



Columbia City Council Meeting Recap
Council Chamber, Columbia City Hall
7:00 PM
Monday, November 19, 2018

Pledge of Allegiance
Roll Call

Approval of Minutes
Adjustment of Agenda

INTRODUCTORY ITEMS

(Recited as indicated.)

(Present: Treece, Peters, Ruffin, Thomas, Pitzer, Skala)

(Absent: Trapp.)

(No minutes were available for approval at this time.)

(PH45-18 and related item B292-18 were both withdrawn from consideration by the applicant. B279-18 withdrawn from Consent and moved to Old Business by Skala. Ruffin indicated that he will request tabling R185-18 but did not formally ask to change the agenda. Pitzer requested to abstain from B281-18. B277-18 and B278-18 were removed from Consent and moved to Old Business by Thomas.)

SPECIAL ITEMS

SI14-18 Strategic Plan Annual Update 2018.

(Action: The City's mission, vision and values provide the foundation for the plan's five strategic priority areas: economy, social equity, public safety, infrastructure and operational excellence; these are supported by 29 objectives. These priority areas provide the structure that directs the City's focus, which includes working toward a local economy with more living wage jobs; stronger neighborhoods that contribute to the family success; greater satisfaction with public safety services; safe and reliable City infrastructure; and higher-performing City employees. The Strategic Plan also includes three Focus Neighborhoods in north, east and central Columbia.

This is the required annual report regarding achievement of the goals articulated:
[2018 Strategic Plan Report](#)

The following discussion occurred:

The Human Resources director appeared to outline the process, the content and the intent of the plan. Other staff members provided highlights of the plan which are all included in the previous link to the overall report. A short video was presented relating to integrated services including transportation, job training, city services, public safety and other infrastructure.

APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

BC11-18 Board and Commission Applicants.

Airport Advisory Board: B.J. Hunter (*Aviation/Pilot*); Chuck Graham (*Educational Institution*)

Community Land Trust Organization Board: Anthony Stanton; Alex LaBrunerie, Richard Mendenhall (*Comm/BusLeader*)

Disabilities Commission: Jonathan Asher, Andrew Liebig

Mayor's Council on Physical Fitness & Health: Christopher Hawf, Lisa Kinser, Susan Miller, Avila Nilon, Matthew Ogle, Sarah Schlemeier

Personnel Advisory Board: Amanda Andrade, Jennifer Barth

Tax Increment Financing Commission: Paul Prevo, Andy Waters applied. NO APPOINTMENT MADE. ITEM WILL BE READVERTISED.)

SCHEDULED PUBLIC COMMENT

SPC65-18 Lynn Maloney - The dismantling of the Community Outreach Unit.

(Action: It is ironic that the earlier presentation praised community policing and that it is now being dismantled. This is willful insubordination. She criticized the City Manger directly and was asked to direct comments to the council. She provided a timeline of failures in terms of implementation of a robust community policing plan. She named the City Manager, Police Chief and Deputy Police Chief as failing in this effort. She indicated that news stories that have reported this story were not correct because the city manager had actually manipulated advertising and the rationale for cutting back on outreach programs. This unit has been dismantled. Several of you will be up for re-election soon. We look for your leadership.

SPC66-18 Andrew C. Twaddle, Ph.D. - Change in CPD policy.

(Action: The speaker recently returned to Columbia and was distressed to find that the COU had been dismantled. He thinks this is a giant step backward. This is a guardian mentality and flies in the face of established policy. It appears that the city manager cannot implement council directives. Apparently, police leaders believe that outreach is just a part of policing. It should be a part of the overall approach. Are they acting in good faith or not? If not, we need a change in leadership. If the policy is true, then we need a plan. Please reassert your previous directive and implement community policing.

SPC67-18 Virginia Muller - Holding city management accountable.

(Action: The city charter indicates that the council can appoint a city manager – or remove him. Is the city council pleased with the performance of the manager? The manager has participated in the bureaucratic dismantling of the police department efforts. People are being redirected to other positions despite the directive of the council. The city manager is not being truthful and is not doing the job he has been tasked with. One of Mayor Treece's first acts was to increase transparency. We know that the city manager was contacted by the media, but he has denied that. We need to hold people accountable. The police chief thinks "action" is more important than effectiveness. The manager shows disrespect to the council and is manipulating the system. You have the power to remove him. We think it's time for someone new who will treat us all with respect. Remove him and move us forward. More consistent leadership is needed.

SPC68-18 Jill Lucht - "Letting go of the good to do better:" Tools we can use to be a more inclusive community.

(Action: The next speaker lives in the First Ward and asks the council to follow through on its original promise of community policing. She asked members of the audience to stand in support of these remarks. She cited the story of a man who was targeted for being black in court. She wondered how people can become better persons. Being considered a "good" person is important. The speaker

believes that she tries to be good. She thinks the council has acted on behalf of many of our most vulnerable citizens. That is important. Community policing is important. But sometimes, when we are good, it keeps us from becoming better. We can learn from our mistakes. I invite you to let go of being a good person and become a better person. We need to value diversity and move past our defensive positions. Acknowledge our historical legacy of racism and move to a better way.

PUBLIC HEARINGS

(The following two items are related.)

PH43-18 Proposed construction of improvements at the Lions-Stephens Park to include replacement of the existing shelter and playground structures, installation of a sidewalk along Ann Street, installation of concrete pads for trash and recycling receptacles, construction of ADA walkways and the installation of additional amenities as funding allows.

[See B284-18/Mayor Memo]

(Action: The proposed improvements at the park will include a new small shelter, playground, water fountain, bike racks, trash/recycling receptacles and ADA walkways. The total project budget is \$100,000 and is one of the projects identified and funded by the 2015 Park Sales Tax. Portions of the project will be bid through the City's Purchasing Department, and the proposed improvements will be completed using a combination of contract and force account labor. Contract labor will be used for the installation of the playground, ADA walkways and site grading. All other work will be completed by park staff. Improvements at the park are scheduled to begin winter 2018, with an anticipated completion date of fall 2019.

The Parks Director provided a report on this issue and provided a timeline for old improvements at this park. He showed diagrams that illustrated the proposed improvements. The neighborhood failed to achieve consensus. So, we delayed the process, included more people and 21 out of 28 people voted to move the location of the existing shelter.

Skala asked about the first meeting of the neighbors and asked what changed? Was the consensus about the shelter location? Yes. People ended up changing their minds.

A speaker indicated that he understands how difficult it is to reach consensus. He mostly agrees with the new proposal. There were some questions about the size of the new shelter (which is smaller), and the location. He does not agree that there was a consensus, but he is OK with this and this is generally a balance between what was asked for and what is possible.

Skala reiterated that this was a process and it seems to have turned out OK and the Parks Department is a good department.

A vote on this issue is reflected in the next item.)

B284-18 Authorizing the construction of improvements at the Lions-Stephens Park to include replacement of the existing shelter and playground structures, installation of a sidewalk along Ann Street, installation of concrete pads for trash and recycling receptacles, construction of ADA walkways and the installation of additional amenities as funding allows; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.

(Action: A motion to approve the proposal passed unanimously.)

PH44-18 Consider approval of the design concept proposed by artist David Spear for the Columbia Sports Fieldhouse Percent for Art Project.

(Action: The Standing Committee on Public Art and the Commission on Cultural Affairs have both voted to accept the design proposal by artist David Spear for the Percent for Art project at the Columbia Sports Fieldhouse. Before Council acts on the recommendation, the final step in the approval process, a public hearing must be held. According to Percent for Art program guidelines, artist David Spear has submitted a design concept for site-specific public art at the Columbia Sports Fieldhouse. Spear did so in accordance with the contract requirements.

There are three parts to this project and each of the elements consist of three-dimensional panels and layers and the integration of functional pieces, including doors, into the project.

The total amount for the Columbia Sports Fieldhouse Percent for Art project is \$50,310. Of those funds, \$42,764 are set aside for the artist's commission. This includes construction, fabrication and installation. \$5,031 is set aside for lifetime maintenance and \$2,515 for administration. No staff salaries are paid from Percent for Art funds. Any administrative dollars left at the close of the project will revert to the maintenance fund.

PH45-18 Voluntary annexation of property located on the northwest corner of the Prathersville Road and Oakland Gravel Road intersection.

[See B292-18 under Intro & 1st Read]

THIS ITEM WAS WITHDRAWN FROM CONSIDERATION BY THE APPLICANT.

(The following two items are related.)

PH46-18 Consider the FY 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan for CDBG and HOME funds in accordance with the City's Citizen Participation Plan.

(Action: The Consolidated Plan is the City of Columbia's guiding document for directing affordable housing and community development strategies and activities. Staff estimates the Consolidated Plan will guide approximately \$7.5 million in federal funds for affordable housing and community development from 2020-2024. The CPP describes efforts undertaken to encourage citizen participation in the development of the City of Columbia's: 5-year Consolidated Plan, the annual Action Plans, and the Consolidated Annual Performance and Evaluation Report (CAPER). The resolution under consideration would set a hearing to approve the Citizen Participation Plan for the City of Columbia's FY 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan public engagement process.

The vote on this proposal is included in the next item.)

R187-18 Adopting the FY 2020-2024 Consolidated Plan for CDBG and HOME funds in accordance with the City's Citizen Participation Plan.

One speaker from the public addressed the council and worried that sometimes the intent to provide new housing displaces existing residents who have affordable rents. She wants the council to think about this. Thomas indicated that he thought the program was thoughtful and well-run. Skala added that he thinks sometimes needs need to be balanced and that the intent is to help those who need help the most.

(Action: After brief discussion, the item was approved unanimously.)

OLD BUSINESS

B274-18 Granting a waiver and design adjustment relating to sidewalk construction along a portion of the west side of Ballenger Lane (1705 N. Ballenger Lane) (Case No. 18-181) \ (Requires approval by 2/3 of Council.)

(Action: Victory Christian Church of Columbia, Inc. (owner) is seeking approval of a design adjustment to Section 29-5.1(d)(2) to allow the waiver of sidewalk construction along the property's Ballenger Lane street frontage, a distance of approximately 1,500 feet. The 13.42- acre subject site is located on the west side of Ballenger Lane, approximately 1,200 feet north of Clark Lane, and addressed as 1705 N. Ballenger Lane. The applicant is requesting waiver of the UDC requirement to construct sidewalks along Ballenger Lane, which was required as part of the new building construction on the site. After evaluating the applicant's request and the circumstances surrounding it, staff did not find adequate evidence that the standards to grant the design adjustment were met. As a note, the City is currently in the design stage of a project that will construct paved shoulders along Ballenger, which will result in providing an area that pedestrians could use in the absence of sidewalks.

The sidewalk construction under consideration would be in addition to this project, and Public Works' staff has preliminarily considered options for connecting the sidewalk to the shoulder to provide access between the two.

The Planning and Zoning Commission considered the design adjustment request at their October 4, 2018 meeting. Staff presented its report and the applicant gave an overview of the request. Commissioners inquired about if the sidewalk would be removed if the street was widened and if so, would the City pay to replace it (the sidewalk would be designed in a location that maximizes the likelihood it would not be removed, and generally the City would pay to reconstruct).

Following the public hearing and additional discussion, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted against the design modification (0-7; none in favor, seven against on a motion to recommend approval of the design adjustment). At this time, staff and the applicant have not discussed any alternatives besides sidewalk construction, or a full waiver as requested by the applicant. The provisions of PR 48-06A allow Council to consider a fee-in-lieu of construction as an alternative to installation of the required sidewalk.

Skala clarified that this project was not completed in the past because it was too expensive and that if a new one was built it would not have to be torn out. If it DID have to be removed for road widening, the city would have to pay to replace it. The ordinance does not allow us to issue an occupancy permit until the sidewalk project is completed or satisfied in some manner. Pitzer asked if there could be some grading or other measures that could offset sidewalk construction at this time. Ruffin asked if you are planning to install shoulders along the road wouldn't that provide pedestrian access? Staff said in this area that is not the case. He also asked if the waiver and design adjustment were two different things? Staff said that the design adjustment would be the variance from the sidewalk rule.

The primary speaker on behalf of this project was the pastor of the church. He asked the people in the audience who support the waiver to stand and many did. He stated that they have a temporary occupancy permit, but for a final permit they need to resolve the sidewalk issue. There is not any money to build this sidewalk. We are flat broke. We can't pass the hat anymore. This took us 3 years to build. We were our own general contractor. And did a lot of the work ourselves. We are trying to help the north side of town. We think the cost of the sidewalk would be \$100,000. That's nothing to you, but it's everything to us.

MoDOT will be doing road work. Why isn't that enough for minimal service? The city said we could pay the city \$91,000 in lieu of construction. If we can buy out, then is it really necessary? We are always going to have to drainage ditches in this area. There are so many things that conflict with each other. The city now tells us that we have to tear out driveway because they are no in charge of this stretch of road. We would also have to tear out trees. We have no idea what that will cost. There are also power poles there and we don't know what Boone Electric will make us do. It is a big deal to us. We are tapped out.

He showed pictures of how the engineered driveway met MoDOT standards, but now the city claims jurisdiction and demands that we are required to put new sidewalks in that connect to nothing, and that will cost thousands of dollars that we don't have. Nobody uses the existing sidewalks out there. We will have to tear out trees, dig up the new construction we have put in, and we can't occupy the building we built over three years. The city has even indicated that they will sue us into compliance. We would rather put our money into helping people, not in building slabs of concrete that no one will use. All of this stuff and rules will do nothing if it doesn't help the people at the church.

The pastor indicated that there was a young man who attends this church, but he can't speak and he is almost totally paralyzed. He can't give money because he can't move his hands. We would rather put our hard-earned money toward helping people like this. We would rather put our money into our children. Sidewalks may be connections, but our church connects people through community. Concrete and steel do nothing unless we build community.

The Mayor asked why the applicant feels like they are being forced to do this when you agreed to do this project up front? The speaker said the were told that they would have to ask for sidewalks but that they could apply for a variance. So, we put it on the application, but we are asking for a variance and are asking for mercy instead of legal compliance.

The next speaker asked how far away the next connecting sidewalk was? Staff indicated that it would connect at the roundabout.

The next speaker indicated that she lives in this area and that sidewalks end at her house and that there are not connecting sidewalks in this area. She does not believe that there will be a functioning network until the city does its part in improving the roads in this area. It is too dangerous to use the way it is. There is no interim usability. I would ask the city to weight the rules and regulations instead of just checking things off a box. Let's consider what really works. We have the opportunity and the power to grant variances. I would like you to use that power.

No further speakers appeared on behalf of the project.

Ruffin indicated that he believes this is very challenging. He commended the members of Victory Church on their efforts to build a new church and he understands the challenges. This looks like a great church in a part of the city that could use this. However, he also understands the rules that the city has. He cannot support putting an undue burden on this non-profit endeavor and thinks it will be a net benefit to the city, even if the sidewalk is not completed.

Skala said he lives close to this area and has for 38 years. He thinks this is a difficult decision. He believes that there are multi-jurisdictional problems involved here. He believes that this is an underserved area of town. There is a bit of history to this parcel and at one point it might have been a school. He also said

that there is never an assurance that you can get a variance. I wish I could craft a solution that would work. I think there may be a cheaper alternative. I wish we could use the existing driveway as part of the pavement. We are always dealing with sidewalks to nowhere. We are so far behind in terms of getting sidewalks in so many places that I have to agree with P&Z and deny your request or maybe establish some payment in lieu of scenario. We are going to need sidewalks eventually and I cannot let this opportunity go by.

Thomas stated that he firmly believes that this policy is in place for very good reasons and when he sees all of the residential development in the area, he thinks this is safer to have a sidewalk than putting foot traffic on Ballenger Lane. If there is a way to make this process easier, I would consider that. If we can stage this, maybe that could work. But it is a large property and we need to make sure it is connected. This does not qualify and will vote against their request.

Skala asked about the fee in-lieu option and if there was a time limit? Staff said there is a seven-year time limit, so any proposal like that would need to have a time limit attached. Peters asked if payments in lieu would equal the cost of constructing the sidewalk? Staff said there were various ways to calculate cost, but that the payment would need to approximate the true cost of construction. Skala said that in some cases they can use alternative surfaces and alternative routes. Staff said that has been used at times, but we have a sidewalk standard and durability and that will require an even different kind of variance. There are also ADA issues that need to be taken into consideration.

The roll was called, and the proposal was defeated with Treece, Skala, Thomas and Pitzer voting NO on the request with Ruffin and Peters voting YES.

(The following two items are related.)

B288-18 Amending Chapters 11, 14 and 17 of the City Code relating to motor propelled scooters and electric assist bicycles.

(Action: Due to changes in technology and modes of transportation, amendments to the City Code are proposed to provide for the regulation and use of motor propelled scooters and electric assist bicycles. In general, the amendments provide for the regulation of motor propelled scooters and electric assist bicycles in a similar manner as roller skates, skateboards and bicycles. The proposed amendments will provide for the following:

1. A “motor propelled scooter” will be defined within Chapters 14 and 17 and is limited to a maximum speed of 15 miles per hour;
2. Electric assist bicycles are added to the definition of “cycle” in Section 14-491;
3. A person must be age 16 or older to operate a motor propelled scooter;
4. Operation of a motor propelled scooter is prohibited in city parks and trails;
5. Motor propelled scooters are prohibited on sidewalks and public parking lots and garages within the boundaries of the Central Business District;
6. Operation of motor propelled scooters is required to be consistent with traffic laws and safety equipment; and
7. Any person who violates the regulations could be subjected to a fine of no less than five dollars (\$5.00) and no more than one hundred dollars (\$100.00).

Public comment was invited.

The first speaker stated that she travels around town in her wheelchair and that she believes the new scooters are dangerous because they operate on the sidewalks, they block the curb cuts and wants

these scooters to be parked in a bike rack, out of the way of handicapped accessible routes. She indicated that her chair is safer, has better lights and is not as likely to crash as these new users.

The next speaker stated that she would like to speak to these agreements. She believes that the places where they park the scooters is wrong. When you open your car doors, you can't because the scooters are actually blocking handicapped access spots. There are many complaints. I want to beautify our city. If you are going to authorize the use of these, you need to do something to insure safety, parking and operation. I understand the transportation problem, but let's take safety into consideration first. Let's manage this problem.

The next speaker said he has heard about safety issues with blind spots for buses and scooters darting in and out of traffic. Why not make them park parallel to the street, not perpendicular to the street. When they fall over, they are all laying all over the street and sidewalk.

The speaker lives at Broadway Village. She was injured by a scooter. She fell over one and broke her glasses, her wrist, her cell phone and is still having back problems. Don't park these on the sidewalk any more. If you park bikes in a bike rack, you can park these things in a rack, too. I know other cities have figured this out. Park them parallel. The company should bear some responsibility. There have been lots of injuries, including broken arms.

Another speaker said she wonders why need these at all with a bunch of drunks riding them. We don't need these. I have seen scooter riders disregard handicapped people and disregard traffic rules.

The following speaker said he agrees with earlier statements and also disagrees with the business model of the companies. They show up in the middle of the night and then demand that we help them out. If I opened a bike sharing program, I would have to apply for a license. This model says we don't have to pay attention to the law. That model should not be rewarded. Maybe we can't get rid of them, but we can certainly regulate them. Our sidewalks should not be an open parking lot for your rental business. City workers need to be protected from all of these scooters.

The Mayor asked if the new regulations address some of his concerns? The speaker said he did not advocate an outright ban, even though he hates them, but he doesn't want to encourage other enterprises doing something like this. The Mayor said what if these were all individually owned? Would we ban bikes and skateboards? The speaker said that if he abandoned his bike or skateboard on a sidewalk it would be impounded.

The next speaker indicated that the scooters cam out of the bike-share concept. We have been looking at this for a while and we think these devices are generally a good thing. They provide alternative transportation, they are electric, they have less emissions than automobiles. We understand the safety and ADA issues. That is a management issue and is a function of newness. I think the issues will be able to be worked out over time. When concerns are brought to you, then think about how you would deal with a car, not a scooter. We don't ban cars. We are used to it. Give scooters a chance.

Another speaker had a couple of questions. Do they have to have a license and why not? Isn't this taking resources out of our bus system? How does insurance work when people crash on a scooter? This kind of bothers me. This is an eyesore. And not just downtown.

The Mayor asked a representative of the CID for an opinion. His response could not be heard on the broadcast.

The Mayor indicated that we could do nothing. We could ban them. Or we could regulate them and impose a license that can be withdrawn. Staff agreed with those options. Staff has also looked at other community regulations and we are trying to take the best elements regarding compensation, safety, and education. Our proposals address blocking sidewalks, parallel parking options, compensation, insurance and necessary amendments to the ordinance.

Pitzer asked if the ordinance differentiates between scooters, motorized bikes and other vehicles? Staff said we have one provision regarding e bikes on trails and that bikes are allowed but scooters are not allowed. Staff said it was a policy decision and that we feared excessive congestion. Is there a speed restriction on scooters? Yes. What about e bikes? No. What about helmets? Staff said there is no additional helmet rule. What is our helmet rule on bikes? Staff said that if you are under 16 you have to wear a helmet, but over 16 you don't have to wear a helmet. The operating agreement gets into this but not the ordinance.

Peters asked about the speed. She thinks they go faster than 15 mph. Staff indicated that we don't have enough data yet. You could limit them to ten miles per hour. People shared anecdotes about crazy behaviors on the scooters. Thomas is in line with most of these ideas, but he wonders about prohibiting the scooters on the trails. He can go along with that if he has to. Then let's get into the agreement. Skala said he will go along with the change in the ordinance but then wants more discussion about the agreement.

This item was voted on and passed unanimously. A vote on the agreement follows.)

B289-18 Authorizing interim operating agreements with Bird Rides, Inc. and Pony Scooter, Inc. for implementation of a shared active transportation operation.

(Action: The purpose of these agreements is to establish interim rules and regulations governing Bird Rides, Inc., and Pony Scooter, Inc.'s Shared Active Transportation Operation within the City to ensure that it is managed in a manner consistent with the safety and well-being of pedestrians, bicyclists, motorists, and other users of City's right-of-way. The Bird Scooters were deployed in Columbia initially during the week of August 20th, 2018. Since then Bird Rides, Inc. and the City have been in discussions to establish an agreement before granting the company an official business license. In mid-October, 2018, Pony Scooter, Inc. contacted the City seeking to establish an operation as well and has signed a similar interim agreement for Council consideration. The City researched other communities that have agreements with scooter companies and along with input from a wide range of constituents have developed this interim agreement for Council's consideration.

Key items agreed upon include:

- The Interim Agreements are for one-year.
- A 24-hour toll free number and email address for the public to contact the Scooter Companies.
- Scooter Companies will take corrective action such as rebalancing, moving and relocating incorrectly parked scooters within 2-hours of oral or written notification or the City will impound the scooter.
- Bird will begin operations within the City with an initial fleet size of 500 scooters.
- Pony will begin operations within the City on January 4th, 2019, with an initial fleet size of 250.
- Scooter Companies will pay a \$10,000 regulatory fee within 30 days of the Effective Date.

- Scooter Companies will pay \$1.00 per day per scooter deployed in the City to be paid quarterly. Staff is recommending 50% of this quarterly fee to be deposited into the Sidewalks Inconvenience project and 50% to be deposited into the Transit Fleet Replacement project line items.
- Scooter Companies will be responsible for paying into a public property repair and maintenance performance bond or similar bond that the City can draw upon as needed for costs associated with auditing, removing, and storing impounded scooters. Bond fee shall be \$30 per scooter deployed in the City.
- Scooters will be governed at a speed not to exceed 15 m.p.h. on a paved level surface.
- Scooter Companies will halt operations completely during inclement weather and remove scooters from the City's right-of-way on days where snow is expected.
- Scooter Companies will initiate a test program that enlists human monitors to ensure compliance.
- Scooter Companies will provide education to riders on the City's existing rules and regulations via the Bird app.
- Scooter Companies shall remove scooters by 8:00 p.m. or dusk, whichever is later.
- Scooter Companies agrees to maintain for the duration of the agreement Workmen's' Compensation & Employers Liability, Commercial General Liability, and Business Auto Liability.

Short-Term Impact: Estimated Revenue of \$308,000 over the first two years

Long-Term Impact: Estimated Revenue of \$144,000 per year

Skala thought there were three areas of importance. He thought the fees are not sufficient to pay our enforcement. He thought our liability coverage was insufficient. He thought that we stand to make \$300,000 each year and wants to double those fees to make sure this is safe for all of our citizens. Maybe triple this. He also asked about information sharing. These companies are also interested in trip generation information and some of that information might be sold. Are we privy to that information and what safeguards are in place? What about lights and reflective materials. Should we have racks for these things? I think all of these things should be done at the same time and I will not support this the way it is. This is insufficient. The Mayor followed this p by asking if meter readers would be given permission to enforce this? Staff said they did not believe so. The definition of small vehicle conforms with other elements of the code.

Peters asked where the agreement with Lime is? Staff said that Lime has asked for some changes and that one is still being negotiated. What about insurance? Staff said the risk management team said that the insurance that is mandated covers Bird employees, people who are riding their scooters and that people who are injured by accidents are covered and that there is a hold harmless provision for the city. Peters asked if a scooter hits a pedestrian, who pays. The injured party of the scooter driver. Staff said that would depend upon a finding of fault. Right now, there is no requirement that scooter drivers have individual insurance, but that the company could be named in a suit.

The public hearing was opened.

A representative of Bird Scooters appeared and described her company. The speaker indicated that safety is very important. They want everyone to be safe. They give away free helmets to anyone who requests. We prohibit people under 16 from riding. You have to scan your drivers license. You have to take a picture of where you park your Bird. We limit our Birds to 15 mph and you can also choose to ride slower. We also deploy Bird watchers to help make sure the vehicles are properly parked. In fact, anyone can take a picture of an improperly parked Bird and we will dispatch someone to take care of

the problem. We also can send reminders to people who park wrong and if they keep doing it, we terminate accounts.

Thomas said he thought it was unusual that you require license scans. He wanted to know if scooters replace walking trips or driving trips. She did say that most rides are between 1.2 and 1.8 miles long. The company was founded by a guy who used to be with a ride-share company and they were looking for alternatives. Thomas asked about poor parking. The speaker said it takes time for people to get used to the new system and that over time they do find increasing compliance. Community mode is a new approach that helps with education and compliance.

Skala asked who saves the drivers license information? Bird says they can identify individual drivers and if there is a report, their rights can be terminated. Where are you banned? We are in 100 cities and we are banned in one. Regarding data sharing, we track data about use, but it is disaggregated, so we cannot always share user information with outside sources. We can share disaggregated information with the city. Pitzer asked the city why the city needs it in the first place. Staff said that public works and parks said they thought they had some use for that sort of data, but they don't know exactly how that will work.

Skala proposed that the motion be tabled until staff could reconsider testimony and new suggestions. The Mayor said he was concerned about the fact that the providers had generally agreed to this version of the agreement. He suggested that the agreement is for a term of only one year and that we should let this go forward so we have something in place now. Skala said if there is no support for this, then he will withdraw his motion to table. Peters said she will support it now, but she will be looking at it. Thomas said he will support getting rules in place now and at least we will have some foundation for being able to address problems. Pitzer agreed that he would support this. The Mayor said he would like to earmark the payments to addressing sidewalk problems and safety. Staff said that this agreement is not retroactive. The effective date is upon approval and there have already been 214,000 rides. The Mayor did not want to change this up too much since it was already signed off on by the companies.

The motion was approved 5 to 1 with Skala voting NO.)

B290-18 Repealing Ordinance No. 022853 which established affordable housing fee waiver and rebate programs and enacting new provisions related thereto.

(Action: The City has made amendments to the previous zoning ordinance to include a housing type known as "accessory dwelling units." Historically, these small houses or apartment additions have been known simply as second dwellings or cottages. Depending on style and purpose, the second dwelling units may also be referred to as "granny flats," "mother-in-law units," "elder cottages," "carriage houses", "alley houses," "garage apartments," or other names. The ADU housing type is permitted by the Unified Development Code, subject to "usespecific standards." The ADUs are permitted-as-of right, subject to development standards, in the two-family and multi-family districts, and they are permitted as conditional uses in the single-family district (a conditional use requires a Planning & Zoning Commission hearing and a Council approval of the specific site).

Since the concept of ADUs has been introduced to the zoning code in 2014, only two true ADUs have been constructed. The dearth of ADUs could be explained by several factors including front-end development costs and regulatory constraints. Council has heard some testimonials that the cost of development fees and charges and some of the development regulations may be an impediment to ADU construction. The Council has responded by requesting that a program be created to waive

development fees for ADUs for up to three years or 30 total dwelling units, whichever will be the first to occur.

Waived fees (rates)

Full waiver of building-related fees for an ADU involve the following:

- Building permit fee: \$2.25 per \$1,000 of value
- Electric, plumbing, mechanical & fuel gas fees: \$35.00 minimum, each
- Right of way permit (driveway apron, sidewalk) \$50.00
- Development charge: (funding for major roadways) \$0.50 per gross square foot
- Storm water development charge: \$0.09 per gross square foot
- Sewer utility connection: \$2,400 per dwelling unit for 5/8-inch water meter
- Water system equity charge: \$1,576.00
- Water meter fee: \$700.00

A building permit fee on an 800 square-foot ADU, no basement, is approximately \$207. Eight hundred square feet is used because that is the maximum size of ADU. Adding in the other charges, the total “out-the-door” cost of a building permit is approximately **\$5,500**.

Advocates for a Columbia ADU incentive program have cited Portland, Oregon’s program. The Oregon city recently made its fee incentive permanent. The Portland program has the following features:

- ADUs that add housing capacity by renting on at least a month- to-month lease receive waivers of “system development charges” (or SDCs, i.e., infrastructure connection charges) for a period of 10 years.
- Because construction of ADUs for use as short-term rentals has been controversial and is not considered to add affordable housing capacity, applicants must sign a covenant guaranteeing that they will not use their ADU for short-term rental. The amount of the fee waiver must be paid back at a 150 percent rate if violations occur.
- Other than adherence to development restrictions and the promise to use the ADUs for homeownership or long-term rental for ten years, the Portland incentive program does not demand continuous occupancy by low- or moderate-income households. The philosophy is that the smaller space in a central location is by nature more affordable to occupants and less costly to the public because smaller living space encourages less energy consumption, reduced goods accumulation, and generally shorter journeys to work, schools, clinics, and grocery stores.

Amendments to Fee Waiver Ordinance

The city has an existing fee waiver ordinance for affordable housing units that are already funded by the city’s affordable housing programs. Staff recommends that separate sections be created in the fee waiver ordinance so the ordinance provides an overview of all fee waiver programs related to housing. Therefore, the ordinance prepared for Council consideration also extends fee waivers to housing development organizations constructing affordable housing units regardless if they receive city housing funds to do so or not. A request for such assistance was made by Habitat for Humanity in May of this year.

Zoning Changes

In addition to the fee waiver program Council has also requested an ordinance reducing requirements for driveway construction and off-street parking for accessory dwelling units. While amendments to Chapter 29 must follow a separate track through the Planning and Zoning Commission, staff has prepared an initial draft amendment to the “use-specific standards” that currently govern the size, location, and site improvement requirements for ADUs. In this proposal existing gravel driveways may

be used, or new gravel driveways may be constructed provided a hard surface is not required by another section of the city code, for example fire access. Driveway aprons or approaches in the public right-of-way would still have to be paved according to city specifications. The off-street parking requirement is reduced from one additional space to no required additional off-street parking for one to two-bedroom ADUs and reduced from two to one additional space for three-bedroom ADUs. A cap on the number of bedrooms is recommended.

Construction of 30 ADUs (which was the suggested maximum) in a three-year period would result in gross revenue forgone to the Utilities enterprise funds and to a lesser degree, to the General Fund building-related fees. Fee revenue forgone could be as much as \$120,000. If the premise is accepted that the fee waivers induce the construction, however, the connection and meter charges would not be collected anyway. It can be argued that the fee waiver adds additional customers for city services without adding additional infrastructure.

Thomas asked if we currently have a CDBG waiver already. How many have been used so far? In the first year, we had 16 the first year, 1 the next year and five the third year. So, we are expanding this to ADUs and CHODOs. How many might that be? Staff thought it might be 8 for the CHODOs and did not know on the ADUs. Historically, only about 10 affordable program homes have been built per year and each one has to be qualified under the new program.

Skala asked if there was anything to insure that this can't just be used as rental property? Staff said most ADUs will be occupied by renters, but that a lot of the time individuals will be related to the larger home owner.

Public comment was opened.

The first speaker favored the new program and believes this helps create sustainable, affordable housing. We also want to eliminate requirements for paved driveways and some parking. She suggested that they eliminate the prohibition about use as a short-term rental. Let's treat all properties the same and don't single these out. Finally, ADUs don't always need to be used for "affordable housing". Get the regulations out of the way. These are good kinds of housing options and the owners are usually homeowners and it adds to housing stock.

The next speaker indicated that he is in favor of allowing ADUs and fee waivers. He is the owner of the second attempted project. He is proud to have played a role, but it is time to move this forward. The thing he is really looking at is the requirement to have a paved driveway all the way to the new home. He started under the old code. Now, his garage is different than his ADU and he has received conflicting advice. I am stalled indefinitely. Don't allow incentives and then override them by making other requirements on the back end.

Another speaker stated his support for the ADU proposal. He thinks will add to the affordable housing stock.

Another speaker asked about the approximate square footage of affordable housing. He suggested that mobile homes might fall into this category. He also talked about carports on Habitat homes. What about carports on ADU's? Maybe that would help disabled people get in and out of cars in bad weather.

Thomas asked about the status of the short—term rental proposals? Staff said there was a public meeting tomorrow and that the whole measure might come to council in January. We can also give you an interim report before then. That being the case, Thomas asked to remove the short-term rental clause from this legislation.

The Mayor spoke against Thomas' suggestion and said he does not want to subsidize short-term rentals. The real purpose is to create affordable housing, not money-making endeavors. **The motion did not receive a second and the motion died.**
The vote was called, and the proposal passed unanimously.)

These two items were removed from the Consent Agenda and moved to Old Business.

B277-18 Authorizing construction of the Nifong Boulevard corridor improvement project between Providence Road and Forum Boulevard/Willowcreek Lane and construction of the Forum Boulevard improvement project between Green Meadows Road and Nifong Boulevard; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

(Action: Staff presented a timeline of activity on this project. Total project cost is \$12.3 million, and construction will start in late 2019.

No public comment was forthcoming.

Thomas indicated that he asked for this project to be revisited to eliminate the Forum Boulevard part of this project from the list. He wants to give the council a second chance. He mentioned that he is looking at projects like Westbury Village, the Oakland Gravel Road and other otherwise good projects that add traffic. I do not want to promote more car use and more traffic. There is no reason to widen all the roads at great expense. I move to remove the Forum Boulevard part of the project from this bill.

The motion failed to receive a second and the motion to amend failed.

Skala mentioned that he thought this proposal fit in with the other part of construction on Forum. This will increase the part of Forum south of Green Meadows. Skala further indicated that these are very expensive projects, but he doesn't understand why they get all the fancy roads with medians and lighting and all we get in my ward are compromised projects.

The motion to approve passed 5 to 1 with Thomas voting NO.)

Another vote was held on the companion bill.

B278-18 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for the Nifong Boulevard corridor improvement project between Providence Road and Forum Boulevard/Willowcreek Lane and construction of the Forum Boulevard improvement project between Green Meadows Road and Nifong Boulevard.

(Action: The motion to approve passed 5 to 1 with Thomas voting NO.)

B279-18 Authorizing construction of the Keene Street and I-70 Drive Southeast intersection improvement project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

(This item was removed from the Consent agenda and moved to Old Business for consideration.)

(Action: Skala indicated that he pulled this off Consent, so he could reassure his constituents about the timeline for completion of this project. Staff said they will begin immediately to complete acquisition of right-of-way and that some of that will come from Moser's. The project is slated to begin in 2019.

No public comment was received.
The bill passed unanimously.)

CONSENT AGENDA

**(All items remaining on Consent Agenda approved unanimously as submitted,
with one abstention on one bill.)**

B275-18 Rezoning property located on the west side of Eighth Street and south of North Boulevard from District R-MF (Multi-Family Residential District) to District PD (Planned District); approving the PD Plan for "Cullimore Cottages" (Case No. 18-180).

B276-18 Authorizing construction of the Carter Lane sidewalk project between Huntridge Drive and Foxfire Drive; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

These two items were removed from the Consent Agenda and moved to Old Business.

B277-18 Authorizing construction of the Nifong Boulevard corridor improvement project between Providence Road and Forum Boulevard/Willowcreek Lane and construction of the Forum Boulevard improvement project between Green Meadows Road and Nifong Boulevard; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B278-18 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for the Nifong Boulevard corridor improvement project between Providence Road and Forum Boulevard/Willowcreek Lane and construction of the Forum Boulevard improvement project between Green Meadows Road and Nifong Boulevard.

B279-18 Authorizing construction of the Keene Street and I-70 Drive Southeast intersection improvement project; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

(This item was removed from the Consent agenda and moved to Old Business for consideration.)

B280-18 Authorizing the acquisition of easements for construction of the Keene Street and I-70 Drive Southeast intersection improvement project.

B281-18 Authorizing a right of use license permit with Shelter Mutual Insurance Company for the construction, installation, maintenance and operation of a private decorative wrought iron fence with gates and stone columns within a portion of the right-of way on the south side of Ash Street, east of Stadium Boulevard. **(Pitzer asked to abstain from this vote.)**

B282-18 Appropriating funds received from Boone County, Missouri per the terms of a cost allocation agreement relating to a traffic flow and proposed alignment study for a portion of Grace Lane located between Richland Road and St. Charles Road.

B283-18 Amending Chapter 14 of the City Code to establish a 10-hour parking zone for an off-street municipal parking lot located on the southeast corner of the Broadway and Providence Road intersection.

B285-18 Authorizing a cooperative agreement with the Missouri Department of Conservation for a Tree Resource Improvement and Maintenance (TRIM) grant to provide advanced forestry training and education for Parks and Recreation Department employees; appropriating funds.

B286-18 Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for maternal child health services; appropriating funds.

B287-18 Accepting a donation from Central Bank of Boone County for the 2019 Fair Housing and Lending Seminar; appropriating funds.

B291-18 Authorizing a memorandum of understanding with PedNet Coalition relating to the disbursement of funds received from a Missouri Foundation for Health Grant for a Vision Zero Smart Road User scholarship program; appropriating funds.

R175-18 Setting a public hearing: proposed construction of improvements at the Oakwood Hills Park to include replacement of the existing playground structure, park benches, retaining wall, and the Lynnwood Drive park sign and entry gate, installation of a climbing structure and swings, renovation of the basketball court and hiking trail, and extension of the existing ADA walkway from Burrwood Drive to the basketball court and playground structure.

R176-18 Placing on file for public use, inspection and examination for a period of ninety (90) days certain uniform codes regulating the construction of buildings and continued occupancy thereof.

R177-18 Authorizing the installation of street lights on Smiley Lane, La Rail Drive and Hinkson Avenue, and authorizing the upgrade of street lights on Hinkson Avenue and Arlington Street.

R178-18 Authorizing CDBG grant agreements with Independent Living Center of Mid-Missouri, Inc., Job Point, Central Missouri Community Action and Family Health Center of Boone County and a HOME agreement with the Housing Authority of the City of Columbia and Bryant Walkway II Housing Development Group, L.P.

R179-18 Authorizing demolition of dilapidated structures located at 509 Clinkscales Road; authorizing a special tax bill against the property.

R180-18 Authorizing agreements for FY 2019 Signature Series Funding under the Tourism Development Program.

R181-18 Authorizing an agreement with Columbia Center for Urban Agriculture, Inc. for funding under the Tourism Development Program relating to the construction of a farmers' market pavilion within the Clary-Shy Community Park located at 1701 W. Ash Street.

R182-18 Authorizing an agreement with Big Bam, LLC for funding under the Tourism Development Program for the 2019 Big BAM (Bicycle Across Missouri) event.

R183-18 Transferring funds from the City Manager's Office to the Community Development Department to fund the Job Point vocational training program.

NEW BUSINESS

R184-18 Approving the scope of work to be used for the solicitation of qualified consultants to assist in the development of an Electric Integrated Resource Plan, Master Plan and Cost of Service Analysis. (Action: At their October 25 meeting the Integrated Electric Resource & Master Planning Task Force approved a scope of services to solicit a consultant to assist staff and the Integrated Electric Resource

and Master Plan Task Force in the development of an Integrated Resource Plan, Electric Master Plan and Cost of Service Study. This Scope of Services is detailed in the following link:

[RECOMMENDATION FROM THE TASK FORCE](#)

The proposed scope includes an evaluation of our current financing model; the methodology for determining the true cost of service for the electric utility; a review of existing assets; a forecast relating to future load growth and demand; an evaluation of how renewable energy resources affect overall rates; and how our current utility can adapt to changing technologies and opportunities regarding emissions, efficiency and renewable resources.

After brief discussion, the motion passed unanimously.)

R185-18 Authorizing an agreement with Nora Stewart Early Learning Center for the Creating Lasting Family Connections program; transferring funds.

(Action: Staff has prepared for Council consideration a resolution authorizing an agreement with Nora Stewart Early Learning Center; and, transferring funds (\$33,855.00) for the Creating Lasting Family Connections Program. Council member Ruffin made a motion during the earlier meeting directing staff to prepare a resolution authorizing an agreement with Nora Stewart Early Learning Center; and, transferring \$33,855.00 from Council contingency to fund the program.

A motion to table this item was made by Ruffin to allow Trapp to participate in this discussion due to his knowledge of the program.

The motion was seconded and passed unanimously.)

R186-18 Amending the “Home Ownership Assistance Neighborhood Development (HOA ND)” provisions within “Section 5: Home Ownership Assistance Program (HOA)” of the City of Columbia Community Development Block Grant (CDBG) and HOME Program Administrative Guidelines and enacting new provisions thereto.

(Action: Current CDBG and HOME Administrative Guidelines allow for non-profit or for-profit developers to obtain up to \$30,000 in homebuyer financing for eligible projects. These funds can go towards filling the affordability gap on new construction or substantial rehabilitation projects. In the past, this assistance was provided in the form of a secondary mortgage in order to provide for an affordable first mortgage for income eligible buyers.

Closing on sales of the Lynn Street Cottages project are complete and staff, local CHDOs and lenders have gained additional information to further codify the manner in which CCLT closing should occur. It is intended that the attached amended “Homeownership Assistance Neighborhood Development (HOA ND)” guidelines replace the existing “HOA ND” guidelines to align City programs with Council policy.

Key points to understand in reviewing the amended HOA ND program guidelines are as follows:

1. Funded projects will be required to donate the land to the CCLT and sell only the improvements to a qualified buyer and subject to the 99-year CCLT Ground Lease.
2. Development subsidy will be provided as a credit to the buyer at closing, provided all terms of the agreement have been met. This subsidy is protected by the CCLT’s Ground Lease, rather than a secondary lien.
3. All projects require an as proposed CLT appraisal and final CLT appraisal to ensure program funds are filling only the gap between total project cost and an affordable price necessary to achieve an 80% loan to value ratio on the value to be utilized by local lenders.

4. The draft guidelines require an agreement between the CCLT and non-profit developers, as well as an agreement between the City and the non-profit developer.
5. All City funding agreements must be approved by City Council.
6. Home sales would be subject to City HOA homebuyer policies and CCLT Homebuyer Selection policies, including industry standards and best practices for credit score requirements and underwriting ratios.
7. The amended guidelines further define the affordability gap and the method to determine that gap.

The program basically allows private developers to collect not more than 10% of the project cost back for constructing affordable housing.

There was no public comment forthcoming.

Skala thought this was a good proposal.

The proposal received unanimous support from the council.)

INTRODUCTION AND FIRST READING (All items introduced as indicated.)

B292-18 Voluntary annexation of property located on the northwest corner of the Prathersville Road and Oakland Gravel Road intersection; establishing permanent R-1 (One-Family Dwelling District), M-N (Mixed Use-Neighborhood District) and M-C (Mixed Use-Corridor District) zoning (Case No. 18-166).

THIS ITEM WAS REMOVED FROM CONSIDERATION BY THE APPLICANT.

B293-18* Approving the Final Plat of "Nanny's Neighborhood Plat 1" located on the east side of McBaine Avenue and south of Lincoln Drive (Case No. 18-191).

B294-18** Approving a major amendment to the Lake George PD Plan located on the south side of Richland Road approximately 700 feet west of Bay Hills Drive (5000 E. Richland Road); approving a revised statement of intent; granting a design adjustment relating to entry door placement (Case No. 18-185).

B295-18* Vacating a sidewalk easement on Lot 108A within Copperstone Plat 7 located north of Copperstone Creek Drive, and vacating sidewalk easements on Lots 415A, 416A and 418A within Copperstone Plat 7 located east of Granite Springs Drive; accepting conveyances for sidewalk purposes (Case No. 18-156).

B296-18 Amending Chapter 2 of the City Code to establish a Tree Board.

B297-18* Authorizing construction of the Police Precinct/Municipal Service Center North facility to be located on the south side of International Drive in the Auburn Hills Subdivision; calling for bids through the Purchasing Division.

B298-18* Accepting conveyances for sidewalk purposes.

B299-18* Accepting a stormwater management/BMP facilities covenant.

B300-18* Appropriating Federal Transit Administration (FTA) grant funds for the purchase of six (6) **replacement paratransit vans and miscellaneous related equipment and services.**

B301-18 Amending Chapter 27 of the City Code as it relates to a renewable energy standard.

B302-18 Authorizing construction of improvements at the Oakwood Hills Park to include replacement of the existing playground structure, park benches, retaining wall, and the Lynnwood Drive park sign and entry gate, installation of a climbing structure and swings, renovation of the basketball court and hiking trail, and extension of the existing ADA walkway from Burrwood Drive to the basketball court and playground structure; calling for bids for a portion of the project through the Purchasing Division.

B303-18* Authorizing a program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for child care health consultation services.

B304-18* Authorizing Amendment No. 3 to the program services contract with the Missouri Department of Health and Senior Services for HIV Prevention services.

B305-18* Authorizing and ratifying a service agreement with PeopleAdmin, Inc. for hosted software and related services to automate human resources administrative functions; authorizing an amendment to the agreement.

B306-18* Adopting the City of Columbia, Missouri Choice Plus \$750 Plan, Choice Plus \$1,500 Plan and Choice Plus \$2,700 High Deductible Health Plan for 2019.

B307-18* Accepting a donation from United HealthCare for wellness promotion and programs for City employees; appropriating funds.

B308-18* Authorizing application to the United States Department of Transportation Federal Aviation Administration and the Missouri Department of Transportation for airport capital assistance grants.

B309-18* Appropriating funds from the 2018 Celebration for the Arts event.

B310-18* Authorizing a grant of easement for gas pipeline purposes with Union Electric Company, d/b/a Ameren Missouri, for the installation of a natural gas line to be located parallel to Schwabe Road on the east and I-70 Drive Southwest on the south within Columbia Cosmopolitan Recreation Area; appropriating funds.

REPORTS

REP99-18 Administrative Public Improvement Project: Stephens Lake Park Sprayground UV System Replacement.

(Action: Under Section 22-72(c) of the City Code, the City Manager is required to report to the City Council any public improvement project that the Manager has determined meets the eligibility requirements of the Code and should follow the administrative public improvement process. Unless the Council determines that the project should follow the standard public improvement process, the Manager may proceed with the administrative process.

The cost of the project is \$25,000, which was budgeted in the FY2019 CIP and funded by the Park Sales Tax.

(The report was accepted. No formal action was required.)

REP100-18 Administrative Public Improvement Project: Cosmo-Bethel Park Small Shelter Replacement.

(Action: This public improvement project is eligible for the administrative public improvement process. Unless the Council wishes to follow the standard public improvement process, staff will proceed with preparing plans and specifications and bidding the project.

The cost of the project is \$25,000, which was budgeted in the FY2019 CIP and funded by the Park Sales Tax.

(The report was accepted. No formal action was required.)

REP101-18 Intra-departmental transfer of funds request.

(Action: Report delivered. No further action required.)

GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, COUNCIL AND STAFF

Public

The first speaker indicated that she thought it was unfortunate that the community outreach policing team was not placed on the agenda. She also thought that the first time she talked to the city manager he lied to her. She thought it was unfortunate that he tolerated the police chief's racism. She thought it

was wrong. Do a better job of listening and less whining and increase your racial literacy. You are either part of the solution or you are one of the racists. You can't have it both ways.

The next speaker is angry that the city manager continues to undermine the efforts of racial justice. I am stunned by your silence. You have the power to fix the problem of the city manager. It is verifiable. The chief and the city manager undermine us all the time. Think about why you were elected. Challenge him.

The next speaker had never spoken at city council before. We need a better way to do this. People who work all day should not have to wait until 11 PM to address the council. My husband and I are from Korea. We are proud of this country. We re proud of Columbia, even if we keep hearing about racism. We can be better. Let's do that. This country should be a beacon of light. Let's be better.

Another public speaker indicated that he is not getting any younger. Skala has been around for a while. I am asking for housing for our homeless. I have seen people who have been homeless for 10 years. Would you want to be in that position? When I helped start Habitat for Humanity, I had no idea what would happen. But, when we get people in those homes, we need to help people who live there get the things they need. I would like to see 25% of the revenue from the new scooters be used for homeless programs. I also think we should cut back on the airport spending. I also think Mike Matthes can get something done if he is given a chance.

The next speaker thought Mike Matthes and Ken Burton need to go. If they are good, it would be something different. It's not just about the policing thing, it's about the budget crisis. If they were doing a good job, they wouldn't have to complain all the time. And if we get rid of Matthes, I think we could also get rid of Burton. I think the council can do that right now. I feel like every time there is a crime in this city it is a shame on this council. Ken Burton and Matthes go along with each other and both need to go. Shame on you all.

Council

Skala stated that he had just returned form the National League of Cities Conference where he served on the racial equity committee. He reported that he had contacted some national experts in that effort and he believes that he has found a place to spend some of the budgeted \$50,000 to local resources and some ideas about creating a local task force to explore racial equity on a local level and then look to some of the national experts. There have been a lot of people who have been working on these issues and I want to make sure their efforts are recognized. Happy thanksgiving.

Peters wanted to comment on the news about the restructuring of the community outreach unit. She thinks there is a misunderstanding here. She thinks the council supports the concept, but there is a restructuring that is misguided, and she wants to get back to the patrols of the 4 priority neighborhoods rather than stretch it too thin. Don't throw out what we already did. Let's go back to the original plan.

Staff

The City Manager indicated that he believes that almost nothing he heard during public comment was accurate. He created the community outreach program. The police chief responded by adding an additional officer to each strategic area. He has used his platform to shine a light on the program and believes it works. He was shocked to hear about this on the news and immediately sent an email to the

council to explain this. He continued by saying that COU is not being dismantled. That was a miscommunication.

We will still have another report by the end of the month. The report strongly suggests that we can't do this city wide without additional resources. We would need 60 more officers to duplicate this project city wide. So, we think about how we can do something else. There is another way to do something. We could expand service to a larger area is structure the program on a beat basis. In theory, it aligns officers with specific areas of town. Sometimes they are called out, but they learn over time and develop a memory and knowledge of the area. That helps all cops do better and provides better service. Right now, 100% of our COU program provides service to 10% of the city. This helps spread it out.

So why did that email go out? Because we were trying to recruit people for all 8 roles and we had 5 people and we need to have our year's staffing in place for January by this month. COU is not dismantled. You will see this in the report that will come out later in December, but we jumped the gun to find staffing and it has been misunderstood.

The Mayor asked for the city manager to put everything on hold until that report comes out and let us decide. Peters asked about what happens to the bidding process according to the union rules. Matthes said we can wait until March or June, but the bid process has to happen at some point. The police try to plan vacations, weddings, etc. and they need to know when they will be working. We try to get this before the end of the year. We can do it later and we can do what you are asking, but those 8 people who are chosen will want to know now what they are going to be in for. We change people's days off all the time in emergencies, but it will affect how people bid for jobs and what they can expect.

The Mayor asked the chief when they started coming up with this plan. He indicated that broad strokes started in August. I presented it to the City Manager in October or November. What was the first meeting where this came up? The police chief said he didn't know for sure. The Mayor told him to check his calendar. The chief said some of this was informal and he couldn't say for sure.

The chief indicated that some police like to have different kinds of policing challenges. Every police officer likes the variety of the law enforcement challenge. If you have enough resources to spread it over the whole city, it's a lot easier. The new model was an attempt to get more officers involved in the community policing model without making any of them do it all the time.

The Mayor tried to find out when they actually talked about this. The city manager told the chief not to change the name of the unit. The chief did not instruct the deputy chief to send out an email with a new name called a response unit. He explained that a member of the police team came up with the original idea. He thought this would be a good application and he would like to be a part of it. He focused on some of the downtown units, and it would switch some hours and other responsibilities. It is real policing. It would include 8 officers and 2 sergeants. The COU would not go away. The Community Response Team would exist simultaneously. The Mayor asked the chief where this whole idea existed in the draft report? The chief said it is not in there. The Mayor asked why not? The chief indicated that it was not formalized by that time, but they had to put together some sort of way to allow the officers to bid and plan for the coming year.

The chief commented that apparently this has blown up in our face and that's why we are here tonight.

The Mayor directed the chief not to make any changes at this time and the council generally supported that directive. Skala then asked the chief if you were expecting to make this change, and if you are spreading the police assignments thinner, then you are diminishing their effectiveness in the areas where they work now, right? The chief said that was a possibility. The chief asked how long can we go on spending \$1 million on ten percent of the city? Skala and the Mayor did not respond.

No further comments were made. The meeting was adjourned.

ADJOURNMENT
(Time: 11:49 PM.)

©2018 CityWatch-Columbia

(This document may not be reproduced, redistributed or significantly cited in other works without the written permission of the author.)

DO NOT COPY