

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
DECEMBER 1, 2014**

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, December 1, 2014, in the Council Chamber of the City of Columbia, Missouri. The Pledge of Allegiance was recited, and the roll was taken with the following results: Council Members CHADWICK, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE and MCDAVID were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

Ms. Hoppe asked that the last sentence in the second to last paragraph under B339-14 in the November 17, 2014 meeting minutes be changed from “about 20 years” to “about 20 years ago.”

Mr. Thomas asked that the references under B325-14 to the streets without sidewalks be changed from “300 linear feet” to “300 linear miles.”

The minutes of the regular meeting of November 17, 2014 with the changes requested by Ms. Hoppe and Mr. Thomas were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Ms. Hoppe.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Mayor McDavid asked that B362-14 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

Ms. Nauser asked that B367-14 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

Mr. Thomas asked that B351-14 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B351-14, B362-14 and B367-14 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Hoppe and a second by Ms. Chadwick.

SPECIAL ITEMS

None.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None.

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

Jeff Stack – Emergency shelter for the homeless.

Mayor McDavid explained Mr. Stack had withdrawn his request to speak.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

B356-14 Authorizing construction of improvements to the Albert-Oakland Family Aquatic Center located within Albert-Oakland Park; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Griggs provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

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

B356-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: CHADWICK, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

(A) Construction of the Woodrail Sewer Replacement Project.

Item A was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid presumed placing the sewer above ground was considered a best practice 40 years ago. Mr. Glascock stated he would never consider placing a sewer line above ground as best practice. Mayor McDavid understood it was clearly not a best practice now, and asked if there were other similar situations within the City. Mr. Glascock replied the City had aials, which came out of the ground, crossed a creek, and went back into the ground, but noted the City tried to avoid sewer lines above ground.

Mayor McDavid asked if the City was seeing a flurry of projects like this. Mr. Glascock replied no, and explained this had just been a problem in the past.

Ms. Hoppe understood this sewer was installed during the 1970s and the City was no longer allowing that type of sewer installation.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Richard Royer, 1515 Woodrail Avenue, stated he represented the Woodrail Home Owners Association No. 4, and explained the ground for this proposed project was their responsibility as it was common ground to the Neighborhood Association. He noted there had not been comments, objections, or questions from any neighbors, and that the Association was supportive of the project. He pointed out the Association Board would only ask that the easement documents be reviewed by their legal counsel and properly executed, that they be consulted on any material changes made during and after the bid process as they felt the drawings presented were representative of the project, and that the contractor be required to restrict activity to digging and chipping as they did not want any blasting in close proximity to any residences and that they be consulted if there was a desire to move in that direction.

Mr. Glascock stated he believed staff could accommodate the requests of Mr. Royer.

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

Ms. Nauser asked if Mr. Royer's requests needed to be included in the motion for approval. Mr. Glascock replied he did not believe so, and noted those requests would be included in the plans and specifications.

Ms. Nauser made a motion directing staff to proceed with final plans, specifications, and construction of the Woodrail Sewer Replacement Project. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

OLD BUSINESS

B328-14 Amending Chapter 12 of the City Code to add a new Article V pertaining to employment opportunities for qualified applicants.

The bill was given third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Reharde stated Dan Hanneken, a member of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence, would provide an explanation as to why the Task Force had submitted this for Council consideration.

Mr. Hanneken noted Ban the Box was a national trend to remove the felony question from job applications, and to postpone the inquiry of a criminal history to later in the hiring process. He understood 13 states and 69 local jurisdictions had already adopted such a policy, and while there were not a lot of predictors for violent crime, it was highly correlated with poverty and equality in the blue collar workforce. He stated one in four American adults had some type of criminal record, and current technology, made it harder to find employment. He pointed out full-time employment was the greatest predictor for success among released offenders, and the recidivism rate for those employed full-time upon release from prison was 30 percent less than those not employed full-time. He thought they would want these individuals contributing to the tax base instead of drawing from it as the cost of incarceration was high. He explained the proposed Ban the Box legislation was a small and important piece of the solution to reduce crime, particularly violent crime, as it would create a more level playing field for those in the community with a criminal history by prohibiting blanket bans by companies against ex-felons. He noted research indicated two out of three employers would not knowingly hire someone with a felony conviction, and the other third would likely discriminate against the person with a felony conviction if all else was equal. He commented that the Ban the Box policy would allow employers to look for employees that were best qualified for the job, and would allow them to inquire about a criminal history later in the process.

Mr. Reharde provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser understood the City had employed this process for some time now, and asked if there had been any problems or if it had been overly burdensome. Ms. Buckler replied the City had removed the box from the applications over two years ago and there had not been any adverse effects, but pointed out the City currently conducted background checks on many jobs prior to making an offer for employment so this ordinance change would require the City to change its practices. She noted the City had employed people with felony convictions, and consideration was given to the type of job and the reason for the felony. She stated the City had not had any adverse effect, and reiterated this ordinance would require them to slightly change their practices.

Mr. Skala commented that the Council had received a letter from David Overfelt, who was the President of the Missouri Retailers Association, asking for consideration to not look at a criminal record until the applicant was selected for an interview or prior to the conditional offer if an interview was not conducted as that was consistent with Minnesota and Illinois laws, and asked if that would be acceptable. Mr. Hanneken replied different jurisdictions had implemented the policy with different language, so some were more convenient for employers, but those would also be less effective in terms of the ultimate goal of improving

employment opportunities for people with criminal histories. If this proposed ordinance was passed, Columbia would have a more effective policy even though it would require a little more sacrifice from employers. He noted his concern with the Illinois law was that an employer would not schedule an interview or would cancel the interview if a background check was done at that point. He understood some employers were concerned about the amount of work it would take to get to the point of a conditional offer, and then not be able to hire the person due to a criminal history, but felt employers would likely have alternative candidates in mind. He did not believe it would be necessary to start the entire process over again.

Mayor McDavid explained he endorsed removing the question of previous criminal history from the job application, and asked for clarification with regard to a conditional job offer. Mr. Matthes replied the City routinely provided conditional job offers in that the offer was conditional upon the applicant passing a drug test. He thought this legislation would add another condition the applicant would have to pass in order to be hired.

Mayor McDavid understood only four municipalities had enacted language to encompass the private sector and asked if that was correct. Mr. Hanneken replied he did not have a count, but thought the law in the State of Hawaii applied to private employers as well.

Mayor McDavid asked who would be considered an employer. He wondered if he would be considered an employer if he hired a daycare or healthcare worker for his 85 year old mother. Ms. Thompson replied a person or entity was considered an employer if they paid wages. She did not believe this would apply to someone hiring an independent contractor. If the person hired was paid wages like a typical employer/employee relationship, a conditional job offer would have to be made prior to conducting the background check. Mayor McDavid did not feel there was a way to enforce this if someone conducted a CaseNet search prior to making a conditional job offer because there was no way for a prospective employee to know whether CaseNet had been reviewed.

Mayor McDavid understood a landscaper for a person's home would be considered a contract employee and would require a conditional offer prior to conducting the background check. Ms. Thompson explained the hiring of an independent contractor was not necessarily an employment relationship. Mayor McDavid asked if the same was true for someone cleaning homes. Ms. Thompson replied it would depend on the relationship, and whether withholdings on wages were necessary. Mayor McDavid stated he was confused by that part of the process and hoped it was clarified.

Mr. Trapp asked if it was any more difficult to prove whether or not someone conducted a background check than the current mandate of the Human Rights Commission with regard to discrimination. He wondered if something in the ordinance made it more difficult than the current mandate. Ms. Thompson replied both were fact-driven and dependent upon the evidence to prove whether or not a violation had occurred. Mr. Trapp understood it was similar to current law.

Ms. Hoppe understood someone with a live-in babysitter or homecare provider might or might not fall under this legislation depending on whether the person was employed as per that definition. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct as the person would have to be an employee for this ordinance to impact them.

Mr. Thomas asked if there was specific IRS criterion that distinguished an employee and a contractor. Ms. Thompson replied she did not believe the City wanted to make those determinations. She believed it would be an IRS determination as to whether or not an individual was an employee for the purposes of withholding, etc.

Ms. Chadwick understood it was pretty clear to a business whether someone was an employee or contract employee based on the forms filed, whether they were paying social security, whether they were completing a 1099, etc. Ms. Thompson stated that was correct.

Matt McCormick, 300 S. Providence, explained he was the President of the Columbia Chamber of Commerce and noted they represented more than 1,100 businesses that employed a little over 51,000 employees in Columbia and Boone County. He understood this ordinance would require employers to eliminate the checkbox asking applicants whether they had ever been convicted of a felony from employment applications, and noted their members were supportive of the elimination of that box as number of businesses in the Columbia area had already removed the box from their applications. He asked the Council to remove the paragraph that eliminated the opportunity for an employer to inquire, question, or otherwise seek information as to whether an applicant had ever been arrested, charged, or convicted of a crime until after the applicant had received a conditional offer of employment. He explained this request was based upon the fact that while larger companies might be able to absorb the time and resources it would take to comply with the ordinance, smaller businesses feared they would suffer in terms of time and money. In addition, both large and small businesses feared they would be open for possible litigation as a result of this process. He understood some companies would be exempt from the ordinance based on federal compliance, and this would put those not exempt at a disadvantage for attracting quality employees. They also found a number of their businesses did not fall under the federal guidelines for an exemption to this ordinance even if a majority of their clients were school districts, which would not allow the businesses it worked with to hire people with past criminal histories. He commented that he believed waiting until a conditional offer was made was inefficient, slowed the hiring process, and took away the opportunity of the applicant to explain the prior conviction. He asked the Council to remove Section 12-90(a)(2) from the ordinance. He reiterated the Chamber agreed banning the box was the right thing to do, and thought the City could later determine if other language could be added to the ordinance to help people enter the workforce and help employees and employers in getting together for meaningful employment.

Tyree Byndom, 4601 Alan Lane, commented that he had spent about 15 years in human resources at a local staffing service, which included a lot of the temporary staffing at the City of Columbia for over a decade. He noted the first question most individuals looking for a job would ask was whether his company hired felons, and he would tell them to not label themselves as a felon until he had the opportunity to see their humanity. He stated those released from jail would come to him because they knew he would give them an opportunity to show their humanity prior to judging them for a mistake. He asked whether a child making a mistake should be considered a second-class citizen for the rest of his life. He believed this ordinance, as it was written, was important because most employers looked up applicants on CaseNet and did not hire felons. They did not try to hire the most educated or qualified

person for the position. He reiterated he supported the Ban the Box ordinance, as it was currently written, to help purge the culture of creating second-class citizens.

Marcus Buford, Ashland, Missouri, explained he was born and raised in Columbia, Missouri and had lived in Columbia until January, and the box on employment and rental applications had hampered his life significantly. He noted he had been convicted of a drug possession charge and a stealing charge in 1991 as he had been on drugs and had stolen to try to obtain more drugs. He stated he was currently the Executive Director of Operation KITE, a local non-profit organization that provided free transportation to families that could not afford to travel to prisons to see their families as he understood the meaning of a visit when incarcerated. He explained he had purchased a mobile home in January, but had been denied a place to put it 3-4 times locally and the people he purchased it from provided him a place for it in Ashland, which was why he resided there now. He stated he had flooded the job market in order to find employment, and was finally accepted by Caterpillar in Boonville, so he commuted from Ashland through Columbia to Boonville, but he was in Columbia daily with Operation KITE. He noted he had recently accepted a position at a warehouse in Fulton, primarily because Fulton was closer to Ashland than Boonville. He commented that he appreciated the City's efforts and attention with regard to this matter, and hoped there would be progress to the point of providing everyone a fair chance as he was currently hampered by having to live in Ashland and work in Boonville/Fulton instead of Columbia, even though he had been born and raised in Columbia.

Cameron Dunafon, 4906 Fall Brook Drive, stated his company employed approximately 250 employees in Columbia, and they had not had a box on their application for approximately two years. He believed there had been an advantage to removing it as it no longer created an integrity issue. He felt applicants were afraid to be truthful when the box was on the application, and not having the box allowed for an honest discussion with the people his business tended to employ. He commented that his business had open positions all of the time, and he felt as though they could not find enough employees, but he believed Section 12-90(a)(2) would create a disadvantage because requiring a conditional offer prior to a background check would add time to the process and delay the opportunity for people to be employed. He noted his business was a cash business that employed younger individuals so they were concerned about theft and violence, but they did not have a blanket policy. He reiterated the removal of the box from the application eliminated the blanket policy that was likely not intended along with any integrity issues as it allowed for communication with a potential employee, and had provided several people a chance to be employed.

Brian Waller, 615 W. Rollins Road, stated he was speaking on behalf of Shelter Insurance and noted federal law prohibited them from hiring certain felons, but not all felons, as it depended upon the class of felony. They had already changed their hiring process to meet the requirements of the proposed ordinance as their application only discussed the certain classes of felonies that would prohibit them from hiring someone. They would not address the other types of felonies until after the conditional offer was made. He stated his appreciation of the time those involved had spent in educating and listening to them.

Jon Galloway, 1400 Veterans United Drive, explained he was the Vice President of Government Affairs with Veterans United Home Loans and thanked the Council and staff for

speaking with various members of their company regarding this proposed ordinance. He noted they were severely restricted in their hiring practices because they were a licensed financial institution and were required by law to determine the criminal histories of all applicants, which included felonies and misdemeanors. They could not exercise any discretion regarding certain criminal offenses and were prohibited by law from hiring individuals that had committed a felony and certain misdemeanors. He commented that laws, such as the one proposed by the City, could create unintended consequences, but he did not believe there were any unintended consequences with this proposed ordinance with regard to his company.

Mayor McDavid commented that he was not comfortable with Section 12-90(a)(2) because he felt small employers would not have the sophistication to monitor it and individual citizens that employed people would have difficulty complying with it. He also believed it would be unenforceable because it would be difficult to prove someone had reviewed CaseNet, and thought it might create more litigation.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend B328-14 by striking Section 12-90(a)(2). The motion died for lack of a second.

Mr. Skala stated he supported this legislation as he believed in rehabilitation and second chances. He understood there might be some difficulty in terms of the enforceability of this ordinance, but felt this was an attempt to change the culture and the challenge to integrity in terms of encouraging people to lie on their application. He did not believe Section 12-90(a)(2) would prevent employers from taking the necessary care to protect their interests.

Mr. Thomas stated he would support this proposal as well as he believed the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence had thought through all associated with the nuances of this proposed law. He thought the criminal justice system had a lot of flaws as it systematically disadvantaged the same people over and over, and although the Council could not correct the criminal justice system, they could take this important step. He understood the concerns of employers and agreed this would be an inconvenience and create inefficiency in some cases, but felt the benefit to individuals that were disadvantaged frequently and to society as a whole was greater than that inconvenience.

Ms. Hoppe explained she had a unique perspective as she had spent 23 years working in the public defender system and had seen many innocent people convicted and many guilty people not convicted. She agreed the criminal justice system was very flawed, and people of color and of lower income were arrested and convicted much more frequently and inequitably than others. She commented that even if the box continued to show up on applications, employers could hire someone that had committed a crime that was not caught or convicted. She noted they knew those that were fully employed had the best chance of living a law-abiding life as they would be able to support themselves and their families and contribute to the community, and felt the passage of this proposed ordinance was a small step in that direction. She understood there would be some inconveniences and delays, but believed the overall benefits far outweighed the problems.

Ms. Nauser commented that she probably would have had a different opinion about this issue 10 years ago, but after working in the juvenile system, she had seen and heard compelling stories of the impact of a criminal history in finding a job. She noted the United

States had the highest incarceration rate in the world, and believed changes needed to be made. She explained she and her husband owned a business so she understood the implication this would have on businesses. She pointed out she had received many conditional job offers throughout her career that were pursuant to a financial background check, a criminal background check, or a drug test. It had not impeded her employers from hiring her once they determined there were no issues or from discussing any issues. She understood the concerns of some small businesses, but did not feel the burden of the proposed ordinance would be overwhelming. She thought they needed to try to end this blanket discrimination as she did not feel someone that made a mistake should be continually penalized for it. She asked if someone that had lived a clean life for 30 years should be penalized and not be considered for a job or have the opportunity to discuss how they had changed and could now contribute to society. She agreed there might be some enforceability issues, but believed those could be worked through. She stated she would support the proposed ordinance as written.

Mr. Trapp commented that he believed employers were already at risk of violating Title VII of the Civil Rights Act for asking the blanket felony question as there were racial disparities with regard to certain felony convictions, and as a result, he believed the proposed ordinance would reduce the chance of litigation. He noted the Human Rights Commission had a great track record of education and negotiation instead of prosecution in resolving issues. He explained this process had already started a dialogue and had created changes in the hiring practices of some local employers. He commented that they all wanted a prosperous economy and to be safe from violent crime, and this was fundamentally a measure to reduce violent crime as it would provide people with a second chance. He noted he worked for a non-profit that already followed these policies so he understood the issue of having to move on from the preferred candidate to the second choice, but pointed out the intent was to improve the community and public safety. He explained they had to do something to address the perception that the crime rate was high in Columbia as that affected the business community in terms of recruiting people to work and people to start businesses within the City. He stated this proposed ordinance was a small step forward in that effort.

Ms. Chadwick commented that there were many opportunities for the City to change the social detriments to the health that shaped the outcome of members of the community, and allowing individuals the opportunity to participate in the workforce was beneficial on many levels. She noted there was a stigma to having a felony conviction and believed it was time to move past the idea that a felony conviction made someone a second-class citizen. She felt this was an opportunity for the Council to make policy that would benefit the community. She thanked the Task Force for working on this issue and stated she was in support of the ordinance.

The vote on B328-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: CHADWICK, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B350-14 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code relating to on-street parking enforcement hours.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Debbie Sheals, 406 W. Broadway, stated she was speaking on behalf of the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) and commented that they believed this small change would be good for downtown. She noted parking meters were very important in the downtown, and felt they should be used as a tool to manage parking behavior more than a source of income. As a result, they felt the enforcement hours should be from 9:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m., when demand was higher, instead of adding an extra hour. Also, the addition of the extra hour meant the City had to staff the streets for another hour when parking demand was low. She pointed out this would be helpful for downtown residents as many of those residents had to feed the meter from 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. prior to leaving for work. In addition, this would assist anyone that had left a car downtown from the night before as they would have until 9:00 a.m. to move it instead of 8:00 a.m. She thanked the Council for its support of a future parking commission and believed this was the type of situation a parking commission could help address.

Ms. Hoppe explained the Council had received a letter from the Downtown CID recommending 1-3 month grace period for fines from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m., and asked for clarification. Ms. Sheals replied the Downtown CID wanted to be as friendly as possible with regard to the change in enforcement hours as it would be a shock to many people, and they did not want those that regularly parked surprised with a ticket. They believed a grace period would assist in that someone would find a flier notifying them of the change instead of a ticket during that 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. time frame. She noted the Downtown CID marketing director was already designing posters to place in shop windows to inform people as well.

Ms. Hoppe asked if the Council needed to add the suggestion of the grace period to the ordinance. Mr. Matthes replied he thought the Council could amend the effective date, which would allow the City to start warning people in January. Mayor McDavid asked for the current start date for the new enforcement hours. Mr. Glascock replied January 1.

Mayor McDavid understood Ms. Hoppe could offer an amendment to start the new enforcement hours on April 1. Ms. Chadwick thought the ordinance could still be effective January 1. Mr. Thomas agreed and noted the City would stop enforcing the 8:00 a.m. to 9:00 a.m. hour on January 1. Ms. Hoppe suggested the effective date remain January 1 and the City issue warning tickets for one month. Ms. Chadwick stated she would recommend the ordinance be effective January 1, and the City could issue a warning instead of a ticket from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. because they still wanted the meters to be paid, but if they were not paid, they could explain the change through a warning.

Ms. Thompson commented that she believed the warning could be done by an administrative direction to the manager. She thought the effective date for all of the changes in enforcement hours should be made at the same time as signage needed to be installed on the meters and public education would be needed. She reiterated the decision to issue citations between 6:00 p.m. and 7:00 p.m. was an administrative function and did not require

an amendment to this ordinance. She suggested a separate motion to suspend enforcement from 6:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m. at the end of the Council Meeting.

Ms. Chadwick asked if staff felt they could make that change by January 1 in terms of signage, etc. Mr. Glascock replied yes.

Ms. Nauser commented that she thought placing notes on everyone's vehicles would be a costly endeavor. Mr. Glascock explained only those people in violation would receive a warning. Ms. Hoppe agreed, and noted she hoped most people would know the meter would have to be paid until 7:00 p.m. and would feed the meter. Mr. Glascock pointed out the City did not normally start ticketing the day an ordinance change was effective. They would try to educate the citizens with the assistance of the Downtown CID. He understood the Downtown CID placed information in store windows the last time meter costs had changed.

Mr. Thomas noted the purpose of this bill was to move forward with the recommendation of the Downtown Parking Task Force. He understood there might be reasons for greater changes to the parking laws, but thought they should wait to make those types of changes until after a workshop on parking was held in early 2015.

Ms. Chadwick thanked the Downtown CID for bringing this issue to the Council and for assisting with signage and education.

B350-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: CHADWICK, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B351-14 Authorizing application for public transit planning, operating and capital assistance grants with the Federal Transit Administration.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood the City had planned to issue a request for proposals within the next several months for a consultant to review City's transit operations and system design and to help with a long-range plan for serving customer demand in the future, and asked if there were grants available that would assist with that planning activity. Mr. Glascock replied possibly. He explained this ordinance would allow them to apply for all grants, and included operating grants.

Mr. Thomas asked for the match requirement of the City for Federal Transit Administration grants. Mr. Glascock replied operating grants had a 50/50 cost share and capital grants had an 80/20 cost share. He noted he did not know what the cost share requirement would be for planning grants, but assumed they would be in the 80/20 range. Mr. Thomas asked staff to look out for those planning grant opportunities.

B351-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: CHADWICK, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B362-14 Establishing plan year 2015 active employee and COBRA medical, dental and vision premium rates, and non-Medicare medical, retiree dental and Medicare retiree medical and dental premium rates; providing for payroll withholdings; adopting the Choice Plus \$750 Plan, the Choice Plus \$1,500 Plan, the Choice Plus \$2,500 High Deductible Health Plan and the Group Dental Plan for the City of Columbia.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Ms. Buckler provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked for the total cost of healthcare coverage for City employees paid by the City. Ms. Buckler replied the cost for the entire plan was about \$14 million, and it included medical, dental, and post-65 retirees, life insurance, total long-term disability, and other City administered plans.

Mayor McDavid understood Exhibit A indicated domestic partners with children would pay \$5,000 a year less than a married couple with children in the \$2,500 high deductible plan, and asked for clarification as it had been brought to his attention by a constituent. Ms. Buckler replied the lower rate for married and domestic partners was because both were employees of the City. Mayor McDavid understood both had to be City employees. Ms. Buckler stated that was correct.

Mayor McDavid understood the cost was almost \$12,000 per employee. Ms. Buckler stated it was about \$10,000 per employee, and the City had 1,455 employees and covered about 2,600 people. Mayor McDavid stated it was an expensive proposition, and as a result, he thought they owed the public information with regard to how they stood against comparable employers, and asked if that information could be provided in the future. He thought they should show whether they were in line with Columbia Public Schools, the University of Missouri, etc. He believed the City's health benefits were in line with the national average and the private sector, but wanted that information during the budget next year so they could show they were fair to employees while being as frugal as possible. Ms. Buckler pointed out that the City's per member per month cost on claims had gone from \$217 to \$172 so the rate was less than three percent on the medical side. The pharmacy numbers were higher.

Mr. Skala understood the City had a different mission as a non-profit governmental entity than the private sector, and as a result, the City had the reputation of providing some additional benefits to retain the best qualified workers for this type of governmental mission. He thought they had comparable rates with other municipalities with the same mission and with some private entities. Ms. Buckler replied she thought the rates were comparable, and explained they tried to not out-price or overtax since they had control over their own rates.

Ms. Hoppe stated she assumed part of the reason the claims were decreasing was due to the vigorous and proactive healthy employee programs the City had. Ms. Buckler stated she thought the City's wellness programs helped, but believed the change was largely driven by the migration to the high deductible health plan.

Ms. Chadwick commented that she had talked to a transit driver the City had recently made full-time, and he had indicated that his son had received his first well-child visit in years. She stated preventive healthcare was important and was glad the City provided it for their employees.

B362-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: CHADWICK, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B367-14 Authorizing the Chief of Police to apply for grants and execute grant agreements for law enforcement activities.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Chief Burton provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser explained she was supportive of providing the authority to acquire grants, and wanted to know the general philosophy for applying for grants. She noted the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence had recommended more diversity training, community engagement, etc., and wondered if the City was focusing on grants that allowed for equipment and other services or if they applied for what was available, etc. Chief Burton replied they applied for what was out there if it was something they needed, and very little of it was equipment related. He noted they received Byrne grant funding, which was shared with Boone County, and they had to purchase equipment with it. He pointed out he had applied for the COPS grants to add officers since he had come to Columbia, but they had never been awarded that grant. He stated they tried to apply for anything they thought would be a benefit, and thought there were very few types of grants that would help with the recommendations mentioned by Ms. Nauser, but noted they would be considered if seen.

Mayor McDavid stated he believed public safety was understaffed and underfunded so he encouraged the City to seek all of the help they could find.

Mr. Trapp asked that the Council be notified of anything they could do at a policy level to make them more competitive for grants, such as the COPS grant, or in moving forward with the recommendations of the Task Force.

B367-14 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: CHADWICK, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B369-14 Amending Chapter 28 of the City Code to add a new article pertaining to transportation network services.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. St. Romaine provided a staff report.

Ms. Chadwick understood the City was asking for less from Uber and other transportation network services than was currently being asked of from the taxi cab companies. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct.

Ms. Chadwick understood Uber had been operating illegally in Columbia the past couple of weeks since they were now charging for rides. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct.

Ms. Chadwick understood the ordinance regulating taxi cab services was outdated, and that this proposed ordinance would only address a new type of service referred to as a transportation network service and would not update the ordinance affecting taxi cab companies. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct. He explained the ordinances could not be the same for these two types of services, but the City was committed to making sure the ordinances were fair and competitive. They were similar from a fee standpoint, and the City had committed to reviewing the existing taxi cab regulations to determine if changes could be

made. He stated they would look at the reasoning for an office to be located within the City, for the requirement of a landline, for taxi stands in the downtown at certain times, etc.

Ms. Chadwick commented that she was disappointed that the City had focused time and resources on an ordinance for a company that was illegally operating in Columbia while a legally operating business had to deal with an outdated ordinance. She wished ordinances for both issues had been brought forward at the same time. Mr. St. Romaine explained Uber had notified them two days prior to intending to operate in Columbia, and this created the need to create an ordinance to make them legal since they had already hired drivers. They had agreed to provide free rides on a week-by-week basis, which he believed ended on November 23, so they had been operating illegally for a one week period. He noted they had notified Uber that if the City had received complaints against any of the drivers, they would have to enforce the existing vehicle-for-hire ordinances.

Mayor McDavid understood Mr. St. Romaine had indicated permitting would be a 5-10 minute process. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct, especially if they completed the permit application on-line prior to coming to City Hall.

Mayor McDavid asked if each prospective driver would be required to pay \$70 or if Uber would pay \$7,000 for 100 drivers. Mr. St. Romaine replied Uber would have the opportunity to pre-pay for a bucket of drivers, so if they anticipated 100 drivers, they could write a check for \$7,000. When the City was close to licensing that number of drivers, Uber could then pay for additional drivers. He pointed out the City would require them to pay \$70 per driver.

Mayor McDavid asked if this proposed ordinance was consistent with what had been seen in other college towns. Mr. St. Romaine replied he thought it was consistent, but noted most other towns were in various states of negotiation. He explained staff had reviewed ordinances that had been in effect for six months to one year, and believed every segment of this ordinance was in effect in at least one city within the United States. He did not feel this was the most or least restrictive ordinance in the Country, and explained the goal was for the City to be able to provide the public adequate protection and ensuring the rides taken were safe.

Mayor McDavid understood the City had committed to reviewing all regulatory burdens of taxi cab operators. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct. He commented that if this ordinance was more competitive or created an advantage for transportation network companies, it was incumbent on the existing taxi cab companies to consider moving to this model. He understood one local company had already created an app because they felt this was the future for taxi cab companies.

Mr. Skala understood this approach by Uber of free rides and then charging for rides in violation of ordinances was occurring across the United States, and the Chief Deputy Attorney General in Nevada had indicated Uber's approach was to start operations in open violation of the law in hope a ground swell of public opinion would override the regulatory concerns, and that when it wanted, Uber could work within regulatory oversight. He felt this was the business approach of Uber. Mr. St. Romaine commented that he had read other stories similar to the Nevada story, and felt the approach used was lacking. The two-day notice prior to operations created a large obstacle as they were not considerate of the lack of

requirements and regulations the City had in terms of enforcement against those types of companies. Mr. Skala understood this was really about safety. Mr. St. Romaine agreed, and explained that if the City had received notice of 3-6 weeks, Uber likely could have been operating legally by now. He reiterated it was the business model of Uber to hire drivers and declare the beginning of their ride service as it provided them publicity. He noted he was upset the free ride service had not been extended to today. He understood there were some things Uber had indicated it could not agree with in the ordinance, but this was not an agreement with Uber. It was a City ordinance, and any company that operated a ride share service in Columbia would be expected to comply with it.

Ms. Nauser wondered why the \$70 fee per driver was necessary as she understood Uber would be conducting the background checks for its drivers, which was different from the taxi cab companies as the City conducted the background checks for taxi cab drivers. She thought the cost of the background check should be deducted from the \$70 fee. She asked for clarification regarding the services provided by the City for taxi cab companies. Mr. St. Romaine thought the background checks were done for the City by the Missouri State Highway Patrol, and the Police Department conducted vehicle condition checks. Ms. Nauser understood the \$70 fee was for services the City rendered, and noted she was in favor of charging a fee since paperwork had to be processed, but thought the fee should be adjusted for the services provided.

Ms. Nauser understood Uber had concerns with regard to the Sunshine Law and asked for clarification. Mr. St. Romaine understood Uber wanted to receive notification of Sunshine Law requests involving them in advance of filling the request so they could potentially go to court and seek an injunction against the release of that information. He stated his understanding of the Sunshine Law was that the City had to provide the information immediately if it had it. Ms. Nauser understood that would hold true if there was a Sunshine Law request involving a taxi cab company as well. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct. Ms. Hoppe asked if there was any prohibition from notifying Uber of a Sunshine Law request. Ms. Thompson replied the law required the City to respond as soon as practicable and favored openness, and she believed it would be contrary to the law to put a condition upon themselves to notify a third party. Ms. Hoppe asked if they could do it as a matter of courtesy. Ms. Thompson replied they could, but did not believe they wanted to impose that type of obligation on the City from a legal standpoint as it could create a liability.

Ms. Hoppe commented that Uber drivers were different than taxi cab drivers in that they had drivers that might only drive for four hours during the weekend and for only a month or three months, so she was unsure as to whether the \$70 fee was the fairest way to charge them. She understood they had offered to pay a flat fee of \$14,000. Mr. Matthes explained the City had already spotted Uber a lot in terms of time, money, and other resources, and the \$70 fee was almost immaterial as it did not come close to recovering costs. In addition, he anticipated complaints involving Uber, which the City would receive, and there was a value to that. He noted they tried to provide a number that reflected the real costs. He agreed the City would accept the background check conducted by Uber, and that Uber would have to prove to the City the background check was completed.

Mayor McDavid understood there would be administrative costs to the City in terms of enforcement and oversight, which was how the same \$70 fee charged to taxi cab drivers was justified. Mr. St. Romaine noted that fee had been set many years ago, and he thought it might need to be addressed when they looked at the requirements of taxi cab companies as he believed it was on the low end. He pointed out the fee amount was not an issue that had been raised by Uber as being objectionable or excessive, and he had seen the \$70 fee in an ordinance in a city within Louisiana.

Terry Nickerson explained he was the owner of Taxi Terry's, which had offices at 1200 Wilkes Boulevard, and noted they did not have any problem with Uber coming to Columbia as they welcomed the competition. They only wanted a fair playing field. He disagreed with the idea that Uber was different than them because both companies picked people up from Point A and took them to Point B. In addition, they began operating in Columbia five years ago, and the City did not create special rules for them. They had to abide by the rules already in place, and had not been able to provide free service until negotiations were over. He felt Uber was in control instead of the City in this situation, and it was not fair for those that had been providing transportation services in Columbia for years. He noted they could be reached by phone locally if something occurred, but Uber had to be contacted by e-mail and there was no assurance a response would be received. He questioned how the City would know the number of Uber drivers in Columbia as he believed they would have to take the word of Uber in those situations. He commented that since Uber would be conducting its own background checks, Uber could decide who they hired based upon those checks, but who taxi cab companies could hire was dictated by the City as the City conducted the background check. He pointed out the fee paid by taxi cab companies for their license and background checks had increased a couple of years ago from \$23.50 to \$33.50. He stated his appreciation for the fact the City was trying to make this a fair situation, and asked the Council to not allow Uber to call the shots.

Joyce Mayfield stated she was the owner of Metro Taxi, which had offices at 501 Fay Street, Suite 120, and commented that she was not sure why Uber could not put a magnetic sign on their ride share vehicles similar to Lyft, which was another ride share company. She also did not believe any ride share company should be able to charge for time and distance, especially since taxi cab companies could only charge for distance. She pointed out many states, cities, and foreign countries were issuing cease and desist orders against Uber because they were a bullying and bad company, and understood they had an F-rating with the Better Business Bureau due to the number of complaints and the lack of responses to those complaints. She commented that she felt the \$70 fee was justifiable as local taxi cab companies had a lot of overhead in terms of offices, phones, etc., and the fee charged to Uber needed to offset some of those costs. She pointed out taxi cab companies had a lot of driver turnover as well, and their new drivers had to pay the required fees. She did not feel Uber was being treated unfairly with regard to the fee per driver as it was a turnover issue they all had. She noted she looked forward to working with the City in reviewing and changing the current taxi cab ordinances.

Charles Reno stated he was speaking on behalf of Economy Cab Company and commented that Uber did the same thing as taxi cab companies, but called it something

different. He understood comments had been made indicating the taxi cab ordinance had not changed in years, but pointed out there had been changes in the way they operated as the taxi stands had eliminated their ability to provide door-to-door service in the downtown, and had greatly affected their business. He noted Uber had been operating illegally from day one as their drivers had been paid since day one. He understood Kansas City, St. Louis, and other communities were fighting with Uber, Lyft, and other ride share companies. He believed Uber was a bad company with bad business practices, and understood an executive for Uber was under investigation for illegally tracking a journalist he had a gripe against through the Uber tracking device. He did not believe they wanted a company operating in Columbia without public safety being addressed.

Pooneet Kant stated he was the General Manager of Uber and explained Uber had worked successfully with cities and states across the United States to create models that recognized the differences between ride share companies and traditional taxi cab companies while ensuring the goal of public safety. He noted they shared the goal of public safety because they did not have a business unless people felt comfortable choosing Uber to provide them a ride. He thanked those in attendance and those that had written in support of the ride share business model, and felt it was evidence of the enthusiastic response to Uber. He explained they chose to launch in Columbia because they had seen thousands of people checking to see if it was available. He noted 75 percent of rides provided by Uber drivers occurred between 9:00 p.m. and 2:00 a.m. on Friday and Saturday nights, outside of big game weekends, so it was during a time when they wanted people making safe decisions. He believed the City's permitting requirement was an unnecessary step, and noted Uber drivers had to go through a stringent Uber background check before becoming active, and in lieu of a City permitting process, they were proposing to give the City audit authority that this process had been done for all Uber drivers by enabling the City to have a clear mechanism for holding Uber accountable. He commented that this approach had been used in Austin, Texas and the State of Virginia, and felt this met the City's goal of ensuring public safety, while recognizing the ride sharing model of partnering with part-time drivers was different than a traditional model. He explained Uber's platform relied upon their ability to bring on part-time drivers that might work 1-10 hours a week, on game weekends, for a month between jobs, etc., and Uber's data and experience in other jurisdictions showed the permitting process was a serious detriment to bringing on those part-time drivers. They would ask for a two-week grace period if the permitting process was required to allow part-time drivers to try the Uber system prior to going through the process. He noted he did not have an issue with the \$70 fee, but had proposed a \$14,000 flat fee, which was three times more than what all taxi companies paid the City annually, so it would be easier to bring on part-time drivers. It met the City's goal of recovering costs, and if the City felt it was not recovering costs, they could retain the right to increase the fee in future years through further legislative action. He pointed out they had asked the Council to consider an amendment requiring the City to notify Uber of Sunshine Law requests with the goal of protecting driver confidentiality in case competitors were trying to obtain that sensitive information. He understood there were legal issues, and asked if that could be done on a best effort basis.

He noted Uber remained excited about the Columbia market and was dedicated to continuing to work with the City.

Ms. Chadwick asked when Uber started charging for rides. Mr. Kant replied he believed they started charging for rides on November 16.

Mr. Trapp asked what assurance the City had that Uber would follow whatever laws were passed tonight if they were currently operating illegally. Mr. Kant replied they had been committed to working with the City since before launching and wanted to continue to grow their business here. He thought it was difficult to get an Uber car because drivers were waiting to see what happened with this regulatory process, so they remained very committed to the regulatory process.

Ms. Chadwick asked if the drivers had accepted tips during the time Uber had offered free rides. Mr. Kant replied the acceptance of a cash tip was at the discretion of the driver and Uber would not have any knowledge of that since there was no ability for riders to tip through the app. Ms. Chadwick asked if the drivers were being paid during that time. Mr. Kant replied the drivers had been compensated.

Mr. Thomas asked if Uber ever contacted authorities to explain its business model to determine how it would fit within existing laws or how it could enter the market in a legal fashion when entering into new communities. Mr. Kant replied he had not seen a city where existing regulations truly encapsulated Uber's model. Most of the laws had been formulated prior to the emergence of smart phone and GPS technologies, which was what made Uber possible. He commented that Uber worked with communities in every jurisdiction in which it operated and had worked with the City of Columbia prior to launching, even though it was a short period of time, and noted they remained committed to working with the City. Ms. Chadwick asked how many days before launching Uber started working with the City. Mr. Kant replied two days.

Robert Stewart, 2012 W. Ash, stated he was a pastor for two churches in Missouri and a current driver for Uber, and understood one of the taxi cab companies had indicated Uber would make them better. He agreed and noted competition brought out the true character of people. He asked the Council to give Uber a chance to exist a little longer so they could determine Uber's true character, and pointed out it would also help to create a final better product for both Uber and the taxi cab companies.

Jeremy Elson, 2808 Jacobs Place, commented that he had a full-time job at MFA Oil, but was also a driver for Uber. He explained he only drove a few hours a week, and during the past two weeks, he had not driven at all, so he felt the fee should be different for him than another driver or the taxi cab company drivers since a background check was conducted by the City for them. He understood someone had indicated it was comparable to a food handler's card, but the cost was not comparable. He wondered if Lyft would be willing to pay \$70 per driver, and was not sure Uber would be able to do it based upon demand. He did not believe a fee of \$70 per driver made sense if the City would not be responsible for the driver and did not conduct the background check. He commented that a taxi cab company would not hire him due to the number of hours he could work, and Uber was perfect in that it allowed him to make extra money to pay off student loans. He stated he loved driving for Uber and enjoyed his customers, and pointed out that if a customer gave him a rating of 3-

stars or less, he would never be matched with that rider again. He agreed safety was a big issue, but did not feel this proposal would address any safety issue. It would only collect a \$70 fee. He thought the taxi cab company laws should be revisited as he did not understand the need for a meter in the car or a land line. He suggested the City look at the big picture.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that this appeared to be a pyramid scheme and asked the Council to look into liability, etc. prior to agreeing to move forward. He believed the City would have trouble collecting fines because every two weeks there would be a new point of contact. He also wondered how riders would know the vehicle was for them.

Angie Nickerson stated she was a co-owner of Taxi Terry's, which had offices at 1200 Wilkes Boulevard, and commented that she did not understand how Uber could require the City to change its rules to fit their business when the City had not changed the rules to fit local taxi cab businesses. She did not believe Uber had the same interest in the City as them as she had been born and raised in Columbia. She understood Uber had indicated it conducted extensive background checks on its drivers, but noted a lady with prior convictions spanning over 20 years had been approved as an Uber driver through an undercover operation by a Chicago news station, and the lady had one incident involving a fight that was as recent as two years ago. The lady had indicated she, herself, was surprised because her main crime was robbery and she could go back to people's homes to see what they might have that was of interest to her. Ms. Nickerson understood Uber had indicated they were a ride share service, and another word for ride share was carpool, and if it was a carpool, the passengers and driver would get out together at the destination. Uber picked people up at Point A and dropped them off at Point B, and provided the same service as a taxi cab company. She was not sure why the City was being so accommodating to Uber, and did not understand the concern for a \$70 fee when the company was worth \$19.2 billion. She asked the City to address four compliance issues. She wondered why Uber could not be required to have a commercial insurance policy. She was concerned the insurance of an Uber driver would be canceled because they would be providing a delivery service, which could not be done under a private insurance policy. She asked why Uber was able to do its own background checks. In addition to the commercial insurance policy requirement, she thought the City should conduct the background checks and vehicle inspections and that Uber should be required to obtain a license just like taxi cab companies as she felt those items were necessary for the safety of the citizens of Columbia.

Ms. Chadwick asked if it would be beneficial to taxi cab companies to not have signage on their cars. Ms. Nickerson replied no. She explained it was their best advertising method. She noted, however, that it would be helpful to not have signage during the evenings when the bars closed so they could pick up clients at the doors of businesses instead of at the taxi stands.

Ms. Chadwick asked if it would be beneficial for the taxi cab companies to be provided a two week grace period similar to the request of Uber. Ms. Nickerson replied she did not feel Uber should receive a grace period since taxi cab companies did not receive a grace period, and she was not sure why they would have a driver out there that had not been approved or authorized by the City.

Ms. Chadwick asked for clarification regarding what she wanted included in this ordinance. Ms. Nickerson replied she wanted the City to conduct the background checks and the vehicle inspections, and for enforcement if Uber did not comply.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, suggested the City ban Uber from doing business until the taxi cab service regulations were revised because he believed they would discover many other issues that would need to be addressed. He noted he was also offended by the perception that the City was going out of its way to make it easy for Uber to operate, and thought they should fine Uber for operating illegally. He did not believe the proposed ordinance was equitable as the taxi cab companies had a larger cost to get started. He also felt proof of insurance should be required for each driver showing commercial activity was allowed by the policy. He agreed the issue of pick up locations needed to be addressed, and noted taxi cab companies, unlike Uber, were likely subject to regulations in terms of taxation, etc. if their drivers were considered employees instead of independent contractors.

Phillip Chisholm, 4510 Weybridge Drive, stated he was an Uber driver and believed those threatened were finding reasons to not support Uber. He understood some people had indicated Uber drivers did not pay taxes, and noted the Uber app tracked all driver fares and made it convenient to pay appropriate income taxes. He pointed out there was a lot of ingenuity built into the Uber app that had not been discussed, but would solve many issues. He commented that he wanted the best and most dedicated drivers and did not feel it was an inconvenience to spend 10-20 minutes at City Hall to obtain approval to be an Uber driver as he already had the vehicle inspection and the necessary insurance policy.

Mr. Reno, who operated a local taxi cab company and spoke previously, stated he could not hire anyone without consulting the City and his commercial insurance company. The City conducted the background check and had to approve all of his drivers and he had to submit the name and social security number of every driver to his commercial insurance company for coverage. He did not believe this was required of Uber.

Sid Sullivan, 2980 Maple Bluff Drive, commented that new technology changed the way people did business, and it created a lot of fear. He stated he did not believe the taxi cab companies had indicated the rules they had to follow had hurt them prior to competition of a different model that might be more efficient coming to Columbia. He agreed competition was good for everyone, and thought that instead of banning Uber, they needed to look at how the competitive business model could affect the way business was done in Columbia. He noted a ride from downtown to his home through a local taxi cab company was \$30, which was expensive. He commented that the City was providing services to the taxi cab companies, which they would not provide for Uber, and that those things should be considered with regard to the fee. He agreed the amount of money the City had to invest in employees in terms of public safety and to enforce the regulations was a legitimate charge to the transportation service companies.

Sam Urkov explained driving for Uber was his part-time job on top of his full-time job. He commented that he was concerned about requiring the Uber logo on vehicles because he felt anyone could mimic it, which would create a public safety risk. He pointed out Uber drivers were required to submit proof of insurance, registration of vehicle, etc. during the Uber application process. He noted a grace period would be beneficial to him as he had a full-time

job. In addition, whether he was an Uber driver was dependent upon whether people would request rides from him when he was available, and if he was required to pay the \$70 fee, it could be wasted money. He thought it made sense to continue to allow Uber to do the background checks, etc., and for Uber to provide that information to the City so taxpayer money was not wasted.

Nathan White, 409 N. College Avenue, explained he was an Uber driver, and agreed that although some of the taxi cab regulations were unfair and archaic, it was not a reason to not address this new technology with a different business model. With regard to insurance concerns, he noted he had his own private insurance on his vehicle, and Uber also took out a \$1 million insurance policy that was active whenever he provided rides so there was plenty of insurance coverage when someone was given a ride.

Ms. Nauser asked if the offenses that would preclude someone from being a transportation network company driver were the same as those that would preclude someone from being a taxi cab driver. Mr. St. Romaine replied he thought it was similar. He understood some speakers felt the City should do the background checks and vehicle inspections for all Uber drivers, but noted the City did not have the resources to do that based upon the potential number of Uber drivers that would be within the City. If they wanted to make it the same, he suggested allowing taxi cab companies the ability to provide the City proof of a standardized background check and vehicle inspection. Ms. Nauser explained her concern was the limitation of a person being able to drive for a taxi cab company due to a past offense, but still being able to drive for Uber. She wanted to ensure it was the same for both types of services. Mr. St. Romaine stated the City could review this to ensure the traditional cab company driver requirements mirrored that of what they would allow for Uber or another transportation network services company. Ms. Nauser stated she would like that as she believed it needed to be equitable.

Ms. Nauser asked if a copy of the background check would be provided when a transportation network services company driver came to the City to obtain a permit. Mr. St. Romaine replied they would ask the drivers to complete a simple application form, and would ask them to provide the proof that Uber had provided them to indicate the background check and vehicle condition check had been completed. They would also ensure they had a drivers' license and insurance. The City would not keep that documentation as they only wanted to be assured that it had been done prior to issuing the permit.

Ms. Nauser asked for clarification regarding the taxi stands and the inability of taxi cab companies to pick up clients at the door. Mr. St. Romaine replied the problems they were trying to overcome were the hordes of people that congregated on downtown streets when bars closed and the taxi cab company cars being double parked as it put pedestrians at risk. The taxi stands allowed for this process to be more organized, and it was common in larger cities. Citizens could contact Uber drivers for pick up at certain locations, but those drivers could not be double parked. They would have to be parked at a legal parking space when picking up clients in the downtown. A police officer would ticket anyone they saw double parked. Ms. Chadwick pointed out the City did not allow taxi cabs to park in legal spots as they were required to be at the taxi stand. Mr. St. Romaine stated that was correct, but pointed out they would not allow Uber drivers to utilize the taxi stands. Ms. Nauser

understood the reasoning for the taxi stands, but thought the issue needed to be revisited. Mr. St. Romaine stated the need for the taxi stands could be reviewed. Mr. Matthes noted the Police Department felt the taxi stands had an anecdotal effect of reducing the number of brawls after bars closed. He thought staff could do some research and provide more information. Ms. Nauser agreed it might be beneficial to have taxi stands at certain times, but not seven days a week. Mr. St. Romaine pointed out the taxi stands were only enforced from 9:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. Mr. Matthes stated staff would review the need for taxi stands for those time frames.

Ms. Chadwick asked for clarification regarding the insurance requirement for Uber and wanted to know if it was less than what was required of a taxi service. Mr. St. Romaine replied it was actually more than what was required of existing taxi cab companies. He noted Uber had a \$1 million umbrella coverage, which covered the vehicle while the Uber driver was in the process of transporting a passenger from Point A to Point B. He understood the driver's personal insurance coverage would cover the vehicle in instances when the driver was not transporting someone, and to ensure there was coverage, the ordinance indicated additional insurance coverage of at least \$50,000 per person, \$100,000 per accident, and at least \$25,000 for property damage for times a transportation network company operator was available for service but not providing service, which were the state minimums. Ms. Chadwick asked how this was more than what the City required of taxi cab companies. Mr. St. Romaine stated he did not believe taxi cab companies carried \$1 million in commercial liability insurance during the time they were transporting passengers. He thought they carried insurance of \$200,000 - \$300,000.

Ms. Chadwick understood Uber made the decision on whether to hire a driver for its company while the City made that decision for a taxi cab company in terms of the results of a background check, and that this issue would be reviewed to ensure it was equitable. Mr. St. Romaine stated he thought they needed to be reasonable. He understood Uber had a zero tolerance policy in terms of alcohol and drug use and believed it was stricter than what was required of a taxi cab driver. He agreed this issue, along with other differences, needed to be reviewed, but felt they should allow companies, like Uber, to have a more stringent policy. He pointed out Uber only allowed the use of a car that was not older than 7-8 years old, but taxi cab companies were not restricted by the age of a vehicle. He noted they did not expect the ordinances for transportation network service companies and taxi cab companies to be the same since they had different models of operation, but thought the ordinances needed to be fair.

Mayor McDavid stated he planned to support the ordinance as written and believed the \$70 fee was reasonable. He commented that the company had not earned his trust, and thought the City would have to deal with substantial oversight issues, which would cost money. He noted he also did not support a grace period as that was not allowed for taxi cab companies. He stated he thought it was imperative that the City immediately review the restrictions and regulations placed on taxi cab companies because this changed everything. He commented that Uber provided a model some liked, but it also tended to be a model that was more expensive. The estimated cost to the airport per the Uber app was \$39-\$52, but Taxi Terry's would only charge \$30. He thought this might change the way people traveled

and believed the legacy taxi cab companies would adopt some of the new technology. He noted he respected the entrepreneurs that operated taxi cab companies in Columbia as they had invested time and effort to build a reputation, and felt that should be honored. He reiterated he believed transportation network service companies should play by the same rules as taxi cab companies, and that the City should immediately review the rules imposed on taxi cab companies to level the playing field.

Mr. Skala commented that he did not appreciate a business model that would violate the law by imposing its service before the City was able to create a reasonable regulatory regime designed for public safety. He agreed the City needed to ensure the playing field was even for existing taxi cab companies. He read an article from *Salon* that was written from the perspective of an Uber driver that felt the software was bad, the hourly rates were terrible, it took two months for Uber to process the paperwork to allow her to be an Uber driver, and for Uber to mail her the iPhone 4 loaded with the app, which she did not need since she had an iPhone 5. He reiterated he really did not appreciate the imposition of this business model before they could really settle the issues between Uber and the City and the taxi cab companies and the City. He thought they should take the advice of Mr. Clark to ensure issues were addressed so the result was a relatively equitable playing field, and noted he was inclined to support this, but was anxious to hear comments from the rest of the Council.

Mr. Trapp commented that in general he liked the idea of a ride sharing economy and innovative new technology, but also had concerns. He referred to a 2011 report regarding taxi stands when it moved from a pilot project to its current form, and noted that prior to the taxi stands the police would observe disturbances in front of the bars due to the crowds exiting and the large number of people waiting for taxi cabs, and this issue had improved due to the taxi stands since bar crowds tended to disburse sooner. He commented that he agreed it was a huge competitive advantage to being able to pull up in front of bars to pick up riders. He pointed out the taxi cab companies had expressed concern about these antiquated and burdensome regulations, and as a result, he had asked for a report many months prior to the City hearing about Uber. He felt many of the issues discussed tonight might have been resolved if the same energy and enthusiasm had gone toward completing that report as had gone toward responding to Uber. He was concerned with exempting a new industry that had flagrantly violated the law and moving them ahead of an existing industry that had previously asked for relief, and was not sure there was a need to push this existing proposed ordinance forward. He noted he thought they needed a ride share industry, and stated he would love to see Lyft or another service that did not have the negative connotations that Uber had. He commented that although the ride sharing law was not about Uber, moving forward with this proposal tonight was all about Uber, and they had not done anything to suggest he should support changing any laws tonight. He stated he did not plan to support this proposed ordinance.

Ms. Chadwick understood the F-rating Uber had received from the Better Business Bureau was due to its lack of responsiveness. She apologized to the taxi cab companies in the community as she felt it was unacceptable for the City to allow an unlicensed company to operate within the City limits and to push forward a transportation network services ordinance prior to reviewing the existing ordinances placed on taxi cab services. She suggested the

Council table this proposed ordinance until the City was able to review the ordinances governing taxi cab service, and noted she expected Uber to follow the current regulations as a taxi cab service or be cited for operating an unlicensed business.

Ms. Chadwick made a motion to table B369-14 to the February 2, 2015 Council Meeting to allow time for staff to review and update the current ordinances governing taxi cab services, and for Uber to be cited for violating the laws of the City if it operated as an unlicensed business. The motion was seconded by Mr. Thomas.

Mr. Thomas stated he was in support of tabling this as he was uncomfortable with the pressure to rush these new rules. He also thought it made sense to look at the whole picture at once if the existing laws for taxi drivers were antiquated as it was a similar business.

Mr. Skala commented that he had been leaning in favor of the technology, but thought the arguments made by some of the Council were valid. He noted he could also not get over the issue of violating the law before considering the equity for both of these business models, and felt it was prudent to table this issue so everything could be considered at the same time before proceeding.

The motion made by Ms. Chadwick and seconded by Mr. Thomas to table B369-14 to the February 2, 2015 Council Meeting to allow time for staff to review and update the current ordinances governing taxi cab services, and for Uber to be cited for violating the laws of the City if it operated as an unlicensed business, was approved by voice vote with only Ms. Hoppe and Mayor McDavid voting against it.

Mr. Matthes noted the City would enforce the law and placed Uber drivers on notice of that fact.

CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B349-14** Approving the Final Plat of Linkside at Old Hawthorne Plat 2, a Replat of Linkside at Old Hawthorne Plat 1, located north of Route WW and on the west side of Old Hawthorne Drive East; authorizing a performance contract.
- B352-14** Authorizing application to the United States Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration and the Missouri Department of Transportation for airport capital assistance grants.
- B353-14** Accepting conveyances for sewer, utility, drainage and temporary construction purposes.
- B354-14** Accepting a conveyance for Stormwater Management/BMP Facilities Covenant purposes.
- B355-14** Accepting conveyances for utility purposes.
- B357-14** Authorizing a cooperative agreement with the Greenbelt Land Trust of Mid-Missouri for the implementation phase of the "Our Natural Legacy: A Plan for Columbia and Boone County" open space/green infrastructure project.

- B358-14 Authorizing the acquisition of additional easements for construction of the Grindstone Creek Trail Phase I project between the Grindstone Nature Area and Maquire Boulevard.
- B359-14 Amending the FY 2015 Annual Budget to add and delete positions in the Human Resources Department and Employee Benefit Fund; amending the FY 2015 Classification and Pay Plan by adding and reassigning positions in the Human Resources Department and Employee Benefit Fund.
- B360-14 Amending the FY 2015 Annual Budget to delete positions in the Public Safety Joint Communications Department; amending the FY 2015 Classification and Pay Plan by closing classifications.
- B361-14 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code to eliminate provisions specific to the Public Safety Joint Communications Department.
- B363-14 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to health care benefits.
- B364-14 Authorizing an amendment to the PCS Antenna Agreement and a Memorandum of Lease with New Cingular Wireless PCS, LLC relating to the lease of property and space on the Shepard water tower located at 1160 Cinnamon Hill Lane.
- B365-14 Authorizing Amendment No. 1 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Comprehensive Tobacco Control Coalition Building and Support program; appropriating funds.
- B366-14 Authorizing a subrecipient monitoring agreement with Boone County, Missouri relating to acceptance of the FY 2014 Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program Award to purchase equipment for the Police Department; appropriating funds.
- B368-14 Appropriating funds from the 2014 Poster Party for the Arts event.
- R218-14 Setting a public hearing: construction of traffic calming speed humps along Derby Ridge Drive, between Smiley Lane and Brown School Road and between Blue Ridge Road and Smiley Lane.
- R219-14 Setting a public hearing: construction of an upgrade to the existing control systems at the Columbia Energy Center.
- R220-14 Setting a public hearing: consider an amendment to the FY 2014 Annual Action Plan as it relates to CDBG funding and HOME Community Housing Development Organization (CHDO) set-aside funding.
- R221-14 Authorizing an agreement with the Boone County Historical Society for caretaking services at Nifong Park.
- R222-14 Authorizing an agreement with the Boone County Historical Society for operation of a museum and maintaining and making improvements to the Maplewood Home and other historic buildings in Nifong Park.
- R223-14 Authorizing a first amendment to the agreement for professional engineering services with Structure Consulting Group, LLC for design assistance to replace existing Supervisory Control and Data Acquisition (SCADA) and Automatic Generation Control (AGC) systems as it relates to the City's energy management needs.
- R224-14 Granting temporary waivers from the requirement of Section 24-151 of the City Code to allow mobile food vending trucks to operate at the Wabash Station for the North Village Arts District First Friday events.

The bills were given third reading and the resolutions were read with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: CHADWICK, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bills declared enacted and resolutions declared adopted, reading as follows:

NEW BUSINESS

R225-14 Authorizing a parking services agreement with Parkmobile USA, Inc. and Parkmobile Group B.V. to allow for the activation and payment of parking transactions using mobile technology.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Glascock and Mr. Bitterman provided a staff report.

Ms. Chadwick asked if the City did an RFP to ensure this was the best company for this service as she understood there were many parking apps. She wondered how the City decided on Parkmobile. Mr. Bitterman replied that when the City did its pilot project a couple of years ago, Parkmobile was one of the companies that had offered to conduct a free trial, which had worked well without any complaints. In addition, it could not cost the City anything to implement as it was already set up and ready to go once the City approved the license.

Mayor McDavid commented that he believed the Parkmobile app was easy to download and use, and felt this technology would be the standard in parking ten years from now.

Mr. Glascock pointed out a meter was not really needed for this technology. Only a space number was needed. Ms. Chadwick commented that not everyone had a smartphone. Mr. Glascock agreed and explained that was why the City was keeping the coin-operated meters.

Ms. Chadwick thanked staff for moving forward on this project as she thought it would be successful.

Mr. Thomas stated he liked the fact this could be applied to the downtown employee parking program and was excited to see the details.

Mr. Skala thought this might be able to be utilized in the Benton Stephens and East Campus neighborhoods. Mr. Glascock agreed.

Ms. Nauser understood if someone parked at a two-hour meter this system would still not allow someone to extend payment past those two hours. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct.

Ms. Nauser stated she welcomed this technology for the parking meters and noted she would also welcome this type of technology for bus service in terms of being able to pay for bus passes with a smart phone. Mr. Glascock explained the issue with transit was making it work with the fare box as it required an additional investment.

Mayor McDavid asked for the credit card rate to pay for parking with this app. He assumed it was higher than the coin rate. Mr. Glascock replied the City did not pay a credit card rate for this. Mayor McDavid understood if the cost was 60 cents per hour, the cost would be \$1.20 plus another 35 cents for two hours. Mr. Glascock stated that was correct. Mayor McDavid understood that was how the company profited. Mr. Glascock pointed out

the app would send a message if the person was late getting back to the meter. Ms. Chadwick noted the 35 cents was cheaper than a ticket.

The vote on R225-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: CHADWICK, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

R226-14 Referring to the Planning and Zoning Commission for public hearing, report and recommendation a proposed amendment to Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to group homes in R-1 zoning districts.

The resolution was read by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala asked for clarification as to why a variance could not accommodate this situation. Mr. Teddy replied it was not recommended to be handled via a variance. He explained the 1,000 feet appeared to be a dimensional standard at first glance, which was appropriate for a variance, but variances were usually applied within a property. This issue was external to the property. In addition, the theory and practice of group homes was to disperse them into neighborhoods so they were among conventional neighbors. Ms. Thompson pointed out in order to qualify for a variance the applicant would have to show a hardship, and this would be a self-created hardship since they purchased a piece of property next door to another group home. It was for the convenience of the property owner, but did not really meet the standards for a variance that would be granted by the Board of Adjustment. If the Council deemed it was appropriate under certain circumstances to allow a group home to concentrate in areas closer than a 1,000 foot distance, they would need to establish appropriate guidelines.

Mr. Thomas asked for the number of group homes in Columbia. Mr. Teddy replied he counted 44 that were on file today, but noted he did not know if they were all active.

Mr. Thomas understood there was a different rule on the number of unrelated adults living in the house for group homes. Mr. Teddy stated he thought the underlying principle was that there was a dependent relationship, and it was not a conventional group of adults living together as a common household.

Mr. Thomas understood the dispersal philosophy was believed to be beneficial to the neighborhood and the group home residents. Mr. Teddy stated that was correct. He explained this went back a few decades to the deinstitutionalization movement and the idea that rehabilitative practice was better in a neighborhood setting than a large institution and that contact with neighbors was good. The idea of imposing the 1,000 foot restriction was to ensure an institution would not be recreated in any one neighborhood or a pocket of a neighborhood.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, thanked staff for dealing with this as a zoning change as opposed to a Board of Adjustment case as he believed it was a better process. He hoped this view of a zoning change versus a variance continued as it would prevent spot zoning.

Mr. Trapp commented that this seemed like a good, even-handed approach. He noted he was supportive of group homes and the process of deinstitutionalization, but understood neighbors had concerns, and this appeared to be a carefully tailored way to provide flexibility while achieving operating efficiencies without upsetting neighbors.

The vote on R226-14 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: CHADWICK, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, HOPPE, MCDAVID. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Resolution declared adopted, reading as follows:

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B370-14** Rezoning property located on the southeast corner of Carter Lane and Huntridge Drive from District R-3 PUD to District O-P; changing the uses allowed on O-P zoned property located north of Carter Lane; approving the statement of intent; approving the O-P Plan and Preliminary Plat for River Region Credit Union.
- B371-14** Approving the M-P Development Plan of Negwer Warehouse & Office Tower Industrial Park, Lot 1 located on the northwest corner of Prathersville Road and Tower Drive.
- B372-14** Vacating an electric utility easement located east of Brickton Road and running generally parallel to U.S. Highway 63.
- B373-14** Authorizing construction of an upgrade to the existing control systems at the Columbia Energy Center; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B374-14** Amending Chapter 11 of the City Code as it relates to the sale of tobacco products to minors.
- B375-14** Amending Chapters 11, 3, 9 and 16 of the City Code as it relates to vapor products.
- B376-14** Amending Chapter 11 of the City Code as it relates to the sale of alternative nicotine products and vapor products to minors.
- B377-14** Appropriating funds for Share the Light Program.
- B378-14** Authorizing a donation agreement with Wells Fargo Bank, N.A. for property located at 3704 Southridge Drive; authorizing Addendum Nos. 1 and 2 to donation agreement with Wells Fargo Bank, N.A.; authorizing the use of CDBG demolition program funds outside the boundaries of the Neighborhood Response Team (NRT) area for demolition of the structure.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP114-14 24 Hour Abandoned Vehicle Policy.

Ms. Christian provided a staff report.

Mayor McDavid asked if the ordinance could be changed to conform to the practice. Mr. Matthes replied it could.

Mr. Trapp explained a constituent of his had unexpectedly been towed and he could not defend the 24-hour policy so he asked for a report. He noted he would be agreeable to allowing this 24-hour policy to apply to neighborhoods with real parking issues, but wanted to change it to a 48-hour policy for everyone else.

Mr. Skala commented that he thought this policy might have been generated by complaints of truck drivers parking their large trucks on the street since they would not fit in driveways. He noted he was not aware of the fact many other places provided a more liberal

amount of time. Ms. Christian explained feedback she had received from staff was that this policy was likely generated from complaints. She did not recall an issue with large vehicles, and thought it was due to areas where there was not enough parking and vehicles remained in the same place for too long. She pointed out the 24-hour policy could be maintained for certain areas with the over-arching ordinance being changed to a 48-hour policy.

Mayor McDavid asked if staff had a recommendation. Mr. Matthes replied staff was happy to bring forward an ordinance and to include the notice requirement as was currently done. Mr. Skala noted the addition of the notice in the ordinance might lead to the 48-hour policy. Mr. Matthes understood the consensus was for the City to go to a 48-hour policy and provide notice. Mr. Skala thought that was reasonable.

REP115-14 Intra-Departmental Transfer of Funds Request.

Mayor McDavid understood this report had been provided for informational purposes.

COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, commented that he believed changing the 24-hour abandoned vehicle policy in the central city area would gut any effort to control parking.

Mr. Clark provided a handout and explained he was speaking on behalf of People's Visioning with regard to Regional Economic Development Inc. (REDI), which was a stand-alone 501(c)(6) independent corporation. People's Visioning wondered if there were better alternatives to contracting with REDI in terms of planning and implementing an economic development policy for Columbia so there was more sustainability, it was more equitable, it was more transparent, there was more balance between the costs and revenues of economic development, and there was more accountability to the City Council. He commented that he was not sure the Council knew the City contracted with REDI for economic development, and thought it was a strange arrangement. He noted the People's Visioning recommended the Council substantially revise or terminate the current contract with REDI effective January 1, 2016, and that the Council provide written notice of the revision or termination by June 30, 2015. They also wanted the Council to initiate a deliberate process to consider these recommendations at the January 5, 2015 Council Meeting in order to meet the June 30, 2015 deadline for the benefit of REDI and the City's economic development planning process.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, thanked the City Manager for putting Uber drivers on notice, and thanked the City for its involvement in a future homeless shelter. He asked if the location of a shelter on Eighth Street in April 2016 had been decided upon. Mr. Trapp replied it was still an on-going process, and there would be a call for requests for proposals. Mr. Elkin stated he was being told this process would drag on to 2017 or 2018, and hoped it would be completed sooner as shelters for men and women with children and single males and females were needed.

Mr. Thomas understood the City had a long-term plan for a day center, which would serve as a night shelter during extreme weather conditions, but until then he thought they should assist with the Room at the Inn like they did last year. He suggested they provide \$3,600 from the council reserve fund to the Room at the Inn, which would open December

11, 2014, as it would cover some of the costs of the overnight shelter manager and the shelter program coordinator.

Mayor McDavid commented that he thought they would agree they should not be making policy or appropriating money during this part of the Council Meeting, and asked if this was different because the funding would come from the council reserve fund. Mr. Thomas stated he did not believe it would as it was still public money. Mayor McDavid asked how quickly the Room at the Inn needed the money. Mr. Thomas asked if it would require an ordinance or resolution. Ms. Amin replied she thought it would require an ordinance if money needed to be appropriated for budget purposes.

Mr. Thomas made a motion for staff to bring forward legislation so \$3,600 from the council reserve fund could be provided to the Room at the Inn for its winter shelter program. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Skala commented that he had already asked for a report with regard to the City's relationship with REDI, and asked if the recommendations from People's Visioning could be considered and addressed in the report.

Mr. Skala noted he and other Council Members had recently attended the National League of Cities Congress of Cities and Exposition and asked for a work session to be scheduled so they could present some of the information they collected during the conference.

Ms. Nauser commented that she had attended a session on student housing, and noted Fort Collins, Colorado coordinated and worked with Colorado State University with regard to the student housing market through a liaison position. She thought that position played a key role in bringing people together during disputes and other issues. She understood they also had a liaison committee that dealt with student housing issues. She asked staff to look into whether Columbia could follow that model to become more engaged with the University of Missouri and other stakeholders in order to mitigate potential issues. She encouraged staff to contact the liaison, Emily Allen, and those in other communities that had similar processes for town-to-gown relationships.

Mr. Skala noted eight sample ordinances had been provided in terms of the town-to-gown relationship and with regard to student housing, which they could share with staff.

Ms. Hoppe thought this information should not only be shared with the rest of the Council and City staff, but with the Downtown CID and the Downtown Columbia Leadership Council as well. She noted the university and city each paid half of the salary for the liaison in the Fort Collins model, and that it was a busy job as the managers of student housing changed often requiring a continuing education process.

Ms. Hoppe suggested a one month warning period after the change in the hours of enforcement for parking meters was effective as follow up to the discussion on B350-14, and asked if a motion would be needed. Mr. Glascock stated he would suggest a two month warning period since students would not be in town until mid-January, and noted a motion was not needed.

Ms. Hoppe noted she had asked that information indicating transit was free for students 18 years old and younger to be placed on the City's website, and understood a "Kids Free" graphic was on a page with changing graphics, but felt that was not sufficient. She asked staff to review this and to provide more detailed information as she did not believe it was clear that it was meant for students 18 years old and younger. She asked that this information be placed with the fares as well.

Ms. Hoppe understood a recommendation at the pre-council meeting with regard to chronic nuisances was for fireworks to be added to the chronic nuisance activity list.

Ms. Hoppe made a motion directing staff to move forward on including fireworks as a chronic nuisance activity. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Ms. Hoppe understood staff was looking into what other communities did in terms of an economic development director and noted the Economic Development Director for Austin, Texas was in a session with her at the National League of Cities conference. This person indicated Austin had an organization similar to REDI, and that the City contributed 10 percent of the operating costs of that organization since other entities were involved. She also understood this person was not the director or a staff person of that organization, and asked that staff look at Austin when reporting back to Council on this issue.

Ms. Hoppe noted she came across a program at the National League of Cities conference that allowed the Council and the public to look at financial information in many different ways and to obtain comparative information graphically. She asked staff to look at the program, which was illustrated at www.opengov.com, and report back as to whether something similar could be done in-house or if this was a service the City should consider acquiring.

Mayor McDavid noted the City published a 10-year manual annually that incorporated a lot of this information, but that did not mean the City was transparent enough with some of its financial information.

Ms. Chadwick thought the issue was simplicity. Mr. Skala believed the interface played a role in making it more useful. Ms. Hoppe explained the website illustrated what could be done and asked staff to assess it.

Mr. Trapp commented that he wanted to clarify his request at the previous meeting involving the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence's recommendation for the City to provide more robust support for the Missouri High Steppers. He thought it was clear in the minutes, but wanted to clarify, he was not proposing to directly support the Missouri High Steppers. He only suggested the City allocate a not to exceed amount to a host site for the Missouri High Steppers. He noted they would not be providing any money to the Missouri High Steppers, and would only help facilitate a process for them to find space. He believed this was a low-cost, high impact proposal, and looked forward to discussing it at the next Council Meeting.

Ms. Chadwick stated she had been provided the opportunity to visit the OpenGov site in California and their staff had shown her the way they presented information for several different cities. She noted it was extremely user-friendly in terms of its quickness and its clarity of information, and thought it would be a great asset for the City.

Ms. Chadwick noted her daughter had attended the *Fiddler on the Roof* performance at Hickman High School, and had sent her a picture of an “18 years old and under ride for free” ad.

Mr. Skala commented that there had been a session on participatory budgeting at the National League of Cities conference, and an alderman from Chicago had indicated his part of the participatory budgeting system, which was a system by which they allowed the public to make decisions about a discretionary part of the budget, was with \$1.3 million they were provided to spend for things they felt were necessary.

The meeting adjourned at 11:14 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk