

**MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
VIA VIDEOCONFERENCE
Monday, February 8, 2021
6:30 p.m.**

A. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

At the Regular Session of the City Council of University City held via videoconference, on Monday, February 8, 2021, Mayor Terry Crow called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

B. ROLL CALL

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

Councilmember Stacy Clay
Councilmember Aleta Klein
Councilmember Steven McMahon
Councilmember Jeffrey Hales
Councilmember Tim Cusick
Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson

Also in attendance were City Manager, Gregory Rose; City Attorney, John F. Mulligan, Jr.; Director of Planning and Zoning, Clifford Cross; Director of Finance, Keith Cole; Director of Public Works, Sinan Alpaslan; Nashaun Bates; Nicole Bates; Brian Hoelscher, Sean Hadley and Saad Amir of MSD, and Mike Williams of Hochschild, Bloom & Company.

Mayor Crow thanked everyone for their attendance and stated that in honor of Black History Month Council extended an invitation to Nashaun Bates, an eighth-grade student from Brittney Middle School, and his mother, to recite the poem he wrote entitled, "*Young Black Boy*". Mayor Crow thanked Nashaun for the beautifully written and meaningful remarks he shared with the community in December. He stated the City of U City welcomes the opportunity to support its youth in their future endeavors and wish them the best of luck.

(Recitation of Young Black Boy by Nashaun Bates)

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Councilmember Clay moved to approve the Agenda as presented, it was seconded by Councilmember McMahon and the motion carried unanimously.

D. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. January 11, 2021, Regular Meeting Minutes were moved by Councilmember Klein, it was seconded by Councilmember Cusick, and the motion carried unanimously.
2. January 25, 2021, Regular Session Minutes were moved by Councilmember Hales, it was seconded by Councilmember Clay and the motion carried unanimously.
3. January 27, 2021, Special Session Minutes were moved by Councilmember Cusick, it was seconded by Councilmember Hales, and the motion carried unanimously.

E. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS & COMMISSIONS

1. Carl Hoagland is nominated for reappointment to the Park Commission by Councilmember McMahon, it was seconded by Councilmember Hales, and the motion carried unanimously.

F. SWEARING IN TO BOARDS & COMMISSION

1. Charlotte Colonna was sworn into the Civil Service Board on January 26th, via Zoom.

G. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION

Procedures for submitting comments for Citizen Participation and Public Hearings:

*ALL written comments must be received **no later than 12:00 p.m. the day of the meeting.** Comments may be sent via email to: councilcomments@ucitymo.org, or mailed to the City Hall – 6801 Delmar Blvd. – Attention City Clerk. Such comments will be provided to City Council prior to the meeting. Comments will be made a part of the official record and made accessible to the public online following the meeting. Please note, when submitting your comments, a **name and address must be provided.***

Please also note if your comment is on an agenda or non-agenda item. If a name and address are not provided, the provided comment will not be recorded in the official record.

Mayor Crow thanked everyone who participated in this process and reminded commenters to include their name and address on each submission. He stated the vast majority of tonight's comments were directed towards the public hearing. All comments have been reviewed by Council and will be made a part of tonight's record.

H. PUBLIC HEARINGS

1. Market At Olive - Redevelopment Project Area #1 (RPA1) Map Amendment Request (PC 20-11)

Mayor Crow opened the Public Hearing at 6:38 p.m. He then acknowledged that several citizens had submitted comments on this topic which have been included as a part of this hearing.

Mr. Rose read the following statement into the record:

"There are multiple steps in the process to rezone a parcel of land. One step is the Public Hearing which gives all interested parties an opportunity to state his or her position on the matter. The Public Hearing is not the final step in the process. For this property to be rezoned the Mayor and Council must approve an Ordinance to rezone the property. I am recommending Council not take a final action to rezone any parcel in the RPA1 area until NOVUS Development has control of the property."

Mayor Crow closed the Public Hearing at 6:39 p.m.

I. CONSENT AGENDA

- 1. Kaufman Park Playground Surfacing Project**
- 2. Kingsland Park Playground Surfacing Project**
- 3. Mooney Park Playground Surfacing Project**
- 4. One 2022 Sutphen Fire Rescue Pumper**
- 5. Parking Space Agreement with Delmar Harvard, LLC**
- 6. Small Business Assistance Program – COVID-19 Forgivable Loan – Round 4**

Councilmember Cusick moved to approve all six items on the Consent Agenda, it was seconded by Councilmember Hales.

Councilmember Smotherson asked Mr. Rose if the Parking Space Agreement would be necessary to accommodate the hotel if there was no Police Station located in Civic Plaza? Mr. Rose stated the Police Station would not necessarily impact this agreement since the rationale for establishing the contract is based on Delmar Harvard's use of the property they own. However, he would refer any further comments about this project to the City Attorney or the Director of Planning and Zoning.

Mr. Cross stated the agreement was entered into to meet the number of parking spaces required per the Zoning Ordinance. Therefore, the existence or non-existence of a Police Station would have no bearing on this agreement.

Councilmember Smotherson asked if additional parking spaces would still be required in Lot #4 if City Hall's parking lot was available? Mr. Cross stated since Lot #4 is the area being utilized, the same process would have to be followed to meet the requirement.

Councilmember Clay stated he noticed that the resurfacing project for three of the City's parks went to one contractor who staff identified as the lowest, most responsible bidder. And while he understands the City does not have a hard and fast quota system for contractor's as it relates to diverse representation in its workforce, he is interested in finding out how the City can address this issue; especially with projects like these that will be extremely visible throughout the community?

Mr. Rose stated staff within the Finance Department is currently having discussions about how to develop a Minority Women Business Enterprise (MWBE) Program that establishes these kinds of goals. And although Mr. Cole has a number of projects on his plate at the moment, he might have a more recent update on the status.

Mr. Cole stated at this point, steps to initiate this program are in progress which will require an amendment to the City's Purchasing Policy.

Mr. Rose stated once that amendment is finished, it will be brought before Council for review.

Councilmember Clay asked Mr. Rose if he had an anticipated timeframe for its completion?

Mr. Rose stated the City is in the process of assisting with two audits, in addition to the audit being presented tonight. Staff has been asked to compile and prioritize a list of projects based on the results of those audits, and once that occurs, he will have a better idea of the timeframe for the MWBE Program. He stated he hopes to have that list completed within the next two weeks.

Councilmember Cusick stated he is happy to see that Round 4 of the Small Business Assistance Program will include home-based businesses.

Voice vote on Councilmember Cusick's motion to approve carried unanimously.

J. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT

1. MSD Proposition Y Proposal Presentation

Director of Public Works, Sinan Alpasian stated Proposition Y is a wastewater rate proposal that will be explained in more detail by Mr. Brian Hoelscher, MSD's Executive Director of this District. He then asked Mr. Hoelscher if he could address the question of when MSD would be seeking to place this proposal on the ballot?

Mr. Hoelscher stated every four years MSD asks its ratepayers how they would like MSD to fund the next four years of this program, which is based on an agreement with the Department of Justice, the EPA, and The Coalition for the Environment. These proposals are developed by staff and then sent to a 15-person Rate Commission for their recommendation to the Board, who makes the final decision.

Proposal Objective

The wastewater rate proposal seeks to fund a four-year, \$1.58 billion capital improvement program to meet regulatory and system improvement needs.

Within this program, which is anticipated to be placed on the April 2021 ballot, MSD would:

- Eliminate sanitary (wastewater) sewer overflows from sewer pipes
- Reduce combined sewer overflows (where wastewater and stormwater share a pipe)
- Prevent building backups
- Repair and rehabilitate an aging system
- Replace incinerators at Bissell and Lemay treatment plants
- Build a tunnel from the Fenton treatment plant to the lower Meramec plant to eliminate the Fenton plant

With an Additional 500 Million Dollars of Bond Financing the change in rates for the average residential customer:

Projects funded with cash and debt

	<u>\$\$\$</u>	<u>Change</u>
FY21	56.40	CURRENT
FY22	58.33	3.4%
FY23	60.36	3.5%
FY24	62.59	3.7%

- ❖ *These rates will put MSD slightly above the media for wastewater rates for large municipalities throughout the country.*

Without an Additional 500 Million Dollars of Bond Financing the change in rates for the average residential customer:

Projects funded with cash

	<u>\$\$\$</u>	<u>Change</u>
FY21	56.40	CURRENT
FY22	65.07	15.4%
FY23	76.12	17.1%
FY24	86.12	13%

Mr. Hoelscher stated there will also be five additional proposals on the April ballot associated with MSD's Charter.

- Modernization of the Charter
- Increased compensation for Trustees from \$300 to \$600 a year
- Several requests from the Rate Commission

Additional details on these proposals will be provided later by MSD's Public Affairs Department.

Councilmember Cusick asked Mr. Hoelscher if this rate proposal is in line with the original Consent Decree MSD entered into with the three entities he mentioned earlier? Mr. Hoelscher stated except for the replacement of incinerators at the Bissell and Lemay Treatment Plant, which is a separate regulatory requirement, it is in line with the Decree.

Councilmember Cusick questioned whether the recently reinitiated OMCI tax; Operation, Maintenance, and Construction Improvement, has any correlation with Project Clear or this bond proposal? Mr. Hoelscher stated it does not. MSD has two utilities; wastewater and stormwater, and this proposal only pertains to wastewater.

Councilmember Clay asked whether the Consent Decree requires MSD to seek a wastewater rate proposal every four years? And if so, how long will this process continue?

Mr. Hoelscher stated the original Consent Decree was for 20 years; from 2011 to 2034.

However, due to a change in the incinerator schedule, as well as some affordability issues, the EPA agreed to extend the Decree by five years, to 2039. So, 3 until that time, MSD is required to seek two proposals every four years.

Councilmember Clay stated based on the information provided, most people would elect to go with the bond financing versus cash. But how will this scenario play out over the next eighteen years? Mr. Hoelscher stated those two lines will cross somewhere in mid-2030; which is where the payoff of the loans makes it cheaper to use case versus bond financing. Under the current rate structure, MSD has projections of what those rates would be under the two scenarios up to approximately the year 2040. Overall, the total cost is about two-times more because of the debt service but it does make things more affordable and seems to flatten out future rates. Mr. Hoelscher stated if anyone is interested, he could provide some of this information to Mr. Rose for distribution to Council. Councilmember Clay stated he would like to see the numbers.

Mr. Hoelscher stated one other thing he would mention is that MSD gets loans through the State where it pays about three-quarters of a percent interest. But in December, when they went out on the open market for a 120 million dollar bond sale they were able to get a rate of 2.75 percent. He stated he thinks the additional information will provide the City with a better understanding of these values.

Mayor Crow thanked Mr. Hoelscher for his presentation.

2. FY20 CAFR /Audit Presentation

Director of Finance, Mr. Keith Cole stated the City is required to conduct an audit every year. The Fiscal Year 2020 Audit was conducted by Hochschild, Bloom, and Mr. Mike Williams will present the findings from their Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR).

Mr. Williams stated tonight's presentation will focus on two reports:

- The Comprehensive Annual Financial Report (CAFR)
- The Report on Federal Awards

CAFR

Introductory Section

- Transmittal Letter consisting of the economic condition, outlooks, financial information, a list of principal officials, and the Certificate of Achievement for Excellence in Financial Reporting issued by the Government Finance Officers Association

Financial Section

- Independent Auditor's Report
- Opinion Section
 - The Unqualified Opinion: In our opinion, the financial statements referred to above present fairly in all material respects.
- Government-Wide Financial Analysis of the City
 - Management's Discussion & Analysis
 - Summary of Blended Funds
 - Changes in Net Position
 - » Business-type activities equal approximately \$4.9 million
 - » Total assets equal approximately \$79 million
 - » The City had a decrease in net position of \$1.4 million due to pensions, changes, and charges for services related to COVID, reduced taxes, and capital grants

Balance Sheet - Governmental Funds

- General Fund
 - Total cash and investments equal approximately \$8 million
 - Receivables and other assets equal approximately \$20 million
 - Liabilities equal approximately \$2.6 million
 - Total fund balance equals approximately \$16 million; some of which is non-spendable, making the unassigned fund balance approximately \$10 million
- Public Safety
- Park & Stormwater
- Capital Improvements

Statement of Revenues, Expenditures, & Changes in Governmental Fund Balances

- General Fund
 - Approximately \$23 million in revenue
 - Approximately \$25 million in expenses
 - Approximate \$1.3 million decrease for the year
- Total Governmental Funds show a decrease of approximately \$897,000

Statement of Net Position - Proprietary Funds

- Parking Garage
 - Cash & Investments equal approximately \$470 thousand
- Golf Course
 - Cash & Investments equal approximately \$150 thousand
- Solid Waste Fund
 - Cash & Investments equal approximately \$1.5 million
 - Included in the Solid Waste Fund is a net pension liability of approximately \$1 million
 - Negative total net position of approximately \$191 thousand

Statement of Fiduciary Net Position - Pension Trust Funds

- Positive net position of approximately \$47 million
- Decrease of approximately \$1.7 million as a result of a depreciation in the value of investments

Note A - Summary of Significant Accounting Policies

- No significant changes from year-to-year

Note B - Cash and Investments

- No significant changes from year-to-year

Note C - Capital Assets

- Governmental activities less the accumulated depreciation for buildings, improvements other than buildings, equipment, and infrastructure
- The beginning balances for governmental activities accumulated depreciation were decreased by \$327,974 to reflect a prior period adjustment for various assets.

Note D - Long-Term Debt

- The City paid off significant amounts of its long-term liabilities, i.e., mortgages, special obligation bonds, certificates of participation, capital leases, and compensated absences

Note E - Employee Retirement Benefit Plans

- Non-Uniformed Employees' Retirement Fund
 - Changes in Net Pension Liability

Balances at June 30, 2019

Total Pension Plan	Fiduciary Net Pension Liability	Net Position Liability
(a)	(b)	(a)-(b)
\$ 29,705,101	23,647,381	6,057,720

Balances at June 30, 2020

Total Pension Plan	Fiduciary Net Pension Liability	Net Position Liability
(a)	(b)	(a)-(b)
\$ 31,353,110	23,371,435	7,981,675

Net Pension Liability

1% Decrease	Current Single Rate Assumption	1% Increase
\$ 12,017,839	7,981,675	4,602,526

Police and Firemen's Retirement Fund

- Net Pension Liability as of June 30, 2019, is approximately \$10 million
- Net Pension Liability as of June 30, 2020, is approximately \$12 million
- Total Net position as of June 30 is approximately \$47 million

Note F - Post-Employment Benefits Other Than Pensions

- No significant changes from year-to-year

Required Supplemental Information Section

- Required Supplemental Information - Schedule of Revenues, Expenditures, and Changes in Fund Balance - Budget and Actual - General Fund
 - Total Revenue in the General Fund was under budget by approximately \$1.7 million
 - Total Expenses are under budget by approximately \$152 thousand

Statistical Section

- Financial Trends
- Revenue Capacity
- Debt Capacity
- Demographic and Economic Information
- Operating Information

Report on Federal Awards

- Total Awards Expended is approximately \$1 million eight hundred fifty thousand
- Opinion on Each Major Federal Program
 - In our opinion, the City complied, in all material respects, with the types of compliance requirements referred to above that could have a direct and material effect on each of its major federal programs for the year ended June 30, 2020.

Section II - Findings - Financial Statements Audit

- There are a total of fourteen comments and recommendations compared to twenty-two in FY19
- There were no new comments and recommendations

Mr. Williams stated this report, which consists of 107 pages, was a lot to go over in the allotted time, so if anyone has questions, they should feel free to contact him at any time.

Mayor Crow posed the following questions:

Q. Is my assumption that the logical connection to the deficit in the Solid Waste Fund created by the pension is attributable to a percentage of the pension costs for Solid Waste employees within Public Works, correct?

A. (Mr. Williams) - It is allocated based on the employees.

Q. Was the global actuarial change regarding age and life expectancy a major factor in the City's increase?

A. (Mr. Rose) - The timing of the Actuarial Study resulted in some of the City's contributions to the Pension Fund not being credited. Those contributions will be added to the study conducted in May of this year. If you recall, I committed to keeping both pension funds 80 percent funded, and the contributions for this fiscal year, as well as next year, will reflect that commitment.

A. (Mr. Williams) - There are multiple reasons for changes in the total liability.

The report provides multiple-year schedules related to the changes and additional information in the Required Supplemental Information, which are documented in various footnotes.

Mayor Crow thanked Mr. Williams for his presentation.

3. PC 21-01 – Approval of a Conditional Use Permit (C.U.P.) to accept and approve shared parking “Exceptions” for the proposed TruHotel Development.

Mr. Rose stated staff is recommending that Council approve a Conditional Use Permit for shared parking exceptions for the proposed TruHotel Development.

Mr. Cross stated the TruHotel came before Council for approval of a map amendment to the PD-C Zoning District and a Preliminary Plan for its mixed-use concept of a hotel and office complex.

As part of that process, one condition suggested by the Plan Commission and adopted by Council was that they meet the 96-space parking requirement. The C.U.P. is required to make sure the applicant is consistent with 400.2130 Subsection D of the Zoning Code, which allows for an exception of reduced parking through the shared parking process. He stated the C.U.P. was presented to the Plan Commission who recommended approval of the additional 17 spaces on Parking Lot #4 at their January 2021 meeting.

Councilmember Cusick moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Klein, and the motion carried unanimously.

K. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

- 1. BILL 9423 – AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 210, ARTICLE I OF THE UNIVERSITY CITY MUNICIPAL CODE, RELATING TO ANIMALS GENERALLY, BY ENACTING THEREIN A NEW SECTION TO BE KNOWN AS “SECTION 210.130 COMMUNITY CATS--MANAGEMENT OF CAT POPULATION--PERMITTED ACTS.”**

Bill Number 9423 was read for the second and third time.

Councilmember Cusick moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Clay.

Mr. Rose proposed an amendment to Section 210.130.b.5 of the Ordinance which reads as follows: *"Trap, Neuter, Return shall be the preferred disposition of impounding community cats. Animal Control Officers and local animal shelters are authorized and encouraged to conduct trap, neuter, return, or to direct impound community cats to a Trap, Neuter, Return program, unless the cat is adopted."*

Mayor Crow stated the phrase, *"unless the cat is adopted,"* was added to address some of the concerns expressed to staff and Council.

Councilmember Cusick moved to approve the amendment, it was seconded by Councilmember Clay

Roll Call Vote on the Original Motion Was:

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

Nays: None.

Councilmember Clay asked if there was a measure staff or any member of Council would be able to use to determine the effectiveness of this program? Mr. Rose stated although staff has not established any performance measures, a standard way to determine its effectiveness would be by observing whether the number of community cats has increased or decreased. So, he could look to his Code Enforcement Officers to provide input on the City's community cat population. Councilmember Clay stated while he does not want to get staff involved in this process, this could be something the TNR organization, who probably has its own metrics related to effectiveness, could help with. Mr. Rose stated staff can reach out to TNR to determine the type of metrics they are using and respond back to Council.

Councilmember Klein stated general studies of TNR programs have shown that a good volunteer program can be more cost-effective than any other method.

Roll Call Vote on the Amended Ordinance Was:

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

Nays: None.

- 2. BILL 9424 - 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. 7129. Bill Number 9424 was read for the second and third time.**

Councilmember Klein moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Cusick.

Roll Call Vote Was:

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

Nays: None.

L. NEW BUSINESS

RESOLUTIONS

BILLS

Introduced by Councilmember Hales

1. **BILL 9425** –AN ORDINANCE APPROVING A FINAL PLAT FOR A MAJOR SUBDIVISION OF A TRACT OF LAND TO BE KNOWN AS “CROWN CENTER SUBDIVISION OF DELCREST” AND LOCATED AT 8348 – 8350 DELCREST DRIVE. Bill Number 9425 was read for the first time.

M. 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

Councilmember Clay posed the following questions related to the Public Hearing for Redevelopment Project Area #1:

Q. Is this a continuation of Ordinance 9421 that was introduced on January 11th?

A. Yes. Typically, the Public Hearing and Ordinance are presented at the same time, however, since he has recommended that Council not take any action on the Ordinance, the Public Hearing will actually be the final step in the rezoning process.

Q. Is it correct that the standard procedure is to have the first reading of an Ordinance at one meeting, and then the second and third readings at the next meeting?

A. That is correct.

Q. Is it correct that Council is operating differently in this case because your conclusion is that Council should not act on the Ordinance until the Developer has the site under control?

A. That is correct.

Q. Will anything regarding this site change tomorrow morning as a result of the Public Hearing?

A. There is no change that would impact any of the residents or businesses within RPA-1 as a result of the Public Hearing held tonight.

N. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilmember Cusick announced that he and Councilmember Klein will be holding a 2nd Ward Zoom meeting on Wednesday, February 17th at 6:30 p.m. to discuss and gather feedback on the recommended bond projects presented at tonight's Study Session. Invitations will be sent out to residents on their mailing list, but anyone interested in attending should contact them by email. RSVPs are required and based on the response there could be a second meeting later.

Councilmember Clay stated he and Councilmember Smotherson will also be conducting a 3rd Ward Zoom meeting on Thursday, February 11th. Residents can participate via audio, by submitting comments in the Chat or an email prior to the meeting.

O. EXECUTIVE SESSION

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.

Councilmember Hales moved to close the Regular Session and go into an Executive Session, it was seconded by Councilmember Clay.

Roll Call Vote Was:

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

Nays: None.

P. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Crow thanked everyone for their participation and closed the Regular Session of Council at 7:40 p.m. to go into a Closed Session. The Closed Session reconvened in an open session at 8:50 p.m.

LaRette Reese
City Clerk



LaRette Reese

From: Corrine Haskins <corrinehaskins1@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 30, 2021 9:56 AM
To: Council Comments Shared
Subject: Questions for Plan Commission

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello,

I received your letter in reference to the virtual public hearing. Although the letter is letting me know of a hearing it is not providing much information about the hearing. I have questions that I hope you can answer for me:

- Are all homeowners required to accept an offer in order for this plan to happen?
- What is the expected time frame that construction is to begin and end?
- In case a person does not want to move what provisions are available?

Corrine Haskins
1133 N. McKnight Road
University City, MO 63132

C: 314-708-9972



From: Corrine Haskins <corrinehaskins1@gmail.com>
Sent: Saturday, January 30, 2021 10:07 AM
To: Council Comments Shared
Subject: Questions for Plan Commission

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Hello,

I received your letter in reference to the virtual public hearing. Although the letter is letting me know of a hearing it is not providing much information about the hearing. I have questions that I hope you can answer for me:

- Are all homeowners required to accept an offer in order for this plan to happen?
- What is the expected time frame that construction is to begin and end?
- In case a person does not want to move what provisions are available?
- My home is paid off. How can you ensure that funds to purchase another home are enough for me to buy another home at equal or more value, is sentimental value involved in your analysis?
- Is there a monthly severance pay provided to homeowners on top of the money provided to buy the property, again my property is paid for and I may not want to move.

Corrine Haskins
1133 N. McKnight Road
University City, MO 63132
C: 314-708-9972

3

From: jinnett anderson <sunraven24@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, February 4, 2021 3:23 PM
To: Council Comments Shared
Subject: Jinnett Anderson, 8632 Orchard Court, University City, MO 63132

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Jinnett Anderson
8632 Orchard Court
University City, MO 63132

On June 9, 2020, I signed a Real Estate Option Agreement with U. City, LLC, granting it an option to buy my property at 8632 Orchard Court. This option lasted until September 30, 2020, the purchaser let the option expire without making me, or my attorney, any offer to extend it. Thereafter, before the purchaser sent any communication to me or my attorney about extending the option, Novus sent an email to the City Manager on October 15, 2020 requesting that the City Manager meet with me about Novus's need to purchase my home. We obtained this email through a freedom of information request. Since then, Novus has made a couple of half-hearted requests that I enter into a new Real Estate Option Agreement, but they continue to insist that I accept worse terms than the prior option- less money, less time for me to vacate the property, etc. I do not necessarily oppose this proposed re-zoning, but the City Council should understand that I have been continuously harassed by Novus about what they consider their absolute right to buy my property, on their terms, not mutually agreeable terms, and when my attorney responds to Novus, in what we consider to be a reasonable manner, Novus waits weeks before responding. Unless Novus is going to start conducting themselves in a professional manner that demonstrates that they are actually interested in acquiring my property and are capable of pulling off this development, the City Council should not allow Novus to continue this charade to the detriment of our community and a waste of your time.

Thank you,
Jinnett Anderson

Sent from [Mail](#) for Windows 10

A

1 of 2

From: R&R Lacy <rrmmln18@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, February 5, 2021 3:28 PM
To: Council Comments Shared
Subject: comments for proposed redevelopment area public hearing PC 20-11

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Richard Lacy
 1109 N. McKnight Rd.
 St. Louis, MO 63132

Regarding Proposed Redevelopment Project Area #1, Case Number PC 20-11.

As a voting constituent in the proposed rezoning area I am writing to inform you we are vehemently opposed to the proposed rezoning and redevelopment project. The City has completely failed to address any of the affected residents' concerns, let alone satisfactorily, with regards to lack of competing bids for the proposed project, finances for the project, addressing the projected increase of crime the project will bring and resulting need for increased police force, the increase of traffic especially along the residential McKnight Road and finally the how laws on your own books prohibiting this project until buildings are vacant.

The stated intent of this proposed project is to raise property values. A simple examination of recent area home sale prices indicates the property values have increased greatly in the past several years. While that rate of increase will not continue given the current administration's flurry of writing executive orders all willy nilly with no regard to the Constitution, people's wellbeing or market stability, the fact remains property values have gone up. The City must put an end to the redevelopment project as it has not satisfactorily addressed the concerns of its affected constituents.

Elaboration:

After the previous hearing on the proposed redevelopment project the City (one councilman anyway) stated they were just shopping to see what the values were. That is a very inappropriate conduct for an elected official and clearly shows they do not look out for their constituents' wellbeing. The lack of competing bids, especially for such a massive proposed project, is reckless and unacceptable.

Especially when the selected developer has a less than stellar record in the St. Louis area on other projects. Additionally, the use of eminent domain to remove people from their homes or remove existing business for commercial development is an abuse of City government's power. The Olivette development between 170 and Price Road took only one national retail business and seven homes. The other Olivette Olive Road developments are on vacant lots with the exception of one lot where the business were relocated a short distance away, no residential relocation. By contrast the proposed U. City redevelopment Phase One alone will displace not just one national retailer but over a dozen local businesses and restaurants and more than 10x the number of homes than the Olivette development.

U. City is and has been operating in the red. Yet the sales tax rate is higher than Olivette and property tax rate is in line with Olivette, Ladue and Clayton. Asking for deferred taxes from the businesses coming in from the proposed project is reckless. The existing residents and business cannot pay more taxes to make up for shortfalls, especially in this pandemic environment. The funding for this proposed project is simply not available.

The developer and City at a previous meeting dismissed the notion there would be increased crime from the proposed project. Lunacy. Big box stores experience much more theft than the current businesses do.

(5)

2 of 2

The big stores are also more frequent targets of carjackers (armed criminal action) than the current small businesses. And when more people are put into the same size area there will be more crime be it more theft or domestic disturbances.

This is now the third time I have brought up the McKnight traffic and I know neighbors are on record about it as well. The average speed on McKnight is close to 50% over the posted speed limit. When the radar sign showing "your speed" was put on the street it was set up near the stoplight at Olive and thus did not record any meaningful data.

Personal note: I was recently nearly rear ended after pulling onto the street when it was clear; a car came from behind at very high speed, went around into the oncoming traffic lane, and ended up sitting at the Olive stoplight three seconds later. I frequently observe 60 mph traffic on McKnight and occasionally see much higher.

There has also been a noticeable increase in heavy truck and of course [empty] Metro Bus traffic on McKnight in the past year. The proposed project will exacerbate this traffic issue. Even without the proposed project the City needs to work with the county on curbing the traffic and reckless driving on a residential road. I can think of several options, some are very easy and inexpensive to implement (hint: does not include speed bumps which are not allowed on public roads by Missouri law).

To reiterate: The City does not have the funding in place nor has it met its requirements for undertaking this redevelopment project and does not have its residents' and existing businesses best interests in mind with this proposed project. Voting against this proposed rezoning and redevelopment project is a necessity.

Respectfully,
Richard Lacy

6

LaRette Reese

From: Roisin Halfar <roisin.halfar1@gmail.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2021 8:48 PM
To: Council Comments Shared
Subject: Concerns for Public Hearing Case Number: PC 20-11 Monday Feb 8, 2021 6:30 PM

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To Whom It May Concern

Hi, thank you for the notice; My name is Mrs. Roisin Halfar. I live at 8516 Richard Ave within the 500 ft. courtesy notice area.

May I please have a link so that I can virtually attend the hearing tomorrow evening?

Please send to

roisin.halfar1@gmail.com

I would like to go on record about potential parking, general neighborhood safety and traffic concerns on Richard Ave.

Will there be disruption to my immediate neighborhood with building vehicles on my street?

We already have people speeding through using Richard Ave as a short cut to Page Ave.

How does University City propose to

put traffic control in place both during and after the new project is completed?

I would like to see speed bumps put in the avenues -of Elmore, Richard and Orchard adjacent to Woodson Road, extending East to 81st Street-

Thanks again for your attention,

Sincerely,

Mrs. Roisin Halfar

Home owner since 2001

I

Roisin Halfar RN, LMT



From: greghal@earthlink.net
Sent: Monday, February 8, 2021 10:11 AM
To: Council Comments Shared; Clifford Cross
Subject: I need an invite to the virtual Public Hearing, Case Number PC 20-11, for Feb 8 at 6:30pm

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Good morning,

I am a long time resident of 15 years at:

Gregory Halfar
8516 Richard Ave
University City, MO 63132

Please email me an invitation to the virtual public meeting
Public Hearing, Case Number PC 20-11
Scheduled for Monday, February 8 at 6:30pm

“Considering the application by U-City and Novus Companies
For the Zoning Map Amendment to rezone 31.79 acres
For the proposed Redevelopment Project Area #1”

I am interested in what is the impact on my residence, particularly what will be the traffic and noise and the property tax effects on me.

Thanking you in advance,

Greg Halfar
greghal@earthlink.net
314-910-1824

8

102

LaRette Reese

From: Meg Mannion <Meg.Mannion@cblproperties.com>
Sent: Sunday, February 7, 2021 5:24 PM
To: Council Comments Shared; bwaynesmotherson@gmail.com; Stacy Clay
Cc: Julie Mannion; Meg Mannion
Subject: NOVUS Development Comments for Meeting 2/8/2021

Importance: High

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

To the University City Council Members –

My name is Meg Mannion and I am a partner (along with other family members) in four properties on the southwest corner of Olive and 170 that Novus wants to acquire for their development. My husband, Mark, worked directly with Novus since the beginning of this project. After Mark’s passing from cancer in November, I am left with trying to figure out the status of our empty buildings in addition to the debt service on those properties.

- Novus has allowed the contract for the Mannion properties to lapse as of the end of 2018 (to the best of my knowledge) and Novus has not discussed or negotiated in good faith or on any kind of continuing basis a renewal of the contract since it lapsed.
- The properties have remained vacant since the end of 2018 with the burden of paying real estate taxes, insurance, utilities and maintenance falling on the property owner without the ability to lease the properties in order to offset those expenses.
- Novus has not been communicative and it is not fair or reasonable to expect the property owners to hold their property off the rental market for such an indefinite period of time without an agreement with Novus for fair compensation during the pre-development/pre-acquisition period. In other Novus projects, some where they partially proceeded and some where they didn’t - like Sunset Hills and Rock Hill, the commercial properties were either allowed to be leased with a kick-out/termination clause or Novus master leased the property.
- It is important to make sure the rezoning is not effective until such time as the property is sold. It is our understanding that this is a key issue. If the City rezones the property and Novus doesn’t perform, then the industrial properties have the potential to become a non-conforming use and we could have a very difficult, if not impossible, time leasing the property as occupancy permits will not be issued to users who are not a permitted use under the new zoning.

Thank you for your consideration.

Meg Mannion
314-420-0873

The information contained in this communication is strictly CONFIDENTIAL and may contain privileged attorney-client or work-product information. It is intended solely for the use of the individual to whom it is addressed. If you are not the intended recipient and have received this communication in error, please contact the sender immediately at the telephone number or e-mail address set forth above and destroy all copies of this communication. In addition, you are notified that any distribution or use of this communication is strictly prohibited.

9

262

LaRette Reese

From: Meg Mannion <Meg.Mannion@cblproperties.com>
Sent: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:14 AM
To: Council Comments Shared
Subject: RE: NOVUS Development Comments for Meeting 2/8/2021

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

8 Fox Run Lane
63131

Thank you!

Meg Boyce Mannion | Business Development Manager
Advertising & Strategic Partnerships
Direct: 314-288-2032 | Cell: 314-420-0873

CBL & Associates Properties, Inc. | West County Center
80 West County Center, Des Peres, MO 63131
meg.mannion@cblproperties.com

From: Council Comments Shared <councilcomments@ucitymo.org>
Sent: Monday, February 08, 2021 11:08 AM
To: Meg Mannion <Meg.Mannion@cblproperties.com>
Cc: Council Comments Shared <councilcomments@ucitymo.org>
Subject: RE: NOVUS Development Comments for Meeting 2/8/2021

Warning: This email originated outside of CBL. Verify the email address (not just the display name) before exchanging emails, clicking links or opening attachments.

Good morning,

May I please ask for your address? A name and address must be provided with all comments.

Thank you in advance.

LaRette



LaRette Reese
City Clerk
City of University City
6801 Delmar Boulevard
University City, MO 63130
P: 314.505.8605 | www.ucitymo.org

10

LaRette Reese

From: Gabe Angieri <gabe.angieri@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 8, 2021 12:03 PM
To: Council Comments Shared
Subject: Fwd: Case# PC 20-11 | Public Hearing Comments Submission

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Submitted by:
Gabe & Nichole Angieri
University City Residents Residing at 8633 Mayflower, St. Louis, MO 63132

Dear University City Council Members:

My spouse, Nichole Angieri, and I have resided in University City for 15 non-consecutive years in total, and as homeowners on Mayflower Court where we are raising our two children for the past 13 years. We love UCity and have identified it as the only municipality in St. Louis County that we would want to live.

We were caught off-guard (to say the least) when we received notice of this hearing to consider rezoning our single-family residential neighborhood to Planned Development - Mixed Use for the Novus development to say the least. We can't comprehend how the city, which has repeatedly and unquestionably asserted that it will not exercise eminent domain on residential properties, can consider this issue before Novus has made an offer to purchase our home.

As you may know recall, both Nichole and I have made public statements in support of this project for the past 3 years, and some to this very body, because we truly believe that it will be of benefit to this community and its residents. However, after having come to mutually-agreeable terms with Novus in 2018 and being ready and willing to execute the sale of our home with the firm for over 18-months, Novus ultimately failed to exercise its rights to purchase our home and has not made any subsequent offer or serious effort to come to terms with us since then.

This move to consider rezoning by the city is as unconscionable as it is premature, given that there are many homeowners without contracts or any terms agreed upon with Novus, and by moving forward with this process you are fundamentally undermining your residents' rights to self-determination and our ability to negotiate with a profit-motivated development company in good faith.

Though we are certainly disappointed and discouraged by their inability to execute contracts our family had agreed upon, which at the time were both fair and equitable, we do not fault Novus in this process because, as stated, they are only looking out for their financial well-being and little else can be expected of them. It's just business!

But, isn't the City Council vested in the financial, emotional, and physical well-being of its residents? Especially during a global pandemic that is already causing massive economic uncertainty? There aren't enough to describe how disappointed we are that this is even an issue. The City Council should stand by its residents rather than a private developer, and ensure that the interests of this community come first in determining this matter.

In the strongest possible terms, we urge this body to suspend this process and reconvene only when Novus can substantiate their ownership or rights to purchase ALL residential properties within Redevelopment Project Area #1.

Sincerely,
Gabe & Nichole Angieri

E - 3 - 20

LaRette Reese

From: Adande Lane <aek.lane@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 8, 2021 11:45 AM
To: Council Comments Shared
Subject: Questions for NOVOUS & UCity Council

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

What does this potential expansion mean for the activation timeline?

Many of us have been waiting in limbo for almost 3 years now regarding the outcome of this endeavor.

My family has been in favor of this development from the beginning, with the anticipation that it would help revitalize the area and keep UCity competitive (or help it to become competitive) with the surrounding areas; however, it now feels as though UCity & Novous are incapable of coming to an agreement that is in the best interest of the residents.

Two years in a row we were expected to close our contracts with Novous and prepare to relocate. First it was getting the City Council to vote in favor of the development, then getting the anchor store to sign on, then the issue of the McNair building and now an expansion.

For older adults, the inability to make plans for their future is stressful and unsettling. For those with special needs or health concerns who determine their living situation based on proximity to certain service providers, the unfamiliarity of circumstances is stressful and unsettling. For young parents who are trying to set roots and establish patterns for their family. The uncertainty of school access or home affordability is stressful and unsettling.

Housing is a basic need the affected homeowners have attained SO the potential to uproot- should be handled with greater grace. It should be settled keeping in mind those who will be most affected--the current residents. It should be decided upon more quickly than what is happening here.

So, What is the hard line where this project is activated or ended for good? Your constituents are stressed and unhappy.

Respectfully,
A resident of Mayflower Court

--
Adande Lane
Founder | Director
empowerSHE Network

LaRette Reese

From: Adande Lane <aek.lane@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, February 8, 2021 12:59 PM
To: Council Comments Shared
Subject: Re: Questions for NOVOUS & UCity Council

CAUTION: This email originated from outside your organization. Exercise caution when opening attachments or clicking links, especially from unknown senders.

Thank you for your response. Please see my address below.

8609 Mayflower Court, 63132

--
Adande Lane
Founder | Director
empowerSHE Network

On Mon, Feb 8, 2021 at 11:56 AM Council Comments Shared <councilcomments@ucitymo.org> wrote:

Good morning,

I am in receipt of your comments. May I please ask for your address? In order that your comments be made a part of the official record, a name and address must be provided.

Thank you in advance.

LaRette



LaRette Reese
City Clerk
City of University City
6801 Delmar Boulevard
University City, MO 63130

My Name Is Jeremiah Sullivan

I have lived at 8637 Richard Court
for almost forty years. I've stayed there
because it's a nice quiet court

I work nights and usually sleep until noon.
Just a couple weeks ago, Diana from News

said "Most likely, your house won't be
'Bought Out' until 6-18 months after those
on the Cul-de-sac ← this had never been
discussed; much less agreed upon.

I love to work in my yard and listen to the birds
Nearby bulldozers would wreck that;

The Quality of my life severely impacted.

— Diesel fumes... dust... dirt, maybe even asbestos
permeating my breathing air when houses
just 35 yards from mine are demolished

— OR... what if they ran out of money
and this development never goes beyond
initial development?? Then I'm stuck looking
at a retaining wall for the rest of my life

on the ugly Chopped-off Street... And
Get None of the Big Bucks Promised.

I partnered with Novus... yet they now
won't return calls about Renewing Contract.
which Expired December 17th

I eventually talked with Stacy Clay,
who went to City Manager ← he apparently
called Novus... they suddenly called me.
yet were reluctant to Renew Contract,
now mentioning they 'Needed Ducking'.

— We've all heard about what happened
to them in Sunset Hills, and their
Rock Hill Project ended up a 1/2 actually done.

— I would not hesitate to seek legal help
but I hope & pray we can resolve this ourselves

314-991-2169