City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, July 6, 2020 7:00 PM	Regular	Council Chamber Columbia City Hall 701 E. Broadway

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, July 6, 2020, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri.

Mayor Treece explained social distancing was being reflected as a number of chairs had been removed in an effort to maintain a distance of six feet. He encouraged everyone to observe six feet of social distancing to the extent possible and to wait in the lobby or outside until the item they were interested in was up for discussion so others interested in a prior item could listen to the debate and participate for that item. Once done, they could then leave opening spots for others. He pointed out the Council Chamber and lobby had been marked to help everyone maintain an adequate distance from one another.

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

Mayor Treece explained the June 15, 2020 meeting minutes were not yet complete.

Upon his request, Mayor Treece made a motion to allow Mr. Pitzer to abstain from voting on B126-20. Mr. Pitzer noted on the Disclosure of Interest form that he had a professional conflict of interest with the counterparty to the City in the contract. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas asked that B136-20 and B137-20 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B136-20 and B137-20 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Thomas and a second by Mr. Skala.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI11-20 David Lineberry, Chair of Mayor's Task Force on Bicentennial Celebration Planning.

David Lineberry explained he was the citizen volunteer Chair of the CoMo 200 Task Force, which was for and about the City's bicentennial. It had been a while since the Task Force had updated the Council and there had been changes in leadership since then. He stated the three guiding principles for their work were inclusion, celebration, and legacy. With regard to inclusion, they wanted everyone within Columbia to have a positive experience with CoMo200 by the end of 2021, the bicentennial year. He noted they wanted to be inclusive by interest, age, race, ethnicity, and culture, by interest and performance in the past, present, and future, and by location. He pointed out downtown Columbia was very rich in its history, but the City was larger than this area and they wanted to capture everyone in town. He referred to the "You Don't Say" radio series on

KBIA, and noted it was the result of a partnership between CoMo200, KBIA, the African-American Heritage Committee, and the Sharp End group to look at the black experience in Columbia's history and capturing those mostly oral recollections. He stated there would be more inclusion events and activities as they got closer to the bicentennial year. He commented that the second of their main concepts was the celebration. The bicentennial was a birthday so they wanted to celebrate it. They had designed and were in the process of implementing art, media, and history based projects across the City. He noted the celebration would be held on June 12, 2021. He explained that if they would have had to nail down a date for the bicentennial, it would have actually been held in the month of May, but that month had been booked in every way. As a result, the main event, which would be centered in the downtown, would be held on June 12. He explained there would be other satellite events throughout the City at pocket parks and other parks and locations throughout 2021. He commented that the Boone County bicentennial was this year, and their programming had been impacted due to COVID restrictions. As a result, the City had reached out to them to be a part of the CoMo200 celebration as there were several opportunities for collaboration. He stated the last of the three elements was legacy, and explained the products of this effort would be archived at the Boone County Historical Society and the Missouri State Historical Society. In addition, the physical legacy of their work would largely be seen through the Flat Branch Park extension project. He displayed a diagram showing what it might look like when completed. It was a multi-million dollar project, and as a result, they had adopted a modular approach with a multi-phased development plan. He described the project, which would include the restoration of the creek, a pedestrian bridge, lighting, etc., and noted the Gateway project would finish off the design. He commented that the City had made its contribution to this work by providing the funds to acquire the property and the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) was pledging $1 million toward the project. The other elements would total $1.2 million, and they had a fundraising director, Chris Kelly, and honorary co-chairs who were also former mayors, Mary Anne McCollum and Bob Pugh. Although they did not know the impact of COVID, they were continuing to develop conversations and relationships for monetary and in-kind donations. He commented that there were opportunities for anyone that wanted to help in this effort, and noted the next meeting of the Task Force would be held on July 23.

Ms. Fowler noted the City had 10,000 paving bricks that had been saved from older structures within the downtown, and she understood they were superior and much less expensive than some other options. Mr. Lineberry understood there was a dedicated fund within the City's structure for brick street renovation and repair although it remained generally unfunded. He wondered if the Council might join them in contemplating how they might bring those bricks into some sort of element of that fund so those bricks could be placed in the street. Ms. Fowler explained she had been advised that those bricks would be suitable for landscaping, but not for paving. She commented that she was hopeful the bricks already in the streets could be removed and replaced after reestablishing the base. Mr. Lineberry understood and stated he would make note of her observation on the other bricks.

Mayor Treece pointed out the centennial had also been faced with a pandemic in 1918.

B131-20 Accepting a donation from Maxito Lindo for the City's roadside pollinator program; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

Mayor Treece asked for the representative of Maxito Lindo to come forward.

Max Garcia-Rubio stated he was representing his band, Maxito Lindo. He explained they had embarked in making an album in 2018 and could not have accomplished what they had without the help of the community, which included financial assistance from musicians and businesses such as Hitt Records and Maude Vintage. As a result, he felt the need to give back to the community in the form of a donation to the roadside pollinator program. Having noticed the decline of pollinators in his own garden in the

years past, he was happy to learn of the City's monarch butterfly program and its roadside pollinator program. He commented that what he found most important in the pollinator program was the awareness and inspiration it brought as the City had committed to a long-term investment in the local food system. He noted the donation and the City's initiative were miniscule in comparison to the food justice that was needed in the community and world at-large, but was happy the program existed. He explained his intention with this donation was to raise awareness of pollinators while also informing everyone that the Office of Sustainability and its pollinator program was of great value. He thanked the City for providing him an outlet to be a part of the solution.
Mayor Treece stated he appreciated Mr. Garcia-Rubio's contribution to the pollinator program and the music scene.
The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Skala thanked Mr. Garcia-Rubio for his interest and work.

B131-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

Mayor Treece appointed Kathy Becker, who would represent the Downtown CID, and Joy Bess, who was employed by the Columbia Public Schools (CPS), to the Mayor's Task Force on Bicentennial Celebration Planning, which was also known as CoMo200.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC26-20 Jamie Reeves - Police defunding.

Jamie Reeves did not speak and was not in attendance.

SPC27-20 Robert Todd Haenisch - Redox cell signaling molecules technology.

Robert Todd Haenisch, 1715 Gordon Street, stated he was the founder of a not-for-profit, which was now a 501(c)(3) thanks to John Baker, and noted Mr. Baker was working endless hours to try to help with the shortfalls of charitable giving in the community. He explained he worked in clinical research and had grown up with pharmaceutical products as his grandfather had been a pharmacist in Saline County. He commented that there was a supplement that reduced symptoms, and although he supported masks out of a courtesy for the spread, if more of them had this technology, fewer people would die. He noted it reversed symptoms at the cellular level, and was anti-microbial, anti-fungal, anti-bacterial, anti-viral, and anti-apoptosis. He stated he had been meeting with his patent attorneys and his focus was on this technology for agriculture and animal health. The only place it could be obtained was from a factory in Utah, and there were 40 patents tied to it. He explained the Norton family, who controlled it, had become billionaires during this pandemic because those that knew of the technology consumed large amounts any time they had a symptom. He commented that it was also important in detox. As they talked about excessive force and what it cost to call 911 in Columbia, he felt there were better ways to do things. He noted it was an immunization product that had no toxicity and reversed symptoms. He thanked Mr. Trapp for his relentless efforts to try to do something for the homeless people in the community. He believed they needed more beds and to address the necessary issues. He commented that if they knew of someone with COVID-19 or a child with cancer, his charity would give the technology to them or their parents. He stated it was not something doctors could prescribe as they were governed by a code of ethics which did not allow them to treat, diagnose, prevent or cure a disease unless the FDA approved it, and the FDA would not approve something that would not help people so it would always be a supplement. He thought it was incredible that so few people had died in Columbia and was impressed by how well prepared the City was. He commented that he hoped they could think globally

and act locally by inviting international visitors to Columbia as they had so much to share.

SPC28-20 Lynn Maloney - Institutional racism and city contracts.

Lynn Maloney understood Mayor Treece had been quoted in the newspaper saying "it was our responsibility to break down the systems of institutional racism" and noted they were eager to see what actions the Council would take to dismantle the institutions within Columbia. She pointed out the Council had an excellent opportunity as the City prepared to finalize the next formal contract with the Columbia Police Officers Association (CPOA). She understood Chapter 19 of the Code of Ordinances governed the relationship between the City and the CPOA and stipulated that the changes Council wanted to make to its contractual agreement with the CPD had to be shared with the CPOA prior to discussion with the Council, which she felt was fair. She pointed out that they had been told the former Police Chief could not be fired due to state statute a few years ago, but when the City felt it was time for him to go, they had compelled him to resign, and suddenly the state statute was no longer an obstacle to doing the right thing. She pointed out slavery had been legal in this country until they had decided to make it illegal. She commented that the CPOA was a part of the institutional racism in Columbia, Missouri. In 2015, Dale Roberts, as the leader of the CPOA, had declared the anniversary of the day St. Louis police officer, Darren Wilson, had shot and killed Michael Brown to be celebrated as Darren Wilson Day, and Mr. Roberts had not been fired by CPOA. In years since, the public had complained about the offensive posts within the social media of the CPOA numerous times, and the CPOA membership had still not fired Mr. Roberts. She stated that in reviewing the CPOA website, it had become clear to her why the CPD, which had been mandated to implement community oriented policing over two years ago, still had not done so. They had their own philosophy of policing, which could be seen on the "About Us" page located at columbiacpoa.org and said "I am the police, and I am here to arrest you. You have broken the law. I did not write the law, I may even disagree with the law, but I will enforce it. Nothing will stop me from placing you in a steel cage with bars…I am fate with a badge and a gun." She did not feel this was what the community meant by community oriented policing. The overwhelmingly successful outreach unit, which had been dismantled by the previous chief and was now contrary to the department-wide implementation they had been promised years ago, now only had three officers. She understood they were hoping to get up to a mere six when there might have been 17 officers in that unit years ago. She commented that the culture of the CPOA was clearly at the heart of the failure to create a department based on the philosophy of community oriented policing. Doing business with the CPOA, an organization that was demonstrably racist and whose public declaration on the website was contrary to the mandate of Council for community oriented policing, could simply not be justified by Chapter 19 of the Code of Ordinances. She pointed out others had also stood at the podium begging the Council to end the institutional racism maintained by the City in its relationship with the CPOA, and explained that to object to the racism of the CPOA was not a reflection of an anti-union perspective. She believed the City had to maintain its integrity and relations with unions, but did not feel it should be held hostage by an explicitly racist institution. She stated the City could have asked the CPOA to fire Mr. Roberts, who had been singled out for these problems, but they had not done so over the many years. She thought they could also require all members of the CPOA to uphold an agreement to perform community oriented policing or even change the philosophy they had on the website. She felt the culture of the CPOA precluded the ability of officers to implement the policing the Council had mandated, and noted the Council could follow the actions of the Minneapolis City Council by dismantling the CPD altogether. She stated Mayor Treece had promised to dismantle institutional racism in Columbia, and the City's current relationship with the CPOA was at the very heart of that racism today.

SPC29-20 Kimber Summers - Shifting the responsibility of addiction and drug use from the criminal justice to the social justice system.

Kimber Summers commented that in the last month or so, there had been a wonderfully significant rise in community conversations surrounding Black Lives Matter (BLM) and the idea of defunding the police. She stated they could not talk about racial inequality, systemic racism, or defunding the police without also talking about mass incarcerations, and they could not effectively talk about mass incarcerations without discussing drug abuse and addiction. She explained most of her numbers were from 2014, but they were the most recent available statistics on the Bureau of Justice Statistics website. In 2014, the CPD had made about 4,700 arrests, and of the 4,700 arrests, about 10 percent were for non-violent drug abuse violations. In addition, 86 percent of those non-violent drug abuse violations were for possession, while only 14 percent were for sale and manufacturing. As a result, most of those people were not running meth labs or providing drugs. They were people that were either recreational drug users or people who had addictions, and those populations should not be in prison or jail, especially if the charges were non-violent and did not include driving while intoxicated or child negligence. Per City documents, the CPD had a budget of $23.3 million in 2019 while the budget for the Public Health and Human Services Department had been less than $7.5 million in 2019. That was $23.3 million to treat the symptoms of society and $7.5 million to treat the causes of the problems. The numbers made even less sense when considering the $7.5 million included the budgets for animal control and environmental public health. If they wanted to talk about the numbers invested directly in improving the lives of the citizens of Columbia, it would be just over $6 million. She noted $6 million was invested in community health, community health promotion, human services, social services, and administration costs. She reiterated 10 percent of the arrests had been for non-violent drug abuse violations, and suggested shifting them from the criminal justice system to the social service system while proportionately shifting 10 percent of the CPD budget. That would provide another $2.3 million for the social sector of the budget, which would result in increasing the amount of money invested in citizens by almost 50 percent. It was money that could go toward rehabilitation facilities, sober living houses, housing in general, job preparation programs, and other programs that would help make the lives of people better instead of putting them in jail and restricting their access to food stamps, housing, voting, state and federal scholarships, etc. She explained they could expand this scenario for arrests for driving under alcohol influence as it made up another 10 percent of total arrests. She noted there had been 119 arrests associated with liquor laws and 327 arrests associated with disorderly conduct, and pointed out disorderly conduct arrests were primarily related to alcohol, drugs, or mental illness. By shifting funds, it could provide another $4.6 million for the social services sector. She thought some of those funds could go towards public transit so people did not have to drive drunk. She commented that 11 percent of the population of Columbia was black, but 45 percent of those arrested for drug abuse violations were black, and 10 percent had involved black children under the age of 18. Out of 327 arrests for disorderly conduct, 33 percent were black. She did not feel that made sense and did not believe money should be used for putting people in jail for those types of violations.

SPC30-20 Roy Lovelady - Police, policies, and the racial injustice happening here in Columbia.

Roy Lovelady explained he was representing the People's Defense and noted the demographics in Columbia included 77 percent of white people, 11 percent of black people, 6 percent of Asian people, and 6 percent of "other" people. In reviewing police data, 64 percent of the people stopped were white and 30 percent of the people stopped were black. In addition, 16 percent of the stops involving black people resulted in a search while only 8 percent of the stops involving white people resulted in a search. He

noted 54 percent of black people were involved with excessive use of force while only 41 percent of white people were involved with excessive use of force, and 57 percent of black people were involved in resisting arrests cases while that number was only 38 percent for white people. He continued by explaining suspicion of weapons involved 63 percent of black people and only 34 percent of white people. He reiterated and pointed out that black people only made up 11 percent of the population in Columbia. He stated Columbia had a policing problem as black people were more heavily policed than other populations. He believed the role of law enforcement was to guard against criminal wrongdoings, restore order with limited force, and ensure due process for every individual. The "war on drugs" along with the expansion of the 1033 program, which militarized and heavily armed the police, had created an all-time high in terms of vicious use of force and surveillance, especially in the black community. He noted this had created trust issues between the community and the police. He commented that in the black community, calling the police was the last resort due to fear of jail with skin color being the crime, and the low-income and high crime areas were heavily policed. He believed proper policing required the police to build positive relationships with the community. He stated 1 in every 4 black men would go to jail in their lifetime while it was only 1 in every 23 for white men. The fathers not being in the home led to men being 20 times more likely to end up in prison, 6 times more likely to drop out of school, and 9 times more likely to lead a life of crime. This did not happen by accident. It was a product of systematic racism. He thought it was time to rethink and reform the police. He understood policy 300.11.4 indicated strangles and chokeholds were prohibited unless officers believed it was a life threatening situation. He felt they either did not do chokeholds or they did. He believed training and education needed to be increased. At one time, a bachelor's degree was required to be a police officer. The requirement was then reduced to an associate's degree, and now, only a GED or diploma was necessary to become an officer. He suggested an associate's degree still be required along with some ethics and discrimination training. He commented that the policy regarding intervention was vague and short, and felt they either intervened or they did not intervene. He stated community policing was something they wanted to see locally as he believed it would help to address some of the trust issues. He understood pretext stops were not happening during COVID, and felt that should continue through the end of the year so they could determine how that impacted policing. He noted people felt they were not being heard when making complaints to police officers and suggested software so people could see the status of their complaints. In addition, he believed they should utilize social workers instead of having the police show up to every call as they were overworked and sometimes underfunded. He referred to SB600 and noted it took more power away from the people. It also introduced new mandatory minimums, 3-5 year deals or life in prison, and redefined gangs. In addition, two new prisons would be built at a cost of $500 million to taxpayers. He understood this bill was on the Governor's desk and he would love to see it get vetoed. Mayor Treece stated the Governor had signed it today.

Mr. Lovelady thanked the police officers that had done a great job this past weekend during the 4th of July when responding to those that were shot as the result of a drive-by shooting. He noted the CPD was above the curve when it came to some things, but felt work still needed to be done. He stated that black lives mattered and they wanted everyone to take their knees off of their necks so they could breathe. He commented that the People's Defense was here to stay until they saw change.

SPC31-20 Renee Maxwell - Police reforms.

Renee Maxwell commented that she wanted to address the Council about budget priorities. She understood there had been a lot of talk recently with regard to defunding the police, which was not really an accurate framing of the true objective. The real objective was to allocate public funds with the intention of making the community a safer, stronger, and healthier place for everyone. She noted Ms. Summers had made some really good points in that regard. She felt if they invested in the health and well-being of

the most vulnerable people in the community, they would no longer need to rely on the police to react to the problems which stemmed from the unmet needs of neighbors. She believed they also needed to address the real harm that was done to communities by the carceral system through overpolicing and the criminalization of survival. They could no longer pretend that a militarized police force was an appropriate tool for keeping a community safe. If investing in policing and prisons was truly a deterrent to crime, the United States would be the safest and most crime-free nation on Earth. She thought it was abundantly clear that was not the case. The system was failing all of them, but especially black, brown, and poor people. It was said that a budget was a moral document that revealed their values and priorities, and according to Mr. Thomas, Columbia spent about $25 million annually on the police and approximately $2 million on health and social services. This disparity was a sobering indicator of the priorities of Columbia, and while damning, the numbers provided a clear roadmap for how they could shift priorities to better serve the community. She commented that she believed City leadership had failed to address the needs of unsheltered neighbors as they had been telling citizens for years that the City could not afford to house the chronically homeless. She felt they could not afford to leave them on the streets. She stated the City somehow managed to find $9 million for a new police facility, but it could not find the resources to care for the homeless community. She did not feel the problem was a lack of funds. It was a matter of political will. Instead of investing in punitive systems which reacted to crime and violence in the community, it was time to invest in programs that would address the root causes of crime and violence. She explained they did not want more lip service or empty gestures. They were there to demand that City leaders take immediate action to reprioritize the needs of the City to ensure that those that were the most vulnerable, i.e., those that were left behind while others benefited, would finally receive the care and opportunities needed, not just to survive, but to thrive as beloved members of the community. She suggested reforms with the objective of reducing the impact of policing on vulnerable communities while also investing in the health and well-being of residents. She asked for changes to the CPD to include immediately firing officers that had any excessive force complaints, ending the CPD's role in jailing children by investing health and wellness programs that would divert children away from incarceration, which meant permanently ending the contract with the CPS and removing all school resource officers from schools, eliminating the CPD hiring freeze, ensuring no additional funds go to the CPD or toward hiring officers, ending no-knock warrants, acknowledging disparities in vehicle stop data, engaging in concrete actions to reduce the disparities by changing patrol patterns to decrease contact with black people and people of color, focusing resources on reducing violence rather than enforcing minor traffic violation, and making police interactions with the public transparent by providing no-cost records of stops, arrests, interactions and no-cost access to body camera footage since transparency was an important aspect of public trust. She commented that the City should implement policy changes, to include further decriminalizing drug possession, banning the use of neck restraints, tear gas, pepper spray, rubber bullets, and stun grenades by the police to reduce the militarization of local law enforcement, requiring police officers to carry personal liability insurance to cover the costs of brutality or death claims so taxpayers were not responsible for those settlements, and reallocating a substantial portion of the police budget to a crisis response team modeled after the one in Eugene, Oregon, known as CAHOOTS, along with a permanent homeless shelter, addiction treatment, and mental health treatment. She felt they would all benefit from making those items a priority.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH23-20 Proposed construction of a sidewalk along the north side of St. Charles Road between Demaret Drive and Battle Avenue.

PH23-20 was read by the Clerk.
Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.
Mr. Skala stated this had been long in coming as there had been many requests for sidewalks on St. Charles Road and difficulties with respect to Demaret Drive. He understood the discussions had been productive between the City and the CPS in terms of cost sharing. Mr. Nichols explained discussions had initially also included Boone County, but there had been some issues. As a result, they had to redraft the agreement and that had taken longer than anticipated. Mr. Skala understood there had been complications with the plans near Battle High School. Mr. Nichols stated a lot of coordination had been required.
Ms. Fowler asked if the 50 percent cost share was exactly half of the costs or if it 50 percent of a portion. Mr. Nichols replied it was 50 percent of the cost. Ms. Fowler understood it was a straight 50 percent cut. Mr. Nichols stated that was correct.
Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.
Mayor Treece explained a written comment had been received by Clint McMillen, who voiced his support for the sidewalk as he thought it was crazy for a high school to even have been built without proper pedestrian access, especially considering how disadvantaged much of the school's students were and the fact a Battle High School student had died walking home from work on Clark Lane. He felt pedestrian-friendly roadways should be a priority with regard to infrastructure. He commented that he believed municipalities around the country had made a huge mistake the last several decades by not considering pedestrians more. The written comment was filed with this agenda item.
There being no further comment, Mayor Treece closed the public hearing.

Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to proceed with the final plans and specifications for construction of the St. Charles Road Sidewalk, Demaret Drive to Battle Avenue, Project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH24-20 Proposed replacement of a sanitary sewer under Providence Road, south of Nifong Boulevard.

PH24-20 was read by the Clerk.
Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.
Ms. Fowler understood there had been a persistent problem with grease in the downtown sewers that had been quite expensive to remediate, and asked if they had a problem with grease being dumped into the sewers or if this was just an accumulation. Mr. Sorrell replied it was just an accumulation due to the settling of the pipe. He noted all food service establishments were required to have grease traps, which were inspected to ensure they were pumped out on a regular basis. He believed the grease problems they had in the past had been addressed and that this was just build up due to the settlement of the pipe.
Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.
There being no comment, Mayor Treece closed the public hearing.

Mayor Treece made a motion directing staff to proceed with the South Providence Sanitary Sewer Replacement Project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B120-20 Amending Chapter 11, Article IV, Division 2 of the City Code related to communicable diseases within the city.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.
Ms. Browning provided a staff report.
Mayor Treece understood this was not legislation to approve the action previously taken by Ms. Browning, but rather an amendment to the process by which she issued orders. Ms. Browning stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood this would provide for 21 days, similar to that of the City Manager under an emergency declaration, in terms of acceptance or rejection, and it was only being extended to Ms. Browning for this purpose. Ms. Browning stated that was correct.
Mayor Treece commented that in February when he had read Chapters 7 and 11 of the City Code regarding emergency orders, he had been struck by the reference to the public health director as a male. Ms. Browning replied that had been the case until 1999 when she was hired.
Mr. Skala understood this ordinance would allow for the Council to act in concert with public health due to the review process that would occur after 21 days. He asked if the significance of the 21 days had to do with council meetings. Ms. Browning replied that was probably the case in terms of the orders of the City Manager, but for her, it happened to coincide with the timing by which she reviewed the situation in terms of an incubation period.
Mr. Skala noted this ordinance allowed for a cooperative effort between public health and the City Council in addition to addressing the gender issue.
Ms. Browning pointed out the order that was in place now, which limited mass gatherings to 100 people, was set to expire on July 20. The next stage of the reopening plan was to move to 250 people, but given where they were now, she was not confident they could move forward to that, and although this ordinance would not apply to that order, she wanted everyone to know that now.
Mr. Skala thanked her for her work during this trying time. Ms. Browning noted she had an amazing staff.
Ms. Peters understood the plan was not to go backwards. It was to stay where they were while continuing to monitor the situation. Ms. Browning stated that was the goal. Ms. Peters commented that she hoped that would work.
Mayor Treece asked if any order limiting capacity, or even the stay at home order issued by Ms. Browning, took effect in the County or if the County Commission had to approve and issue the order. Ms. Browning replied she issued the orders for the County, but the process was for the County Commission to adopt the order. Mayor Treece understood all of the actions Ms. Browning had taken had been approved by the County Commission to take effect in the County area, and this would replicate that process with a 21-day lag time.
Chris Devine, 2211 Rose Drive, asked if this involved wearing a mask as he understood Japan just opened up today and China had been opened for months and felt mandatory masks were unconstitutional. Mayor Treece explained discussion regarding masks would happen when they got to B168-20, which was the last item under new business. This ordinance would only allow for a process change. Mr. Devine understood this meant the Council would back everything Ms. Browning ordered. Mayor Treece explained this would actually change the law so Ms. Browning did not have full authority as it would have to come to the Council for approval or rejection.

B120-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B126-20 Authorizing a third amendment to the solar power purchase agreement with Truman Solar, LLC.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Sorrell provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B126-20 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B126-20, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. ABSTAINING: PITZER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B150-20 Establishing an administrative delay in the enforcement of land use and business regulations related to short-term rentals.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.
Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.
Mayor Treece asked Mr. Teddy for his sense with regard to what the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) was doing in the interim, between now and when the item was to return to Council. Mr. Teddy replied he thought the PZC would be willing to take on a few work session discussions on this, and that they likely wanted to hear from the Council as to expectations. They could critique the ordinance that had been offered or do something else. Mayor Treece thought that had been done. Mr. Teddy explained the PZC had provided Council a report, but they could review it more deeply with regard to specific objections in terms of what could be done differently.
Ms. Fowler thought the Council had sent the issue to the PZC knowing it would be some time before they were able to take it up since they had not been meeting then.
Mayor Treece understood the PZC wanted to know what the Council wanted them to do with regard to short-term rentals and his recollection was that the Council had referred it back to them for comment and to harmonize some of the amendments. Mr. Skala stated that was his understanding as well. He assumed that since things were back to some semblance of normal they would take this issue up and advise them of any potential future public hearing.
Mayor Treece asked if anyone had a different impression or recollection. Mr. Pitzer replied he did not believe the PZC could harmonize all of the amendments. He pointed out they had referred it back to the Council without a recommendation and everyone that had voted against the recommendation had voted against it for different reasons. He understood they had also asked PZC to take a look at the short-term rental industry in terms of what it would look like post-COVID and whether changes were necessary in that regard.
Mr. Skala noted there had been a new appointment to the PZC so there was another voice.
Mayor Treece stated he believed the PZC needed to have some type of work session as that had been the intent when tabling the ordinance.
Mr. Teddy understood the Council wanted the PZC to deliver recommendations and comments prior to December 7. Mr. Skala stated that was correct, and understood that might include a revision to the ordinance since there were new members. Mr. Teddy agreed the pandemic would be a new topic associated with it.
Ms. Fowler noticed the staff report had more expansive language than the ordinance when discussing the essential things that would be enforced, such as life-safety, trash, etc., and asked if it was necessary for the ordinance to have that same language for that to be in effect. Mr. Teddy replied he thought the Law Department would have included it in the ordinance had that been the case. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct, and noted it did not have to be exactly the same. Ms. Fowler understood it was not necessary to follow the spirit of the staff report. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

B150-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B136-20 Vacating a tree preservation easement on Lot 1 within Chapel Hill Meadows located east of Louisville Drive and north of Chapel Hill Road (Case No. 97-2020).

Discussion shown with B137-20.

B137-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Chapel Hill Meadows, Plat No. 2" located on the northeast corner of the Chapel Hill Road and Louisville Drive intersection; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 109-2020).

The bills were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked Mr. Teddy to describe the alternative tree preservation requirement that had been approved by staff allowing for the vacation of this one. Mr. Teddy replied staff approved tree preservation plans based on the ordinance, and it was a part of the land disturbance process, which was a permit process. The City Arborist had worked with the applicant to devise an area that was on the north side that created an enhanced buffer. He understood there would be a number of tree plantings, shrubs, and native grasses in the area, and it was denoted as a restoration area on the plat. There were a few trees within the easement that the applicant had indicated they would make the effort to save voluntarily at the request of property owners. Mr. Thomas asked if that was in the area that would be vacated. Mr. Teddy replied yes. He explained there were a number of large trees in the easement, and the applicant had indicated they would work with the property owners, which he assumed were the lot purchasers, that wanted to make extraordinary efforts to save the trees.

Mr. Thomas understood there was an equitable alternative requirement for tree preservation within the City's normal procedures. Mr. Teddy stated the approved preservation plan met the standard for significant trees. He explained they had to preserve 25 percent or more of the trees that were 20-inches in diameter or greater, and they had done that. He thought they were at 29 percent.

Mr. Thomas understood the reason the location of the tree preservation area had changed was due to the construction of a detention pond, and asked if those two things had happened on separate tracks, i.e., the design of the detention pond and the decision about which trees to preserve. Mr. Teddy replied the specific configuration of the preservation area had kind of been an artifact of the ordinance. A permit for the church building, which was under construction, had been requested, and they were required to have a preservation area that met the minimum standard for that specific lot. As a result, they had worked with the City Arborist on it as an interim solution. He explained that when they had brought in the two cul-de-sacs, it created more impervious surface and the pond was necessary for stormwater detention.

Mr. Thomas commented that currently there were stormwater issues that existing homes were experiencing, and asked Mr. Teddy to describe what he knew about those and how it related to the various different management plans for the new lots. Mr. Teddy replied the stormwater pond and dam would help enormously with the discharge of stormwater through and off of the site. He explained two intermittent streams came together and left the site. The streams ran from the west to the northeast exit on the east boundary of the property, near the north boundary, so that was the critical area. He noted measures were in place, i.e., a sedimentation basin, which was a temporary feature that caught silt, a double silt fence, and rock checks, which were basically rubble-type structures that filtered stormwater and slowed the flow of water controlling erosion. Mr. Thomas understood those had not been quite adequate for the task. Mr. Teddy stated he thought

there had been issues during the heavy rains last week as he had seen pictures of gravel that had escaped the site. He explained he had been told repairs had been made and that it was under control, but felt getting the full stormwater management plan in place was important. Mr. Thomas understood that included adopting this ordinance. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct.

Tim Crockett, an engineer with offices at 100 W. Nifong Boulevard, explained the church actually owned two separate platted properties at this time, and would continue to do so until the plat was approved. The reason for the current tree preservation area was due to the Unified Development Code (UDC) requiring tree preservation for a non-residential area to be on the lot itself. As a result, they had to move it to the current location. He noted City staff had understood they would move it at a later date so they were not in nonconformance with the UDC. It had always been a part of the plan to move it, and they were proposing to move them closer to the property lines to shield the neighbors. It would involve the same amount of trees, if not more, and the same significant trees, etc. Mr. Thomas understood it had been a technical interim solution. Mr. Crockett stated that was correct. He explained staff had suggested assuming the residential development would not take place as they would then have the tree preservation area covered and could move it in the future. With regard to the current stormwater issues, he did not believe they had disturbed the area of concern identified by the neighbors. The church drained to a different location and construction had not started for the residential portion. He commented that the gravel had never been intended to be rock check, and it ended up flowing downstream. It had mainly been on their property, but a little of it had gotten on to the neighbor's property, and they would work with the neighbor in that regard. Mr. Thomas understood Mr. Crockett felt the final stormwater plan and tree preservation plan would be adequate. Mr. Crockett stated yes. He explained they had run everything through the City's engineers, who had reviewed it multiple times and concurred it would be adequate and conform to all standards.

Mr. Thomas stated he was satisfied with the process and planned to support it.

B136-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B137-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. 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.

B122-20 Voluntary annexation of property located on the southeast corner of Highway WW and Elk Park Drive; establishing permanent District M-N (Mixed-use Neighborhood) zoning (Case No. 76-2020).

B123-20 Granting the issuance of a conditional use permit to Reliable Community Bancshares, Inc. to allow the establishment of a light vehicle service and repair use for a gas station and convenience store, and a drive-up facility as an accessory use to a financial institution (bank), on property located on the southeast corner of Highway WW and Elk Park Drive in an M-N (Mixed-use Neighborhood) zoning district; providing a severability clause (Case No. 77-2020).

B124-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Southfork of the Grindstone, Plat No. 1-A" located on the southeast corner of Highway WW and Elk Park Drive;

	authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 78-2020).
B125-20	Approving the Final Plat of "The Gates, Plat No. 4B" located on the north side of Sella Court, approximately 600 feet east of Rivington Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 111-2020).
B127-20	Accepting Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenants.
B128-20	Repealing Ordinance No. 024235 which authorized a first supplemental agreement to an airport aid agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission relating to air service promotion for the Columbia Regional Airport; authorizing a new revised first supplemental agreement.
B129-20	Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for the terminal project at the Columbia Regional Airport.
B130-20	Authorizing a contract for sale of real estate with DFR, LLC for the acquisition of Lot 53 in Deerfield Ridge Plat 2 Subdivision located north of the intersection of Scott Boulevard and State Route K for the intended purpose of future construction of a fire station.
B132-20	Authorizing a cooperative agreement with the County of Boone, Missouri for radio consultant services and the installation of a single site repeater at the Columbia Regional Airport.
B133-20	Authorizing approval of an Abatement Order On Consent with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources.
B134-20	Rezoning property located on the west side of Sixth Street and south of Wilkes Boulevard (811 N. Sixth Street) from District R-MF (Multiple-family Dwelling) to District R-2 (Two-family Dwelling) (Case No. 90-2020).
B135-20	Granting the issuance of a conditional use permit to JSAE Enterprises, LLC to allow for the construction of an accessory dwelling unit on property located at 507 S. Greenwood Avenue (Case No. 84-2020).
B138-20	Approving the Final Plat of "The Villages at Arbor Pointe Plat 4" located on the west side of Arbor Pointe Parkway between Waco Road and Flatwater Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 102-2020).
B139-20	Vacating a utility easement on Lot 1B1 within Broadway Farms, Plat No. 13-A located south of Broadway and west of Fairview Road (Case No. 44-2019).
B140-20	Authorizing construction of Discovery Parkway from Discovery Drive to south of the intersection of New Haven Road and Rolling Hills Road; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
B141-20	Authorizing a waterline relocation contract with Public Water Supply District No. 9 of Boone County, Missouri relating to construction of the Discovery Parkway extension project, from Discovery Drive to south of the intersection of New Haven Road and Rolling Hills Road.
B142-20	Authorizing construction of the Lenoir Street improvement project.
B143-20	Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of the Lenoir Street improvement project.

B144-20 Authorizing a right of use permit with Missouri Network Alliance, LLC, d/b/a Bluebird Network, for installation and maintenance of fiber optic cable within the City rights-of-way.

B145-20 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of the Glenwood Avenue PCCE #25 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project.

B146-20 Authorizing an agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for the 2020 Missouri State Senior Games and Show-Me STATE GAMES.

B147-20 Authorizing an agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission to allow the installation and maintenance of an African-American Heritage Trail marker in right-of-way located on the southwest corner of Providence Road and Ash Street.

B148-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating restricted hotel tax revenue to the terminal project at the Columbia Regional Airport.

B149-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds to close out a loan received from the Missouri Transportation Finance Committee (MTFC).

R80-20 Setting a public hearing: consider the FY 2021 Capital Improvement Project Plan for the City of Columbia, Missouri.

R81-20 Authorizing various Adopt A Spot agreements.

R82-20 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Anderson Engineering, Inc. for the design of a replacement bridge on Ridgemont Road over the County House Branch.

R83-20 Authorizing an agreement for professional engineering services with Kenneth H. Lemp Elevator Consultant, Inc. for the evaluation of City-owned elevator equipment and the preparation of a request for proposal (RFP) for a comprehensive elevator service and maintenance contract.

R84-20 Authorizing the installation of street lights on the west side of Edenton Boulevard, north of International Drive.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

R85-20 Reaffirming the commitment of the City to values of equity, fairness, inclusion and justice in the provision of city services in the wake of COVID-19.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.
Ms. Thompson provided a staff report.
Mr. Skala commented that this had been a longstanding effort by the Race Equity and Leadership (REAL) Council within the National League of Cities (NLC). REAL had been formed in 2015, after the 2014 Ferguson incident, as an initiative of the NLC, and had moved up in status to the REAL Council within the last two years. This resolution had been written with respect to underserved areas, particularly the black underserved areas in the community, and with respect to COVID-19, which was a recent phenomenon. He

believed it fit nicely with their earlier resolution in affirmation of diversity in the community, and was an exemplar in terms of how they viewed the underserved areas with respect to how they were adversely affected by COVID. The REAL Council had supplied a template, and this resolution had come from that template.

Mr. Trapp stated he was happy to support this as he believed it was important to make their values known, clearly state what they were trying to do, and take meaningful action toward making those values real. He commented that the part the leapt out to him was that they affirmed the inherent dignity and value of every person and strived to maintain a climate for work and learning based upon mutual respect and understanding. He noted they always had a number of folks that were left behind, and they needed to do more serious work in terms of having a climate where individuals, especially those that were unsheltered, had an opportunity to move out of that condition, be able to maintain themselves, and have access to sanitation and handwashing as they were not meeting that obligation. He thought they had to continue to look at what they were doing at every policy level until they reached that basic standard for everyone in the community.

The vote on R85-20 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R86-20 Approving Amendment #3 to the FY 2019 CDBG and HOME Annual Action Plan to allocate Round 1 Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act funding.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Cole provided a staff report.

Mary Ratliff, 211 Park De Ville Drive, commented that she had received lots of complaints as to how funding had been allocated. There had been a window in which the application could be made, but it appeared as though many of the applicants had been told very early on that all of the money was gone and that there was not a need to submit an application. She wondered how the determinations were made, and noted she was hopeful the needs along with other items were reviewed instead of just accepting applications as they were submitted and allocating funds as such. She commented that if they had a window and applications were submitted within that window of time, it should not matter if someone submitted their application at 8:00 a.m. while another person submitted their application at 8:15 a.m. She reiterated she felt the need should be considered. She hoped that would be addressed with the second round of funding.

Mayor Treece stated he had asked something similar with respect to notice to ensure everyone had the window to submit an application, and noted he would ask Mr. Cole to respond to Ms. Ratliff's concern.

Traci Wilson-Kleekamp, 2905 Greenbriar Drive, explained the City was not very good in terms of outreach to minority communities so she was concerned about prompt access. She also did not feel they should count on the internet to get information to minority business owners. She pointed out not everyone had access to the internet and not everyone obtained information from the City's website. She suggested the City think more deeply with regard to how they did outreach to minority communities, not only in terms of this, but in general. She stated those businesses were not present tonight and believed something with the way they discussed policy, etc. left people out. She noted it was not appropriate to tell people to come to them. There needed to be a team that went to them.

Mayor Treece asked Mr. Cole to discuss outreach, specifically with regard to microenterprise assistance. Mr. Cole replied in terms of microenterprise assistance, a meeting had been held at Second Missionary Baptist Church two Saturdays ago, which had included five local African-American ministers along with at least 15-20 minority owned business representatives, and the City had provided quite a bit of information which they would disseminate to their groups. He thought they had made an effort to

meet people where they were. He noted a group of six local African-American leaders were also helping them call Jim Whitt's list of 200 minority owned businesses, and Ms. Ratliff, who had spoken earlier was helping in that effort. He stated he felt they were doing a lot and believed they would have a good showing of minority owned businesses when they released funding for the microenterprise program and the small business recovery program.

Mayor Treece asked about Ms. Ratliff's point with regard to first come, first served. He understood discretion worked both ways as they might not want discretion in certain situations. He wondered if there was a way to weigh applications based on how many employees might be served or what they might be committing to do. Mr. Cole replied they planned on utilizing a rating criteria for the microenterprise program and the small business recovery loan program, which he had described at the June 15, 2020 Council Meeting. He explained it would involve a five point system, and a point would be attributed to any minority owned business, woman owned business, a business whose owner lived locally, or a business whose owner was investing and adapting to the pandemic. He commented that any minority or woman owned business that applied during that 8-hour window would be moved to the front of list, and there was a high likelihood the business would be funded. He stated he also planned to conduct an informational meeting as a follow up to the meeting that had been held two Saturdays ago.

Ms. Peters understood the original allocations had been provided on a first come, first serve basis, and the process had now been adjusted with better outreach and allowing all applications to be submitted. Mr. Cole stated that was correct. In their review of the first round of applications, 10 of the 18 had been minority or woman owned businesses, and City staff had contacted each of those businesses to determine how they had learned of the programs. He understood four had a personal relationship with Nickie Davis who was with the Downtown CID, three were connected via the Women's Business Center through the Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA), and the remainder had been connected through his office and previous work the City had done in the community. He thought that spoke to some of the input they had received from Keith McIver of the Men's Minority Network and Nickie Davis, i.e., the personal connection mattered the most. It was also the reason all 200 hundred people on Mr. Whitt's list would be contacted by phone while doing additional outreach at local churches and meeting people where they were located.

Ms. Fowler stated she appreciated the efforts of Mr. Cole, and understood there would be an 8-hour window to submit an online application. Mr. Cole stated that was correct. He explained the guidelines indicated it would be kept open for a day or until they had 1.5 times the amount of applications they could fund within the system. Ms. Fowler asked if there were stations and locations people could go to use online tools for those that did not have that available to them. Mr. Cole replied the CMCA Women's Business Center had hired four new business coaches, and they would connect people that might need that assistance to that resource. Ms. Fowler asked if she could go to that resource center if she was a minority owned business owner who did not have sufficient internet service for this online application for assistance, and if there would be sufficient people there and available during that 8-hour time frame. Mr. Cole replied yes. He noted that had come to fruition with the first round of applications.

The vote on R86-20 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

B168-20 Establishing the requirement to wear a face mask in certain locations in order to prevent or limit the spread of the COVID-19 disease; authorizing the adoption of further orders for the implementation of the ordinance; and declaring an emergency for enactment.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Thompson and Ms. Browning provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked how long it took to train someone for contact tracing and what requirements were necessary. Ms. Browning replied contact tracers and investigators had to go through a Johns Hopkins' course that was available online. For some, it took about six hours, and for others, it could take longer. Once the person completed that course, staff would meet with them via Zoom to teach them how it was done in Columbia and to allow them time to practice. She noted they were eased into it slowly. Mr. Skala understood they needed help. Ms. Browning stated that was correct, but pointed out they had been lucky in that they had some Master of Public Health (MPH) and medical student volunteers along with others.

Ms. Peters understood the City utilized volunteers if they were willing to take the course and passed any other screening requirements that were necessary. Ms. Browning stated that was correct.

Ms. Fowler understood there was an exception for people that had health conditions and could not wear a mask due to that condition, and asked for clarification. Ms. Browning replied some people could have difficulty wearing a mask due to a medical condition, such as asthma or another respiratory issue, a mental health condition, such as those that had dealt with trauma and found the mask suffocating, or a physical disability that might make it difficult to put on and take off a mask. It could also apply to someone that was hearing impaired. She stated they had tried to allow for those exceptions and did not feel people with those conditions should be shamed for not wearing a mask. Ms. Fowler asked Ms. Browning if her staff had the training necessary to recognize and discuss those exemptions with members of the general public that might have questions. Ms. Browning replied yes.

Ms. Fowler understood a lot of parents had tried to introduce mask wearing to their kids and had discussed how to keep a bubble around them, and asked about the exemption for children. Ms. Browning replied this ordinance would require masks for children ages 10 years old and up. It was the same for Kansas City, St. Louis City, and St. Louis County. In addition, pediatric infectious disease specialists felt that was an appropriate age where a child could wear a mask independently and safely. Younger kids needed a little more one-on-one assistance. She pointed out her two five year old twin grandsons had successfully worn masks every time they were out so it could be done.

Ms. Fowler asked for clarification for those exercising, whether exercising in groups or running on the trail. Ms. Browning replied that under this ordinance, if one could maintain that physical distance of six feet, one would not need to wear a mask.

Ms. Fowler commented that she used to work at the University of Missouri and recalled students being generally noncompliant with things such as wearing helmets while riding a bicycle, and asked Ms. Browning if she knew the plan for the University of Missouri with regard to students returning in the fall in terms of mask use on campus. Ms. Browning replied her understanding was that the University would require masks on campus in the classroom settings, and that they would encourage it while in the campus environment. She commented that she felt this ordinance was important so students would continue to wear their masks when off campus. Ms. Fowler agreed college students were often off-campus in addition to being on-campus.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was a process if someone wanted to volunteer to assist with contact tracing or have a paid position as a contact tracer. Ms. Browning replied they did not have any funding for paid positions at this time. Mr. Thomas asked if there was a process for volunteers. Ms. Browning replied anyone interested could reach out to them at coronavirus@como.gov or email her.

Mr. Thomas understood everyone in the meeting room would have to wear a mask if the ordinance, as presented, went into effect, even those standing at the podium. Ms. Browning replied yes. Mayor Treece asked for clarification as to when the 6-foot rule applied. He asked if it was only outside or if it could apply inside. Ms. Browning replied

it could apply inside. She commented that they had measured everything at the Health Department so people were at least six feet apart and would not need to wear a mask when they were working within their space but would when moving through the building to use the restroom or go to the breakroom.

Mayor Treece asked for clarification regarding the 6-foot rule when entering a restaurant. Ms. Browning replied people should wear their masks until they got to their table, and could then take it off at the table because they should be six feet away from others. She noted the mask should be put back on when leaving the table.

Mayor Treece asked on average how many physical interactions people that had tested positive had with others by the time her office received the State Health Lab report and was able to contact the person to find out who they might have interacted with so those people could be contacted to be notified to self-isolate. Ms. Browning replied it varied by every person. She noted it had lately been a lot more because some of their younger people had lots of contacts. Early on, they might have had only 2-3 in a household, but now because they had community spread and people were out and about in the community, the number had increased. She stated she thought they had 50 once. Mayor Treece understood they had someone that had been in contact with 50 people. Ms. Browning stated that was correct for the window of time they reviewed. Mayor Treece asked Ms. Browning if she had a rule of thumb or anecdotal information as to whether wearing a mask would decrease the likelihood of those 50 people contracting the virus. Ms. Browning replied if people were universally wearing a mask, it would definitely result in a decrease. She commented that countries like Japan and China that wore masks commonly were opening back up. Mayor Treece stated he had read about the Great Clips experience in Springfield, Missouri where there had been an infected hairdresser that had been in contact with 140 people that had not become infected because she had worn a mask as had all of them per corporate policy. Ms. Browning noted there had been a similar situation at a salon in Columbia where all of the patrons and stylist wore masks resulting in zero cases.

Mayor Treece understood one of the four indicators involved hospitals, and noted that had not really changed even though the number of cases was increasing, and asked why that might be. Ms. Browning replied her theory involved the fact that Columbia was younger in terms of population and that treatment was advancing in terms of being able treat COVID-19 better. She stated they had been very lucky in that there had been good testing from the start, 24-hour results, the ability to maintain contact tracing at the beginning, and a generally healthier population than many other places. Mayor Treece asked if this could also be a lagging indicator. Ms. Browning replied yes. Mayor Treece wondered if they might see a rise in hospitalizations now that they were seeing 100 cases from 55 days to 26 days to 14 days to 8 days to 4 days. He asked Ms. Browning if she thought the number of cases would continue go up while the number of days between 100 cases would continue go down. Ms. Browning replied yes, but noted she hoped they could slow that down by wearing masks.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the Health Department would be conducting enforcement. Ms. Browning replied it would be the Health Department along with the assistance of the Office of Neighborhood Services. Mr. Pitzer understood it would be complaint driven enforcement, meaning someone would call indicating masks were not being worn at a business or elsewhere. Ms. Browning stated that was correct and explained they would make contact with the business and talk to them. She pointed out they would also make signs available for businesses to place at their entrances. Mr. Pitzer understood the Police Department would not be enforcing this. Ms. Browning explained, early on, when they had compliance issues with some establishments regarding occupancy limits, the CPD had accompanied them when they had done occupancy checks. She stated it was not a CPD resource requirement.

Mr. Pitzer understood the City itself would be subject to a fine as well. Ms. Browning stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked if the City was prepared to provide a clean

mask to all employees at all times. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Mr. Pitzer asked where the fine money would end up. He wondered if it would be paid to the Municipal Court. Ms. Thompson replied it would go into the general revenue fund as all fines and forfeitures went into the general revenue fund.

Ms. Thompson pointed out that although the Health Department would be designated administratively to be the primary enforcement, it did not prevent CPD from participating if necessary.

Mr. Pitzer understood a lot of the cases they were seeing now involved the younger population and that was due to crowded spaces, and asked if stricter enforcement actions were being taken in terms of social distancing rules or occupancy rules on those establishments where these activities were happening. Ms. Browning replied they had made contact with the establishments on which they had received complaints and had tried to work through issues with them. She noted they had a couple of circumstances in the last week where they had people test positive who indicated they could not identify contacts due to the fact there were so many people in the establishment and because they did not know them all. In those instances, they had to publicize the establishment along with the dates and times when there might have been exposure.

Mr. Pitzer asked Ms. Browning if she felt it would be reasonable to take stricter enforcement action upfront if there was a pattern in the types of places as most locations in Columbia were not contributing to the spread. Ms. Browning replied she and Chief Jones had been discussing that.

Mr. Pitzer understood some communities were requiring people to sign in with their name and phone number when entering bars and restaurants, and asked if that had been considered. Ms. Browning replied she would be open to that, but they had not required it. Mr. Pitzer asked Ms. Browning if she knew if anyone was doing that voluntarily already. Ms. Browning replied she understood hair salons maintained a list. She also understood some of the hotels that had hosted small meetings had also kept lists of who had been there so they could help if the need arose.

Mr. Pitzer understood the Health Department had started a more aggressive education campaign with regard to masks in the last week or two, and asked if they had tried any other more positive reinforcement activities showing the benefits of wearing masks. He wondered if Ms. Browning thought anything else might work short of it being required by law. Ms. Browning replied they had been doing more education and had also started a social media campaign for people to submit pictures with their masks on in an effort to normalize the wearing of masks. She stated they had a talented group of employees that were spending a lot of time doing things other than what they were trained to do in an effort to provide guidance for businesses. Mr. Pitzer asked if there was any indication that those might be effective in increasing the amount of mask usage. Ms. Browning replied yes, and noted if the ordinance was passed, they could step up their efforts. The goal was to obtain a higher percentage than what they were seeing now.

Mr. Pitzer understood the City did not have any funding for contact tracing, and asked Ms. Browning if she had people she would be able to train and utilize right away if she had funding. Ms. Browning replied she thought they could find people. She explained they would have to go through a hiring process, but it was quicker with temporary employees. She commented that she would have to determine if they would have to supply the temporary employees with a computer, phone, etc. if they were to hire them. Thus far, they had been able to work those issues out with the volunteers by safely using REDCap or with them coming into the office one day per week. They would need to work out the logistics. Mr. Pitzer asked Ms. Browning if she felt they could be more aggressive in outreach if they had funding. Ms. Browning replied yes.

Mr. Pitzer understood the County was sitting on $23 million in federal aid that was to be used to respond to COVID, but the money had not been made available to the Health Department. Ms. Browning stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer commented that it seemed as though contact tracing was the chokepoint of

the four indicators, at least at this time. Ms. Browning stated that was correct. She noted it would also be helpful to have testing dollars in terms of resources. The University of Missouri (MU) Hospital and Boone Hospital had drive-through testing, and MU Hospital had lost a lot of money by providing it for free. They could not continue to do that forever as they now had employers sending all of their employees to get tested when they had an employee with a positive case even when it might not be time appropriate. In addition, the City did not have those resources if someone needed to be tested. They had to take it out of their existing budget to pay for it.

Mr. Pitzer understood a business or establishment would have to turn any person away that was entering without a mask or ask them to put on a mask. He asked for clarification as to how it would work. Ms. Browning replied the business should have a sign. If someone went into the business without a mask, she thought it was fair to offer one if the business was able to make masks available. She also thought it was fair to say a mask was required. She commented that there would be people that were not able to wear a mask for health reasons so there would need to be some balance. Mr. Pitzer asked if the business could ask if there was a medical or other reason. He understood some of that was private information and wondered how that would actually work. Ms. Thompson replied the City's ADA Coordinator, who was within the Law Department, would provide guidance as to what type of information could be asked. She thought a reasonable inquiry could be made, but the size of the business or the number of people it employed would determine if a reasonable accommodation had to be made. She noted reasonable accommodation was required if someone said they had a disability and a requirement beyond it would not be able to be made, but it would be determined on a case-by-case basis because not all businesses were of a size or scope where they had to provide a reasonable accommodation. Mr. Pitzer asked if it would be the end of the conversation if someone went into a store, was told to put on a mask, and responded by saying they could not because they had a disability. Ms. Thompson replied yes in those stores or locations where an accommodation was required.

Mr. Skala assumed Ms. Browning worked in concert with CPS and the University of Missouri, which were independent and interdependent governmental entities, and asked her to describe that work and process. Ms. Browning replied they were working closely with CPS as they developed their plans for the upcoming year. They were also working with all of the rural school districts in Boone County in terms of reviewing plans and providing feedback and guidance. She stated they had been working with the University of Missouri since the very first days. She noted the University had a contact tracing team that was trying to determine how they would do that work and the City was providing support to them as well.

Mr. Skala asked for the Law Department to discuss some of the exceptions at some point tonight.

Mayor Treece asked if a clear face shield could be used to meet the requirements of this ordinance. Ms. Browning replied there might be some cases where that might be acceptable, such as with people with a hearing impairment or by a speech pathologist that was working with a child as the lips needed to be seen. She stated the Centers for Disease Control (CDC) had not come out strongly on face shields being a substitute for masks. In health care settings, a shield and a mask were both required so the eyes were also protected. In terms of the shield alone, airborne transmission from droplets could still come out of the sides, and that was the reason it had not yet been reviewed as being equal to a mask.

Mayor Treece asked about the plexiglass barriers they saw at grocery and hardware stores that came all of the way down, and at best, had a slot to place goods. Ms. Browning replied it was a good physical distancing tool. In her office, the hole so one could hear through the plexiglass was literally at face level so her employees had to wear a mask as well.

Mayor Treece asked if one had to wear a mask when shopping for a car outdoors when it

was easy to maintain six feet of social distance. Ms. Browning replied no unless the sales person was right next to the person. Mayor Treece understood that when they went to the desk to compete the transaction, both people should wear a mask.

Mayor Treece asked Ms. Thompson to walk through what the ordinance included and what it did not include, and to address the potential amendments crafted based on feedback received. Ms. Thompson replied the ordinance, as currently drafted, included 15 exempted activities, and listed those activities.

Mayor Treece understood a mask would not be required when walking on a trail or playing golf so long as six feet of distance could be maintained. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. She explained there was also a separate exception for a person exercising outdoors if the person was able to maintain six feet of distance. She thought that was due to breathing being difficult when engaging in strenuous activity.

Mayor Treece asked for clarification regarding the fourth exception of when at home and exclusively in the presence of members of their own household; provided, however, the wearing of a face mask was required in all common areas of any multifamily structure. He understood that would be the hallway of an apartment building, a joint mailroom or vestibule, etc. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. She stated there was a lot of multifamily housing in Columbia, and that it included things such as study rooms that were an extension of someone's home. This ordinance would require the face mask when outside of the confines of one's singular apartment.

Ms. Thompson pointed out the ADA only protected a person with a disability that could not use a mask. It did not protect someone that chose not to wear a mask. She reiterated it was for people who could not wear one based upon their particular disability.

Mayor Treece stated he had received a couple of emails regarding conceal and carry permits, and asked if there was a conflict of wearing a face mask when carrying a concealed weapon. Ms. Thompson replied no. Mayor Treece understood they were not taking anyone's gun away if they wore a mask. Ms. Thompson replied no.

Ms. Peters asked for examples of situations where federal or state law might prohibit the wearing a face mask or require removal. Ms. Thompson replied she thought it might be an issue for some federal facilities when going through security, and noted airport security was a good example as the mask had to be removed for identification purposes.

Mayor Treece stated they were still learning about this contagious virus, and the direction received by the CDC in April was different than what they had received in June. He asked if they would want to give the Health Director discretion to review the orders and grant other exemptions if they were to adopt this for 90 days. Ms. Thompson replied the Health Director could not issue guidance that was contrary to legislative action, but she could provide some interpretation, guidance, or allow businesses to come up with an operational plan much like the current health orders did as long as the Council provided some authority. They could not grant legislative authority to the Health Director. Mayor Treece wondered if they needed additional language to provide the Health Director the imprimatur to make those interpretations. Ms. Thompson explained they had drafted potential amendments for Council consideration based upon community feedback received.

Mr. Skala thought there was also a provision for the 90-day time frame to be shortened and asked how that would work. Ms. Thompson replied the Council would have to repeal the ordinance to shorten the time frame. She explained the ordinance was drafted to be effective for 90 days unless rescinded by the Council. She pointed out it could not be rescinded by the Health Director. She commented that if the ordinance was amended to shorten the time frame, the Heath Director could issue a similar order to the ordinance, which would in effect extend it, but she could not shorten it.

Ms. Thompson listed the draft amendments.

Mr. Pitzer asked if the proposed Amendment #2 changed the application of the law at all. Ms. Thompson replied she did not believe it did. She stated she thought it made it clearer that they were not engaged in a debate as to whether or not it was a public space

or a private space. The way it was currently written could be interpreted 6-7 ways, depending upon where they placed the comma. She also felt it was superfluous language that did not have any meaning.

Mayor Treece understood proposed Amendment #3 would completely exempt the at home requirement. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct with the exception of multifamily homes. Mr. Pitzer understood that was when people were at their own homes, and not at someone else's home. Ms. Thompson stated it would apply to someone else's home as well. Ms. Peters understood she would be responsible for her own behavior if she was in someone else's private home. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

Mayor Treece asked about a situation where 250 students were at a duplex for a party. He wondered how that would be regulated and what authority the Health Department would have in that situation. He wondered if it was any different than it was now or pre-COVID. Ms. Thompson replied she did not feel it was any different. The only enforcement would be the limitation on intentional gatherings that was in the current order of the Health Director, which involved 100 people. Ms. Peters understood it would be regulated by the Fire Marshall and the current health order regarding gatherings. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood it would not be a face mask violation. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. She pointed out anyone eating or drinking was already an exception.

With regard to proposed Amendment #4, Mayor Treece understood that if one had a distributed workforce whereby everyone was in their own office or cubicle one would not have to wear a mask, even when walking to the breakroom to get coffee, if they were able to maintain a distance of six feet. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer noted the proposed Amendment #5 had been requested by him. He explained he felt the draft language allowed for too many hypothetical situations since it said the employer would be required to provide a clean mask at all times to all employees. He felt it could be onerous for a business with a large workforce in instances in which 50 employees did not have a clean mask at one time. He believed it could multiply quickly and become an onerous burden, but felt it could be discussed further later.

Mr. Skala understood two unrelated people in a company vehicle that were not wearing masks could be assessed as much as $15 each and the company that employed them could also be assessed $100 for each. Ms. Thompson stated that in order for the company to be assessed, it would have to be done with the company's knowledge and acquiescence. Mr. Skala understood the individuals could be fined, but not necessary the company. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

Ms. Peters thanked Ms. Thompson for drafting the amendments as they had received a lot of emails, and many had pointed out concerns related to the proposed amendments. She appreciated having a framework to begin with instead of trying to craft things tonight.

Mayor Treece made a motion to waive the rule requiring consideration of this ordinance at two separate meetings and to place B168-20 on its second reading. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Patricia Casey commented that she had been in health care since 1972, which meant she had worn a variety of masks. She understood the proposed ordinance would require a cloth mask and noted she had made over 250 masks with the JOANN program. They had started out with double-fold masks and later made them with four layers for the University. As a result she wanted to know more about the masks, such as the number of layers, the type of cloth material, how long they could be safely worn, what was considered clean, etc. She understood the paper masks she had worn in the hospital were only good for 20 minutes because they became moisture-laden due to breathing,

which allowed microbes to transmit back and forth more easily. She commented that in the medical field they were not supposed to touch their masks, and if they touched them with their hands, the masks were no longer good and they needed to wash their hands. As an aside, she noted cleaning hands with alcohol wipes was only good for 6-8 times. Hands needed to be washed with soap and water. She stated she did not see the care and feeding she felt was necessary within this ordinance. She asked about a bandana train robber-style face mask and wondered if it was sufficient as it was only one layer of thin cotton. She questioned how long a mask should be worn and how often it should be washed. She commented that she sprayed hers with Lysol and then hung them up in the sun for a half-hour prior to reusing them. She wondered what constituted the mask was clean in terms of employees. If they touched it, it was no longer clean. She wondered where the masks would come from, and asked if they would come from China. She pointed out France had been forced to recall two million masks from China since they had been defective.

Mark Haim, 1402 Richardson Street, stated he was the Director of Mid-Missouri Peaceworks and noted he was present to urge the Council to pass this ordinance and to take strong measures to address a crisis that was tragic elsewhere and more and more tragic locally each passing day. He could not emphasize enough how what had been happening over these past 4-5 months was tearing a lot of people apart. It had led to over 130,000 deaths of fellow American citizens, and there had been many times that in terms of people getting sick and suffering. He reiterated he believed it was important to take strong measures and address the tragedy of having the country torn apart. He felt it was deeply troubling that this issue had been politicized. It was a public health issue. It was not a left or a right issue. It was just science and facts, and there was strong scientific evidence indicating masks should be worn when in a setting where other people would be inhaling what they were exhaling. He thought it made sense and felt they needed to deal with the fact the government had failed. Countries like South Korea, New Zealand, and Japan had either eliminated or were close to eliminating the virus with losses only in the hundreds. He pointed out Japan had not even had a thousand people die yet, and they would likely not have many more people die either. He believed it was incumbent upon them to take steps now, and felt this was a very important one. He hoped the Council would pass the proposed ordinance.

Dave Shene, 804 Moon Valley Drive, stated he had taught nuclear, biological, and chemical warfare defense for three years in the United States Army, and had spent almost seven years in the 141st Veterinary Detachment in Columbia, Missouri. He noted the Veterinary Corps of the United States Army was the proponent for biological warfare and contagion for the Department of Defense and the federal government. He commented that he found it very peculiar that the Health Director had said face shields would not be okay because air could get around them when none of the masks they were talking about were airtight. The masks they were talking about were designed to keep mucus and saliva from falling into wounds in a surgery theater. The air was still moving around them. In addition, the education issue needed to be addressed. In this room, he had seen people improperly wear masks by placing them under their noses, touch their faces repeatedly with and without masks, and touch their masks. He pointed out all of the Council had done this as well. He felt if it did not work, it should not be made into a law. He understood people were scared and wanted something to be done, but thought doing something that was ineffective and ill-advised was not doing something. If they considered the total numbers of contagion they had in Boone County with a population of 180,000, they did not have an epidemic in the County. They only had the potential for one. He suggested the Council not use its emergency measures and to utilize education instead.

Mary Ratliff, 211 Park De Ville Drive, thanked the Council for taking the proactive steps that had gotten them to this point. If they had done what some other cities had done, they might be in a much worse situation. She stated she had worked in an operating

room as a surgical nurse for about 20 years, and they had worn masks for eight hours per day and it had not killed or hurt them. Doctors and nurses still work masks all day if they worked in the operating room. She commended the Council for taking this step, and understood there were pros and cons to it. She commented that there were a lot of exemptions and potential amendments that would lessen the effectiveness of the ordinance. She felt that since the University of Missouri, Boone Hospital, and other entities were within Columbia, the City should be able to say everyone within its limits was required to wear a mask. She suggested Mayor Treece be like Governor Cuomo and make it happen as that would help keep her, her grandchildren, and others safe. She noted the argument about having the right to do what one wanted had occurred with smoking, and yet, people were not allowed to smoke in certain places. She pointed out some businesses said "no shoes, no shirt, no service" and people did not go into those establishments without those items. She thought they should be able to say the same with masks if one was within six feet of other individuals. She stated neither she nor others should have to be subjected to a disease someone else might have, and this was a serious disease as it was very contagious. She believed they should do everything they could to ensure Columbia did not have the spread seen in other areas. She hoped the Council would pass this ordinance requiring masks be worn in Columbia.

Mayor Treece asked if the NAACP had taken a position on the ordinance. Ms. Ratliff replied yes. She explained she had received support from the national office and the local office.

MacKenzie Everett-Kennedy commented that she owned a business located at 14 S. Second Street, and wanted to speak to the Council as a parent, teacher, and business owner. She noted she saw the impact of this virus deeply at all three levels. Throughout the pandemic, she had worried daily about the mental health and academic success of her students, the financial stability of her business and family, and the physical health of her students and family. They knew the rates were rising and appreciated the Heath Director speaking about that along with the social media graphics that made the rapid rate of increase very clear. Even with this information, they were not witnessing voluntary mask wearing in the community. When going to the grocery store, Walmart, Target, Westlake, etc., people were not engaging in basic public safety practices, and for that reason, she believed it was time for local authorities to take action and lead. She explained she had detailed several successful protocols she had been implementing in her business in an email she had sent earlier, and it had included required masking, a reservation system with extensive detail to make it easier to do contact tracing, sanitizing, and the cleaning masks worn by employees. She welcomed anyone to the business to see how they were doing this seamlessly while taking care of 20 cats. She also noted the business had received very positive receptions to these procedures, which they had announced very early on. She pointed out the at-risk people in the community had spoken vocally about how appreciative they were about those procedures, and even the disgruntled occasional person was happy with the implementation of those procedures. She commented that she was speaking on behalf of 36 local businesses, which ranged from iconic businesses like Shakespeare's Pizza and Broadway Diner to more unknown businesses like Salon Nefisa, Yellow Dog Books, and her own business, Papa's Cat Café. She stated now was the time for bold and brave action by the City Council. She understood these types of ordinances had failed in other communities and sometimes by only one vote. She reiterated now was the time to be brave.

Angelino Lefevers, 1309 Ashland Road, quoted Ronald Reagan who, in 1964, had asked "do you believe in a man's capacity to govern himself in self-government or do you believe a group of intellectual elites could plan their lives better than themselves?" He commented that he did not believe it was the responsibility of the City Council to keep him, his grandmother, his children, etc. safe. He believed it was his responsibility. It was also his responsibility to wear a mask, be six feet away from others, and visit businesses that implemented the necessary precautions. He stated he wanted to see

this more often along with the use of incentives. He did not want it to be done with negative reinforcement. He did not want to see it as a law or rule with fines. He reiterated he preferred positive reinforcement and incentives. Instead of fining someone $15 for not wearing a mask, he suggested giving people $15 for taking the test once a week, twice a month, or once a month. They could then find those asymptomatic cases, which seemed to be the cause of the spread. He suggested incentives to businesses via tax breaks or tax credits if employees and customers all wore masks or for businesses that tested their employees regularly. In terms of whether they had faith in their fellow man, neighbor, or the community, or trust in themselves and each other, he did not feel they should push each other around. He believed they needed to do the hard work and commit to one other. He did not believe they needed another law to divide them, which he felt the mask ordinance would do.

Ray Holland, 2 Albany Drive, stated he had been working from home since mid-March and described himself as the average Columbian. He was 29 years old and had lived in Columbia for about ten years, although not continuously. He noted he went out 3-4 times per week with friends to bars and restaurants. This past week he had met up with a friend who had been wearing a mask when he saw him, and his friend had indicated he was wearing the mask because the law had passed. As soon as he was told it had not yet passed, he had immediately taken it off. Mr. Holland commented that he felt wearing a mask was only a minor inconvenience and literally had no effect on the person wearing it. He stated it was not huge issue, and no one was trying to attack anyone or their rights. He explained he was fine with wearing a mask and pointed out he just did not want to go back to a phase where businesses had to shut down again. He preferred they stay open and believed the inconvenience of having to wear a mask every now and then would be great for the community in both the long and short terms.

Chris Devine, 2211 Rose Drive, understood one of the exemptions involved exercising and wondered what would be determined to be exercise, as walking could be considered exercise. He commented that the Occupational Safety and Health Administration (OSHA) had certain standards for oxygen levels, and studies had shown wearing masks could lower those levels. He stated Boone County and the University of Missouri were both in the United States, which was a free country. He understood wearing masks might be a minor inconvenience and believed some only wanted to appease others in order to go about their lives without worrying about other issues, such as the three aircraft carriers right outside of China, the 300,000 abortions performed per year, which did not appear to be a mass crisis since they did not value human life in that sense, the 40 people in Chicago that were killed, etc. He reiterated this issue was trivial and divisive when they needed to come together. He referred to the Tenth Amendment and stated that even when they had unjust politicians, they could stand together. He referred to the Book of Titus as well and indicated he had been saved 2-3 years ago. He commented that Bill Gates' cryptocurrency vaccines and patent 666 were the closest thing to the "mark of the beast" he had ever seen, and felt those with wisdom knew. He suggested the Council solve actual problems if they wanted to do something, and provided the decriminalization of marijuana as an example. He pointed out it could be taxed to give the police more money so the law could continue to be enforced for a safer community. He reiterated that they needed to work together, and felt that if they did, they could all be on Unified Payment Interface (UPI) in ten years. He stated the CDC was fraudulent and that Bill Gates should be arrested for crimes against humanity. He believed there was so much fraud related to COVID and that there was so much misinformation. He suggested everyone watch Infowars like he did for 10 hours per day. In terms of COVID, he wondered if anyone within six feet of another person would be charged with assault. He believed laws were being written to appease a mob that was funded by George Soros, who he felt was an actual Nazi. He referred to eugenics and felt global warming was a fear tactic to try to control the population. He stated there was forced sterilization and other things no one wanted to discuss. He commented that if they were going to talk

about reparations, reparations were needed for the three million Muslims in China, which no one was discussing. He reiterated that they should talk about things that mattered, and he did not believe this ordinance mattered. He questioned why churches were closed and mentioned Jesus had been around lepers without fear. He noted disease was based on one's connectivity with God, and that the Bible referenced not to be fearful 365 times, which was once for each day of the year. He believed in freedom of religion and felt there should be a no harm rule. He did not feel it mattered if someone wanted to smoke marijuana, and again stated they should focus on what mattered. He commented that the laws and semantics were a joke, and pointed out that half of the deaths involved those in nursing homes. He noted contact tracing in Texas meant someone with the sniffles could have COVID due to the looseness of the definition. He stated there had been a lab in North Carolina run by Dr. Fauci and Bill Gates under the presidency of Barack Obama, which had been relocated to Wuhan, China, and reiterated there were a lot of inconsistencies. He felt they should have Nuremberg-level trials to obtain truth and justice as they had fraud at every level. He thought defunding the police was a joke and believed they should go after the people that were trying to depopulate the planet instead of requiring people to wear masks.

Joe Anderson, 5107 Rosewood Court, commented that he had been in the active and reserve Army for 34 years, and his home base had been in Columbia since 1995. He stated he was not against masks for individuals in terms of choice. His complaint was with a mandate and forcing it on people. He explained he had been separated from his family for six of the 34 years he had served so people would have a choice and exercise that choice to protect themselves and their families. This choice would be taken away by any mandate. He commented that any business that indicated they were in support of requiring masks could require them at their business as every business had that right. Businesses did not need a mandate from the City of Columbia. They could require it if they wanted to do so. He reiterated he believed it should be a choice. He noted he had chronic lymphatic leukemia, which meant he was in the at-risk group. Based on his research, it was not something that scared him as he would be dead in 10-15 years. He stated he would not allow it to scare him, and pointed out he would continue to live his life. He reiterated everyone should protect themselves, and those that wanted to wear a mask could, but it should not be forced upon him or anyone else.

Brian Mayse explained he was from Ashland, but operated businesses in Columbia, and was opposed to the mask mandate. He commented that he was not opposed to a recommendation, but was opposed to a mandate for a lot of reasons. He stated he did not have any credentials in virology, but noted he found the mask to not be very effective. He believed in a lot of cases it was safety-theater in that it looked good and people felt good when they wore a mask because they were helping out by being a part of the solution versus the problem. He reiterated he did not believe they did much good. He commented that he had done his own independent testing and felt most of the air one exhausted when exhaling came out of the sides and underneath the eyes and the chin creating a cloud, which dissipated through diffusion all around the person. From a business standpoint, his objection was that most of his customers either did not wear their masks correctly when coming into the store or were opposed to wearing one like him. They felt it was a violation of their freedom, independence, and liberty. He stated he had trouble with the concept of stopping them at the door and asking them where their mask was because they would all say they were exempt. He wondered if he would have to dive into questions at that point as it would put him in an awkward position when he wanted satisfied and happy customers. He did not want to have to enforce something that he did not even believe in.

Jeff Zimmerschied, Jr., stated he was from Harrisburg and commented that he felt the Council had already made up their mind as to how they would vote. He thought Mr. Pitzer had asked some good questions, but believed everyone else had asked easy questions. He reiterated he felt everyone knew how they would vote tonight, and stated

that was extremely disturbing for Columbia citizens. He explained he was a business owner and farmer, and thought he treated everyone well by giving them good quality food, which he wanted to continue doing. He commented that he believed a lot of them were searching for true health, and understood a lot of people were very scared. He stated he had initially been scared because the media was distributing deception and lies to the public. He noted he did not mind people wearing masks as he felt people should do what made them comfortable. He also did not believe it should be mandated and forced through fines and fees when businesses were already hurting. He did not feel the Council understood what 30-50 percent of business loss would look like in Columbia, and suggested rolling back restrictions even further, opening businesses up so restaurants could be full and alive, and allowing herd immunity to take over as that had helped them through hundreds and thousands of years of life on Earth. He commented that what hurt him the most was the fact that not many questions had been asked of the Health Director, such as those related to enforcement. He stated he also believed this would further divide them as citizens. He reiterated his thanks to Mr. Pitzer for asking serious questions, which he believed they needed more. He wondered if masks worked or if they did not, or if it was a feeling of pure comfort. He stated he had not worn a mask tonight because he would not be able to breathe well due to health issues, and was concerned about getting harassed for not wearing a mask. He wondered if he had to wear a tag that said he had asthma or something else. He reiterated it did not make sense to him. He pointed out he was open to more education, but opposed to contact tracing as he felt that was against his constitutional rights. He suggested the Council sleep on this and really think about what this would do to the community, which was already suffering. He stated he had been flabbergasted when hearing the opening comments and statements along with the questions that were asked, and did not feel the Council understood the repercussions of this mandate. He questioned whether it could be enforced as people were already wearing them improperly or touching them. They were not being properly used. In addition, he questioned what qualified as a mask. He asked where they drew the line, and reiterated he believed this would pass because he felt the Council liked power.

Dani Perez, 1403 University Avenue, commented that she did not believe masks were as efficient as washing ones hands and social distancing when it came to this virus, but that she was still in favor of the mask because she felt there was psychological power behind ritual, symbolism, and visual action. When she put on her mask before going outside, she was making herself mindfully aware of the emergency crisis that was happening and that was affecting other people. When she saw others wear masks, she knew they were taking this seriously. She pointed out there were people that did not wear masks that were still mindful of her space, but she saw so many others that were not mindful. She stated she lived in East Campus, which was a big party area with many people that were not social distancing. She noted she also saw people barhopping. She commented that she once walked by a bar on her way to a protest and no one was wearing a mask, not even the bartender. She felt there was an entitled attitude by some that did not wear a mask, and it was not about the mask or health for them. It was about people that did not like being told what to do, especially by the government. If they thought about it, however, they had always had government intervention when it came to health risks. They had seatbelt laws, smoking laws, and tons of health codes for businesses to follow, and all had massive resistance before becoming laws. Unlike those laws, the mask mandate would not be permanent as the virus was not permanent. It would only be needed until they found a vaccine. She commented that she understood some anti-maskers were also anti-vaxxers, which was another issue they would have to face in the future. She felt the Council had included a lot of exceptions, which had watered down the ordinance, and did not understand why people were against wearing a mask. She reiterated she thought some people just did not like being told what to do. She pointed out they had previously had the opportunity to address the issue when they had shut

down, which had caused people to lose their jobs, livelihoods, or even their lives, but when they opened back up, they had not been responsible, and as a result, the numbers were increasing. She thought they needed this mandate to make them more mindful, and hoped the Council would not try to appease those that felt it was against their rights because there were thousands of people marching on the streets for oppressed people, many of whom were disproportionately affected by the virus as people of color. She asked the Council to do its duty of protecting citizens by doing what the President and Governor could or would not do.

Sandy Johnson, 3416 Jamesdale Road, stated they knew that wearing masks could save lives as it was a proven fact. She wondered if those that did not wear masks were willing to sign a health waiver indicating they did not want medical intervention if they got COVID-19. She suggested they be required to sign a waiver. She commented that she had a scare with a grandchild that had been sick. Although it had ended up being strep, the pediatrician had told them that children went from not feeling good to being in the ICU two hours later fighting for their lives due to COVID. She noted that was how fast it affected children. She stated they wanted people to wear masks because they saved lives.

Lynelle Phillips, 800 S. Johnmeyer Lane, explained she was a member of the Board of Health and also on the Contact Tracing Committee at the University of Missouri as she was a faculty member of the School of Health Professions within the Department of Public Health. She noted she was also a longtime public health professional and nurse and was volunteering at the Health Department assisting with case investigations and contact tracing. She commented that the people within the Health Department that she had encountered were the unsung heroes of the community as they had a thankless job, and none of them had been able to take a day off since early March so they were exhausted. She stated they were looking at a huge upswing in cases and was worried about them. She was not sure what influence the Council had over funding to help them out, but thought they could use the help. She explained many were volunteering to include her and her students. Most of the cases involved people in their 20s, and they tended to range between really apprehensive to terrified. In terms of contacts, they would ask the person if they had been around anyone more than 15 minutes in the last 48 hours while not wearing a mask. They would then enumerate those that fell into that category. For those that wore masks, it was 2-3 people, and mostly roommates, but for those that did not wear masks, it could involve 50-70 people. She commented that she did not believe it was a political issue. She thought young people liked to have fun, and masks were not fun so they were not worn. She believed this ordinance would be good as they needed to social norm the use of masks even if it was not fun. She commented that the escalating numbers were with the 20-24 year olds, and they were not the ones that would end up in the hospitals using up the vents, but she believed that bubble would burst. The virus would not stay contained in the 20-24 year old age group because they went home to do laundry, attended their grandparent's birthday party, waited on tables full of older people, etc. She felt it would spread to more vulnerable populations and would then wind up affecting the hospitals. She stated they needed to lower the numbers and felt this ordinance was a positive step in the right direction. She pointed out countries that had embraced mask use had seen a decline in cases and countries that had not had seen an escalation in cases. She did not feel they needed to get into the particulars in terms of the types of masks and reiterated those that had used masks had seen a drop in cases while countries that had not had seen escalating cases. She hoped the Council would pass this ordinance.

Alyce Turner provided a handout and commented that not too many of them would have thought they would be making decisions about their health, the health of their families, the health of the economy, etc. a year ago. She stated she had lived in the community for 40 years and had worked in public health for most of those 40 years, and no decision was as important as the decision the Council would make tonight. Two weeks ago,

someone had approached her about buying her house, which made her wonder where she could move and be safer going into a store because people wore masks. She believed masks in addition to social distancing would keep them safer. She explained that several of them had gotten together to draft a petition a few days ago. The petition said they supported the Council in making a positive decision on the mask requirement ordinance, and in eight days, about 3,000 people she did not know had signed the petition, and more and more were continuing to sign it. She believed there was broad support for the ordinance in the community. She pointed out that in order to successfully open the economy, people needed to feel safe. She stated she felt safer at a BLM rally doing voter registration than she had felt going to Walmart because those in Walmart were not wearing masks and not social distancing. This past week, when going to Gerbes, she had noticed more people wearing masks, and felt it was due to the rates being up and the Council and Health Department telling people to wear masks. If they wanted to educate people, she believed they needed a policy to enforce. She hoped the Council would pass this ordinance so people like her felt safe. She stated she wanted to stay in Columbia, but wanted to stay here safely. She believed everyone wanted to be safe and thought the way to do that was to pass this ordinance as a first strong step.

Jen Reeves, 1023 Vegas Drive, explained she was part of the group that had started the petition and wanted the Council to know a lot of people in Columbia had provided comments in support for the ordinance. She commented that a reason she took this so seriously was because she believed the community was a community when everyone worked together and this mask ordinance would help ensure they had a more confirmed and understood commitment to the public health of the entire community. She felt she was showing she cared about Columbia and Boone County when she wore a mask. The more they did that, the more their kids and college students would understand that as well. She thought it was important for this commitment to be in place before college students came back to campus so they felt the pressure of the community wanting them to care just as much. She stated her favorite comment had been that not wearing a mask was like drunk driving as it might not kill the person that was drinking and driving, but it might kill someone else. Other comments they had received were to consider those at risk of death from the virus by requiring masks in public, including when outdoors, as it was the right thing to do, and the fact that masks could prevent another lockdown, and more importantly, could prevent more needless deaths. She hoped the Council would take the time to look at the comments that had been provided with the petition.

Matthew Arnold, 261 Moonglow Lane, commented that he worked in Columbia and had two daughters that attended CPS schools, but his house was technically outside of the city limits. He explained he wanted to voice his opposition to the mandatory mask wearing rule. He stated he worked at a place that mandated the use of masks, but most of the time, they were not wearing them correctly. They might have the mask on them, but when worn, they did not cover their nose or their mouth properly. In addition, the masks were recycled over and over and were being used when not sanitary. He commented that he wore masks when warranted, and had noticed that people tended to social distance, and provided walking on the sidewalk as an example. He stated he hoped this bill was not being considered so they could say Columbia, Missouri was more progressive. He noted he personally cherished his constitutional rights of life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, and was worried about government overreach as they were starting to get used to that happening to them. He commented that he recalled watching the news regarding the Lake of the Ozarks during Memorial Day Weekend and explained he had related to it in some ways because they had all felt as though they were confined and wanted to get out. He felt people would not worry about the virus anymore at some point if they were required by law to wear a mask. He also believed enforcement would be impossible if hundreds of people refused to wear it.

Mayor Treece explained he was trying to project that Columbia was a safe place to do

business, the City could keep the economy open, and parents could send their kids back to school.

Ginny Chadwick, 305 Alexander Avenue, stated she did not feel they were recreating the wheel, but were simply replicating the wheel as 21 states had mandated mask wearing in public spaces and 31 states had some form of mask wearing at a local level. It was required in Kansas City and St. Louis, and Columbia was actually behind them and others like normal when it came to protecting the health and well-being of citizens. She commented that the ordinance that had been drafted was good. She explained she had the opportunity to interview community and national leaders on KOPN once a week, and this morning, she had interviewed a council member from a community in Colorado that had adopted an ordinance in April. She noted they had renewed that mask wearing ordinance four times now. She felt it was important to note that masks protected everyone, not just her. In addition, she felt they should be concerned about online shopping and losing revenues to online sales. She thought they wanted to ensure further sales within the community for an economic benefit. She had heard comments regarding the availability of masks, and was heartened to see the businesses that had popped up to help make masks. She noted her daughter had made the mask she was wearing tonight. She had also been able to buy masks from local community members that were making them. The person from Colorado had indicated that even Costco and Sam's Club had packages, and that once the community had mandated the wearing of masks, they seemed to be readily accessible at most local businesses. She explained she had been provided the opportunity to interview Peter Stiepleman recently, and understood CPS was requiring students to come with masks. She commented that she believed the age restriction within the ordinance was adequate. In terms of amendments, she thought it might be hard for employers to always ensure a clean mask was available, but the availability of masks in general was found in many mask ordinances. She stated she was concerned about a delayed implementation as they were at a point where this requirement was already needed. She felt Amendment #8 was already addressed by the exemption identified at item 14 as a mask was not required when one was six feet from someone else. She reiterated this was being done for the community, and they were not the first, nor would they likely be last, to require masks.

Matthew McCormick, 300 S. Providence Road, stated he was the President of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce and noted they had sent the Council a letter last week expressing concerns and asking questions. He agreed with Ms. Peters in that they were thankful that some of those concerns or questions had been looked into with the drafted amendments. He commented that they were concerned with implementation as it would be effective tonight if the ordinance passed as it was proposed. Since the beginning of COVID-19, every time there had been an ordinance change or order, they had asked that businesses be provided a minimum of five business days to implement it. Businesses needed time to write policy and educate their staff, contractors, and customers. He understood that had been addressed by a proposed amendment, but wanted to reiterate that if the Council decided to move forward with the ordinance that the timing be considered, especially due to the requirement to supply masks as businesses needed time to obtain those masks. He explained another concern was related to enforcement. The fear was that enforcement would fall upon the business community. The business community was already struggling and overburdened, and they were afraid enforcement would cause undue burdens on businesses and COVID-19 related liabilities. He asked the Council to ensure there was a clear line of communication with the business community to ask questions and obtain clarification as had been done in the past. He commented that there also needed to be an appeal or reporting process for businesses if the fines were put into place in case they had people with a medical condition who could not or would not wear a mask. It was needed for businesses that were following the ordinance and doing their due diligence to put this order into place. He stated the Chamber of Commerce understood the urgency and the fact this was such an important

conversation for Columbia, the community, and businesses. They only asked that the ordinance be clear, concise, and reasonable for the business community and the community as a whole for implementation purposes.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, thanked the Council for paying attention when he spoke in March about COVID-19. He did not feel they were being educated enough to know what decision to make tonight. He believed masks were needed, but wondered about the type of mask. It was important that each of them ask questions. He suggested a plastic, laminated card be provided for those that had a medical condition causing them to not be able to wear a mask as there had been tremendous violence towards people that were not wearing masks. He believed those with medical conditions needed something to display to a business indicating they had a reason for not wearing a mask and were not trying to cause problems. He stated he had experienced a dental visit today and had done a dental rinse with hydrogen peroxide and had to sign a liability waiver. He commented that he had entered another business that afternoon that had made improvements with multiple doors. As result, they could not reach a particular item without opening a door, which in itself created a hotspot.

Ann Marie Long commented that she had a very young, one-year old massage therapy business, and in March when things were shutting down, they had a conversation regarding how they would keep clients comfortable and how they, as business partners, would stay comfortable with each other. At that time, she had started making her own masks just to provide some kind of barrier. She understood it was not 100 percent perfect as she had made it and likely touched it too often, but if she was going to be close to another person, she wanted some protection. She noted she had since learned that wearing a mask was already required for personal care for people, and although she had not known that, it made sense. She agreed the requirement to wear a mask was not a perfect effort, but it was a compassionate and comprehensive effort to try to get everyone to establish a culture. She pointed out Japan and China had that established culture, which made it easier for everyone to be on the same page in terms of limiting their exposure to pathogens as a culture. She felt that was a common sense measure and noted she was grateful the Council was thoroughly investigating the issue by considering the concerns of everyone. She stated she wanted to see this ordinance pass.

William Gregory, 3305 Clark Lane, commented that fear was a great motivator, and believed a great number of people in the United States and Columbia were afraid, but the statistics did not show this was as deadly as once thought. Only two people have died out of 512 cases, and one was suspect in terms to being COVID-19 related. The numbers resulted in only 0.39 percent, and only 10 percent of the people tested tended to test positive, which he understood was essentially happening nationwide. He felt many of the amendments seemed to be good. He understood the proposed ordinance indicated a person that had been convicted of a violation of this ordinance or an order implementing this ordinance might be sentenced to pay a fine, which did not exceed $15. He wondered if this was a misdemeanor or criminal conviction, if it would require a trial, and if that trial would be by jury or if it was a judgement by a judge. He also wondered how someone would get in front of a judge. He believed there were several factors with regard to how the ordinance was written that did not seem to be well thought out or well written. If they were going to pass the ordinance, he suggested it be tabled to secure the ordinance sufficiently enough so everyone understood what would happen, especially in terms of compliance and enforcement. He thought there had been a lot of great comments tonight for and against the proposed ordinance. He stated he was personally against it for a myriad of reasons, and many others in the community were against it. He pointed out the proposed ordinance did not address a lot of the issues mentioned this evening, and hoped the Council would either vote no or table it. He commented that the 6-foot rule was an arbitrary rule, droplets from the mouth could travel more than six feet, a sneeze could travel up to eight meters, which was 27 feet, and a cough could travel up to six meters,

which was 24 feet. He stated no one in front of him would be protected, and that he was not worried even though he was a high risk individual.

Robert Ryan, 821 Walnut Street, commented that he believed faith was a greater motivator, and hoped the Council would make a good and wise decision that was harmless to the community.

David Lancaster, 2012 Woodhollow Drive, explained he was a licensed physician and board certified in physical medicine and rehabilitation. He noted he had also been a medical director for eight years in the rehabilitation unit at Capitol Region Medical Center. In his professional opinion, he highly supported the mask rule. They worked and the science was pretty clear in showing they worked. He thought, as a community, they needed to look at the models of other communities that had been successful in treating the disease and flattening the curve, and those communities tended to use masks, distance, test, and contact trace. He reiterated the mask rule was a very important step in making Columbia a safer community in which to live. Economically, this would help to open businesses and make it safe to do business. They were a capitalistic society that ran on money, and they needed this to help businesses. He agreed masks were not 100 percent effective and neither were seat belts and the drunk driving law, but they were effective. His mask was preventing spit from floating around the room while he was talking. In addition, if he were to sneeze or cough, the mask would provide protection. He hoped the Council would make the right decision in this matter.

Mayor Treece noted he had received a letter from the Boone County Medical Society, and they too had strongly encouraged mask usage as a way to prevent the spread of the coronavirus.

Janna Lancaster, 2012 Woodhollow Drive, stated she was also in support of the mask requirement. She explained there was a lot of misinformation and bad information regarding masks, carbon dioxide, and whether it was bad to wear one all day. She believed it was up to the Council as the leaders of the community to help guide the citizens of Boone County with good information, and requiring masks would help protect them all, i.e., employees, customers, young students, college and graduate students, etc., which was important in making the economy run and as back to normal as possible. Paired with social distancing, handwashing, contact tracing, etc., masks were a vital piece of getting in front of the pandemic. She reiterated her support of the proposed ordinance.

Gina Rende, 2412 Bluff Boulevard, commented that she had been taking matters associated with this virus, to include quarantining, seriously as she was an at-risk health individual, but she was also opposed to the mandatory mask law. She explained she was worried about what might be next if they passed the mandatory mask law. She wondered if it would lead to mandatory vaccines, blood withdrawals, etc. She pointed out a lot of masks were being polluted into the Earth, and they were utilizing a lot of plastic again, like plastic gloves. She thought that needed to be addressed. She understood there were fines for not wearing a mask, but asked if anything was being addressed in terms of pollution. She stated she was a commercial real estate broker and a lot of her clients had indicated they were requiring masks as part of their business. She felt that was appropriate and noted she would wear a mask in those establishments. She commented that she believed requiring masks would also hurt businesses. She explained she sometimes had to ask people to wear a mask when touring a business that required it, and at times, the person would indicate they would visit the site when the COVID concerns were over. She understood some people would not even go out to lunch or would order everything online because they were getting shamed for not wearing a mask. This was a concern for her as she did not believe it would help businesses. She stated she also did not feel masks were effective, and noted her doctor personally recommended not wearing a mask for a number of reasons, but mostly because they did not work and because he wanted her to build her immune system. She commented that there was not a mandatory requirement for people to take care of themselves. She

explained she was a very healthy individual in terms of eating healthy and working out on a daily basis, which might be a reason she did not get COVID even when on a private plane with an individual that had COVID. She felt it was important for people to learn to take better care of themselves and for education to occur.

Amy Spain, 3416 Jamesdale Road, stated the doctor and his wife had made some really good points. She noted she had one grandchild with preexisting conditions and another that was healthy, and wanted to send them to back to school. A concern she had was with adults saying the government should not tell people what to do and that masks were not important as they did not stop anything. She pointed out they knew masks blocked spit and viral transmission by catching the moisture in the mask. Paper masks could be thrown away and cloth masks could be washed. She understood some were concerned about the kind of mask, and felt the most important thing was to have a barrier. Anyone researching the issue could find this information. She understood CPS would implement mask wearing at elementary schools, and the school bus system was concerned they could not provide for social distancing so they wanted people to transport their own kids to school. She commented that they needed to have a mask ordinance in place. Businesses that had concerns about turning people away could just explain they did not agree with it either, but it was the rule. She understood some did not want to do it because they felt their rights were being infringed upon, and pointed out her 11 year old grandson's rights were infringed upon every time someone got close to him without a mask as he wore his all of the time. She wondered how they would know that the kids going back to school were not walking around with the virus if they did not require masks and encourage the washing of hands, the use of hand sanitizer, etc. She was concerned that if that was not reinforced, they would not be able to send kids to school safely and it would continue to affect them economically.

Chimene Schwach, 1232 Sunset Drive, explained she was in support of requiring masks. She understood many people had mentioned respiratory illnesses, and noted she had extremely severe asthma and had been intubated multiple times. She even received a shot every month so she could breathe. She noted she had the mask she was wearing on since 8:00 a.m. this morning. She stated she worked in a high risk area as she did child home visits. She supported a requirement for people to wear masks and noted they were not asking people to do it forever. She explained they knew masks worked. They also knew they had not had leadership from the top down in this country during the pandemic, but Columbia had done well in terms of not becoming a hotspot due to the leadership of the Council and the Mayor. She noted it was leadership that was needed. She commented that she also believed behavior needed to be modeled for their kids, and kids should learn that they should wear a mask even if inconvenient as it would only be for a short period of time. They would then have more people who felt science was not science. She stated they were in this together as a community, and the community was made up of a lot of different people, not just businesses or people with kids. It included people with health issues, people with and without money, etc. If they could not take care of each other in times like this, she feared for the community to come across something more serious. She appreciated the fact the Council had shown leadership earlier by locking down the community, and hoped they would continue in that leadership role by passing this ordinance.

Mayor Treece stated the Council had received 75 emails and 3 voicemails in support of the proposed ordinance, 16 emails, 5 voicemails, and one hand-delivered document against the proposed ordinance, and 5 emails that had not expressed support or opposition. They had either requested more information or had questions. He noted these communications would all be filed with this agenda item.

Greta McNamee, 8130 S. Country Aire Lane, understood the plural of anecdote was not evidence, but noted she had found a series of anecdotes that were complimentary to the evidence that had already been presented by organizations such as the CDC and the World Health Organization (WHO). She questioned what those that were against the

mask ordinance were communicating to the people that had already been impacted by COVID. She wondered if they were communicating that they appreciated the company of their loved ones, but not enough to be inconvenienced by a mask even if it kept them alive. She also wondered what those who refused to wear a mask gained or choosing to claim the right to not wear a mask gained other than a $15 fine. She commented that she felt the majority of dissenters happened to be male and the majority of supporters happened to be female. As a female, she thought women disagreed with the notion that the mask ordinance infringed upon bodily autonomy because they knew what infringements on bodily autonomy actually looked like in legislation. This was a very basic ask that supported the health and safety of the entire community. As a woman that was familiar with what bodily autonomy infringement looked like in law, this was a very minor infringement that would save the lives of dozens of people.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B168-20 per Amendment #2, which would strike "in public or private indoor spaces" from Section 4 of the ordinance for clarity. The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece.

Mr. Thomas understood this did not change the meaning and only removed some rather awkward language. Mayor Treece stated that was correct.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Mayor Treece to amend B168-20 per Amendment #2, which would strike "in public or private indoor spaces" from Section 4 of the ordinance for clarity was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas stated he believed there was a typographical error in the fourth whereas clause as the same order number had been mentioned twice.

Mr. Thomas asked if this was a criminal violation, a civil violation, or a code enforcement situation. Ms. Thompson replied this would be a civil violation. Mr. Thomas noted there was language indicating conviction and sentencing, and asked if that was appropriate for a civil violation. Ms. Thompson replied everything went through the Municipal Court. That was the procedure for the purposes of due process. The person or entity had to be found guilty or be convicted.

Mr. Thomas asked about the liability to a business if a customer that refused to wear a mask entered the business and what the City's advice might be to that business owner. He wondered if they could receive a fine if they were doing everything they could to enforce the wearing of masks on premises. Ms. Thompson replied if the business was doing everything it could, the business would not be fined. Mr. Thomas understood the business would not be fined if they had a sign on the door indicating masks were required per ordinance and the customer refused to wear a mask. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. She commented that she was concerned about being boxed into saying they would never be fined because there could be circumstances whereby the business put up a sign but did not attempt to do anything else. As long as a business was doing everything it could to notify customers and get customers that were able to wear a mask to do so, they would not be fined. Mr. Thomas asked for clarification if there was a confrontation issue with a business. Ms. Thompson replied there was not a liability for a business owner if a customer did not wear a mask. Mr. Thomas asked if there was a phone number the business owner could call to obtain assistance for enforcement if there was a disagreement. Ms. Thompson replied a business should contact 911 any time there was a customer that was a danger to a business. Mr. Thomas understood it could be in the form of a complaint to the Health Department if someone refused to wear a mask in a business. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct. A complaint could be filed against the customer.

Mr. Thomas asked if there would be a public awareness campaign or if the City had a plan for what would be rolled out if this passed tonight. Ms. Browning replied they had staff that worked on campaigns and social media messaging, and that would continue.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding what might be an appropriate mask. She

wondered if that was defined as 4-ply, 2-ply, etc. Ms. Browning replied it was a face covering. Some people utilized bandanas or gators. For a cloth mask, it should ideally be 2-ply. Breathable cotton was also helpful. She noted the density of the material should be considered as well.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B168-20 per Amendment #4, which would change item 14 of Section 6 so it read "When in a business/commercial/office setting and not within six feet of any other person; provided however, when moving from place to place in a business location where the person cannot maintain at all times a distance of six feet from all other persons a face mask shall be worn." The motion was seconded by Mayor Treece.

Mr. Trapp stated he was supportive of the amendment because it would then be consistent with the six feet distance whether one was stationary or in motion. In addition, he believed it made it clearer.

The motion made by Mr. Trapp and seconded by Mayor Treece to amend B168-20 per Amendment #4, which would change Section 6 so it read "When in a business/commercial/office setting and not within six feet of any other person; provided however, when moving from place to place in a business location where the person cannot maintain at all times a distance of six feet from all other persons a face mask shall be worn" was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to amend B168-20 per Amendment #3, which would amend the in home exception. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters.

Mr. Thomas understood if this motion was approved, it would not matter if people were from different households if they were inside someone's private home.

Mr. Trapp stated he was planning to oppose this amendment. He did not think there was an enforcement component since it was in people's homes if they were looking at a complaint driven focus. He thought many people wanted to abide by the law, and there was a possibility of home parties, which were not different than public spaces. He felt it would weaken the law and planned to oppose it.

The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Ms. Peters to amend B168-20 per Amendment #3, which would amend the in home exception was defeated by roll call vote with Mr. Thomas, Ms. Fowler, Mr. Trapp, and Mr. Skala voting no and only Mr. Pitzer, Ms. Peters, and Mayor Treece voting yes.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to amend B168-20 per Amendment #9, which dealt with personal vehicles. The motion was seconded by Ms. Peters.

Mr. Thomas understood this was the same situation as the home except that it involved a personal vehicle.

Mr. Trapp thought some people might like the force of law to be able to insist on masks in their vehicles. He stated he sometimes transported homeless individuals and believed it made sense. He understood it was less problematic as there would likely not be a party in a vehicle.

Ms. Peters felt it was an overreach. In addition, she did not believe people would be stopped as a result of it. She questioned why a person transporting another person could not just ask that person to wear a mask. She did not feel an ordinance was needed.

The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Ms. Peters to amend B168-20 per Amendment #9, which dealt with personal vehicles was approved by roll call vote with Mr. Thomas, Mr. Pitzer, Ms. Peters, Mayor Treece, and Ms. Fowler voting yes, and only Mr. Trapp and Mr. Skala voting no.

Ms. Peters made a motion to amend B168-20 per Amendment #8, which would change item 2 of Section 6 so it read "While exercising outdoors or while exercising indoors when able to maintain a distance of at least six feet from others." The motion was seconded by Mr. Pitzer.

Ms. Peters stated she had been to a couple of different indoor gyms within the City, and they definitely wanted people to be six feet apart. She believed it was reasonable to not have to wear a mask when working out.

The motion made by Ms. Peters and seconded by Mr. Pitzer to amend B168-20 per Amendment #8, which would change item 2 of Section 6 so it read "While exercising outdoors or while exercising indoors when able to maintain a distance of at least six feet from others" was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to amend B168-20 per Amendment #5 to eliminate Section 5, which discussed employers providing face masks to employees. The motion failed for the lack of a second.

Ms. Peters made a motion to amend B168-20 per Amendment #1, which exempted the County of Boone, the State of Missouri, and the United States of America from having to follow this ordinance.

Mayor Treece understood this was in reference to property owned by Boone County that was within the city limits. Ms. Thompson stated it would be those that were owned or exclusively operated by Boone County or one of the other entities. She noted the language was written to say "under the jurisdiction and control." She pointed out some of the University of Missouri operated buildings were not owned by the University, but they were operated by and completely controlled by them.

Mr. Thomas asked for the rationale for exempting a Boone County building or the University of Missouri buildings, but not private businesses, the public library, or CPS facilities. Ms. Thompson replied the University of Missouri was an arm of the State of Missouri, and the regulation and ordinances of the City of Columbia did not apply to them. They had their own rules. She noted it was the same in terms of the federal government. In addition, the City had deferred to the County of Boone the ability for them to regulate their own buildings in the past. It did not have to be done, but it had been done in the past in terms of buildings, operations, and enforcement of laws within their buildings. Mr. Thomas asked why Ms. Thompson felt this should be done for the University of Missouri or federal buildings. Ms. Thompson replied the City was not able to enforce this in those areas. This amendment would just make it clear so there was not any confusion. The University of Missouri had approached the City about including an exemption for them when it had come to the health orders, which had been done in the most recent health orders, and from the staff perspective, she recommended it for the ordinance as well so there was not any confusion.

The motion made by Ms. Peters to amend B168-20 per Amendment #1, which exempted the County of Boone, the State of Missouri, and the United States of America from having to follow this ordinance, was seconded by Mayor Treece.

Mr. Trapp stated he found the argument of the City Counselor persuasive.

Mayor Treece commented that he felt a facility like the Boone County Courthouse likely had different security needs, witness needs, etc. that this ordinance might not contemplate. In addition, the University had its own intercollegiate requirements that this ordinance did not contemplate. He thought it made sense.

The motion made by Ms. Peters and seconded by Mayor Treece to amend B168-20 per Amendment #1, which exempted the County of Boone, the State of Missouri, and the United States of America from having to follow this ordinance, was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to amend B168-20 per Amendment #7, which changed the number of days the ordinance would be in effect from 90 days to 30 days.
Mr. Thomas noted they would have a council meeting just before the 30 days were up and could then look at the impact to decide whether to continue it or not.
The motion made by Mr. Thomas to amend B168-20 per Amendment #7, which changed the number of days the ordinance would be in effect from 90 days to 30 days, was seconded by Mr. Pitzer.
Mr. Pitzer stated there were multiple approaches they could take, but felt the shorter time frame was appropriate given how much they continued to learn and how much the situation continued to change. They were about 100 days into the pandemic, and had not done anything for 90 days so this would be far beyond what they had previously done. He pointed out most of the health orders were for a period of a few weeks before they were revisited, and some of them had been extended. The health orders requiring masks in other cities like St. Louis and Kansas City were only for a few weeks. He was sure some of those would be extended, but felt a shorter time frame would ensure they were acting on the most current information and data they had.
Ms. Fowler commented that she was opposed to shortening the number of days from 90 to 30 because they could repeal this at any time if they felt conditions had changed. In addition, the longer time frame allowed them to have the behaviors they wanted the young people to use in practice when they returned to Columbia, which would be in August. She stated she did not want another upsurge in community spread. She wanted the University of Missouri to come back and the businesses to stay open, and also did not want to have to set aside time to have another lengthy discussion about this in the middle of the budget process when they could just as easily revoke it if the circumstances changed. She noted she would vote against this motion.
Mr. Skala stated he concurred with Ms. Fowler. He suggested they leave this for the longer period of time because there was always the option to change it.
Mayor Treece understood they could adopt Amendment #6 to delay implementation until July 10. In addition, the Health Director had indicated they had a 14-21 day incubation window. This meant they would not see the effects of this proposed ordinance until the end of July. If they changed it to 45 days, it would put them at August 15-20 when the students were coming back, and it would send the wrong message to repeal it then as it would make it seem as it was okay to not wear a mask. He thought they wanted a continuous community ethos in place so the students knew this was a safe place when they returned and that Columbia embraced public health. He believed 90 days was appropriate, and explained he would vote in favor of Amendment #10 if they wanted to provide the Health Director the authority to exempt other activities as they came up. He pointed out the Council could always revisit the issue and repeal it in one meeting if needed.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Pitzer to amend B168-20 per Amendment #7, which changed the number of days the ordinance would be in effect from 90 days to 30 days, was defeated by roll call vote with Mr. Thomas, Ms. Peters, Mayor Treece, Ms. Fowler, Mr. Trapp, and Mr. Skala voting no, and only Mr. Pitzer voting yes.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B168-20 per Amendment #10, which would change item 15 of Section 6 so it read “Under such other circumstances identified in any subsequent order, formal guidance or approved operational plan issued by the Director and in general conformance with the spirit and intent of this ordinance.”
Mayor Treece commented that this would allow the Health Director to address circumstances as they came up between council meetings and to review and approve plans by an entity.

The motion made by Mayor Treece to amend B168-20 per Amendment #10, which would change item 15 of Section 6 so it read "Under such other circumstances identified in any subsequent order, formal guidance or approved operational plan issued by the Director and in general conformance with the spirit and intent of this ordinance" was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mr. Trapp stated Ms. Browning had shown excellent discretion in finding a nice balance in terms of working with businesses, reaching solutions, and protecting the public health. He trusted her with the discretion to make those adjustments that were within the spirit of the law.

Mr. Skala commented that this would allow for flexibility and updates, and felt it was perfectly reasonable.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend B168-20 per Amendment #10, which would change item 15 of Section 6 so it read "Under such other circumstances identified in any subsequent order, formal guidance or approved operational plan issued by the Director and in general conformance with the spirit and intent of this ordinance" was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B168-20 per Amendment #6, which would make the requirement to wear a face mask effective on July 10 at 5:00 p.m. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pitzer.

Ms. Peters stated she would support the motion grudgingly because she would prefer it start as soon as possible, but practically speaking, she thought it was reasonable to wait until Friday. She noted she would not want to delay it any further than that as the purpose of the ordinance was to manage the spread of the virus.

Mr. Thomas stated he hoped the public communications campaign would begin immediately as he believed it would have a large effect. Ms. Peters agreed.

Mayor Treece thought they could require this to be in place now without enforcement. Mr. Skala stated that was his preference. He noted he understood the position of the Chamber of Commerce and was sympathetic toward allowing people some time, but this was also an emergency ordinance under the provisions of the Charter, which he felt needed to be honored as well.

Ms. Peters understood Mr. Skala would recommend starting it tomorrow, but not enforcing it until Friday. Mr. Skala stated that was correct.

Mr. Trapp commented that he had planned to support the motion, but Mr. Skala made a compelling argument. He noted enforcement would be a small part. It was primarily education, negotiation, and moving people into compliance. He thought ordinances were routinely effective immediately and staff showed good discretion with delaying enforcement until they were able to get the word out. He stated he would oppose the motion.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he thought it muddied the message to have a law or ordinance and to then not enforce it. He pointed out every health order had a date and time when it went into effect. Practically speaking, there needed to be some type of delay, otherwise no business could legally open tomorrow unless they had clean masks for every employee at all times.

Mayor Treece noted Kansas City and St. Louis County had provided 2-3 days of notice before theirs had taken effect, and the State of Kansas had provided five days of notice.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Pitzer to amend B168-20 per Amendment #6, which would make the requirement to wear a face mask effective on July 10 at 5:00 p.m., was approved by roll call vote with Mr. Thomas, Mr. Pitzer, Ms. Peters, Mayor Treece, Ms. Fowler, and Mr. Trapp voting yes, and only Mr. Skala voting no.

Ms. Peters stated she had recently been traveling and had been in a couple of states that required masks be worn in all businesses. She presumed those businesses had been required to have masks available for those customers that did not have masks. She understood the ordinance did not address that situation. She explained she had not had her mask once, and the business had offered hand sanitizer and a mask as they wanted her to shop there. She stated she did not want to create a barrier to improving the economy, but also did not want place an unreasonable burden on business owners. She wondered if the Chamber of Commerce had any thoughts.

Mayor Treece commented that he felt having masks for customers was a good business practice. He wondered why any business would want to turn away a customer that might have forgotten their mask or might be visiting. He felt a lot of businesses were missing a marketing opportunity by having their logo on a mask and having it worn around town.

Ms. Peters wondered if it should be something they mandated in the ordinance. Ms. Fowler replied she thought businesses would figure that out for themselves. She stated she had brought one of the many boxes of masks she had been acquiring since the pandemic had started on behalf of the small construction business she worked for as she was the risk manager for that company. She explained it was in their best interest to have individually wrapped masks at the front door along with hand sanitizer to welcome people into their business. She stated she had noticed a lot of small businesses were already doing this in Columbia. She thought they would figure it out for themselves because it was an opportunity to be generous and kind. Ms. Peters stated she was okay with not offering another amendment.

Mr. Skala commented that he had been a former biomedical researcher and behavioral scientist, and during the last 5-6 years of his tenure at the University of Missouri, he had spent 4-6 hours a day in sterile surgery at the School of Veterinary Medicine. He did not feel it was cumbersome to wear a mask, and noted it was something one would get used to doing. He referred to a Forbes article, which discussed the effectiveness of masks. The article had reported that early data seemed to indicate that wearing masks was useful in reducing the spread of COVID-19. As of July 3, there were 21 states with some form of a mandatory mask policy. In 14 of 21 states, the policy had been implemented over 30 days ago so there had been ample time to evaluate the results. The average rise in new COVID-19 cases over the last 14 days in the states with a mandatory mask policy was +16 percent. The states without the mask wearing mandate had an average rise in new cases of +79 percent. Notwithstanding the vagaries of masking and some of the imperfections of this ordinance, it seemed to work. He noted there had been 130,000 deaths since the January 1 so it was very serious. He understood some were worried about liberty and government overreach, and pointed out it was not about them. It was about protecting others, which included them. It was also not only about masking as social distancing was important as well. He stated masking was necessary when social distancing was problematic, and when combined with scrupulous hygiene, he believed they could continue with the good record they had in Columbia while bringing back trust so businesses could thrive. He noted he would support this ordinance for those reasons.

Mr. Pitzer stated he thought it was clear the three recommendations the Health Director had been giving them in terms of wearing masks, social distancing, and hand hygiene had been slowing the spread. He pointed out he had been trying to model good masking behavior himself, and as he gotten used to it, it had become less of a big deal. He commented that he appreciated what Ms. Fowler had indicated she had been doing for her company, and felt that was an example of a good business practice that was becoming more common. He hoped the Health Department continued with its positive outreach to all gathering places, whether a business, bar, or other organization, to ensure they were following those three prongs to help slow the spread. If it came to it, he would be in favor of very aggressive enforcement against those establishments that had become hotspots. He was sure the City Counselor could come up with a list of criteria that met

the rationale basis test to determine whether an establishment was truly protecting the public health that was needed. He stated the chokepoint seemed to be with contact tracing as they had not seen hospitalizations or issues with the other necessary factors. He pointed out the County had received $23 million from the federal government through the State of Missouri, and he was shocked they were not using it to fund its own Health Department in an effort to ramp up contact tracing in very short order. He believed that needed to happen. In walking through City Hall, he had seen City employees modeling better mask behavior. He felt as the local government, they needed to lead by example, and as recently as last week, that had not been the case. He hoped it was better going forward. He stated he had problems with the ordinance as he believed the in-home mandate was an overreach. In addition, he thought 90 days was way too long. No one else was establishing a mandate for that length of time. He felt they should take shorter term steps while continuing to adapt and respond to where the data took them. He stated he would be stunned if they rescinded the order in less than 90 days even if the data was clear that the mandate was not needed. He thought encouraging more positive outreach and incentive based actions was an approach that would help make the necessary actions more widely acceptable on a long-lasting basis. He was concerned this would be required for a certain period of time, and people would then feel as though they did not have to do it anymore. They needed an approach that changed what was socially acceptable and the social norms over the long term as this would not go away, and they would need good masking behavior beyond the 90 days. He was not sure how much of an appetite there would be to extend the requirement for the long term if it came to that. He stated he was not sure he could support this ordinance because he thought they needed to be more positive in working together and because some of these provisions were too much.

Mayor Treece commented that he believed widespread mask usage in Columbia made them more attractive. It provided parents with the confidence they needed to send their kids to in-person classes. It leveled the field for all businesses and restaurants since they would have the same protections and practices in place as their competitors. He felt it protected the public health and the economy. They could not resume economic recovery until they tamed the virus. If they wanted to keep the economy of Columbia open, he believed they needed to wear a mask.

B168-20, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: PITZER. Bill declared enacted, 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.

B151-20 Repealing Section 4 of Ordinance No. 024211 to lift the temporary waiver relating to the payment of transportation fares.

B152-20 Rezoning property located on the southeast corner of Coats Street and North Boulevard (1206 Coats Street) from District PD (Planned Development) to District M-C (Mixed Use Commercial) (Case No. 99-2020).

B153-20 Rezoning the A. Perry Philips Park property located on the northeast corner of Gans Road and Bristol Lake Parkway from District PD (Planned Development) to District O (Open Space) (Case No. 113-2020).

B154-20 Granting a design adjustment relating to the proposed PD Plan Major Amendment #2 for Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 4 located on the

	northwest corner of Nocona Parkway and Briarmont Avenue to allow a lot line to bisect an existing structure (i.e., parking lot) (Case No. 114-2020).
B155-20	Approving PD Plan Major Amendment #2 for “Discovery Park Subdivision Plat 4” located on the northwest corner of Nocona Parkway and Briarmont Avenue (Case No. 114-2020).
B156-20	Granting a design adjustment relating to the proposed Final Plat of Battle Crossing - Plat 1 located on the southwest corner of Clark Lane and Lake of the Wood Road to allow a lot line to bisect an existing structure (i.e., parking lot) (Case No. 85-2020).
B157-20	Approving the Final Plat of “Battle Crossing - Plat 1” located on the southwest corner of Clark Lane and Lake of the Woods Road; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 85-2020).
B158-20	Approving the Final Plat of “On The Ninth At Old Hawthorne, Plat No. 2” located on the east side of Old Hawthorne Drive West and approximately 1,300 feet north of Route WW; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 107-2020).
B159-20	Vacating a sanitary sewer easement on Lot D2 within On the Ninth at Old Hawthorne Plat No. 1 located on the east side of Old Hawthorne Drive West and approximately 1,300 feet north of Route WW (Case No. 115-2020).
B160-20	Approving the Final Plat of “The Gates, Plat No. 5” located south of Old Plank Road and west of Rivington Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 108-2020).
B161-20	Authorizing a financial assistance agreement with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources for the North Central Columbia Historic Survey - Phase III; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
B162-20	Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking on portions of Bradington Drive, Bristol Lake Drive, Bristol Lake Parkway and Gans Road.
B163-20	Authorizing an agreement for professional architectural services with Simon Oswald Associates, Inc. for proposed building modifications of publicly accessed services within the City Hall Building to create a “Customer Experience Center” and recycling chute; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
B164-20	Authorizing a cooperative agreement with Boone County Family Resources for additional funding for the Parks and Recreation Department’s Career Awareness Related Experience (CARE) Program for youth employment placement and mentoring services.
B165-20	Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds received from miscellaneous revenue, donations and a grant to provide funding for various Parks and Recreation Department projects.
B166-20	Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for the purchase of replacement communications equipment.

B167-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating Share the Light Program funds for the purchase of smoke alarms and carbon monoxide alarms to be distributed to low income residents.

X. REPORTS

REP36-20 FY 2021 Annual Budget - Downtown Community Improvement District.

Mayor Treece understood this was provided for informational purposes as the Council did not have any authority to approve the budget.

REP37-20 FY 2021 Annual Budget - Business Loop Community Improvement District.

Mayor Treece understood this was provided for informational purposes as the Council did not have any authority to approve the budget.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Kirubel Mesfin explained he was a student at the University of Missouri and one of the leaders of the People's Defense, the group that had been marching. On June 8, which was a little less than a month ago, they had been at the columns getting ready to protest when four cop cars traveled by with their sirens on. Since they had planned on marching in the area, they decided to see what was happening in case they needed to take a different route. When they arrived, they saw a man sitting on the steps holding two knives, one to his neck and another to his rib area. The cops there all had some form of weapon pointed toward the person, which he thought was disturbing. He commented that they did not see any de-escalation happening from the police standpoint so they took matters into their own hands by saying to the person that his life mattered. After about 10-15 minutes, the man dropped his knives. Mr. Mesfin noted the cops had thanked them and one of the cops had said he did not know what they would have done had they not been there. He did not feel that could be put on a 19, 20, and 23 year old that did not have experience in handling those types of situations. He did not know if that meant a task force for those situations was needed or what that might look like financially, but something different was needed. He implored the Council to pay attention to where the money was going. He stated they marched every day at 6:00 p.m. from the Courthouse columns, and he would be there at 5:00 p.m. every day this week if they wanted to talk to him. He explained he wanted that story to be told correctly because the police report and the articles said something else. He commented that People's Defense was not going anywhere as they were looking for change, and he hoped they were not fighting against them, but were fighting with them instead for that change.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Rangeline Street, thanked Mr. Pitzer for speaking up, and noted he had planned to suggest making mask wearing voluntary for 30 or 60 days prior to enforcement. After listening to Mr. Pitzer, he thought they may want to look at this mandate every 30 days instead of waiting for 90 days to review it. He commented that he had been upset to hear there was money behind the requirement, and did not feel everything should involve money. The homeless would not be able enter into businesses, and there would be bathroom issues in the alleys. He suggested they look into COVID respirators and issue them to businesses or allow for a tax deduction. He stated he did not feel the $15 and $100 fines were fair. They all wanted the businesses to succeed, and those fines would hinder it that effort.

Alfred Patenaude, 4103 Spring Cress Drive, thanked the Council for what they did, and extended an invitation to visit those with People's Defense at the Boone County Courthouse at 6:00 p.m. He stated their intentions were great, and they were in their infancy. They appreciated the ears of Council and would like to see a couple of them out there.

Ms. Peters understood the CPD was changing its vehicle stop requirements as they would address traffic violations versus the more mundane license plate issues or tail light out issues. She asked that a report be provided on a monthly basis starting in August, preferably at the second council meeting of each month. She wanted to see how they were doing and if there was improvement in the data. She asked Mr. Glascock to ensure that information was provided.

Mr. Thomas understood there had been some discussion regarding a town hall meeting that would involve consultants that had been hired to design a process, and asked for an update. Mr. Glascock understood the consultants were beginning to meet with the various groups, and thought they were starting with someone from the Citizens Police Review Board and the Commission on Human Rights. Mr. Thomas asked if there had been meetings with the leaders of People's Defense. Mr. Glascock replied he did not know. Mayor Treece stated the People's Defense was on the list. He understood there was a very robust fact finding stakeholder group. Mr. Thomas asked if there was a date for an actual meeting. Mayor Treece replied not soon enough, and thought the only other alternative was for each of the council members to organize something within their wards at a place that was convenient, accessible, socially distant, etc. It was a challenge to hold a meeting. Mr. Thomas noted they could go to the Courthouse at 6:00 p.m. Mr. Glascock pointed out there were multiple groups they needed to meet with for input. Ms. Peters asked if this might be done within the next month. Mr. Glascock replied he thought meetings were being held with certain groups every week for the next 30-60 days.

Mr. Skala commented that he had spoken with a few people last week with respect to how to marshal things through the Council in terms of who to approach, talk to, etc. As a result, he anticipated an active process.

Mayor Treece explained four general public comments had been received.
He noted two were in the form of emails from Seileach Corleigh, the President of the Columbia Area National Organization for Women, and Diane Meeker discussing the CPOA and anti-civilian hostility within the CPD. They asked the Council to disavow systemic racism by cutting ties with Dale Roberts and the CPOA.
He stated a voicemail had been received from Tobi Coffee urging them to do everything in their power to make meaningful significant cuts to funding for police and prisons.
He commented that they had also received an email from John Amick asking them to reallocate funding in the CPD for CAHOOTS, a permanent homeless shelter, addiction treatment, and mental health treatment. It also asked that they immediately fire police officers who used excessive force.
He noted those comments would be filed with other items associated with this meeting.

Mr. Trapp stated the City had obtained 45,000 masks and were making a good effort to get them out to unsheltered neighbors. He thought the ridership on buses would be a good way of mask distribution as well.

Mayor Treece commented that a lot of families were hurting right now. There had been another senseless gun shooting late Saturday night into Sunday morning. He encouraged everyone to reach out to those that needed help.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 12:08 a.m.