

MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL  
CITY HALL, Fifth Floor  
6801 Delmar Blvd.  
University City, Missouri 63130  
**January 22, 2018**  
**6:30 p.m.**

**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, January 22, 2018, Mayor Shelley Welsch called the meeting to order at 6:32 p.m.

**B. ROLL CALL**

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

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

Also in attendance was City Manager, Gregory Rose, and City Attorney, John F. Mulligan, Jr.

**C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Councilmember Smotherson requested that the nomination of Jeffrey Mishkin for reappointment to the Traffic Commission be added to the appointments.

Councilmember McMahon requested that under his appointments Jaclyn's name be amended to read "*Kirouac-Fram*," rather than "*Kirouac-Farm*".

Councilmember Carr moved to approve the agenda as amended, it was seconded by Councilmember Jennings and the motion carried unanimously.

**D. PROCLAMATIONS**

**E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

1. January 8, 2018, Regular Session minutes were moved by Councilmember Glickert, seconded by Councilmember Jennings and the motion carried unanimously.

**F. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS**

1. Barbara Chicherio and Mary Harvey are nominated for re-appointment to the Urban Forestry Commission by Councilmember Steve McMahon, it was seconded by Councilmember Carr and the motion carried unanimously.
2. Robert Wilcox and David Stokes are nominated for re-appointment to CALOP by Councilmember Steve McMahon, it was seconded by Councilmember Carr and the motion carried unanimously.
3. Jaclyn Kirouac-Fram is nominated for re-appointment to Human Relations by Councilmember Steve McMahon, it was seconded by Councilmember Carr and the motion carried unanimously.
4. Jeffrey Mishkin is nominated for re-appointment to the Traffic Commission by Councilmember Smotherson, it was seconded by Councilmember Crow and the motion carried unanimously.

Councilmember Crow stated he would like to put his colleagues on notice of his intent to reappoint Ms. Cirri Moran, whose term has expired. He is asking that consideration be given to

making an exception to allow Ms. Moran to serve either a partial or full term based on the numerous items currently before the Planning Commission and its lack of senior voting members.

## **G. SWEARING IN TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS**

1. Kathy Caton, Ben Evans, Ryan Patterson and Jen Rieger, were sworn into the Loop Special Business District Board on Jan 19<sup>th</sup> in the Clerk's office.

## **H. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (Total of 15 minutes allowed)**

### **Jeff Hales, 7471 Kingsbury, University City, MO**

Mr. Hales expressed satisfaction with Council's decision to hire Mr. Rose, as the new City Manager, and hopes that sometime in the near future he will implement the same wonderful streaming of meetings that he did in Maricopa County.

Mr. Hales stated he is troubled by the accusations being made in the Sunday newsletters, specifically, the Mayor's article where she questions the motives of various members of Council. These kinds of comments do not serve the City well, so he looks forward to the day when Council can handle their disputes in these chambers and not out in the public.

### **Don Fitz, 720 Harvard, University City, MO**

Mr. Fitz expressed the following concerns about the highly dubious nature of the unsigned packet submitted to City Council on January 8th, referred to as the "*Firefighter's Media Report*".

- Page 6 claims "*Prop H was formed and supported by the 2014 candidates who worked closely with the Firefighter's Union.*" (This confuses Preserve U City; which was a citizen's organization spearheaded by residents of University Heights whose community was directly threatened, with Prop H, a measure that was placed on the ballot.)
- Page 12 claims that Axiom Strategies was a so-called media partner of Preserve U City. (At no time did he, as the head of this campaign, collaborate or meet with any representative of Axiom Strategies.)
- Page 2 claims that "*The people of U City and the entire St. Louis region deserve to know what is happening.*" (Ms. Welsch has a Trump-like ability to hypnotize followers into believing anything she says, even if it contradicts their own interest.)

Mr. Fitz requested that the authors of this report identify themselves, acknowledge their misrepresentations, and apologize to the people who successfully won 69 percent of the residents' vote. (*Mr. Fitz asked that his written comments be made a part of the record.*)

### **Judith Gainer, 721 Harvard, University City, MO**

Ms. Gainer addressed the following claims made in the Firefighter's Media Packet.

- The document asserts that it is the work of "*U City residents who were concerned about the negative influence that large amounts of cash donated by local Paks and two U City businessmen have on the legislative process in U City.*" (Outside of James Baskin, she does not know who these concerned citizens are, or who prepared the document.)
- Page 6 claims that the professional firefighters of Central St. Louis County Pak contributed to Prop H, a total of \$4,495.00 and that \$3,995.00 of this amount was paid in direct expenditures which were not reported to the Missouri Ethics Commission.
- Page 56 claims that Preserve U City and its "*media partner, Axion Strategies,*" received 60 percent of its funding from firefighter Paks. It also claims that Preserve U City failed to report the \$3,995.00 allegedly received from the firefighters on the Ethics' Report.

As Treasurer of the April 2016 Prop H initiative she can unequivocally state that \$3,383.00; which includes a \$500.00 contribution from the firefighters, was reported on the Missouri Ethics and was the total of all contributions received by Preserve U City; that this \$500.00 contribution constituted less than 15% of the total funding received by Preserve U City and not 60 percent as claimed, and finally, that Preserve U City never had a media partner and none of the core group of residents working for Prop H had any contact with Axion Strategies.

Ms. Gainer stated it is extremely disheartening to have her integrity impugned and now has a new sense of empathy for civil servants who have to tolerate this kind of malicious carelessness on a regular basis.

**I. PUBLIC HEARINGS**

**J. CONSENT AGENDA**

**K. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT**

**1. Site Plan - Lady of Lourdes**

City Manager, Gregory Rose stated staff is recommending approval of the Lourdes' Site Plan which seeks to build an addition to the school and parking lot.

Andrea Riganti, Director of Community Services, stated this property is located on the southeast corner of Forsyth and Asbury and is currently the site of a church and school. The Site Plan illustrates a 12,813 square foot expansion of the existing school to the west, and the demolition of adjacent properties acquired by Our Lady of Lourdes for the construction of a new parking lot. The Site Plan review procedures per the Zoning Code have been satisfied, and include a traffic impact analysis that was presented to the Traffic Commission on 12/13/17. The Commission's comments have been incorporated into Staff's Report. Ms. Riganti stated as a side note, approval will also be required from MSD however it is not contingent upon the City's approval.

Councilmember Crow moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Glickert.

Citizen's Comments:

**Thomas Jennings, 7055 Forsyth, University City, MO**

Councilmember Jennings stated in his opinion, the Our Lady of Lourdes' proposal should be viewed as a positive improvement for the entire neighborhood and surrounding areas.

For the first time in many years, young families are starting to move into the area which ultimately, produces an enhanced base of citizens. So his hope is that Council will vote to approve this proposal.

Voice vote on Councilmember Crow's motion carried unanimously.

**2. Funding Authorization – Hiring Engineering Firm - MSD Project**

Mr. Rose stated staff is recommending that Council give consideration to the allocation of funds for the purpose of hiring a consulting engineer to review MSD's proposed options to determine the most reasonable approach for the construction of sewer lines and storage tanks in U City. If approved, funding will be taken out of the Capital Projects Reserve Fund and upon completion of the review, Council will be provided with the consultant's recommendation.

Councilmember Crow moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Glickert.

Citizen's Comments:

**Tim Cusick, 7915 Glenside Place, University City, MO**

Mr. Cusick stated as a candidate for Council in the 2nd Ward, MSD's plans to place wastewater storage containers in the 2nd Ward is important to him both politically and personally.

After talking with residents in the area where MSD is proposing to place these containers he can honestly say that no one wants this in their neighborhood. One of the proposed locations for the final placement of these containers; specifically Area C, Option 6, will not only be in his and several of his neighbor's backyards, it will require that sections of their yards be utilized for placement of the proposed easements. He stated while MSD claims to have received numerous responses from residents asking that the containers be buried underground in Area C, Option 6, many of the residents he spoke to expressed an intent to sell their homes and move out of the area should this proposal be approved. Therefore, he would question the validity of the process used to reach this consensus, especially since there are looming questions that still remain.

1. How safe will these storage containers be?
2. What happens if there is a catastrophic failure?
3. Area C, Option 6 is located in the floodplain; will this generate any odors?
4. Will there be any damage or alterations made to the aesthetics of these neighborhoods during construction?
5. Will property values for homes located in the immediate area be impacted?
6. Isn't the proposal to place these containers underground in a nonresidential area a more viable alternative?

Mr. Cusick stated now is the time for U City to be more proactive in their dealings with MSD, and consequently, he would urge Council to approve the funding recommendation to hire an engineering firm. He also suggested that the City submit an invoice to MSD to recoup the monies spent to conduct this engineering study. Mr. Cusick acknowledged his gratitude for the Councilmembers; specifically, Councilmembers Carr and Smotherson, who have kept residents in the 2nd and 3rd Wards informed and up-to-date on this issue.

Mayor Welsch questioned whether the City would have access to the information already prepared by MSD and Burns McDonnell to assist the engineering firm with conducting their review?

Mr. Rose stated based on his understanding, MSD has agreed to work cooperatively with the City, and staff has already submitted a request for information regarding their designs. Although to date, no information has been received, he concurs that this would be vital information for the consultant and since it is public information staff can pursue alternative options for its retrieval.

Councilmember Smotherson stated his concern regarding Area C, Option 6, is that the permanent easement will be located in the 3rd Ward on 82nd Street, and impact roughly six to ten homes.

Voice vote on Councilmember Crow's motion carried unanimously.

### **3. Heman Pool – Main Drain Valve Replacement**

Mr. Rose stated staff is recommending the approval of funding to replace the main drain valve at Heman Pool.

Sinan Alpaslan, Director of Public Works and Parks, stated the main drain valve operates to isolate the filter room of the pool from the main basin and impacts the water quality where swimming occurs. The valve must be opened and closed on a weekly basis in order to clean the filters, and since there is no auxiliary system to handle this function, last summer staff had to close the pool because of the valve's failure to operate properly. Therefore, staff is recommending that the replacement of this main drain valve be completed prior to the opening season. This is an unbudgeted expense and although only one estimate of slightly over \$30,000 is being presented to Council, staff's evaluation of industry norms determined this to be a reasonable price.

Mr. Alpaslan stated the estimate; which was received from the original installer of the pool, includes overflow gutters that connect to the filter room, as well as the addition of an auxiliary valve located in front of the main drain valve, that can now be used as a backup in case of a failure or maintenance activities.

Mayor Welsch asked if a one-year warranty was also considered the industry norm? Mr. Alpaslan stated a one-year warranty covering any workmanship defects does constitute the norm; however the product warranty would exceed one-year.

Councilmember Glickert stated the pool; which was built in 1933, seems to have been experiencing major problems over the last ten years. So he is curious to know whether staff has performed any type of needs assessment to assist in the development of a plan to address issues that are bound to happen in the future? Mr. Alpaslan stated his goal is to ensure that there is a plan going forward because even a 15-year lifespan for this type of valve does not meet industry standards and there should be a more durable system. He stated that he and his staff will look into possible solutions and present a recommendation to Council via the City Manager.

Mr. Rose stated staff has already initiated their budgeting process. And as a part of that process, they have been asked to examine every facility and develop a strategy to determine the amount of funding the City should be investing for the maintenance of these buildings versus having to approach Council with urgent requests like this. He stated that if approved, the intent is to utilize funding from the Capital Reserve Fund and take any excess funds from projects that come in under budget to cover the cost.

Although there was no pending motion, Mayor Welsch called for a voice vote to approve the recommendation which was unanimous.

**L. UNFINISHED BUSINESS**  
*BILLS*

**M. NEW BUSINESS**  
*RESOLUTIONS*

*Introduced by Councilmember Crow*

1. **Resolution 2018–1** Budget Amendment #2 – FY18. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Carr and carried unanimously.

*BILLS*

**N. COUNCIL REPORTS/BUSINESS**

1. Boards and Commission Appointments Needed  
Mayor Welsch announced the appointments that were needed.
2. Council Liaison Reports on Boards and Commissions
3. Boards, Commissions and Task Force Minutes
4. Other Discussions/Business
  - a) **Requests from Park Commission:** (*Requested by Councilmembers Carr and Smotherson*)
    - (1) Formation of an Enterprise Fund, and
    - (2) Review of Ordinances to deal with problems noted at Park recreation facilities.

City Clerk, LaRette Reese, asked Council if they could provide her with the author of the motion for Item No. 3, under the City Manager's Report? Mayor Welsch stated her assumption was that Councilmember Glickert made the motion and that it was seconded by Councilmember Carr. But perhaps, she may have moved too fast?

Councilmember Carr noted that Council has previously been made aware of these requests pursuant to Council Liaison Reports presented on behalf of the Park Commission at several meetings last year.

**ITEM NO. 1** - On May 16, 2017, the Park Commission voted and unanimously approved the following Resolution, which declares:

- That Ruth Park Golf Course and Driving Range generates revenue above expenses;
- That the Park Commission believes revenue generated to Ruth Park in Fiscal Year 2018, and thereafter, should be treated as a separate Enterprise Fund;
- That should 2018, and thereafter, generate total revenue in excess of golf course-related expenditures 50 percent of said excess shall be retained and maintained in the separate Enterprise Fund to be used for Ruth Park Golf Course and Driving Range capital improvements, and
- That any remaining funds be used for U City parks.

Councilmember Carr stated that along with this Resolution she has provided Council with an email from Mr. Goldstein, the Chair of the Park Commission, which includes financials based on conversations with Ms. Charumilind regarding expenses and revenue for the golf course. The Commission has therefore asked that the City Manager review this request to determine its feasibility, and provide both Council and the Commission with his recommendation.

Mayor Welsch stated she has asked Mr. Rose if he would provide Council with the pros and cons of Enterprise Funds to use in their discussion.

**ITEM NO. 2** - A memo prepared by Mr. Goldstein and adopted by the Park Commission was sent to Councilmember Carr, Mr. Alpaslan, and Ms. Riganti on October 17, 2017. This memo seeks to determine whether the City's current ordinances cover the problems presented, and if not, whether these issues can be addressed through the amendment or adoption of new ordinances.

Mayor Welsch asked if members of the Park Commission had developed a list of the problems identified at various parks? Councilmember Carr informed Mayor Welsch that Mr. Goldstein was in the audience and could provide more details about the Commission's request.

#### Citizen's Comments:

Mr. Goldstein stated one example of the problem, is that on more than one occasion while playing golf, players have placed Bluetooth speakers in their cup holders so they can listen to music. Oftentimes this occurs in close proximity to a tee shot, which is contrary to proper golf etiquette to not disturb anyone during a shot. And as reported to him by Mrs. Taylor, this same type of activity occurs at the pool.

On the issue of giving private lessons, there is an individual; who is not a PGA licensed pro, that hangs out at the golf course and solicits potential clients by handing out his business cards. Mr. Goldstein stated the Commission's belief is that the current ordinances are insufficient, and as a result, puts City employees in the untenable position of having no regulations to support or enforce actions that might need to be taken. So just as other City Codes become incomplete or obsolete due to the passage of time or the advancement of new technology, it is the Commission's belief that these issues fall into that same category.

### Council's Comments:

Councilmember Glickert stated he is in absolute agreement with Mr. Goldstein's comments. As far as the music is concerned, this seems to be a regional or maybe even a national phenomenon that based on his observations, may not be limited to just the younger generation. He also noted that these issues might be a little more sophisticated than the so-called "Marshal;" a retired individual who gets to play golf for free, might be accustomed to dealing with.

Councilmember Glickert applauded the Commission for introducing Council to the concept of an Enterprise Fund.

Councilmember Smotherson stated he would be interested in finding out whether there really is a profit being made at the golf course, and if so, the total amount of that profit. He stated he would also like the City Manager to provide an opinion on whether earmarks were necessary to accomplish the Commission's requests.

Councilmember Carr stated the Park Commission and staff have a lot of facilities to take care of that are fundamental to the City's recreation programs.

There is never enough money, so she too would applaud the Commission for their efforts to think out of the box in an attempt to come up with a plan that covers these expenses.

Mayor Welsch apprised Mr. Rose about the number of complaints she has lodged regarding the volume of the pool's loudspeaker system which can be heard around Vernon and Midland as she takes her walks through Heman Park.

## **O. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (continued if needed)**

## **P. COUNCIL COMMENTS**

Councilmember Crow praised Mr. Rose for his ability to promptly move Council through tonight's agenda. Yet, in spite of this progress, there seems to be one continuing trend which saddens him; the Mayor's Sunday evening missive. Regarding the financing of campaign comments expressed several weeks ago by concerned citizens, the Mayor writes, "*Mr. Logan then called on the Council to pass a Resolution that would limit the size of such contributions to Councilmembers, groups or individuals, who do business with the City*". However, if this was important enough for the Mayor to memorialize, one would presume that her next step would have been to put this on the agenda and allow every member of Council to ask questions about each other's campaign finances. So perhaps, her intent really is to take this in a different direction?

Next, the Mayor writes about EMS outsourcing and the misguided efforts of some members of Council. "*Those who are attacking Gateway are by doing so insinuating that the company somehow has convinced all of our U City staff dispatchers to fudge the numbers. This is simply not the case and insults the integrity of our staff members and Gateway.*"

Councilmember Crow stated he has no knowledge of any member of staff's integrity being insulted. However would admit, that he is not overly concerned about insulting Gateway's integrity. And in his opinion, this statement pales in comparison to the Mayor's statement that the Interim City Manager was not professional. He stated it cost the City an awful lot of money the last time the former administration relied on a citizen who pretended to be an expert on the numbers and does not believe that the *Baskin/Logan Report*, as the Mayor has now termed it was developed to explain the cost of restoring EMS. Councilmember Crow stated, at this point, the only action that has been taken is a request by the new City Manager to be provided with an opportunity to review the contract, the relationship, and determine the next steps. Next, she writes, "*But I would say why take on a service that we know costs hundreds of thousands of dollars a year after an initial, very expensive startup if the service is already being provided in an excellent fashion by another entity?*" Councilmember Crow stated while the Mayor's comments do not make sense from a fiscal standpoint, the reason this should be considered is that U City residents did not support the outsourcing of this service at the time it was proposed, and still do not support it. So it's time that we right that wrong.

The Mayor's next comment is, "*I believe that using Prop P Funds would go against the*

wishes of the voters of U City." This is somewhat ironic since the wishes of U City voters were not considered when EMS was outsourced. Next; *"If in fact, Gateway were to go away, residents would not have to worry because the other surrounding communities would help through the use of mutual aid"*. Councilmember Crow stated U City screwed-up its opportunity to participate in the Mutual Aid Agreement. Next; *"There is no indication that Gateway Ambulance is having any financial difficulties. Gateway's finances were checked out in depth before the former City Manager made the recommendation. This type of talk, I believe, is an effort to frighten our residents."*

Councilmember Crow stated what he and several of his colleagues want is an honest discussion about the pros and cons of outsourcing; to determine Gateway's satisfaction with the current relationship and to implement a transition plan in the event Gateway decides to terminate its contract with the City. Next; *"The decision on whether or not to return EMS to U City firehouses is a policy decision. The new City Manager is going to have to deal with whatever happens and adjust the budget to cover the cost if Council directs him to do so. But I believe to do so would put the integrity of our City Government at-risk within the wider business community."* Councilmember Crow stated he would question who, in the wider business community is really concerned about this issue? Nevertheless, for the Mayor to lecture Council about the integrity of this City's Government when the night before Mr. Walker was kicked out of the ICMA for life, a group of five Councilmembers deleted the ethic's portion of his contract, is a pretty low blow. And as a side note, out of the five members of Council who voted to approve Mr. Walker's contract, one has retired; one resigned, and the remaining three have chosen to forgo putting their names on the ballot in the next election. Next; *"If a future Council pulls out of this contract the City will be put at a legal risk; Gateway may sue and in fact, should sue."* Councilmember Crow stated to hear a statement like this coming from the Mayor of this community is extremely sad.

The Mayor's final quote states, *"Our City's financial well-being is at stake here. There is no doubt about that and we should not be putting our financial future at risk because a Union provides lots of campaign donations. And I believe that is why some members of Council are making this a policy discussion once again."* Councilmember Crow stated he views this as another sad statement from someone who has repeatedly lectured Council about questioning the motives of their fellow colleagues.

Councilmember Crow stated he is optimistic, that at this City moves forward residents will be able to notice that the dysfunction is not within this Chamber, but in the Mayor's one-sided lectures that appear every Sunday evening. These Sunday evening missives that impugn the integrity of people who have dedicated their lives to this community need to stop. One can only hope that the same demeanor of dignity and grace displayed by President Obama as he transitioned out of office will be exhibited in this instance.

Councilmember Carr stated during her election campaign in 2016, the resounding question asked time and time again, was; are you for or against the outsourcing of EMS? She won that election by almost 70 percent, and that is the guiding principle for why reason she believes the Mayor's comments sound very disconnected. Not only were these halls filled on the day when residents begged Council to postpone taking this action, the people who greeted her at their doors were fed up. So when the Mayor insinuates that her integrity is based on a minor campaign contribution, her response would be, look in your own pot.

Councilmember McMahon stated a few months ago he made a proposal for the establishment or reinstatement of an Architectural Review Board and his understanding was that the City Attorney and Director of Community Development were going to research this issue. He stated conversations with a number of residents have not only disclosed their excitement about this proposal, but their eagerness to contribute to the guidelines and serve on such a Board once it is up and running.



So to keep this process moving forward if possible, he would like to be provided with an update.

Recently, the City Clerk certified the individuals officially running for office in the upcoming election. So he would like to announce his decision to run for reelection, which is a little bittersweet since he does not have an opponent. But at the same time, this lack of interest may also fuel the debate regarding the need for Council to augment their discussions by including issues that are important to the residents of U City. In 2016 the issues centered on change; increased funding for streets; greater transparency, and the quality of Council meetings. Those were the changes this current Council set out to accomplish, and he believes they have been delivered. Councilmember McMahon stated one of his campaign promises was to put residents ahead of himself. And that's exactly what is happening when Council starts to express concerns about campaign contributions and the outsourcing of EMS.

Gateway's contract was sold based on a scientific analysis of outcomes associated with the location of Gateway's ambulances. However, to this day, no one has explained why putting an ambulance at the Jack-In-The-Box is better than putting one at the Monument on Olive. The contract states that ambulances should be located at the Golf Course and behind Cicero's, but they aren't there because they move around all over town. And in spite of the fact, that he and possibly several other members of this Council have received troubling information, Gateway has been on the job for two years and no one has ever conducted a review of their performance. Councilmember McMahon stated this is an important issue that needs to be discussed. But instead, he is being questioned and accused of having no independent judgment when it comes to issues about public safety because of a \$1,000 contribution he received in 2014 when he ran as a write-in candidate for Mayor and lost. In 2016, he never received one penny or in-kind contribution for his campaign. So if the accusation is that they've found someone they can pay off, then why haven't those contributions continued? That's why he was glad when he had the opportunity to speak with Mr. Logan about his comments. And what Mr. Logan said was that his comments were not about pay-to-play, they were just a way of reminding people that when you take any kind of contribution you have to be cognizant of the fact that there is a need to put the City's interest first. Councilmember McMahon stated while he certainly agrees with Mr. Logan's position, the interesting thing is that no one else had bothered to talk to him about his views or motivation as it relates to EMS. Nonetheless, they've assumed them, published them, and put them out there for the public to see; which is absolutely their right to do. However, he wants everyone to know that he is not for sale and that he will continue to put the interest of this City's residents before himself. So he is going to continue to make this an issue; continue to keep looking for potential problems, and work to ensure that Council is provided with an opportunity to conduct a review of this process in the right way.

For the record, Mayor Welsch stated that she and Councilmember Glickert have talked about a Resolution related to the suggestion of Mr. Logan. And as a result, Mr. Logan has provided the two of them with information from San Diego to assist them in their research. So their goal is to shot for completion by late February or early March.

**Q. ADJOURNMENT**

Mayor Welsch thanked everyone for their attendance and closed the City Council meeting at 7:42 p.m.

LaRette Reese  
City Clerk

Statement to City Council of U City, January 22, 2018 by Don Fitz, 720 Harvard, U City

U City Friends,

I am speaking regarding the unsigned packet submitted to City Council of U City, January 8, 2018, the first line of which read "Index for background information packet" and has been referred to as "The firefighters media report." The fact that the authors were unwilling to sign their work and ignorant of how to give it a clear title reflect its highly dubious nature.

The report mentions Prop H or Preserve U City on pages 1, 6, 8, 12 and 56. Since that document had bizarre page numbering, reference numbers of the pages I received may not correspond to its numbering. On my page 6, it claims that "Prop H ... was formed and supported by the 2014 candidates ... who worked closely with the firefighters union."

First, this reveals the sloppy work by the author, who confuses Preserve U City, which was a citizens organization, with Prop H, which was the measure put on the ballot. Vastly more serious was the false claim that the group was started by candidates for public office.

I know quite a bit about the creation of Preserve U City, since it occurred in the living room of my home. On June 29, 2015 we met as the Outreach Committee of the Delmar-Harvard Redevelopment Concerned Citizens, the DHRCC. The DHRCC had been formed to stop the building of a 5 story apartment building and 6 story garage on the old playground of Delmar-Harvard. Toward the end of the meeting, former City Manager Frank Ollendorff mentioned that Kay Drey had spearheaded efforts to halt the sale of parks by having an amendment to the City Charter that would require a vote prior to the sale of any park.

It was clear to us that the sale of the Delmar-Harvard playground would be the first step in a land grab of Civic Plaza buildings for Washington University development of student housing. So, we imagined a referendum to save them.

That quickly evolved into the Preserve U City campaign. It was spearheaded by residents of University Heights, whose community was most directly threatened. To say that it was formed by candidates for public office is insulting, demeaning and inaccurate.

The report makes an even worse allegation on page 12 when it claims that Axiom Strategies was a so-called "media partner" of Preserve U City. I was the head of the campaign and at no time did I collaborate or meet with any representative of Axiom Strategies. I didn't even know that such an entity existed until I read the report making the false accusation.

If the person writing this report so erroneously reported the history of Preserve U City and Proposition H, one must ask how much of the rest of the report is in error,

I request that the authors of the report identify themselves, acknowledge its misinformation, and apologize to the over 200 people who became involved and won 69% of the vote from Univ City residents.

The report states on p 2 that "The people of University City and the entire St. Louis region deserve to know what is happening." However, its falsification of fact means that the true nature could not have been to bring truth to Univ City.

Perhaps its goal was to smear the Firefighters Union so that providing quality emergency service would not be given back to that organization.

Or perhaps it aimed to smear those who have challenged Shelley Welsch and encourage her supporters to launch a last minute write-in campaign to restore her to power. On rare occasions, write-in campaigns do win. Ms. Welsch does have a Trump-like ability to hypnotize followers into believing anything she says, even if it contradicts their own interests.

I found this out during the Prop H campaign, when a group of people who usually support historic preservation actually opposed their own values by encouraging votes against Prop H.

They seem to have been taken in by Welsch's ludicrous statement that Prop H was unnecessary because there were no plans to sell off historic buildings. Such a claim would only make sense if the council which existed at that time would remain in office for eternity – otherwise, it was obvious to any thinking person that a charter amendment would protect future councils from selling historic property. The absurdity of Welsch's claim only led credence to the suspicion that there were secret plans to auction our historic sites to the highest bidder.

Tim Cusick, 7915 Glenside Place.

I stand here in support of the Funding Authorization for Hiring an Engineer firm to look into the MSD Project to build waste water storage containers in University City.

As you all know, I am a candidate for Council in the 2<sup>nd</sup> Ward. Let me say that this MSD project to place waste water storage containers in University City, and now, specifically in the 2<sup>nd</sup> ward, is not only political for me, but also personal.

Politically, I have been spending time speaking with the residents in the areas where MSD is proposing to place these containers. I can truly say that no one wants these containers in our neighborhoods. And I say this MSD project is personal, because the proposed final placement of these containers by MSD, specifically, Area C, Option #6, is in my immediate back yard. Not across the street or 50-100 feet away, but right smack in the back of my yard. MSD talks about some permanent property easements, these easements would take sections of my back yard and the yards next to mine.

MSD has stated, in their most recent release, that they have received responses from people in the area and that most responders want these containers buried. And buried in Area C, Option 6. While they may have received many responses and people have said they want them buried, I question the validity of the process they used to determine this solution. I have been to ALL of the MSD town hall meetings, meetings held in this esteemed chamber, and at the MSD board meetings downtown. And it seems to me that they were offering the underground storage as an either or---either we take the homes in the 3<sup>rd</sup> Ward, or we build it underground in the 2<sup>nd</sup> ward. How then would people respond? Of course we want it underground. I question their methodology to make these determinations. I don't feel that the study they did was valid.

And, MSD, still, to this day, does not answer key questions that many residents and members of this council have put to them. Looming questions remain: How safe will these storage containers be? What happens if there is catastrophic failure? And the area they have chosen, Area C, Option 6 is in the flood plain area. What about odors? What will our neighborhoods look like during the construction process? What about the property values of the homes in the immediate area? MSD has probably spent a lot of money on studies, engineering

studies, feasibility studies, research and other technical aspects for a project such as this---given the price tag--yet still remain consistently and completely ignorant as well as seemingly indifferent on how this will impact the value of the homes in the area. And I can say with certainty, that the residents in the area do not want this. I have had many of my neighbors tell me to let them know if this project is a certainty in the area that MSD is now proposing, because they are going to put their homes on the market, sell and move. They won't live here.

It does seem that now is the time for University City to be more proactive and aggressive when it comes to dealing with MSD. The proposal of placing these storage containers underground in a less residential area seems a viable alternative, and MSD has even suggested as much. And there does seem to be areas available for this.

OH, and also, let's send the bill to MSD for the money that University City will be spending to do this engineering study.

In closing let me say that I am very grateful for the council members who have been involved in keeping those of us in the 2<sup>nd</sup>, and 3<sup>rd</sup> Ward, informed and up to date on this issue. I would specifically like to thank Council members Carr and Smotherson. Thank you.

Statement by Judith Gainer, Treasurer of April 2016 *Proposition H* ballot initiative  
*Preserve UCity*  
Meeting of the University City City Council  
January 22, 2018

I am here tonight to address claims made in a document entitled “Firefighters Media Packet” which was read into the record at the January 8 City Council meeting. The document is the work of, and I quote, “University City residents who are concerned about the negative influence large amounts of cash donated by local union PACs and two University City businessmen will have on the legislative process in University City”

I don’t know who these concerned residents are or who actually prepared this document. What I can categorically and unequivocally state is that the document makes false assertions that relate to my role as treasurer of the April 2016 Proposition H ballot initiative, Preserve UCity. Specifically,

#1. On Page 6 in a section titled FUNDING MORE THAN CANDIDATES, the author of the document claims that the “Professional Firefighters of Central St Louis County PAC contributed to Proposition H a total of \$4,495--\$500 in cash and **\$3,995 paid in direct expenditures.**

#2. On Page 56, the document claims that “Preserve UCity and its media partner, Axion Strategies, received 60% [of its funding] from firefighter PACS.”

#3. Also on Page 56 the document claims that Preserve UCity failed to report the \$3,995 allegedly received from the firefighters on its filing with the Missouri Ethics Report.

I can state categorically and unequivocally that Preserve UCity did not have a media partner, and that none of us in the core group of residents

working for Prop H had any knowledge of or contacts with Axion Strategies.

I can also state categorically and unequivocally that the \$3,383, that includes a \$500 contribution from the Firefighters, that was reported on the Missouri Ethics Report, was the total of all contributions received by Preserve UCity.

The \$500. contribution of the Firefighters constituted a little less than 15% of the total funding received by Preserve UCity, not the 60% claimed by the authors of the Firefighters Media Packet.

Whoever prepared this packet seems to have connected the wrong dots. It is my understanding that in a filing, the Firefighters claimed a direct expenditure to Axion Strategies. The Firefighters also claimed a donation to Preserve UCity. But how someone then made the leap to claim that Axion Strategies was a “media partner” with Preserve UCity is beyond me! Preserve UCity had and continues to have no knowledge of the services for which the Firefighters paid Axion Strategies.

In conclusion, I must say it is extremely disheartening to have my integrity as the treasurer of Preserve UCity impuned, and I now have a new sense of empathy for those civil servants who have to tolerate this kind of malicious carelessness on a regular basis.