



MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CITY HALL, Fifth Floor
6801 Delmar Blvd.
University City, Missouri 63130
July 25, 2016
6:30 p.m.

A. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. PROCLAMATIONS

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. July 11, 2016 Study session minutes
2. July 11, 2016 Regular session minutes
3. July 14, 2016 Study session minutes

F. APPOINTMENTS to BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

1. Donna Leach is nominated for appointment to the Historic Preservation Commission by Mayor Welsch
2. Holston Black, Jr. is nominated for reappointment to the Pension Board by Councilmember Crow.
3. Richard Juang is nominated for reappointment to the Green Practices Commission by Councilmember Crow.

G. SWEARING IN to BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

H. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (Total of 15 minutes allowed)

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

J. CONSENT AGENDA

K. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

1. Approval of the Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Grant (JAG) Program
VOTE REQUIRED
2. Approval to award contract for the annual police uniform order to Leon Uniform for \$42,646.15
VOTE REQUIRED

L. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

1. **BILL 9287** – An ordinance amending Chapter 8.12 of the University City Municipal Code relating to solid waste management and disposal, by establishing and imposing fees for solid waste collection services, effective September 1, 2016.

M. NEW BUSINESS

RESOLUTIONS

1. Resolution 2016 – 14 Requested by Mayor Welsch and Councilmember Glickert
A resolution approving amendments to the Fiscal Year 2016 – 2017 budget for the City of University City and appropriating said amounts

BILLS

N. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (continued if needed)

O. COUNCIL REPORTS/BUSINESS

1. Boards and Commission appointments needed
2. Council liaison reports on Boards and Commissions
3. Boards, Commissions and Task Force minutes
4. Other Discussions/Business
 - Presentation of final four candidates for Ward One open Council seat.
DISCUSSION and VOTE

P. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Q. ADJOURNMENT

UNIVERSITY CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION
5th Floor of City Hall 6801 Delmar Blvd
July 11, 2016
5:30 p.m.

The City Council Study Session was held in the Council Chamber, 5th floor of City Hall, on Monday, July 11, 2016. Mayor Shelley Welsch called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m. In addition to the Mayor the following members of the Council were present:

Councilmember Paulette Carr
Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson
Councilmember Michael Glickert
Councilmember Terry Crow
Councilmember Rod Jennings

Also present was the City Manager Lehman Walker.

Mayor Welsch asked if any members of Council would have any changes to propose on the upcoming agenda. Councilmember Smotherson asked where on the agenda of the upcoming meeting, he would be able to address his questions to the City Attorney. Mr. Walker stated that City Attorney. Mr. Walker stated City Attorney Forster will be present at 6:30. Mr. Smotherson stated that he would like to have this conversation before the City Manager's report.

Residents' deadline for submittal of applications for the vacant Council seat was Friday, July 8. Council received eight applications. The meeting tonight was held to discuss a process that will be used to move from eight applicants to hopefully one appointee.

Mayor Welsch stated what previous processes were used in similar cases. Questions she presented to Councilmembers tonight were:

- Shall all applicants be interviewed or should the list be whittled down prior to the in-person interviews?
- If everyone is interviewed should each member vote on their top three choices and whittle list down to three or four to be interviewed for the second time?
- When should the interviews be scheduled?
- It was decided all Councilmembers should be present for the vote but it was not necessary for everyone to be present for the interviews. Does that still hold?
- Should each finalist speak at the public session, if one is held after the interviews?
- Should applicants have five or ten minutes to give prepared remarks?
- Council has determined four votes will be needed to make appointment.
- Should written ballots be used?
- Should each member vote for a top choice of the three finalists?
- Should Council keep voting until a candidate is chosen or decide that Council cannot reach a conclusion as to the top candidate

Councilmember Carr reviewed previous processes used from the minutes. She noted the next question that should be raised was in regards to the appointment, would this person stand for election in April of 2017. In 2006 the election took place in the off year of April 2007. That appointment lasted until appointment in April 2008, which was a normal University City election year. She stated that if Council appoints there should be a special election in April 2017 and if Council could not decide on an appointee, the special election would be November 2016.

Councilmember Carr asked if there is a special election in November, does that person have to go through another special election in April 2017. She did not feel that was the case. She asked that Council receive a legal interpretation on this if Council gets to that point.

Councilmember Crow suggested two meetings and allow five – eight minutes for each to give their presentation and then Council would have a chance to ask questions with a time frame not longer than 30 minutes per applicant. He is not in favor of written votes.

Councilmember Jennings suggested take a written vote on applications received and then interview the top four.

Councilmember Glickert favored picking the best four from interview and paper.

Councilmember Carr favored interviewing all eight and find with taking a voice vote.

There was a consensus that all applicants should be interviewed.

Next Step to be considered:

After interviews should Council cast their votes to whittle down the list to three?

Councilmember Crow said some of the applicants should be questions and it should happen in public. He is not in favor of written votes unless they are opened and read at the meeting.

Mayor noted that following previous process, each member of Council gave their top three choices after the second set of interviews to come up with the top three. (It has been decided to do one interview.)

Councilmember Crow said that picking the top three would not necessarily rank them one-two or three for the final presentation.

Mayor Welsch said if, after the first vote, there is not a clear top three another vote will be taken.

Those three applicants would come to a public meeting where they would give a presentation to and take questions from Council.

Mr. Glickert asked for the time limit on the final three presentations. Time would be left up to the applicants.

SCHEDULE FOR APPLICANTS' INTERVIEWS

Two interview sessions on Thursday, July 14:

- First session from 1:00 p.m. to 3:00 p.m. with four of the candidates
- Second session from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. with four of the candidates
- Truncated questions on this first round to keep each session to 20 minutes
- Each applicant will do a short presentation and then take questions from Council
- After all interviews, Council will vote to whittle down to three final candidates

Monday, July 25 – Regular Council session, 6:30 p.m. Final three applicants will give their presentations and take questions. Council will then vote, one or more times, to try to reach agreement on one candidate.

- Tuesday, July 26 – Special Council meeting at 6:30 p.m., if needed, voting will continue if needed.

Meeting was adjourned at 6:05 p.m.,

Joyce Pumm, City Clerk, MRCC/CMC

MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CITY HALL, Fifth Floor
6801 Delmar Blvd.
University City, Missouri 63130
July 11, 2016

A. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

At the Regular Session of the City Council of University City held on the fifth floor of City Hall, on Monday, July 11, 2016, Mayor Shelley Welsch called the meeting to order at 6:30 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

In addition to the Mayor the following members of Council were present:

Councilmember Rod Jennings
Councilmember Paulette Carr
Councilmember Terry Crow
Councilmember Michael Glickert
Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson

Also in attendance was City Manager, Lehman Walker.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Hearing no requests to amend the agenda, voice vote to approve the agenda as presented carried unanimously.

D. PROCLAMATIONS

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. June 27, 2016 Study session minutes were moved for approval by Councilmember Jennings, seconded by Councilmember Glickert and the motion carried unanimously.
2. June 27, 2016 Regular session minutes were moved for approval by Councilmember Jennings, seconded by Councilmember Smotherson and the motion carried unanimously.

F. APPOINTMENTS to BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

G. SWEARING IN to BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

1. Dorothy Merritt to be sworn in to the Senior Commission in the City Clerk's office.
2. Wayne Flesch was sworn in to the Senior Commission.

**H. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (Total of 15 minutes allowed)
Elsie Glickert, 6712 Etzel, University City, MO**

Ms. Glickert made the following suggestions for consideration:

- That the vacant lots along the northeast section of Kingsland and Sutter that are currently being maintained by the City be sold to the adjacent property owners for a nominal fee. This would put the properties back on the tax rolls, eliminate the City's cost of maintaining the lots and improve the neighborhood.
- The City establish aggressive collection measures to recapture delinquent trash fees, which may include an increase for residents that are habitually late or refuse to pay.

Patricia McQueen, 1132 George Street, University City, MO

July 25, 2016

E-2-1

Ms. McQueen provided Council with a copy of her table regarding Study Sessions related to the budget at the last meeting. She stated that according to Sections 33 through 35 of the Charter, a tie vote means that the budget was adopted without the inclusion of the amendments. Ms. McQueen suggested that the proposed budget book in the future include specific dates that study sessions will be held and the process defining how amendments should be submitted, reviewed and included.

Beth Norton, 734 Trinity, University City, MO

Ms. Norton noted the difference with entering the police station for a few minutes versus hours and ways this can be managed. She mentioned City is not trying to bust the fire fighter's union as no fire fighters have lost their jobs. She also spoke of the constant cruelty spoken against Councilmembers except for Carr and Crow, by their supporters.

Julia Li, 7200 Shaftesbury, University City, MO

Ms. Li stated that Create Space is not about any one person, it is about many that are working to pursue their entrepreneurial dreams. Partners include the World Trade Center, professional volunteers from the Regional Arts Commission, Polsinelli, RubinBrown, Regions Bank, and Slate, who believe in economic development for the creative class. Presently, the Cities of Austin and Miami are looking at Create Space Generator as a model for economic development to help makers understand the fabric of business.

To date, all of the architectural drawings have been completed and 40 percent of the building design for both Make Space and Kitchen Space are complete. There is a list of food trucks that are looking for a commercial kitchen and the finished project is scheduled to open in November. Ms. Li stated that to stop this project midway would not only defund the average American's ability to take their idea and make it a sustainable structure, it would abate the City's potential to strengthen its industrial corridor, and leave another vacant building on Olive. She encouraged Council to think about the difference it could make to have young, creative energy from all over St. Louis here in U City.

Mr. Walker stated that prior to the City's Manager's Report Councilmember Smotherson has some questions for the City Attorney, Katie Forster, who was present.

Councilmember Smotherson stated that after his review of the Charter and Council Rules, he is having trouble understanding the process that took place at the last Council Meeting on June 27th. Rule 33 states that the budget is to be submitted by May 1st, and makes no mention of revisions being made by the City Manager. Council was presented with a Revised Budget dated June 13th. So his first question is whether the June 13th budget voted on at the last meeting was a valid submission? Ms. Forster stated that her understanding is that on June 27th the budget was not approved by Council. Therefore, since no action was taken, Section 35 of the Charter states that the budget as submitted shall be deemed to have been finally adopted. Her belief is that the language "*As submitted,*" is somewhat ambiguous; there is no expressed language in Section 35 which states that the budget as presented with amendments or revisions is deemed adopted. As such, her interpretation of "*As submitted,*" in this instance is that the budget submitted to Council on February 22nd; which is the same budget submitted May 23rd during the Public Hearing, is what is deemed to have been adopted at the June 27th meeting.

With respect to making revisions, there is language in the Charter that allows the City Manager to review and revise financial information he has received, and in his expressed powers in Section 110.060 of the Code, he has the authority to keep Council advised of the financial condition and future needs of the City and make such recommendations as he deems desirable. She stated that the amendment regarding the modular units represented a situation that was unforeseeable by the City Manager or department heads and resulted in an obvious need to amend the Proposed Budget after May 23rd. Councilmember

Smotherson asked if Section 110.060 gives the City Manager fiscal authority in general terms or specifically related to the budget. Ms. Forster stated that while it is in general terms, it also applies to the budget. She reiterate that based on her interpretation of, "As submitted," and since there is no law in this area that states how it should be done, none of the amendments are included in the budget that was adopted. City Council has the authority to issue resolutions to incorporate any of the proposed budget amendments. Ms. Forster stated that University City is only one of two other Charter cities that has this type of language. Councilmember Smotherson stated that the reason he had asked that the fire truck be placed on tonight's agenda is because his desire is to move forward, and he wanted to make sure that he had a clear understanding about what budget Council should be addressing when doing so.

Councilmember Smotherson stated that he had sent out an email addressing a stream of comments by Council, and what was most confusing was the Mayor's comment that two members of Council did not have private meetings with Mr. Walker about the budget prior to June 27th. So his second question is whether there is any language contained in Rules 33 through 35 that requires Council to conduct private meetings with Mr. Walker? Ms. Forster stated that the rules neither require nor prohibit such meetings. However, if the majority of Council has a different interpretation of the language they have the authority to make the final decision.

Councilmember Smotherson thanked Ms. Forster for both clarifications. He stated that the kind of meeting he was looking to have was a Study Session with Council, as well as the public, to learn what each ward wanted to see achieved from the budget. That did not happen, and his hope is that the actions that took place on June 27th never happen again.

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

J. CONSENT AGENDA

K. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

1. Replacement of the Fire Department's ladder truck #2615 with a lease to own agreement.

Councilmember Glickert moved to approve, seconded by Councilmember Smotherson.

Councilmember Carr stated her assumption is that once the lease is over, this fire truck will be several years old, which could result in the need for continuous leasing. Her question was whether the City will be spending more money by leasing, than it might by purchasing and financing a new truck? Fire Chief, Adam Long, stated that this is a lease-purchase where the City can spread the payments out over seven years and at the end of the lease the truck will belong to the City. Councilmember Carr asked what the life expectancy of a fire truck is. Chief Long stated that typically trucks last between fifteen to twenty years. He noted that University City's equipment does not suffer a lot of abuse, so it may last even longer.

Councilmember Carr asked if a lease-purchase was the most economical way to acquire this equipment. Mr. Walker stated that it is staff's belief that it is.

Councilmember Glickert asked Chief Long if the Quint model was used extensively in the City of St. Louis, and if so, if he would give a brief background of his personal experience with this equipment? Chief Long stated that the Quint model is extensively used by the City of St. Louis and that after St. Louis adopted this concept a number of cities around the country adopted it as well. The Quint model is very versatile and eliminates the need to purchase individual pumpers and ladders, because it is a combination of both.

Councilmember Glickert asked where the trucks were made. Chief Long stated that they are

made in the United States.

Councilmember Crow questioned whether the truck that is being replaced was of a lesser quality than the Quint truck? Chief Long stated that quality of the Quint was better. Councilmember Crow asked Chief Long if he had any information related to the typical cost of repairing this vehicle. Chief Long stated that repairs are always difficult to estimate, but Sutphen is a very reputable company that has been around for 125 years with great success.

Mayor Welsch asked that the motion be amended to state that Council approves all of the changes to the Proposed Budget detailed by the City Manager in his budget amendments, including the lease/purchase of the fire truck... She provided Council with a copy of the details of her motion on the adjustments to revenue, expenditures and all recommendations presented by the EDRST Board. Mayor Welsch requested that this be a clean vote with no amendments, since every item contained therein had been voted on at the June 27th meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Glickert.

Mayor Welsch stated that her belief is that Mr. Walker tried to do well by informing the City and presenting a Proposed Budget in February, especially when she recalls that when she started on Council in 2002, members would get the Proposed Budget after May 1st, and neither Councilmembers nor the public had any real chance to study it prior to a vote that was taken five weeks later. So she was quite distressed when three member of this Council decided not to accept any amendments to the budget, many of which covered unforeseen costs that occurred after February. Therefore, she would like the record to reflect that she supports the amendments Mr. Walker provided in the Proposed Budget, and does not support the efforts to reduce funding to U City in Bloom, Create Space, and businesses supported by the Chamber of Commerce, and wants to allocate more funds for our pension plan.

Point of Order: Councilmember Carr noted that this amendment was not properly noticed and does not fall within the category of an emergency situation.

Mayor Welsch stated that under *Robert's Rules* a Motion to Amend does not require notice. Councilmember Carr asked Mayor Welsch if she was representing that this was an amendment to the recommendation to replace the fire truck. Mayor Welsch stated that her Motion to Amend encompassed funding for the fire truck.

Councilmember Carr asked the Mayor if she would issue a ruling on her Point of Order. Mayor Welsch stated that she did not agree with Councilmember Carr's point of view. Councilmember Carr asked for an appeal of the Chair's decision.

Mayor Welsch asked the Clerk to poll the Council. She further explained that an affirmative vote to appeal her decision would result in no consideration being given to the massive amounts of funding needed to improve the community.

Councilmember Carr stated that although the Mayor has every right to bring these issues forward, it must be noticed publically, therefore making it a clear violation of the Sunshine Law.

Councilmember Crow stated that in the Study Session preceding this meeting the Mayor asked if there were any changes or additions to the agenda and the only response came from Councilmember Smotherson. This amendment consists of four pages that were available prior to this meeting, the Mayor elected to shanghai this on Council and then say that any member who was not in support of this budget was un-American.

Mayor Welsch stated that first, she has never called anyone un-American and second, she has never seen notice given for any of the amendments that have come before Council at these meetings. She stated that her amendment represents information that Councilmembers have had in their possession since June, and was talked about for four and a half hours at the June 27th Council Meeting.

Councilmember Glickert stated that although he is reminded of Councilmember Smotherson's comments regarding the need to move forward, he is somewhat ham-strung with respect to this discussion. Therefore, he would ask if Council could get a ruling on this process from the City Attorney.

Mr. Walker stated that he did not want to place the City Attorney in the position of making a decision on an issue that Council should make on its own.

Councilmember Smotherson stated that the problem he has with these amendments tonight, is the same problem he had at the last meeting; they indicate a budget deficit which he does not believe to be factual. With respect to Create Space, the one thing he wants them to understand is that in spite of the fact that the adopted budget does not include funding for their organization, it does not preclude Council from amending the budget to request that EDRST's recommendation be given further consideration.

Mayor Welsch asked Mr. Walker if he would provide an explanation regarding the deficit budget. Mr. Walker stated that although the Proposed Budget did start out with a surplus the costs associated with the one-time spending for the temporary police facility is going to put the City's budget in a deficit situation.

Councilmember Carr reiterated her concerns regarding the amendment and stated that when she looked at the \$250,000 that was going out to Create Space and compared it to the \$300,000 allocated for streets and the fact that Council had voted repeatedly against taking money from the surplus to add to streets, she could not support the amendments presented by Mr. Walker. Councilmember Carr stated that although she does not think this amendment should be voted on tonight, she would encourage the Mayor to put it on the agenda at the next meeting.

Mayor Welsch stated that Councilmember Carr not only went through every one of these items in the amendment, but offered thirteen additional amendments that she had drafted. The Mayor noted that she can be heard on tape saying, "*I wish you would have shared these with us first,*" she did not ask that they be called out of order because legally, motions to amend do not have to be shared with Council beforehand and do not have to be posted. Mayor Welsch admitted that she had failed to inform Council of her intentions, due to a hectic schedule.

Councilmember Jennings stated that Council had discussed all of these amendments during the Study Session, so based on his assessment it is legal to present it in this manner and a vote should be taken.

Councilmember Carr cautioned Council that Rule 24 would come into play if this motion failed.

Councilmember Glickert stated that what he is getting a sense of here is that although some members feel they have been blindsided, they are not against the amendment and are amenable to it being brought back in two weeks. He stated that there is too much riding on this amendment and he wants to see it passed. So if that can be accomplished in two

weeks, then that's how it should be handled.

Mayor Welsch stated that she had received a call from a member of U City in Bloom questioning whether they were supposed to just let plants die along Olive and Delmar, because the funds provided in this amendment provides for water. She would be willing to acquiesce if her colleagues would agree to expand the July 25th meeting into a regularly scheduled meeting, a meeting not just to interview candidates for the open Council seat, rather than waiting until August. There was consensus the July 25th meeting would be a regular meeting of the City Council.

Councilmember Glickert made a motion that the amendment be postponed until the next regularly scheduled Council meeting on July 25th. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Carr.

Voice vote on Councilmember Glickert's motion to postpone carried unanimously.

Mayor Welsch asked the City Clerk to place this item on the July 25th agenda, and informed members of the public that the date of this meeting would not be found on the City's calendar because normally Council does not schedule a second meeting in July.

Councilmember Jennings questioned whether Council would be asked to vote on this as one amendment or each individual line item? Mayor Welsch stated that she had presented it as one item. The voice vote on Councilmember Glickert's motion to replace the fire truck carried unanimously.

L. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 1. BILL 9286** – An ordinance amending schedule VI, Table VII-A Stop Intersections, Chapter 300 Traffic Code, of the University City Municipal Code, to revise traffic regulation as provided herein. Bill Number 9286 was read for the second and third time.

Councilmember Carr moved to approve and the motion was seconded by Councilmember Smotherson.

Citizen Comments

Elsie Glickert, 6712 Etzel, University City, MO

Ms. Glickert stated that this is a stop sign being proposed at Westgate and Enright based on a request from Washington University associated with their impending construction. She stated that this is a very short block in a densely populated neighborhood and in the eighty-eight years she's been in this neighborhood all of the families who lived there have never had any difficulty crossing the street, in addition to the fact that it would cause traffic to back up on Delmar. So if Wash U's students don't have enough patience to turn left off of Enright into Westgate then perhaps.

Council Comments

Councilmember Glickert stated that there is no need for three stop signs in this area. Councilmember Glickert made a motion that this item be postponed to certain date, with the intent of revisiting it once construction starts. His motion was seconded by Councilmember Crow.

Councilmember Carr stated that since it looks like the stop sign was approved by the Traffic Commission and if it is going to be postponed, she would like someone from the Commission to explain why they thought it was a good idea.

Councilmember Jennings stated that a member of the Traffic Commission had indicated to him that there has been seven accidents in this area within the last three years, and that concerned him. He agreed that this item should be postponed in order to gain additional information.

Mayor Welsch stated that she would have to disagree with Ms. Glickert because she perceives this as a troublesome area that she tries to avoid, largely due to the vegetation and the way Enright curves coming into Westgate. Seven accidents in three years is a lot and now that the bikeway crosses Westgate, she does not believe this is only being proposed for Washington University. She stated that while she would acknowledge that there were more people who lived in this area than in the past, she does not believe there were as many cars and bikes as there are now. One of the existing stop signs is for the driveway coming out of the apartment building. So she is fine with postponing this issue, but when it comes back to Council she will vote in favor of erecting the signs.

Councilmember Carr stated that in reading the Commission's minutes she found nothing to indicate that they had not conducted serious deliberations prior to reaching their unanimous decision.

Mayor Welsch asked Councilmember Glickert if there was a date certain attached to his request to postpone. Councilmember Glickert stated that he was requesting that the sign be installed temporarily, removed after construction is completed, and then reviewed by Council to determine whether it should be installed permanently. Mayor Welsch stated she had not understood that to be the gist of his motion, and would like to inquire as to whether Councilmember Crow had a clear understanding of the motion when he expressed a desire to second it?

The City Clerk advised Council that Councilmember Glickert's most recent explanation represented a major change to the motion.

Councilmember Crow acknowledged that this amendment was totally different from what he had seconded. However, since he does believe that Council owes the Traffic Commission a degree of respect, he would amend Councilmember Glickert's motion and ask that this Bill be postponed until July 25th. Councilmember Glickert withdrew his motion and presented a second to the amended motion.

Voice vote on Councilmember Crow's amended motion to postpone until July 25th, carried unanimously.

- 2. BILL 9287** – An ordinance amending Chapter 8.12 of the University City Municipal Code relating to solid waste management and disposal, by establishing and imposing fees for solid waste collection services, effective September 1, 2016. Bill No. 9297 was read for the second and third time.

Councilmember Glickert moved to approve and the motion was seconded by Councilmember Jennings.

Councilmember Carr stated that at some point the City generated an additional expense associated with the outsourcing of mulch that she is unable to find listed in the expenditures. Sinan Alapasian, Director of Public Works and Parks, stated that the expense of \$145,000 for the removal of the City's leaves is listed in the cost calculations under leaf collection as contracted services.

Councilmember Carr asked Mr. Walker for an explanation of what had contributed to the shortfall in the solid waste fund? Tina Charumilind, Director of Finance, stated that expenditures, equipment and the low fee assessment have resulted in a deficit for the solid waste fund and even in previous years. Fees have not been increased since 2007, and when you compare them to private companies and other municipalities the City's rate is really low. The deficit does not, however, include delinquent fees, which the City has aggressively tried to collect over the past three years by working with a collection agency and implementing a payment plan. Councilmember Carr questioned whether the City was still carrying this million-dollar deficit associated with uncollected fees? Ms. Charumilind stated that although the total amount of delinquent fees have been reduced from one million dollars, anytime the City buys new equipment funds are taken out of the Enterprise Fund which was established in 2008.

Councilmember Carr asked if the capital and employee expenditures were listed under operations. Ms. Charumilind stated that they were. Councilmember Carr asked Ms. Charumilind if she could provide her with an explanation of the \$130,000 expenditure under capital improvements. Ms. Charumilind stated that it represented small expenditures for items with less than a one-year life expectancy. Councilmember Carr asked for an example of this type of an expenditure. Ms. Charumilind stated that she did not have a specific example with her tonight, but could provide it to her. Ms. Charumilind stated that the Enterprise Fund is divided into three parts - administration, operations and leaf collections. In the past, the City utilized employees from the Street Department to handle the collection for some of the leaves, today that function is being outsourced. Councilmember Carr asked if these contractual contracts were contributing to the debt. Ms. Charumilind stated that they were.

Mayor Welsch asked Ms. Charumilind whether the fees charged had ever covered all of the costs related to the Solid Waste Fund. Ms. Charumilind stated that since she has been employed here the expenditures have always exceeded the revenue. Mayor Welsch asked if the 12 percent proposed increase is approved, would there continue to be a deficit? Ms. Charumilind stated it would provide an opportunity to finally balance the budget for the Enterprise Fund.

Councilmember Carr stated that at the last meeting she suggested that the fee be increased to 14 percent, because next to police and fire she believed Solid Waste is probably the area of service where citizens have the most interaction with the City. She also is of the opinion that since this is such a large and relatively complex entity it deserves to have its own manager; which she believes her proposal would have addressed as well. She agreed that such an increase would impact residents, specifically those on a fixed income. When she coupled this with the reality that contractual contracts are contributing to this debt, she would also have to agree with Ms. Glickert, the City is balancing this deficit on the residents who pay these fees. If this fund has been running at a deficit for a long time, and yet, no one has addressed the scales of economy, particularly related to the cost of outsourcing, she believed that before any increase is proposed there is a need to take a look at the process that is being employed.

Councilmember Carr made a motion to postpone this Bill for a definite time, to allow Council an opportunity to consider the impact an increase would have on the community and explore alternative ways to operate the fund more effectively. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Smotherson.

Councilmember Carr stated that after review, if Council still believes the City cannot get by without an increase, she would suggest that a smaller fee be considered.

Mayor Welsch asked Councilmember Carr if she has designated a specific timeline for the postponement. Councilmember Carr stated that although she is not sure what date should be attached, but for convenience sake she would ask for a month.

Councilmember Smotherson stated that although he does not have a problem with the increase, he would agree with Councilmember Carr in the sense that there should be some accountability associated with making this request. Therefore, he would like Mr. Walker to provide Council with information related to how the collection process is being implemented by staff.

Mr. Walker stated that he would provide Council with a separate packet of material addressing this process.

Mayor Welsch stated that while she would agree that there is more to do, she would like to assure her colleagues that the City has been doing a lot over the past six years to collect delinquent fees. Ms. Charumilind just alluded to the fact that the amount outstanding has been significantly reduced.

Voice vote on Councilmember Carr's motion to postpone until the first Council meeting in August carried by a majority with a Nay vote from Mayor Welsch.

3. **BILL 9288** – An ordinance fixing the compensation to be paid to City Officials and employees as enumerated herein from and after its passage, and repealing Ordinance No. 7004. Bill Number 9288 was read for the second and third time.

Councilmember Glickert moved to approve and the motion was seconded by Councilmember Jennings.

Councilmember Crow stated that he is very comfortable with giving employees a 2-percent cost of living adjustment, but is concerned that as a matter of policy, the job reclassifications and eliminations listed at the bottom of this Ordinance might overpower the COLA and cause unfavorable results. Councilmember Crow amended the motion and suggested that Council delete all of the classification/titles listed to be eliminated, replaced, renamed, added or reclassified in the ordinance and deal only with the cost of living adjustment. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Carr.

Voice vote on Councilmember Crow's amended motion carried by a majority, with a nay vote by Mayor Welsch.

Councilmember Carr stated that if the amendment represented a significant change, then she would suggest that the Ordinance be back-dated to July 1st to make certain that no employee lost out on receiving their cost of living adjustment.

Mr. Walker stated that based on his understanding that what Council has done is approved the 2-percent cost of living increase and reserved judgment with respect to the proposed classification and position deletions, he does not believe the amendment would represent a considerable change.

Mayor Welsch stated that that was also her understanding of the amendment.

Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Councilmembers Crow, Glickert, Smotherson, Jennings, Carr and Mayor Welsch.

NAYS: None.

M. NEW BUSINESS

RESOLUTIONS

Introduced by Councilmember Carr

1. Resolution 2016 – 13 Requested by Councilmembers Carr and Crow

A resolution to hire an architectural and/or design and build firm to serve as independent consultant to review the March 14, 2016 Chiodini Architects report, *Facility Analysis Report* with regard to the accuracy of solutions proposed and the associated costs of the alternatives presented. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Crow.

Councilmember Carr stated that at the last meeting Council voted to postpone a decision on the bond council and financial advisor for general obligations bonds for the new police station, pending the engagement of an independent consultant to review the Chiodini Report and determine whether their proposed solutions were reasonable. She stated that several days later she contacted the City Manager to determine what progress had been made, wherein Mr. Walker informed her that Council had not provided a scope of work, and that several members of Council had indicated that they did not want the assistance of staff. Councilmember Carr explained that her statement regarding no assistance from staff was specifically related to the selection of a consultant and not the RFQ. Thereafter, she drafted this resolution in an effort to move the process forward.

Scope of the Resolution:

(1). *The City will provide funding up to \$40,000 to hire an architectural and/or design-build firm to serve as an independent consultant to review the March 14, 2016, Chiodini Facility Analysis Report with regard to the accuracy of solutions proposed and the associated costs of the alternatives presented.*

(2). *"The City Manager of the City of University City will cooperate in selecting the consultant by preparing a request for qualifications with the input of Councilmembers, and advertising of the said RFQ."*

Councilmember Carr's unanswered questions were:

- Is the City doing the right thing by following the recommendations contained in the Chiodini Report?
- Is it really necessary to remove the bricks and put them back up again?
- If a new police facility is warranted, should the Municipal Courts be incorporated in the design?

Councilmember Carr stated that her real desire is to get the answers to these questions within the next thirty-one days and be able to work towards the passage of a bond issue.

Councilmember Glickert stated that he had discussed this resolution with Councilmember Carr and they had reached a consensus that the word "*cooperate*" would be amended to "*assist*"; that Whereas 4 through 6 would be removed, and that funds for the consultant should come from the general reserve. Where they disagreed in part was on the specific definition of this independent consultant. He stated that this is a situation where he believes there is a need to find a consultant who specializes in the design of police stations.

Councilmember Jennings stated that he does not believe Council can get a consultant to render a report of this nature within forty-five days. He also does not believe Council will be able to find a consultant with the right qualifications to address these specific areas. Based on those beliefs, he wanted to remind everyone about the consequences associated with non-compliance of Senate Bill No. 5. Councilmember Jennings stated that Council should

be talking about how to fast-track the construction of a new building for these employees rather than trying to retread an old pair of shoes for them, which he found offensive.

Councilmember Crow stated that he was not sure how under-the-gun the City was, since it only took fifteen months from signing the contracts to occupancy to complete the Clayton Police Station. It is good for Council to step outside of the politics of the situation and ask questions of those who may know more about a specific topic than they do. He learned that Council needed to find an architect that specialized in historic reconstruction/renovation, has public safety experience and to team up with a cost estimator. Based on that information his belief is that the issue is not necessarily what the cost estimator did, it's with the numbers that Chiodini provided to the cost estimator.

Councilmember Crow said that when he talked to companies which participated in the first RFQ process and had not been selected, what he heard was that staff had basically informed them that they were more interested in firms with experience in building new police stations than they were with firms who had experience in the renovation of old buildings. So he would agree with Councilmembers Carr and Glickert that this resolution needed to move forward, because before Council asks this public for \$15 million dollars they need to make sure that they have received an apples-to-apples comparison.

Citizen Comments

Patricia McQueen, 1132 George Street, University City, MO

Ms. McQueen provided several suggestions for finding a consultant: firms located outside of the state, the list of architectural and engineering firms who participated in the RFQ, the architects who came forward at the March 2016 Council meeting and residents with similar professional backgrounds. Ms. McQueen acknowledged that the clock was ticking, but she saw no need to use Senate Bill 5 as a scare tactic because concessions can always be made when a City with this size and magnitude demonstrates that they are making progress in the right direction.

Jan Adams, 7150 Cambridge Avenue, University City, MO

Ms. Adams expressed concern that Resolution 13 does not include the language that any independent consultant hired must be both bonded and insured. Further, that any contract between the City and said consultant must include an accountability section that provides for damages against the consulting firm if it underestimates, to an unreasonable degree, the cost of a new or renovated police facility. She stated that she simply wants any firm hired by the City to ensure their work product with sufficient bonding and insurance to reimburse the City if their estimate is not within a reasonable range and the City suffers damages as a result thereof relying. (*Ms. Adams requested that her statement be added to the minutes*)

Council Comments

Councilmember Carr thanked Ms. Adams for her excellent suggestion. She stated that since her preference is to get this on the November ballot, her hope is that Council will work to complete the Scope of Work portion of the resolution tonight. Councilmember Carr recommended that the consultant be an architect who specialized in historic renovation and police facilities.

Councilmember Glickert's Proposal:

"The City will provide funding, up to \$40,000, out of the general reserve fund, to hire a consultant to review the March 14th Chiodini Architect's Facility Analysis Report with regard to the costs of the alternatives presented."

Councilmember Carr concurred with Councilmember Crow's conclusions regarding the quality of the cost estimator and the issues associated with identifying the exact numbers.

Councilmember Jennings asked Councilmember Carr if she was amendable to adding the language suggested by Ms. Adams. Councilmember Carr stated that she absolutely had no problems with the language, but believes her suggestion to include it in the RFQ was an excellent idea.

Councilmember Glickert voiced a concern about the exclusion of some type of cost estimate.

Mayor Welsch stated that perhaps, she could support the term "*independent consultant/s*," but could not support the specificity of "*an architectural and/or design-build firm*". She stated that as Councilmember Crow alluded to, respondents to the RFQ will put their own team together to perform the work. An architectural firm without expertise in law enforcement or historic renovation would not be good. She stated that what had also been made clear during several of the Study Sessions is that there are not a lot of architects around the country renovating historic police stations because of the Essential Services requirement. There is also a question in her mind as to whether Council will be able to find a consultant to look at every scope of this project within thirty days, when it took Chiodini fourteen months to complete it.

Councilmember Crow stated that based on his understanding, Councilmember Carr's Seconded Amended Proposal answered all of the Mayor's questions and concerns.

Mayor Welsch stated that the point she was trying to make is that there may be individuals outside of an architectural firm who might be qualified to respond by virtue of their experience or expertise.

Councilmember Crow asked the Mayor if she was suggesting that someone other than an architectural firm work on the cost estimates. Mayor Welsch stated that she was referring to the proposed options because there are numerous consultants around the country who have expertise in this field who might not be associated with an architectural firm but act as consultants on the design of these facilities.

Councilmember Glickert stated that he is willing to agree to the Second Amended Proposal if some type of verbiage was added to deal with the estimated costs, because Council has a responsibility to explicitly state their expectations.

Final Amended Proposal:

"The City will provide funding up to \$40,000, out of the General Reserve Fund to hire an architectural and/or design-build firm to serve as an independent consultant with a specialty in police stations and historic renovation to review the March 14, 2016, Chiodini Architect's Report with regard to Chiodini's recommendations on the scope of the work, and required methods proposed and the costs of the alternatives presented."

Councilmember Glickert seconded Councilmember Carr's motion to adopt the Third Amended Proposal relating to the scope of work, and requested that Paragraphs 4 through 6 be removed from the resolution.

Councilmember Carr stated that she had no objection to Councilmember Glickert's requested, and asked that Council also review the last paragraph to change "cooperate" to "assist"; *"The City Manager of the City of University City will assist in selecting the consultant by preparing a request for qualifications with the input of Councilmembers, and advertising of the said RFQ."*

Councilmember Glickert stated that he was in agreement with the language as proposed.

Voice vote on Councilmember Carr's motion to adopt the Third Amended Proposal to the Resolution carried by a majority, with a nay vote from Mayor Welsch

Voice vote on the Amended Resolution 2016-13 carried by a majority, with a nay vote from Mayor Welsch.

BILLS

N. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (continued if needed)

Niecy Davis, 7010 Corbett, University City, MO

Ms. Davis stated that Create Space and its partners, have afforded her the opportunity to start and grow a small business, and it would create a hardship for this community, as well as other creators such as herself, if they were to lose their funding.

Mary Bogaski, 800 Olive Street, University City, MO

Ms. Bogaski stated that she is a business owner, entrepreneur, friend and colleague of Julia Li, who knows that Ms. Li truly, truly believes in University City. Create Space is a viable investment opportunity that will allow U City to become a pioneer and gateway to St. Louis.

Akosua Yeboah, 525 Claire, St. Louis, MO

Ms. Yeboah stated the value of Create Space is more along the lines of access and inclusion. Many of the people who are served by this entity are immigrants, minorities, women and individuals who come from low-income neighborhoods that are often shut-out of business opportunities. Ms. Yeboah stated that Create Space aims to increase this City's tax base and fill some of their abandoned buildings. She stated these individuals also represent your voting base.

Mayor Welsch noted that several individuals were no longer present but had signed up to speak on Create Space, Make Space and Kitchen Space.

Thomas Jennings, 7055 Forsyth Blvd., University City, MO

Mr. Jennings expressed his thoughts about Resolution 2016-13 and the need for Council to get this project completed in a reasonable and efficient manner.

Carol Wofsey, 7171 Kingsbury, University City, MO

Ms. Wofsey stated that she was here tonight in reference to an exhibit that had been attached to the June 27th Council minutes wherein Suzanne Greenwald states she was privy to conversations where Ms. Wofsey accused Councilmember Carr of Tea Party affiliation. Ms. Wofsey stated that she is not sure what Tea Party affiliation is, because it is not the type of language she would use. She did wish to clarify, on the record, that she has no recollection of this conversation ever taking place.

Jan Adams, 7150 Cambridge Avenue, University City, MO

Ms. Adams stated that this was an unusual time with respect to deadlines and the need to be flexible, so she would remind Council that since they created Rule 24, they could also change it, suspend it or create an exception, as long as there is a six member panel.

Ms. Adams stated that she was surprised to hear Councilmembers directing very harsh language to City employees at the June 27th meeting. City employees are not elected officials; therefore Council cannot legally subject employees to the same political tactics of slinging lies and baseless accusations as they would be allowed to do with other elected officials. She informed Council that employees are granted legal protection from being used

as pawns in political battles, and have legal remedies to redress their injustice, which could cost taxpayers a great deal of money. So when City employees are required to attend Council meetings and then are publicly defamed, it does constitute a hostile work environment. Only the members of Council who engaged in this defamatory conduct can mitigate the City's damages. Ms. Adams stated that for the sake of the entire City she would call upon members of this Council to publicly retract their claims against these employees. *(Ms. Adams requested that her written comments be attached to the minutes.)*

Jeff Hales, 7471 Kingsbury, University City, MO

Mr. Hales stated that what everyone witnessed tonight in the discussions for the first time, in a very long time, Council was engaging one another, working to build consensus, compromising, but most importantly, listening. It is one of the moments he has been waiting to see, and believes that it was a great example of good governance. Mr. Hales thanked Council and encouraged them to maintain this type of behavior going forward.

O. COUNCIL REPORTS/BUSINESS

1. Boards and Commission appointments needed
Mayor Welsch made the appointments that were needed.
2. Council liaison reports on Boards and Commissions
3. Boards, Commissions and Task Force minutes
4. Other Discussions/Business

P. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilmember Glickert stated that two Saturdays ago, he and Councilmember Jennings had participated in a beautification event sponsored by Lions Against Litter, and it was very heartwarming to see thirty participants. He stated that another event has been planned for August 6th at Majerus Park and he would encourage anyone interested in beautifying this community to attend.

Councilmember Jennings added that not only did this group make an impact with respect to the removal of litter in the Third Ward; it attracted participants from the First and Second Wards, and provided elected officials with an opportunity to talk with residents and invite them to join Council at their Monday meetings. So he would really like to see other members of Council come out and, perhaps, be an inspiration to neighborhood kids by letting them see everyone work and in fellowship together. Councilmember Jennings acknowledged all the vendors whose donations helped to make this event a success. The upcoming schedule for Lions Against Litter is posted on the City's website

Mayor Welsch stated that it would be greatly appreciated if anyone in the audience who had applied for the vacancy on the City Council would come up and let Ms. Pumm know about their availability to take part in an interview on July 14th.

Q. ROLL CALL VOTE TO GO INTO A CLOSED SESSION authorized by Section 610.021 (1) Legal and (3) Personnel.

Councilmember Carr moved to go into closed session and was seconded by Councilmember Crow.

Councilmember Carr stated that prior to casting her vote she would like to say that in these chambers an accusation was leveled by the City Manager that Councilmember Crow was creating a hostile environment, and when an employee speaks about that, it must be addressed. So if Council did not discuss these matters in a closed session she will be

forced, as will others, to discuss them in public. She noted that she is not at all intimidated by a citizen coming up here and telling her that she is putting the City at-risk, because she does not believe that the previous speaker's comments were accurate. Councilmember Carr stated that this is the same citizen who accused her of something that was a legal decision.

Roll Call Vote:

AYES: Councilmembers Smotherson, Carr and Crow

NAYS: Councilmembers Glickert, Jennings and Mayor Welsch

R. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Shelley Welsch adjourned the meeting at 8:51 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Joyce Pumm, City Clerk, MRCC/CMC

UNIVERSITY CITY COUNCIL STUDY SESSION
5th Floor of City Hall 6801 Delmar Blvd
July 14, 2016
Session One 1:00 p.m. – 3:00 p.m.
Session Two 6:00 p.m. – 8:00 p.m.

The City Council Study Session was held in the Council Chamber, 5th floor of City Hall, on Thursday, July 14, 2016. Mayor Shelley Welsch called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. In addition to the Mayor the following members of the Council were present:

Councilmember Paulette Carr
Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson
Councilmember Michael Glickert
Councilmember Terry Crow
Councilmember Rod Jennings

Mayor Welsch opened the study sessions at 1:00 p.m. and 6:00 p.m. The purpose of the two sessions was to interview all applicants for the vacant seat in Ward One.

The applicants interviewed at Session One were:

- John Solodar via SKYPE
- Maureen McDonnell
- Greg Pace
- Rachael Sobotka by teleconferencing

The applicants interviewed at Session Two were:

- Carol Wofsey
- Jeff Hales
- Steve McMahon

Two other applicants who were traveling and unable to make interviewed stood on their application information. All applications can be found at the end of the minutes.

Mayor Welsch stated that Councilmember Crow asked that each Councilmember fill out their ballot with their three top candidates, sign the ballot sheet and they would become part of the public records. Upon collection of the ballots, the votes of each Councilmember would be read.

There was discussion as to whether to pick three or four candidates. The consensus was to pick three candidates.

Mayor Welsch reminded Council that two of the applicants were on the road and were standing on their application and noted that Council could review these applications in their packet.

Councilmember Crow eluded to the possibility of an applicant not picked as the top three could potentially still be nominated later down the line as council has no defined rules.

Councilmember Carr asked for an understanding of what Councilmember Crow meant.

Mayor Welsch said what Council has on the 25th or 26th that maybe someone who did not make the first cut could possibly be brought back as someone Council can coequal around. Consensus of Council was to stay with the three applicants picked and see where it stands on after that.

Ballots were filled out and Mayor Welsch read the results:

Councilmember Rod Jennings

- Lew Prince
- John Solodar
- Carol Wofsey

Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson

- Jeff Hales
- Steve McMahon
- Rachel Sabotka

Councilmember Terry Crow

- Jeff Hales
- Steve McMahon
- Maureen McDonnell

Councilmember Paulette Carr

- Jeff Hales
- Steve McMahon
- Maureen McDonnell

Councilmember Michael Glickert

- Jeff Hales
- Greg Pace
- Carol Wofsey

Mayor Shelley Welsch

- Maureen McDonnell
- John Solodar
- Carol Wofsey

Results provide one candidate with four votes and three candidates with three votes each. Mayor Welsch asked Council if they would like to just go with the four for the meeting on the 25th and 26th. Consensus of Council was to interview the four candidates.

Meeting was adjourned at 7:39 p.m.,

Joyce Pumm, City Clerk, MRCC/CMC



Council Agenda Item Cover

MEETING DATE: July 25, 2016

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Grant (JAG)
Program – FY2016

AGENDA SECTION: City Manager Report

CAN THIS ITEM BE RESCHEDULED: Yes

BACKGROUND REVIEW: Purchase of fourteen surveillance cameras to be installed on the interior and exterior of the temporary modular buildings for the Police Department. The cost of each camera is \$1039.93. The total cost is \$14,559. This purchase is fully funded by the grant.

RECOMMENDATION: Approval

City of University City
University City Police Department
Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program – FY 2016
Local Solicitation

APPLICATION ORDER

Abstract	Page 1
Program Narrative	Page 2
Budget Narrative	Page 3

ABSTRACT

Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program – FY 2016 University City Police Department

Project Identifiers

Equipment – Video/Audio, Surveillance

The University City Police Department strives to keep its equipment up-to-date to allow officers to maintain safety and security for residents and visitors.

In order to maintain safety in the immediate vicinity of the police headquarters building, the University City Police Department is in need of camera surveillance. The Department will be moving to a temporary location while a new headquarters building is being constructed; therefore, surveillance will be needed for both the exterior and interior of this temporary facility.

The University City Police Department will purchase 14 cameras, at the total cost of \$14,559 (\$1039.93 per camera), no later than September 2016.

PROGRAM NARRATIVE

Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program – FY 2015 University City Police Department

The University City Police Department is a municipal police agency which provides full police services. The City of University City is one of ninety-one municipalities in St. Louis County; it is six (6) square miles in area and has a population of approximately 36,000. University City is one of the most densely populated communities in St. Louis County, with an extremely diverse make-up both racially and socio-economically. The University City Police Department currently is budgeted for eighty full-time commissioned officers and nineteen full-time civilian employees.

The monies provided by this grant now will offset the monies expended by the City of University City in the future. Economic constraints have required the City of University City to make budget cuts on many levels. Although future personnel cuts are not predicted at this time in the police department, items we can acquire with the funds provided by the Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program will help protect the future of the department. The funds received will also allow us to maintain the safety of officers, inmates, employees, and visitors of our department.

The funds provided from the JAG program will be utilized to purchase 14 security cameras. These cameras will be placed on the exterior and interior of the temporary police headquarters building, while the new building is being constructed.

Security Cameras

The City of University City will purchase 14 cameras. There will be seven cameras placed on the exterior of the temporary headquarters building to view the perimeter of the building; the remaining seven will be installed within the interior of the building.

City of University City

2016 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant

The City of University City will create a separate trust to track all drawdowns from this grant. The trust will enable the City of University City to track drawdowns and expenditures separately from other federal funding. The department will adhere to financial and programmatic reporting on a quarterly basis. The Department plans to complete equipment acquisition within the required two year grant period. Equipment purchased under the JAG Program will be done so, no later than September 2017.

BUDGET NARRATIVE

Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program – FY 2016 University City Police Department

A. Personnel

There are no expenses for personnel.

B. Fringe Benefits

There are no expenses for fringe benefits.

C. Travel

There are no expenses for travel.

D. Equipment

Security Cameras

University City Police Department will purchase 14 cameras for its temporary headquarters. This will allow increased security for the officers, inmates, employees, and citizens.

The total cost for fourteen cameras is \$14,559. Each camera costs \$1039.93.

Total federal is \$14,559.

The grand total for equipments costs will be \$14,559.

E. Supplies

There are no expenses for supplies.

F. Construction

There are no expenses for construction.

G. Consultants/Contracts

There are no expenses for consultants.

H. Other Costs

There are no other costs.

I. Indirect Costs

There are no other indirect costs.

Budget Summary

A. Personnel	\$0.00
B. Fringe Benefits	\$0.00
C. Travel	\$0.00
D. Equipment	\$14,559
E. Supplies	\$0.00
F. Construction	\$0.00
G. Consultants/Contracts	\$0.00
H. Other	\$0.00
TOTAL COSTS	\$14,559



Council Agenda Item Cover

MEETING DATE: July 25, 2016

AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Annual Order for Police Uniforms

AGENDA SECTION: City Manager's Report

CAN THIS ITEM BE RESCHEDULED? : Yes

BACKGROUND REVIEW: Invitation to Bids were issued to three vendors for an estimated amount of police uniforms and related equipment which includes uniform trousers, shirts, raincoats, boots, gloves, hats and miscellaneous accessories. The vendors are Quinn Uniform Company, Heros In Style and Leon Uniform Company. One bid was received:

Leon Uniform Company.....\$42,646.15

Leon Uniform has provided excellent products and service to the Police Department in the past several years. Other possible bidders cannot meet Leon Uniform's quality, variety and the ability to outfit new officers in person. The majority of the prices bid this year remained the same, but there was a small increase in some products such as shirts, trousers and jackets, which resulted in a total price which is slightly higher than last year's bid of \$41,848.15.

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends the award be made to Leon Uniform for their bid of \$42,646.15.

**CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY
6801 DELMAR BOULEVARD
UNIVERSITY CITY, MO 63130
314-862-6767**

July 10, 2014

INVITATION TO BID

Bids for the estimated requirements for Law Enforcement Uniforms will be accepted in the Finance Department-Purchasing Office, 1st Floor, 6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, MO 63130, until 11:00 A.M., July 24, 2014, there and then to be opened and the award made subject to the approval of the City Council. The City reserves the right to reject any and all bids or part of the bids, to waive any technicalities and to accept the bid that in its judgment, best meets the requirements of the City of University City.

The initial term of this contract will be for two (2) years from date of award, with an option to extend two additional years at the discretion of the City Manager. This option will be considered in the final year of the original contract and each year thereafter. All quotes should be firm for the duration of the contract. The City should be notified in advance of any price increases. The various uniforms items will be purchased on an "as needed" basis throughout the City's fiscal year. A blanket purchase order will be issued to the successful bidder for the annual uniform requirements as listed in this document. Orders will be placed against the blanket purchase order throughout the year. The officer(s) will be measured for proper size as the items are needed. Bid prices should be F.O.B. the City's Police Department, 6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, MO 63130. All quantities are estimated and the City reserves the right to add to or decrease the quantity ordered during the year.

The bidder will state if representatives will be sent to measure for uniforms or if it will be the responsibility of the City. The bidder will state if a delivery or pick up service is available or if all service is to be conducted by mail or courier. State the brand of clothing which is bid. Samples, if requested by the City's Police Department, will be sent free of charge and returned after award of the contract if requested on bid. If brand other than specified is bid, include specifications and other literature that will help the City in making an alternate decision.

Bidder will give an approximate delivery schedule of items from receipt of order and turnaround of tailoring and miscellaneous sewing jobs.

Bidder must maintain a stock of the items to be purchased.

The City of University City has implemented an ordinance requiring apparel and laundry contractors to certify they and their subcontractors, including production facilities, are in compliance with core labor standards, acceptable conditions of work, and standards relating to wages and remuneration. The affidavit of compliance accompanying this invitation to bid is required. Failure by the vendor to respond to a specific requirement may be the basis for elimination during the City's selection process.

All bid requirements and administrative questions may be addressed to Danella Lang, Administrative Assistant, (314) 505-8538 or dlang@ucitymo.org. Technical questions regarding the product request or specifications may be addressed to Captain Carol Jackson, (314) 505-8654.

PLEASE ADDRESS THE BID TO THE FINANCE DEPARTMENT AND MARK OUTSIDE OF ENVELOPE: POLICE UNIFORMS, 7/24/2014.

BID FORM

To: The City of University City

The following bid is being submitted in response to your Invitation to Bid dated July 10, 2014. These prices are good for the first year of the contract. The City will be notified in advance of any price increases for subsequent contract years.

I. UNIFORM PRICING:

<u>QUANTITY</u>	<u>UNIT</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>	<u>PER UNIT</u>	<u>TOTAL</u>
16	EACH	UNIFORM JACKET: FEMALE AND MALE SIZES - 10R - 46R COMPARABLE TO BLAUER #9810Z-13	<u>185.00</u>	<u>2960.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
7	EACH	UNIFORM JACKET: OVERSIZE MALE SIZES 46L THRU 60L, COMPARABLE TO BLAUER #9810Z-13	<u>205.00</u>	<u>1435.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
100	EACH	MALE NAVY BLUE UNIFORM TROUSER SIZES 29 THRU 42, COMPARABLE TO SWS 7500-1	<u>46.00</u>	<u>4600.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
18	EACH	MALE NAVY BLUE OVERSIZE UNIFORM TROUSERS SIZES 44 THRU 56 COMPARABLE TO SWS 7500-1	<u>50.00</u>	<u>900.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
50	EACH	FEMALE NAVY BLUE UNIFORM TROUSER STANDARD SIZES 6 - 18, COMPARABLE TO FECHEIMER SECURITY MISS	<u>46.00</u>	<u>2300.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
90	EACH	FEMALE BLUE SHORT SLEEVE SHIRT STANDARD SIZES, COMPARABLE TO LEVENTHAL #4492-21	<u>34.00</u>	<u>3060.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
50	EACH	FEMALE BLUE LONG SLEEVE SHIRT STANDARD SIZES, COMPARABLE TO LEVENTHAL #5001	<u>36.00</u>	<u>1800.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
100	EACH	MALE/FEMALE NAVY BLUE UNIFORM TROUSERS SUMMER WEIGHT SIZES 28-42	<u>39.00</u>	<u>3900.00</u>

		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
100	EACH	MALE BLUE AND OR WHITE SHORT SLEEVE SHIRTS, SIZE SMALL THRU EXTRA LARGE EQUAL TO LEVENTHAL #4225	<u>34.00</u> <u>3400.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
25	EACH	MALE BLUE AND OR WHITE OVERSIZE SHORT SLEEVE SHIRTS, 2XL THRU 4XL, EQUAL TO LEVENTHAL #4225	<u>38.00</u> <u>950.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
100	EACH	MALE BLUE AND OR WHITE LONG SLEEVE SHIRTS, SIZE 15-1/2 X 34 THRU 17-1/2 X 35 EQUAL TO LEVENTHAL #5000	<u>36.00</u> <u>3600.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
30	EACH	MALE BLUE AND OR WHITE LONG SLEEVE SHIRTS, SIZE 18 X 34 THRU 19-1/2 X 35 EQUAL TO LEVENTHAL #5000	<u>40.00</u> <u>1200.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
18	EACH	ALL WEATHER BLUE HATS WITH SILVER OR GOLD BAND, ADJUSTABLE SIZES COMPARABLE TO MIDWAY CAP CO.	<u>47.00</u> <u>846.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
24	EACH	NAVY BLUE ARCTIC CAPS, SIZE SMALL THRU EXTRA LARGE, COMPARABLE TO MIDWAY CAP CO.	<u>22.00</u> <u>528.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
16	EACH	RAINCOATS, REVERSIBLE, BLACK/FYL-ANS-3 LIGHTWEIGHT SIZE 38S THRU 46L	<u>99.00</u> <u>1584.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
4	EACH	OVERSIZE RAINCOATS, LIGHTWEIGHT - STYLE NUMBER 734 SIZE 48R THRU 60L	<u>109.00</u> <u>436.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
18	EACH	PLAIN BLACK DUTY BELT. 2-1/4 WIDE, WITH BUCKLE. - 4 STITCH DESIGN. COMPARABLE TO COURTLAND BOOT JACK - SIZES 28 - 48	<u>58.00</u> <u>1044.00</u>

		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
18	EACH	PLAIN BLACK BELT WITH VELCRO CLOSURE, 1-3/4 WIDE. COMPARABLE TO BAY LEATHER SIZES 28 - 48	<u>18.00</u>	<u>324.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
20	EACH	PULL OVER SWEATERS WITH EPAULETS, BADGE PATCH WITH EYELETS AND NAME PLATE PATCH WITH EYELETS. SMALL TO X LARGE COMPARABLE TO BLAUER #210	<u>64.00</u>	<u>1280.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
3	EACH	PULL OVER SWEATERS WITH EPAULETS, OVERSIZED. XXLARGE - XXXLARGE, BADGE PATCH WITH EYELETS AND NAME PLATE PATCH WITH EYELETS. COMPARABLE TO BLAUER #210	<u>70.00</u>	<u>210.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
66	EACH	POLY 3" X 14.5" OR 3" X 18" BLACK CLIP ON TIES W/BH	<u>4.95</u>	<u>326.70</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
60	EACH	SERGEANT CHEVRON 3"-2-COLOR(PAIR ROYAL-ROYAL-WHITE	<u>3.50</u>	<u>210.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
36	PAIR	BLACK PLAIN GLOVES, SIZES SMALL THRU EXTRA LARGE, MEN STYLE	<u>23.95</u>	<u>862.20</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
9	EACH	DON HUMES SECURITY HOLSTER	<u>NA</u>	
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>HOLSTER DISCONTINUED</u>		
17	EACH	MACE HOLDERS, PLAIN BLACK	<u>24.95</u>	<u>424.15</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
88	EACH	DOUBLE SNAP PLAIN BLACK BELT KEEPER WITH SILVER SNAP BUTTONS	<u>3.50</u>	<u>308.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: <u>AS SPECIFIED</u>		
18	EACH	HANDCUFF CASES PLAIN BLACK WITH		

		SILVER SNAP BUTTON	<u>33.50</u>	<u>603.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID:	<u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
14	EACH	COLLAPSIBLE BATON HOLDERS BLACK WITH SILVER SNAP BUTTON	<u>37.50</u>	<u>525.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID:	<u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
30	EACH	THUNDER 2 BLACK PLASTIC WHISTLES	<u>5.50</u>	<u>165.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID:	<u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
18	PAIR	SMITH AND WESSON HANDCUFFS	<u>28.95</u>	<u>521.10</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID:	<u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
48	EACH	COMMUNICATION ROCKER PATCHES WITH GOLD LETTERING AND DARK BLUE OR BLACK BACKGROUND	<u>2.00</u>	<u>96.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID:	<u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
100	EACH	SERGEANT STRIPS (SILVER ON BLACK AND SILVER ON ROYAL BLUE)	<u>3.50</u>	<u>350.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID:	<u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
16	EACH	ACADEMY LONG SLEEVE SHIRTS	<u>20.00</u>	<u>320.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID:	<u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
8	EACH	ACADEMY TROUSERS	<u>21.00</u>	<u>168.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID:	<u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
6	EACH	ACADEMY BELTS	<u>16.00</u>	<u>96.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID:	<u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
400	EACH	UNIVERSITY CITY SHOULDER PATCHES	<u>1.25</u>	<u>500.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID:	<u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
8	EACH	ACADEMY SWEATS AND JACKET	<u>42.00</u>	<u>336.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID:	<u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
4	PAIR	BATTLE DRESS UNIFORMS FOR MRT UNIT	<u>52.00</u>	<u>208.00</u>
		MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID:	<u>AS SPECIFIED</u>	
2	SETS	WEB GEAR FOR MRT	<u>135.00</u>	<u>270.00</u>

MANUFACTURER AND ITEM NUMBER BID: AS SPECIFIED

GRAND TOTAL 42,646.15

II. MISCELLANEOUS:

- Will your company provide representatives to come on-site to measure officers or will the City be responsible for going to your site for measurements?
THE DEPARTMENT PREFERENCES TO SEND THE OFFICER TO THE STORE AND LEAVE WITH THE ITEMS.
- Does your company provide a delivery or pick up service or will items have to be sent through the mail?
PICK UP SERVICE
- What is the approximate delivery turnaround from order placement to item Delivery?
IMMEDIATE WHEN IN STOCK
- How long does it usually take for alterations and patch sewing?
5 MINUTES

EXCEPTIONS:

\$41,848.15 @FY14

PLEASE CHECK IF BUSINESS IS: MINORITY OWNED ___ WOMAN OWN ___
Minorities and females in work force assigned to carry out this contract

ITEM(S) BID ARE UNITED STATES MANUFACTURED, ASSEMBLED AND, _____
If "NO", please indicate which item(s) are foreign manufactured, assembled

ALL STATE AND CITY TAXES DUE HAVE BEEN PAID: YES NO ___

7.11.14
Date

HOW
Print Name

AT ONCE
Expected Delivery

[Signature]
Signature

NET 30
Terms

VP
Title

314.828.4301
Telephone

LEON UNIFORM COMPANY
Company

1 YEAR
Quote Valid for How Long?

142 HANLEY IND. CT., ST. LOUIS, MO 63144
Address

AFFIDAVIT OF COMPLIANCE

POLICY

The City of University City requires Apparel and Laundry contractors to certify that they, and their subcontractors, including production facilities, comply with core labor standards, acceptable conditions of work, and standards relating to wages and remuneration. The goal of the City of University City is to use government purchasing power to create a market for decent working conditions by working collaboratively with suppliers to improve working conditions when needed, and avoiding purchases of products from companies that fail to eliminate sweatshop conditions.

The City of University City requires contractors to submit this Affidavit of Compliance with bids for Apparel in accordance with the City's Sweatfree Procurement Policy and Code of Conduct.

I. Definitions

For the purposes of this Affidavit:

Apparel includes, but is not limited to: uniforms (e.g. sports and public employee uniforms); footwear (e.g., athletic shoes and work boots); sweatshirts; caps and hats; and other clothing, whether or not imprinted with the City of University City's name or logo.

Laundries are facilities that perform processes related to the renting and cleaning of Apparel.

Production Facilities are facilities that manufacture (including cutting and assembly by weaving, knitting or felting,) finish, apply marks, or engage in any other processes that contribute significantly to the finished Apparel for procurement of government entities.

Code of Conduct is a set of labor standards, defined by the City of University City, applicable to Production Facilities where Apparel is manufactured for government procurement.

II. Process

For all procurement contracts for Apparel and Laundries, contractors shall comply with the following procedures:

1. Disclosure Requirements
 - a. An Affidavit of Compliance with labor standards specified in the City of University City's Code of Conduct.
 - b. The names, addresses, and telephone numbers of each subcontractor and physical address of each Production Facility or Laundry to be utilized in the performance of the contract, which shall be updated to show any changes in subcontractors or facilities during the term of the contract.

- c. Description of the methods used to monitor and verify that Production Facilities or Laundries comply with the labor standards in the City of University City's Code of Conduct.
- d. A copy of each Production Facility's or Laundry's standard payroll records, including the minimum base hourly wage of non-supervisory production employees, percent of wage level paid as health benefits, other benefits, regular deductions from paychecks, normal working hours per day and week, and overtime policy.
- e. When requested, written assurance from each of its subcontractors' Production Facilities or Laundries to be utilized in the performance of the contract that they are in compliance with the City of University City's Code of Conduct. The contractor shall provide the written assurance within the time period specified by the City. In the event that any information provided by the contractor changes during the specified contract period, the contractor shall notify the contracting entity within 21 days of the change, or according to the requirements of the City of University City, and submit sworn affidavits relating to the updated information.

2. Agreement Requirements

- a. Each contractor shall commit to the following:
 - (1) That the contractor and each proposed supplier or subcontractor will adhere to the Code of Conduct;
 - (2) That a copy of the Code of Conduct has been furnished to each of the contractor's suppliers and subcontractors; and
 - (3) That the vendor has required each supplier to post a copy of this code, including a procedure for filing complaints, in a location that is visible, obvious, and accessible in the workplace and translated into each worker's first language.

III. Enforcement and Contractor Compliance

To ensure contractor compliance with the labor standards specified in the City of University City's Code of Contract, the City of University City may use an independent, third party monitoring agency and/or the Sweatfree Purchasing Consortium.

Independent monitors and/or the Sweatfree Purchasing Consortium may verify that the information disclosed in accordance with the requirements set forth above is accurate and complete and request evidence of production or planned production at the given locations. Contractors shall provide the compliance evaluation provided by the Sweatfree Purchasing Consortium and/or independent monitor to the City entity conducting the bid. If the compliance evaluation demonstrates the need for further action to ensure compliance, the

Contractor shall take steps to become fully compliant within a reasonable period of time as specified in the contract. If the Contractor is unable to become fully compliant, the City entity may refuse an award or terminate the contract in accordance with the contract terms.

IV. Code of Conduct

A Contractor who engages in or bids for City contracts shall comply with the requirements in each subsection below and may not supply goods or services to fulfill a City contract except as provided below. These requirements shall be known as the "Code of Conduct."

- (A) Compliance with All Laws. A Contractor shall comply with all federal, state, and local laws and workplace regulations in the jurisdictions where the work is to be performed, including those regarding wages and benefits, workplace health and environmental safety, freedom of association, and the fundamental conventions of the International Labor Organization, including those regarding forced and child labor and freedom of association.
- (B) Harassment and Abuse. A Contractor shall not engage in behavior that harasses or abuses a worker in a sexual, psychological, or verbal manner. Nor shall a Contractor use corporal punishment in its employment practices.
- (C) Discrimination. A Contractor shall not engage in discriminatory employment practices on the basis of gender, race, religion, age, disability, sexual orientation, nationality, political opinion, or social or ethnic origin in hiring, salary, benefits, advancement, disciplinary action, termination, or retirement. A Contractor shall not require pregnancy tests as a condition of employment nor demand pregnancy tests of employees. Women workers shall receive equal treatment and remuneration, including pay, benefits, and the opportunity to fill a position that is open to a male worker.
- (D) Exposure to Toxins. A Contractor shall not expose a worker to toxic chemicals that may endanger a worker's health. A Contractor shall take appropriate measures to safeguard workers when any aspect of work requires exposure to any toxic chemical. If a federal, state, or local occupational safety or health law or regulation applies to the workplace condition, compliance with such a law or regulation is not a violation of this subsection.
- (E) Wages and Benefits. A Contractor shall pay wages that comply with federal and state law requirements in the jurisdiction where the work is being performed, as well as the requirements set forth in the City's standard contract terms and conditions.
- (F) Wage and Hour Records. A Contractor shall maintain verifiable wage and hour records for each production worker, employee or independent contractor.
- (G) Working Hours. A Contractor shall not require hourly and quota-based employees to work more than 48 hours per week or the limits on regular hours allowed by the law

of the country of manufacture, whichever is lower. In addition, a Contractor shall provide a worker with days off, as provided by applicable labor law.

- (H) Overtime Compensation. A Contractor shall not require a worker to work overtime hours unless the worker is paid at a rate of at least one-and-one-half their regular hourly compensation rate as provided by the federal Fair Labor Standards Act.
- (I) Termination. A Contractor shall provide for a mediation or grievance process to resolve workplace disputes if required by federal law.
- (J) Closure to Avoid Compliance. A Contractor shall not close or reduce orders for a production facility:
 - (1) as a punitive measure against workers for exercising their right to freedom of association; or
 - (2) to avoid its responsibility to take corrective action after there has been a determination that a violation of the Code of Conduct.

Affidavit of Compliance with the Labor Standards Specified in University City's Code of Conduct to be Completed by Each Bidder and Submitted with the Bid

Request For Proposal (RFP):	Date of Bid Opening
# _____	____/____/____
Invitation For Bid (IFB):	Return To:
# <u>POLICE UNIFORMS</u>	(Insert government entity's name address, including the name of the Procurement Officer responsible for the solicitation)
Quotation:	<u>UNIVERSITY CITY POLICE DEPT.</u>
# _____	<u>6801 DELMAR BOULEVARD</u>
	University City, MO 63130

Certification

- The Apparel offered complies with the labor standards specified in University City's Code of Conduct.
- The name and address of each subcontractor, Production Facility or Laundry utilized or to be utilized is:

Name of Entity:	Type of Entity (Production Facility and/or Laundry)	Volume of Production (% of contract to be produced in facility)	Complete Mailing Address of Entity	Contact Person and Title:	Telephone Number, Fax, and E-mail of Contact Person
FECHHEIMER	PRODUCTION	100%	4545 MARLSBARY CINCINNATI, OH	MIKE BAIRD 417-437-0947	417-437-6947
G+G	PRODUCTION	100%	709 E. McNEIL LILLINGTON, NC	JEFF MASON	636-399-8076
ELBECO	PRODUCTION	100%	19603 POTTSVILLE READING, PA	CINDY DEHOFF	816-500-2984

Addendum

The Contractor must also provide the following information for each entity listed above:

- Minimum base hourly wage
- Percentage of wage paid as health benefits or other benefits
- Average number of hours/week for the most recent quarter
- Overtime policy



 Signature of Responsible Party



Council Agenda Item Cover

MEETING DATE: July 25, 2016
AGENDA ITEM TITLE: Solid Waste Fee Increase
AGENDA SECTION: Unfinished Business
CAN THIS ITEM BE RESCHEDULED? : Yes

BACKGROUND REVIEW: In the FY 2009 Budget the City established a separate Solid Waste Fund establishing the goal that this fund will be self-sustainable. Revenue generated through solid waste management will pay for the cost of the refuse collection and billing services. Recent efforts toward collection of delinquent payments have brought many customers to a current status in their billings, and these efforts will continue. The last rate increase was in 2009 for 6.5%.

For FY 2017, staff has estimated the need for a 12.0% rate increase as provided in the final budget. Attached are refuse fee comparisons to prior years. Below is a schedule of projected revenues and expenditures for the Solid Waste Fund for FY 2017:

Revenue	
Yard Waste	\$ 80,000
Solid Waste Fees	3,248,000
Interest and Penalties	60,000
Salvage	30,000
Transfer Station Fees	40,000
Miscellaneous Waste Services	30,000
Total Revenue	<u>\$ 3,488,000</u>
Expenditures	
Administration	\$ 440,000
Operations	2,456,000
Leaf Collection	462,000
Capital Improvement	130,000
	<u>\$ 3,488,000</u>

Note: The rate increase of 12% will generate additional \$348,000 to Solid Waste revenue.

Proposal for Rate Increase as of 9/1/2016

Rate	9/1/2007	9/1/2008	9/1/2009	9/1/2016	Monthly Change
Single and 2-Family	\$ 14.61	\$ 15.05	\$ 16.03	\$ 17.95	\$ 1.92
Single and 2-Family - Senior	12.33	12.70	13.53	15.15	1.62
Single and 2-Family Alley	15.75	16.22	17.27	19.34	2.07
Single and 2 - Family Alley - Senior	13.58	13.99	14.90	16.69	1.79
3 + w/Alley mechanical	10.34	10.65	11.34	12.70	1.36
3 + w/mechanical box	6.17	6.36	6.77	7.58	0.81

RECOMMENDATION: Staff recommends increasing refuse fees by 12.0% to provide for self-sufficiency of the Solid Waste Management Fund.

INTRODUCED BY: _____

DATE: June 13, 2016

BILL NO.: 9287

ORDINANCE NO.: _____

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 8.12 OF THE UNIVERSITY CITY MUNICIPAL CODE, RELATING TO SOLID WASTE MANAGEMENT AND DISPOSAL, BY ESTABLISHING AND IMPOSING FEES FOR SOLID WASTE COLLECTION SERVICES, EFFECTIVE SEPTEMBER 1, 2016.

WHEREAS, the cost of the services provided by the City to its residents for the collection and disposal of solid waste and for the administration of the City's solid waste management program exceeds the fees collected for such services; and

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to increase the fees for solid waste management services as provided herein; and

WHEREAS, the fee increases reflected in this ordinance are designed and intended to recoup the City's costs for the provision of these services, and the City Council finds and determines that the increases provided for herein are reasonable and necessary for such recoupment and reflect the actual value of the services so rendered.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY, MISSOURI, AS FOLLOWS:

Section 1. The collection fees established in the attached Exhibit A, incorporated by reference, are hereby ratified, established, and imposed as authorized by Section 8.12.200.A of the University City Municipal Code to cover the cost of providing solid waste management services.

Section 2. This ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after its passage as provided by law.

PASSED this _____ day of _____, 2016.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

CERTIFIED TO BE CORRECT AS TO FORM:

CITY ATTORNEY

Exhibit A

University City refuse collection rates effective September 1, 2016:

Type	Monthly Rate
a. Single or two-family units and buildings with three or more units with curb line pick up, per unit, per 90 gallon cart	\$17.95
Senior rate (available to a residential unit occupied by no more than two persons, one of whom is at least sixty-five (65) years of age), per unit, per 60 gallon cart	15.15
b. Single or two-family units with alley line mechanical box pick up, per unit	19.34
Senior rate	16.69
c. Three or more units with alley line mechanical box pick up, per unit	12.70
d. Three or more units with mechanical box pick up and waste reduction, per unit	7.58

Resolution 2016 - 14

***A Resolution Approving Amendments to the the
Fiscal Year 2016-2017 (FY 2017) Budget
for the City of University City and Appropriating Said Amounts***

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of University City, Missouri, that the Annual Budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2016, having been adopted on June 27, 2016 without any of the amendments proposed by the City Manager, is hereby amended as detailed in Attachment A.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in accordance with the City Charter, the several amounts stated in the amendment as presented, are herewith appropriated to the several objects and purposes named.

Adopted this 25th day of July, 2016

Shelley Welsch, Mayor

Attest:

Joyce Pumm
City Clerk

ATTACHMENT A

REVENUE:

Sales Tax

The Missouri Senate has approved a change to the St. Louis County system for distributing a one cent sales tax. The bill would allow pool cities to keep at least 50% of sales generated in their cities. This change would likely result in sales tax revenue decrease for University City by nearly \$100,000.

Golf Course Fees

Proposed budget includes an estimate for Golf Course fee increases. The Park Commission recommended fee increases in April 2016, and was approved by the City Council. This fee increase would generate revenue increase of approximately \$30,000.

EXPENDITURES:

Non-Uniformed Pension Plan

Increase the City's contribution to Non-Uniformed Pension Plan to \$1,026,700 or approximately 13% of total compensation.

Reduction in Force

The City is not replacing vacant positions in several departments across the City. This action resulted in a cost savings of approximately \$560,000 in General Fund and \$90,000 in the Solid Waste Enterprise Fund.

Police Facility

Temporary Building rental is estimated to be \$1,180,000 annually
The lease for 601 Trinity is projected to be \$80,000 annually

FY17 EDRSTB RECOMMENDED BUDGET: PROJECT DETAILS

CITYWIDE PROJECTS - \$157,123

Public Relations, Marketing, and Advertising: \$30,000

The Chamber of Commerce has created a robust citywide PR and Marketing, and Advertising Campaign. EDRST funding will enable the Chamber to build an annual marketing plan with quarterly activities goals and milestones outlined and to finance a citywide advertising campaign.

Training Program: \$10,000

The Chamber will expand upon the existing Small Business Workshop series by offering additional training classes, seminars, and workshops for University City businesses, residents, and others. Training will be curriculum based offering classes in: banking, accounting, legal, marketing, insurance and basic business planning.

Taste of U City: \$7,000

The Chamber would use EDRST funds to advertise and promote the event regionally. Additionally, the Chamber will promote the event City-wide via street banners and through various partnerships most notably with the School District.

City-Wide Marketing: \$10,123

City-wide marketing efforts by the Department of Community Development include business attraction efforts, partnerships for joint advertising to promote citywide programs, Lion Pages printing, etc.

Create Space: \$100,000

Create Space will use the funds to continue development of the SPACE EntrepreneurSHIP program for artists and makers. Currently the program has 24 participants who take businesses development classes and sell products in the retail space in the Delmar Loop. The City will work to retain and expand the Create Space artists in the incubator program. Funds will also be used to finish the Olive Blvd Make and Kitchen Spaces – a co-working concept for makers, bakers, and food truck operators. The program will offers classes and rental spaces to U City residences at a subsidized rate.

DELMAR BOULEVARD PROJECTS - \$177,605

Marketing: \$5,000

EDRST funds will be used for marketing needs by The Loop Special Business District.

Loop Brochures and Directory: \$14,000

The Loop brochure and directory is an important promotional and marketing product. Funds will be used for the printing and distribution of Loop brochures and updating the directories in the Loop. The brochure will also be included in the City's economic development marketing materials.

Loop Events: \$60,000

EDRST funds will be used for four events in the Delmar Loop over the course of the year. The EDRST Board did not specific which events the LSBDD can use the funds. This amount does include funds for the Ice Loop Carnival.

Official St. Louis Visitors Guide: \$10,500

Funds will be used for advertising space in the Official St. Louis Visitors Guide.

Farmers Market Events and Marketing: \$21,000

The Midtown Farmers Market will use the funds to provide additional music events and chef demonstrations at the Saturday Farmers market located in the Delmar Loop.

Delmar Pedestrian Lighting: \$59,097

Funds will allow U City Department of Public Works and Parks to upgrade existing pedestrian lights in The Loop to LED bulbs which provide increased light coverage, safety, energy efficiency, and savings.

Delmar Planters: \$8,008

U City in Bloom will use EDRST funds to provide care and maintenance of 90 existing planters on Delmar.

OLIVE BOULEVARD PROJECTS – \$215,272

Olive Beautification: \$60,272

UCIB will install and maintain hanging baskets on the decorative lampposts between Midland and Grant (\$20,140); Olive Tree Care (\$8,109); care and maintain nine Olive Gardens (\$14,218); install new decorative planters on Olive in the Interchange District (\$9,997); and provide ground cover for the trees on Olive (\$7,808).

Lunar New Year Celebration: \$15,000

The Chamber will organize and market a Lunar New Year celebration on Olive Boulevard. In 2016, the event had record-breaking attendance from the public and wide support.

Olive Streetscape Project: \$80,000

EDRST funds will allow the U City Department of Community Development to install and update 13 high-use frequency bus stops on Olive Blvd. All shelters will receive trash and recycling containers and a decorative art component. Five of the shelters will be completely new.

Façade Improvement Program: \$60,000

The City provides up to \$15,000 to assist a business seeking to restore, replace, or improve, the exterior facade of a property. The existing Façade Improvement Program is out of funds due to the success of the program and interested property owners.

EDRSTB RECOMMENDED BUDGET: USE OF RESERVES

Olive Boulevard Projects: \$118,000

EDRSTB recommends using \$8,000 in Olive Reserves to allow the Chamber to continue to manage and update TheOliveLink.com website. Following an evaluation of performance metrics, an additional \$50,000 will be given to Create Space to allow expand program offerings and management Make and Kitchen Space. The U City Department of Public Works and Parks will utilize \$60,000 to upgrade 120 pedestrian light bulbs on Olive Blvd. to LED which will provide increased light coverage, safety, energy efficiency, and savings.

Delmar Boulevard Projects: \$3,000

EDRSTB recommends allocating an additional \$3,000 from reserves upgrade pedestrian lighting in the Delmar Loop.

Meeting Minutes – University City Green Practices Commission

May 12, 2016

Location: Heman Park Community Center
Attendees Present: Dianne Benjamin, Bob Elgin, Jeff Mishkin, Scott Eidson, Lois Sechrist,
Jenny Wendt (Staff Liaison)

Absent: Richard Juang, Tim Michels

1. Meeting called to Order, Roll Call at 6:12 p.m.
2. Opening Round
 - a) Dianne attended a University City Citizen Volunteer Corps Meeting. A new action group, “Lions against Litter” will be performing cleanups around the City. They will meet at parks, almost every Saturday. They will begin in the 3rd Ward and the Olive Business District.
 - b) Lois attended the St. Louis Regional Chamber Green Business Challenge meeting. There was focus on biodiversity, specifically bat surveys and bird strikes. The Missouri Botanical Garden has a new program, BiodiverseCity, which recognizes the region’s reliance on biodiversity. University City should consider taking the BiodiverseCity Pledge.
 - c) Jenny discussed the Electronics Recycling Event on May 7th. EPC, the vendor collecting the materials, did not anticipate the volume of electronics that would come in from this event.
 - d) Jenny also requested discussion of the weed ordinance to be added to the agenda.
 - e) Steve Kraft indicated that this was his last meeting with the GPC. He complimented the group for being engaging, effective, and well-run.
3. Approval of Minutes
 - a) April 14, 2016 Meeting Minutes were approved with two revisions.
4. Special Presentations
 - a) None
5. New Business
 - a) Wash U Ackert Walkway/Greenway South proposed changes – the proposed changes include widening the bridge and adding an element to slow down cyclist and skateboarders. In addition, greenspace below the bridge will replace the concrete which is currently present. LED lighting will also be added. Approximately 20 trees will be removed, but 55 trees will be added by the end of the project. Jenny will ask the following questions to Cheryl Adelstein of Washington University:
 - What types of trees will be added?
 - What will be planted in the greenspace, possibly natives/low maintenance plantings?
 - Will there be a detailed commission presentation?
 - b) Weed Ordinance – there has been a suggestion to add verbiage to the ordinance. The current ordinance states: *[occupants shall keep] the lot, land or premises free from such noxious weeds and vegetation...*
It was suggested to include “invasive plants and nuisance plants” in addition to “noxious weeds”. This addition was suggested to make it conducive to the City meeting the Municipal Separate Stormwater Sewer System (MS4) regulations which include the

removal of such plants. The Commission did not agree to this change; this would put a heavy burden on occupants in regards to honeysuckle, winter creeper, and other invasive plants that are in heavy abundance throughout University City.

6. Old Business

- a) Finalize Date for Council Meeting and Study Session – The commission suggested adding this to the June 13, 2016 Council meeting agenda. Scott and Jenny will work with Lois to prepare.
- b) Finalize Commission Goals – Jeff felt the Commission needed to look through notes and decisions that were made in the past regarding the breakdown of the subcategories and the mission statement. The following tasks need to be completed:
 - i. Find notes of suggested commission categories
 - ii. Revisit and study mission, vision, and values
 - iii. Consider eliminating categories, become more project based.
 - iv. Take list from work session, turn into SMART goals.
 - v. Ask for input at the Council PresentationJeff and Tim will be rotating off of the commission in August. It is important to recruit new qualified members.

7. Reports – None

8. Closing Round

- a) Dianne had asked about updating the Parks Master Plan from 2008. This plan will not be updated; instead each park will have its own Master Plan specific to its amenities and function.
- b) Scott asked to be on the July agenda to discuss the recycling ordinance.
- c) Jeff has had several local speaking engagements about energy savings.

9. Meeting adjourned at 7:33pm



Commission on Senior Issues

6801 Delmar Boulevard, University City, Missouri 63130, Phone: (314) 505-8563

Meeting Minutes – University City Commission on Senior Issues

June 20, 2016

Location: Heman Park Community Center

Attendees Present: Margaret Diekemper, Mary Hart, Sue Slater, Elaine Henton, Bill Thomas, Marcia Mermelstein (Senior Coordinator), LaRette Reese (staff Liaison)

Guest: Wayne Flesch, Shawn Rimerman and Angela Haas, ComForCare Home Care

Ms. Margie Diekemper called the meeting to order at 6:13PM

Roll call was done by Ms. LaRette Reese

Approval of Minutes:

Ms. Slater moved to approve the meeting minutes from the April 26, 2016 meeting; it was seconded by Mr. Thomas. The motion passed.

Guest representatives (Shawn Rimerman and Angela Haas) from ComForCare, a new home care agency were present and gave a brief overview of the services they offer for older adults. They offer services such as medication reminders, meal preparation, companionship, light housekeeping and limited transportation. ComForCare is a home care agency, unlike a home care agency with offers medical assistance.

Ms. Mermelstein provided an update on the many activities and meetings that she's been involved with, including members of the school district, the religious organizations as well as others associated with older adult services. The mailing distribution database is up to 50 people and there are about 8 people confirmed to be on the program committee that will look for ways of providing or improving social and educational programming, fundraising as well as other areas. The article for the July/August issue of ROARS was accepted and submitted. The article outlines the "Taking Care of Our Parents...and Ourselves" workshop series to be held in the fall. The four workshops are Retirement 101-Your Personal Roadmap to a Better Retirement, How to Talk with Family Members about what's Important At The End of Life, Getting Your Parents (or Your) Legal Matters in Order and lastly Navigating the Medicare Maze. There was a recommendation to hold a training to teach seniors how to use tech devices; such as smartphones and tablets.

Unfinished business items were discussed, which included the need to fill the open seats on the Commission. Mr. Wayne Flesch, who will fill one of the open seats, was present at the meeting. The Mayor has a nominee for the other opening which would bring the Commission up to full staffing. Members decided to hold off on the Age-Friendly Business Community initiative and thought perhaps the soon to be formed program committee could take the lead on contacting business owners. The senior webpage was discussed, Ms. Reese stated the page would be available and visible to the public on Thursday, 6/23. A recommendation was made to add food/grocery delivery options to the FAQ section.

A brief update was given on the iTN transportation meeting; four Commissioners are on the steering committee for this initiative. Everyone thought the iTN meeting went well and that the people involved are truly vested in starting a pilot program. There are still many questions around how to get things going and how the funding works. The next meeting is scheduled for some time in July.

There was discussion about amending the by-laws to include a provision to modify the quorum requirement if and when the Commission is understaffed. Ms. Diekemper agreed to contact the City Clerk for clarification on the policy.

The Seniors Count initiative and the role of the senior commission was raised by a meeting guest. It was discussed that until there was up-to-date information available the Commission was not in a position to make any recommendation on the initiative. Members present were in accord, however, that it was within our purview to make a recommendation to the City council to endorse Seniors Count if we so choose to do so. In any event, it was decided that we would like the Senior Services coordinator to explore a time and place for a public forum on the Initiative in fall before the November election. The Commission will again take up the matter of a recommendation to the City Council in the fall.

Follow-up Actions:

1. All members are asked to visit the webpage on or after Thursday, June 23rd
2. Ms. Diekemper will follow-up with the City Clerk regarding changing the by-laws as it relates to quorum requirements
3. Ms. Mermelstein will schedule an education session regarding "Seniors Count"

Next Meeting: Monday, July 18 at 6:00 PM. – Heman Park Community Center

**Historic Preservation Commission
June 16, 2016 Meeting Minutes**

The Historic Preservation Commission held a meeting in the Heman Park Community Center located at 975 Pennsylvania Avenue, University City, Missouri on Thursday, June 16, 2016. The meeting commenced at 6:30 pm.

1. Roll Call

Voting Members Present

Donna Marin, Chairperson
Esley Hamilton, Vice-Chairperson
Richard Wesenberg
Sandy Jacobson

Voting Members Absent

Bill Chilton
Mark Critchfield

Non-Voting Members Present

Rod Jennings, Council Liaison

Staff Present

Andrea Riganti, Director of Community Development
Zach Greatens, Planner

2. Approval of Minutes / Summary

2.a. April 21, 2016 Historic Preservation Commission meeting minutes

A motion was made by Mr. Hamilton to approve the April 21, 2016 meeting minutes as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Wesenberg and carried unanimously.

2.b. May 12, 2016 Historic Preservation Commission study session summary

A motion was made by Mr. Wesenberg to approve the May 12, 2016 study session summary as written. The motion was seconded by Mr. Hamilton and carried unanimously.

3. Old Business – None

4. New Business – None

5. Other Business

5.a. File Number: HPC 16-02 – 630 Trinity Avenue – Zoning Code Text Amendment to include the Old University City Library in the Civic Complex Historic District boundary (Local Historic District)

Mr. Greatens provided a brief overview of the proposed Text Amendment including a map depicting the proposed change to the historic district boundary.

Questions, Comments, and Discussion:

- Additional historical significance of this building and other buildings in the area around City Hall was stated in a book published by the Historical Society of University City about the University City Civic Plaza. It was recommended that the book (*“The University City Civic Plaza: A Brief History of Its Planning and Architecture”* published by the Historical Society of University City in 1995) should be included as a reference similar to the paragraph after the full description of the boundary (400.1740.B).

A motion was made by Mr. Hamilton to recommend approval of the Zoning Code Text Amendment, expanding the boundary of the Civic Complex Historic District to include the Old University City Library, with the addition of language referencing the University City Civic Plaza book as discussed. The motion was seconded by Ms. Jacobson and carried unanimously.

Mr. Greatens stated that the proposed Text Amendment would be forwarded to the Plan Commission for their consideration. The recommendation of the Plan Commission would then be considered by City Council.

5.b. Public Comments

There were no public comments.

6. Reports

6.a. Council Liaison Report – None

6.b. Department Report: Update from staff

Ms. Riganti stated that construction of the Loop Trolley was still moving forward and the next area for construction would be the intersection of Delmar Blvd. and Kingsland Avenue. The Comprehensive Plan Update was still underway and a draft document would soon be ready for presentation to the public. The Police Department was in the process of moving out of the Annex and into modular units to be located north of City Hall. This would occur sometime in August. Maintenance and repair to the City Hall Annex was ongoing.

Questions, Comments, Discussion

- Commission members asked about further discussions about the formation of a committee to consider the reuse of the City Hall Annex and Old Library
- Ms. Riganti stated that the discussions about the committee and possible uses of the buildings that were held at the study session in May, there had been no further action from City Council at this time. However, HPC feedback could still be gathered. A tour of the Annex was still not possible until the building was vacated by the Police Department. However, a tour of the Old Library building could be arranged.
- It was stated that not much could be done until Council provided further direction and the Commission members could see the buildings.
- Commission members stated that there could be further discussion on ideas for committee formation and who should be on the committee. There would be no reason to not provide input early and the full HPC should provide advice on committee membership.
- Commission members stated that ideas for committee membership should be discussed at the July 21 HPC meeting. Discussions about the repurposing of the buildings should wait until after touring the buildings.

Public Comments

Barb Chicherio, 720 Harvard Avenue, stated that it would be important that someone representing University Heights Subdivision should be on the committee due to its proximity to the buildings.

HPC members agreed they should consider a wide representation from the community and a general cross-section of residents. Discussion about various groups should occur prior to submittal of specific names.

7. Adjournment

The meeting adjourned at 7:10 pm.

DRAFT