



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

City Council

Monday, February 1, 2021

7:00 PM

Regular

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

I. INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at approximately 7:00 p.m. on Monday, February 1, 2021, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Member IAN THOMAS, Council Member MATT PITZER, Council Member BETSY PETERS, Mayor BRIAN TREECE, Council Member PAT FOWLER, Council Member MIKE TRAPP, and Council Member KARL SKALA were present. City Manager John Glascock, City Counselor Nancy Thompson, City Clerk Sheela Amin, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

The minutes of the regular meeting of January 19, 2021 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Trapp and a second by Skala.

Pitzer asked that B35-21 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B35-21 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Treece and a second by Skala.

II. SPECIAL ITEMS

SI6-21

2021 Diversity Award Winner Presentations.

Treece commented that every year, for the last 25 years, the City of Columbia had held an annual diversity awards breakfast, typically the week of Martin Luther King, Jr.'s birthday and prior to Black History Month in February. Like a lot of events this year, the annual diversity awards celebration had not been what they had planned or had hoped for, but it had not diminished the great work in the areas of diversity that individuals and organizations within the community had accomplished. Treece noted he had previously recorded a video announcing the two winners and tonight allowed for the formal presentation of the awards.

Treece stated the individual award winner was Peter Stiepleman with the Columbia Public Schools (CPS). During his time with CPS, Stiepleman had served as a teacher, principal, assistant superintendent, and superintendent. In each of those roles, Stiepleman had made equity, diversity, and inclusion one of the ideals of CPS, whether by leading by example or setting the pace for creating an environment where everyone could succeed. Under the direction of Stiepleman, CPS had established the achievement, enrichment, and opportunity themes that rallied CPS staff around the goals and objectives of diversity and the idea that every child in the community had to have genuine access to the real benefits of education. This had been done in tangible ways, such as ensuring there were scholarships available for field trips and after school activities so every child was able to participate and creating a program to attract future teachers that looked like the community they served. Stiepleman's selfless service in the education community truly exemplified the teachings of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., along with his efforts to bring up the next generation of leaders that would continue the work moving forward. Treece presented the award to Stiepleman.

Treece noted the 2021 group award winner was the Eta Alpha Chapter of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity. The brothers of the Eta Alpha Graduate Chapter of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity had been serving the Mid-Missouri community since 1934 by performing service projects throughout the community and hosting fundraisers to sponsor college scholarships for youth. They annually provided scholarships to high school seniors along with one to a Lincoln University student. Recipients of the scholarships had come from Columbia, Fulton, Jefferson City, and surrounding areas. They supported local families by supplying Thanksgiving dinners, conducting toy drives that distributed holiday gifts through the Boys and Girls Club, and adopting families during the holidays to meet their individual needs. Treece noted one of his favorite programs was their Feed and Read program whereby they met elementary students at a Columbia pizza restaurant reading books and eating pizza together. Treece felt that was a great way to mentor kids. This year, they had held a voter registration event encouraging community members to register to vote in the 2020 election and had been active in calling for changes to address systemic racism in Columbia. The selection committee had pointed out the brothers were actively involved in that work and were quick to call and offer their time to support local diversity, inclusion, and charity efforts. Treece explained they were dedicated to service to anyone in need, regardless of race, religion, or economic status. The Eta Alpha Chapter believed in the uplift of their community by serving the members of the community that were in need. Treece presented the award to Andre Cook, who was present on behalf of the Eta Alpha Chapter of the Omega Psi Phi Fraternity.

SI7-21**Columbia Bicentennial Year.**

Dave Lineberry, the Chair of the Mayor's Task Force on Bicentennial Celebration Planning, welcomed everyone to the bicentennial year as it was the first year of their third century in Columbia. Lineberry noted the historical anniversary would be in the late spring, and they had originally targeted some programming for May and June, but due to COVID, they were now targeting their big celebrations on and around the July 4th holiday. Lineberry stated they were looking forward to the temporary renaming of some streets close to the original founding of Columbia for the period of the bicentennial. In addition, they were working with some interns from Stephens College to provide pop-up pocket parks in neighborhoods throughout the City using the bicentennial as the theme. Lineberry noted there would be a slew of events and activities branded CoMo200 in collaboration with the Parks and Recreation Department. Those would be included in the Leisure Times guide that would come out on March 3. Lineberry explained they had held a citywide art contest involving school-aged kids with 13 fantastic winners. The original plan had been for a calendar, but the winners would now be included a cool journal with a broader distribution. Lineberry reiterated the major events would be scheduled on and around the 4th of July holiday and would include tours, trails, concerts, historical presentations and lectures, and a fireworks show. Lineberry stated they were especially interested in encouraging every person and every group of any description or type to bring their story to them through the CoMo200.com website, which had a "share your story" tab for anyone to present the ways Columbia had impacted them and the ways they had impacted Columbia. They wanted to hear from everyone regardless of age, longevity in Columbia, etc. Lineberry commented that when they studied the history of Columbia, they were too often too dependent on too few voices, and thought they could now move beyond that by encouraging people to share their story through that portal. Lineberry pointed out the stories would go to the County archives and the State Historical Society of Missouri allowing future historians to have a fantastic cross section of what life was like in Columbia in 2021. Lineberry noted they could also look forward to CoMo200 beer in June from one of their collaborators.

Treece thanked Lineberry and asked him to extend his appreciation to those at Logboat.

Skala suggested they think of the wine drinkers as well. Lineberry stated he would investigate that item.

Thomas asked to what extent the event would acknowledge the history of injustice and atrocities toward African-Americans in Columbia. Lineberry replied they had three principle organizing planks to their work, one of which was inclusion. They were champions of sharing the story, and not necessary good stories. He reiterated his request for everyone to share their stories. Lineberry stated they learned from the past, and in order to keep moving forward, they needed all of the stories. A principle example was their first effort out of the gate, their very popular and well-received series on the radio, "You Don't Say." Lineberry explained they were purposefully bringing to light previously hidden stories and allowing the community to speak for themselves. Lineberry commented that there were some other projects in process now that he could not share, but noted they were focused on youth as the stories of race in the community were not only stories of those 50 years old or older. They needed to learn what was happening now to ensure their third century was better than prior centuries. Lineberry pointed out there would be collaboration with the African-American Heritage Trail organizers and other groups during the July 4th time frame.

III. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

IV. SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC5-21 Rachel Proffitt - The Societal Implications of the New Trash and Recycling Rules.

Rachel Proffitt explained she was representing the unofficial roll cart group and noted they had been able to collect about 1,000 new signatures at the drive-through voucher redemption event. Their current count was just over 2,200 signatures, and they needed 3,219. They were looking at spring events with the hope the warmer weather and an increase in vaccinations would allow more people to be out that were willing to sign the petition. Once they submitted the petition and the citizens voted to approve the ordinance, she hoped the Council would take a step back to reflect on what they wanted in their trash and recycling collection systems. If they removed the ban, it opened up the option of roll carts, but the roll carts would not necessarily be implemented. Proffitt stated she was an occupational therapist and they set goals with their patients for the long-term and the short-term. They asked the patient what matter to them and what they wanted. Proffitt asked the Council to forget about roll carts, bags, and dumpsters, and to instead think about the overall goals of the system, such as reducing waste, financial and physical accessibility, decreasing the impact on the environment, etc., and to then use that as a guide for the system in terms of who they hired, whether to do roll carts, bags, etc. Proffitt reiterated they needed to establish goals prior to establishing the method, and pointed out those goals could be set now. Proffitt understood the goal now was to reduce waste since the City had moved to a pay-as-you-throw system, but noted the system was struggling. Proffitt noted bags had not been picked up, likely due to not being in the correct bags and recycling being placed out when it was not the correct recycling week. In addition, some had not yet received their vouchers. Proffitt hoped, when they opened up all of the options, the Council would determine what it wanted with the trash and recycling collection systems for all that were impacted, i.e. the citizens and

the workers.

SPC6-21

Julie Ryan, COMO Safe Water Coalition - Utilities Advisory Board Past Discussion and Present Need.

Julie Ryan stated the final report from the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure dated December 2016 had referenced functional recommendations, including that of an umbrella-type utilities board. The Task Force pointed out the benefits of each utility having its own board that would have a representative on the broader board, and the COMO Safe Water Coalition endorsed this structure as this oversight could improve the lack of performance seen from the utilities. The Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) in its current iteration was no longer achieving what it was created to do as it was a board of only five members, and the experience of the COMO Safe Water Coalition was that none of its members had a dedicated interest in the water utility. Meetings of this Board, unlike many other City boards and commissions, occurred at 8:00 a.m. on a Wednesday when many members of the public were at work and others who might be interested in serving would be required to take at least a half-day off of work. Ryan felt the current structure had outlived its usefulness and that the citizens deserved more. If they had a true integration with the utilities, including more citizen voices, they might have seen a more reasonable approach to solid waste. Besides the fact she would be putting 13 gallon kitchen trash bags into City logo trash bags to add more plastic to landfill, she anticipated impacts to the watersheds. Due to a solid waste decision that was difficult to manage and completely without customer focus, potential illegal dumping and excessive litter now posed a threat to their watersheds and community bodies of water. In 2017, the City had developed an integrated management plan specifically to address areas of improvement in their wastewater and stormwater utilities in an effort to protect the community waterways and meet the Clean Water Act requirements. Without true oversight and integration, they could now see the further impairment of the bodies of water due to the ramifications of the solid waste decisions. Ryan noted this was another example of a lack of performance. With regard to the current water treatment plant project, Ryan stated the schedule was buried in the WLAB meeting minutes, and pointed out most residents would not dig into those minutes if they wanted to know the status of the project. Ryan asked when the last time was that anything was updated on the water treatment plant portion of the City's website, and noted it still referred to chlorine disinfection in the summer months, which had stopped years ago. Ryan believed the project timeline should be front and center, and the City should want to share the information transparently. While the monthly status updates provided by staff had included comments on a portion of the schedule, nothing had been mentioned about public outreach, which showed as originating in October on the schedule. To their knowledge, this had not yet happened despite the alternative treatment analysis being underway and pilot testing results being obtained. Ryan explained task 8 of HDR's scope of services had indicated several action items with regard to the involvement of interested parties in public outreach, and wondered where there was a delay. The contract provided for a community outreach plan, project website content, social media campaigns, and coordination of interested parties meetings. Ryan felt the performance audit results had only scratched the surface in terms of the problems within the City's utilities. They could talk about the lack of project templates making it difficult for citizens to track milestones and the 2018 water bond being used to fund maintenance items, which took away the needed funding from a treatment plant that had long been ignored

along with the lack of oversight. Multiple consultant reports with recommendations had been paid for and provided, but no one was being held accountable for implementing the recommendations. There was a complete lack of performance in respecting the value of ratepayer funding of the reports. Ryan asked how this demonstrated that City leaders were protecting their infrastructure and being good stewards of ratepayer funded reports and consulting contracts. Ryan felt this was like a homeowner getting an estimate from a plumber because the toilet did not work and then getting another quote to renovate the whole bathroom with the estimates and recommendations not being followed up on while the toilet was still broken. Ryan stated she wondered how much needed to be broken in the City before anyone was willing to stand up and say it was enough. The proposed priorities for the 2020 strategic plan included high performing government, safe community, reliable infrastructure, healthy environment, and thriving community, and the City's mission was to serve the public through democratic, transparent, and efficient government. Ryan thought it would be great if they put those things into practice instead of just saying it. Ryan noted integrated equaled excuses within the City of Columbia and felt that needed to stop now.

SPC7-21 Douglas Mann - Right-Wing Extremism.

Douglas Mann noted he planned to speak on far-right extremism and the potential threat it played to the community and their neighbors. Mann explained he would not accuse any members of the Council or the community of wrongdoing, was not saying that extremism was only an issue on one side of the political spectrum, and was not asking for a witch hunt of any kind. Mann indicated he planned to point out some realities and ask the elected representatives and those that worked within government what, if anything, they would do in light of those realities. About a month ago, a mob of insurrectionists had overtaken the Capitol in Washington D.C., due to deeply rooted beliefs in unfounded conspiracy theories with regard to the 2020 election and the Democratic Party at-large. The mob was comprised of white nationalists and members of so-called patriot militias. The groups included Patriot Front, the Proud Boys, the Three Percenters, and the Oath Keepers. Mann felt it was important to note all of the groups he had mentioned had active members and chapters in Missouri, and that on January 27, the Department of Homeland Security had issued a bulletin warning of a heightened risk of ideologically motivated violent extremists launching attacks based on perceived grievances fueled by false narratives. One thing they knew about these groups was that they acted in a violent manner as many of them described themselves as brawler organizations, which meant they went out trying to incite violence to allow them to physically assault people they disagreed with politically. They were also vehemently anti-government and linked to conspiracy theorists, such as Alex Jones and David Icke. In addition, they had specific demographics they targeted for membership, i.e., predominately younger white males with military or law enforcement backgrounds. Data from the Capitol riots showed that one out of every five defendants had a military background, and dozens of off-duty police officers had been suspected of having involvement in one way or another in the riot. Mann commented that the stated purpose of any Police Department was to protect and serve the citizens of the community, and noted the belief systems and actions of the so-called militia groups were antithetical to that purpose. Policy 105.3 of the Columbia Police Department (CPD) manual stated "I will keep my private life unsullied as an example to all and will behave in a manner that does not bring discredit to me or my agency." In addition, Policy 1058.4 prohibited

"speech or expression that, while not made pursuant to an official duty, is significantly linked to or related to, the Columbia Police Department and tends to compromise or damage the mission, function, reputation or professionalism of the Columbia Police Department or its employees." Mann stated that he was asking about the position of the Council and the CPD with regard to officer involvement or affiliation with those groups. Mann felt the policies did not make it clear whether involvement with those groups would be considered as hurting the mission, function, or reputation of the CPD. Mann pointed out he was not in any way accusing any specific member of the CPD of being a member of one of these groups, but about a week ago, Mann had been driving on Range Line Street and had seen both a Fraternal Order of Police and a Three Percenter sticker on the back of a truck, which implied the person was a member of both organizations. Mann reiterated he was not saying every member of CPD was a member of both organizations, but felt the protests over the last year had shown there was distrust between the police and the citizenry, and that there was a not zero chance that among the ranks of all of the well-meaning officers, there were people with violent and dangerous belief systems. Mann noted they had heard time and again over the last few years of bad apples, and felt it was important to remember that one bad apple could spoil the barrel. Mann believed Columbia should have a plan in place and an understanding of what they would do if this issue were to arise.

SPC8-21 Jeanne Mihail - Analysis of Geographic and Racial Arrest Patterns from Public Data Sources.

Jeanne Mihail provided a handout and commented that she had been a resident of Columbia for more than 30 years, and was motivated to speak this evening in an effort to end the use of cash bail. Mihail stated she believed that system unfairly punished poor people. As part of her volunteer work, she had been reviewing the publicly available data from two Boone County Jail sources. The first was the 7 a.m. report, which reported those persons that had been booked within the previous 24 hours. The other was the daily listing of current detainees. Mihail noted her decades-long research experience with the analysis of quantitative data at the University of Missouri gave her confidence in the summary she was presenting tonight. When first reviewing the data, it had quickly become apparent there was a highly uneven geographic distribution of the bookings among Columbia residents based upon the addresses listed in the 7 a.m. report. Mihail explained she had divided the City into the three zip codes of 65201, the eastern part of the City, 65202, which was north of I-70, and 65203, the western part of the City, and had reviewed the distribution of bookings and the types of charges. Mihail stated this was illustrated in the top graph on the first page. Of the number of charges brought in the final five months of 2020, 53.5 percent involved residents of 65202, while that zip code represented only 33.4 percent of the population per U.S. census records. Mihail noted the population of residents in 65202 was 14.7 percent black based on census statistics while the other two zip codes had only 7.6 percent and 9.5 percent black residents. Mihail pointed out race was not included in the 7 a.m. report, and thought it should be. Mihail noted race was included in the Jail's listing of current detainees, but their addresses were not included. Mihail explained she had analyzed about six months of current detainee information involving August 2020 through January 2021, and while black Columbia residents were 10.7 percent of the City's population, they were 45.6 percent of the current detainees listing Columbia as their home address. This could be seen in the lower graph of the first page. Mihail felt this disparity was very strong evidence of active

racial bias in the arrest of Columbia residents. Mihail noted she had also reviewed the average total bond for black current detainees compared with white current detainees where the bond was set above zero, and the average bond for black detainees was twice that of white detainees. Mihail found those to be shocking disparities, which required immediate action. Mihail commented that she had read with great interest the recent two-part story in the Columbia Daily Tribune a couple of days ago of the racial disparities in Columbia traffic stops, which was consistent with what she was reporting tonight, but pointed out she had been dismayed to read several responses to those findings suggesting the next step of action should be to gather more data. Mihail did not feel there was any need for more data prior to taking action since she was able to easily find publicly available data that strongly supported the same conclusion of geographically focused and racially disparate arrests. Mihail believed collection of further data could proceed in parallel with immediate action. Mihail felt there was an urgent action role for the City Council in redirecting the activities of the CPD and felt it was imperative that there be a thorough review of training and priority setting policies of the department to address those attitudes and practices that influenced officers to disproportionately arrest African-American citizens of Columbia. With the training programs and attitudes currently in place, they had the outcomes documented here. They needed new attitudes and different training approaches. Mihail believed trust in government and its institutions could not be built or sustained when it was abundantly clear arrests and pre-trial incarcerations were disproportionately decimating one portion of the community, and stated there was no time to defer or delay action.

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

PH2-21 Proposed construction of the Wabash Drive extension project.

PH2-21 was read by the City Clerk.

Public Works Director David Nichols provided a staff report.

Trapp asked if this project was in lieu of studying the redesign of the Vandiver Drive, Paris Road, and Oakland Gravel Road intersections. Nichols replied no, and explained it was an interim step. Nichols stated they only had \$100,000 to do a study for a long-term solution, and at this time, MoDOT was not moving forward. As a result, they wanted to pursue an interim solution as they worked toward a long-term solution potentially with the next ballot. Until that time, staff felt this would improve the intersection. Trapp commented that he thought it was brilliant and that it might address a chunk of the problem.

Peters asked if the concern was that too much traffic was backing up on Vandiver Drive going east. Nichols replied yes. Peters commented that she did not feel turning right was difficult. Nichols explained traffic could not get through to make the right turn since they had to wait for the through movement to make the turn. Trapp noted Vandiver Drive backed into the Oakland Gravel Road intersection, which was right on it and created a massive cluster. Trapp stated it was a mess.

The Mayor opened the public hearing.

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

Skala agreed this was a problem that had been looking for a solution for a long time and that it was at the juxtaposition of the Second and Third Wards. Skala thought this solution was a good step forward and was curious as to what might be suggested in the future as well.

Trapp made a motion directing staff to move forward with final plans and specifications for construction of the proposed Wabash Drive extension project. The motion was seconded by Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH3-21

Proposed construction of the Fourth Street and Broadway pedestrian crossing project.

PH3-21 was read by the City Clerk.

Nichols provided a staff report.

Treece asked if a traffic study had been done on the impact of narrowing it to one lane there in order to preserve parking. Nichols replied it would create a little bit of backup when someone wanted to turn southbound on Fourth Street.

Pitzer commented that it would create a bit of an awkward movement to go from two lanes to one lane for one block and back to two lanes, and asked if other designs had been considered to preserve the two lanes. Nichols replied that was a possibility if the parking was removed, but he was not sure they had looked into that. Public Works Engineering and Operations Manager Richard Stone explained they were dropping the eastbound two lanes at Fifth Street so there was a right turn only lane that would go north on Fifth Street and just a single lane that continued westbound on Broadway. Two lanes would go eastbound, which was how it was configured now, and that continued to the east. At Sixth Street, one of those dropped off as a right turn only lane currently and that would continue with this proposed design. About six years ago, the extra lane had been added for westbound traffic by reconfiguring the area, and it would now be removed due to the lack of pedestrian connectivity. Stone thought it was more important to have better pedestrian connectivity in the area given the nature of the downtown area rather than the two lanes going westbound at this time. If someone wanted to turn left, it could create a bit of a backup for a brief period of time until the turn was made. It was better than any other option available at this time. Pitzer explained he did not have a problem with the pedestrian connectivity as it appeared to be a good goal, and asked if options had been considered going eastbound where they lost that right hand turn lane one block later that would preserve the two through lanes on the westbound side. Stone replied that got into the issue of lane balance at the Providence Road intersection. The amount of traffic trying to get to downtown tended to be higher, and they wanted people to remain in those two lanes utilizing that intersection at Providence Road going eastbound while providing a little space between Providence Road and Sixth Street to get back into the through lane that traveled all of the way to the east side of town. They could get captured in the right turn only lane, but, generally, people driving in Columbia in that area knew that would occur and would go ahead and get into the through lane. Given the volumes and lane balance at Broadway and Providence Road, which was pretty much at capacity or overcapacity, the lane utilization eastbound was more important than trying to get into it in the westbound approach. Pitzer understood and was interested in the thoughts of everyone else as Broadway was two lanes at both College Avenue and Providence Road, and it narrowed to one lane. Stone stated that was through a section that was heavily pedestrian oriented and trying to maintain four lanes was not in alignment with the downtown portion of Broadway.

Skala asked if staff had considered the increased pedestrian traffic due to the Gateway development in the area. Stone replied they had considered the scenario of the African-American Heritage Trail along with the general nature of the downtown area becoming more pedestrian oriented. The project did not include all of the bells and whistles, but it would provide good pedestrian connectivity and had been successful at Waugh Street.

Peters understood, going west, it was currently one lane that went to two lanes at Sixth Street, and asked if it would be one lane all of the way through now. Stone replied there were two lanes between Fifth Street and Sixth Street, and one of those would be captured as a right turn only lane in an effort to utilize the space available there. Parking would still be allowed on both sides and there would be a left turn lane. The right turn only lane would go north on Fifth Street. There would also be a bulbout along with adequate marking and signing to indicate only the inside lane was the through lane. Peters explained the right hand turn lane seemed like a good idea as she had been

concerned about going to two lanes for one block.

Treece asked if the median would be raised or painted. Stone replied it would be raised.

Treece asked how they could extend Wabash Drive for \$100,000, but a crosswalk would cost \$230,000. Stone replied there was more to the project than just the crosswalk. The planter islands and bulbouts involved a fair amount of stormwater work. Thankfully, there were a couple of existing inlets they could tie into, but the infrastructure was relatively old and would require repair and installation work. In addition, they had to meet the ADA requirements, which involved some configuration on the north and south sides.

Treece asked if the ice house was on the southwest corner of the diagram displayed. Nichols replied yes. Treece asked if they had considered putting it on that axis where they actually had some extra lane width and no parking. Stone replied the southwest corner would be difficult to deal with from a stormwater perspective while still creating enough of a bulbout. The other side worked better and removed it more from Providence Road providing a visual cue that they were entering the downtown area where there would be more pedestrians.

Treece asked if a parking audit had been done on the parking spots. Treece wondered if they were used all day and every day of the week. Stone replied several years ago they had removed a couple of spaces, and they would be adding one back now. Nichols thought it would provide more parking because the spots were parallel now. It would go from about four spaces to eleven spaces. Treece did not think they were parallel. Stone replied a couple of the spaces were diagonal while another couple of the spaces were parallel. Treece understood that was near the tire shop. Stone stated that was correct. Nichols commented that he thought there would be push buttons in the middle of the pedestrian islands, which involved an added cost.

The Mayor opened the public hearing.

Randy Minchew, 2416 Kays Pointe Drive, stated he traveled this route as they had an office at the corner of Broadway and Providence Road. Minchew understood it would be one lane even further past Commerce Bank. Currently, it opened up to two lanes heading west after Commerce Bank and then there were three lanes closer to Providence Road as there was a right turn lane and two through lanes. Minchew asked if that would be condensed. Minchew noted the congestion downtown loosened up when it went to four lanes near Tropical Liquors and Commerce Bank. Minchew asked if they had that many people crossing the road there or if it was more of an ornamental way to welcome people to the downtown. Treece replied Thomas would probably argue that people would be there if they built it, and he tended to agree that if there was a safe place to cross, people would use it. Minchew commented that there was a crosswalk similar to it across from Douglass Park, which had not been used.

Thomas stated he did not feel the argument that there had to be people trying to cross when it was not safe to do so before the City would build a crosswalk was valid. It was similar to saying they would not build a bridge across a river unless they saw people swimming across it in large numbers. The Douglass Park pedestrian bridge had been a very inconvenient way for pedestrians to get across Providence Road, especially for those in a wheelchair, pushing a stroller, or having difficulty with stairs. As a result, it was taken down and replaced with a much better surface crosswalk with push buttons. He thought this would be an excellent project and that they would see lots of people utilizing it.

Minchew commented that he did not think it was just a crosswalk. Thomas stated it was, and explained it would be on the surface and vehicles would have to yield to the pedestrians in the crosswalk. Minchew wondered if people would walk down there to that or if they would cross at the other two lights that were available at Providence Road and Fifth Street. Thomas replied people walking out of Second Missionary Baptist Church going to Flat Branch Park would likely utilize the crosswalk there. In addition, people following the African-American Heritage Trail would use it because it was the direct connection between some of the exhibits.

Minchew explained his concern was narrowing the traffic downtown until reaching Providence Road for a crosswalk that might not be utilized. Treece commented that if it was not used to visit the establishment on the north side of the street, it might be used to visit the establishment on the south side of the street.

Nickie Davis, Executive Director of the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) with offices at 11 S. Tenth Street, commented that the Downtown CID had submitted a letter in support of this project as it was something they had been advocating in favor of for about 7-8 years. A lot of it had to do with the worship services on Sundays, but the need for a safe crosswalk in the area with the Gateway project and the African-American Heritage Trail was becoming more and more important. Davis asked people to think about the crosswalk that was toward Stephens College near the Smoothie King as it would be similar. Davis reiterated the support of the Downtown CID as it would make the downtown more accessible.

Treece asked Davis how she felt about the narrowing of the lanes. Davis replied this area was one where people tended to turn left regardless of whether there was a crosswalk. Davis commented that she believed this project would only help the situation, and did not feel it would slow traffic down too much before the stoplight.

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

Fowler commented that she did not have anything to do with the project, but was delighted to see it because she had been watching for it since 2008 or 2009 when she had first become aware of the plans for the African-American Heritage Trail. Fowler stated that given the new Gateway, the expansion of the Flat Branch Park, the African-American Heritage Trail with lots of markers, and three of the most historic structures when coming downtown from Fourth Street, she was enthusiastic and grateful for it. Fowler thanked those that had worked on this and had advocated for it.

Skala stated he thought the benefits for pedestrians crossing Broadway justified the project, and noted he did not believe it would be much of an impediment to traffic.

Thomas commented that he thought it was an excellent project. It would communicate that it was a pedestrian oriented area of Columbia, and that pedestrians were welcome while cars were tolerated as cars would have to travel more slowly. Narrowing to one lane would not cause any harm and would make it much safer. It would also create a better ambiance. Thomas stated he hoped the landscaping in the bulbouts and the center island was substantial and attractive.

Trapp explained he walked the area now since he did business in Flat Branch Park and it was sketchy. Trapp noted he was looking forward to it for that reason along with the fact it was nice to see a project that had been alive his entire political life come to fruition.

Fowler made a motion directing staff to move forward with final plans and specifications for the construction of the Fourth Street and Broadway pedestrian crossing project. The motion was seconded by Thomas and approved unanimously by voice vote.

PH4-21 Consider proposed Amendment #4 to the FY 2019 CDBG and HOME Annual Action Plan to allocate Round 3 and reallocate a portion of Round 1 Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act funding.

Discussion shown with R21-21.

R21-21 Approving Amendment #4 to the FY 2019 CDBG and HOME Annual Action Plan to allocate Round 3 and reallocate a portion of Round 1 Coronavirus Aid, Relief and Economic Security (CARES) Act funding.

PH4-21 and R21-21 were read by the City Clerk.

Community Development Housing Programs Manager Randy Cole and Paul Whatley, Chair of the Housing and Community Development Commission (HCDC), provided the staff report.

Peters asked what Rock the Community was interested in doing. Cole replied their proposal included rent assistance, vocational training, and food assistance, and understood their main goal was to connect populations that might not be traditionally connected to other nonprofit providers.

Peters understood the second round of this funding had not been allocated. Cole stated that was correct, and noted that round was going through the State. The State of Missouri had received about \$7.9 million, and he planned to participate in an informational meeting this Thursday as entitlement jurisdictions could access those funds by law depending upon the plans of the State.

Peters asked about the third round of funding. Cole replied that had come directly from HUD to the City of Columbia since they met the minimum criteria of being an entitlement community. As a result, they received funds directly from HUD for the first and third rounds along with their annual allocations. The second round went to the states to allocate through their processes.

Peters asked if other rounds were planned. Cole replied no, but thought they would know more in March with the next stimulus package. He felt there was likely something in some form that would come to the City.

Peters understood \$60,000 had been reallocated from the first round to the third round and asked for clarification. Cole replied those were funds that had been allocated to Room at the Inn for a homeless shelter at a hotel, but there had been an issue of a conflict of interest so they had to take those monies back and reallocate them.

Fowler commented that every organization identified tonight did good work, but felt going forward, there should be plans and procedures for bringing in minority led not-for-profits due to their capacity to reach populations that otherwise might not be reached. They were talking about equity as a community, and Fowler thought they should think about the fairest way to allocate funding to all organizations. Fowler stated she did not know what shape that kind of an inquiry would take. Since they had given out so much money this year due to COVID from not only the federal money received but also through CoMoHelps, which were funds from private sources, Fowler wondered if they could do a look backwards to see exactly how the money was allocated, to which organizations, whether the organizations were minority led, and the demographics of the people served. Fowler thought looking backwards would help them plan for looking forward. Cole commented that connecting minority populations to their programs was an area in which they had made a lot of gains. In tracking the demographics of the population served, it was something they tracked in almost real time because they had to collect that data. In a normal given year, such as between 2017 and 2019, the number of minority populations as program beneficiaries had hovered between 25-35 percent. In 2020, Cole thought they were at over 48 percent, but noted he was still compiling the report. They had made a lot of gains, particularly through the small business assistance programs, as they had put over \$1 million in minority and women owned businesses. Although they were making good gains, Cole agreed more work could be done. Cole felt this last funding process had exposed the fact they could do a lot more in terms of connecting with minority led nonprofit organizations. Cole noted he was working Dr. Angela Hull and a couple of master's degree students at the Truman School of Public Affairs to critique everything they had done all of the way back to last March with a lens toward equity and inclusion. Cole commented that he thought the HCDC could revisit its nine point criteria by weaving in diversity and inclusion as part of the rating criteria.

Fowler asked Cole if he would come back to Council with a report after that work was done. Cole replied absolutely.

The Mayor opened the public hearing.

Treece noted written comment had been received by Rebecca Shaw, who had indicated that she recognized the work of the HCDC in making the suggested recommendations for the allocation of Round 3 COVID relief funding and appreciated their time, and had pointed out that only two of the organizations were primarily smaller minority run

operations, Powerhouse and Rock the Community. Shaw thought perhaps the City should consider working with those groups to assess needs specific to minority communities since they had been disproportionately impacted by COVID. Shaw also felt the City should make an effort to get the word out to these and other smaller organizations who were often so immersed in their work they were unaware of opportunities or were overwhelmed by the application process for any subsequent funding. That written comment was filed with other items associated with this meeting.

Erika Buford, a Second Ward resident, commented that one of her concerns was that the organizations that continued to receive money all of the time were not the ones out in the streets so they were not reaching the people that actually needed their assistance. Buford explained she was out in the neighborhoods every day and received phone calls because people knew her or knew of her. Buford noted she was with the People's Defense and with Almeta Crayton's Community Programs but was not with any other organization. Buford commented that it was bothersome to see the same organizations receiving funds all of the time while not seeing any change as a result of it.

Treece asked Buford if she applied for funding. Buford replied she had not applied as she was not associated with a nonprofit. Buford explained she had reached out to several organizations, and had helped Rock the Community write their proposal. Buford understood kids were having headaches due to playing games and being on tablets all day, and a thought was for vouchers for eye doctors because they might not have insurance or had not had eye problems in the past. Buford did not feel the organizations could say COVID was the reason people were not out in the streets as she thought they could be out in the streets to get the information out while using safety precautions. Buford noted she had been out in the Demaret, Indian Hills, and Rice Road areas all spring and summer feeding over 220 kids and felt it was possible to continue to communicate with families. Buford pointed out that not all of the families wanted a handout as some preferred a hand up to help them get to where they needed to be. Not everyone was looking for an easy way out.

Treece asked Buford if she would consider serving on the board of some of these groups that traditionally received grant funds. Buford replied possibly. Buford noted she felt there were enough small minority group organizations that were out there doing the work, but they were not receiving the funds. Buford stated they wanted better for their communities.

Treece asked Buford what she thought the barriers were for them accessing these funds. Treece wondered if it was the lack of a legal entity as a not-for-profit, lack of tracking, lack of knowing about it, not knowing how to fill out the application, not having time to fill out the application, etc. Buford replied she did not feel it was a matter of not being able to complete the form, but thought they might not have all of the information. In addition, she was not sure there was enough communication. This past summer, the Health Department had held an event related to COVID in Indian Hills, but no one in Indian Hills had known about it. Buford noted she had been upset because many of the people residing there were older and had been there for a long time. They only had 3-4 people there, and it was because Buford had gone on Facebook Live. Many of those people did not have the internet or the phones that allowed for Facebook. In addition, not everyone would read the newsletter with their utility bill. Buford stated she could have gone door to door.

Randy Minchew commented that he served on the board for the Phoenix Programs and had previously served on the board for Love, Inc., and was good friends with quite a few of the executive directors of the nonprofits that were proposed to be funded. Minchew noted there was a wealth of knowledge there and that Charlie Stephenson with Powerhouse Community Development Corporation helped nonprofits get their 501(c)(3) status. Minchew suggested a roundtable or forum involving those that were not funded along with those that were funded. Minchew thought the ones that were being proposed to be funded tonight did well and served the community. They had to learn to apply for grants

as it was not as easy as it appeared. Minchew felt Buford had a point and believed training could come from within the community.

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

Skala commented that when it came to places such as Indian Hills, it took door to door interactions as Buford had indicated. Skala noted they had lost a bit of opportunity when they had shifted the prior community policing plan as they were serving the underserved areas via door to door interactions for not only public safety needs but also social welfare needs. Skala understood resources had to be shifted to establish communitywide policing. Skala reiterated part of the issue was to get to those that needed the help and would not automatically volunteer solely because there was an opportunity. Conversations and a relationship were needed to allow them the opportunity to become interested in the opportunities. Skala stated he liked some of the comments of Fowler and the response of Cole with regard to the rating system as it might help the situation for it to be a part of the decision making process. Skala believed it was an issue of getting to the doors of folks who might not normally be inclined to take advantage of what they might not know existed.

Treece stated this was a challenge that they as a Council had acknowledged and addressed in their selection of a City Manager and his selection of an executive leadership team and cabinet that reflected the community served. They had sought to diversify their board and commission appointments, and had appointed over 308 qualified women applicants to boards and commissions. Treece commented that not-for-profits were not black owned or white owned. They were for the benefit of the community as they were a community chest. By virtue of them not paying taxes, they served the community. That being said, it was incumbent on them to have boards of directors that also reflected the community they served to ensure they were reaching all of those populations and that they were benefitting from the same diversity of opinion that the City did because they were inclusive. Treece commented that it was unprecedented to have a third round of CDBG monies to the tune of \$2.9 million, and noted they had been getting better with outreach as well. Treece wondered what they would find if they looked at the boards of directors of those that applied for funding in terms of whether they reflected the community they served. Cole replied that would be interesting to do. In his interface with the leadership of the traditional nonprofits they worked with, Cole felt it was reflective of the community. There was a lot of diversity in some of those traditional nonprofits they funded year after year. Cole noted the HCDC had added a question to the RFP of how the organization valued diversity. It was new to this round of funding, and it had actually drawn out one organization that had been behind in that area whereby they had been questioned on it in a public meeting. Cole felt adding it to the rating criteria could help. It could lift up organizations that were doing a really good job while exposing areas of improvement. Cole pointed out CDBG was a very cumbersome funding source for startup organizations in general, and HUD was looking at mechanisms within the program to assist with capacity building.

Thomas stated he believed this was a really good conversation and appreciated the comments of Buford as there were a lot of hard working informal groups and individuals doing good work. It benefited the community to have a large and diverse base of organizations that were connecting resources to the people that needed the resources. Thomas encouraged Cole to do what he could on capacity building to allow more perspectives on how best to provide support or a hand up rather than a handout.

Fowler commented that it was a good idea to diversify the boards of their more traditional organizations, but it was also about power-sharing within the community. If the minority members wanted the ability to control their own destiny, which was why they had come to them asking for recognition, a way to do that was to fund their initiatives when those came forward. Fowler understood Rock the Community had applied for funding in several categories and had met the criteria, but their ratings were lower and their requests were zeroed out in several places. Fowler noted Columbia valued diversity, but it tolerated

disparity, and this was a disparity. One way to address the disparity was to start thinking in terms of how they empowered the black and brown community to be full partners with them in caring for each other. As a result, Fowler wanted to encourage a power-sharing view of how they did that going forward.

Treece stated he wanted to look at the board of directors to make sure they reflected the community.

Trapp commented that he was heavily involved in this sphere and knew a lot of the players, and there were a lot of people doing really good work. Trapp noted Fowler had a great point in that if African-American communities wanted to find their own groups and move forward, they needed to provide more accessibility through capacity building. Trapp liked the idea of changing the scoring criteria in terms of what the organization was doing with regard to inclusion and diversity. Trapp stated the comment of Treece was valid as well in that all of these community groups should be reflective of the entire community, and not every nonprofit was doing everything they could to ensure they had a diverse board of directors. All of them in every institution needed to look at what they were doing in terms of recruitment, how they were bringing folks up, and how their organization looked, but they also wanted to make room to provide funding and support for those groups that had historically not been invited to the table or had access to the resources. Trapp noted everyone had made good points. Trapp stated there had been a good improvement through COVID, and thought they should pat themselves on the back any time they held their ground or improved in difficult circumstances. Trapp thanked the staff for its leadership while recognizing the challenges still out there and the terrible history they had inherited. Trapp believed there had been some good ideas they should follow up on and noted he would love to see some capacity building project. Trapp explained he had worked with some grassroots organizations and the barriers were the technical sophistication of administering HUD funded projects and finding the time to build for the future.

Skala stated it bothered him that some of these were zeroed out even though they had received a reasonable score, and that there were some quality proposals that just had not quite made the grade. Skala wondered about a ratio system based upon the number of points received in terms of the amount of money granted.

Treece asked if there was cap on administrative costs that could be attributable to these grants. Cole replied the cap on administrative costs was for the City's own staffing. Cole explained he had encouraged the HCDC members to think about limiting the number of allocations. Regardless of whether they were funding a new grassroots organization or an old organization with a new idea, every proposal funded brought on additional risk, and there were fairly stringent guidelines on getting the money spent quickly otherwise it had to be returned to HUD. In the end, the HCDC had funded a greater number of proposals than Cole had envisioned, and as the collective wisdom of the community, he fully supported their decision. Cole commented that there could be a way of spreading those dollars further to more organizations, but he did not feel they would want to fund projects much lower than \$10,000 due to the amount of regulatory work associated with CDBG funding. It was different than human services and other funding due to the HUD regulations. Skala stated he had not expected a solution and noted it had just been an idea. Cole commented that they could consider that approach in terms of how they might mix it in for the future.

Peters asked if they had any idea of how diversified The Salvation Army or Love, Inc. was in terms of the clientele served. Cole replied he was not quite as familiar with those two organizations, but would get a better feel as they worked with them. Cole noted he had a better feel of the organizations he worked with year in and year out.

Fowler asked if there was any funding left in CoMoHelps. Cole replied he did not know. Glascock thought there might be some money left, but was unsure of the amount. Fowler asked that they look into that to determine if they could add money to Powerhouse and Rock the Community. Glascock replied he could check on that.

Fowler commented that the needs were wide, and they had people that had relationships and the ability to bring necessary resources to people in need, particularly during this time with COVID.

The vote on R21-21 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

PH5-21 Proposed improvements at Albert-Oakland Park to include resurfacing and restriping the existing three (3) tennis courts to create a complex that contains one (1) tennis court and six (6) pickleball courts.

Discussion shown with B36-21.

B36-21 Approving a revised Albert-Oakland Park Master Plan; authorizing improvements at Albert-Oakland Park to include resurfacing and restriping the existing three (3) tennis courts to create a complex that contains one (1) tennis court and six (6) pickleball courts; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division; amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.

PH5-21 was read by the City Clerk, and B36-21 was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Parks and Recreation Director Mike Griggs provided a staff report.

Peters commented that they had heard from a lot of pickleball players, but not a lot of tennis players, and asked if the tennis courts were used as well as the pickleball courts. She wondered if they were just not hearing from the tennis players or if there had just been a shift to pickleball. Griggs replied he thought it was likely a little bit of both. He understood tennis players tended to prefer to play on the designated tennis courts at Cosmo-Bethel Park, Cosmo Park, and Fairview Park. Since those included USTA funds, they were tennis only parks. They did not see as many tennis players at Albert-Oakland Park.

Skala understood, per the master plan, this site would accommodate ten pickleball courts in addition to the six pickleball courts already there and a facility on the east side with two dedicated tennis courts. Skala wondered about the timeline and whether there would be assurances for the dedicated tennis courts. Skala stated he could not speak for all tennis players, but he played twice a week and usually played at Albert-Oakland Park, but could move on. Skala commented that he did not want to include pickleball as a function by cannibalizing existing tennis courts unless they had facilities that would accommodate both groups. Griggs explained they wanted to proceed cautiously as they wanted ensure it would keep going. As they came back to Council in the June or July time frame with their ballot issue projects, there would be a resolution that would identify the projects they would do, and it would include that project. Griggs thought that would be the assurance for tennis players that there would be tennis courts there.

Skala wondered if they should just go ahead with the ten pickleball courts instead of the six and reserve the decision of the two tennis courts on the east side of the park. Skala felt it was a better solution than double striping the courts. Griggs stated he thought they needed to keep the one tennis court shown on the plan until the other two were constructed. Griggs understood one person had regular lessons out there and there were others that utilized it.

The Mayor opened the public hearing.

Steve Lewandowski, Show-Me Pickleball Club, explained his role in the Club was to help maintain the courts and equipment, set up for tournaments, and act as the liaison between the Club and the Parks and Recreation Department. Lewandowski stated he had been responsible for proposing the tennis court conversion project to the Parks and Recreation Department and the one to blame for the deluge of emails the Council had

received. Lewandowski commented that he had started playing pickleball about eight years ago on the very courts they were discussing tonight with only three lined tennis courts. About six years ago, Skip Deming had persuaded the Parks and Recreation Department to convert two of the sand volleyball courts into six dedicated pickleball courts, and the Club was forever indebted to Deming, the Parks and Recreation Department, and the City for constructing the courts as it allowed pickleball to blossom in Columbia. When the six courts were built, their club had about 60 members. Today, they had over 200 avid members, and thus the need for additional courts. In 2008, pickleball had become part of the Show-Me State Games, and there had been about 40 participants of 50 years of age or older. In 2009, all ages were permitted to participate, and in 2010, it had become the four-day tournament it was today. Seniors played the first two days and all ages competed on the last two days bracketed by skill level. Since the founding father of the Club ran these first tournaments, the official Club had continued working with the Show-Me State Game staff to manage the annual tournament. The tournament had expanded from 40 people on three courts to more than 200 on as many courts as the cracks allowed, usually about 10-14. Lewandowski noted there were about 70 tennis participants in the Show-Me State Games and the Senior Games. Lewandowski also noted pickleball had attracted participants for the Show-Me State Games from in-state, the surrounding states, and states as far away as Texas. Improving the playing surface and increasing the number of dedicated courts would enhance Columbia's image. Since Columbia was centrally located, Lewandowski believed additional quality courts would attract more outdoor tournaments, visitors, and business to the City just as the new disc golf course had. Lewandowski stated the Executive Director of the Show-Me State Games, Dave Fox, had provided a letter of support for this project as well, and he could provide a copy if desired. Lewandowski commented that pickleball was a very social activity so having a high concentration of courts in one area was desirable and facilitated tournament play. In addition, courts dedicated to pickleball provided for high level players, a proper practice venue, and more time playing versus chasing balls. Lewandowski understood Columbia had nearly 50 public tennis courts versus six dedicated pickleball courts. If the tennis courts were consistently busy with players waiting in lines, this proposal would not have been made. Lewandowski noted there was seldom more than one tennis court in use at Albert-Oakland Park, while pickleball players were almost constantly competing for court time. Approving this project would turn the underused tennis courts into a popular destination for not only local and state residents but also players traveling through Columbia to other destinations while still allowing for tennis play on a dedicated tennis court. Lewandowski pointed out the Club had contributed the nets, posts, and sleeves for this endeavor. As a Club, members could contribute to a court fund for future improvements. Lewandowski noted members had also donated money to the park fund directing their contribution to the Albert-Oakland pickleball courts. The Club had taken these steps in order to fast track the project, share in the financial burden, provide input related to design and features, and share the benefits provided by the sport.

Kay Barbee explained she and Skip Deming were USA Pickleball ambassadors for Boone County, i.e., volunteers who pledged to promote the sport of pickleball. They worked with communities, clubs, and others getting pickleball going wherever possible. Barbee noted she had started playing about four years ago, had been an ambassador for less than a year, and active with the Show-Me Pickleball Club for three years. The Club had started with 15 members and had now grown to over 200 members, and not all pickleball players joined the Club so they estimated hundreds of others playing or eager to learn how to play. Barbee pointed out the game was easy to learn, and there were young and senior players, to include a couple in their 90s. Pickleball was in all 50 states and there were more than 1,900 ambassadors, and as of 2019, nearly 8,000 known pickleball locations could be found using the USA Pickleball website. There was also an average of 110 new locations per month. Barbee provided an example of a small town in

Georgia with a population of 900 that had started off with four tennis courts that were striped for pickleball, which within two years had constructed a 14-court dedicated recreational center. They held tournaments and the businesses liked the additional traffic. Barbee commented that a community the size of Columbia should have 24-26 dedicate pickleball courts, and if they were built, the pickleball players would come.

Doug Schwandt stated he was a long time Columbia resident who had come to the University of Missouri in 1976. Schwandt noted his major had been in recreation and park administration, but he had ended up working for the police department, and after 42 years, he was still in the law enforcement business. Schwandt commented that he had been a long time hockey player, and later a tournament tennis player. About three years ago, his neighbor had introduced him to pickleball, which he had quickly taken to and had been more conducive for him to play due to past surgeries. Schwandt pointed out the draw of pickleball tournaments was unbelievable as there were tournaments in every state all of the time. At the end of this month, there would be a tournament in Cape Girardeau with 350-plus players, and it was a big draw economically. Schwandt stated he had played in the World Games in Florida last year, which had 1000-plus players. Schwandt was not sure why anyone would not be in support of this project. Schwandt noted there were 48 dedicated publically available tennis courts, and those at Albert-Oakland Park were rarely used except for pickleball players playing on the tennis courts. Schwandt hoped the Council would support it.

Diane Rubenstein commented that pickleball was a great sport for all around fitness and social networking, and both elements were crucial components of good health and longevity. Pickleball was also an easy entry sport where newbies could play a game in an hour. Lightweight equipment and smallish sized courts made the game accessible to people of all ages and all sizes. It was an equalizing sport that rewarded finesse and accuracy, and curbed the advantages of physical size and strength. It was a game of strategy like a chess match that allowed people of varying ages and strengths to play competitively together. It exercised all muscle groups, provided a weight bearing cardio workout, and improved dexterity, mobility, and balance. There were many stories of improved health and fitness, weight loss, and reductions in medication. Unique to pickleball was large group play, also known as open play or drop in play. Players would show up at scheduled times rotating in and out of doubles games and playing with and against a variety of players. Rubenstein noted they would find as many as 40 people showing up for open play at Albert-Oakland Park, and it was scheduled nearly every day of the week. Playing doubles with four people on the court created comradery, which sounded like a compliment, a taunt, or trash talk, and games lasted about 20 minutes. Socializing between games became as important as playing the games. Rubenstein explained the courts were also used by individual groups of people, i.e., college kids, couples, 30-somethings, and families. Pickleball was a family favorite because grandma and grandpa were even-odds to take home bragging rights. Rubenstein noted they were learning the importance of social interaction to overall health and wellness. Short games and rotating play combined the social engagement with meaningful physical activity. Pickleball players were passionate about pickleball. It was similar to a pyramid scheme where people that loved the game were constantly bringing out new players. More courts were needed to accommodate current players and all of those that were anxious to play. Rubenstein felt pickleball players were exactly what they wanted in the community. They were people of all ages using City resources for healthy, physical activity they could enjoy with family and friends. Rubenstein asked the Council to expand the facilities to accommodate the players they had and to allow them to welcome new players.

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

Skala commented that he would vote in favor of this project, and noted he believed ten dedicated pickleball courts were needed next to the existing six dedicated pickleball courts with assurances to expedite the two separate tennis courts. Skala agreed it would be beneficial in terms of tournaments and the passion for pickleball.

B36-21 was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

PH6-21 Proposed construction of improvements to support the Gans Creek Cross Country Course at Gans Creek Recreation Area to include construction of a race headquarters building, multi-tier awards platform and connecting walkways.

Discussion shown with B37-21.

B37-21 Authorizing construction of improvements to support the Gans Creek Cross Country Course at Gans Creek Recreation Area to include construction of a race headquarters building, multi-tier awards platform and connecting walkways; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division for a portion of the work or authorizing a contract for the work using a term and supply contractor; amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds

PH6-21 was read by the City Clerk, and B37-21 was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Griggs provided a staff report.

Treece asked for the square footage of the race headquarters building. Griggs replied 1,600 square feet. Treece asked if it was big enough. Griggs replied he thought it was, and explained that across the road would be the indoor pavilion. Griggs noted the sports fieldhouse would be able to utilize the pavilion as well.

The Mayor opened the public hearing.

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

Peters understood this ordinance would authorize construction and would appropriate funds, and understood the University of Missouri was providing that funding. Griggs explained the funds from the University of Missouri were already appropriated as that had been done when they had been authorized to move forward with the pavilion. The appropriation now was the \$30,000 that was recently donated.

B37-21 was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VI. OLD BUSINESS

PR16-21 Approving the content and recommendations contained within the Status Report to "Columbia Imagined - The Plan for How We Live and Grow."

The policy resolution was read by the City Clerk.

Community Development Director Tim Teddy provided a staff report.

Fowler commented that mostly white people who owned their own homes and lived in the Fourth, Fifth, or Sixth Wards had answered the survey, and if they wanted to reach non-white people that did not own their own homes, but were just as likely to be impacted and have their lives changed by the outcome of a comprehensive plan, they needed to find them via the people that knew them. Fowler felt that before they attempted to engage a consultant or spend money, she wanted a report indicating what the plans were so they could broadcast it wide in an effort to reach those demographics. Fowler saw them headed down a path they had been down before unsuccessfully. Teddy commented that he understood her point and thought there were resources other than consultants. Fowler stated there were other people that could be paid in the community that could do that work as well, and she wanted them to have that chance. Teddy noted that involving minority communities and others that were underrepresented in their

surveys in the making of the actual engagement tools would be helpful as well. Teddy understood some of it had to do with the questions that were asked as some people wanted to have different discussions that were just as sophisticated and complex.

Fowler asked about the choice of language in the policy resolution. Over time she had learned there was a difference between accept, adopt, or acknowledge. In reviewing the minutes of the Planning and Zoning Commission (PZC) meeting, they had different language in terms of what they voted on, and as a result, when it was appropriate, Fowler stated she wanted to change Section 1 of the policy resolution so it said the Council accepted the content and recommendations instead of approved the content and recommendations. This would allow them to stay in the same lane that they ask of their boards and commissions. Fowler commented that she was not sure how that change happened and had noticed it in the past. Teddy stated he did not believe it was intentional. The Community Development staff had used acknowledged, generally speaking, through the process. Fowler understood they had acknowledged the interim plan met the five-year goal. Teddy thought they had primarily utilized acknowledged or recognized. Fowler stated the motion indicated the PZC acknowledged the status report fulfilled the objective of the five-year status report and the PZC accepted the status report as presented, and she wanted them to more closely track that language. Fowler noted she planned to make a motion to amend the language. Treece stated that language had been the language in the suggested action of the council memo as well.

Skala asked if there had been any discussion regarding the "tensions" portions of the status report, and whether that would take the form of a priority list or if certain policies would supersede others. Community Development Senior Planner Rachel Smith replied that having a "tensions" chapter was an emerging best practice in the planning field to attempt to determine how to deal with competing goods if they only had so much money and resources. It was really more of a framework of decision making. Smith noted priority based budgeting was the financial way for the same idea. Smith commented that these discussions had been held during the development of the Climate Action and Adaptation Plan (CAAP), which had embedded in it some references regarding tensions. In this situation, they were talking more about an entire chapter regarding the framework of decision making, i.e., a decision making tree that could transcend between plans, policies, regulations, etc. Skala stated he was glad it would be included and had been unaware it was new trend. Smith commented that the crosswalk idea was not very new, but the framework combination was new.

Trapp stated he thought the comprehensive plan was one of the core things they did and noted it informed the decision making as a Council. Trapp was glad they were getting to the five-year update. Trapp also appreciated the awareness of the inadequacy of who had been brought to the table and that they would look at the foundational levels of the questions being asked in terms of engagement. Trapp commented that he concurred with the recommendations of Fowler in that they wanted to be thoughtful in who they brought forward. Trapp appreciated the increased attention to affordable housing as it had certainly become more of an issue, and was something he had wanted to see addressed in the Unified Development Code (UDC). Trapp noted he was looking forward to it at least being addressed at the planning level. Trapp stated it had been a neat process and he was glad they had been able to make some measureable milestones of accomplishment. There were more things they had not done than they had done, but it was hard to make changes at the community level scale. It was a big ship that mostly grew organically, and there were some limits in planning because things could come forward that they had never planned for or anticipated.

Thomas commented that he thought this was a really great piece of work, which validated all of the time and energy that thousands of community members had put in during years past to develop it. Thomas stated he liked the idea that this started the clock on the next full revision of the comprehensive plan along with the tensions section. Thomas thought it was a good way to capture them, and to then study them to decide how to resolve them.

Thomas asked that they consider the tension between the *Columbia Imagined* and the CATSO long-range transportation plan. Thomas had seen the 2050 CATSO long-range transportation plan listed as an accomplishment of the comprehensive plan goals, but did not feel there was much in common between the CATSO long-range transportation plan and the transportation goals in *Columbia Imagined*. Thomas appreciated a new look at the right-of-way requirement for major arterials and freeways in the City as he felt that was a huge problem. Thomas understood it might have made sense to engineers 30-40 years ago, but did not believe it made sense now. Thomas agreed there was a much bigger focus on affordable housing now, and thought they had to help nurture a vision of people living closer together on smaller lots and smaller homes while being less car oriented, which he felt could be done with form-based zoning throughout the community as it would create more acceptance of people living closer together. Thomas understood much of the objections people had with regard to increasing density was with the visual imposition of the buildings, which he believed form-based zoning could address. Thomas stated he appreciated the recognition that the public engagement effort, which had been quite impressive, had not accomplished the goals of adequate representation. As a result, Thomas supported more effort in that area along with the resources necessary to do a more effective job in having a more representative public input process.

Skala asked if any section was dedicated to growth management planning in terms of population growth and the response of government to provide services and facilities. Teddy replied the existing structure of the plan of land use growth management was almost one and the same. Skala asked if it addressed the issue of public facilities. Teddy replied yes, and explained it included the fair allocation of costs for infrastructure made necessary by development, and both the consequence of the development in terms of building infrastructure that would become public and maintained by the public and the needed capacity expansions delivered by public projects.

Treece made a motion to amend PR16-21 by changing Section 1 so it read "The City Council acknowledges the Status Report fulfills the object of the Comprehensive Plan which states that the Planning and Zoning Commission review a Status Report on the Plan after five years of its initial adoption" and adding a Section 2 to read "The City Council accepts the Status Report, as presented, to serve as the guide for future work program activities, policy, and regulatory changes necessary to effectuate implementation of the Columbia Imagined Comprehensive Plan, a copy of which, marked 'Exhibit A,' is attached to this policy resolution." The motion was seconded by Trapp. Fowler understood that would track with the action of the PZC. Treece agreed.

The motion made by Treece and seconded by Trapp to amend PR16-21 by changing Section 1 so it read "The City Council acknowledges the Status Report fulfills the object of the Comprehensive Plan which states that the Planning and Zoning Commission review a Status Report on the Plan after five years of its initial adoption" and adding a Section 2 to read "The City Council accepts the Status Report, as presented, to serve as the guide for future work program activities, policy, and regulatory changes necessary to effectuate implementation of the Columbia Imagined Comprehensive Plan, a copy of which, marked 'Exhibit A,' is attached to this policy resolution" was approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on PR16-21, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Policy resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

PR17-21 Adopting a vision statement, mission statement, core values and strategic priorities for the 2021 Strategic Plan.

The policy resolution was read by the City Clerk.
Assistant City Manager Carol Rhodes provided a staff report.

Skala asked if staff wanted Council to strike the word “modern” and include it with “reliable.” Rhodes replied they wanted the change in the title. Skala commented that there was some redundancy in the goal statement in terms of the word “reliable” and asked if that was necessary. Rhodes replied they had not discussed changes to the goal statement.

Trapp stated he did not have any strong feelings with regard to modern versus reliable. If staff preferred modern, Trapp did not have a problem with it if someone wanted to make that motion. Trapp commented that by having 5, 6, 10, or 35 priorities, it really meant they did not have a priority. Trapp thought they should have one or maybe 2-3 priorities if they were really focused. Trapp suggested that as they determined how to operationalize these, they think about scaffolding them whereby multiple areas had measurements. Trapp reiterated they should not have more than 1, 2, or 3 wildly important goals on which to focus as they would otherwise not make strategic progress. Trapp commented that he thought this structure was fine as it was salvageable, but believed they needed increased focus. If they chose equity as the one priority, every department could then harmonize their efforts to ensure they had equity as part of their doing. It was something they could message and they could potentially have interdepartmental change teams, which would allow them to make serious progress in 2021 on equity. Trapp reiterated an increased focus was needed on the priority of priorities.

Treece explained he had suggested reliable over modern, but he did not object if staff wanted to go back to modern.

Peters stated she liked reliable. Modern made it seem like they were renewing everything, and they were not renewing everything. In addition, it would be nice if the sewer system, for example, was reliable. Treece agreed it would be nice if the lights worked, but they did not need a new light bulb. Peters agreed.

Peters commented that she appreciated the effort of everyone in thoughtfully looking at moving the City forward.

The vote on PR17-21 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Policy resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

B5-21

Rezoning property located on the north side of Northridge Drive and east of Oakland Gravel Road from District R-1 (One-family Dwelling) to District PD (Planned); approving a statement of intent; approving the PD Plan and Preliminary Plat for “The Cottages of Northridge” (Case No. 201-2020).

The bill was given third reading by the City Clerk.

Treece understood there had been a request to table this item for two weeks.

Tim Crockett, an engineer with offices at 1000 W. Nifong Boulevard, commented that they had requested to table this item because they were working with the neighbors. They had come to terms on many items that had been of concern, but had a little disagreement on a couple of items. The reason for the tabling was to revise the statement of intent for those items they had agreed upon, and staff felt tabling was the best route so the statement of intent and plan could coincide with each other. It would otherwise be text in the ordinance itself and would be separate of the statement of intent.

Robin Anderson, a neighbor, explained she thought they had what they needed to move forward and did not feel there was really any benefit to tabling the item. R. Anderson noted they would prefer a decision tonight.

Skala commended the applicant and neighbors for getting together to make great progress on this item. Skala stated he was inclined to favor tabling the item at this time to modify the statement of intent based on the recommendation of staff, but also understood the position of R. Anderson of having to come to another council meeting to testify.

R. Anderson commented that they had spoken on the phone with staff today because

they wanted to move forward with a decision and understood they could go through the points and concessions so they could be added to the statement of intent.

Crockett noted they would revise the statement of intent, but there were still a couple of points of disagreement, and thought what R. Anderson was alluding to was for a consensus of Council as to what needed to be included in that statement of intent. The item they were really discussing was the maximum square footage of the homes within the development. Currently, the developer was proposing 1,550 square feet as a maximum. They were not saying every home would be that large as they were looking for smaller homes. They only wanted the maximum in case someone wanted to add a sunroom on the back or wanted a larger home. While they were not looking to build homes that large, they wanted to have a maximum of that size. Crockett explained R. Anderson wanted something a bit smaller than that.

Pitzer asked if they would have to add the items of agreement of which there might be about ten to the ordinance. Thompson replied yes. Thompson commented that she thought Crockett was suggesting the Council allow for public comment and then make a determination as to whether to continue the item for another two weeks to allow the developer to amend the statement of intent with the feedback provided by Council in addition to what the developer was suggesting happen. If Council provided feedback, it would help the developer know what the statement of intent should look like. The other option was to amend the ordinance with all of those things, and that would create a situation with two conflicting documents since the attached statement of intent would be separate and different than what they had in the ordinance.

Crockett explained his initial conversation with staff was whether they could proceed as he knew that was the preference of the Andersons as that had been done in the past although not to this extent. Crockett noted his client would prefer to be done tonight as well.

Treece commented that the other alternative was for Council to defeat it. Crockett understood.

Treece asked if the bottom line for R. Anderson was to amend it or end it. R. Anderson replied she would like to see it amended.

Treece asked for a staff report and Teddy provided that report.

Treece asked about the advantage of the hammerhead turn instead of a cul-de-sac. Teddy replied it consumed a bit less land. In addition, it was being extended into the west property line to get a couple of lots in there. A standard turnaround required at least 76 feet of pavement plus right-of-way. Treece asked what the Fire Department thought about that. Teddy replied they had signed off on it, and noted it was allowed under Appendix D of the National Fire Code. The number of lots was less than 30 so there was not that additional factor of a large number of lots being served by a dead end.

Teddy continued with the staff report.

Fowler understood this lot was set below the road, likely about 5-7 feet, and asked about the entrance into the subdivision. Teddy replied they had to look at the slope and potentially provide some fill to bring the road and adjacent lots up. Ideally, they wanted the house above curb level for positive drainage. Teddy thought that might be a question for Crockett as the engineer for the project.

Skala asked if the maximum size of the footprint was what was holding up this project. Teddy replied he thought that was the case. It was not addressed within the statement of intent. There were envelopes defined by the setback and the original intent was to build houses within those defined envelopes. Skala understood the rest of the concessions had been more or less agreed upon. Teddy stated he thought that was correct.

Crockett commented that he felt Teddy had provided a good overview. In terms of the turnaround, when the City adopted Appendix D of the Fire Code, the fire turnarounds did not comply with the turnarounds set forth in the design manual of the Public Works Department. They contradicted one another. The cul-de-sac size in Appendix D was much larger than what the City had traditionally built, and it really would not fit well in this

location. As a result, the Fire Department asked for a turnaround that was compliant with one of the turnarounds in Appendix D, and this was one of the approved turnarounds. Crockett understood the Fire Department was good with the T-intersection and that the Public Works Department was okay with it even though it might not be the cul-de-sac they wanted. They had originally planned for a cul-de-sac, but the Fire Department had asked for the modification. Crockett described the types of development in the area, which included duplexes, triplexes, and four-plexes along with single-family residential, and noted multi-family and higher densities in the area were not necessary out of the ordinary. Crockett stated they would be in full compliance with the stormwater plan. In terms of traffic, Crockett understood there had originally been concerns about traffic on Northridge Drive. They had talked to the neighbors and would work with them to get traffic studies done with the City of Columbia if they could. Crockett explained the purpose of the cottage development was to provide a small pocket affordable small lot infill cottage style development and to develop in conjunction with the surrounding area while maintaining density and utilizing the UDC in doing so. This site was within walking distance of Blue Ridge Elementary School. It was also less than a half of a mile to Oakland Middle School and a third of a mile to healthcare facilities. It was within walking distance of a major park, Albert-Oakland Park, and about a third of a mile away from the future 30-mile trail that would be developed in the area sometime in the future. It was truly an infill development. Sewer and water were on the property, and there were already improved roads adjacent to and leading to the development. In addition, it would not be any more burdensome on solid waste, police, or fire as there were already facilities serving the existing area. Crockett stated the development supported diverse and inclusive housing options and involved smaller lot sizes promoting homeownership and encouraging integrated residential design. As a result, they were in conformance with *Columbia Imagined*. In terms of public engagement, it had started out a little slow, but they had finished fairly strong. They had participated in lots of conversations with the Andersons, who had been in conversations with other residents in the area, and they had given them a list of items they wanted addressed, which they had addressed as best as they could. They had beefed up the landscaping, both shrubs and trees. They would commit to 15 percent of the front façade of each house being brick or stone. An item that was important to the neighbors was to increase the rear yard setback, and Crockett believed they had come to agreement that 20 feet for the rear yard setback was appropriate for a development such as this. Crockett pointed out the cottage standards allowed for 10 feet, and they had increased it to 20 feet. Another item of concern was a single car garage versus a two-car garage. They had originally intended to allow for both, but the neighbors had safety concerns. The neighbors felt people should be able to look out of a window and monitor what was happening in the front of their homes, and this could not be done if the whole frontage was essentially a garage. As a result, they had eliminated the two-car garage option. In terms of the maximum square footage of the home, they had it as 1,550 square feet. Crockett understood R. Anderson wanted that to be reduced. Crockett explained they would need square footage in trying to provide for a 3-bedroom home. They also wanted the flexibility in case a homebuyer wanted a slightly larger home or wanted to make modifications in the future. This was a 16-lot development so there had been discussion on what they could or could not add. There were a lot of things they would like to accommodate, such as a clubhouse, but they were not really afforded that opportunity with 16-lots. They were proposing a small community garden, multiple picnic tables, a park bench, a little library stand, and a dog waste station on the common lot of the development. Crockett pointed out they had also told the neighbors they would advocate for the neighbors in terms of requesting traffic calming on Northridge Drive, install a speed limit sign if the Public Works Department allowed it, and assist them with a sidewalk study. Crockett commented that he believed this was an appropriate location for cottage style developments, and reiterated many of the concessions they were in agreement with needed to be included in the statement of

intent. Crockett noted he had that statement of intent written, but the Community Development Department had not had the opportunity to review it and neither had the Council. As a result, Crockett felt the proper route would be to present it at the next council meeting for final approval after the Community Development Department staff had time to review it.

Treece asked if the plan also needed to be changed. Crockett replied a couple of notes on the plan would need to change as well. For example, the current plan showed a 10-foot rear yard so it would need to be revised to show a 20-foot rear yard, and it would need to include the increased landscaping.

Fowler asked Crockett how they proposed to bring the residents and their cars into the neighborhood due to the grade. Crockett replied they would come in off of the road via a four percent grade and would then drop it to a steeper grade until they flattened out when they came to the bottom of the hill. There would be an area in the front on Northridge Drive that they would fill to accommodate for it. All of the homes would be above grade adjacent to the road they built. Crockett explained they wanted all of the homes to sit above the adjacent street, which was the street they would build. As that street came in, there would be a little fill as it dropped down. Given they could drop 10 feet over 100 feet, they could drop down relatively quickly with a new public street. They would drop down to the lower area as soon as they could and the homes on each side would be built accordingly. Fowler understood they would be at the grade of the street. Crockett stated that was correct, and pointed out all of the drainage would be accounted for and they would not put more water on the neighbors or their own lots.

Treece clarified it would be at the grade of Bragg Court, not Northridge Drive. Crockett stated that was correct.

Fowler asked if the homes would be one and one-half story or two story homes. Crockett replied they would likely be one and one-half story or two story homes due to the square footages and small footprints. There might be some slabs as well. Fowler thought people would be looking at rooftops. Crockett assumed she was speaking about the first couple of lots and noted they would not be that low because they could not drop that fast. They would see the side of the first home.

Fowler understood this neighborhood did not have sidewalks on either side of the street. Crockett thought there were some sidewalks, and described the sidewalk configuration. Crockett noted there was a sidewalk all of the way to the elementary school.

R. Anderson commented that the neighborhood was supportive of the City's initiative for infill development, and stated she thought the negotiations were right where they needed to be. R. Anderson explained they wanted to see the community grow into something they could be proud of and were able to live next to as opposed to something they had to live next to. R. Anderson stated they were representing the neighbors and had been in communication with them through Facebook, texts, calls, emails, and visits. At the PZC meeting, the plan had been presented on the basis of affordability and providing affordable housing. A couple of the PZC members had given really great talks on the virtues of infill and affordability, and had advised them to be in contact with the neighbors. R. Anderson understood the purpose of a PD was to require planned developments provide the City amenities or benefits that helped to achieve the goals of *Columbia Imagined* that were not otherwise required by the base zoning district in return for the added flexibility in uses and design offered by the PD district. The neighbors were intrigued with infill and affordability, but were concerned about the lack of provisions. R. Anderson noted HUD defined affordable as 30 percent or less of income, and the median income in Columbia was about \$51,000. This meant affordability was at about \$170,000-\$171,000. They had done some research and had talked to Kay Wax regarding another development, and understood higher density required smaller houses as it was less disruptive. One resource they had consulted had indicated up to twelve homes centered and shaped around a common shared amenity along with open and common greenspace, and if they got above twelve, they tended to lose the tightknit connections. R. Anderson indicated

the homes also needed to be intelligently designed with every square inch being utilized. R. Anderson commented that since they felt affordability and size went hand in hand and cottage R-2 plats should be designed for smaller houses, they believed a cap of 1,400 square feet or an average of 1,100-1,300 square feet would make the most sense. R. Anderson noted they had presented some alternative designs and had gone back and forth with the developer regarding amenities that would contribute to community in terms of inviting interactions and increasing common and open space.

Blake Anderson, the husband of R. Anderson, commented that they were not building developers or community planners so they did not know how to interpret the data to do hard nose negotiating. They had assembled the data they could find. They had asked a realtor to provide them a list of all of the homes that had sold north of I-70 recently and had found the price for a 1,500 square foot home was about \$200,000. B. Anderson noted the prices would likely be inflated a bit due to COVID. A 1,400 square foot home was about \$190,000, which was closer to affordability. B. Anderson commented that he did not believe building smaller homes would result in the loss of profit for the developer. These were the reasons they were making the case for the smaller square footage.

R. Anderson reiterated they were suggesting 1,400 and would defer to Council.

Treece understood the property was zoned R-1 now, and when R. Anderson had referred to R-2, it did not mean they were changing the zoning to R-2. Crockett stated that was correct, and noted R. Anderson was alluding to the cottage standards being within the R-2 zoning code. They had two alternatives. They could have rezoned the property to R-2 and then gone to the Board of Adjustment to allow for cottage standards, but the only way they could assure the neighbors they would do a cottage style development was to go the PD route, which was why they were requesting it.

Skala commented that he had lived in this neighborhood for about four years in the 1980s, and it had always looked like a low lying area or drainage basin. Skala understood that had been resolved as engineering had made development feasible. Skala stated he was amazed at the amount of cooperation between the developer and the neighbors, which was available with PDs. Skala commented that he was inclined to favor the suggestion of Crockett that the maximum be set at 1,550 square feet rather than limiting it to 1,400 square feet, but noted he was curious as to the thoughts of everyone else.

Treece stated he tended to lean toward what the neighbors wanted, but thought the neighborhood would benefit from having the diversity and some larger footprint homes. The difference between 1,500 and 1,400 was a small bedroom. Treece thought it would help property values to have the larger homes in the long term.

Peters understood there was a question as to whether a 1,500 square foot home would be affordable if the cost was about \$200,000.

R. Anderson commented that they had discussed a potential average as well, and understood that might be harder from a developer standpoint to meet because of the constant tracking needed. If the houses were capped at a certain size, it would guarantee the open space for amenities, which was a provision of a planned development. R. Anderson understood 1,000 to 1,300 square foot homes of three bedrooms and two bathrooms were being built with the Cullimore Cottages. It was small, but it worked.

Treece asked R. Anderson if she had any issue with 16 homes versus 15 homes. R. Anderson replied it would not be a problem if they were smaller. R. Anderson noted she could not speak to the profit margins in that regard, and reiterated they were okay with infill and the density if the homes were smaller.

Treece understood the applicant was looking for direction as to what to come back with at the next council meeting and there was a protest petition requiring a supermajority vote.

Trapp commented that he was supportive as it was way below the median average even if they did the larger homes. It felt a bit like micromanagement to get into the individual size of the houses. Trapp thought some good points had been made regarding diversity

and leaving it open to the people who were purchasing the homes. Trapp stated he hoped there was a general trend for smaller homes as they were intimate and cheaper.

Peters noted Crockett had indicated a desire to allow homeowners the option to add a patio or some other amenity. It did not sound like the developer was planning to build 1,550 square foot homes. Crockett stated that was correct, and explained several of the floor plans they had were actually for 1,450 square feet. They wanted to accommodate someone that built the 1,450 square foot home and wanted to turn the patio into a sunroom in the future. If the maximum square footage was 1,400 square feet, they would not have that opportunity. Crockett reiterated that a lot of the floor plans they had for the development were less than 1,550 square feet in size. Crockett explained they were trying to hit a certain price point and were trying to keep the price point down. In order to do that, they would have to cut square footage. Crockett believed the homes built would be smaller than 1,550 square feet in size, but noted that maximum would allow some flexibility for a larger bedroom or some other amenity.

B. Anderson commented that he thought a big reason the neighbors had become involved with this project was due to the lack of information in the beginning and a distrust of the basic process. There had been a lot of things that had been questionable then. B. Anderson explained they had been working to get things in writing since then. Ultimately, the question would be whether all of the houses would be 1,550 square feet in size. If the plans said they could be, then they might be. B. Anderson suggested something more creative. B. Anderson noted they wanted to see affordable homes, but understood the developer needed to make a profit and build houses that could potentially be extended. B. Anderson reiterated that creative thinking might address the issue.

Peters stated she was fine with 1,550 square feet for the size of the homes.

Pitzer commented that everyone had made a lot of good points, and noted there were a lot of positives in this proposal, which he would hate to lose over 150 square feet. Pitzer stated he did not want to get into the details of it, but hoped it would move forward. Pitzer explained he would be pleased if they could agree to a creative solution, and reiterated he only hoped to see it move forward.

Skala stated he was inclined to support what the neighbors supported, but pointed out that when he had first seen the proposal, he had been against it, partly due to comments at the PZC meeting. Skala thought there had been some misrepresentation in terms of this being a cottage project that had acreage limitations, but it really was not. Since then the neighbors and the developer had gotten together resulting in these concessions with only the square footage being the stumbling block. Skala commented that he trusted the judgement of Crockett and what he said, and if he was saying not all of the homes would max out at 1,550 square feet, it would approach the satisfaction of that average. Skala thought on the whole it was likely a good fit.

Treece stated he agreed, and explained his experience was that this applicant did not misrepresent the intent of his client because he knew it would hurt him the next time he appeared before the Council. As a result, if Crockett was saying not all of the homes would be built to 1,550 square feet, he believed it. Treece understood some of them might grow to that square footage. Treece thought it should all be incorporated into the statement of intent leaving flexibility with regard to the square footage. Treece felt the way it had been portrayed made sense and would be very attractive.

Fowler asked Treece if he was suggesting the statement of intent could include a statement indicating the houses would vary in size with the largest being 1,550 square feet. Treece suggested it say something indicating the houses could not exceed 1,550 square feet.

Fowler commented that she philosophically disagreed with the idea that they could not get into the details because if the applicant had not wanted them to get into the details, they would not have chosen the PD zoning district. PD allowed them the opportunity to help work out some of the details with the neighbors. Fowler explained the part about the size of the house that gave her pause was how it might impact someone wanting to add

on to their house and was unable due to the requirements of the PD. Fowler noted she thought smaller was better and appreciated the position of the neighbors. Fowler complimented R. Anderson and B. Anderson in terms of their preparation, and stated they would all love to have them as neighbors because they cared enough to do this work.

Fowler asked if there could be a statement related to size in the statement of intent. Treece replied he thought it would have to be so flexible that it would then be meaningless. Treece believed it should be something indicating a not to exceed 1,550 square feet with the intent to build 1,300 to 1,550 square foot homes. Fowler stated she would feel much better if the language indicated the intent was to build a range of sizes, i.e., from 1,300 square feet but not exceeding 1,550 square feet.

Treece asked Crockett if he was able to capture that. Crockett replied yes.

Fowler asked R. Anderson if she was agreeable. R. Anderson replied yes.

Treece made a motion to table B5-21 to the February 15, 2021 Council Meeting.

Fowler understood they would be able to review the statement of intent to ensure what had been agreed upon was included. Crockett stated that was correct. Thompson pointed out a revised PD plan would need to be provided as well.

The motion made by Treece to table B5-21 to the February 15, 2021 Council Meeting was seconded by Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B45-21

Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for the purchase of equipment and software to aid with Sunshine Law compliance for board and commission member public meeting attendance by videoconference.

The bill was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Information Technology Director Jim Chapdelaine provided a staff report.

Fowler appreciated the fact they would be able to pin everyone to the screen and that other people could watch without interrupting the meeting. Fowler asked if they had the ability to let one of the viewing members of the public speak if they wanted to comment during a portion of the meeting where it would be allowed, such as a scheduled public comment. Chapdelaine replied they would have the ability to control that. Fowler explained she, like many other members of the Council, had been receiving comments of COVID substantially impacting the ability to bring comments and concerns to the Council and their boards and commissions. Some of their boards and commissions, particularly the Disabilities Commission, was having difficulty getting a quorum in the room because some of the members were medically fragile, had transportation issues, etc., that would expose them unnecessarily. Fowler commented that she appreciated that this was more robust than Zoom, and wanted to ensure the preservation of the ability to allow the public to speak to them on a scheduled basis. Chapdelaine stated this would allow for that flexibility.

Thomas asked what their policy would be on board and commission meetings and city council meetings. Thomas understood the technology would allow for more comfort with regard to compliance with the Sunshine Law, but felt that was a separate issue. At the moment, they were allowing board and commission meetings to proceed with members participating remotely as long as a quorum was physically in the room. Chapdelaine stated that was correct. Thomas understood this technology would improve that process. Chapdelaine stated that was correct.

Skala understood interface with the public had been a problem during prior discussions and asked if this would satisfy that issue. Thompson replied this software would allow for better compliance with the Sunshine Law because they could pin all of the members to a screen while still allowing for a presentation to be visible. The members that were physically present in the room would have a computer with a camera in front of them so those that were participating remotely could see the individual members in the room.

Currently, they satisfied the "see and be seen" requirement within the Sunshine Law by broadcasting the entire dais. This did not provide a good experience to the person participating remotely. The software along with the computer purchases would address this. Thompson commented that it would also do the things Fowler had mentioned as this was webinar technology whereby each member was a presenter allowing them to be pinned, and the public had the opportunity to view the webinar or attend if the Council decided to have a policy allowing it, but they would be off of the screen. Skala understood this satisfied some of the requirements for interface with the public in addition to some other features. Thompson stated that was correct if they chose to use it in that manner. Thompson explained that since the policy was currently for a quorum to be present in the room, the meetings were considered to be in-person meetings. They were not allowing virtual attendance by members of the public. If Council wanted to allow members of the public to attend virtually, there would be a need for a staff member to be present to allow people into a virtual viewing room. It was more technology and would require more of staff, but the technology would be available to do it.

Skala explained he had recently tried to participate in a meeting by phone and it had been difficult to hear and understood this would fix the problem. Skala asked if this would be available to all of the boards and commissions or just a few. Chapdelaine replied it would be available to whoever they wanted to make it available. In terms of Skala as the end user, the equipment and provider being utilized would determine how well it would work. The software would allow the flexibility for people to participate remotely, vote, and provide comment, which was something they did not have at this time.

Thomas asked if the Council could take public comment live from it remotely because they were already broadcasting council meetings remotely. It would not be any different if it would not take comment remotely. Thompson replied staff had not envisioned using that technology for a council meeting unless a council member was participating virtually. It would be more complicated and rules would need to be established in order to take remote public comment. Although it seemed easy and straightforward, they would have to have policies in place, such as whether people would need to register in advance or if they could just show up and raise their hand. Thomas understood that when they had been discussing people participating remotely, it was essentially the same as people watching the live webcast, which was already done for council meetings and some boards and commissions. Thompson stated that was correct. If Council wanted to authorize public participation, it would be a next level issue. Thomas commented that it would be another big step to take live public comment remotely.

Treece asked if there was anything in the Sunshine Law that required them to take remote public comment. Thompson replied no. Treece asked if there was anything in the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) that required them to take remote public comment. Thompson replied no. Treece asked for some of the other ways people could provide public comment if they were not at the meeting. Thompson replied they allowed people to make comments in writing, whether it was snail mail or email, to the City Clerk or to the Council as whole or individually. They could also call anyone of them and submit verbal comments in that manner, or come in person to the meeting to speak. Treece asked if that was an acceptable accommodation to those that did not feel they could attend in person. Thompson replied yes. The one caveat was that if the Council was going to hold a completely virtual meeting, they would have to find some way to allow the public to participate virtually.

Fowler stated she had read the letter that had come from the Great Plains ADA Center, and it had made a compelling argument that they had been denying their citizens with medical and physical disabilities from being able to participate fully. Not only did the Disabilities Commission have trouble making a quorum when they held their meetings, but Fowler thought many of them likely wanted to testify tonight on this bill and be a part of the conversation. Fowler suggested they ask the Disabilities Commission for recommendations as to how their community could participate in meetings so they were

not disenfranchised from the decision making process after approving this equipment. Fowler believed staff was looking at the narrow path with regard to the law, and felt Columbia held itself to a higher standard. Fowler understood they were headed into a darker period with COVID due to the variants, and they would not have enough vaccine to vaccinate all community members until August or September if they were lucky. That would mean there would be an awful lot of decision making they would do without providing some the opportunity to comment. Fowler understood many members of the public did not feel it was sufficient to provide comments in writing as it did not necessarily receive the same weight or visibility. After seeing the letter from the Disabilities Commission, Fowler believed it was a much greater issue than she had previously thought when she had agreed to go along with the idea of requiring a quorum in the room. Fowler commented that the Council had shown an ability to be able to come to City Hall absent quarantine or isolation due to exposure, but they did not know that their board and commission members and the public had those abilities. Fowler stated she wanted them to approve this and purchase the equipment, and she then wanted them to come to a broader understanding of allowing the citizens to participate with them. It had been suggested to her that citizens could schedule public comment if there was a particular item they wanted to weigh in on, and whoever was administering the meeting could let them in at the appointed time. Fowler asked that they move with deliberate speed on determining how to accommodate those with medical and physical abilities, and to take seriously the letter they had received today from Kate Graham. Treece stated they had all received that letter and it would be incorporated with the items associated with this meeting.

Thomas understood there was a difference between the 4:00 p.m. email sent by the City Clerk and all of the other forms of testimony as the input received in the form of an email via the City Clerk was read out loud into the meeting record. The others were not as they came to them individually.

Glascok asked Chapdelaine for a timeline to make this operational should it be approved tonight. Chapdelaine replied it would take time to get the equipment and suggested they be allowed 8-10 weeks. Glascok understood it would not be up and running next week. Fowler understood and thought that would provide them time to work with the Disabilities Commission about what it needed to look like for them to have access.

Glascok pointed out this was not the end all in terms of cost as there would likely be an ongoing cost associated with it. Fowler understood City Channel staff was already here every day. Glascok noted this would involve Information Technology staff. Fowler asked if the City Channel staff was not capable of managing it. Glascok replied not if there was a problem. Chapdelaine explained there were both a video portion and a technology portion in terms of tracking and the hosting component. They would have to figure all of those things out to determine how it would work and who would have to be present for the meetings. Treece noted it was the responsibility of the chairs to recognize people when they spoke. Chapdelaine agreed.

Treece asked if the software allowed for real time or if there would be a delay. Treece pointed out the live stream and cable feeds for these meetings were slightly delayed. If someone was waiting to testify, they might have already moved on past that point. Chapdelaine replied staff would look into that issue as well.

Pitzer commented that the accommodation Fowler was suggesting might have come to their attention due to COVID, but was not a COVID specific accommodation. Pitzer understood the suggestion was for a permanent policy. Fowler stated that she was suggesting they utilize the system in that manner for the duration of COVID, which, by all estimations, would last several more months. Fowler noted she was not projecting beyond that as she felt that was another conversation. Pitzer pointed out it was likely that some people might not have been able to participate before, which was why he was stating it was not specific to just COVID. It might be more apparent now, but it was not a COVID specific issue. In addition, the letter they had received had referenced COVID

once or twice, but it was not about a response to COVID in terms of what was required under the ADA. Fowler stated she had not made that same leap and felt it was a response to COVID. A person with disabilities who might not drive could accept a ride from someone else, but it was not safe to accept a ride from someone that person did not shelter with at this time. Fowler thought it was a COVID related issue, and COVID would continue for a period of time. In addition, citizens with disabilities were the front line of being affected and cut out of the process. They also had other members of the community who were unable to come to the meetings because they had medically fragile conditions that they would not have known about had it not been for COVID. Fowler reiterated that they had left a lot of their citizens on the periphery of a decision making process that they wanted to be a part of, and for her it was about COVID.

Thomas understood specific hardware would be installed in the form of cameras for individual members of boards and commissions. Chapdelaine noted this bill would allow the purchase of 20 laptops. Thomas understood this would allow these meetings to take place in the Council Chamber and Conference Rooms 1A, 1B, and 1C. Chapdelaine stated they would have to look at the different locations, and they might be restricted to only a few. Thomas wanted to ensure they understood there were 50 or more boards and commissions that met in a variety of locations as some met in the Chamber of Commerce building. Thompson pointed out there might be some technological issues with meeting elsewhere because the system that was designed by the Information Technology Department actually contemplated using the microphones in the Council Chamber as opposed to using the microphone on the machine because when they had multiple people in the same room utilizing a camera and microphone, there was significant feedback. There were some technological issues that might restrict them to this room or Conference Room 1A and 1B if they could get microphones set up in there. It was a problem when they had some people participating in the room and others remotely. Thomas commented that he had participated in the last meeting remotely, which included a closed meeting that was held in Conference Room 1A and it had been virtually impossible to hear what had been said from his perspective. Chapdelaine stated the Council Chamber was the ideal location, which limited the number of meetings at any one time.

Treece asked if the City would provide a laptop if a board or commission member could not participate in person and did not have a laptop with a camera. Chapdelaine replied they would be able to provide the chair a laptop, but the others would have to provide their own. This would not accommodate everyone on every board. Treece understood the laptop would be for the duration of the meeting. Thompson stated it would only be provided for the meeting room. It would not be delivered to someone's home. Chapdelaine stated that was correct. Fowler agreed it should not leave the building, and that all of the equipment should stay in City Hall.

Skala understood there would be dedicated computers with cameras that would show them on screen in the Council Chamber, but if he was at home, he would need to utilize his own computer with a camera. Chapdelaine stated that was correct. Skala understood the software would work with both personal computers and the ones provided by the City and that the microphones were needed for sound quality, etc. Thompson stated that was correct.

Thompson explained the numbers were based on trying to accommodate the boards and commissions with the elevated "see and be seen" requirement whereby they could see each other's faces before voting for items such as property rights and due process standards. They were trying to ensure they had the minimum equipment for a PZC meeting as it had a large number of members. Thompson pointed out that not every room would accommodate this technology due to the audio issues.

Trapp made a motion to amend B45-21 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Treece and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B45-21, as amended, was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B46-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds from Fund Balances for FY 2020 encumbrances.

The bill was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Finance Director Matthew Lue provided a staff report.

Treece asked if anything in particular had caught his eye. Lue replied no. Lue explained this had been a learning experience, and noted this would be handled differently next year as the funds would be budgeted as part of the budget instead of encumbering them and moving them to the next year.

Treece asked why these items had not been included in the budget. Lue replied it was because they had been treated as encumbered funds in the past so they would be rolled into the next year increasing the authority to spend in the next year. Pitzer understood the money had been in last year's budget, but had not been spent. Lue stated that was correct.

Pitzer understood these would be handled differently next year. Lue stated that was correct. Pitzer understood that once it was budgeted, it would not matter if it was spent on September 30 or October 1. Lue stated that was correct because it would be in the budget.

Lue pointed out there would be some nuances, such as it being too late in the process whereby they could not actually budget it. Lue noted they would attempt to have everything in the original budget.

Pitzer stated he was glad they were doing this and had sent the list, but noted it was also not completely helpful to have a laundry list of items. As a result, he thought what Lue had indicated they would try to do would be an improvement.

Treece understood the Council had not been given the opportunity to determine if the department had sufficient funds without the knowledge that they had leftover funds. Pitzer stated that was correct.

Treece made a motion to amend B46-21 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B46-21, as amended, was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PITZER, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B35-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for sewer rehabilitation projects.

The bill was given second reading by the City Clerk.

Pitzer noted this would reappropriate funds from the Henderson Branch sewer extension, which had been defeated by Council. Pitzer commented that when the ratepayers had approved the bonds and the rate increases that had gone with the bonds, they had also approved the expansion and extension of the sewer system. Pitzer explained the ratepayers had been paying for an expansion and extension of the sewer system for 6-7 years, and that had not occurred. In addition, that money was now being reappropriated to projects that were not within the initial bond discussion. While there might be a need, Pitzer did not feel it was transparent to not disclose the additional cost to ratepayers, and it was being hidden by handling it in this manner. Pitzer commented that the ratepayers had been paying for an expansion that was not happening for 6-7 years, and the money was being reappropriated elsewhere now. Pitzer stated he wanted to see a more straightforward or transparent way of showing what that cost would be to the community and then make the decision as to whether to increase rates to pay for it.

Treece asked if the Henderson Branch sewer extension had been on the ballot. Pitzer

replied not specifically, but the ballot had said expansion and extension. Treece asked if they had expanded and extended the sewer system since the ballot was passed. Pitzer asked if it had been done with these bond funds. Treece commented that they would now be taking care of what they had with what the taxpayers had given them. Pitzer disagreed. Pitzer pointed out he had not brought up the issue to argue, and explained he had brought it up so he could vote against it.

Trapp noted he, like Pitzer, had voted for the extension and had been disappointed it had not moved forward, and pointed out there was still not a majority of Council in support of it so they could not spend this money on that project. Trapp commented that the bond projects were typical examples of things they could do. Trapp understood no particular project was an ironclad project when doing the bond sales because there was a recognition that things change. In that case, one could argue that the soil analysis had proved it was more expensive. Trapp noted these were appropriate maintenance issues and stated he was pleased 85 percent of the bond would go toward remediation versus expansion so if even more went toward remediation, he felt that was good. If they were ever able to get a majority of Council to agree to the expansion project, Trapp felt they could make other adjustments to pay for it.

Fowler commented that she had brought this to the attention of the City Manager as she had wondered how it had gotten on the list of possible projects to begin with and understood it had been at the request of a council member. Fowler stated the money that had been in the bond for the extension project had not been sufficient to complete the project, and there was not a cost-sharing agreement to cover the deficit, which was one of the reasons she and others had opposed it moving forward. Fowler explained she had been concerned about it being mentioned because she did not want people to be under the impression that it would be held in reserve and would happen. The Council had voted it down, and the escalation in price was the reason for voting it down. Fowler stated she was not sure she understood the concern of Pitzer. Fowler thought they could have perhaps reappropriated the money sooner rather than leaving it in some account, and if that was the concern, she would agree. Fowler also noted she did not want to open up an argument for a sewer extension that was outside of the urban service area and one they could not afford.

B35-21 was given third reading by the City Clerk with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: THOMAS, PETERS, TREECE, FOWLER, TRAPP, SKALA. VOTING NO: PITZER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

VII. CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B32-21 Approving the Final Plat of "W.W. Payne's Addition Plat 2" located on the north side of Broadway and the south side of Walnut Street (505 W. Broadway and 412½ W. Walnut Street) (Case No. 33-21).
- B33-21 Authorizing agreements for professional architectural services with Simon Oswald Associates, Inc., d/b/a SOA Architecture, for design of semi-permanent modifications to the Council Chamber dais and design of a Municipal Court dais that is ADA compliant; amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B34-21 Authorizing updates to the Home Performance with Energy Star® participating contractor agreement; authorizing the City Manager, or the Manager's designee, to enter into agreements with qualifying contractors relating to the Home Performance with Energy Star® program.

- B38-21 Accepting donated funds for the Parks and Recreation Department's Holiday Toys for Columbia's Youth Program; amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B39-21 Authorizing an aviation project consultant agreement with Burns & McDonnell Engineering Company, Inc. related to the procurement of aqueous film forming foam (AFFF) testing equipment to be used by aircraft rescue and firefighting vehicles at the Columbia Regional Airport; amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds.
- B40-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by adding and deleting positions in the Community Relations Department, City Utilities Department, Police Department, Convention and Visitors Bureau and Department of Public Health and Human Services; amending the FY 2021 Classification and Pay Plan by adding and closing classifications and changing a classification title; amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to unclassified service.
- B41-21 Authorizing an agreement renewal for the purchase of services with Boone County, Missouri, on behalf of the Boone County Children's Services Board, for the Teen Outreach Program (TOP).
- B42-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds to the Department of Public Health and Human Services for the reimbursement of costs related to the COVID-19 pandemic.
- B43-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds to the Fire Department - Emergency Services Division to cover overtime costs related to the COVID-19 pandemic.
- B44-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds for a property evaluation of City-owned buildings.
- R18-21 Authorizing a government product lease agreement with Quadient Leasing USA, Inc. for a mail processing postage meter.
- R19-21 Authorizing staff to proceed with the preliminary design and expenditure of funds associated with the proposed construction of the Hickory Hill Drive and Sunset Drive Private Common Collector Elimination Project (PCCE #28); directing that a public hearing be held upon completion of the preliminary plans.
- R20-21 Approving the Preliminary Plat of "Northland Acres Plat 3" located on the southeast corner of the Northland Drive and Range Line Street intersection (3206 Range Line Street) (Case No. 35-21).

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

VIII. NEW BUSINESS

None.

IX. INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B47-21 Approving a Major Revision to the PD Plan for "Columbia Plaza South" located on the southeast corner of Stadium Boulevard and Bernadette Drive (2010 Bernadette Drive); approving the design façade and construction elevations; granting a design exception to permit a drive-through window and lane in the front yard adjacent to Stadium Boulevard (Case No. 45-2021).
- B48-21 Rezoning property located at the southeast terminus of Scarborough Drive from District PD (Planned) to District R-1 (One-family Residential) (Case No. 37-2021).
- B49-21 Approving the Final Plat of "Cottages at Evergreen Place" located on the west side of Ballenger Lane and north of Dehaven Drive; authorizing a performance contract (Case No. 167-2020).
- B50-21 Authorizing a right of use permit with Boone County, Missouri, on behalf of its Office of Emergency Management, for the construction, improvement, operation and maintenance of warning sirens with supporting infrastructure in a portion of the Pergola Drive right-of-way.
- B51-21 Authorizing a first amendment to the small generator interconnection agreement with Truman Solar, LLC; authorizing a fourth amendment to the solar project power purchase agreement with Truman Solar, LLC.
- B52-21 Accepting conveyances for sewer and drainage purposes; accepting a Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenant.
- B53-21 Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B54-21 Authorizing an airport utility right of use license permit with Union Electric Company (d/b/a Ameren Missouri) for the installation and operation of natural gas supply lines and related equipment at the Columbia Regional Airport.
- B55-21 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for public health services in 2021.
- B56-21 Authorizing an agreement with Boone County, Missouri for animal control services in 2021.
- B57-21 Amending the FY 2021 Annual Budget by appropriating funds to re-establish a budget for temporary employee expenses in the Department of Public Health and Human Services - Health Promotion Division.
- B58-21 Authorizing an amendment to the collective bargaining agreement with Columbia Professional Firefighters I.A.F.F. Local 1055.

X. REPORTS

- REP9-21 Historic Preservation Commission - 45-Day Demolition Permit Application Review Period.

Treece commented that he had been on the Historic Preservation Commission (HPC)

when the 30-day period had been established and asked what the extra fifteen days would give them. Teddy replied the concern of the HPC was that they met monthly and often they would receive notice of a permit a day or two before or after their meeting so it was not timely to allow for a good discussion or to give notice of it.

Treece asked if 45 days was enough. Fowler replied she did not know, but it was what they had requested.

Trapp noted it was the only thing with teeth they had for historic preservation and would support a longer review period. Trapp understood there was an emergency clause if the building was a hazard. Teddy stated they could order demolition immediately if it was a public nuisance. Trapp commented that he thought 60 days might be more appropriate than 45 days to provide enough time for deliberation regardless of a meeting schedule.

Treece noted the HPC had requested 45 days and suggested they request legislation be prepared to accommodate the 45 days, which they could then amend if so desired. Trapp was agreeable.

REP10-21 Citizens Police Review Board - Request to Televis Meetings and Requested Change to Section 21-46(c).

Treece understood a meeting was scheduled with the Citizens Police Review Board (CPRB) on February 10, and suggested they discuss these issues with them in the context of everything. They could then decide if they wanted to move forward with the changes recommended by the CPRB.

Trapp understood Fowler had indicated to the City Manager the desire to have a conversation regarding the agenda for the February 10 meeting with the Chair of the CPRB, and noted he was agreeable to her taking the lead since she had been genesis for it.

Fowler provided a handout of a draft agenda, and understood all of the council members were able to attend on February 10. Fowler stated they might not be able to have tables, but noted it appeared as though there was plenty of room in the Council Chamber for them to spread out in some fashion. In addition, if they wanted to speak, they could potentially step to the microphone. From her perspective, the importance in setting up for this meeting was that the discussion be recorded so others could listen to it and be a part of understanding the decision making process.

Treece asked Fowler if she meant livestream or just recorded to be posted later. Fowler replied it could be posted later.

Glascok commented that they would not be able to fit all of the Council and CPRB members along with the public in the Council Chamber. As a result, they had planned to hold it at the Hampton Inn on Stadium Boulevard, and it would be recorded. Peters asked how many members of the public were anticipated to attend. Glascok replied he was not sure.

Fowler stated she had not been aware that staff was looking at an off-site location and felt that sounded drastic. Fowler noted she was okay with the CPRB being at the dais and the Council being in the audience since they would be attending the CPRB meeting. In terms of the public, they had the ability to accommodate people in the lobby. Fowler pointed out she was not anticipating public comment. It would essentially be a work session during a time the CPRB normally met. Fowler stated she did not feel comfortable going off-premises. Fowler noted the Council Chamber was essentially a television station and people were accustomed to being there. Glascok explained that had not been the direction previously given as he understood the desire was for all of the participants to be on the same level and for the public to be able to attend, and that had been what they were trying to accommodate. Glascok noted they could accommodate something different and only needed to know the desire of Council. Fowler commented that she had received in an email with five choices and had responded by saying the most important thing was for an informal discussion to be held, and for that discussion to

be recorded so people could watch it later. Fowler apologized if she had sent staff on a path of looking for alternative space.

Fowler commented that at the request of the CPRB Chair, the agenda items would include two priority items and a few other non-priority items, and she was not sure any of them were designed to allow for public comment. Fowler viewed this as an opportunity for Council to talk with one of their boards regarding relevant issues of concern. Fowler reiterated she felt this room would work well with what they were trying to accomplish. If they could not be accommodated in a semicircle type format, the Council could sit in the gallery because they were going to the CPRB meeting. Treece agreed they should try to make it work in the Council Chamber. Glascock noted they would set it up in there.

Skala asked for clarification regarding the public as it was a CPRB meeting and they usually accommodated the public. Treece replied it was only required if their agenda indicated they would allow public comment, and he would suggest it be handled as more of an informal meeting between the Council and the CPRB. Skala understood the public could be in attendance. Treece stated that was correct, and noted it was a public meeting. They would not livestream it and they would not take public comment. Treece suggested it not last more than about 90 minutes. In addition to the Council, Treece thought they might want the City Manager, the Deputy City Manager, the City Counselor, the Assistant City Counselor that staffed the CPRB, and the Police Chief in attendance. Fowler agreed and noted any extra spaces could hold the public, and the lobby could accommodate overflow.

Treece asked about the tentative agenda. Fowler replied the highlighted items were the items the Chair and Vice Chair of the CPRB saw as their priorities. Treece thought they could get through 7 and 8. Treece also felt it was a CPRB meeting, and it was up to them to try to get through it. Fowler agreed the Council was there to listen and try to problem solve with them. Fowler pointed out it was also not the end of the conversation either as more substantive conversations might be had in the future.

Peters commented the first six items on the draft agenda appeared to be secondary priorities. Fowler stated they could reorder it. Treece explained he was not sure they should as he thought they would need some opening comments along with a look back as to how they got to this point, the national standards, the local ordinances, state statutes, etc. Fowler noted the Chair of the CPRB was ready for this conversation. Peters stated she was agreeable with the agenda. Fowler commented that she was happy to edit it as necessary. Peters explained her only concern was trying to get through everything within 90 minutes. Skala agreed that was his concern as well. Peters understood they could meet again in a few months if necessary.

Fowler explained she thought they were trying to get back on a path of positive interactions and rebuilding trust around policing and their citizens. Fowler felt this was an important opportunity for them to listen to the frustrations of the CPRB in terms of improving trust between the community and the police.

Fowler apologized to the staff for the extra work she might have created in terms of meeting space and accommodations. Glascock said it was not a problem, and explained they had just been trying to accommodate her desires.

Thompson commented that if they were going to have a full room, they would likely have to livestream because the Sunshine Law required public access. If they had overflow in Conference Room 1A/1B, there would need to be a live recording. It did not necessarily need to be broadcasted, but would need to be filmed and projected at least internally in this building. Amin noted the meeting could be livestreamed without an extra staff person if necessary. Treece understood livestreaming was not necessary to broadcast what was happening in the Council Chamber to Conference Room 1A/1B. Thompson stated that was correct, and noted she had used the wrong term. It would only need to be internally projected. Treece understood the cameras would be on, but it would not be livestreamed.

REP11-21

Citizens Police Review Board - Supplement to the 2019 Annual Report.

Treece commented that this was supplemental to the annual report that showed a

breakdown of demographics for complainants. The CPRB had not drawn any conclusions and had indicated they were monitoring it.

REP12-21

Wastewater and Stormwater Integrated Management Plan 5-Year Action Plan Annual Summary.

Utilities Director David Sorrell provided a staff report.

Peters asked how long this plan would last and for the milestones associated with it other than reporting it to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources (DNR). Peters wondered where they needed to be and if they were anywhere near that point. Sorrell replied the plan included the goals they hoped to achieve in the first five years along with where they were at with each one of those goals. The idea was to reevaluate the entire plan toward the end of the five years and include any new regulatory requirements or new operational or maintenance needs along with updating the next five-year action plan that could be tied to their next permit renewal. Peters asked Sorrell if he thought they were making good progress. Sorrell replied he thought they were, and noted part of the appropriation passed earlier tonight would help them achieve that five-year plan. Sorrell stated they were on track to meet the goals of the five-year action plan.

Peters understood that at one point they did not have enough people to actually do the work in terms of the sewer lining projects, and asked for a status. Sorrell replied they had just entered into a new contract for a term and supply contract for a sewer line, which would allow them to make some progress.

XI. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Thomas stated they had previously discussed selecting an election date to place the use tax on the ballot, and asked if there had been any further discussions while he was gone as he had missed a couple of meetings. Thomas also wondered if it would get through the Missouri legislature this session. Peters stated she did not think they would put it on the ballot locally until they knew the State would facilitate collection. Treece explained an agreement had been reached in the Missouri Senate between the conservative caucus and the other two parties, and the agreement was essentially where they had ended up in the last two weeks of the legislative session in 2020. It authorized a use tax, phasing out the cable franchise fee over 5-7 years to about 2.5 percent, the creation of a task force, and ballot language that more adequately informed voters that it would level the playing field between brick and mortar and online retailers. Thomas asked about the ballot language. Treece replied it had been something the Governor had vetoed since it had been within some unrelated legislation. Treece pointed out this deal was only good in the Senate, but it did get the bill out of the Senate to a House that was still hostile to it at this point. If it passed, Treece did not think the votes were there for an emergency clause, which required a two-thirds vote, so that meant the Governor would have until July 1 or July 15 to sign it. In addition, the bill would not take effect until August 28. It would likely be impossible for the City to put something on the April ballot because the deadline had passed. It would be difficult to put something on the August ballot. Thomas understood that decision would have to be made in May. Treece stated that was correct, and explained they were really looking at November or later. Thomas understood it would be huge risk to put it on the ballot prior to actions at the State level. Treece agreed. Treece pointed out they might not see revenue until 2022 if they were able to get it on the ballot and passed in November. Thompson noted it would be the first full quarter after the first quarter.

Fowler understood they were discussing when to put the park sales tax on the ballot and that it would be a bad idea for it to go with the use tax. Treece stated he thought those should be kept separate. Glascock noted the park sales tax would be placed on the November ballot if approved by Council.

Fowler asked how they could move forward given the Disabilities Commission had a

strong opinion and wanted to influence their ability about allowing remote public comment while they were waiting for the equipment, etc. Fowler explained she did not want to speak for them as she preferred they spoke for themselves. Fowler noted they were having trouble getting a quorum. Treece understood they had been unable to get an in-person quorum. Fowler stated that was correct.

Thompson understood they had held at least one meeting, but she was not sure they had held any others. Their agendas had not been heavy lately so they had not been trying to force the issue with a number of the members. They could reach out to them individually for feedback, but they could not be polled.

Skala wondered if one or more of their members could attend the council meeting to express their opinions. Fowler stated she could reach out and ask if someone could attend, but it would be that person's opinion. Fowler noted she wanted them to take the concerns of the Disabilities Commission seriously and move forward in finding a resolution.

Trapp commented that a constituent of Fowler's had contacted him regarding a chaotic scene at Wilkes Boulevard Church during the Loaves and Fishes food program. Trapp wondered if there was any capability for extra police presence as it would be appreciated. It was an inadequate facility run by volunteers as part of their essential safety-net food program. Trapp asked that extra police presence be accommodated.

Treece asked if there was any objection.

Fowler commented that they recently had a neighborhood association meeting and there was concern with regard to people getting picked up and taken to the Boone County Jail. As a result, a lot of the neighbors were not contacting the police when incidents were happening at and around the Church. Fowler noted the neighborhood had asked for stakeholders to be present at the next neighborhood meeting for some solution based conversations. Fowler reiterated the neighbors were clear they did not want people to be arrested unnecessarily.

Trapp commented that he had participated in the police ride along, the police had proactively stopped by, and it had been something Brad Bryan had requested in the past from time to time. Trapp did not view it as an enforcement action. It was more relationship building and a presence that set a tone. Trapp noted police overtime was done at Room at the Inn and there had never been an arrest situation.

XII. ADJOURNMENT

Treece adjourned the meeting without objection at 12:10 a.m.