

MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CITY HALL, Fifth Floor
6801 Delmar Blvd.
University City, Missouri 63130
Monday, September 9, 2019
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, September 9, 2019, Mayor Terry Crow called the meeting to order at 6:34 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

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

Councilmember Stacy Clay
Councilmember Paulette Carr
Councilmember Steven McMahon
Councilmember Jeffrey Hales
Councilmember Tim Cusick
Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson

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

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Councilmember Carr moved to approve the agenda as presented; it was seconded by Councilmember McMahon.

Voice vote on the motion to approve the agenda, carried unanimously.

Mayor Crow reminded everyone of the upcoming commemoration of September 11th and he shared the following remark made by Sandy Dahl, the wife of Jason Dahl, the captain of flight number 93, "If we learn nothing else from this tragedy, we learn that life is short and there is no time for hate". He asked everyone present to join him in taking a moment of silence in memory of 9/11.

Mayor Crow then read a quote by President Obama, "even the smallest act of service, the simplest act of kindness, is a way to honor those we lost, a way to reclaim that spirit of unity that followed 9/11".

D. PROCLAMATIONS

1. 2019 Extra Mile Day – "Go The Extra Mile In Personal Effort, Volunteerism, And Service"

Mayor Crow said members of Council would sign the Proclamation at the conclusion of tonight's meeting.

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. August 12, 2019, Regular Session Minutes were moved by Councilmember Carr; it was seconded by Councilmember McMahon and the motion carried unanimously.
2. August 12, 2019, Joint Study Session Minutes – Park Commission were moved by Councilmember Carr; it was seconded by Councilmember Hales and the motion carried unanimously.
3. August 17, 2019, Special Session Minutes were moved by Councilmember Carr; it was seconded by Councilmember Smotherson and the motion carried unanimously.

F. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

1. M. Jean Russell is nominated to the CALOP Commission as a fill in replacing Beth Norton's vacated expired term until 9/9/2021 by Councilmember Smotherson on behalf of Councilmember Clay; it was seconded by Carr and the motion carried unanimously. Councilmember Carr requested that the outgoing commissioner's name be corrected from North to Norton.
2. Mark Harvey is nominated to the Plan Commission as a fill in replacing Rosalind Williams unexpired term until 1/1/2020 by Councilmember Tim Cusick; it was seconded by Councilmember Carr and the motion carried unanimously.
3. Wendy Harris is nominated to Loop Special Business District as a fill in replacing Kathy Caton unexpired term until 1/1/2021 by Mayor Terry Crow; it was seconded by Councilmember Hales and the motion carried unanimously.

G. SWEARING IN TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

4. James Nowogrocki was sworn in to the Civil Service Board.

H. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (Total of 15 minutes allowed)

Aren Ginsberg, 430 West Point, University City, MO

Ms. Ginsberg stated in the past two weeks, U City's TNR Volunteers trapped neutered, vaccinated and returned 4 community cats; two adult cats in the 3rd ward and two kittens in the 2nd ward. The hope is that University City will one day adopt a TNR ordinance to protect the community cats and the colony caretakers. The hope is to host the hopspot veterinary van regularly to provide low cost neutering and vaccinations for U City's pets and community cats. U City's TNR is celebrating the new partnership with St. Louis Feral Cat Outreach and the Missouri Animal Protective Association (APA). Ms. Ginsberg gave a special thanks to the Petco Foundation for their generous donation; which is making the new combined TNR effort possible.

Donna McGee, 7584 Melrose, University City, MO

Ms. McGee thanked the Council for the opportunity to speak about the tree that she believes is a hazard, safety issue and liability. Ms. McGee stated that she's been coming to speak for a while and will continue to come because this is very important to her. It's a nuisance to her and the tree needs to come down. She stated it is the wrong tree in the wrong place; she said she is not a tree hater.

Ms. McGee stated that the tree should be in a park or along Delmar and not anchored by her driveway and a small lawn. Ms. McGee believes the Park Commission's protocol is not being followed which would allow her to address them in a timely fashion. She believes the Forester inspects the tree, then if she provides a written statement/request, she should be given the opportunity to address the Commission; she says that has not happened. Ms. McGee says there's a "widow-maker branch" hanging from the tree and another large branch hanging close to her door; both were there before the rain so she does not believe it's an act of God. The root is open and visible on the City side of her driveway. Someone poured loose gravel on the driveway. She thanked her neighbors for helping her move the large branches. McGee stated that she would like her street to be accessed; there are dead, diseased trees up and down her street (7567, 7576). Ms. McGee says she witnessed a tree fall a few houses before hers, she called and the Public Works Director, Sinan, helped to get the tree removed.

Ms. McGee says she googled widow-maker branch and that it is a forestry term for a dead or detached branch hanging from a tree, risky enough that it is defined by OSHA. They most commonly occur during tree felling (term/process), statistically responsible for 11% of all chainsaw related fatalities."

Leif Johnson, 836 Barkley Square, University City, MO

Mr. Johnson started his comments by asking the following question: Wasn't the Former Chancellor of Wash. U., Head of Better Together?

Mr. Johnson stated that it's been a year since the Post-Dispatch ran the biggest P.R. campaign in their history for Rex Sinquefield's Better Together, the plan to eliminate local government. Wasn't the former Chancellor of Washington University the chairman of this effort? Mr. Johnson stated that despite lining up the top cats in town, and plumping it for weeks, (in addition to all the years-long stream of columns by Tony Messenger) and adding TV, (including Public Television), and radio, it just didn't fly.

Mr. Johnson said with financial stakes of hundreds of millions, or probably billions, the architects of the County Government must have had a back-up plan. Indeed they did. It was called the Freeholder's Plan. The mayors who wanted this on the ballot said that the Better Together plan was flawed because it allowed out-state voters to vote on a measure that only affected City and County voters. What they didn't tell you was that in the vote on a similar plan in 1966, the out-state voters rejected it by a plurality even greater than in the City and County.

Mr. Johnson said that under the State Constitution, the only thing the Freeholders can do is combine the City and County. Well, that was exactly what Rex Sinquefield wants. Of course the voters could turn down the Freeholders too. But with all the efforts that some mayors and city councilmen have made to put Freeholders on the ballot, there will probably be no organized force left to say "Vote No". Sinquefield wins.

Mr. Johnson stated that Wash U. which is taking over the Loop to reap tax free real estate income. How would they feel about local government? Well, for their purposes it is very inefficient. It might oppose, slow down, or even halt their plans. So it is understandable that Wash U. would like to get rid of local government, especially the one in University City.

(Mr. Johnson asked that his statement in its entirety, be attached to the minutes)

Steve Glickert, 7750 Blackberry Ave., University City, MO

Mr. Glickert stated about two weeks ago two Councilmembers forwarded a marketing piece on social media to inform the citizens of the nuisance property hotline. He stated that he was here to inform the citizens in the audience, those streaming online and anyone within ear shot that this service will be a complete waste of their time. Mr. Glickert stated that he has been waiting fifteen months to see results on numerous violations brought to this administrations attention. He says he has received during that time delays, excuses, tricks, evasion, shuffling, dodging, and being copied on a low orchestrated scam of emails shifting the issues from department to department that gives the illusion that something is happening. He stated he was here to give the proof, evidence facts and the confirmation that those violations are still in the same place that they were fifteen months ago. This administration has given excuses like; we're having a meeting regarding that situation, we're strategizing over the approach of the situation, that department is running thin. These are all excuses with no results. Mr. Glickert stated that you don't need meetings or strategy and if the department is thin; hire somebody. Or you could utilize the high priced assistants you hire for the City Manager to pick up the slack. The rules, regulations, laws, codes and ordinances are already in place; enforce them. No more delays; do the job, fifteen months and counting with no conclusion.

Mr. Glickert stated that greeting on the nuisance hotline should be changed, be honest, tell the caller it will take at least fifteen months if not longer to be rectified.

Mr. Glickert stated he wanted to report just one issue at this time:

In the alley located at the 6700 block of Corbitt, it's a rock alley that runs east of Ferguson Ave. It curls south and makes a 90 degree turn into the 6700 block of Corbitt. There is a truck with a trailer; it's parked on the shoulder of the alley, on an unpaved surface; that's a violation. The truck and the trailer have expired Illinois plates; that's a violation. The truck has been parked for over eight months without moving; that's a violation. The grass surrounding the truck and trailer is excessively tall; that's a violation. There is a car parked next to the trailer on the same unpaved surface with Missouri expired plates (June 2018); that's a violation. Mr. Glickert stated he provided pictures of this situation to Mr. Rose, and Councilmembers Clay and Smotherson in March.

I. PUBLIC HEARINGS

J. CONSENT AGENDA – Vote Required

1. FY20-21 Proposed Work Plan
2. Mobil Data Purchase (Police Department)
3. Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Grant (JAG) Program – FY2019
4. Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD) Intergovernmental Agreement Extension – Federal Flooding Reduction Study
5. US Army Corps of Engineers – River Des Peres Study – Amended Agreement (2004 Design)

Councilmember Carr moved to approve the Consent Agenda; it was seconded by Councilmember Hales and the motion carried unanimously.

K. CITY MANAGER’S REPORT

1. Metropolitan Sewer District (MSD) – Stormwater Operation, Maintenance and Construction Improvement (OMCI) Taxing Sub-districts Update
(PRESENTATION ONLY)

Mr. Rose stated this is asking Council to listen to a presentation from MSD’s Executive Director and CEO, Brain Hoelscher, regarding OMCI Taxing Sub-districts.

Mr. Hoelscher thanked the Mayor and City Council for the invitation to come and speak at tonight’s meeting and stated that he would try to keep the presentation within the time limits given to him. He asked everyone to turn to the fifth page titled OMCI Taxing Sub-District. This picture reflects the situation in 2016 regarding stormwater funding. The area that MSD was addressing in 2016; the area in red and the area to right or east of it; MSD had money to operate and maintain the public storm sewers. The areas to north, south or west are left in gray; MSD owned public storm sewer systems and manholes but no revenues were put in place to operate or maintain them. In April 2016, there was a vote on Proposition S that allowed MSD to go through and provide district wide property taxes for MSD to operate and maintain all the public storm sewers throughout the entire district. In addition another tax was being collected to protect flooding and erosion in the red areas only. There were twelve sub-districts where the money was being collected and the money could only be spent in those areas.

With the passage of the provision in 2016, MSD committed to the Municipalities in that area that they would temporarily set the taxing rates at zero. They would spend the fund balances in each taxing sub-district on flooding and erosion issues.

Then after MSD went to the voters to see if they wanted to provide a district wide funding source for flooding and erosion, they would come back to the Municipalities to get their opinions with MSD’s recommendation of what to do with the existing sub-districts. That last step was done in April 2019, Proposition S, it failed 47/53. Following up as commented, MSD is now coming back to all sixty municipalities located in the red area to get your opinion as input to the board of trustees as what should be done with the taxing sub-district currently with a rate of zero.

The first option other than raising taxes back up would be:

Option 1: Funding Administered by MSD

- Funding generated would be totally administered by MSD as prior to April 2016
- MSD would plan, design, and construct projects within each area based on available funding and established priorities to address flooding and erosion.

University City is in three of the sub-districts and a small part of University City that is not in any of the sub-districts. We would set the taxes back in place; so red area would be the only place that would have a revenue source to address flooding and erosion throughout the entire district boundaries. The taxes would be set to what they were prior to the 2016 vote.

Option 2: Funding Administration Split

- Funding generated within each municipality/unincorporated area would be split between MSD and the local agency at 50/50 or other ratio
- Municipality/County could use its funds to address its priority stormwater issues
- MSD would use remaining funds to plan, design, and construct projects within each OMCI area based on established priorities to address flooding and erosion

This idea would be to take half of the revenues collected within each of the sub-districts (drawn by watersheds not by municipal boundaries) and continue working down the project list that MSD has on benefit cost ratio. There is a benefit calculated for each problem. An erosion of a backyard fence that is starting to have problems has one value and somebody's garage is ready to fall in the creek; has a higher value. That is divided by cost to get the cost/benefit ratio.

Take half the revenues collected by municipality; track them within the municipality with 2 options. One would be to find the next priority project that MSD is aware of, tag it and allow the bank to build up and MSD would design and build the next project specifically within the individual municipality.

The second use of the fund could be used for other stormwater needs, desires or plans that the municipality has that don't match up with MSD's mission. The money could be used as grant funds for the municipality. It would be forwarded to the City, the City would be expected to execute; whether it's a plan or cleaning roadside culverts or actual design and construction of projects. It would allow the City to execute projects based on your own priorities.

Conclusions:

4 situations for University City: most of University City is located within an OMCI called University City. There are 14 different municipalities within this OMCI. University City provides about 40% of the revenue to the fund; 40% of the 880,000 would be collected annually.

Either University City would continue to contribute 350,000 dollars to the district wide/OMCI wide 880,000 pool.

Or

Donate 175,000 to overall pool; with a 175,000 per year being built up in an account with University City to be spent on the next project just in or for another stormwater initiative that the City felt higher priority.

University City is also in a watershed area called Deer Creek in the southwest corner of U City, about 3200 residents. University City generates 1.7 % of the revenue; 64,000 per year to the pool area. The area called Wellston; University City shares this one with 8 other municipalities. It generates 3.4% of the revenue; 1,100 per year to the pool.

Also there's a part of University City, these are older taxing sub-district that have been in place since the 60's, they're grandfathered in under Handcock, east of Hanley and south of Delmar that is not in any OMCI sub-district. This would not affect them, there would be no taxes collected.

MSD collecting information from the sixty municipalities on their opinions, advice and or suggestions to take to the board of trustee's as to how to prepare. They are not asking for any kind of vote or for you to take responsibility for the ultimate decision the MSD board makes. It is important what we hear back from the municipalities but also important is list of projects from the rate payers; what project looks like, how severe the situation is etc. All of things will be taken into consideration as to what to do in the future.

The schedule is set as listed below. MSD must inform the state what they want to do with these taxes by mid-January.

- July – September 2019:
 - Establish committees
 - Hold planning meetings

- Discuss final recommendations on rate and administration
- October – December 2019:
 - MSD staff make recommendations to MSD Board
 - Board votes on re-establishing sub-district rate

Councilmember Carr thanked Mr. Hoelscher for his presentation. She stated that the City established a Stormwater taskforce about two years ago. They are currently in the process of writing a report, which will include a recommendation to hire a consultant to help prioritize the many, many instances of stormwater insurgent that MSD does not address; especially since we have some of the natural portion of the River Des Peres running through the City.

Councilmember Carr stated that she would be interested in the 50/50 split, and also in having a citizen committee that includes some of members of the Stormwater taskforce. They have taken this matter very seriously and she was personally saddened that the tax increase did not pass to address stormwater issues.

Q: What is necessary to reinstate the OMCI tax? City Council, Public Vote, MSD Board of Directors?

A: It is a decision made annually by the MSD Board to look at all the possible tax authority that the district has and then to notify the State that they are going to set this year's rate for use at a certain level. You can only raise the level every other year.

Q: Would we reinstate the previous tax rate or is there a possibility that it could be increased; especially over time?

A: The plan would be to set at the current maximum rate based on the Hancock renew by the state annually. The board has no desire to set anything in between. The idea is to get them back to where they were in 2016 before we set them to zero.

Q: That is the maximum rate?

A: Yes it is

Q: The currently selected projects that you gave us; is there a way to expedite the process?

A: It would be more accurate to say it's a list of currently identified projects. If we start back up, we're constantly looking at the issues and things could change. Priorities would not change in the middle of year but if more information was received it was determined that a project had gotten worse or the one has gone away; we would calculate that into the plan on an annual bases.

Q: The taskforce and public works department could convey that kind of information to you? If inventory has been done that did previously exist.

A: Yes a number of municipalities do that. They do their master plan and coordinate with MSD staff to make sure MSD knows what they found, and then MSD can incorporate that into their priority list.

Q: Is there anything the City can do to speed up the implementation?

A: The implantation is set by the State. MSD has to do the proper notification to the state to collect the money. If this moves forward, the state has to be notified in April and again in August to start collecting money at the end of calendar 2020. For accounting purposes MSD will actually start working July 1.

Q: Once the projects that will be addressed are identified; you will notify the City correct?

A: Yes, that is correct. And it will show in MSD's annual budget on July 1.

Q: Could the Cities have input with the other 50% if you decide to go in that direction? Can the City adjust the order of implementation or the prioritization?

A: The prioritization would be at the sole discretion of the City with that separate pot.

Q: The other portion is more or less fixed by your board correct?

A: Correct, that is set by policy. However, if you have additional projects we can include them just in case there's something missed.

Q: Over time, is the plan to keep at the maximum rate with small increases based on the Hancock policy to include the most projects?

A: The amount set will be the maximum by Charter for OMCI Sub-Districts. If we turn all the red areas up to the maximum; 9,000,000 dollars per year would be collected. We will continue to look for district wide solutions. In 2020 the plan is to have extensive listening, educational and fact distribution sessions to try and solve this problem throughout the entire district.

Councilmember Cusick thanked Mr. Hoelscher for coming to present the information.

Q: The revenues discussed in the previous slides are all OMCI money correct?

A: Correct

Q: Are there 14 sub-districts throughout St. Louis County area?

A: There are 12; all within MSD's service area boundaries, you will find them generally located between the St. Louis City boundaries and 270.

Q: Do all 12 municipalities have to agree to participate or show a wiliness to participate or can some municipalities opt out?

A: MSD is looking for opinions from everybody, but if the program is turned on and we raise the taxes in the OMCI sub-districts; nobody will be able to opt out. Everyone in the sub-district would have to pay the tax.

Q: If OMCI is reinstated what would it look like on my home bill in terms of dollars?

A: Generally, they're all set the same the rate varies a little bit because there's been a different Hancock adjustment every year. On average; for every 100,000 value, it would be amount 25 dollars per year on your property taxes.

Q: How will MSD decide if option 1 or Option 2 will be offered?

A: That will depend quite a bit on what is heard from the municipalities and we are pretty far along, the overwhelming feeling is that flexibility provided with option 2 is what most municipalities are saying. If he had to make a recommendation today, it would be option 2.

Councilmember Cusick said he was in favor of option 2.

L. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 1. BILL 9391 - AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 110 OF THE UNIVERSITY CITY MUNICIPAL CODE, RELATING TO ADMINISTRATION, BY REPEALING SECTION 110.040 THEREOF, RELATING TO DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST, AND ENACTING IN LIEU THEREOF A NEW SECTION TO BE KNOWN AS "SECTION 110.040 DISCLOSURE OF CONFLICTS OF INTEREST."** Bill Number 9391 was read for the second and third time.

Councilmember Carr moved to approve; it was seconded by Councilmember McMahon.

Roll Call Vote Was:

Ayes: Councilmember Carr, Councilmember McMahon, Councilmember Hales, Councilmember Cusick, Councilmember Smotherson, and Mayor Crow.

Nays: None.

Councilmember Clay was excused.

M. NEW BUSINESS

RESOLUTIONS

- 1. Resolution 2019-14 Budget Amendment #3 – Fiscal Year 2018-2019**

Councilmember Carr moved to approve; it was seconded by Councilmember Cusick and the motion carried unanimously.

BILLS

Introduced by Councilmember Cusick

- 2. BILL 9392 - AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY TO ENTER INTO AND EXECUTE A CONTRACT WITH ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI, FOR VECTOR CONTROL SERVICES AND AUTHORIZING AND DIRECTING THE CITY MANAGER OF UNIVERSITY CITY TO ENTER INTO ON BEHALF OF SAID CITY A CONTRACT WITH ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI, FOR VECTOR CONTROL SERVICES.**
Bill Number 9392 was read for the first time.

N. COUNCIL REPORTS/BUSINESS

1. Boards and Commission appointments needed
2. Council liaison reports on Boards and Commissions

Councilmember Carr stated that the Stormwater Taskforce is in the process of writing their report; which contains recommendations as well as the data that they've collected. She believes it will be done within the next couple of months.

3. Boards, Commissions, and Task Force minutes
4. Other Discussions/Business

O. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (continued if needed)

P. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilmember McMahon stated that he was glad that a resident read something that he posted on social media. A resident asked what they should do about a nuisance and that they should do so he directed them to what the City website to find the information. He said that's part of what Councilmembers do. It's not a new program, it's been around a long time and it works. He wasn't taunting it as something new. When people call him, the first thing he tells them to do is call the hotline; one because it's anonymous. People usually call him back to say thanks "it got mowed". It just happened up on Tulane by the golf course, he spoke with residents, checked up on it, the problem was in system and the problem was taken care of and people called to say "thanks it worked".

It does work in the 3rd Ward; he's received calls for abandoned cars, long grass and the same system worked.

Why it hasn't worked with these fifteen incidents; I can't say. But that's the process; call the hotline, if that doesn't work, call one of the Councilmembers, call City Hall, and talk to the City Manager. If that doesn't get it; come to Council meeting; so we can step and get the customer service that we have to deliver through the City as best we can. Councilmember McMahon stated that he knows it because residents have called to say it worked, the car is gone.

Councilmember Smotherson stated that he passed on Councilmember McMahan's post, and placed on next door. A lot of things get done in the 3rd Ward; we have problems but they get addressed. If we get a call we jump on immediately and staff and the City Manager are absolutely responsive to issues. There are some problems but there is a process called "due process". We have to give citizens due process.

Councilmember Smotherson stated that we have a great city. We have a development going on and he's frustrated at the recent Riverfront Times article that wasn't favorable. He is looking forward to the City being responsive with our own narrative. Our narrative is a lot different than what is being reported and they are not doing a good job and it's not fair to the City. The development is a great thing for University City.

Councilmember Hales stated he wanted to recognize one of the residents, his neighbor, Kye Pietoso and the family's restaurant, Café Napoli in Clayton. Last Wednesday, he delivered dinner for 20 to the U City Fire department, which was well received. They had the biggest shrimp he's ever seen. It was a pleasure to be there with them.

Councilmember Hales thanked Kye for very nice event with our fire department.

Councilmember Cusick reminded everyone about the annual U City in Bloom Plein Air event will be held on Sunday, September 26th. Artists are invited to go out into the neighborhoods to paint pictures in many of the gardens around the area of Brittany Woods. Cindy Thierry, Councilmember McMahon's wife's garden will be on the tour. Following the tour, there will be a reception at the Community Center with food and beverages and the art work will be on display for sale at 5:00 p.m.

Councilmember Carr stated that she should have thanked Rosalind Williams for her long service on the Plan Commission. She recently resigned and Mark Harvey is going to take over for her. She not only served on the Plan Commission for many years, she also stepped forward to act as the Interim

Community Development Director at a time when we needed it. Thank you to Rosalind.

Mayor Crow congratulated the University City School district, the Superintendent and staff of Flynn Park Elementary school for being honored as Bayer School of Excellence. The school will receive a 2,500 grant, 8 new laptops and coverage in the St. Louis American newspaper. The Mayor sent a shout out to Jason Wells, the football coach at U City Sr. High school, he and his team put together 750 donated backpacks for kids in need.

- Q.** Motion to go into a Closed Session according to Missouri Revised Statutes 610.021(1) Legal actions, causes of action or litigation involving a public governmental body and any confidential or privileged communications between a public governmental body or its representatives or attorneys and (3) Hiring, firing, disciplining or promoting of particular employees by a public governmental body when personal information about the employee is discussed or recorded, and (13) Individually identifiable personnel records, performance ratings or records pertaining to employees.

Councilmember Carr moved to go into a Closed Session; it was seconded by Councilmember Cusick.

Roll Call Vote Was:

Ayes: Councilmember Hales, Councilmember Cusick, Councilmember Smotherson, Councilmember Carr, Councilmember McMahon, and Mayor Crow.

Nays: None.

Councilmember Clay was excused.

R. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Crow closed the regular City Council meeting at 7:32 p.m. to go into a Closed Session on the second floor. The Closed Session reconvened in an open session at 8:27 p.m.

LaRette Reese
City Clerk

Leif Johnson
836 Barkley Square
U. City, MO 63130

Wasn't the Former Chancellor of Wash. U., Head of Better Together?

Has it been a year since the Post-Dispatch ran the biggest P.R. campaign in their history for Rex Sinquefield's Better Together, the plan to eliminate local government. Wasn't the former Chancellor of Washington University the chairman of this effort?

Despite lining up the top cats in town, and plumping it for weeks, (in addition to all the years-long stream of columns by Tony Messenger) and adding TV, (including Public Television), and radio, it just didn't fly.

With financial stakes of hundreds of millions, or probably billions, the architects of the County Government must have had a back-up plan. Indeed they did. It was called the Freeholder's Plan. The mayors who wanted this on the ballot said that the Better Together plan was flawed because it allowed out-state voters to vote on a measure that only affected City and County voters. What they didn't tell you was that in the vote on a similar plan in 1966, the out-state voters rejected it by a plurality even greater than in the City and County.

Under the State Constitution, the only thing the Freeholders can do is combine the City and County. Well, that was exactly what Rex Sinquefield wants.

Of course the voters could turn down the Freeholders too. But with all the efforts that some mayors and city councilmen have made to put Freeholders on the ballot, there will probably be no organized force left to say "Vote No". Sinquefield wins. So, get ready to bail out the City bonds, build the soccer stadium, "revitalize downtown", build sports complexes, build a marina, build recreational or theme parks along the river, subsidize or build new hotels.

Now back to Wash U. which is taking over the Loop to reap tax free real estate income. How would they feel about local government? Well, for their purposes it is very inefficient. It might oppose, slow down, or even halt their plans. So it is understandable that Wash U. would like to get rid of local government, especially the one in University City.

Another way for Wash U. to win is to bring back Shelley Welsch, or her friends, to continue her "hands off" policy towards Wash U. Like Freddy Kreuger, Shelley is coming back. Of course our candidates will run a "clean and positive campaign" and not criticize Shelley, her vicious slandering, undemocratic behavior, corruption and inveterate lying.

Welsch's friends will campaign on opposing the TIF project. Isn't it a pity that no one researched who organized that "community" protest? Was there a connection to Wash U.'s Brown School of Social Work?