

**CITY COUNCIL MEETING MINUTES
COUNCIL CHAMBER, CITY HALL
701 E. BROADWAY, COLUMBIA, MISSOURI
SEPTEMBER 21, 2015**

INTRODUCTORY

The City Council of the City of Columbia, Missouri met for a regular meeting at 7:00 p.m. on Monday, September 21, 2015, 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 MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER and PETERS were present. The City Manager, City Counselor, City Clerk, and various Department Heads and staff members were also present.

APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES

The minutes of the regular meeting of September 8, 2015 were approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Trapp.

APPROVAL AND ADJUSTMENT OF AGENDA INCLUDING CONSENT AGENDA

Ms. Nauser asked that B261-15 be moved from the consent agenda to old business.

The agenda, including the consent agenda with B261-15 being moved to old business, was approved unanimously by voice vote on a motion by Ms. Nauser and a second by Mr. Trapp.

SPECIAL ITEMS

MU Civil Engineering Academy of Distinguished Alumni Award presentation to Public Works Director John Glascock.

Mayor McDavid asked Mr. Glascock to join him at the podium, and explained Mr. Glascock had been presented with the Mizzou Civil Engineering Academy of Distinguished Alumni Award at a special ceremonial banquet held at the Tiger Hotel on Friday, September 18, 2015. The Civil Engineering Academy had been established in 1998 for the purpose of honoring civil engineering graduates from the University of Missouri who were outstanding in their field, leaders in community affairs, and worthy of emulation. He noted Mr. Glascock had graduated from University of Missouri in 1990 with a Bachelor's of Science in Civil Engineering, and had obtained his professional engineer license in 1995. He stated Mr. Glascock had joined the City of Columbia in 2003 as Chief Engineer of Public Works and was subsequently promoted to Public Works Department Director in 2005. He congratulated Mr. Glascock on receipt of this award.

Dan Watkins-Gary Whorton Personal Service Award presentation to Water and Light Director Tad Johnsen.

Mayor McDavid asked Mr. Johnsen to join him at the podium, and noted Mr. Johnsen had been presented with the Dan Watkins-Gary Whorton Personal Service Award during the Missouri Power Utilities Alliance Conference in Branson, Missouri on Thursday, September 17, 2015. The award was presented to an employee of an Alliance system that had actively participated in the Alliance for at least five years and whose special public or community

service had been a credit to public utilities. He explained Mr. Johnsen had served as the Director of Water and Light since 2010, and prior to his tenure as Director, he had served as the Utilities Power Production Superintendent from 1994-2010. During his time of leadership, the utility had earned a wide variety of national and state honors for its public service and environmental programs from the American Public Power Association, the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, and state organizations. Since 2012, Mr. Johnsen had served on the Executive Committee of the Missouri Joint Municipal Electric Utility Commission, a joint action agency that operated as an electric utility for the benefit of 67 member municipalities, and this year he had also served as Chair of the Commission. He congratulated Mr. Johnsen on receipt of this award.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

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

BUILDING CONSTRUCTION CODES COMMISSION

Bernacik, Andrzej, 4414 Maxwell Lane, Ward 2, Term to expire August 1, 2016

CITY OF COLUMBIA NEW CENTURY FUND, INC. BOARD

Gillispie, John, 5500 Kelsey Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire September 30, 2018

CONVENTION AND VISITORS ADVISORY BOARD

Beard, Joan, 154 W. Green Meadows Road, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2016

Cristal, Scott, 2205 N. Country Club Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire September 30, 2017

Laird, Don, 1205 Larail Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2017

LaRocca, John, 2507 Corona Road, Ward 4, Term to expire September 30, 2017

McDonald, Bob, 13013 Strathmore Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2017

Thomas David, 155 Maple Grove Way, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2017

PERSONNEL ADVISORY BOARD

Kinkade, Kevin, 4512 Royal Lytham Drive, Ward 5, Term to expire September 30, 2018

Slade, Leslie, 2107 Carol Drive, Ward 3, Term to expire September 30, 2018

SUBSTANCE ABUSE ADVISORY COMMISSION

Landes, Derek, 1203 Spurgeon Court, Boone County, Term to expire October 31, 2017

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

Lynn Maloney, Race Matters - Implementation of recommendations from the Final Report of Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence.

Ms. Maloney, 204 Maplewood Drive, stated she was a representative of Race Matters, and explained not one of the 28 recommendation presented by the Race Relations Task Force in 1996 to address racial inequities had been enacted. The only action taken as a result of that Task Force had been the mounting of a plaque by the back door of the Missouri Theatre. In May of this year, the City commemorated the bulldozing of the black business district known as Sharp End following a year long study focused on the loss of those

businesses and homes, and the sole result was a plaque placed on Walnut Street across from the Post Office building. She commented that last November, this Council had received the final report of the Mayor’s Task Force on Community Violence, and nearly a year later, a plan of action, budget, or timeline for completion for any of the recommendations was still not in place. She felt race relations in Columbia were worse than a year ago, and this was due in part to the very visible failure to act on the recommendations of that Task Force. She explained the public needed evidence that City leaders were willing to make the necessary effort to address and heal a host of racial inequities, which included inequities of health, education, and unemployment. The Public Health and Human Services Department and the Columbia Public Schools were leading the way in rectifying this negligence by training several staff members to teach a program entitled *Building Inclusive Communities*, and the Council had recently amended the City’s Strategic Plan to address racial inequities within the City’s Administration. She understood Stephanie Browning, the Director of the Public Health and Human Services Department, was committed to see the fulfillment of this amendment by offering this training to City staff. She challenged all City leaders to make it a priority to participate in the *Building Inclusive Communities* training in order to learn how to become more effective in addressing social inequities, and noted she did not feel time or money were acceptable excuses for not participating in the training.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

- (A) FY 2016 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
 B220-15 Adopting the FY 2016 Annual Budget for the City of Columbia.
 B221-15 Amending Chapter 6 of the City Code as it relates to trade permit fees.
 B222-15 Amending Chapter 12A of the City Code as it relates to stormwater utility charges.
 B223-15 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code as it relates to parking fees for unmetered off-street municipal parking lots and facilities and parking meter hoods.
 B224-15 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to solid waste rates and services.
 B225-15 Amending Chapter 22 of the City Code as it relates to sanitary sewer utility connection fees.
 B250-15 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code to change the name of the city department of “Public Communications” to “Community Relations” and add a Utilities Department.
 B251-15 Amending Chapters 12A, 13, 17, 22, 25, 27 and 29 of the City Code as it relates to the creation of a utilities director and reorganization of the duties of the public works director.
 B252-15 Amending Chapter 19 of the City Code as it relates to personnel policies, procedures, rules and regulations.
 B253-15 Adopting the FY 2016 Classification and Pay Plan; providing FY 2016 salary adjustments relating to the Classification and Pay Plan; providing for a 2% salary increase for eligible employees; establishing an implementation date of September 27, 2015.

Item A was read by the Clerk, B220-15, B221-15, B222-15, B223-15, B224-15, and B225-15 were given fourth reading by the Clerk, and B250-15, B251-15, B252-15, and B253-15 were given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Mr. Skala understood it might not be in the best interest of an employee to request an open hearing, and asked if it would only be done at the request of the employee. Mr. Matthes replied yes, and noted it had been requested five times in the past.

Ms. Peters understood there were 31 new permanent positions and asked for clarification. Mr. Matthes replied that was a total, which sometimes constituted a half of a position, a quarter of a position, or one entire position. Ms. Peveler listed the positions and noted a couple of positions would be deleted too, such as a park ranger and a recreation specialist.

Mr. Skala asked about the shift in personnel from the City to the County for emergency services. Mr. Matthes replied the County had hired all of the employees so they were no longer employees of the City. The City, however, was still the landlord as they were using the same offices and equipment. He understood the County had broken ground and was in the process of constructing the new building, and would move the employees once that was done. Ms. Peveler explained the City was still carrying \$1.1 million in the costs, but the County was reimbursing those costs.

Mayor McDavid understood the \$17.39 million in personnel services for the Police Department included \$2 million in unfunded accrued liability, and asked if that was a personnel cost. Mr. Blattel replied pension costs were part of personnel costs. Mayor McDavid commented that the problem with governmental accounting was that there was no way to know that \$2 million of the \$17.3 million was due to yesterday's employees. He thought subsequent council members needed to know the costs of the pension debt. Mr. Blattel stated staff had planned to add that information prior to publishing the final budget. Mayor McDavid pointed out the same issue existed for the Fire Department in that personnel expenses were \$14.8 million but \$2.8 million of that amount was for the pension liability.

Mr. Skala made a motion to amend B253-15 per the amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor McDavid opened the public hearing.

Lorenzo Lawson, 2301 Shamrock Drive, commented that he was present to express his support for Columbia Access Television (CAT) as the program was instrumental to him and the at-risk youth he worked with as they were partnering with CAT to do a youth led talk show. The show would allow these youth to express their opinions and provide a different point of view. He explained young people tended to aspire to be a sports figure, a rapper, a nurse, etc., and he wanted them to know there were other career opportunities. CAT provided training in terms of how to use the cameras, how to edit, etc., and this was very valuable to them.

Mr. Thomas understood Mr. Lawson had participated in a show on CAT that had been related to the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence. Mr. Lawson stated that was correct. He explained the show had been entitled, *What's Going On*, and he had hosted it for about six months so the community was aware of what the Task Force was doing.

Jennifer Erickson stated she was the Executive Director of CAT, and asked those in support of CAT to stand. Approximately 20 people stood. She thanked the City for its continued support of CAT and community media in the budget. This wise investment allowed residents and local non-profits to share their diverse voices with Columbia, learn new and innovative media skills, and gain access to high-tech video equipment and other media technology. If the Council decided to honor the current two-year contract, CAT would continue to put that funding to work in the community. City support of CAT helped to keep

membership fees affordable and to train community members in resume building skills. CAT also helped to contribute to community dialogue in a meaningful way through CAT produced shows, and residents were able to submit programming to CAT regardless of their views. City support also allowed CAT to continue to serve the underserved as part of its mission. She noted CAT was the only local organization to put high-tech video equipment in the hands of youth, local non-profits, and the public. She stated CAT did not want a blank check from the City, and wanted to continue to report to the City on its cable channel, programming statistics, partnerships, community events, and happenings at the downtown community media center on Tenth Street. She commented that CAT was much more than the public access television channel, and noted they were effectively Columbia's public voice.

Patricia Holt, 3705 Monterey Drive, stated she was in support of CAT and noted she joined CAT in 2008 when it was in the basement of Stephens College building. At that time, she had used their cameras to film a few things, but they did not have people around for editing and camera instructions so she did not rejoin the following year. She decided to try again in 2013, and they had better cameras and knowledgeable people to teach her how to use the cameras and editing software then. She stated it was nice to see young people and people closer to her age working on projects they had created using the equipment and training. She explained that after taking a studio class, she was able to facilitate an interview that was shown on CAT and her YouTube channel, which allowed her to put her ideas in a public forum. She also did some green screen shots, which she edited into a scene to make a silly movie. Since joining CAT in 2013, her films had been accepted in *Give Me Truth*, a part of the True/False Film Festival, and this year she would have a film in the Citizen Jane Film Festival. She had also purchased her own cameras and sound equipment, but still used the Panasonic camera and editing software at CAT's Tenth Street location. She stated CAT had helped her to continue to be a happy and productive member of Columbia, even at the age of 75.

Dan Komo, 3234 Jenne Hill Drive, explained he and his wife had started their own business a couple of years ago, and were involved with Tigers on the Prowl and a few other charities. He noted they had been able to use CAT services to help film items associated with those charities, and it had helped their business to learn more about filming commercials, etc. He understood a local writer planned to do a show on CAT next month, and believed the service was valuable.

Shawna Johnsen stated she was the Executive Director of Access Arts, a local arts education organization, and their mission was to provide creative learning experiences for everyone. They served all age groups and ability levels, and had provided free art education to over 6,000 people in 2014. They believed everyone could develop artistic skills if given the proper instruction, and their approach to combatting the thoughts of fine art being too elite or people needing to be born with an artistic ability was to share stories of students and staff through video. They showed real people learning art and enjoying themselves, and as a result, people were more apt to try it themselves. CAT had been instrumental in their video-making efforts as the equipment was top notch and the staff was incredibly helpful in providing tips and guidance for their projects. She noted Access Arts was a small organization with a limited budget so they were unable to purchase this type of equipment or

contract for such professional services. They, however, were able to purchase an annual membership at CAT. In their first year with CAT, they had sponsored three University of Missouri students as interns, who were able to expand their own education by utilizing the equipment of CAT, and had produced twelve promotional and educational video for the organization. They had also launched their first *Celebrarty* fundraiser, and that project resulted in another six videos and over \$4,000. She stated they needed this partnership to reach the community to pursue their mission, and noted CAT was a resource for all non-profits in Columbia. She asked the Council to continue to support CAT.

Allan Benson explained he was an intern from the University of Missouri, and was supportive of CAT. He commented that CAT provided great opportunities for all majors and career paths, to include those in the Business School. He noted CAT allowed people to express their artistic voices and display what they had created. A decrease in funding for CAT would result in a loss of the artistic value created by community members.

Amy Roche stated she was a digital film maker and a work-study student at CAT. She appreciated CAT providing a platform for her to create films, and noted she and other Stephens College students were able to use the studio, equipment, etc. She pointed out she had learned a lot due to CAT resources during her first year of college.

David Wilson, 1810 Riback Road, commented that he was a co-founder of the Ragtag Cinema and the True/False Film Festival, and had a hand in creating CAT. He explained a friend of his, Kim, who had grown up in a small town in central Missouri and had no resources, had wanted to make movies. CAT had provided her the needed experience in film making, and she now had made films that had grossed over \$20 million and had been included on an impressive list of 25 new faces in independent film. He pointed out she and four other Columbia film makers had been on that list since 2010, and all had directly or indirectly benefited from working with CAT. It was a great organization that supported film making in Columbia, which in turn supported other things. He felt the existence of CAT was vital to Columbia.

Peter Anger, 2101 W. Broadway, Suite 108, stated his support for CAT and agreed with Martin Luther King Jr. in that the creative, dedicated minority had made the world a better place. He believed CAT was a wonderful community organization, which allowed artists and progressives in the community to have a voice and express themselves through media. It allowed the opportunity to use the arts as a place to talk about what was important and to tell stories. The CAT website listed a variety of groups that expressed themselves creatively, and he thought it would behoove the City to continue to support CAT.

David Spear, 2607 Burrwood Drive, explained he became a member of CAT about a month ago because CAT provided him equipment for video editing that he could not afford. He saw media as a new art form, and thought it was beneficial to have a place to make that art and to then put that art on television. He pointed out this was great resource and special to Columbia as many other communities did not provide this opportunity. He encouraged the Council to continue to support CAT.

Joel Herron stated he was originally from a small town in Kansas and was blessed to have come to Columbia to attend Columbia College and earn a Bachelor's in Business, but had not known what he wanted to do after graduating from Columbia College. He had grown

up admiring entertainers, and had accidentally come across CAT where he and friends had produced a video that had gained national attention. As a result, he was inspired to pursue his passion. CAT provided him the opportunity to learn the skills needed to produce videos, and that along with his business degree had allowed him to help local businesses evolve at a similar pace that corporate businesses were able to evolve. He thanked the City for its support in the growing of CAT in the past and his personal life, and noted he thought there were likely other passionate people in the community that could also have their voices heard through CAT.

Mike Burden, 1011 Again Street, stated he was speaking on behalf of the Central Missouri Returned Peace Corps Volunteers (CMRPCV) and noted they had partnered with CAT for about five years. CAT had been instrumental in the growth of the Third Goal Film Fest, which was established to enhance cultural understanding. CAT had enabled them to bring in an upcoming film maker every year and had helped them professionalize their message to spread the word about the event. He explained CMRPCV had also recently made some films themselves, which he had taken to the National Peace Corps Association conference. He believed they would not have been as successful without the support of CAT, and urged the Council to continue to support CAT.

Jason Black, 1507 Waterford Drive, commented that he had heard a lot about the value of CAT to a lot of people, but noted they needed to understand the fact the City's resources were not unlimited. He believed the Council needed to determine whether the value added to the City by CAT outweighed what the City had to give up for it. He explained he was not questioning the value of CAT, but wondered if this was a resource the City government needed to provide or if it was a resource that should be provided by private donations or other sources. He reiterated the City's resources were limited and taxation of the local community was the only source of income. He thought they needed to question whether CAT was where they needed to focus their attention, energy, and resources when they did not have the budget to maintain all of the needs of the City.

Louis Wilson, 404 W. Broadway, explained he had attended the press conference on the City's Strategic Plan 2016-2019, and had been impressed by the fact the City recognized social equity as a goal of the Plan. He believed achieving a form of that goal would allow more people in Columbia to be empowered and to be economically activated. He also felt a thriving community that was socially empowered had the skills and training to fill local jobs and create entrepreneurial opportunities to grow in a way to better all lives, and asked that the Plan recognize the value of individual access to broadcast media and other forms of First Amendment expression. He pointed out the United States was different from many economies in the world in that they had a free flow of information, and countries without this had economies that struggled. He thought this effect was the same at the local level. He commented that he would champion CAT as it provided training and experience in video technology and studio experiences. It had vocational implications as those trained could get or make jobs as no one else in Columbia provided the same service. CAT as the public access television component of the public, educational, and governmental cable television network provided citizens access to the cable television network as a function of the inherent

First Amendment interests, which had been codified in the 1984 Cable Communications Policy Act. He encouraged the Council to support CAT today and in the future.

Kelley Lucero, 407 Sanford Avenue, stated she had been a member of CAT since 2011 due to her job with Central Missouri Community Action (CMCA), a non-profit that served eight counties in Mid-Missouri, and explained non-profits could generally not afford video services. She noted CMCA had initially used CAT to teach volunteers to produce videos, but she later decided to learn herself since all of the volunteers eventually left the organization. She stated she had taken several classes and had produced about a dozen videos for CMCA, and had also helped other non-profits produce videos with CAT's equipment. She pointed out she also made an hour long documentary about her father before he had passed away, which she would not have been able to do if she had not learned those skills from CAT. She believed CAT was one of the best resources in Columbia as anyone could go there to learn, and thought it was a great resource for at-risk students since it was of interest to them and they could see a future in it. She hoped the Council would honor the contract and continue funding CAT.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, asked the Council to support CAT as it provided a direct investment in entrepreneurial economic development in Columbia, and an investment that produced dramatic results as evidenced tonight. He also asked the Council to increase the sewer connection fee. He did not believe that was a barrier to creating affordable housing in Columbia as 80-90 percent of the benefit of lower fees would go to people purchasing \$150,000 and higher houses. Very little would benefit those needing affordable housing. He felt keeping the fee low would subsidize the rich and derivative development, such as retail development or residential development. He noted HOME and CDBG funds could then be used to subsidize qualified low income housing projects.

Alan Mitchell stated he was the President of the Columbia Police Officers Association (CPOA) Fraternal Order of Police Lodge No. 26, and noted their organization represented close to 90 percent of the sworn personnel at the Columbia Police Department. He explained he was present to speak on B252-15, which would close hearings of the Personnel Advisory Board, and noted the CPOA was vehemently opposed to the proposed change. The CPOA did not feel the amendment would solve any problem, and believed it would only take away a valuable employee right. He understood City staff felt this amendment would protect employees, and questioned how since City employees currently had the right to have a closed hearing if they wished. He believed the employees were already protected. He understood City staff also felt the current ordinance was not in the City's best interest, and wondered how. He believed that would only be true if the City did something incorrectly or improperly, and the better solution would be to not do anything incorrectly or improperly instead of hiding it from the public. The National Association for Civilian Oversight of Law Enforcement had published a study that had indicated transparency reduced corruption and the possibility of corruption. In addition, accountability and transparency were signals of a strong institution and democratic governance. If improprieties of the system were discovered in the process, he felt the City should welcome the chance to fix those problems and to move the City forward. The police in Columbia were well accustomed to accountability and oversight as the Police Department had an extensive internal affairs system and the Citizens

Police Review Board (CPRB) provided additional impartial oversight. He noted the CPRB operated in the open as well. He understood some had indicated other cities did not operate in this manner, and if that was true, he believed Columbia was ahead of its time with regard to this process. He reiterated that changing the ordinance did not solve any problems and only reduced the possibility of transparency in a day and age when transparency was becoming more and more important. He pointed out the employees were already protected under the existing ordinances. He asked the Council to not approve the change in the hearings of the Personnel Advisory Board as indicated in B252-15.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, commented that he was present to support the passage of the Water and Light Department portion of the budget as the Water and Light Advisory Board (WLAB) had played an instrumental role in its development. He noted the 2016 fiscal year budget supported the long range planning goals of the Water and Light Department as was exemplified by reports completed or in the process of being completed by Carollo Engineering, Black & Veatch, and Jacobs Engineering. He noted the budget also supported the commissioning of the Water Integrated Resource Plan, which would assess demand and supply side practices. He thanked the Council for commissioning all of these reports.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, suggested the Council support the request of the CPOA. He was happy to hear there would be more jobs at the City and asked how many would be at a minimum pay. Mr. Blattel replied none. Mr. Elkin stated he thought that was good news. He commented that it appeared a small investment was monumental in terms of CAT. He asked about new household hazardous waste and whether it would be relocated. If it was to be relocated, he thought that should be done carefully so debris did not fall on the streets.

Tyree Byndom commented that at the time of the dissolution of the Enhanced Enterprise Zone (EEZ) ordinance, Mayor McDavid had challenged the audience to create a solution to the challenges in the community. He took that challenge personally by creating a consulting firm that offered strategies to highlight efforts to achieve minority inclusion, social and economic equity, etc. He noted the black community had reached out to former Mayor Darwin Hindman to express their feelings and displeasure about the lack of inclusion and the troubled relationships between black and whites and the Columbia Police Department. A task force report at that time had offered 28 recommendations, but those recommendations were never acted upon. During the observance of the celebration of the Sharp End, Mayor McDavid had indicated the black community was resilient and that they should keep situations in the community that had led to the demise of Sharp End from happening again. He noted many felt those conditions were in existence now. He stated there was less than one percent minority leadership in any position in Columbia so there were some definite issues. He explained the Sharp End land and businesses would have been valued at over \$2 million in the 1950's, and today the land had a collective value of over \$2 billion. This did not include the emotional or cultural value of the village lost. He commented that money was used to create housing authority projects instead of aiding individuals in rebuilding and repairing their homes and connect sewers to their homes. He pointed out 60 percent of the African-Americans in Columbia had convictions due to the lack of inclusion and opportunity

and discriminatory practices. He recommended the City invest into the local human capital by creating a social development process that would work in conjunction with the economic engines already in place. He suggested the \$4 million in savings be invested in this effort and for \$50,000 to be provided to CAT.

Roger Fries, 3512 Hedgewood Drive, stated he would sleep a lot better if he had an extra patrol car traveling through his neighborhood than the ability to watch a movie on the CAT station.

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

The vote on B221-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

The vote on B222-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mr. Thomas understood the parking fee changes would be effective on January 1, 2016, and suggested they honor the request of the Downtown Community Improvement District (CID) to delay approving the fee increases until after the parking workshop was held tomorrow and Wednesday in case any new strategies were formed resulting in a change to these fees. He asked if tabling this item would affect the budget. Ms. Peveler replied tabling this would require an amendment to the budget, and stated she was unsure of a dollar amount. Ms. Nauser pointed out they could pass this and amend it later if necessary. Mr. Matthes recommended they move in that manner if they were comfortable. Mr. Thomas stated he was fine with that recommendation.

The vote on B223-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Ms. Nauser understood Mr. Lindner of the Forum Group had spoken at a previous meeting questioning these rates and that staff had planned to look into his concerns. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, and explained they would follow up with him as an individual customer. He did not believe there was a reason to change the system at this time. Mayor McDavid pointed out an amendment to this could also be done later if necessary.

The vote on B224-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mayor McDavid commented that he disagreed with the analysis of Mr. Thomas as he felt 90 percent of user fees went toward the maintenance of the system, and only 10 percent went toward the treatment plant. He believed the sewer connection fee increase would affect supply and demand economics, and that affordability was the reason many employees lived outside of the City limits. He noted home building was booming in Hallsville and Ashland, and believed the high costs to build in Columbia were the reasons. He understood an

increase to \$2,400 was wanted by some on the Council, and pointed out the next highest city in Missouri was St. Louis at \$1,072, and after that the next highest was at \$500. He noted the costs of capitalization were recouped by user fees in many communities, such as Moberly, Mexico, Fulton, and Kansas City, as there were no sewer connection fees. He commented that the best way to slow growth in Columbia was to spike fees for new houses. He stated it would likely not affect \$800,000 homes, but would affect more affordable homes. He noted he would vote against this sewer connection fee increase.

Mr. Thomas stated he planned to support this sewer connection fee increase. Between 2004 and 2013, the City had collected \$6.5 million in sewer connection fees, but had spent \$24.4 million on new sewer infrastructure to simply accommodate new growth in Columbia. This eliminated all maintenance and rehabilitation projects of the sewer system, such as inflow and infiltration. The sewer connection fee only covered about 27 percent of the cost of growth, and the rest was funded by the sewer rates. He believed that was an inequitable and illogical system. It underpriced new homes and made it more difficult for existing residents of Columbia to sell their homes because they were competing with artificially undervalued new homes. He commented that he was not against growth in Columbia, and noted a study in Florida had indicated increases in connection and impact fees did not change growth patterns. He also agreed with John Clark, who had indicated earlier tonight that this was not necessarily the kind of primary growth they wanted to encourage. He noted they wanted to bring in employers. He stated people already wanted to live here. He noted the recommendation they were following for phasing in the fee increase from \$800 to \$2,400 had come from a study conducted by Burton and Associates, and they had slowed down the time frame to reach the \$2,400 considerably. The increase to \$2,400 would take them to 75-80 percent of the cost of expanding sewer infrastructure to accommodate new growth. Although he did not believe much of the new development in Columbia involved affordable homes, he did not want to discourage it, so he planned to ask staff to provide recommendations to either exempt or discount the sewer connection fee for federally defined affordable homes. He hoped Council would support this sewer fee increase as it was the right thing to do.

Ms. Nauser commented that she would not support an increase to the proposed amount as she did not feel the fee in Columbia should be higher than the fee charged by Boone County. She believed the study in Florida involved metropolitan areas and areas where vast amounts of farmland was not available for people to live. People here could reside right across the City limits. In Florida, they would be in another metropolitan area that had similar costs. They did not have the competition that Columbia had. She felt it was poor policy to have the highest fee in Missouri, and that comparison communities with similar rates included Boulder, Colorado, Columbus, Ohio, Ann Arbor, Michigan, Lawrence, Kansas, and other communities that were not even within Missouri. She understood the national trend was a decrease in development and home building, and did not believe it was good policy to rely on connection fees to balance the budget. Building costs for improvements and growth into the rate structure would create a steadier income stream, and the costs would be spread out so they were lower for all rate payers. She commented that she believed in paying into the system, but did not feel they should make themselves the highest place to do business as

that would not result in a continued rate of return. She believed growth helped the economy, and noted she would be agreeable to increasing the sewer connection fee to only \$1,400 since that was comparable to the fee in Boone County.

Mr. Skala agreed there were benefits to growth, but noted there were also costs associated with growth that had to be considered. He stated they had discussed a cost recovery plan last year, and had decided to phase this increase in over a period of three years. This was the second year of that plan. He understood they might lose some development if the fee was too high, but at this point he believed the increase would be beneficial. He agreed this increase would affect supply and demand, and thought they were debating to what extent it would be affected. He did not believe the housing boom in Hallsville could be directly connected to the anticipation of an increase in sewer connection fees as there were many variables. He suggested they move forward with the plan they had agreed to last year in order to account for some of the rising costs. He pointed out they had always subsidized growth to some degree in Columbia, and would continue to subsidize growth to some degree.

Mr. Trapp stated this was a rate neutral plan because these new costs would not have to be included in the rates. It was net equal in terms of overall affordability for those that lived in Columbia. He commented that Ms. Nauser and Mayor McDavid had made some fair points in that they needed to watch overall costs so they did not get too far out of step in terms of driving development to the County and surrounding communities. This was the reason they decided to phase in the increase to \$2,400 over many years, and why it was a modest increase of only \$400. This allowed other communities to look at what Columbia was doing. He explained Columbia was a leader in many ways in Missouri, and many of the communities with similar rates were leaders and cultural centers in their states. They were the communities that looked into questions of equity. He understood there was a gestalt within the community that wanted to see more of the costs of new development attached to new development, which he thought should be considered to the extent possible since it created a sense of fairness, but noted it had to be balanced with reasonable changes that fit within the local context. He believed this increase continued to do that, and suggested it be evaluated every year because if they continued to see a decline in building permits or other changes, they might want to hold off and give the region a chance to adjust.

The vote on B225-15 was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, PETERS. VOTING NO: MCDAVID, NAUSER. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B250-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B251-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mayor McDavid commented that people outside of government believed employees in government could not be fired. He felt in the mix of employees and employers, there were bad employees in every profession, and he could not imagine wanting personnel issues addressed in a public setting. He thought the police, who he honored, were getting bad advice from the lawyer who ran the CPOA. He commented that he had been on hospital quality assurance boards where they sometimes took privileges away and had been a consultant for the Missouri State Board of Healing Arts where investigations were conducted, and those processes were all confidential. He felt those in the wrong would more likely admit to it in a confidential meeting than in a public meeting, and as a result, the problem would be addressed. He did not believe there was any reason for open evaluations unless the party wanted to create an adversarial relationship, which he thought would get in the way of what could be a positive and open relationship where expectations could be clarified, problems could be remedied, and rehabilitation could occur without the employee having an open legacy. He stated he would vote in favor of B252-15 because he could not understand the concept of public criticism in employee performance.

Mr. Skala stated he agreed with Mayor McDavid in that he did not know why anyone would want an open session, but was also concerned about re-establishing public trust and did not see any harm in continuing to allow an employee to have an open meeting even though he felt it was a bad idea. He commented that he was worried about someone wanting an open meeting in order to create a spectacle, but did not see any reason to move to a more confidential or secret process at this time. Generally speaking, openness and transparency along with public trust was paramount. He noted he would oppose this part of the B252-15.

Mr. Thomas commented that he believed transparency was extremely important in government, especially in Columbia at the present time. He did not feel he could vote in favor of this in the current environment of distrust, and thought the only way he could support it was if everyone was supportive of it. He acknowledged the normal personnel practice was to keep these things private, and did not understand why someone would want it to be public. He noted they had only heard from one of the three employee groups, and that group was opposed to this change. He explained he did not see what the City had to gain from taking away a choice the employee currently had, and stated he would vote against this portion of the ordinance.

Mr. Ruffin understood the process was private except for this one section, which was public. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct. Ms. Buckner noted this portion was only public if the employee chose for it to be public. Mr. Ruffin understood it was private until this one point of decision. Mr. Matthes explained it was private until this hearing, and the decision was then private as well.

Ms. Thompson commented that the complicating factor from the legal point of view was that most personnel issues might not involve a single employee, and if there was more than one employee involved, the other employee could not block it from being open. One employee could make a choice for another so it could be manipulated.

Mr. Skala noted that was a little troubling because he did not want the process to be manipulated. He wondered if it could be written so everyone involved had to be agreeable to a public hearing. Ms. Thompson pointed out hearings involved witnesses and others so it

would be very difficult to craft appropriate language. Mr. Skala understood this impacted only the employee, and felt consensus was a simple solution if more than one employee was involved. Ms. Thompson explained it was not typically that straightforward. The employment matter was specific to the employee as group employment actions were not done, but there could be peripheral involvement. She gave the example of a public safety incident as more than one officer usually responded to a situation. If 3-4 officers were taking action, they would all be witnesses and only some might be affected by disciplinary actions.

Mr. Matthes pointed out a worst case scenario would involve a sexual harassment complaint. The employee might want the hearing to be public, but the person that was complaining about the harassment might not want it to be public.

Ms. Buckler explained personnel records were closed under the Sunshine Law, and with a public hearing, the media and others tended to want copies of files, which the City would not provide. This did not block the employee from providing the media any records or saying whatever he or she wanted while the City continued to say nothing, so it became a one-sided situation.

Mr. Thomas understood the open hearings tended to tie the hands of the City in terms of what information could be presented to the Personnel Advisory Board during the hearing. Ms. Buckler explained it limited the ability to give documents to all of the people of the press that wanted them. It was very confusing to the media. She noted she agreed with the comment of Ms. Thompson in that it could create some uncomfortable situations when other employees had to come before the Board and testify in an open hearing. The employee subject to the hearing was not the only one impacted as those that had to testify were also affected. Mr. Thomas understood it could distort the fairness of the hearing. Ms. Buckner explained hearings were difficult situations in general and volunteers served on the Personnel Advisory Board. She noted she needed good personnel people to apply, and many people did not want to apply.

Mr. Skala commented that his initial thought had been no harm, no foul, but he now understood there was the potential for harm. He noted he was still concerned about the perception of the public that the City was trying to reduce the amount of transparency.

Mr. Thomas understood there had been five cases of an employee electing to have an open hearing, and asked if there had been a situation of another employee having to testify and being uncomfortable with doing so in the public. Ms. Buckler replied she could not speak to specific situations.

Mr. Matthes commented that if an employee behaved badly someone else was likely involved, and there was a huge amount of pressure on that other person. He noted that although it was their professional opinion that it was best to close the hearings, it was okay if Council chose not to do it.

Mr. Thomas asked if the Personnel Advisory Board had expressed an opinion on this issue. Ms. Buckler replied they had been given the information and were asked for comments, and no one objected or commented about any of the changes proposed to Chapter 19.

Mr. Thomas stated he was inclined to want to table this decision to allow more time to think it over and for the other employee associations or the Personnel Advisory Board to

provide their thoughts. Mayor McDavid commented that he would oppose tabling the issue because he felt they were capable of making the decision tonight.

Mr. Matthes pointed out the real open process came after the City's disciplinary process, and the City's process was administrative except for that one piece. If there was still disagreement, the issue could be taken to court, and that was where everything was public.

Mr. Trapp commented that this was a very difficult decision as there was strength and validity in the cases stated by both Mayor McDavid and Mr. Skala. He thought they all wanted to be able to grant the request of any work group when possible, and the CPOA was asking to continue the option of an open hearing, but he also felt they needed to weigh how personnel decisions were made in almost every other institution. He noted even their own deliberations for the three employees that reported to them were private. He stated he had been undecided about this issue, and explained they sometimes they had to choose between the greater harm. In this situation, they risked harming their relationship with the CPOA and police officers because they would not feel supported, or they risked continuing a problematic personnel policy that violated human resources best practices and could create huge potentialities in terms of a negative impact on the City or its employees. He agreed it was a vote they could make tonight as he did not believe there would be any new information or consensus on this matter in the community. He noted he planned to support this without any amendments.

Mr. Thomas stated he would like to delay a decision on this particular issue for a couple of weeks. He understood a lot of new information would likely not come forward, but he had absorbed new information tonight and wanted time to process it.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to amend B252-15 by striking the proposed changes to Section 19-239. The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala.

Mr. Skala commented that he was now leaning toward the opposite direction than previously on this subject, but still believed it was reasonable to delay a decision on the issue in case they were provided another perspective.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Skala to amend B252-15 by striking the proposed changes to Section 19-239 was defeated by voice vote with only Mr. Skala, Mr. Thomas, and Ms. Peters voting in favor of it.

B252-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B253-15, as amended, was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

Mayor McDavid stated he thought CAT was a great organization and wanted them to be successful, but noted the Police Department was 30 percent understaffed and the Fire Department was 25 percent understaffed. In addition, the City was not fixing its roads in a timely fashion, and a decision to fund CAT \$50,000 meant that \$50,000 was not going toward community policing. He commented that the Council had been begging CAT to become self-sufficient for the past four years, and thought they were close.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend the amendment sheet associated with B220-15 to transfer \$50,000 from CAT to community policing. The motion failed for the lack of a second.

Mr. Thomas understood all of the items on the amendment sheet associated with B220-15 were changes to the City Manager's proposed budget that had been published a couple of months ago, and that staff wanted these items that had come up since that time to be built into that budget. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, and explained many of the changes were due to the passage of the capital improvement sales tax ballot.

Mr. Thomas noted there were several items under net general fund impact, and asked for clarification. Ms. Peveler replied the net general impact of all of those changes was \$0. Mr. Thomas understood the public improvement fund had \$1.2 million associated with it and asked for clarification. Ms. Peveler replied that was outside of the general fund, and had to do with the ballot issue. She explained the City accumulated development fees and then allocated them to projects, and now that they knew the projects, they also knew what portion of the development fees were needed to support those projects, so that was the amount they needed to pull from the public improvement fund to the capital improvements fund to help fund the projects. She noted the projects were not fully funded by the capital improvement sales tax. Mr. Blattel stated the reason they had to wait until the capital improvement sales tax ballot passed was because certain funds used for capital improvements could only be used for specific purposes. He explained the money the City received from Boone County for county roads could only be used for roads as an example and pointed out the public improvement fund could be used for sidewalks, streets, etc. They looked at all of the projects the City promised would be done and matched them with funds that had specific purposes first. They then looked at the funds that could be used for more than one purpose to complete the allocations for those projects. Mr. Thomas asked how much money from the projected capital improvement sales tax revenues was now being put into the budget for projects and which projects were those funds going toward. Ms. Peveler replied the list of projects were on the second and third pages of the amendment sheet.

Ms. Peters asked for clarification with regard to the economic development item on the amendment sheet. Ms. Peveler replied the budget originally had the transfer coming directly from the Convention and Visitors Bureau to Economic Development, but due to the way the agreement was written, the money needed to come from REDI and not the Convention and Visitors Bureau. The money would be given to REDI who in turn would give it to Economic Development. Mr. Matthes stated it was equivalent to a typographical error as there was no real change. Mr. Skala understood it identified a pathway.

Mr. Thomas asked for clarification regarding the council reserve fund. He understood it used to be \$100,000 per year, and that they were funding CAT with it. He did not feel that was the role of the council reserve fund. Mr. Matthes explained it had been \$100,000, and was reduced in a year where every service line was cut by two percent, which left it at \$98,000. CAT had the unfortunate luck of a contract expiring the year \$1.9 million was cut from the budget. Their continued support was initially funded with savings for the first year, and the second extension came from two years of council reserves. The \$50,000 was a third extension that had also been funded with council reserves.

Mr. Trapp stated he would like to see the council reserve fund revert back to \$98,000 next year or at least \$73,000 if they decided to provide CAT a further step down of \$25,000. He understood CAT was making good progress in developing other funding sources and that their budget was not much smaller than when the City was giving them \$200,000. He noted this was not an issue of the worthiness of CAT or how meaningful they were to the community, but a matter of how it related to other budget priorities. He recalled they had decided to fund CAT with council reserve funds so it did not come from money needed to deal with pay compression, etc. He stated he had been happy to help CAT to become fully supported with other funding, and agreed there were other venues of City support, such as arts funding, economic development funding through CDBG funds, etc. The City had a vetted process for funding agencies, and did not fund much of these from the general fund. He understood cable franchise fees were a small source of the general revenue fund, but those funds had been decreasing. He had wanted CAT advocates to consider revenue sources and compensating cuts. He noted he could live with council reserves to fund CAT this year, but wanted it to be more substantial next year so they had the flexibility to fund important opportunities or critical needs that had not been pre-identified. He provided the time the City provided Job Point with critical bridge funding for its YouthBuild program, which provided job training for at-risk youth, as an example. Since Job Point had maintained their capacity, they were able to get their federal funding back, and the program continued to exist and thrive. He noted the City would not be able to do something similar this year because there was only \$48,000 in council reserve. He reiterated he thought they needed to reduce funding to CAT and build the council reserve fund back up next year so they were able to address community crises and needs, emerging issues, etc.

Mr. Thomas commented that he agreed they needed to build the council reserve fund back to \$100,000, but was not sure they should step CAT down to \$0. He understood the general fund received \$600,000 per year from the cable franchise fee, and the Council had allocated \$200,000 to CAT in 2008 for five years. He believed that was based on a broadcast communications philosophy of public, education, and government. He understood that philosophy was less strong now, and that there was no legal requirement for the recipient of franchise fees to fund public access, but many did. He thought they needed to consider the value of a new community relations director position that had been created by the City at \$150,000 against the value of providing CAT \$50,000 per year. He stated he did not want to give an impression that he was ready to completely cut funding for CAT as he believed the City's support of CAT was an important statement and lifeline to an organization that did so much good in the community.

Mr. Skala stated he believed CAT had tremendous value in the community, and noted he was inclined to want to discuss the suggestion of Mr. Trapp, but was leaning toward the argument of Mr. Thomas in that this should be a discussion of priorities. He thought they could argue this was economic development because it was in many ways. He noted he wanted to have the discussion in the next year.

Ms. Nauser explained the City had originally planned to cut funding for CAT when it was still suffering from the impacts of the recession, but had entered into an agreement to fund a portion of what they had previously been provided annually. She commented that

each year, they continued to renegotiate new agreements. She stated franchise fees were part of the general revenue so those funds were not dedicated to a specific item. The tax base was declining due to internet sales, so the City was trying to do more with less per capita. She explained she was not necessarily opposed to funding CAT, but felt they needed to compete with other cultural entities in the community. She did not believe it was fair to fund one cultural entity by a line item as there were other good entities as well. She noted she did not like this funding coming from the council reserve fund as that was money that could be used for emergency services, but would support funding this year due to the existing agreement.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B220-15 per the amendment sheet dated September 21, 2015. The motion was seconded by Mr. Ruffin and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on B220-15, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

OLD BUSINESS

B238-15 Approving the Final Plat of Howell Subdivision, Plat No. 3 located on the northwest corner of Strawn Road (Route ZZ) and West Broadway; authorizing a performance contract; granting variances from the Subdivision Regulations relating to sidewalk construction and direct driveway access; setting forth conditions for approval.

The bill was given third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas understood the topography made the sidewalk on the west side of Strawn Road very expensive or impossible to build, and asked if there was a sidewalk on the east side. Mr. Teddy replied no, and explained the nearest sidewalk on Strawn Road was north of Worley Street where it connected to the sidewalk on Worley Street. Mr. Thomas asked what the topography was like on the east side of Strawn Road, and wondered if they could ask the subdivider to build a sidewalk along that side to provide some pedestrian access. Mr. Teddy replied staff had not investigated that, and noted he would be curious to know what might occur with those lots adjacent to that area because they would be obligated to construct a sidewalk if they subdivided. He commented that the Bellwood Subdivision had a complete street system with internal sidewalks that fed into a crosswalk north of Worley Street that gave access to the sidewalk. It was a much larger scale of development, which justified the off-site improvement due to providing a route to school and routes between neighborhoods. This would likely be two single-family homes, or there could be an institutional use on Lot 2, but it would be small in scale. Mr. Thomas stated he believed the area included a lot of pedestrian generators and destinations. Mr. Teddy explained staff considered whether there was a meaningful connection, and any building on those lots would be oriented elsewhere so they questioned where individuals would cross Strawn Road. Mr. Thomas asked about people needing to get to one end of Strawn Road to the other. Mr. Teddy agreed it would benefit others. Mr. Thomas commented that he was looking at it from a systems approach, and believed it was a critical connector road. He stated the policy of constructing sidewalks

with platting or the development of an undeveloped lot was designed to look at the network connection. Mr. Teddy explained since staff did not conduct that analysis, he did not know what would be involved with a sidewalk on the east side in terms of right-of-way, topography, etc.

Phebe La Mar, an attorney with offices at 11 S. Ninth Street, commented that she was present on behalf of the applicant, Jesse Martin, and noted her client had a two tract property at the northwest corner of Strawn Road/Route ZZ and Broadway. The right-of-way already owned by the City for one-half of the extension of Scott Boulevard was adjacent to the western boundary line of the property. She explained they were requesting a sidewalk variance because the topography and cost-analysis did not allow for building a sidewalk along Strawn Road. She understood Mr. Thomas was inquiring about sidewalk construction on the east side of Strawn Road, and pointed out the Bellwood Subdivision involved a lot of lots so the cost of the sidewalk on the other side was spread out among many different people. In this situation, there would likely be only one or two houses, so it would increase the cost of development of these lots in ways that were not manageable. She did not believe it made sense to require off-site improvements in this case. She explained they were also asking for the use of a driveway over the right-of-way that would access Broadway as there was no other method of access to a public street. She noted they would not develop this property to the extent it could be developed, and were only asking to place one house on Lot 1 and potentially another house on Lot 2. She asked the Council to grant the right of use agreement and to consider providing access to Lot 2. She noted she did not understand until today that City staff was not recommending any driveway access to Lot 2, and pointed out the lot could not really be used for anything without a driveway. She asked Council to allow a driveway for a single-family residence on that lot, and noted the lots were large enough for a circle drive so people would not have to back out on to the public road.

Mr. Thomas asked Ms. La Mar if she would be open to negotiating a payment in lieu of not building a sidewalk on Strawn Road. Ms. La Mar replied it would depend upon the amount of money. Mr. Thomas thought a per foot figure had been used for a property on the Business Loop recently. Ms. Thompson explained that was not a payment in lieu of situation. It was a payment that went into escrow for future construction when the anticipated roadway improvements were completed.

Ms. La Mar commented that these situations were very different as one was a commercial development on a busy street while the other was two-family residential home development. She noted the variance ordinance presented the methodology by which the City was to determine whether a variance was warranted, and this particular property met every criterion for what would warrant a variance. The topography would not allow for it and an ADA compliant sidewalk would likely not be able to be built due to the difference in elevation. In addition, the cost would be out of line from what an ordinary sidewalk would cost. As a result, she was not sure requiring a payment in lieu of or building a sidewalk in a location that would not be used by this property was the right course of action.

Mr. Thomas commented that he did not believe staff would have supported the variance request if the topography had not been an issue, and noted the length was due to the design of the lot. Ms. La Mar agreed, but pointed out the ordinance set out the

methodology for determining if a variance was warranted, and City staff and others agreed this particular piece of property warranted a variance.

Mr. Trapp asked if a circle drive could be required so people did not back out onto the roadway. Mr. Teddy replied it would have to be included in the ordinance. He noted they could require a circle drive or something with a three point turnaround as it would be sufficient for a residence. Ms. La Mar stated she thought her client would be agreeable. Mr. Trapp understood this would require an amendment in addition to the amendment sheet.

Ms. Nauser asked to be shown where the Bellwood Subdivision was in comparison to these lots. Mr. Teddy replied it was the north portion of Lot 1. Ms. Nauser understood that would not be the route considering the easement the City had from the Bellwood Subdivision was along the east boundary line. Mr. Teddy explained the diagrams were conceptual in nature and only showed travel from point A to point B without pre-determining an alignment. Ms. Nauser stated she was looking at the future in terms of easements for when the property was developed. Mr. Teddy explained staff was trying to protect the right-of-way so the property owner did not build too close to the side lot line as the City would then have to purchase a house when the road was constructed.

Mr. Trapp stated he had met with the applicant and his attorney, and they were in the position of having three roads that did not allow access. The applicant wanted to build a house on fairly good sized lot so they would respect the existing topography. He noted they felt the City was forcing them into a land bank by denying the variances so the property would remain undeveloped and the Scott Boulevard extension could be run through the subject property. He explained he did not feel that was fair or reasonable since the City already had right-of-way on the other side. He understood the staff and Planning and Zoning Commission had recommended the sidewalk variance, and the property met the criteria for that variance. The real issue was the driveway variance to access the limited access roads. Since driveways were not allowed, they would have to build a road to access the main road, which meant they would have to further subdivide the lot and build more houses to pay for the road. As a result, he did not believe the City gained anything with a road versus a couple of driveways.

Mr. Trapp explained he would like to make a motion to amend B238-15 to allow driveway access on Lot 2 with the provision for a circle drive or a three point turnaround.

Ms. Thompson explained Section 5 provided for direct residential driveway access onto Strawn Road for Lot 2, so they would only need to add “provided that the driveway shall be constructed with a paved area of sufficient size and design to provide for vehicles to turn around and enter Strawn Road without backing into the roadway.”

Ms. Amin asked if one of the notes on the amendment sheet for Section 6 would need to change. Mr. Teddy agreed the note would contradict that language.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to table B238-15 to later in the meeting, after discussion on B272-15, to allow for appropriate amending language to be prepared. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B255-15 Approving the Final Replat of Landmark Subdivision – Plat 3 located on the south side of McAlester Street and the north side of Country Club Drive; authorizing a performance contract; granting a variance from the Subdivision Regulations relating to sidewalk construction.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Teddy provided a staff report.

Mr. Thomas asked for an explanation for the recommendation of staff to deny the variance. Mr. Teddy replied the denial was based upon the letter of the policy. He displayed a view of the proposed lot, and explained they felt there was fairly flat topography and nothing that would physically prohibit a sidewalk. He noted it was also in a developed area. He agreed it was along a low traffic local street without sidewalks and that there were not major pedestrian generators nearby, which were reasons to support the variance. Mr. Thomas understood there were four separate categories by which staff measured requests for variances, and in this instance, they had supported two and did not support the other two. He asked how that translated that into an overall recommendation. Mr. Teddy replied it was a judgement call. He noted there could be a connection of Alfred Drive to Old 63 in the future. He explained he thought the Planning and Zoning Commission had been persuaded by the consistency argument in that the Council should grant the variance again since they had granted it a couple of years ago.

Mr. Thomas stated he would not oppose this variance request, but noted he really wanted to work toward sidewalk districts similar to what existed in Austin, Texas. This would allow money to be placed in a district fund if a property owner did not want to build a sidewalk or there was another issue so they could address sidewalk gaps.

B255-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B261-15 Authorizing an STP-Urban Program supplemental agreement with the Missouri Highways and Transportation Commission for the Providence Road improvement project from Stadium Boulevard to Stewart Road.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Nichols provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser commented that many of her constituents were anxious to see this project move forward so she was concerned about a delay. Mr. Nichols explained it looked like a delay, but it really only provided a longer window to get the project done. He noted he anticipated the consultant providing right-of-plans in October, which would then allow them to start negotiations. He stated they would come to Council with an easement acquisition ordinance once those properties were described. He commented that staff was concerned it might take time to obtain the easements. Ms. Nauser asked if actual construction would start in 2017. Mr. Nichols replied traffic was a lot less in the summer so it was more ideal. He explained they could move the schedule up if they had been able to acquire the properties more quickly, but he was not confident that would happen. Ms. Nauser understood the acquisition of easements on Turner had put them back six months. Mr. Nichols stated that

was correct, but noted they were able to save quite a bit of money by ensuring those easements were dedicated through the platting process.

B261-15 was given third reading with the vote recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B272-15 Appropriating FY 2014 General Fund savings for projects identified by the City Council as part of the Incentive Based Budgeting Initiative.

The bill was given second reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to table discussion on B272-15 until after discussion on B238-15. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser and approved unanimously by voice vote.

B238-15 Approving the Final Plat of Howell Subdivision, Plat No. 3 located on the northwest corner of Strawn Road (Route ZZ) and West Broadway; authorizing a performance contract; granting variances from the Subdivision Regulations relating to sidewalk construction and direct driveway access; setting forth conditions for approval.

The bill was read by the Clerk.

Ms. Thompson explained that assuming the Council would consent to having driveway access for Lot 2 on Broadway as opposed to Strawn Road, which was now the request of the applicant, she noted Section 5 of the proposed bill would need to be amended. Item 1 under Section 6 of the amendment sheet would also need to be amended so driveway access was prohibited on only Strawn Road, and not Broadway.

Mr. Trapp made a motion to amend B238-15 by changing Section 5 so it read “subdivider is granted a variance from the requirements of Section 25-53(4) of the Subdivision Regulations to allow Lot 2 within the Final Plat of Howell Subdivision, Plat No. 3 to have direct residential driveway access on Broadway; provided that, the driveway shall be constructed with a paved area of sufficient size and design to provide for vehicles to turn around and enter Broadway without backing into the roadway” and to amend the amendment sheet associated with B238-15 so subsection 1 of Section 6 read “ a note shall be added to the final plat indicating that Lot 2 is prohibited from taking driveway access onto Strawn Road (Route ZZ) for the purpose of residential development, per section 25-53(4) of the City Code and that Lot 1 is prohibited from taking driveway access onto Broadway, Strawn Road (Route ZZ), for the purpose of residential development, per section 25-53(4) of the City Code, except as provided in the manner set forth in a Right of Use Permit Agreement executed between the City and the owner of Lot 1.” The motion was seconded by Mr. Skala and approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend B238-15 per the amended amendment sheet. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp and approved unanimously by voice vote.

The vote on B238-15, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

B272-15 Appropriating FY 2014 General Fund savings for projects identified by the City Council as part of the Incentive Based Budgeting Initiative.

The bill was given third reading by the Clerk.

Mr. Matthes provided a staff report.

Ms. Nauser stated she had recommended the \$10,000 for community policing, and anticipated it being used for programming, such as community activities in which they wanted citizen engagement. She did not want it to be used for overtime.

Mayor McDavid made a motion to amend B272-15 by transferring the \$100,000 for Strategic Plan Implementation – Miscellaneous Contractual to Strategic Plan – Community Policing Activities. The motion was seconded by Ms. Nauser.

Mr. Skala stated he did not believe there was any issue with spending \$100,000 for community policing, and understood this was a way to specifically earmark the money for that particular purpose. Mr. Matthes stated that was correct, and one idea was for officers to teach children how to safely ride bikes. It was still about public safety, but did not involve enforcement.

Ms. Nauser did not believe it made sense to have \$10,000 set aside for community policing in one location and another \$100,000 set aside elsewhere. Mr. Matthes asked if they wanted \$110,000 or \$100,000 for community policing. Mr. Trapp replied he was agreeable to \$100,000. Mr. Skala thought that was reasonable.

Ms. Nauser stated she wanted components of the recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence to be evaluated and addressed with these community policing funds, especially as the Police Department embarked upon its strategic planning process. She wanted to ensure there was community outreach and citizens could voice their opinions. She thought they needed to study re-entry issues to see how they could implement some items. She noted those were conditions for her vote in favor of the \$100,000 for community policing. Mr. Matthes commented that he thought the next step was to conduct some robust research on those topics, and this funding would help.

Mr. Ruffin understood the City was not at a point of being ready to implement specific projects or programs recommended by the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence, and that more research was needed. Mr. Matthes stated the Task Force had done some good research on their own, and the City now had to determine what might work in Columbia. It was not a matter of whether they should move forward with some of the recommendations, but a matter of what might be best. Mr. Ruffin stated he sensed frustration in the community as many wanted to see some action as opposed to more meetings and research. He wanted to ensure they did not lose the opportunity to initiate a program within the coming year. Mr. Matthes explained staff was preparing a report to Council as quite a bit of work had occurred, such as ban the box, but he agreed more work was left to be done.

Mr. Skala noted some information would come from the NLC Conference in Nashville as a group was specifically dedicated to racial equity issues.

Mr. Thomas stated he shared the concerns of Mr. Ruffin, and pointed out they could earmark the \$100,000 for community policing components from the recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence or solely for the recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence. He noted a question that had been asked was

whether any money had been allocated to implement those recommendations, and this would provide a clear answer of yes.

Mayor McDavid commented that many people did not believe the City spent enough money on policing, so he would hate to remove the word policing as an identifier. Mr. Thomas agreed there was a lot of overlap. Mayor McDavid stated he wanted to be able to say they added \$100,000 to community policing, and allow staff to determine how that fit with the recommendations of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence.

Mr. Matthes explained the \$50,000 for strategic plan implementation had been intended to develop a violence interruption service of some kind, and this \$100,000 would be a greater catalyst.

Ms. Nauser noted money had been budgeted for other related items, and it was just hard to find it in the budget. She provided the increase in overtime funds to place school resource officers in the middle schools as an example, and pointed out that was a specific recommendation of the Mayor's Task Force on Community Violence. Funding Cradle to Career would help obtain metrics and data and would help with the collaboration of government and non-profit agencies, which was associated with Task Force recommendations.

Mr. Thomas understood the motion was to put \$100,000 toward community policing activities. Mayor McDavid stated that was correct, and clarified that his motion was to amend B272-15 so Strategic Plan – Community Policing Activities was funded \$100,000 and for the necessary funds to come from Strategic Plan Implementation – Miscellaneous Contractual. Ms. Nauser, who seconded the initial motion, was agreeable.

The motion made by Mayor McDavid and seconded by Ms. Nauser to amend B272-15 by allocating \$100,000 to Strategic Plan – Community Policing Activities, and for those funds to come from Strategic Plan Implementation – Miscellaneous Contractual, was approved unanimously by voice vote.

Mr. Thomas asked how much was now unallocated. Mr. Matthes replied \$28,000.

Mr. Thomas stated he wanted to allocate a maximum of \$21,500 for an affordable housing symposium, which he and others had been working on. He noted the symposium was expected to be held December 3-4, 2015 and the funds would be used for professional facilitators, the marketing of the event, and travel expenses for the visiting speakers.

Mr. Matthes suggested the motion be for \$28,000 unless anyone had other uses in mind as travel could be unpredictable.

Mr. Thomas made a motion to amend B272-15 so \$28,000 was allocated for the affordable housing symposium. The motion was seconded by Mr. Trapp.

Mayor McDavid commented that he loved Boulder, Colorado, but was concerned about bringing someone in from that community to talk about affordable housing as he could not afford to live there. He listed the average cost of homes in surrounding communities, which ranged from \$95,000 in Mexico, Missouri to \$166,000 in Jefferson City, Missouri, and noted Columbia was at \$233,000. This was one of the reasons half of the workforce did not live in Columbia. He pointed out the average listing price in Boulder, Colorado was \$1,001,000. It was an elite community with a black population of one percent. He noted he

could be convinced, but was skeptical of someone from Boulder being able to teach them about affordable housing.

Mr. Thomas explained Randy Cole, the affordable housing expert on City staff, had spoken highly of the program in Boulder, and noted they had a policy that development had to include a component of affordable housing or the developer had to pay into an affordable housing subsidy fund, which had raised \$19 million.

Mayor McDavid stated he believed those were price control developments, which he considered to be a huge tax, and thought this would be great for existing Columbia homeowners because the value of their homes would likely increase. He commented that inclusionary housing had been around for decades and likely worked in areas of very high demand where there was a lot of wealth, but believed inclusionary zoning would stop growth in Columbia.

Mr. Thomas stated he was not proposing the passage of inclusionary zoning. The person from Boulder would be invited to tell them about a strategy that had been very effective over the last several years in creating affordable housing units in a community that did not have many affordable homes.

Mr. Skala suggested they reserve judgement until after the person speaks, and believed they could learn a lot regardless of the person delivering the information. In addition, they did not have to use the advice of this person if he did not have anything to offer.

Mr. Trapp pointed out it would only be one presentation of a larger symposium, and there would also be a speaker from Missoula, Montana, which he felt was a fairly comparable community to Columbia. He noted the intent was to bring the community together to learn of a range of solutions so they could then move forward on those items with consensus.

The motion made by Mr. Thomas and seconded by Mr. Trapp to amend B272-15 so \$28,000 was allocated for the affordable housing symposium was approved unanimously by voice vote.

John Clark, 403 N. Ninth Street, stated he was glad they were asking for money to plan this summit, but noted he was somewhat concerned about the summit since the result would likely be a strategy for new buildings. He hoped the result would be a policy instead as it would also address how to maintain existing affordable housing, trailer parks, building codes in terms of insulation, transportation availability, and breaking up income segregation. Mr. Clark stated he was happy \$100,000 would go toward community policing, but was concerned the focus of the strategic plan was on geographic policing, which was not community policing. He thought geographic policing was a step backwards, and felt the \$100,000 would go a long way in facilitating a 12-15 month process for a community-based strategic plan after the Council adopted community policy as the policy for Columbia. He believed this would dramatically reduce distrust, and did not feel the Police Department could do this work internally.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, commented that the \$100,000 for community policing was an excellent idea, and suggested it be increased by 25 percent per year to help pay for future officers or other needs.

The vote on B272-15, as amended, was recorded as follows: VOTING YES: MCDAVID, RUFFIN, TRAPP, SKALA, THOMAS, NAUSER, PETERS. VOTING NO: NO ONE. Bill declared enacted, reading as follows:

CONSENT AGENDA

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

- B254-15 Rezoning property located on the north side of St. Charles Road and west of Elderbrook Drive (4515 St. Charles Road) from District A-1 to District R-1.
- B256-15 Approving the Final Plat of Wyndham Ridge, Plat No. 3-A, a Replat of Lot D2 Wyndham Ridge Plat No. 3, located on the north side of Steinbrooke Terrace and east of Scott Boulevard.
- B257-15 Approving the Final Plat of Wyndham Ridge, Plat No. 3-B, a Replat of Lot D3 Wyndham Ridge Plat No. 3, located on the north side of Steinbrooke Terrace and east of Scott Boulevard; authorizing a performance contract.
- B258-15 Approving the Final Plat of Rock Bridge Christian Church Plat 3, a minor Replat of Lot 201 Rock Bridge Christian Church Plat 2 located on the north side of Green Meadows Road and east of Bethel Street.
- B259-15 Authorizing construction of street and sewer improvements along a portion of Discovery Drive, from the intersection of Discovery Drive and Discovery Parkway southeastward; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.
- B260-15 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of sanitary sewer improvements along the MKT Trail and Providence Road from Stadium Boulevard to Elm Street, more specifically described as the Flat Branch Watershed Relief Sewer Project No. 1.
- B262-15 Authorizing an agreement for conveyance of easements with Woodrail Home Owners Association No. 4 as it relates to the Forum Boulevard pedestrian bridge (GetAbout) project; vacating easements for sidewalk and drainage and temporary construction purposes.
- B263-15 Appropriating transit division funds to cover overages in personnel and fleet maintenance accounts.
- B264-15 Declaring the results of the election held in the City of Columbia, Missouri on August 4, 2015; reimposing a sales tax of one-fourth of one percent for funding capital improvements.
- B265-15 Authorizing amendments to PCS antenna agreements and memorandums of lease with T-Mobile Central LLC relating to the lease of property and space on the Shepard Water Tower (1160 Cinnamon Hill Lane) and the Walnut Street Water Tower (15 E. Walnut Street).
- B266-15 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the Healthy Families America program.
- B267-15 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for the issuance of birth and death certificates and the associated technology resources.
- B268-15 Accepting a Walmart Community Grant to be used by the Fire Department for the purchase of physical training equipment for the Fire Training Academy; appropriating funds.

- B269-15 Appropriating funds to cover the costs of FY 2015 medical and prescription drug claims.
- B270-15 Appropriating funds to the Firefighters' Retirement Fund and Police Retirement Fund.
- B271-15 Appropriating FY 2014 General Fund savings to General Fund departments as part of the Incentive Based Budgeting Initiative.
- R148-15 Setting a public hearing: construction and installation of concrete pads and bus shelters at various locations throughout the city.
- R149-15 Setting a public hearing: construction of water mains along portions of Molly Lane, Lakeland Drive, Linda Lane and Sarah Ann Drive.
- R150-15 Transferring funds for repairs to the art exhibit at the Martin Luther King, Jr. Memorial at Battle Garden.
- R151-15 Transferring funds for building security upgrades to the Columbia Police Department building.
- R152-15 Authorizing submission of a FY 2016 Historic Preservation Fund Grants Survey/National Register Projects Application to the Missouri Department of Natural Resources to fund the North Central Columbia Historic Survey.

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

NEW BUSINESS

None.

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING

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

- B273-15 Amending Chapter 29 of the City Code as it relates to pet stores, grooming or small animal care establishments.
- B274-15 Approving the C-P Plan for First Midwest Bank – Red Oak South located on the southeast corner of Grindstone Parkway and Norfleet Drive.
- B275-15 Approving a major revision to the C-P Development Plan for Lot 2 – Katy Place Heights located on the southeast corner of Forum Boulevard and Forum Katy Parkway (1410 Forum Katy Parkway).
- B276-15 Authorizing the release of access easements on Lot 303 within Berlekamp Subdivision Plat 3 located on the west side of Paris Road and north of U.S. Highway 63; authorizing execution of an easement release conveyance.
- B277-15 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to prohibit parking along both sides of Allen Street, from Bryant Street to Trinity Place.
- B278-15 Authorizing conveyance of street and utility easements to The County of Boone, and a water line easement to Consolidated Public Water Supply District No. 1 of Boone County, Missouri, necessary for the relocation of

Rangeline Road as part of the Runway 13/31 extension project at the Columbia Regional Airport.

B279-15 Accepting conveyances for sewer, utility and temporary construction purposes.

B280-15 Authorizing the construction of water mains along portions of Molly Lane, Lakeland Drive, Linda Lane and Sarah Ann Drive; determining that the work shall be done by City employees.

REPORTS AND PETITIONS

REP94-15 Requiring Property Owners to Identify Illegal Connections to the Sanitary Sewer System.

Mayor McDavid understood the only way to obtain compliance would be to require this at a point of sale. Mr. Glascock stated that would be the easiest way, but there were likely other options. Mayor McDavid asked if this would require inspection by the City. Mr. Glascock replied staff had contacted some professional service companies, and they had indicated the cost for them to provide the service would be \$200-\$500. He noted they would likely want the lateral inspected at the same time to ensure it was in good repair as well, and that would cost more. They believed the lateral would likely be in worse shape than anything connected to it, and would likely leak the worst. Mayor McDavid asked who would be responsible for fixing the lateral. Mr. Glascock replied the property owner. Mayor McDavid commented that this would be an increased burden on central city citizens, who were already stressed financially. Mr. Glascock noted they were finding that about nine percent of homes had illicit connections, and his goal was to get the City's system in good repair before asking homeowners to resolve their issues. He explained that was the reason they had not pursued this previously, but agreed it would need to be pursued in the future.

Ms. Nauser stated she had asked staff to provide a report on this issue because they had a backlog in trying to fix the inflow and infiltration problems throughout the City, and ratepayers were paying for the work. She thought it would be helpful to identify the issues more quickly so they could be addressed more quickly. She understood they could not make a decision on this particular issue at this time.

Mr. Matthes noted the City could begin to address the situation with rental properties. Ms. Nauser thought they should move forward with whatever they could to address the situation sooner than later as that would be more cost-effective for everyone in the long run.

Mr. Skala asked if they had exhausted the capacity to incentivize actions to correct illegal connections. Mr. Glascock replied the City had a program to help with some of the costs for disconnecting downspouts or sump pumps, but the problems needed to be found and the property owners had to want to correct the problem.

Mr. Trapp asked if the rental housing inspectors would be able to do a visual inspection as part of their normal inspection process, and understood this would not involve inspecting the laterals. Mr. Glascock replied the inspectors would only look at downspouts and sump pumps. Mr. Trapp stated he thought that was reasonable.

REP95-15 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 the increase in the sewer connection fees would not pay for all of the new infrastructure required, but it would be fairer than the current system. It was the first step in convincing other people that they would have to pay their fair share. He explained he was tired of the Council and City staff saying they could not plan or forecast, and noted there were people all over the country that could reasonably project costs for a variety of infrastructure. He suggested those people be contacted so they could determine a fair and proportionate amount for new development to pay.

Mr. Clark suggested the City require sidewalks similar to how they require streets as a long term policy, and believed they could then think their way back to how they would deal with the older sidewalks. He reiterated the sidewalks needed to be a part of the right-of-way and dedicated to the City similar to streets.

Eugene Elkin, 3406 Range Line Street, understood there had been a major accident on Scott Boulevard this morning, and asked if Scott Boulevard was owned by the City. Mr. Matthes replied it was owned by the City. Mr. Elkin suggested speed monitors be placed along Scott Boulevard to address speeding issues. He also suggested the use of rumble strips horizontally to slow down traffic.

John Conway, 4902 Thornbrook Ridge, understood some wanted to include the water system in the review by the Mayor's Task Force on Infrastructure, and noted there were many existing studies which were guiding documents for the future. He recommended the Council read those studies he had mentioned earlier tonight as they would provide some insight on the work needed in the future, and pointed out an integrated resource plan for water had already been commissioned as the Water and Light Advisory Board had been involved with developing the scope of services. He explained the Water and Light Advisory Board was a citizen board whose members were appointed by the Council, and he believed they were fulfilling the obligations of the Board.

Mr. Skala explained he had recently returned from a National League of Cities (NLC) summit in Orlando, Florida, whose theme was *Leading Through Times*, and issues of social equity and economics were discussed. He commented that there was a new group called *Race, Equity and Leadership*, who planned to speak at the NLC Conference in Nashville, Tennessee in November. He listed some of the speakers at the summit, and noted they had discussed the unique aspects of Columbia and the unique aspects of Orlando. He stated he would present the information to the Council in the future, and had planned to pursue connections with the *Race, Equity and Leadership* group.

Mr. Skala commented that he was asked by a couple constituents to determine if there might be consensus on the Council to consider holding closed sessions at times when other open sessions were not being held. It was inconvenient for the public when invited to an open session without proper time being allocated due to closed meeting issues. He asked for some resolution to the problem.

Ms. Peters stated she had the same thought, especially when they invited people to present information. She believed the open session should be held first, and the closed session should be held at the end of the meeting. She understood they could do another night, but noted she was not fond of that idea.

Mr. Ruffin explained he had starting participating on the Columbia Alliance to Combat Homelessness (CATCH) Board, which was an outgrowth of the Room at the Inn program, prior to being elected. The goal of CATCH was to build a comprehensive service center for the homeless located in the First Ward. He noted they were sponsoring a meeting at 6:30 p.m. on October 6 at Jefferson Middle School for the surrounding neighborhoods and public to share their thoughts about this vision.

Ms. Nauser asked that more detail than account numbers be provided in the future for bills such as B271-15, which appropriated money from the budget surplus. She suggested the department name and what specifically the money would go toward to be a part of the ordinance or report.

Ms. Nauser noted a speaker earlier in the evening referred to a Race Relations Task Force report and asked for a copy of the document as she did not believe she had ever seen it. Ms. Amin replied she would provide them a copy.

Ms. Nauser commented that although violent crimes had gone down over the 2012-2014 time frame, there had been a spike in violent crime in the last six months, and mainly due to assaults. She asked the Police Department to include the reason for that increase in the report they planned to provide to Council.

Mayor McDavid explained he reviewed the data as well, and from January to August, violent crime was at 330 this year compared to 285 last year. This was an increase from where it was the last few years, but it was not in a range that was out of line. He noted the statistics were also showing a reduction of 50 percent in property crimes, so he was unsure if the data could be trusted. He thought there was some credence to assaults being up.

Ms. Nauser reiterated her request for the Police Department to share any theories they had for the increase in assaults, and the types of assaults that had increased.

Mr. Thomas asked staff to prepare a report as to whether other cities helped to encourage affordable housing by providing discounts, subsidies, or exemptions on various connection fees and impact fees, or if they had other similar strategies that could be controlled to specifically target and encourage affordable housing. He also wanted the thoughts of staff with regard to similar strategies being implemented in Columbia.

The meeting adjourned at 12:01 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Sheela Amin
City Clerk