



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, August 17, 2020

7:00 PM

Regular

**Council Chamber
Columbia City Hall
701 E. Broadway**

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, August 17, 2020, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP (arrived at approximately 7:18 p.m. and left at approximately 10:06 p.m.), SKALA, PITZER, and PETERS were present. Council Member THOMAS was absent. The City Manager, Deputy City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of July 20, 2020 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mr. Skala and a second by Mayor Treece.

Mayor Treece noted the August 3, 2020 regular meeting minutes were not yet complete.

Mayor Treece stated he wanted to move B212-20 from the public hearings section of the agenda to old business, and for it to be considered after B194-20, which was the bill that would involve a discussion regarding roll carts. He explained B212-20 would amend Chapter 22 of the City Code to eliminate the requirement of the City to provide bags for residential refuse and recycling and residential curbside recycling collection. He thought they needed to have the discussion on roll carts and to then discuss this item as he felt those were policy decisions, not budget decisions. He stated he believed they needed to have the policy decision inform the budget instead of the budget decision informing the policy.

Mr. Skala commented that he was not sure he agreed with which item informed what, but agreed they should move B212-20 to old business and discuss after the decision on roll carts.

Mayor Treece made a motion to move B212-20 from public hearings to old business, and to address it immediately after B194-20. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Pitzer stated he agreed they should take the bills in numerical order. He understood B212-20 had been placed under the public hearings section of the agenda and was to be read and held, and not voted on this evening. He was not sure how it had gotten to that point or how that decision had been made. Mayor Treece stated he was not sure why it had been handled in that manner either. Mr. Glascock explained B212-20 had been included with the public hearing items because it was a part of the budget. Mayor Treece stated he did not believe it was a part of the budget. Mr. Glascock commented that he felt it was because they were eliminating positions in the budget. He viewed it the same way as he did fees. Mayor Treece understood the positions would be eliminated if the City Code was changed, but noted that if those sections of the City Code were not repealed, the positions would not be eliminated. Mr. Glascock pointed out the budget as presented would need to be amended if that happened. Mayor Treece commented that depending on how the Council disposed of B212-20, it would provide staff 40 days to address the issues as opposed to holding it until the very end causing them to scramble to redo the budget. He reiterated he felt it was a policy decision versus a budget

decision.

Mayor Treece stated he could argue that B211-20 was similar, but since the fares had already been eliminated it was budget neutral.

Mr. Skala commented that he did not agree that it was solely a policy decision as the budget could sometimes drive policy. He noted he might ask for a tabling of the item until they started discussing the budget. Regardless, he agreed it belonged after the decision as to whether the issue of roll carts should be placed on the November ballot.

Mr. Pitzer stated he was fine with voting on B212-20 tonight. He commented that he was also not sure all three of the issues should be considered in one vote, and noted it was something he would bring up when they discussed it.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Skala to move B212-20 from public hearings to old business and to address it immediately after B194-20 was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The agenda, including the consent agenda and with B212-20 being moved from public hearings to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Mayor Treece and a second by Mr. Skala.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC7-20 Board and Commission Applicants.

Upon receiving the majority vote of the Council, the following individuals were appointed to the following Boards and Commissions.

BOARD OF HEALTH

Gadbois, Mary, 3600 Vawter School Road, Ward 5, Term to expire August 31, 2023

Heidt, Jonathan, 5106 Sockeye Court, Ward 4, Term to expire August 31, 2023

Kingsley, Laura, 303 Lindell Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire August 31, 2023

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION CODES COMMISSION

Creasy, Jay, 911 W. Rollins Road, Ward 4, Term to expire August 1, 2023

CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION

Barnett, Joseph, 1208 Parkridge Drive, Ward 4, Term to expire November 30, 2020

Diamond, David, 2515 Basswood Court, Ward 4, Term to expire November 30, 2021

COLUMBIA HOUSING AUTHORITY BOARD

Calloway, Stephen, 3900 Sherman Court, Ward 4, Term to expire May 31, 2024

Mayor Treece asked that the other vacancy for the Columbia Housing Authority Board be readvertised.

COMMISSION ON CULTURAL AFFAIRS

Thompson, D'Andre, 1326 Ashland Road, Apt. H, Ward 6, Term to expire October 31, 2021

DISABILITIES COMMISSION

Chadwick Graham, Kathryn, 102 W. Green Meadows Road, Ward 5, Term to expire June 15, 2022

HISTORIC PRESERVATION COMMISSION

Bybee, Stephen, 205 Spring Valley Road, Ward 4, Term to expire September 1, 2023

Richenberger, Heather, 907 Maupin Road, Ward 4, Term to expire September 1, 2023

RAILROAD ADVISORY BOARD

Hendrickson, Blair, 5600 Majestic Circle, Ward 5, Term to expire July 15, 2022

Mayor Treece stated he wanted to readvertise the Tax Increment Financing Commission vacancies.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC44-20 Lillian Davis - Property management companies and homeless population.

Lillian Davis commented that she had recently seen a lady in front of City Hall with a sign stating "rent forgiveness." She noted the people that worked for property management companies were heartless, and that the State of Missouri was filled with them. She explained many people had lost their jobs, were sick, or had their work hours cut, and these management companies were kicking them out of their homes causing them to be homeless. She stated she knew of a woman who had endured two heart surgeries days apart that had not received an eviction notice, but had been put out on that street, and noted she had been that woman. She reiterated the property management companies were heartless and stated she was sad for the people impacted by them. Her hope was for the government to shut down all of the property management companies because they were bad for the economy and those needing housing. She commented that she had been left with a lot of restrictions due to the two heart surgeries, and pointed out there were a lot of homeless people in the community, which was sad.

Mr. Trapp joined the meeting.

SPC45-20 Lexie Irvin - Mask ordinance.

Lexie Irvin did not speak as she was not in attendance.

SPC46-20 Dr. Elizabeth Allemann - Recommendations for COVID-19 regulations.

Elizabeth Allemann commented that she lived in Harrisburg, but owned property and practiced family and community medicine in Columbia. She thanked the Council for providing courage and leadership at a time when they desperately needed it and it seemed as though it was in scarce supply. She also thanked them for the mask ordinance as she believed it was working and doing what a mask ordinance could, which was not everything, but a lot. She referred to an open letter that was located on her website, drallemann.com, which had been signed by 141 local concerned citizens, including 16 physicians, 30 nurses, 23 other health professionals, a bar manager, and many educators. She stated they wanted the City to close the bars so public schools could open. She commented that they were standing with the Director of the Public Health and Human Services Department, Stephanie Browning, as she had served them tirelessly. She understood the Council had delegated some of their authority to her and understood the reason, but felt they could not leave her alone in being criticized and harassed. She stated she was standing there to be with her, and was asking the Council to also stand up and pass ordinances designed to reduce the spread of COVID-19 in the community and to back those up with incredible enforcement. She commented that central Missouri was vulnerable at this time due to three things coming together in a very unfortunate way. One was that the Public Health and Human Services Department was vulnerable. She explained a family she served had notified her they had a COVID positive person in their household on Wednesday, and a representative of the Public Health and Human Services Department had contacted them on Sunday night. This showed they were working on weekends, and that despite their tireless efforts, they were not able to keep up. She stated four days was not timely notification. She understood they were staffing up and would emerge stronger and more capable, but it was a vulnerable time

now as they were not able to respond in a way that was necessary. She reiterated this was not a criticism of what they were doing. It was a statement of an essential service that was not able to keep up. Another was that they had 30,000 college students returning to town, some of which were COVID positive. She noted they were in the demographic that spread the disease since they interacted with each other in more intimate ways and in higher numbers. She explained they lived in congregate housing in the dorms, Greek houses, and apartments. She pointed out the University of North Carolina announced today that it would go 100 percent virtual one week after starting school due to three clusters, two within resident halls and one within a Greek home. She commented that masks did not work in bars as people could not wear masks when they drank and ate. In addition, they tended to stand close to each other, speak loudly, and participate in singalongs. She stated live infectious SARS-CoV-2 could be recovered from aerosols more than six feet away from a patient with COVID-19, and this suggested HVAC systems might be a problem and that sitting six feet away from a colleague might not be enough. She explained they were learning as it was a rapidly evolving situation. The third was that it was back to school time. They wanted to provide in-seat opportunities for their public school students, and that would connect households that had been separated since March, which meant the numbers would likely increase. She commented that the scientific advisory for the emergencies in the United Kingdom had indicated publically that they might have to close their pubs in order to open schools. Many states within the United States had required bar closures statewide and others had addressed it locally. She believed Columbia was behind the curve in this regard, and that they needed to close their bars so they could open their schools as schools were a higher priority than the bars.

SPC47-20

Laura Mitchell - Right of way.

Laura Mitchell, 209 Ridgeway Avenue, explained that flags marking underground utilities had shown up all around the West Ash Neighborhood three weeks ago. A few days later some heavy equipment had been rolled out into people's yards and crews were digging holes in the yards to place tubing in the 2-3 foot wide holes. She pointed out no one in the neighborhood had known what was happening. The foreman had indicated that they should have received a letter, but no one had. She noted she had eventually learned that Bluebird Excavating had obtained a permit to put in new fiber optic cable, and according to the permit, there would be a total of 27 miles of cable that would be placed in different neighborhoods along streets and thoroughfares. She stated her street was very narrow, which was why there might have been more damage. She pointed out the work had severed someone's current internet connection and had impacted the gas line twice. She commented that the 27 miles of cable was equivalent to 143,745 linear feet for which the City would receive \$1.91 per linear foot per year with gradual increases every five years. She understood there was a provision in the permit to cover damages, but there had not been any provision for notifying the public or property owners in any way, which was one of the most upsetting parts of the process for most of the neighborhood. The holes they had made had been left open overnight, and luckily no one fell into them. Now that the holes had been filled, grass and straw had been put down, and most of the neighbors had been able to put the experience behind them. She suggested if this type of work needed to go forward in the future that residents be notified in advance.

Mayor Treece understood Mr. Pitzer was familiar with a similar incident with another carrier in the Fifth Ward and thought the appropriate staff had been listening to her comments and would follow up on the issues.

SPC48-20

Traci Wilson-Kleekamp - Town Hall on policing (debrief).

Traci Wilson-Kleekamp stated she was with Race Matters, Friends, and wanted to discuss the online town hall that had been held a few weeks ago via Zoom. It had been a collaborative effort by several groups to include CoMo for Progress and Columbia Faith Voices. She noted it had been great to collaborate and think about how they could do

things when they were in charge of the narrative. She understood there had been over 6,000 views of the meeting. She questioned how much city leaders should worry about alienating their citizens and residents if the same citizens and residents did not feel political and social attitudes at the top of the municipal organization reflected their own. Recently the Council had indicated that it was their job to undue institutional racism, and Mr. Glascock had been really thorough in a statement he had issued. She referred to that statement which said "many of the systems that create inequities are rooted in racism, and we need to combat that", and felt they all needed to understand that history and develop a corrective and restorative plan of action. She continued by referencing the statement indicating "we need to educate ourselves about" how systemic racism had worked in Columbia and how to dismantle its habits and systems. She understood Mr. Glascock had stated "we need to have hard conversations with each other and hold each other accountable," and felt that was very important. She commented that she spent about three hours today looking at all of the times they had come before the Council to speak about policing since 2015, and they had been really clear as to what they wanted. Some of the language in the conversation had changed a little bit. For example, they used to talk about anti-bias training, but what they were really saying was that they did not want to have cops that were racist nor did they want to deal with people that did not others due to the color of their skin. She understood this was now called anti-racist. The difference between not being racist and being anti-racist was that action was associated with anti-racists. She commented that she had been insulted with the hiring of a consultant to again ask them about their policing values when they already had volumes of data that should be analyzed to provide those answers. She felt the consultant should only be utilized to address questions for which they did not have data. She understood Chief Jones felt community policing was just good policing, and noted they wanted a commitment to authentic transparency and not crumbs and leftovers. In her opinion, work sessions, like the one that had been held regarding community policing in December and the one that was coming up, were not adequate because the public was not allowed to ask questions. She felt they were at the point where they should be having public conversations about community policing. She commented that a good thing about the online town hall meeting was that people could submit questions, which kept them engaged. She reiterated they wanted more action, and not more consultants and listening tours as that tended to kick the can down the road and was not helpful. She pointed out the Internal Affairs use of force data from 2016-2019 illustrated some serious disparities with regard to who force was used on. It did not make sense that the black population in Columbia was at about 10 percent, but 50 percent of the people experiencing use of force were black, to include a 9 year old child and an 80-something year old man. If they were holding themselves accountable and if they were anti-racist, they needed to ask the hard questions and do the work.

SPC49-20

Grace Vega - How to be an anti-racist.

Grace Vega, 3008 Middlebush Drive, provided a handout and commented that Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp had mentioned a coalition, which had started with three groups and was now 6-8 groups with 20 or so active organizers. They were black, brown, white, as young as the late 20s, as old as the early 60s, Muslim, Christian, atheist, straight, gay, likely other genders and sexual identities not yet named, with and without children, students, hair dressers, interpreters, lawyers, stay-at-home parents, mental health workers, etc. As they spent more time together she was sure they would find out how much more diverse and inclusive of a group they were. She explained both of the town halls held online had been very well attended, and the one that had involved reimagining public safety had received 6,000 views. The other had been about school resource officers and the police presence in schools, and it had also been well attended. She commented that this new coalition might not always initially agree on exactly which strategies to use, which questions to ask, or even how to ask the questions, but there were some very basic tenets they could agree upon that propelled them to keep coming

to the table to find new ways to work together. She commented that they all knew the United States was a racist nation, and that they lived in a country, state, and city that were built upon white supremacy. They also knew that while much of their work as separate organizations might include providing resources and education to individuals that were seeking to deal with their own racism and bias, they had to focus, as a group, on undoing the institutional and systemic racism that had built this nation, state, and city and continued to create the deep well of disparity and inequity between white and black and brown citizens in every sphere of life as that impacted the ability of humans to thrive rather than simply survive. Those areas included education, employment, health, housing, and public safety. All of them in the group had learned in a variety of ways and circumstances that this country, the states, and the cities had not slowly become racist over time. They had been racist from the very beginning, and it was not due to ignorance or hate, it was due to self-interest. As Ibram X. Kendi stated in his latest book, *How to be an Antiracist*, "The history of racist ideas is the history of powerful policy-makers erecting racist policies out of self-interest, then producing racist ideas to defend and rationalize the inequitable effects of their policies, while everyday people consume those racist ideas, which in turn sparks the ignorance and hate." She commented that while she still had much to learn about the people in the new coalition, she was certain they were all tremendously tenacious and profoundly persistence, and that they would refuse to lose hope and the belief that there were more folks who were or wished to be anti-racist in the country, state, and city than there were self-interested racists. She stated they wanted to believe the Council, their elected leaders, were willing to become anti-racist too. She listed a few steps for being anti-racist, which included not using "I'm not a racist" or "I can't be racist" as a defensive denial. As Ms. Wilson-Kleekamp pointed out earlier, being just "not racist" was being neutral, and was a position that did not dismantle racist institutions and systems. She continued with the list and said one must admit the definition of a racist as being someone who was supporting racist policies or expressing racist ideas and confess the racist policies they themselves supported and racist ideas they themselves expressed. She stated the person needed to accept the source, i.e. upbringing, acknowledge the definition of an anti-racist as someone that was supporting anti-racist policies or expressing anti-racist ideas, struggle for anti-racist power and policy in their own spaces, which could be done in many ways to include seizing a policy-making position, struggle to remain at the anti-racist intersections where racism was mixed with other bigotries, and struggle to think with anti-racist ideas. Once they did those things as individuals, they could then work together as a body to truly begin to undo racist city policies and practices by working together to investigate and uncover the racist policies that were causing racial inequity, invent or find anti-racist policy that could eliminate racial inequity, monitor to ensure the new anti-racist policies reduce and eliminate racial inequity, start over and seek new and more effective anti-racist treatments when policies fail instead of blaming the people, monitor to ensure new racist policies were not instituted, and deploy their own anti-racist power to remove unsympathetic racist policy-makers/employees in order to institute anti-racist policy. She commented that she felt there was a real problem within the Police Department of racist employees remaining in power. She noted Mr. Thomas had been the one current council member that had been the most transparent about his struggle to start his anti-racist journey and had often stood alone in this space to challenge self-interested powers in an attempt to truly bring about a community in which all citizens could thrive rather than just survive. She felt he seemed to have embraced the understanding that when each of them did better, they all did better. She hoped the rest of the Council would soon follow his lead to make a true commitment to becoming not only just not racist, but hardworking anti-racists.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH29-20 Setting property tax rates for 2020 for the City of Columbia.

Discussion shown with B209-20.

B209-20 Setting property tax rates for 2020.

PH29-20 was read by the Clerk, and B209-20 was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Lue provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked for the current property tax rate. Mr. Lue replied it was \$0.4075. Mayor Treece asked for the proposed tax rate. Mr. Lue replied it was \$0.4078. Mayor Treece asked if that would result in new revenue. Mr. Lue replied no. He explained it was basically the assessed valuation associated with fluctuation.

Mr. Skala commented that a year or two ago, they had discussed property tax issues along with adjustments in the calculation and the Council had decided not to make an adjustment. He asked if this was related to that or if it was something different. Mr. Lue replied every few years an assessment evaluation was done for the entire City. It was essentially a reassessment and that was what had happened previously. The Council, at that time, had decided to not move forward with the increase. Mr. Skala asked how this was different. Mr. Lue replied this was only a natural fluctuation of the assessments.

Mayor Treece understood this would not result in any new revenue. He explained his concern two years ago was that they would be increasing taxes that would generate new revenue to the City of Columbia without the vote of the people. He understood it had been due to the State Auditor recalculating the property tax ceiling, and Columbia was not at that ceiling. This was an adjustment so they did not decrease revenue. Mr. Skala understood it was a true adjustment. Mayor Treece stated that was correct.

Mr. Pitzer understood these valuations were valuations from the beginning of the year or last year. Mr. Lue stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer understood there would be another assessment next year. Mr. Lue stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer understood that would reflect changes in property values from the pandemic. Mr. Lue replied possibly. Mr. Pitzer noted there could be some unintended or unknown consequences next year. Mr. Lue agreed there could. He stated he believed the City's current tax ceiling was \$0.41 so there was room for the Council to increase the rate if the valuations came in lower and they deemed it necessary.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

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

Mr. Skala understood this was an adjustment that was necessary based on the calculation, and as a result, he was willing to support it.

B209-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES:

TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA, PITZER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE.

ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH30-20 FY 2021 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.

Discussion shown with B211-20.

B210-20 Adopting the FY 2021 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.

Discussion shown with B211-20.

B211-20 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to eliminate transportation fares in FY 2021 for users of the GoCOMO Public Transit System.

PH30-20 was read by the Clerk, and B210-20 and B211-20 were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer understood parking enforcement would be moved to the Police Department and that there were six new police positions associated with it, and asked if those were the parking enforcement positions. Mr. Glascock replied yes. He explained they were eliminating 4-5 positions within parking enforcement and those positions would then be moved over to the Police Department. Mr. Pitzer understood the police officers that were downtown would be in charge of parking enforcement as well. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer asked what that did to the number of officers on patrol at any given time. Mr. Glascock replied it should increase the number in the field, and not necessarily just downtown. He explained they were trying to get more uniformed officers in the field versus behind a desk. He understood the Police Chief was adding some administrative positions in order to free up a post-certified officer for patrol. Mr. Pitzer asked if this would result in a consistent presence downtown. Mr. Glascock replied that was the plan.

Mr. Pitzer understood there was a proposal to reduce the health savings account contributions to employees. Ms. Buckler stated that was correct. She explained, for an individual, it would go from \$125 to \$62.50. Mr. Pitzer understood that would be \$1,500 to \$750 per year, and asked how much of a savings would be generated from it. Ms. Buckler replied about \$380,000, and noted it basically covered the 10 percent they were asked to look for in their budget. She explained they had reviewed what other entities, such as the University, the Columbia Public Schools, and others provided, and the City's contribution had been much higher than the average. Mr. Pitzer understood the employees in the high deductible health plan were eligible for the health savings account. Ms. Buckler stated that was correct. Mr. Pitzer understood there was not any charge to the employee for the health insurance premium if they were in the high deductible plan. Ms. Buckler stated that was correct for the employee only. Mr. Pitzer understood part of the incentive to sign up for the high deductible plan was the contribution to the health savings account. Ms. Buckler agreed it had been an incentive, and pointed out some organizations did not offer any contributions. Mr. Pitzer asked if that amount came from the employee benefit fund or if it was charged to the individual departments. Ms. Buckler replied it was not part of the premium structure. It was an additional expense, and this year, it was a little over \$1 million and came from the employee benefit fund. She stated departments were assessed for health insurance coverage for their employees. Mr. Pitzer asked if the \$380,000 would be charged back to departments or if it just came out of the employee benefit fund. Ms. Buckler replied it had just come out of the fund.

Mr. Pitzer understood the cash reserve target for the employee benefit fund was being increased from 30 percent to 70 percent this year, and asked for clarification. Ms. Buckler replied that was a decision made in the budget meeting with the Finance Department. It was basically a different way to look at what they felt was needed every year to cover their expenses rather than having an arbitrary number. She explained they had asked CBIZ, their consultant, to help review it, but the Budgeting Division within the Finance Department determined that 70 percent was where they should land. Mr. Pitzer asked if that was based on historical experience. Ms. Buckler replied it was based on experience and the plan in terms of medical and pharmacy claims as well as the stop loss. Mr. Pitzer asked if there had been years that they had been way over. Ms. Buckler replied she would love to be able to say how many claims they would have in a given year, but was unable. She noted there had been years whereby they had been lucky. In addition, they had a healthier population whereby they had not had to pay out as much in claims. She noted large claims were the nemesis. They covered the first \$400,000 on any large claim, and there were years where they only had 1-2 large claims and other years when they had 7-8. It was unpredictable. She explained there had not been an increase to the premiums last year or any design changes other than the IRS deduction amount for the health savings account. There had been an increase in the prior year of 13 percent because they had not done anything the three years prior to then. She stated they had cash this year and were in a pretty good position thus far. Unless something

really bad happened in the next few weeks, they would likely come in under what they thought they would spend in FY 2020. She explained they based their calculations on a rolling five years to avoid giant fluctuations. In addition, they reviewed medical trends, prescription coverage, etc., and it was anticipated that those costs would increase. She commented that they had tried to come up with an educated guess.

Mr. Pitzer stated he appreciated that they were doing what they could in terms of premium increases since that directly impacted employee paychecks. He explained his concern was that they were \$4 million over in cash reserves under the 30 percent rule, and a change from 30 to 70 percent would mean around a \$5.5 million increase in the cash reserve target. He asked if staff had considered phasing it in over a couple of years. Ms. Buckler replied they had talked about it, and the Finance Department had gone with the 70 percent.

Mr. Pitzer commented that reducing the health savings account contribution could directly increase the amount of out of pocket expenses paid by those that had medical expenses. Ms. Buckler agreed. Mr. Pitzer thought they might be able to afford that for another year if they were to phase in the increase to the cash reserves instead of doing it all at once. Ms. Buckler commented that given where they were today, she would agree, and pointed out these predictions were made when they were in a different place.

Mr. Skala understood Ms. Buckler was saying that this was the right fit now given the advice of the Finance Department, but that it could be adjusted depending on the types of claims they received. Ms. Buckler stated they could make adjustments based on the claims experience. Mr. Skala noted government was not nimble, but they were nimble enough to adjust to a phased approach if it became necessary. Ms. Buckler stated that was correct.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding the closing out of a customer utility fund. Mr. Glascock replied the Utility Billing Division had been within Community Relations so there had been a fee associated with it, but they were now moving Utility Billing into the Utilities Department so they did not have to pay all of those fees. Ms. Peters understood one City entity was being phased into another City entity. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. He explained it had previously been in the Finance Department, was then moved to Community Relations, and would now be moved to the Utilities Department. It would address what he considered double-budgeting.

Ms. Fowler asked about the deductible within a high deductible insurance plan for an employee. Ms. Buckler replied it was \$2,850 for a single employee. Ms. Fowler asked how much the City had contributed back into a health savings account. Ms. Buckler replied \$1,500 for an individual and \$3,000 for a family historically. Ms. Fowler understood the City had increased the amount of the health savings account contribution for an employee with a family. Ms. Buckler stated that was correct. Ms. Fowler asked for the premium to the employee if one went down one level to a lower deductible plan. Ms. Buckler replied \$17 per month for the employee only. Ms. Fowler asked for the deductible at that level. Ms. Buckler replied that was the cost for the \$1,500 PPO plan. She noted it was the only program open to new employees. The \$750 deductible PPO plan had been closed to new employees several years ago, but those that had been in it had been allowed to stay. If they were to ever change, they could never come back. Ms. Fowler asked for the premium amount for the \$750 deductible plan. Ms. Buckler replied she would need to look that up and would provide it later. Ms. Fowler asked if the City also provided a reduction in the premiums for families in the PPO plans. Ms. Buckler replied the City contributed the same amount for all employees in all plans, and pointed out they actually subsidized the full premium for active employees in addition to the health savings account contributions.

Ms. Fowler asked if she and her children would be covered if she was a City employee in the high deductible plan without any additional charge to the employee. Ms. Buckler replied there was not a charge for the employee for that plan.

Ms. Fowler asked if the mention of the \$400,000 large claim was because they were

self-insured up to a certain amount. Ms. Buckler replied they were self-insured and the stop loss limit was \$400,000.

Ms. Buckler stated she would provide Ms. Fowler the premium structure as it was now and proposed for next year.

Mayor Treece opened the public hearing.

James Melton, 5007 Bates Creek Court, explained he was the Vice Chair of the Commission on Cultural Affairs and noted the City of Columbia's funding for arts agencies had helped develop and create a strong cultural environment within the City. He thought they could all be proud of this unique aspect of Columbia. As usual, the annual funding process had started in the spring, and the Commission on Cultural Affairs had spent more than 300 hours completing a detailed review of applications from local arts agencies. He noted that reading through the applications made one appreciate how much the organizations added to the community. The partnership between the City and the arts industry was an important investment for both residents and visitors. He commented that Columbia was a leader in the State due to its arts programming, and had been Missouri's first ever designated creative community. He explained they were particularly proud that the local arts organizations continued to grow their programs and services while serving more citizens and visitors and also providing cultural opportunities for underserved populations. He stated that during the budget process, the Office of Cultural Affairs staff had estimated the funding from the City's general fund to be \$103,000. The budget scenario assumed \$100,000 for annual funding with an additional \$3,000 for small request funding to support applications for new, smaller projects added throughout the year. In addition to City funding, \$5,700 would be distributed from the Columbia Arts Fund and Arts Endowment Fund established at the Community Foundation of Central Missouri in 2012 with an initial amount of \$10,000. Due to contributions by individual donors, the Convention and Visitors Bureau, and fundraising efforts, they had grown the fund to more than \$290,000 and looked forward to growing it into the future. The \$100,000 would be augmented to allow \$105,700 to be distributed in addition to the \$3,000 for small requests. If funding was approved, contracts would be authorized in October to support arts presentation, education, and combined projects. This year, the Office of Cultural Affairs had received 26 applications with requests totaling \$167,760. Since 2017, considerable time and numerous public hearings had been held as the funding process had been reviewed and modified to create a more open and transparent system. He commented that the Commission reviewed applications in a manner patterned after the Missouri Arts Council process, and thus, each Commissioner read, reviewed, and scored all applications on their own in advance of the June meeting. A compilation of the written comments and scores were then provided to all Commissioners and each application was discussed for a preliminary score at the June meeting. He noted the Commission had held a posted public hearing at its July meeting to obtain feedback from organizations and individuals wishing to comment on the funding process, and the Commission then ultimately approved the work done at the June meeting. He stated they deeply appreciated the recognition of Council with regard to the importance of actively supporting the arts locally, and hoped the Council shared the enthusiasm of the Commission for the range of cultural and arts related opportunities the recommended projects would present to Columbia citizens next year.

Ms. Fowler understood the Commission on Cultural Affairs was adding \$5,700 from its endowment to the City's general funds of \$103,000, and asked if there was a formula by which they distributed money from the endowment. Mr. Melton replied yes, and stated he understood they utilized the recommendation from those that managed the endowment in terms of how much could be distributed. The Commission then looked at that range to determine how much more they wanted to allocate while still being able to maintain the endowment over time so it could grow. He noted a committee of the Commission made the recommendation on the final amount.

Ms. Fowler understood organizations could request up to 25 percent, and asked if that

meant 25 percent of the revenue of the organization. Mr. Melton replied yes.

Blaine Regan stated he was Chair of the Housing and Community Development Commission and noted the impacts of the pandemic had pushed their timeline for funding recommendations back a bit. The Commission would hold its hearing with regard to the proposed use of FY 2021 funds and CDBG CARES Act funding on Wednesday, August 19, and would consider final recommendations on August 26. Those recommendations would then be incorporated into the FY 2021 budget via an amendment sheet. The FY 2021 recommendations would include roughly \$1.65 million in federal funds for affordable housing and community development activities, including about \$70,000 in CDBG CARES Act funding to increase levels of service to homeless populations impacted by COVID. He commented that the Commission had received approximately \$3.27 million in funding requests, and although funding requests were typically higher than the funding available, the gap was much wider this year. Proposals for the CDBG CARES Act funding included healthcare access for unsheltered populations, space modifications for facilities, increased operational capacity, and personal protective equipment along with other items to help serve the homeless populations. He stated they had not received a proposal for a large 24-hour multiservice facility to serve the homeless populations, but the proposals received would help address the immediate crisis and increase service levels within the capacity of local organizations. He noted they had received a multiservice facility proposal in 2013, but it had been determined to not be viable. He commented that he believed the focus should be on building the capacity of an organization to take on a larger project versus rushing to purchase a facility. He stated the Commission would carefully examine the most current data and consider public input on priority needs along with the viability of proposed projects and capacities of the organizations submitting proposals. He noted they recognized the exceeding levels of needs, gaps, and resources for all of the different types of housing and community development projects, and thus, individual project viability and past organizational performance would be weighed carefully. He reiterated the Commission would be deliberating over the next two weeks on recommendations, which would then be provided to the Council for approval with the budget.

Stacy Ford stated she was the Chair of the Human Services Commission and commented that the social services provided and purchased by the City addressed some of the most challenging issues, many of which were rooted in poverty and inequity. She noted detailed information about these issues and the social services funding process were provided in a report that had been included as an attachment to the budget items. Nationally, poverty rates had been rising for 30 years and had only started to decline during the past decade, but the individual poverty rate in Columbia had continued to climb and remained relatively high. Currently, 23 percent of Columbians lived below the poverty level. Since the large population of college students affected their individual poverty rate, the City utilized the child poverty rate as another key measure of the level of poverty in the community. She stated they had been positively impacting the child poverty rate, which was lower than the state and national rates and the rates of many of peer communities. She felt this was critical as it was particularly challenging for children in Columbia to escape poverty. Sadly, social, economic, health, and educational disparities continued to be a significant issue in the community. African-Americans in Columbia experienced disproportionately high rates of poverty, unemployment, morbidity, and mortality, and disproportionately low rates of educational and economic attainment. Forty percent of black children in Columbia lived in poverty as opposed to only six percent of their white peers. These disparities had been made worse by the pandemic. While they did not yet know the full socio-economic impact of the pandemic, available indicators pointed to significant challenges. She commented that the unemployment rate in Columbia, which had been at historic lows prior to the pandemic, had more than doubled. Prior to the pandemic, the human services sector was already facing serious challenges as state and federal resources for human services had been steadily declining

since the 1980s, and more recently private donations to non-profits and support organizations, such as the United Way, had sharply fallen due to several factors to include rising income inequality, changes in the standard federal income tax deduction, and instability in the Missouri tax credit policy. Due to the economic fallout of the pandemic, they were seeing unprecedented demands for social services. She pointed out that as the needs for social services increased, federal COVID-19 social relief programs were ending, and as these programs were ending, the community had yet to receive federal CARES ACT funding for human services and housing. At the same time, non-profit partners were indicating their expenses were rising while their fundraising revenues were declining. This existing trend had been accelerated by an alarming rate by the pandemic. She commented that increasingly, local governments were left as the last line of defense on the war on poverty and as they battled the pandemic. Since the City did not have the capacity to provide all of the social services needed in the community, the Human Services Commission and the Department of Public Health and Human Services had been charged by the Council to make annual recommendations for the purchase of social services through professional services agreements with community-based providers utilizing the City's social services funding. The goal of the City's purchase of social services was to ensure basic needs were met and that everyone had the opportunity to achieve their full potential. Unfortunately, the City's investment in social services had not kept pace with the growing number of low income residents in the community. In today's dollars, they spent less than half per low income resident on social services than they had in 1980. In addition, the social services funding represented only two one-hundreds of a percent of the proposed City budget. She noted the issues of poverty and inequity had conspired to keep too many community members from realizing their true potential, and it was the reason the City's investment in social services, which assisted people in meeting their basic needs while also helping people build the skills and assets needed to move up and out of poverty, was so critical. Now, due to the economic fallout of the pandemic, the need for social services was greater, and the pandemic had further shifted the burden of providing and funding social services to local communities. While the Human Services Commission would have liked to have seen an increase in social services funding in FY 2021, they understood resources were limited. She noted they applauded the City Manager's recommendation to include funding for mental health staff at the Department of Public Health and Human Services. She commented that the Commission also wanted to thank the Council for its longstanding support of the City's investment in the social infrastructure of the community. The Commission looked forward to presenting the FY 2021 social services contract recommendations to the Council in December.

Ms. Fowler asked if the Human Services Commission had looked at the return on investment in terms of what the City's money was leveraging. She also wondered if they had a plan for when they might recalculate that number. Mr. Hollis replied that it was calculated based on the dollars invested in each program budget so they would look at it at the end of this fiscal year.

Mayor Treece noted written comments had been received from a few people.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, had provided written comment regarding the CIP budget for the Water Division in terms of whether \$20 million should be moved to FY 2022 since the engineering designs for HDR would run past FY 2021 and into the second quarter of FY 2022. He also wanted to know what was being investigated for the lines that indicated cost of investigation. Mayor Treece noted the Council had a copy of these comments and they would be filed with this agenda item.

Nickie Davis of the Downtown Community Improvement District had provided written comments asking for some relief for downtown business, specifically the hotels that continued to pay their permit fees in the garage when customers were parking for free in on-street parking spaces.

Matthew Schacht explained he was President of the Board of Vidwest, which was a

media non-profit and a community partner of the Ragtag Film Society, and that he had submitted written comments as well. About a year ago, Columbia Access Television (CAT), which had been in existence for about fifteen years, had dissolved. CAT had had a substantial contract with the City to manage and operate a public access television channel, which was historically a service that went back to the 1960s and 1970s when commercial enterprises were taking up the airwaves and there was a need for a public outlet on cable. He noted the City of Columbia had been provided its own public access television channel in 2004, and that this was about the same time YouTube, Facebook, and social media had entered on to the scene making cable less important. Regardless, CAT had been created and had struggled to find its purpose. As a result, the non-profit behind CAT dissolved due to the lack of funding. Last year, the City put out an RFP for a new organization to run the public access television channel utilizing the existing equipment and remaining funds. The RFP that Vidwest submitted had been based on turning a non-profit into a commercial endeavor that could eventually support itself through its own revenues. Thus, they were looking at what might be commercial services CAT could offer while providing access to media equipment to the public so the commercial endeavor would support the non-profit endeavor. Based on the RFP, Vidwest and True/False were given the CAT equipment and some funds for the next year to try to get the enterprise up and running. He noted he had submitted paperwork showing timelines and an accounting of the money provided a year ago. He pointed out their plans had not worked out due to COVID, and he was present to provide the year in review, answer any questions, offer funding options from \$0 to what they had received last year for the upcoming fiscal year, etc. He explained a decision needed to be made with regard to what would be done with CAT resources and the kind of support the City wanted to invest into CAT in the next year. He commented that everyone with Vidwest and the Ragtag Film Society understood the seriousness of the challenges facing the community, and as a result, they were looking at how they could use their resources and expertise as a media organization to address some of those problems. He noted they had created a professional livestream rig which would allow CAT to stream events in real time to fans and family members for any community organization, and pointed out they had recently done a live online fundraising event for Access Arts, which had reached over 1,000 online supporters. He stated CAT, Vidwest, and the Ragtag Film Society were looking for innovative ways to use media technology to serve the community now, and they hoped to continue to do that over the next year. He reiterated decisions needed to be made with regard to the existing contract and what would be renewed.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that those on fixed incomes would prefer not to have fee increases to City services, such as sewer, water, and trash. If trash bags were no longer provided, it would add an expense to the poor. He wondered who would provide the trash bin if that proposal moved forward. In addition, he wondered who would pay if there was a busted bin.

There being no further comment, Mayor Treece continued the public hearing to the September 8, 2020 Council Meeting.

Mr. Pitzer asked for an amendment to be prepared to maintain the health savings account contribution at its current level, and for the phasing to the cash reserve target if that was needed. He was not sure that part needed an amendment.

VI. OLD BUSINESS

B194-20

Calling a special election on November 3, 2020 to consider an ordinance authorizing the use of automated residential refuse and recycling collection, including the use of residential roll carts.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer understood refuse collectors worked 30 minute shifts at a time when picking

up the bags. Mr. Sorrell explained that when they were fully staffed, they had two licensed drivers with each truck that alternated between driving and picking up the trash. It was typically 30 minutes at a time, but they might choose among themselves to go 45 minutes or an hour instead. They each essentially spent half of the day picking up bags and half of the day driving.

Mr. Pitzer asked Mr. Sorrell if any research had been done with regard to how long they could do it before being physically exerted. Mr. Sorrell replied no. He explained they had always encouraged everyone to switch before they got to the point of being physically exhausted.

Mr. Pitzer understood if they did not have two drivers alternating, they would have one driver and two non-drivers that alternated. Mr. Sorrell stated they had two temporary staff agency personnel that alternated picking up bags on the back of the truck.

Mr. Pitzer understood that on an average day about 60 percent of the refuse collectors were temporary employees. Mr. Sorrell replied it was 60-70 percent. Mr. Pitzer understood those were all employees from one private company. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. They were only using one temporary agency at this time for collection. Mr. Pitzer asked how many companies had bid on the contract the last time it had been up for bid. Mr. Sorrell replied he would have to check with the Purchasing Division as he did not know. Mr. Pitzer asked if the company had a capacity limit in terms of the number of workers provided per day. Mr. White replied they had not hit any type of capacity in terms of the company being able to provide the City with employees. There were situations where it might take a day before they could get an employee to them. If they had people call in sick or not show up for work, they might be in a position where they were waiting until the next day before they could get a new employee in to take that employee's position. Mr. Pitzer asked about the terms of the contract with regard to whether the cost was just passed along to the City if the company chose to increase the pay of the temporary employee. Mr. Sorrell replied he thought the contract price was set for the period of the contract, but would need to verify that with the Purchasing Division.

Mr. Pitzer understood the Solid Waste Division had commercial collection drivers and residential collection drivers, and when they had openings on the commercial side, they rarely had trouble filling those positions. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. He explained there was a tendency for staff on the residential side to move to the commercial side when positions became available. Mr. Pitzer understood the two positions involved the same hours, pay, etc., and the only difference was that commercial drivers did not have to take turns picking up bags. Mr. Sorrell stated that was correct. He noted the commercial operation was more automated and much less physically demanding to the employee.

Mr. Pitzer understood some of the City's trucks had temporary equipment or equipment that might be adapted to lift carts. Mr. Sorrell explained equipment, known as Curotto-Can, could be purchased to be added to a front loading vehicle. The forks on the truck could carry the can, and the can had the arm that would dump the roll cart and set it back down. When the can became full, it would then be dumped into the truck. He thought a front load truck would cost about the equivalent of a truck that was made specifically to pick up roll carts, and they would then have the additional expense of the Curotto-Can, which he thought was around \$40,000, so it would actually cost more to buy a front loader and a Curotto-Can than to buy a truck that was actually made to empty carts. He noted they had a couple of those cans that they could put on a front load truck to do some of that work, but most of their front load trucks were used for their routes now. They did not have front load trucks available to be diverted to a different operation. As a result, they would still need trucks to move toward the retrofit model, which would not be as efficient as using equipment that was designed to do the job. Mr. Glascock asked if any of the rear loader trucks had tippers. Mr. Sorrell replied all of the rear loaders had tippers, but it still required two people as someone was needed to drive the truck and someone else was needed to hook the can onto the truck and to set it back down once the

can had been dumped. He pointed out the can tipper was a standard on all rear load trucks. Mr. Pitzer understood those were used for residential operations. Mr. Sorrell replied they were used for residential and commercial operations. He explained they already had some use for that because some routes involved grouped residential units that utilized roll carts. They were mainly in the East Campus area.

Mayor Treece understood Mr. Sorrell had indicated in February that even if the City were to switch to the roll cart system, they still did not have enough staff to operate the system because people with a commercial driver's license (CDL) would still be needed, and asked if that was correct. Mr. Sorrell replied that was correct depending on the day. He noted they had done interviews today, and if they managed to hire three people, they would have enough staff for collection via roll carts. They might even have enough staff to bring back curbside recycling.

Mary Sapp, 3405 Creasy Springs Road, wondered how much per hour the City paid the temporary agency for the workers and how much the workers received from the temporary agency. Mayor Treece stated he thought they were paying \$22 per hour to the temporary agency and that the workers were actually receiving about \$14 per hour. Ms. Sapp wondered why the City could not just hire workers at \$22 per hour. Mr. Glascock pointed out it took two temporary employees so the City was actually paying \$44 per hour for those services per route.

Ms. Sapp stated she wanted to ensure everyone understood what was being proposed in the budget, and noted it included permanently eliminating curbside recycling for a savings of \$1.9 million and no longer providing trash bags and blue recycling bags for a savings of \$700,000. She pointed out the solid waste utility rates would not decrease as a result of these savings, the residents of Columbia would only receive one of the services and would not receive any bags while continuing to pay the same full rate. In addition, residents would have to purchase their own bags. She wondered how they could justify this without a decrease in the rates. She asked about the reserves the utility had amassed while they had the bag system, which she understood to be \$16.38 million last year and \$10 million over the cash reserve target. She did not feel the City had increased wages sufficiently to keep the workers on the trucks nor had that cut rates even with the large surplus. She understood there was a proposal to spend \$12 million for new automated trucks and three roll carts per resident. She wondered how they could commit to a capital expenditure of \$12 million during a pandemic when future City income was uncertain and when they had reduced budgets and had incurred layoffs for a system the voters had already rejected. She commented that they had been led to believe that if they just had roll carts curbside recycling would commence. They would spend \$6.2 million for two recycling roll carts per household even though the City had issued a press release in July indicating there was little to no market for recyclable materials. She did not believe this poor recycling commodity market was temporary. In January of 2018, China, the number one buyer, stopped purchasing U.S. recyclables. This was over two years ago, and China had not returned to the market. The gap between what it cost to collect recyclables and the revenue generated by it had widened. She understood municipalities all over the country had stopped curbside recycling, whether previously collected by bags or roll carts. She stated roll carts would not bring back curbside recycling. She understood the recycling bins around town were overflowing because Columbians wanted to recycle, but the City was begging recyclers to take plastic for no payment. She reiterated roll carts would not fix the market, and believed it would be irresponsible to spend millions to buy roll carts to collect recyclables at a substantial net loss. She commented that residents should continue to receive the bags they paid for, and while they were moving forward without curbside recycling, she felt the Council should insist on providing solid waste utility customers a corresponding reduction in fees. She also felt they should recognize that this was an poor time to commit to a \$12 million expenditure for roll carts.

Chuck Velte commented that he had lived in Columbia since 2013 and appreciated the

excellence in the government, the services of police, fire, utilities, etc. and the outstanding medical facilities. He explained he had moved here from Renton, Washington, which was about the same size of Columbia. For most of the 39 years he had lived there, his trash and recycling had been collected by carts and the service had been excellent. He noted it had been contracted out by the City to a private company, Republic. He commented that he believed the trash service in Columbia was broken and needed to be rebuilt. It was an unsafe, antiquated system with workers hanging on the back of moving trucks in all types of weather and traffic conditions, and then sprinting off the vehicles to grab the trash when the bill was only a little over \$15. He stated Columbia residents were spoiled, and noted it was not a good deal in the long run. It was only a good deal for the customer. It was not good for the City and everyone overall. He commented that increasing worker pay, which had been proposed many times, was really not the solution. He explained there were some jobs today whereby the pay did not compensate for the working conditions of the workers, and this was one of them. The annual outlay for state industrial injuries on these jobs alone spoke to that. It was not a safe job no matter what they paid the loaders. He felt they needed to switch to containers with a reduced crew via automated trucks and provide various size carts based on need versus a flat rate or limited size containers. He also believed there should be charges for bulky waste items. In Renton, they had to pay \$80 for a couch to be picked up. A cost of \$15 was unfair to the people subsidizing it. He pointed out that the service in Renton had accommodated those that were disabled or elderly and on a fixed income in that they only paid \$14 per month for a 45 gallon cart while a family of four paid \$29 for that same cart. As a result, they were not subsidizing the rich and well to do. He stated that was the reason multiple sized carts were needed. He reiterated \$15 a month was low, and those that were not disabled or elderly and on a fixed income needed to be prepared to spend a few dollars more. He commented that Columbia was not an expensive place to live as it was very economical, but pointed out good service cost money. He also suggested getting out of the trash and recycling business by partnering with a private firm. He understood the fear of losing control and of higher costs, but noted they were already undercharging for the service. In addition, a well written contract with performance reviews, specific protective clauses, and partnership agreements would keep the City in the loop and in control without the overhead of equipment, maintenance on the equipment, human resources costs, a cart inventory, etc., and the City could still make a profit on the landfill.

Mayor Treece noted a written comment had been received from Adam Cribbs who wanted to state his support for the addition of roll carts as it prevented the issue of animals getting into the garbage.

Kim Parker, 803 Alton Avenue, commented that she was speaking as a private citizen even though she belonged to the Solid Waste Advocacy Group. She noted the Council was now faced with spending approximately \$200,000 for an election promoted by Columbia MO Citizens for Roll Carts that had 1,600 members, to include her, on Facebook. The citizens of the current system had been required to gather over 3,200 verified register voter signatures to put the proposition on the March 15, 2016 ballot. She understood sweeping changes were being proposed across Columbia to 36,000 households involving three roll carts per households, which meant over 100,000 roll carts at an initial cost of \$12 million. She asked the Council to visualize how their street and the City would look. She agreed there were problems with the curbside collection system. The City required CDLs to drive the trucks yet the drivers did not get paid a competitive wage. She believed the workers on the back of the truck should also be paid full-time competitive wages with benefits and a heavy emphasis on safety. She felt workman's compensation was a wildcard regardless of the profession as one automated truck could be involved in an accident and workman's compensation could skyrocket on that day. She referred to Section 22-159 of the City Code, which indicated all material for collection must be in a bag, disposable containers, or securely bound bundles not greater

than four feet in length or two feet in diameter and not more than 50 pounds total weight each, and pointed out the City workers currently collected almost everything at the curb. She wondered why they were doing this and asked about the use of the ticketing system. She commented that a council member had asked for a report at the budget work session on May 18 to include a comparison cost of the options, and felt this was still necessary along with a cost-benefit analysis. She noted the 2019 citizen survey indicated 91 percent of Columbians had been satisfied or very satisfied with residential trash collection. With the suspension of curbside recycling, she felt this satisfaction rate was likely to change.

Mayor Treece noted written comment had been received from Charlotte Kerr of 117 West Boulevard North who indicated she was in favor of instituting roll carts for waste without an election since the election would cost \$200,000.

Andrew Hutchinson, 607 Washington Avenue, stated he was speaking in his capacity as a union representative for Local 995, and noted they had surveyed the workers regarding this issue. He commented that 21 of the workers, which was a majority of the full-time staff, signed a petition last week asking for roll carts and small raise. He pointed out those that did not sign the petition were not necessarily against it, but based on the collective bargaining agreement, he could only visit them at certain times so it was tough to reach everyone at the same time. He stated every worker they had asked was in support of this, and they understood it would take time and money for implementation. In the meantime, they wanted a raise, which included hazard pay during COVID-19, and a five bag limit per day for pick-up for residential collection and potentially a bulk day collection per month. Around the time of move-ins and due to the pandemic, there seemed to consistently be too many bags for pick-up. It not only made them less effective and efficient at getting their routes done, but it also made them more susceptible to injuries. He noted the workers were clear in that roll carts would make their jobs more safe and efficient, but a bag limit or regulations to at least improve the quality of life for them would make a major impact. He also suggested elevated wages, and noted getting away from temporary workers was always in the interest of all workers. He pointed out the workers were also against the privatization of trash collection as privatization usually resulted in cost savings on the backs of the most vulnerable, i.e. workers in service positions.

Cindy Sheltmire, 1908 Tremont Court, commented that she was a member of the Solid Waste Advocacy Group and opposed to roll carts. She noted it would involve a \$12.2 million cost to implement a roll cart system, and there would also be considerable cost in maintaining the carts over time. She explained her main objection to the roll carts beyond the expense was the ongoing eyesore they created. She stated she had been a realtor for 36 years and her business had always involved selling Columbia to people. When traveling to other cities with roll carts, she had noticed they were visible 24 hours per day seven days per week. They tended to sit out even when it was not a trash pick-up day. Even in nice neighborhoods with 3-car garages where there might be room to place roll carts, they were still located outside. She understood some felt the bags were unsightly as well, but the difference was that they were usually picked up and gone by mid-day. She pointed out the City was considering three roll carts per resident, not just one. She asked the Council to imagine those lining the streets day in and day out. She believed visible roll carts would constitute a permanent blemish on the City. She understood other communities had imposed penalties for leaving roll carts on the curb, and questioned whether Columbia had the resources to enforce compliance. She noted elderly people might have trouble rolling three carts to the curb and back, especially during inclement weather. She understood the City had indicated they could assist any senior citizen that called for help with the roll carts, but again, she questioned the ability of the City to be able to respond in a timely manner to such calls. In terms of the issues of hiring and retaining workers along with worker's compensation claims, she felt the City needed to consider whether there were feasible options within the current system, such

as smaller bags printed with the City logo, limiting the number of bags, allowing additional bags to be purchased by citizens, restricting the weight limit on the bags even further, higher salaries and benefits, safety incentives, and adding and clearing out recycling centers more frequently. She pointed out the satisfaction rate for trash collection had been 91 percent and suggested they find viable ways in which to win that satisfaction rate back.

Alyce Turner, 1204 Fieldcrest, stated she was supportive of roll carts and putting this issue on the ballot. She explained she had worked on a number of campaigns collecting signatures, and even if people disagreed, they would sometimes sign to allow for the right to vote on the issue. She noted this was a controversial issue that had support on both sides. She understood there were some economic issues the Council needed to consider, and stated the first issue she would consider was health. She stated she had served on the Environment and Energy Commission (EEC) for 12 years, and they had discussed the need for a pay-as-you-throw system, which was implicit with a roll cart since only so much could be placed in it. She noted she really wanted to see the pay-as-you-throw system along with a regular recycling program because she did not feel they should subsidize people that threw away way too much stuff. She explained she had grown up in Montgomery County, Maryland, and her mother, at the age of 95, had rolled her two roll carts to the curb and back. She did not feel they looked unsightly there nor in Jefferson City where they had huge hills. She felt torn trash bags were unsightly, and in some communities, they were not cleaned up quickly as it was not the responsibility of those that collected the trash. She was not sure how to address the fact workers would consistently be injured by hauling their trash if they did not go to roll carts. She understood there would be an initial cost of about \$12 million, but pointed out the move to that system would take time as government did not move quickly. In addition, it would be an investment in the health of the workers and the community. She reiterated she did not feel roll carts were difficult to maneuver and explained she utilized one as a senior with a bad back. She also believed that if citizens were not required to pay for the bags, the trash system would be a mess. They would have all sorts of overflowing containers at the curb, and they would not receive a good satisfaction rate. She commented that she had lived in Columbia for 40 years and there was a history of recycling here. Columbia had been the only city in the country at one time that had cans that could be recycled. She reiterated curbside recycling was important as were healthy workers.

Mayor Treece noted written comment had been received by Darrin Ratermann, 5304 Flats Mill Court, who indicated he was having trouble understanding the trash bag issue. Mr. Ratermann stated he had heard many arguments made against it, but each could be dismissed with logic, and noted he was in favor of roll carts. Mayor Treece noted written comment had also been received by Donna Befort, 3419 St. Charles Road, who asked the Council to vote no on roll carts as she felt it would be a disaster. Ms. Befort felt the previous no vote should not be questioned or dismantled by Council.

Kristen Hill explained she was with Columbia MO Citizens for Roll Carts and wanted to remind everyone of what would actually be voted on tonight, i.e., the rescission of the ordinance. The other discussions, such as the types of carts, the upfront cost, or whether it would work in Columbia, needed to be put to the side for tonight as it did not need to be discussed until after the ban was lifted. She noted her group and other citizens had been trying to convince the Council to put this issue on the ballot, and felt the Council should not deny the citizens the ability to vote on the issue again because a petition and vote had occurred five years ago. For those concerned about what those opposed to roll carts had to say, he encouraged them to go online and read posts on Facebook and Nextdoor. She felt 80 percent of those opposed did not want them because they looked trashy, 10 percent of those opposed did not want to roll them back and forth, and the other 10 percent were misinformed as to the cost, refused to accept the information, or were trolling. She did not feel those people should decide the matter

for everyone as they did not care about worker safety, the environment, or the City's long-term outlook. They only cared about how the carts looked. She asked the Council to not risk taking everyone else's voice away. She commented that people were not going to polls in November to decide whether to use rolls cart. They would be voting on whether the City would be allowed to use them. If the citizens voted to allow the use of them, they could then discuss these other details. If the citizens voted not to allow the use of them, she felt the Council should continue the discussion because she believed they would be right back where they were now in another four years. She reiterated she believed the Council should allow this to go on the ballot for the citizens to decide. She provided a few quotes from people that did not want roll carts which included suggestions for not placing the trash out until the morning, a conspiracy between the union and the company that would provide roll carts, and the need for yoga or warm up stretches prior to starting the day.

Mayor Treece noted written comment had been received by Dusty Vines-Mudd, 907 Madison Street, indicating his support for placing the repeal of the wheelie bin ordinance on the November ballot, and from Jean Sparks stating she was 79 years old and felt roll carts were difficult to handle, keep clean, and store. Ms. Sparks asked that the Council not make trash day a chore.

Amy Belcher understood many felt the employees needed a raise, and she agreed, but she was not sure that was the main reason they could not keep people. As Mr. Sorrell had mentioned, when they had openings on the automated side, people tended to move to that. There were not openings in the automated side of trash collection. She commented that she believed safety was the number one reason they struggled to retain employees. She agreed there might be possible solutions outside of roll carts, but did not feel any would be as efficient, cost-effective, or as safe for employees. Any other solution would still have employees on the backs of trucks doing damage to their knees, backs, and shoulders, and being out in the elements every day. She felt those things would keep worker's compensation claims high and the positions open. She commented that they could still provide raises while implementing roll carts. They did not have to choose between the two. Roll carts only made the raises more cost efficient for the citizens in the long run. She stated she agreed that \$12 million was a lot of money, and it was the reason they were not asking for the switch to happen all at once. She noted the City had money in cash reserves to switch only the trash side of service and order the trucks in FY 2021. Switching trash now and raising rates to \$24 per month as they were proposing would pay for a switch in recycling in FY 2024. She stated that raising rates to \$25 per month would also allow for a permanent \$5 per hour increase in employee compensation. She commented that the solid waste utility was going bankrupt, and without carts, they were looking at a much higher rate increase than \$25 in the very near future just to keep it going. The longer they waited to implement this, the more it would cost citizens. Any other Band-Aid solution would cost money that would not be able to go toward an eventual move to roll carts, thus costing the citizens more. She understood 91 percent of customers were satisfied with trash service based on a survey, and noted she remembered filling out that survey and saying she was satisfied. She explained she was satisfied because her trash was picked up every week on time and without fail, and pointed out she had commented on the need for roll carts on the survey as well. She stated that just because she was satisfied did not mean there was not a safer way to collect trash. In terms of a potential bag limit or smaller or lighter bags, she agreed they could move in that direction, but noted roll carts would essentially provide that at no other cost to the City because if it was not in the cart, it would not be picked up. She commented that the Council could propose 100 other solutions, but those would not be any more than a temporary solution. The utility needed something more sufficient like a catastrophic surgery, i.e., roll carts. Any other solution would simply allow the department to hemorrhage money. She stated roll carts were the real and viable solution. She also pointed out that if the Council voted no tonight, she would continue her effort of

getting this question on the ballot, and asked that whatever solution was decided upon to be able to fit seamlessly with roll carts so it would not cost the citizens any extra money. Dennis Wise, Raleigh, North Carolina, commented that he was with Waste Zero, the nation's largest waste reduction company, and noted they had been a vendor to the City for 16 years, to include participating in the voucher program for the past 13 years. He stated he wanted to believe part of the 91 percent satisfaction rate was due to the successful voucher program. He agreed the bags they supplied were thicker than those that could be purchased in stores. He explained his company was agnostic with regard to whether the City continued with its bag system or moved to the roll cart system as they wanted to work with the City to reduce the amount of trash regardless. He commented that their tagline was "cutting the trash in half across America," and noted they had not helped Columbia reduce its trash much, but they had helped the City save a great deal of money, i.e., at least \$200,000 per year. He noted the bags used to be thrown on customer lawns, and pointed out the greatest sin about getting what people thought were free bags was that the bags ended up in the landfill without ever being opened. It was also the reason the voucher program had been created. He commented that he saw a long term future with or without carts as they had a multitude of programs to help improve collection regardless of system utilized and during the intermediary if they chose to move to carts. If the City continued with bags, he felt the key was to have a bag the City deemed should be used. In the immediate, he believed bags, black for trash and blue for recycling, should be provided as he did not want to see the Columbia become messy. He felt the appearance of not having litter or recyclables all over the place was important.

Mayor Treece listed more of the written comments that had been received.

Nina Brown, Ward 3, indicated that after living in St. Peters for 20 years, it had been nice coming to Columbia where trash pick-up was simple and did not involve ugly bins that needed to be pushed around, cleaned, or housed in the garage. She felt they were unsightly and tended to linger around long after the trash had been removed.

Phyllis Cope, 711 Huntridge Drive, stated she was not in favor of changing the waste pick-up system from bags to roll carts because she lived on a street without garages or carports. She noted she was a senior citizen with a steep driveway and no place to store the carts.

Ray Beck, who was a former City Manager in the City of Columbia, indicated that what was needed was enforcement of the ordinance following a good, continuous information program along with requiring the use of City bags for a pay-as-you-throw system and the paying of competitive wages. He pointed out Columbia was one of the first communities with a solid waste utility to allow the Council to set rates to support the operation and he believed the residents would support necessary increases. He felt that if they voted again on roll carts, they should provide residents with a full report to include their usual financial statement along with how it would be enforced.

Ron Colwill, Fourth Ward, asked for the chance to vote for a roll cart system.

Tim Grothe, 3417 St. Charles Road, stated he was highly opposed to roll carts in his neighborhood as they were big and cumbersome to handle as a senior citizen. In addition, they took up a large amount of space in the garage.

Vicki Brown, 4815 Stonington Drive, asked the Council to support making it possible to have roll carts.

Mr. Pitzer stated he appreciated the process they had gone through with this over the last month or so and noted he had actually come around to a point of view that was closer to Ms. Peters in that they should just be responsible enough to do what was clearly in the right interest of the City, and more importantly, the workers. He commented that he had been most educated on the conditions for the workers, and pointed out they did not expose any other worker in any other department to the kind of risk they asked the refuse collectors to take. It was literally so dangerous that people could not do it for more than 30 or 45 minutes at a time, and if they truly cared about their

well-being, they would not have this system of trash collection. He noted safety was not the only consideration. It was clear the system was breaking down. It was in a terrible financial condition as it was hemorrhaging cash, they could not pick up recycling, and they had outsourced 60-70 percent of the job to a private temporary staffing firm. By not doing this, they were telling management to patch things up so it kept running for a bit longer, and the result would just be them twisting themselves into knots and providing pay raises to only one subgroup of employees while no one else in the City received a raise. In addition, they would figure out a way to justify increasing rates even though they were promising to not increase rates across any of the utilities this year. He commented that the management problem here was due to them, the Council, in terms of their unwillingness to do the right thing. They would leave the hands of staff completely tied and without the ability to access and use the one tool that might actually help solve the problem. He stated they had totally spoiled everyone as had been noted in a citizen survey that less than one percent of the residents had responded to indicating that they liked the current service. He explained he would say the same thing because the trash tended to magically disappear, but pointed out that it was not a pretty picture once one understood what was happening to make that happen. He understood that almost five years ago, a six month ban had been put into place, but being scared of that was not a reason to not act at this time. If they had a chance, they would likely put a use tax back on the ballot. That had been rejected less than three years ago and they had no problem discussing that again. He pointed out the reason for that was because things changed. He believed things had changed with solid waste to the point that it was a question that needed to be asked again. He commented that he was not sure what the real solution would look like as there would be a transition period and/or a hybrid approach as there were certain neighborhoods whereby automated collection might not work so well causing exceptions to possibly be necessary. He noted there were likely thousands of scenarios, and they could not talk about any of it while they had the ban in place. He reiterated something needed to change and would change one way or another as the current system was not sustainable. He commented that he was reminded recently of Donald "Hector" Crum, the first Columbia Firefighter killed in the line of duty in 1986, who had been hanging on the back of one of the old fashioned fire trucks when it had taken a turn and flipped over crushing him to death. After that incident, the Fire Department recognized that having their workers ride on the back of trucks was inherently dangerous and they had worked with the Council to find a way to buy trucks whereby no one had to hang off them for worker safety. He understood trash collection was not as glamorous as firefighting, but believed if they had been willing to do that for their firefighters 34 years ago, they should do the same thing for their refuse collectors. He stated that right now, they were exposing them to serious injuries or death, and it was not the right thing to do. He urged the Council to vote to put this question to the voters again so they could make the progress they badly needed.

Mr. Trapp commented that neither the Council nor the voters had the ability to tie the hands of future councils and future voters because circumstances could change, and the circumstances had changed. It was well predicted when the first automation proposal had been proposed. It had not been done in a vacuum. It had been done due to the trend lines showing the difficulties that would occur with the current system, and they had now gotten to that point of difficulties. They had provided raises and still had been unable to address the issue. He understood not everyone liked automated systems and that most of the arguments had come down to aesthetics and convenience. He noted it had been an easy decision for him throughout the debate due to worker safety. He stated there had been a death. It was not a hypothetical situation as it had happened. They had also had serious injuries. He commented that he had been the chairman of the committee for roll cart choice, and one thing that had hurt their campaign in 2016 was the opposition of the union to the change. In speaking with workers since then, there had been a 100 percent change, which needed to be a significant new factor people took into account.

He noted 21 of 21 workers polled had indicated they wanted to move to an automated system as they were more concerned about safety than some hypothetical job loss because the jobs were not being filled and they were not able to keep people in the positions. He pointed out they were asking too much of these workers, and the workers were now asking for this change to make the decision. He stated he felt it was their responsibility as the board of directors for this group. In addition, all of the long term economic projections showed automated systems were cheaper, and it was the reason it had become the norm across the country. He reiterated the Council was responsible for keeping their workers safe, and they were failing at it. He did not feel there was any counterargument to the fact that 21 of 21 people within the union had indicated they wanted to move to an automated system. He pointed out they were not making that decision. They were only bringing it back to the voters due to the inability to bring people together for interested parties meetings to do these types of policy changes, and a poll involving the largest election people would participate in was a great time to find out what was wanted. He stated most elections had a cost, and if this was not placed on the November ballot, he believed it would on the April ballot through a citizen initiative process. He did not feel it was special favoritism to put this on the November ballot as it was really a timing issue involving the collapse of curbside recycling. He reiterated he thought they should have the November voters, the largest electorate Columbia would assemble for another four years, to weigh in and provide the Council the go ahead to plan for a system that would protect the workers, keep rates low, improve recycling, and give them the community they wanted to live in as that was not being done now.

Mayor Treece provided the Council with a handout of a proposed amendment he wanted to offer. He commented that this morning a Cole County judge had issued a ruling on Amendment 3 indicating the changing of the ballot title as insufficient and unfair. In that ruling, the judge said a ballot summary statement must inform voters of the central features of a measure and that failure to do so rendered it insufficient and unfair. There had to be sufficient clearness to give notice of the purpose to those interested or affected by the proposal. He stated he felt there were two issues with the way this proposition was worded that failed to allude to the central feature, i.e., the wholesale repeal of a voter initiated and voter approved prohibition on roll carts. In addition, the second paragraph of the proposed language said "If approved by voters, the use of residential roll carts for refuse and recycling and the purchase of automated refuse collection vehicles would be allowed, but not required." He thought what the summary statement was suggesting was that the Council would be allowed the authority, but they would not be required to issue roll carts. He felt the impression it gave voters insufficiently and unfairly was that they would be allowed to use roll carts, but not required to use roll carts. He thought it implied they could chose to have them or chose not to have them, and that was not what would be done. He noted his suggested amendment would clarify the issues. In the first paragraph, instead of "removing" restrictions, he suggested it say "repealing" restrictions "approved by voters in March 2016" along with the deletion of other wording. He also suggested in the second paragraph, it say "If approved by the voters, the City Council would have the authority to require the use of residential roll carts for refuse and recycling and the purchase of automated refuse collection vehicles."

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B194-20 per the amendment sheet he handed out. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Skala stated he thought the comments of Mayor Treece were well-reasoned and he concurred with that language change.

Mr. Pitzer stated he disagreed with Mr. Skala. He felt that in plain language, they were moving a restriction, and the plain reading of the final sentence was the use would be allowed but not required. He commented that the City Council had the authority to require a lot of things, and they were not going to list everything they had the authority to require. He reiterated he believed it was plain as written.

Mayor Treece believed the voters would always consider how it affected them, and

language creating the impression that they would be allowed to use roll carts but not required to use them was different than giving the Council the authority to undo what voters had indicated less than five years ago. Mr. Pitzer asked Mayor Treece if he would propose the same language if they placed the use tax on the ballot again. Mayor Treece replied the voters had not initiated the use tax that would be undone. In this instance, less than five years ago, a group of citizens had circulated a petition and presented it to Council to put the issue on the ballot and he was not sure they should substitute their judgement for theirs. Mr. Pitzer stated that was not in the amendment.

Mr. Trapp commented that he did not believe this amendment served the plain language of what they were trying to accomplish. He noted confusing ballot language had led to the discrepancy and illegitimacy of the prior roll cart vote, and felt having clear language written by the City Counselor made more sense than this proposal.

The motion made by Mayor Treece and seconded by Mr. Skala to amend B194-20 per the amendment sheet he handed out was approved by voice vote with Mayor Treece, Ms. Fowler, Mr. Skala, and Ms. Peters voting yes, and Mr. Trapp and Mr. Pitzer voting no.

Ms. Fowler commented that she took the safety and care of workers seriously, and the last time the issue came up, she was on the other side of the podium speaking to the then Director of Public Works, John Glascock, about improving the pay for the workers so they could rest their bodies, not have a need for a second job, and take advantage of health insurance benefits. She explained that she was concerned about the \$200,000 it would cost to put it on the ballot at a time when they were cutting budget appropriations in order to meet next year's needs. She stated she saw that \$200,000 as additional pay for the workers in the short term while they moved toward roll carts as she envisioned a future involving roll carts. While they moved in that direction, they needed to address the many other issues that needed to be discussed and identified to include costs. She commented that the \$200,000 represented something they had been unable to do in the last 5-6 years, and noted she would vote no tonight due to the expense of the election. She explained the election in April did not carry that expense since it was an election they were already paying for, and if they were still in a quandary, they could address it then. She reiterated that \$200,000 could be used for additional pay for the workers.

Mr. Skala stated he had been on the Council the last time this issue had come up, and there had been a lot of meetings around the community. The outcome of those meetings had indicated about 80-90 percent of the people were against roll carts, and those people had been the ones that had initiated the initiative petition to place the issue on the ballot. He understood some felt the language had been confusing, and those collecting the signatures for the petition tended to have the upper hand when it came to the ballot language. He believed anyone that had read the language at the time would know it was a ban on roll carts. He commented that there were a lot of ways to mitigate some of the issues, and noted he shared the view of Ms. Fowler in that at some point they would have to move toward roll carts or a hybrid system. He stated he felt a hybrid system might be the best approach, and that it might be required regardless as about 25 percent of the town was inaccessible in terms of automated equipment or involved an elderly person that might need assistance. He commented that the issue had previously been placed on the ballot due to an initiative petition, and he believed it would take more than just a reversal by the Council to undo the initiative petition. He felt it required another affirmation of change. He stated he suspected the ground had shifted to some degree and thought it was likely close to 50-50, but believed an initiative petition should be required to undo it. Meanwhile, he felt there were things they could do in the context of budget discussions to mitigate worker safety, such as smaller bags. He commented that the workers were not on the back of fire trucks going around corners at speeds that would injure them to that extent, and reiterated they could do some things like smaller bags,

pay-as-you-throw, etc. He pointed out those things were not what this vote was about. It was about undoing an initiative petition, and he was not prepared to move in that direction.

Mayor Treece stated he was persuaded by the Utility Director's comments to them at a work session implying that even if they switched to the roll cart system, they would not have enough staff to operate it. He felt they needed to address some of those fundamental management issues before they adopted the shiny object of roll carts.

Ms. Peters commented that she planned to vote in favor of placing the issue on the ballot. She understood this had come up four years ago, and the limitation was for only six months. Mayor Treece stated there was a six-month moratorium that prevented the Council from addressing it, but the prohibition against roll carts was in the initiative petition that the voters initiated and presented to Council. As a result, what they were trying to remove was not just that six-month moratorium. It was the very prohibition against the automated collection system. It was not just a six-month waiting period. It was a prohibition plus a six-month waiting period. The moratorium had expired, but the essence of what the voters had initiated and told them they wanted was what was left in the ordinance that could be repealed by this.

Ms. Peters stated she did not see how they would get away from an automated collection system, and they would just be kicking the can down the road by not moving forward with placing this on the ballot. She noted she agreed with Mr. Trapp in that the November election would have a large enough turnout that they could get a very good read on what the citizens of Columbia thought. She did not feel they would get that in April. Although \$200,000 was a lot of money to place the issue on the ballot, in the big scheme of things, it was not that much compared to having to replace the trucks and address the worker's compensations issues they had. She reiterated she would vote in favor of placing the issue on the November ballot.

B194-20, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:

VOTING YES: TRAPP, PITZER, PETERS. VOTING NO: TREECE, FOWLER, SKALA.

ABSENT: THOMAS. Bill declared defeated.

B212-20

Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code to eliminate the requirement of the City to provide bags for curbside collection of residential refuse and recycling and to eliminate residential curbside recycling collection.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece thanked the Council for indulging his request to amend the agenda as he felt it was timelier to deal with this issue now, and depending on how the Council disposed of it, they would be able to provide the staff some time to come back with another plan if necessary. He noted that when curbside recycling was initially suspended indefinitely, he started receiving emails similar to some of the public testimony tonight with regard to a rate decrease since the full service was no longer being provided. As a result he had inquired about it, and based on research by Mr. Sorrell, in 1998, the curbside collection of recycling was modified for collection on a weekly basis and the program for providing blue bags had been approved by Council. The rates for disposal of material at the landfill had been increased for all customers, even those that did not receive curbside recycling. Thus, there was not a separate charge to residential customers for recycling. There was a flat fee. Consistent with some of the discussion they had on the previous item, he would like to defeat this ordinance, and ask the City Manager to come back with a clear management plan as part of the budget process that included some of the discussion from the work session in February, which included a cap on the number of bags, a special fee for bulk items, enforcement of the ordinances, a requirement to use City-issued black bags, etc. He noted there could be other items as well, and pointed out they had discussed an add-pay to create a better incentive for refuse collectors to do residential pick-up.

Mr. Skala commented that he had disagreed with Mayor Treece earlier in terms of

whether the policy drove the budget or the budget drove the policy, and had raised the prospect of tabling this until after the budget was settled. He noted he was now satisfied with the explanation that had been given in terms of allowing staff the time to look into the issues that would be within the framework of the policy decision. As a result, he did not feel it needed to be tabled as long as they could dispose of the issue now and be provided additional information from staff.

Mayor Treece stated the City Manager would have 40 days to come back with the budget impact if they were to reject this ordinance. If they were to wait until the last meeting in September when it took effect on October 1, there would not be a buffer. Mr. Skala noted he would have waited until the meeting after that so they could take up the issue separately, but he was satisfied if they could dispose of it now.

Mr. Pitzer explained the ordinance as written dealt with three separate issues, and it could have just as easily been written as three different bills instead of just the one. As a result, he wanted to have up or down votes on the three separate items proposed. Mayor Treece understood Mr. Pitzer wanted to divide the question. Mr. Pitzer stated that was correct. Mayor Treece asked if it could be logically divided in three parts. Mr. Pitzer replied yes. Mayor Treece asked what they were. Mr. Pitzer noted the first was Section 22-159(b) which related to the issuance of black bags for refuse collection, the second was Section 22-159.1(c) which related to the issuance of blue bags for recycling, and the third was Section 22-159.1(a) and (b) which related to the picking up of curbside recycling. Mayor Treece stated he did not have any objection to voting on those items separately. Mr. Skala agreed.

Mr. Trapp left the meeting.

Mr. Glascock asked if a rate increase was on the table. He explained he had cut at least \$1.7 million from the budget, and they needed to come up with a way to put that money back into the budget. Mr. Skala replied, from his perspective, yes, but noted he would like to have options with respect to it. Mr. Glascock understood.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to repeal Section 22-159.1(a) and (b) from the City Code, which would eliminate the weekly curbside recycling pick-up service. The motion was seconded by Skala.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he did not feel it was fair to require something that could not be delivered. In addition, not requiring it, as indicated in the amendment to the prior bill, did not preclude the City from offering the service if they were somehow able to find the staffing to provide it.

Mayor Treece thought it would prohibit the director from suspending it indefinitely. The ordinance required weekly curbside pick-up of recycling. Mr. Pitzer agreed, and stated it sounded as though they would be in a situation whereby they would have to start and stop on a continuous basis.

Mr. Skala commented that he felt that was dependent on the potential solutions as the solution might include some staffing solutions.

Mayor Treece noted that nothing precluded them from bringing this back if the City Manager came back to them with more regional tips or regional recycling centers. He explained he had commented on the radio this morning that the amount of tonnage being recycled had not changed. He stated he was not sure he wanted to eliminate it from the ordinance simply because it was not being followed as he felt that was a bad precedent for government.

Mr. Pitzer commented that he was not sure they should promise something they could not deliver.

The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Mr. Skala to repeal Section 22-159.1(a) and (b) from the City Code, which would eliminate the weekly curbside recycling pick-up service, was defeated by roll call vote with Mayor Treece, Ms. Fowler, and Mr. Skala voting no, and Mr. Pitzer and Ms. Peters voting yes.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to repeal Section 22-159(b) from the City Code, which would eliminate the providing of the black refuse bags. The motion was seconded by Skala.

Mr. Pitzer stated he was not from Columbia, but had been here 15 years, and when he had moved here, he had not really understood the system of being given plastic bags. He believed it was an antiquated system, and would thus vote to repeal it. It was not something seen anywhere else in the country, and they did not purchase any other household staple items for citizens.

Mayor Treece commented that he planned to follow the citizen survey, which indicated 91 percent of the people liked the current system. He thought they could amend it with a cap on bags or via other changes that could move them to the pay-as-you-throw system that might alleviate some of the staffing concerns they had.

Mr. Skala stated he was not from Columbia either, but had been here for over 40 years. He noted he was old enough to remember the trash trucks going through the alleys in the suburbs of Chicago to shovel the trash out of the permanent trash cans. They had moved past that to containers until there were problems with the containers. He agreed with a prior person that had indicated they were headed for a real disaster if they did not subsidize quality bags, and noted he was open to limiting the number of bags. He suggested maybe changing the ordinance with regard to how early trash could be set out as well as a lot of complaints regarding animals tearing open the bags was a result of them being out all night long. He reiterated they needed high quality bags and an incentive to ensure the people used them.

The motion made by Mr. Pitzer and seconded by Mr. Skala to repeal Section 22-159(b) from the City Code, which would eliminate the providing of the black refuse bags, was defeated by roll call vote with Mayor Treece, Ms. Fowler, and Mr. Skala voting no, and Mr. Pitzer and Ms. Peters voting yes.

Mr. Pitzer made a motion to repeal Section 22-159.1(c) from the City Code, which would eliminate the providing of the blue recycling bags. The motion was seconded by Skala and defeated by roll call vote with Mayor Treece, Ms. Fowler, and Mr. Skala voting no, and Mr. Pitzer and Ms. Peters voting yes.

B212-20 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: PITZER. VOTING NO: TREECE, FOWLER, SKALA, PETERS. ABSENT: TRAPP, THOMAS. Bill declared defeated.

B195-20 Authorizing the issuance of Special Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2020B.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mayor Treece noted there was an amendment sheet associated with this that reflected the current interest rates.

Mr. Lue provided a staff report.

Ms. Fowler understood that by separating out the parking, they were acknowledging the Short Street garage with its increasing number of spaces that were rented as a private endeavor was really a profit driven endeavor. Mr. Lue stated that was not correct. Ms. Fowler explained that was the impression she had when she finished reading everything, and understood it had been separated out so they no longer had to track the profitable piece versus the spaces that were available to the public. She asked for help in understanding how she was wrong. Mr. Lue replied that since that parking structure had been built, it had always included capacity for private and public use. They had decided to go with a taxable bond so they would no longer have to worry about having so many private versus public parking spaces. It would mitigate a risk. Ms. Fowler commented that she understood that administratively, but felt the impression given in review of the documents was as she had previously mentioned.

Mayor Treece stated he had the same takeaway of the garage no longer being of public use, and that it no longer qualified for a non-taxable bond in the same context as other public assets. Ms. Fowler explained what concerned her about it was the impression it gave when the City incurred such an expense and debt in order to build a garage. She explained she was a strong supporter of the North Village area of downtown, and felt they needed informed consent regarding what was being done and how they spent their money, especially when it involved borrowing money. Mr. Lue commented that the private intent had always been within the bond issue. He noted the bonds were sold with two private holders named in the bond. Mr. McManus explained there was a difference between recognizing there was a risk with regard to how parking was handled, and actually having some knowledge that there was a problem there. The review that was done had recognized there was some risk of having more private parking at the Short Street garage than was allowable under the bonds, but there had not been any conclusion reached that this had been the case. He reiterated there had not been a determination that there was an excess of private parking there. If they did the refinancing separately as had been proposed, the City did not have to worry about the question. He pointed out it did not prevent the Council from making a determination later about how they wanted parking at that garage handled. The Council would have more options on how it was to be handled going forward with the separate financing than they would have otherwise. Ms. Fowler understood and noted they would have a clear and encumbered revenue stream with private leases for the long term. She explained there was a lot of conversation as to why the City had garages and paid for them, and wanted to clarify it rather than start another supposition.

Mayor Treece made a motion to amend B195-20 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Pitzer, and approved unanimously by voice vote.

**B195-20, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows:
VOTING YES: TREECE, FOWLER, SKALA, PITZER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE.
ABSENT: TRAPP, THOMAS. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:**

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B196-20 Approving the Final Plat of "McKee Place, Plat No. 1" located on the northwest corner of the intersection of Clark Lane and McKee Street; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 112-2020).
- B197-20 Approving the Final Plat of "Boone Prairie Village, Plat No. 1" located on the east side of Brown Station Road and south of U.S. Highway 63; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 110-2020).
- B198-20 Vacating a utility easement located on the north side of Switzler Street and approximately 100 feet west of Providence Road (201 Switzler Street) (Case No. 134-2020).
- B199-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating architectural salvage sale revenue funds to the New Century Fund to be used for investment purposes and as a future revolving loan fund for private historic preservation activities.
- B200-20 Authorizing an agreement for the transfer of real estate and homeownership assistance neighborhood development funding with Columbia Community Land Trust, Inc. for the Cullimore Cottages project located on the west side of Eighth Street and north of Fairview Avenue.

- B201-20 Authorizing an intergovernmental cooperation agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri for integrated shuttle bus service on campus.
- B202-20 Authorizing a refund agreement with The Curators of the University of Missouri due to the partial suspension of the integrated shuttle bus service (Tiger Line) on campus related to the COVID-19 pandemic.
- B203-20 Authorizing a joint funding agreement with the U.S. Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior for operation and maintenance of a streamgage on Hinkson Creek to provide historical stream flow data and flood stage information.
- B204-20 Authorizing an agreement for CARES (Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security Act) funding with Boone County, Missouri to hire temporary staff in the Department of Public Health and Human Services to assist with disease investigations, contact tracing, communicable disease investigation, data entry and analysis, and community health education; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B205-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating park sales tax funds and donated funds for various Parks and Recreation Department projects.
- B206-20 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for public health emergency preparedness services.
- B207-20 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code relating to conflicts of interest and financial disclosure procedures.
- B208-20 Authorizing a subrecipient monitoring agreement with Boone County, Missouri relating to acceptance of the FY 2019 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program Award to purchase equipment for the Police Department; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- R99-20 Authorizing a third amendment to lease with International Business Machines Corporation (IBM) for property located at 2810 LeMone Industrial Boulevard.
- R100-20 Authorizing the public sale of Sewerage System Refunding Revenue Bonds, Series 2020.

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

None.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B213-20 Authorizing the issuance of Sewerage System Refunding Revenue Bonds,

Series 2020.

- B214-20 Approving the Final Plat of "The Vineyards, Plat No. 8" located west of Dumas Drive and at the western terminus of Stone Mountain Parkway; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 33-2020).
- B215-20 Authorizing a right of use license permit with P1316, LLC for the construction, installation and maintenance of private trees and tree grates within portions of the future extension of Endeavor Avenue rights-of-way.
- B216-20 Accepting conveyances for sidewalk and street purposes.
- B217-20 Authorizing construction of the Stanford Drive PCCE #21 Sanitary Sewer Improvement Project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division or authorizing a contract for the work using a term and supply contract.
- B218-20 Authorizing construction of the Quail Drive storm water improvement project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B219-20 Authorizing a joint funding agreement for water resource investigations with the U.S. Geological Survey, United States Department of the Interior for groundwater monitoring of well sites in the vicinity of the McBaine wetland treatment units and the Eagle Bluffs Conservation Area.
- B220-20 Authorizing a professional engineering services agreement with Black & Veatch Corporation for the design of a new southeast pump station.
- B221-20 Authorizing a professional engineering services agreement with HDR Engineering, Inc. for design upgrades to the West Ash Pump Station.
- B222-20 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the issuance of birth and death certificates and associated information technology activities.
- B223-20 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Healthy Families Missouri Home Visiting program.
- B224-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for the purchase of a uniform for an honor guard member and testing materials for the Fire Department's new recruit hiring process.
- B225-20 Amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating grant funds received from the National League of Cities for climate action activities.
- B226-20 Authorizing Amendment No. 3 to the 2017 Master Services Agreement with N. Harris Computer Corporation, on behalf of its division Advanced Utility Systems, to implement changes to the budget billing payment plan calculation as part of the utility billing software.
- B227-20 Authorizing acceptance of a grant from the U.S. Department of Justice - Office of Justice Programs, Bureau of Justice Assistance to provide funding to the Police Department and Fire Department relating to the City of Columbia COVID-19 response; amending the FY 2020 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B228-20 Authorizing an amendment to the memorandum of understanding with The Curators of the University of Missouri relating to primary response areas by

law enforcement officers for property owned or leased by the University of Missouri together with certain roadways and intersections within and bordering the University of Missouri Campus.

- B229-20 Authorizing an amendment to the memorandum of understanding with The Curators of the University of Missouri relating to primary response by law enforcement officers for off-campus apartment buildings leased by the University of Missouri and staffed by University's Residential Life Program.

X. REPORTS

- REP43-20 Corrective C-2 Rezoning Authorization (Case #154-20).

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece understood this would initiate the zoning process so a public hearing would still be held at the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) level and afterward it would come to the Council for consideration. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct, and explained notices would be provided to the property owners and surrounding property owners.

Mayor Treece referred to a diagram showing Zoning Area 1 where they had multiple parcels between Towne Drive and Paris Road, and understood the rezoning action would not consolidate those lots. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He noted there were multiple owners and it was a pretty eclectic area with religious institutions and commercial uses. He reiterated there would not be any lot consolidations. Mayor Treece stated he did not have any objection to moving forward.

Mr. Skala understood staff was asking for consideration to start the process for a rezoning consideration. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He explained City initiated rezonings were rare, which was why they were coming to Council first.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification regarding the Columbia Cemetery Association rezoning. Mr. Teddy replied a few small parts of the cemetery would be rezoned. There were some boundary pieces that were adjacent to the shopping center on the east side. He thought there might have been a disconnect between how the district was described and how the properties had actually been described.

- REP44-20 North Village Arts District Honorary Alley Naming Request.

Mayor Treece understood the North Village Arts District wanted to name the alley behind Walnut Street "Wabash Alley" and this would only initiate the drafting of an ordinance that would come back to them for consideration. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Ms. Fowler commented that she understood what they were trying to accomplish with wayfinding. She noted she had had some confusion herself with the proper addresses of the businesses on the back side, and this would solve that.

Ms. Fowler stated there were two other renamings that had been discussed with her, and she had cautioned the two applicants to wait until after the budget to bring those forward since they had their hands full at this time. She noted there was a contemplated request for renaming an alley in the Ridgeway Neighborhood and the North Central Columbia Neighborhood. She pointed out those would be actual renamings as public ways.

- REP45-20 Updating Exhibit A on B208-19 (Ordinance #023957): Memorandum of Understanding with Curators of University of MO for Greek Town operational authority, mutual aid and primary response by law enforcement.

Chief Jones provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked if, generally speaking, the MOU was working effectively, and if they had noticed any difference in their response versus that of the City. Chief Jones replied he had not seen any change in response, and they had not received any complaints with regard to response. He commented that there were some tools the University could utilize that the City could not, such as the Office of Student Conduct. This allowed the

students to not immediately become involved in the criminal justice system. They could go through the University of Missouri process instead.

Mayor Treece asked if this would come back as an ordinance. Chief Jones replied this would go into effect after providing this report.

Mr. Pitzer asked if there was a timeline associated with this. He wondered if it needed to be renewed annually or every few years or if it was indefinite. Chief Jones replied it was indefinite.

REP46-20 Collaborative Adaptive Management (CAM) Progress Report 2017-2018 from the CAM Stakeholder Committee.

Ms. Keys provided a staff report.

Mayor Treece asked how long this had been going on. Ms. Keys replied since 2012.

Mr. Skala commented that he was the Council liaison to the CAM program. He noted COVID had impacted meetings recently and asked Ms. Keys if she knew when they might get back to meeting on a regular schedule. Ms. Keys replied she thought it was still in flux. She understood the County was trying to schedule a virtual meeting for the stakeholders in the next couple of months. She noted the Action Team had not been meeting as regularly and believed the Science Team had been holding virtual meetings.

Mayor Treece asked if the program was working. Ms. Keys replied there had been some improvements that could be seen. They were some studies they hoped would steer them in a direction soon, but since she did not know of the exact results of those studies, she could not speak to them yet.

REP47-20 Monthly Finance Report.

Mr. Lue provided a staff report.

Mr. Pitzer stated he appreciated this report and felt it was a good addition to the agenda. He referred to the 3rd Quarter Revenue Report and felt the columns to the right indicating the difference between FY 2019 and FY 2020 and the FY 2020 budget to actual numbers were pretty grim. He thanked staff for highlighting it.

REP48-20 Amendment to the FY 2020 Annual Budget - Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds.

Mayor Treece understood this was provided for informational purposes.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Tom Jensen, 2416 Wild Oak Court, explained he was recently elected as Chair of the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB), and his miniature platform had included doing what he could to enhance the communication, transparency, and quality of report received by Council. He noted they were an advisory board, and were reminded of that from time to time, but they reported to a supervisory board, i.e., the City Council. The more they could be detailed and efficient in how they communicated what they learned, the better it would be for Council in terms of making supervisory decisions. He planned to create a board book that parsed through the loads of information given and contextualized it to help drill down on the critical finance points they had learned about through their American Public Power Association training. He explained the board book would be available to anyone on the Council to copy or refer to as needed, and it would be something they updated and addressed every month as an advisory board. He hoped that would help them focus on the critical elements of financial overview as well as some of the policymaking. He stated he would email the Council individually to find out if they had any concerns or questions based on past experience or if there was anything else they thought needed to be addressed by the WLAB.

Mayor Treece stated he appreciated this, and congratulated Mr. Jensen for his election as the Chair of the WLAB. Mr. Jensen noted he had been the Vice Chair previously and that he and Jay Hasheider had just switched roles.

Mayor Treece felt this would help with onboarding new WLAB members as well assist Council as they relied on the WLAB for many things to include a detailed review of the monthly financials of the utilities. As a result, if they were encountering barriers to that or if the WLAB felt there were things the Council needed to know, it could be communicated. Mr. Jensen agreed.

Mr. Skala commented that this seemed to be very responsive, which was something, they as a Council, were looking for with boards and commissions. The WLAB had unique properties in terms of importance due to the size of that department. He understood there had been past difficulties in obtaining numbers and financials, and asked if they were receiving that information more reliably now. Mr. Jensen replied he thought they were. He explained one of the things he had pushed for this past year was the ability to focus on the things that were the most important, and to not necessarily get hung up on why a number was different than it had been a month ago. As a result, they had created a list of reports they wanted to see. He commented that they did not need to receive some reports every month. They could receive them quarterly instead. For example, they could review debt coverage ratio formulas and policies semi-annually. The idea was to boil things down so they were asking a lot of staff without burdening them. He stated staff had been very responsive in this respect, and explained the idea was to work hand in hand with staff so there was a stronger sense of trust and transparency with the end result being to help Council get to the right answer quicker. Mr. Skala stated he appreciated that. Mr. Jensen commented that at the end of the day, all three of them, i.e., the Council, the WLAB, and the staff, should be pulling on the rope the same direction.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, understood in terms of the trash discussion, they were moving forward without doing anything at this time. Ms. Peters stated that was correct. Mr. Skala commented that they would actually be doing quite a bit, but with the same type of system that was already in place.

Mr. Elkin thanked Dalton Wilfey for addressing the issue of the volume in the lobby area for those like him that had trouble hearing.

Mr. Elkin commented that he understood COVID-19 had been associated with Legionnaire's disease. He explained he wanted to mention that because some felt children were not getting sick when in fact they were, and one of the culprits could be air conditioning systems.

Mr. Elkin stated that China had launched three satellites in June of this year, which could result in electromagnetic pulsing. He noted he just wanted to bring this to the forefront. It did not mean anything would be happening, but he was thankful he still had his landline.

Mr. Skala noted the roundabout on Keene Street was complete and beautiful. He thought it would go a long way in alleviating some of the traffic on Keene Street and the Woodridge Subdivision. He thanked staff for doing a great job.

Ms. Peters thanked staff for taking the comments on Thursday with regard to signage for off-campus student housing and moving forward with them. She understood the Convention and Visitors Bureau, the Public Health and Human Services Department, the Community Relations Department, and the University of Missouri had a plan for more signs and reminders for students to be safe via social distancing practices.

Ms. Fowler commented that she had asked the City Manager to look into whether subcontractors had to post bond when drilling and trenching in the rights-of-way in neighborhoods and for the process by which they satisfied the concerns of neighborhoods.

Mr. Pitzer understood that a couple of these instances involved situations whereby

permits were not pulled until someone contacted the City asking about it. As a result of the call, the City had then sent out an inspector to investigate, who had asked to see the permit, causing the contractor to then apply for a permit. He pointed out he was not certain that was the exact series of events, but if that was happening, he thought there needed to be more awareness of the permit requirement so the contractors were aware.

Mayor Treece commented that the Council had passed a right-of-way package, and asked if that had been pre-empted. Mr. Glascock replied no. He pointed out that some contractors just ignored the rules until the City went after them. Mr. Pitzer stated he was not sure how widespread this situation was, but it did not sound as though this was a one-time situation.

Mr. Skala understood it had been a company installing fiber. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mayor Treece understood these examples had involved different carriers.

Ms. Fowler felt it was a problem capable of repetition. They had a contractor doing work for another company that left a mess and did not communicate with the property owner as to whether the mess would be corrected and when it would be corrected. She noted there appeared to be a lot of steps involving notification and information that were not being taken when it was not a City project, and felt that needed to be addressed in some manner.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 10:53 p.m.