Administrative Supervisor Kari Utterback, Economic Development Assistant Director Bernie Andrews, Convention and Visitors Director Amy Schneider, and Information Technology Project Leader Shreya Mukerji provided a staff report.

Skala suggested a tutorial to lead people through the dashboard as he felt someone coming across the website might be overwhelmed with all of that data. Mukerji stated she thought they could likely do something of that nature.

Rhodes continued with the staff report.

Treece thanked staff for their work on this plan, and noted he loved the display, measurements, and metrics they were tracking.

Skala commented that in years past there had been an emphasis on the Baldrige Excellence Awards, and asked about the status of that. Rhodes replied they were still working in that direction, and this Strategic Plan was modeled after the Baldrige criteria.

Waner understood a performance measure on the dashboard presentation indicated the construction of at least 1,000 linear feet of sidewalk, but the plan indicated 500 feet, and asked for clarification. Griggs replied 1,000 feet had already been constructed this year since they had additional funding. The measure would be updated every year based on the available resources.

Waner understood the construction of at least one sidewalk project each year was a goal in the Master Plan, and that meant it would take 10-15 years to get through the priority one sidewalks, and asked if that number was flexible. Glascock replied it was flexible, and it was dependent on funding. The amount of money allocated to sidewalks could be increased when the Council put forward a plan for the 2025 capital improvement sales tax.

Waner asked where they were with the creation of an Office of Equity and Inclusion, and whether that proposal included more than just one person. Rhodes replied she thought a position was being proposed as part of the budget. Waner asked if that was for the initial one position. Glascock replied yes. Waner asked if the goal was to expand it to be a bigger department in the future. Glascock replied that would be up to the Council and the next City Manager.

Waner asked if they could move forward with the action item to add a question to the council memos on major items such as capital projects, major decisions, etc., as to the impact for marginalized groups with the decision and how they came to that conclusion. Utterback replied she understood it required something within the Granicus program, but that they had the capability to put the council memo information in Granicus. Amin commented that the council memo was a word document that people uploaded into Granicus so it did not have anything to do with the Granicus software. Utterback understood it was a capability that could be added. Amin agreed since only the word document needed to be changed. Rhodes agreed it would only require a change in the council memo. Waner thought that would be incredibly helpful and more transparent.

Fowler understood a resource fair was being planned for Douglass Park on July 24, and asked if it was possible for staff to interact with the public about the Strategic Plan. Rhodes replied yes. Fowler asked how they could make that happen. Glascock replied they just needed know the time. Fowler stated she would reach out to those that were planning that event and other events so the City Manager was aware. Fowler believed it was a great opportunity to engage with citizens over something that brought hope and inspired them. Rhodes noted that would be a great addition to the external component of the communication plan.

Skala asked if the Office of Equity and Inclusion was an extension of some of the discussions they had previously had regarding taking a look at the City's ordinances, etc., and that some of the money that had been set aside would lend itself to the work of that group. Glascock replied yes. Glascock explained approximately 78 positions had been cut last year, and that would allow Council to add positions where they felt the positions were needed. The position was recommended to be added to the City Manager's Office. Skala stated he was glad to see that coming back.

Treece asked Glascock how he planned to express some of these objectives with financial dollars to get the goals they all wanted within the budget. Treece also wondered about the plan for updating the Council on the deliverables more often than just annually. Glascock replied staff would need to identify items within the Strategic Plan that could be tied to the budget and the capital improvements documents after its adoption. Glascock commented that not everything would have a tie to the Strategic Plan, but they could identify the major items.

Treece suggested the budget document have a separate strategic plan element showing what was being done in the first year. Glascock asked Treece if he wanted it broken down by Ward. Treece replied maybe.

PR116-21 was read by the City Clerk, and the vote was recorded as follows:

VOTING YES: TREECE, FOWLER, WANER, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS.

VOTING NO: NO ONE. Policy Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

B188-21 Authorizing an annexation agreement with The Eric and Nicole Blume Family Revocable Trust for property located on the south side of Richland Road (7750 E. Richland Road) (Case No. 139-2021).

The bill was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Teddy provided a staff report.

Peters asked if the Council would be agreeing to allow this property to be annexed when it became contiguous with the City. Thompson replied the annexation agreement did not mandate the City annex at any future date. It only authorized the City to do so if it chose to do so. Peters asked about the operating agreement with the Boone County Regional Sewer District (BCRSD) indicating people could connect to the City sewer for 80 percent of what the City charged and a 50 percent surcharge, and whether it was something to which they had to agree. Thompson explained these were two different things. There was an agreement with the BCRSD, which set forth who could connect to the sewer and when, where, and how they could connect. This was an agreement between the City and the property owner indicating that if the City allowed them to connect to the sewer, they would agree to annex if they became contiguous at some point in time in the future. Peters understood that was also dependent upon whether the City wanted to annex them. Thompson stated that was correct.

Peters commented that she had spoken to the BCRSD and understood they had become a regional sewer district in 1973 when the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) was somewhat upset with the amount of sewage that was going into the creeks, and that the operational agreement had been set up so they had a planned way of getting rid of private lagoons and smaller sewer treatment plants. Peters explained she had asked for reconsideration of this ordinance because this one family appeared to be caught in the middle. If they, as a City, wanted to renegotiate the operational agreement with BCRSD, she thought that was reasonable, but felt they should abide by it in terms of this situation.

Treece commented that there was not any requirement in the contract with the BCRSD that the Council consent to a connection and annexation agreement so the City was not out of compliance with that agreement simply because they did not consent to it. Peters asked Treece if he was sure. Peters explained she thought they were agreeing to the annexation. Treece stated they agreed if they consented to the annexation agreement or the sewer connection to follow the requirements of the agreement, but the Council still had the option to accept it. Peters asked for the reason they would not accept something they had been doing for the last 15 years for this one particular property. Treece replied, for him, it was a matter of fairness to the 309 people that had been paying higher sewer utility rates for years while waiting on the same promised improvement this property owner would be getting with no connection fee and a 20 percent discount on rates. Peters asked Treece if he was sure there was no connection fee at the BCRSD level. Treece stated the City would not receive a connection fee. There was no payment for the legacy costs of the sewer plant and the sewer lines the City's ratepayers had been paying on for years.

Peters asked for clarification as to whether there was a connection fee at the BCRSD level. Sorrell replied he believed the BCRSD charged a connection fee, but he was unsure of the amount. Treece asked if the City received any of that connection fee. Sorrell replied not per the agreement that covered this property. That agreement between the City and the BCRSD waived all connection fees for BCRSD customers.

Skala understood this sewer connection was contingent upon an annexation and the City had the prerogative as to whether or not to annex. Skala asked if the payment schedule changed if the property was annexed in the future. Thompson replied the Council had two options at this time. The City could allow the property owner to connect to the sewer, and it had been the City's policy to do an annexation agreement if they did that. The second option was to allow the septic system to continue to exist on the property. If the

City did not allow the connection to the sanitary sewer, the septic system would remain in place for this tract or any future tracts. The reason the annexation agreement was before the Council was because it had been the policy of the City to enter into annexation agreements in connection with the permission to attach to the sanitary sewer because prior councils felt there was some value to that when it came to having the properties annexed within the city limits for consolidated services. Skala stated he understood that dichotomy, and explained he was asking if the fees that were paid to the BCRSD would continue in perpetuity regardless of annexation. Thompson replied the fees could change at some point in time if the property was annexed into the City and the property was being served by the City as opposed to the BCRSD, or if the City renegotiated the agreement. Sorrell clarified it would take an agreement renegotiation or the City would have to purchase customers that were annexed per a provision in the existing agreement. Sorrell noted that purchase was subject to a three percent growth rate of BCRSD customers along with other factors. Skala understood it could change, but would be very complicated. Sorrell stated that was correct.

Thompson pointed out the City had reached out to the BCRSD to negotiate and discuss the connection and other fees to determine if they could make any movement with regard to future people connecting to the sewer. As it stood today, the existing agreement from 2005 determined the fees.

Fowler commented that when this had previously come to them, she had been more confused than she was tonight, but what she had found compelling was that the sewer was already crossing this property and that the agreements that had been negotiated with the BCRSD were not of the making of the property owner. It was the making of the City as a sophisticated negotiator with the BCRSD, and it sounded as though the complaint of the Council was with the BCRSD and/or changing circumstances since they had entered into those agreements. Fowler stated she felt remorse and apologized to the property owner for misunderstanding the context of this when it had come to them previously. Fowler noted she intended to support this ordinance tonight. Fowler believed that if they, as a Council, had issues with how they had set up these agreements with the BCRSD, they should take that up with them.

Pitzer understood paragraph 7 indicated the City could adjust the 80 percent figure with 180 days of notice based on the City's actual cost for providing wastewater treatment, and asked if that had ever been considered. Sorrell replied he did not believe that had ever been done in the past, and did not feel those items had been calculated individually in order to provide the documentation that showed the change in the cost of the trunk sewer and interceptor maintenance. Pitzer asked Sorrell if they had that information. Sorrell replied they had information, but it was not broken down to the point that would be an easy calculation. Sorrell noted it could be done. Peters asked if that was something staff was planning on calculating since they were looking to renegotiate. Sorrell replied a cost of service study was being conducted now and he had mentioned doing that due to these conversations, but it was not currently included in the scope. If they decided to do that, it would require a revision to the scope of services of that contract. Pitzer felt that might be worth pursuing if the objection was the 20 percent discount because there was a provision that allowed them to change that 20 percent discount. Sorrell stated they did not have the data right now to give the 180-day notice to change it. Pitzer understood that was separate from this question here, but thought it would be valuable. Sorrell pointed out there were multiple agreements with the BCRSD covering different areas, and most had that same wording in them. Pitzer commented that if they determined the fees were not being addressed correctly, it could solve a lot of problems.

Treece pointed out the City had invested a lot of money in that sewer treatment plant since 1973 and 2005, and believed it would cause the percentage to increase.

Pitzer understood part of this sewer line had been paid for by the BCRSD. Sorrell stated it had been built in several phases, and the BCRSD had paid for essentially all of the sewer line that was shown on the diagram. Sorrell thought they had also paid for a third

of the cost of piece that took them up to the Old Hawthorne area. Pitzer stated the connection charge should recover some of that capital cost although they did not know if that was the right amount, etc. Sorrell agreed, and noted he had not been with the City at that time. Sorrell explained both the City and the BCRSD had capital costs for the sewer extensions. Pitzer understood and commented that he did not feel the idea that they would receive some of the connection charge was a ridiculous idea.

Pitzer understood the Council had asked staff to negotiate the entire agreement, and explained his point was that there was already a clause in the agreement that allowed them to adjust the amount. As a result, outside of any renegotiation, they might be able to change the percentage if it was wrong. Treece understood it would still take six months. Pitzer agreed.

Eric Blume commented that his sewer issue had been going on for six months, and it was real. It was not theoretical or hypothetical. The system on his property was not just failing. It had already failed, and despite his efforts with the BCRSD and the City for six months now, they were left with no resolution. Blume noted that for \$1,500-\$2,000 over what he had already paid, he could connect to the sewer and stop continuing to pollute the creek. In addition, they would no longer have to waste their time on this issue. Blume asked the City to agree to comply with the terms of the agreement in which they had already entered. Blume understood a policy discussion might need to be had moving forward, but did not feel that needed to involve him. That discussion was between the City and the BCRSD. Blume felt he and his property were pawns in the middle of this. Blume commented that to say he had other ways to resolve the issue was not true. The Public Health and Human Services Department (PHHSD) had not yet given him any other option as they were waiting for the result of this discussion. Blume understood if the Council refused to allow him to connect to the existing sewer, the PHHSD would then have to issue him a permit to rebuild an onsite engineered system that would cost \$20,000-\$40,000 and months of time. In addition, it would likely go over the existing sewer line. Blume noted that during that time, his property and the creek would continue to be damaged. Blume reiterated the objection was not with him, and was with an agreement that the City had the authority to renegotiate. Blume asked the Council to provide permission to connect to the existing sewer so he could stop the damage and they could all move on. Blume noted the City could move on with their negotiations, and within a week or two, he could be connected to the sewer.

Skala explained he had voted against this the last time primarily because of a comment indicating the system was failing causing the sewage to go into the creek. That comment had not been reassuring to him even though he understood it might be expensive to address the issue. Skala agreed they needed to revise the policy or utilize the tools they had to address the fees. Skala stated he did not like what Blume had said, but also understood he had been caught in the middle. In addition, Skala wanted the property cleaned up and connected to the sewer. Skala thought they should proceed with allowing Blume to connect to the sewer while also exercising their options on the agreement to correct this situation so it did not happen again.

Treece commented that he would continue to vote no, and thought he had voted against every non-contiguous pre-annexation agreement relating to sewer connections. Treece noted it was not because he was not sympathetic to the concern as all septic tanks fail at some point, but he did not feel that property should leap frog over others within the city limits that had been paying the legacy investment of improving and continuously maintaining the sewer treatment system while waiting for their promised improvement. Treece believed it was a matter of fairness. Allowing a residential customer in the County to connect could create a precedent for larger developments or an industrial user to connect. Treece agreed the agreement with the BCRSD needed to be renegotiated, but felt they also needed to be fair to existing ratepayers.

B188-21 was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: FOWLER, WANER, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS.

VOTING NO: TREECE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B204-21

Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code to establish an account at the Columbia Trust for utility assistance contributions; authorizing establishment of a Utility Assistance Program and contributions to such program by the Columbia Trust; amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

The bill was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Lue provided a staff report.

Fowler commented that Strategic Plan discussed the establishment of a process by which the City staff determined who was income eligible for a variety of programs and not just any one program, and hoped the new standards would be utilized across the board for all of their financial assistance programs, to include this new program. Fowler asked if that would happen sooner rather than later so they could access the funds for those that needed them without creating the extra layer of reestablishing eligibility. Glascock replied it was dependent on one's definition of sooner than later. It would not happen tomorrow and might not happen in a month. Glascock stated they would have to pull everyone together that were involved in programs of this nature to get agreement as to how they would move forward. Glascock noted it would take some time. Fowler understood and noted it was already listed as one of the objectives of the Strategic Plan. Glascock agreed. Fowler stated she thought it would help to have a single standard for all of their programs, and used reduced transit and eligibility for paratransit as examples. Glascock pointed out that the more programs they involved, the more complicated it could get, which would take time to sort through. Glascock explained he did not want to make a commitment he could not meet. Fowler understood, and asked if that meant CASH and HELP would go away. Glascock replied he had not said that, and noted this would be another program.

Pitzer stated his recollection of the May 17 meeting was that Human Services Manager Steve Hollis had indicated that at that time there was not a \$300,000 need, and asked if his memory was correct. Glascock replied that was correct.

Pitzer asked if this fund or trust would be housed under the water and light fund. Lue replied no. Pitzer asked if it would be housed within the general fund. Lue replied it was its own fund, and was not housed within the general fund or the water and light fund. Pitzer understood it would be a trust, and asked if that meant that once the money went into that account, it would not come out for any reason. Lue replied the only reason it would come out was to help customers.

Pitzer asked how the \$300,000 amount had been determined. Lue replied he was not sure, and explained it was related to the money that had been freed up due to the receipt of Boone County CARES Act funds. Pitzer asked if there was any guidance on how long the \$300,000 might last. Lue replied there was no way to tell that right now. Glascock stated staff would report back to Council if they ran out of funds or if the money was just sitting there after a couple of years. Lue noted they could probably report on the trust as part of the budget.

Peters asked who was overseeing this funding. Peters wondered if it was Public Health and Human Services or Finance. Lue replied Hollis presided over the CASH and HELP program and they anticipated him presiding over this as well. Browning commented that like the CASH and HELP program, residents would have the ability to donate to it, which should help sustain it. The Public Health and Human Services Department administered the programs so they would be involved in setting the criteria and monitoring it throughout the year to ensure they had enough to continue.

Peters asked Browning if she expected this to be up and running in a couple of months. Browning replied yes, and explained they only needed to establish criteria. With regard to the question of Fowler about the Strategic Plan, Browning noted that pre-COVID, they had been working with other departments to try to have a uniform measure so that if one

that was eligible for something like ARC passes, they would also be eligible for bus passes. They were trying to streamline the process so people did not have to reapply and complete new paperwork for every program.

Fowler commented that the \$300,000 was the remainder from the \$1.5 million they had agreed would go to help members of the community who had financial difficulties. At that time, Housing Programs Manager Randy Cole and Hollis had brought forward all of the unfunded proposals that had come through their various commissions, and that had only equaled \$1.2-something million. The \$300,000 that was remaining was to be put forward to help with the unpaid utility bills for people. Fowler noted people had difficulty accessing assistance due to the way the City interpreted the requirements for funding, and understood they were hoping to streamline that. Fowler thought there might be people that were not eligible to take advantage of it, but they knew there were people that were unable to pay their utilities due to the number of disconnections. A clearer path of eligibility was needed to allow people to access funds without the restrictions that existed under CASH or HELP. Fowler stated she did not feel it was fair to say there was not a need for this money because she believed there was a need. The criteria for eligibility were such that people could access it.

B204-21 was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, FOWLER, WANER, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B197-21

Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to the discontinuance of service for City utilities due to temperature conditions; making gender-neutral grammatical edits.

The bill was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Thomas explained he would support this ordinance as it would align their methodology for applying the temperature criteria with that of the Public Service Commission (PSC), which made sense. Thomas asked what determined the day on which someone's utilities would be cutoff. Utilities Assistant Director Sarah Talbert replied the utility accounts were due 20 days after the bill date. On the 22nd day, a past due notice was sent to customers with a pending disconnection if the bill was not paid by a certain date. Thomas understood that defined the pending disconnect. Talbert agreed it defined that along with the cost of reconnecting if they happened to get disconnected, and it was generally 35-45 days after the actual bill date. Thomas understood if the temperature criteria on the pending disconnection date determined the utility should not be disconnected, it would not be disconnected. Talbert stated that was correct. Thomas asked if they were then disconnected the first day the temperature criteria did not apply. Talbert replied yes.

Talbert explained there had been a week during the middle of June in which they had not done any disconnections. As a result, there were pending disconnects that had not been disconnected due to temperatures. The next week they had moved forward with those disconnections if payment had not already been made.

Thomas asked if someone would be reconnected if they were disconnected on the last day of reasonable weather and then it got much hotter. Talbert replied no, and explained they would have to pay their bill along with the reconnection fee in order to be reconnected.

Thomas asked for the percentage of disconnected customers that settled their bill and were reconnected within 24 hours. Talbert replied there were quite a few customers that were disconnected, and explained University students sometimes moved out without notifying the City to shut off their services. Thomas understood in those cases no one was there. Talbert agreed and stated they did not know that at the time of disconnection. Those that were still in a residence tended to come in when they could make payment, could sign up for a payment arrangement, or had received assistance from the various pledging agencies to be reconnected.

Treece asked Talbert if she thought three weeks was typical. Treece felt most people thought of bills being due in net 30 days and wondered if that was confusing to people. Treece understood they staggered accounts for mailing, staffing, and other resource management purposes. Talbert replied she did not know if there was confusion. Talbert noted the due date was on the bill, but she could not say people paid attention to it. Talbert commented that they had not really had too many complaints involving a desire for it to be 30 days. The problem to move to 30 days involved the billing cycles as they would potentially overlap billing cycle reads. The 20 days seemed to work in that regard. Skala asked if written advice was given to customers so they knew what they could do to resolve the issue so disconnection did not occur. Talbert replied she thought it had the utility customer service website and phone number for people to contact for additional information.

Fowler asked how a ratepayer could go about changing the date by which their bill was due. Talbert replied the cycles were based on routes in areas of the City. As a result, it would be hard for the utility crews to go to another area of town for a person to be on a particular cycle that might work better for them. Talbert commented that she was not aware of anyone wanting to change their cycle based on pay dates within the last 8-10 months, but it was something they could look into via a report if desired.

Fowler commented that when she worked for the University and was only paid once a month, she had probably received 2-3 disconnect notices per year because she was waiting to get paid before writing the check. It was why she did not want to be on autopay as well because she did not want the money withdrawn on a day when she did not yet have the money. Talbert explained people in that situation could always contact them to place a note on their account with regard to when they were paid so a disconnection notice was not mailed out.

Fowler asked Glascock how the person she referred to him was handled. Fowler wondered if they had been moved to another billing cycle or if a note was put on their account so they would not receive a disconnect notice every month. Glascock replied he did not recall. Talbert commented that if the customer was not able to make the payment by the due date, two days afterwards, they would receive a past due notice so they would not be subject to disconnection at that point. They would still have time to pay their bill. It was about 10-15 days after that notice when the actual disconnection would happen.

B197-21 was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: TREECE, FOWLER, WANER, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS. 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 City Clerk.

- B189-21 Approving the Final Plat of "Old Hwy 63 Storage Plat 1" located on the west side of Old Hwy 63 and approximately one-half mile north of Grindstone Parkway (2801, 2909 and 2911 S. Old Hwy 63) (Case No. 115-21).
- B190-21 Approving the Final Plat of "Plumrose USA, Inc." located on the east side of State Route B/Paris Road (Case No. 142-2021).
- B191-21 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code to establish regulations for an accessory commercial kitchen (Case No. 136-2021, #A1).
- B192-21 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code to establish revised regulations for an artisan industry (Case No. 136-2021, #A2).
- B193-21 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code to establish revised regulations for

- office, personal services, and physical fitness center uses (Case No. 136-2021, #A3).
- B194-21 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code to establish revised regulations for a general retail use (Case No. 136-2021, #A4).
- B195-21 Authorizing construction of the Fourth Street and Broadway pedestrian crossing project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B196-21 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of the Fourth Street and Broadway pedestrian crossing project.
- B198-21 Accepting conveyances for sewer purposes; accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
- B199-21 Authorizing Addendum 1 to the community assistance program agreement with the Missouri Department of Conservation relating to infrastructure improvements at Norma Sutherland Smith Park Lake and The Vineyards Park Lake.
- B200-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the City Manager's Office.
- B201-21 Authorizing a subrecipient monitoring agreement with Boone County, Missouri relating to acceptance of the FY 2020 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program Award to purchase equipment for the Police Department; amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B202-21 Authorizing Contract Amendment No. 1 to the agreement with Boone County, Missouri, on behalf of the Boone County Children's Services Board, for the purchase of services for coordination of prenatal and early childhood home visitation as part of the Brighter Beginnings program.
- B203-21 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for public health emergency preparedness services.
- R117-21 Setting a public hearing: proposed design and construction of an additional electrical generation unit at the Landfill Gas Electric Generation Plant; providing for construction of the proposed improvement using a design/build contract.
- R118-21 Setting a public hearing: proposed development of the MKT Wetlands project located southeast of the Scott Boulevard Trailhead and the MKT Trail to include construction of two (2) wetland cells, wooden boardwalk with a lookout deck and bench seating, and a gravel trail and grass trails.
- R119-21 Authorizing Adopt A Spot agreements.
- R120-21 Authorizing execution of a signature card and certificate of resolution with Commerce Bank; providing for administrative authority to amend any banking authorization or corporate resolution forms and verify authorized signatories on accounts held by City at such institution.
- R121-21 Authorizing a Round 3 CDBG-CV funding agreement with Central Missouri Community Action for childcare business support services.
- R122-21 Authorizing a Round 3 CDBG-CV funding agreement with Central Missouri

Community Action for childcare assistance services.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions read by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: **VOTING YES: TREECE, FOWLER, WANER, SKALA, THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:**

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

None.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B205-21 Amending Ordinance No. 024284 to extend the administrative delay in the enforcement of land use and business regulations related to short-term rentals to January 31, 2022.
- B206-21 Granting a design adjustment relating to the proposed Final Plat of Cherry Street Hotel located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Cherry Street and Hitt Street (1005 Cherry Street) to allow reduced utility easement dedications (Case No. 157-2021).
- B207-21 Approving the Final Plat of "Cherry Street Hotel" located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Cherry Street and Hitt Street (1005 Cherry Street); authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 157-2021).
- B208-21 Authorizing a development agreement with Cherry Street Hotel, LLC to establish public infrastructure obligations associated with construction of a new hotel on property located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Cherry Street and Hitt Street (1005 Cherry Street).
- B209-21 Authorizing a memorandum and agreement of lease of parking rights with Cherry Street Hotel, LLC to establish terms and conditions for the provision of parking spaces in the Tenth and Cherry Municipal Parking Garage.
- B210-21 Rezoning property located on the east side of Old Hawthorne Drive, approximately 650 feet north of Route WW, from District PD (Planned Development) to District O (Open Space) (Case No. 147-2021).
- B211-21 Granting the issuance of a conditional use permit to Boone Development, Inc. and Old Hawthorne Golf Club, LLC to allow "outdoor recreation or entertainment" uses on property located on the east side of Old Hawthorne Drive, approximately 650 feet north of Route WW (1900 W. Old Hawthorne Drive), in an O (Open Space) zoning district (Case No. 148-2021).
- B212-21 Authorizing an amendment to the agreement with Tyler Technologies, Inc., as part of the Columbia Financial Enterprise Resource System (COFERS) project, for implementation of the Executime, Quatred, and General Ledger Application Programming Interface (API) software modules, and hosting services for the MobileEyes and MyCivic software modules; amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B213-21 Authorizing construction of a public improvement project for the Fifth Street and Walnut Street municipal parking structure; calling for bids through the

- Purchasing Division.
- B214-21 Authorizing a right of use license permit with Diggs Meat Packing, LLC for installation and maintenance of private landscaping within a portion of the Rogers Street right-of-way.
- B215-21 Authorizing a second amendment to the small generator interconnection agreement with Truman Solar, LLC.
- B216-21 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to establish compensation to retailers for redeemed refuse and recycling bag vouchers.
- B217-21 Authorizing development of the MKT Wetlands project located southeast of the Scott Boulevard Trailhead and the MKT Trail to include construction of two (2) wetland cells, wooden boardwalk with a lookout deck and bench seating, and a gravel trail and grass trails; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.
- B218-21 Authorizing a participation agreement with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for state investment in local public health services.
- B219-21 Authorizing an aviation project consultant agreement with Burns and McDonnell Engineering Co., Inc. for design of the Taxiway A reconstruction project located south of Runway 13-31 at the Columbia Regional Airport; amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

X. REPORTS

- REP52-21 Planning and Zoning Commission Correspondence - UDC Text Amendment Authorization.
- Teddy provided a staff report.
- Skala commented that this was what they had asked for as they knew tweaks would be necessary when the Unified Development Code (UDC) was adopted. As a result, Skala believed this was perfectly appropriate.
- Treece asked if staff had tracked any issues beyond what they would consider maintenance issues. Teddy replied the consent agenda tonight had included text amendments certain stakeholders had requested, such as commercial kitchens and a better definition of artisan industry. Teddy thought they might have more in the future.
- REP53-21 Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) - FY 2022 Annual Budget.
- Treece asked Kathy Becker, Director of Operations of the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID), when they might reach \$1 million in annual revenue. Becker replied she did not believe they would reach it for a while.
- Skala understood the Downtown CID was contributing mightily to the bicentennial celebration, and asked if it was the project on the corner or other things. Becker replied they were involved with the project on the corner, which they had been working on for several years. Treece agreed and noted it just happened to have coincided with the bicentennial.
- Pitzer asked if \$1 million triggered additional reporting. Treece replied it would require every member of the Downtown CID to submit a personal financial disclosure to the Missouri Ethics Commission.

REP54-21 Business Loop Community Improvement District (CID) - FY 2022 Annual Budget.

Treece commented that the total revenue for the Business Loop Community Improvement District (CID) appeared to \$1.089 million, but that included ARA funding, which he assumed was American Recovery Plan Act funding, i.e., federal money that had gone to the State and was then appropriated for sidewalk improvements or pedestrian improvements. Fowler asked if that was \$750,000. Treece replied it was \$700,000. Fowler stated she recalled hearing about that.

Skala thought that might trigger the personal financial disclosure filings. Treece agreed it could for that year.

Treece understood there was no obligation of the Council to accept or approve the CID budgets, and that the CIDs just had to submit them. Amin stated her understanding was that the CIDs had to provide it and that the Council could comment on it, but they did not necessarily have to do anything the Council asked of them.

REP55-21 Utility Late Fees and Utility Disconnections and Delinquent Accounts.

Treece thanked staff for this report.

REP56-21 List of Addresses on a Private Common Collector Sewer with Submitted Petitions for a Public Sewer Improvement.

Treece thanked staff for the list along with the breakdown of the barriers.

REP57-21 Solid Waste Update on Citizen Feedback on Curbside Refuse and Recycling Collection.

Treece commented that he was not sure of a solution, and thought it was curious how anxiety provoking this was for some. Treece believed the biggest frustration was that the bags seemed to be inferior to the previous bags, and asked if that had been worked out. Treece wondered if it had been a bad batch as he had ripped every bag in his last roll. Sorrell replied they sometimes periodically received a roll of a bad batch as he had some at his house from the previous batch. Sorrell commented that he believed it seemed to be a bigger problem because a complete conversion was done at one time, i.e., everyone received bags in January. Sorrell did not think it was any larger of a problem than previously. Treece understood the failure rate was likely the same but was magnified. Sorrell stated that was correct as they were now required to use the City provided bag. Sorrell felt there appeared to be a massive amount of defective bags at one time due to an entire conversion in a one-month period of time. Sorrell noted they had recently finished with the second mailing of vouchers and had received very few phone calls. In January, they had been flooded with phone calls.

Treece stated he had noticed that the supplemental information had indicated the number of complaints was going down, and he hoped people were not so frustrated that they were just not calling anymore. Treece hoped it was because they were working out the issues. Sorrell commented that he felt a lot of the calls had involved questions. Sorrell was not necessarily sure they were complaints. Sorrell noted people called asking where they could redeem vouchers, when they would receive the vouchers, what items could be put out on the curb, etc., and now people were more aware of the answers to those questions.

Treece understood there was some discussion regarding possible solutions, and believed they needed to consider the problem they were trying to solve. Treece noted landfill use had been reduced and recycling had increased. Treece understood it was not a perfect fit for everyone. Treece asked if ratepayers could drop off extra trash or big bulky items themselves at the small vehicle drop-off site with a roll-off container at the landfill without triggering the \$25 charge. Sorrell replied at this time there was still a \$25 charge, and explained he was gathering information on some proposal in that manner. Sorrell stated

he did not think they could make it free for everyone because it would overwhelm the landfill scale-house since everyone coming in and out still needed to be weighed. They could consider a reduced charge. Treece asked if the current thinking was that the logo bag would not need to be used if the trash was driven out there. Treece understood the reason for the bag was to compensate for the pick-up and delivery to the landfill along with the perpetual storage. Sorrell explained anything driven out to the landfill was not required to be in a bag. Treece commented that it was intimidating to go to the landfill. Sorrell agreed, and pointed out the small vehicle drop-off site did not require someone to go to the landfill property. One would just go across the scale and it was the first turn to the right when headed to the administration building. Treece asked if staff would bring something back for consideration. Sorrell replied they could as they had the information.

Skala commented that he shared the frustrations of everyone, and pointed out he had been on social media trying to provide information to the best of his ability. Anecdotally, as some had cited issues with the quality of trash bags, to this day he had not had a single problem with any trash bag or the ties. Skala explained he kept trying to make the point that this could change with a successful initiative petition and referendum so those who voted in favor of the ban on roll carts would not be disenfranchised. Skala did not believe anything had received as much enthusiasm or controversy as the topic of trash.

Fowler asked if they could consider an allowance for people that could not afford extra bags but had medical reasons for needing them as part of the eligibility process mentioned in the Strategic Plan for certain programs offered by the City. Fowler explained she received 2-3 calls per week about trash, and provided examples of an older person that was incontinent who had extra trash needs similar to a family with a small baby or someone with some type of durable medical equipment, which was all disposable and came with sufficient packaging. Fowler stated she had received calls from people saying they were using 3-4 bags per week and had challenges in going out and acquiring bags due to being medically fragile. Fowler reiterated she thought they should consider including eligibility for a reduced cost on trash bags for persons that had those particular difficulties. Fowler commented that she had also heard from people indicating the conversation in their neighborhood was that they did not want to live in the City anymore because they did not see the value if they had multiple children and had difficulty acquiring the bags and paying for them. In addition, Fowler noted an apartment manager had recently discussed with her the challenges they had with bulky pick-up, and as a result, she had asked the City Manager to coordinate a meeting with property managers of apartment complexes so they could understand the challenges they were facing and determine how best to address it. This apartment manager had indicated a tenant who was moving out would notify the office that they were leaving behind a mattress and the office would contact the City to arrange for pick-up, but by the time the mattress was picked up, the mattress was full of water and too heavy and people had placed other items there thinking their items would be picked up as well.

Pitzer stated he believed another source of frustration was that they were not providing the same level of recycling service while still charging the same amount. Those that were dropping off their recycling at offsite locations were faced with bad conditions or no capacity at those sites. Pitzer understood the fiber container sites were emptied three times per day, and asked if that was correct. Sorrell replied he believed that was correct. Pitzer asked if that was done seven days per week. Sorrell replied yes. Pitzer understood the mixed source containers were emptied once a day seven days a week. Sorrell replied yes. Pitzer asked if staff tried to clean the sites. Sorrell replied they tried to pick up items left on the parking lot site, and they sometimes sent extra people to help when it was really bad. Sorrell commented that Solid Waste Manager Steve Hunt had been out there picking up boxes and cans from parking lots for a couple of hours on more than one occasion. Pitzer asked if the dumping of the containers was an automated process. Sorrell replied yes, and explained the driver backed up and hooked on to the dumpster to dump the material into the truck. Pitzer understood the driver then had to

get out of the truck to pick up the items around the container. Sorrell stated that was correct. Sorrell noted they also had people picking up the sites on the weekends. Peters noted she had run into some of them, and they had indicated it was the third or fourth place they had been that day. Sorrell explained they were part-time staff who picked up stuff at the sites that were not in the containers on Saturdays and Sundays. Pitzer asked if they had trouble staffing those positions. Sorrell replied they were not having a lot of trouble staffing that, and pointed out it did not require a CDL and it was part time.

Pitzer understood Sorrell had announced two of the recycling sites would be closing. Sorrell stated that was correct, and noted they would close tomorrow. Pitzer asked Sorrell if he was concerned about other sites potentially closing. Sorrell replied he was concerned about the potential for any site the City did not own to close. Pitzer asked how many that involved. Sorrell replied just the Home Depot site. Pitzer understood they had approved a new one at Cosmo Park, and asked if there were others in the works. Sorrell replied the Council had approved the design of one at Oakland Gravel Road and Vandiver Drive. Pitzer asked if that would get them to a sufficient number or if more would need to be added. Sorrell replied they would have to add a few more if they continued to do drop-off sites.

Pitzer understood the every other week pick up of recycling was anticipated to continue. Sorrell stated he expected that to continue until they had sufficient staff. Sorrell pointed out the vacancy report last week indicated there were 14 refuse and senior refuse collector vacancies, and he had received another resignation since then. As a result, there were 15 vacancies. Pitzer understood the staffing had never improved, and asked how close they were to not being able to pick up recycling every other week. Sorrell replied they were on the verge, and it was impacted by people calling in sick or not showing up for another reason. When they had started the every other week recycling pick-up in February, they had been cautious in trying to sustain a few people calling in sick and not having to shut it down for one day, etc. They wanted to be able to keep doing it reliably every other week.

Pitzer commented that another complaint he had heard about was the bag availability at retailers. Pitzer was not certain if it was a matter of turning in the voucher for a roll or if it was for the purchase of a roll of five bags, and asked for clarification. Sorrell replied he had received several calls in the last few months with regard to bags not being available at the stores, but every store he had called had indicated they had the bags available at the service counter. Sorrell noted he had also driven to the stores, and every time he had checked, they had been available at the service counter. Sorrell commented that he was not sure if customers were looking for them on the shelves or if they were asking the wrong staff people at the stores. Pitzer understood Sorrell had not been able to identify a problem. Sorrell stated they had run out at City Hall a couple of times where it had taken a day or so to get restocked. Pitzer asked Sorrell if staff was concerned about any retailers dropping out of the program. Sorrell replied yes, and explained an ordinance had been introduced tonight to reimburse retailers for each voucher redeemed because it was actually an expense to the retailer to carry the inventory, pay staff, send the vouchers back to waste zero, etc. Sorrell pointed out two retailers had indicated they might stop participating in the program if their costs could not be recovered. If that happened, the program might not exist any longer because of increased foot traffic at the remaining locations as that could be overwhelming. Pitzer understood there had always been some cost, even when they had the prior black bag system, but it was now magnified.

Glascok asked Sorrell to explain the impact of the \$5 add-pay for those on the back of the truck. Sorrell replied they had seen a lot more applications initially, but they had not necessarily found a lot more qualified applicants, i.e., people with CDLs. They now had employees that were eligible for the \$5 add-pay that would take a transfer within the Solid Waste Division to go to commercial collections so they did not have to ride on the back of the truck so they were essentially giving up the \$5 add-pay. That incentive, in and of

itself, was not sufficient to fill those positions.

Skala asked about the timing of the mailing of the vouchers. Sorrell replied the vouchers were sent out in two mailings, January and June. Skala wondered if people cashing in on those vouchers at the same time accounted for some of the shortages, and whether vouchers being mailed four times a year might help in that regard. Sorrell stated it could, but his personal experience was that the bags had been in stock at the stores.

Fowler understood the \$5 incentive was not working, and asked what would work to get employees to want to work in residential collections. Sorrell replied he did not know, and pointed out Glascock had sent them all an article indicating this was problem being experienced nationwide with refuse collectors. The first three things that could be done were to increase the use of temporary staff, cut back on recycling collection, and increase pay, and they had done all three. Sorrell stated he did not know what dollar amount would help the situation, and pointed out they had done a \$2 an hour increase one year and then a \$5 an hour add-pay the next year. Fowler asked about other conditions of employment. Sorrell replied he did not have a good feel with regard to compensation or other items that might be required so it was a position people were interested in taking and staying at. Treece asked Sorrell if he had sat down with the workers or their representatives. Sorrell replied they were going through the meet and confer process currently, and they had brought up some things, but nothing about pay. Treece asked Sorrell if he had talked to them about the complaints they heard or potential solutions. Sorrell replied not since they had brought information to the Council with regard to them not liking their working conditions, which had resulted in this program. Sorrell thought they liked the change in the working conditions greatly. Treece stated he would be curious to know if they monitored the logo bags, whether just limiting the number of bags would help, whether they felt empowered to leave a sticker on something that was too heavy without discipline, etc. Sorrell noted they could have that conversation with them. Sorrell thought they felt empowered to do those things since they did it. Sorrell believed the program was going fairly well, but it had only been six months. Sorrell thought they should give it another year to determine if it worked.

REP58-21 Amendment to the FY 2021 Annual Budget - Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds.

Treece understood this report had been provided for informational purposes.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Thomas commented that Steve Calloway had spoken to them two weeks ago reminding them of the recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence, and it sounded to him as though violence interruption programs were quite successful in other cities. Thomas understood there was a possibility of putting some American Rescue Plan Act funds into a program of that nature, and asked staff to research those programs in other cities in terms of how they worked and how effective they had been in recent years. Thomas also asked for a report on the pilot program the previous City Manager had put into place with Glenn Cobbins and Judy Hubbard, along with police officers at times, whereby they had engaged with four priority neighborhoods. Treece asked if there was any objection to that request, and no one objected.

Thomas stated he would be absent from the August 2, 2021 City Council Meeting.

Skala commented that the Broadband Business Planning Task Force had decided it would be useful to share mapping data with regard to coverage areas, and the cost of that mapping was estimated at \$5,000. Skala noted there was a bit of a sense of urgency because there was a deadline on July 17 with regard to grants associated with the National Telecommunications and Information Administration, which was an executive branch agency that advised the President, and he wanted to inform the Task Force they

could move forward with the \$5,000 prior to the budget session. Skala asked if that was possible with the approval of Council. Treece thought it was appropriate to use utility dollars for mapping to the extent they wanted to develop a broadband utility so they knew where all of the lines were located. Treece also felt it should be done in way to provide the industry the confidence that their data was anonymized to the point there was no competition, and wondered if the City was already doing this or if they needed to utilize the University in this regard. Glascock thought some of the providers would share their maps with them, and was uncertain as to whether they needed the University to do it or not. Glascock commented that he did not know what the University was providing, and understood they had presented something to the County, who he thought was working with the University. Glascock stated he was not sure what they would get out of it as the City could do the work itself if the providers provided them the information. Glascock felt it was up to whom the providers trusted the most, i.e., the University or the City.

Treece stated he was not opposed to this, but thought the City Manager should determine the best fit. Treece asked if anyone had concerns or objections, and no one objected. Waner pointed out she had prior working relationship with the Center for Applied Research and Engagement Systems, which was who they were speaking of, and they were experienced in overlaying maps and identifying footprints and gaps so she was supportive of that in any way she was allowed to be supportive.

Skala noted another request by the Broadband Business Planning Task Force was for a monthly report of the permits broadband companies had filed to dig into the City's rights-of-way. Glascock stated those were open records a report could be provided.

Fowler thanked everyone that had come together to put on the Bicentennial Celebration. As part of that, the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC) had hosted some walking tours, and in their research, they had discovered that hidden beneath the streets was the base of a bridge that had been built in 1870. Fowler stated it had been a lovely 3-4 days, and it had been very meaningful for everyone to come together to do something joyful after 14-15 months of isolation.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 10:26 p.m.