



MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY
CITY HALL, Fifth Floor
6801 Delmar Blvd., University City, Missouri 63130
Monday, February 23, 2026
6:30 p.m.

AGENDA

A. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

B. ROLL CALL

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

D. PROCLAMATIONS (Acknowledgement)

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. February 9, 2026 Draft Study Session Meeting Minutes (Uniformed Pension)
2. February 9, 2026 Draft Regular Meeting Minutes

F. APPOINTMENTS to BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

1. Karen Palmer is nominated for appointment to the Arts & Letters Commission as fill in by Councilmember Lisa Brenner
2. Barbara Santoro is nominated for appointment to the Library as a fill in by Councilmember Dennis Fuller

G. SWEARING IN TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

H. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (Total of 15 minutes allowed)

Request to Address the Council Forms are located on the ledge just inside the entrance of the Council Chamber. Please complete and place the form in the basket at the front of the room.

The public may also submit a written comment ahead of the meeting. Comments must be received **no later than 12:00 p.m. on 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 the City Council prior to the meeting. Comments will be made as 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 comment provided will not be recorded in the official record.

I. COUNCIL COMMENTS

J. PUBLIC HEARINGS

K. CONSENT AGENDA (1 voice vote required)

L. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT – (voice vote on each item as needed)

1. City Manager Updates
2. Interfund Borrowing from General Fund to Solid Waste Fund in the amount of \$600,000

M. UNFINISHED BUSINESS (2nd and 3rd readings – roll call vote required)

None

N. NEW BUSINESS

Resolutions (voice vote required)

1. **RESOLUTION 2026-01** A Resolution in Recognition of the Indispensable Role of Municipal Government in the Democratic Republic

Requested by Councilmember John Tieman and seconded by Councilmember Dennis Fuller

Bills (Introduction and 1st reading - no vote required)

None

O. COUNCIL REPORTS/BUSINESS

1. Board and Commission appointments needed
2. Council liaison reports on Boards and Commissions
3. Boards, Commissions and Task Force minutes
4. Other Discussions/Business

P. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (continued if needed)

Q. COUNCIL COMMENTS

R. EXECUTIVE SESSION (*roll call vote required*)

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 (13) Individually identifiable personnel records, performance ratings or records pertaining to employees.

S. ADJOURNMENT

The public may also observe via:

Live Stream via YouTube: https://www.youtube.com/channel/UCyN1EJ_-Q22918E9EZimWoQ

NOTE (6/20/25 Update):

- **The only entrance for City Council meetings will be via the WEST side door (Trinity Ave.)**

Posted February 20, 2026.

STUDY SESSION
Uniformed Pension Plans
CITY HALL, Fifth Floor
6801 Delmar Blvd., University City, Missouri 63130
Monday, February 9, 2026
5:30 p.m.

AGENDA

1. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

At the Study Session of the City Council of University City held on Monday, February 9, 2026, Mayor Terry Crow called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

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

Councilmember Stacy Clay
Councilmember John Tieman
Councilmember Steven McMahan
Councilmember Lisa Brenner
Councilmember Dennis Fuller
Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson

Also in attendance were Interim City Manager Brooke A. Sharp, City Attorney John Mulligan, Jr., and Andrew Belknap, Managing Director of Baker Tilly.

2. CHANGES TO REGULAR AGENDA

Ms. Sharp requested that Item K (4), Ratification - MGT - Budget Consultant, be moved to the City Manager's Report.

3. UNIFORMED PENSION PLANS UPDATE

Ms. Sharp stated that Andy Belknap of Baker Tilly is here to provide Council with a presentation on the Police and Fire Pension Analysis.

Mr. Belknap stated that he has been a Consultant to local governments for fifteen years, first with a company called Management Partners and with Baker Tilly since 2022. He stated that he has managed bankruptcies for three municipalities, and his background in local government is that he has worked for three cities in the County as a Finance Director, Public Works Director, and City Manager.

He stated that he prepared this report on the Police and Fire Pension Analysis at the request of Mr. Rose, with whom he has worked with in three different cities going back to 2005. So, he's sorry to miss him tonight, but happy that he has successfully retired after all these years.

Mr. Belknap stated that the first time he looked at this pension plan, he told Mr. Rose that he did not think it was that bad, but he's a very careful man and wanted to make sure he had another set of eyes on it because there were some flashing yellow warning signs. The fund is not in critical condition, but he will go through everything with Council tonight and talk about his recommendations.

Background

- There are 130 public pension systems operating in Missouri, 16 Statewide systems and 114 locally administered plans
- The Missouri Local Government Employee Retirement System (LAGERS) is the biggest, serving 861 agencies and 247 cities
- 50 cities in the State administer one or more pension systems
- In addition to University City, 15 other cities have a police and fire pension system

- St. Louis metro area cities, Brentwood, Clayton, Jennings, Ladue, and Maplewood either had or have such systems

Condition of U City's Police and Fire Pension Fund

- The University City Police and Fire Retirement System (UCPFRS) was below 80% funded, 73%, and 77% in Fiscal Years 2024 and 2025
- Anything less than 80% funded is considered a warning sign
 - Very few systems are funded at 100%
- For comparison, the non-uniform pension system is
 - 96.7% funded
- The UCPFRS is experiencing negative cash flow on an annual basis; it pays out more than it takes in
- On the plus side, the market value of assets under management has increased in 2024 and 2025
- The situation is concerning but not critical

Mr. Belknap stated that he conducted numerous interviews with people who worked with the pension system, and the good thing is that this is a well-known problem that no one was surprised to hear about.

UCPFRS Findings

- a. The system is viewed as underfunded and structurally outdated
- b. Many believe the system needs a structural overhaul and steps to ensure long-term solvency
- c. Administrative costs are high due to the small size of the system
- d. The City lacks a complete view of retirees' retirement benefits, limiting its ability to assess adequacy
 - This is kind of a confusing pension system because it is one part of a larger retirement system for the police and fire, and you really don't know what their retirement situation is because there is a private component and a public component, and you don't have visibility into the private component
- e. Turnover is a challenge in fire and especially the police, and some of that is linked to the uncertainty regarding the pension's stability
 - Typically, people stay with the Fire Department for their entire career
- f. Recruitment is negatively impacted by concerns with pension stability
- g. Employees lack an understanding of the system
 - Trying to read the description of the system is confusing
- h. There is a strong desire for fairness and transparency with any changes
- i. Governance and decision-making can be painstaking
- j. Funding solutions are constrained

UCPFRS Competitiveness

- a. Generally, University City offers a competitive pension program when compared to other cities
- b. The City employees contribute less to the pension system than some other comparable cities
 - The impact is putting less money into the system
- c. Higher turnover in University City may not be due to inferior pension benefits, but a perception that the pension system itself is not as strong as in other communities

Outlook for UCPFRS

- Recent results for UCPFRS have been good, with earnings above 8%
 - The earning presumption is 6.8%
- However, with the status of current funding, the Plan has not been able to offer an inflation adjustment since 2007
 - This is not a good thing for retired annuitants

- With current funding levels, the Plan does not appear to be on a trajectory to obtain 80% funding and be able to offer benefit improvements
- It is possible the Plan could fall below a 70% funded status in down years when it's not earning above 6.8%, which would put the Plan on the State's "watch list"
- All this makes it clear that additional funding needs to be directed to funding the Plan to obtain at least an 80% funded status
- The City has already asked for a voter-approved tax measure to direct more funding to the Plan, but it failed to gain approval
 - The City needs to demonstrate that it is making steps to strengthen the pension system, which could put it in a better position to go back to the voters

Recommendations for UCPFRS

- a. Continue providing discretionary General Fund support of approximately \$545,000 annually to UCPFRS
- b. Negotiate with police and fire employees to provide a similar level of support annually
 - They are not paying into the pension now, and many other jurisdictions are
- c. With recommendations 1 and 2 in place, which will demonstrate a commitment from the City at or beyond what similar cities make, place another ballot measure before voters for police and fire service enhancements and additional pension system support for approximately \$700,000, which would really strengthen the fund and get it above the 80% threshold
- d. In recognition of support from employees, commit to a COLA adjustment study once the funded status reaches 80%
- e. Once UCPFRS is stabilized, approach LAGERS about transitioning into that system, with a pledge that reduced administrative costs will be channeled into COLA benefits or similar improvements for retired annuitants

Mr. Belknap stated that he does not know how much the City would really benefit from relinquishing local control of its pension system. However, when this pension plan was started, LAGERS did not exist as it does today. So, while there are 15 municipalities with this type of plan, over time, most of the cities in Missouri have migrated towards LAGERS.

Councilmember Brenner posed the following questions to Mr. Belknap:

Q. Did you say that Maplewood and Jennings have migrated to LAGERS?

A. Yes.

Q. Do you have a sense of what the process would be like to move from a local pension plan to a state plan?

A. *It is not terribly complicated because many cities in Missouri have migrated into LAGERS. But you have to be financially healthy. You have to be well-funded because they do not want to take on a sick pension fund. It's just beneficial to migrate because it keeps the administrative costs low, and it is a well-managed, good state pension system.*

Councilmember McMahan thanked Mr. Belknap for his work to help the City map out a plan because, as the liaison to the Pension Board, this has been a discussion even with some of the officers who were on the Board. They acknowledged that if the City needed a shot in the arm, they would be willing to talk to their folks about contributing because they understood that it was about getting the fund back on track. Councilmember McMahan then posed the following questions to Mr. Belknap:

Q. So, just doing the math off the top of my head, you're thinking that by taking multiple steps over time, about 1.7 million dollars would really put the fund on solid ground?

A. *It would put the fund on really solid ground.*

Q. Absent that, a couple of years with a bad market could drop the plan down under 70%?

A. *Yes. The City has been overachieving in its earnings. The plan is designed to get a 6.8% return annually, and the last two years it's been over 8%. If you keep doing that, you could conceivably grow your way out over a number of years. But I don't think that is going to happen because you're bound to hit a down year, and you could probably have a year where your return might be under 6.8%.*

So, because of the way this plan is constituted, that could get pretty ugly, especially if it occurred in multiple years. The looming issue would be if you fall under 70% for more than one year, then you would be placed on the State's "watch list," which is bad for your reputation. While it's not clear to him exactly what the State would have in store, obviously, they would not want the pension to fail, and they might start telling the City what it has to contribute towards the pension. So, in his experience, it is always better to get ahead of any state intervention.

Q. If there is a delay in reaching an agreement with the officers, would that change the numbers we're looking at today and cause the need for their contributions to be even higher?

A. Well, I think the common cause here is that you, the officers, and the firefighters almost certainly don't want the state to come in here and start telling the City what to do. So, while there is some common ground, at the end of the day, it's a negotiation.

Q. Let's say we can negotiate a number with our public safety officers that is less than what you've recommended. Does that mean that all of those moving components will fluctuate?

A. Yes, but this is just my recommendation, and it's not necessarily dispositive. It is true that in other jurisdictions the employees are contributing, but the other thing is you've got to offer a competitive pension to get good officers.

Q. Have you had experience with a municipality that had a hybrid system with public and private components, as we have, rolling into LAGERS?

A. Yes.

Q. So that's not an impediment?

A. No. In fact, two of the cities that had a similar pension plan did that, and you can retain the private aspects and still go into LAGERS, which is fine. But, this plan has got to get above 80%. So, it is going to be a couple of years before U City is in a healthy enough situation to even sit down and talk about it with them.

Mayor Crow thanked Mr. Belknap for this presentation and the very detailed information Council received prior to this session. He then posed the following questions to Mr. Belknap:

Q. You've mentioned the administrative costs several times, and perhaps I missed it in the reading, but what is LAGERS administrative cost?

A. I looked it up, but I don't believe it is in the report. So, while I'll have to go back and look for the exact figure, it is much lower than the City's.

Q. I think for our purposes that it would be important to know. So, if you could provide that to the City manager or Chris, that would be great?

A. Sure.

Q. It would also be good to see what LAGERS' rate of return has been over the past couple of years?

A. Sure.

Q. Are all members of LAGERS currently above 80%?

A. Yes, they are.

Q. So, all of the municipalities with plans managed by LAGERS are above 80%?

A. Well, they don't manage individual plans because it's an amalgamated plan. So, you would become a member of that plan, just like many other local governments have.

Q. If it's amalgamated, does LAGERS have a number that shows its members what that plan is?

A. Yes, they publish annual statistics.

Q. I'm just trying to understand these numbers because I think that would be important information for us to have. On average, are all of the members 85% funded?

A. Of course, you would want to do your due diligence about LAGERS before you even thought about joining their plan, but it is a good, well-funded plan, well above 80%.

Q. The reality of this is, if in fact our public safety members are contributing to their private plan, then they can invest those funds with anyone they want, is that correct?

A. I believe so.

Q. Can they borrow against those funds?

A. I don't know.

Q. One of your comments in the written report says that one of the things you noted throughout the survey was that there was tension between the representatives of the different plans, and I'm just curious to know more about that comment?

A. I don't recall.

Q. Is Maplewood really funded at 200%?

A. Yeah, that's what it said.

Q. That's a heck of a lot of funding, and I'm trying to figure out what jackpot they hit to get 200% funding. Another option in your written materials would be to discuss increasing the retirement age of our uniformed officers from fifty to fifty-one or fifty-two. I think Clayton's is fifty-five. So I'm just trying to come up with as many arrows in our quiver as we possibly can to help make this as painless as possible for our employees and citizens. Do we have a number that demonstrates how you think that would help us ameliorate our deficit?

A. Well, I think the typical retirement age in the state for police and fire is fifty.

Q. Didn't you also say that the retirement age at Brentwood, Clayton, and Ladue is fifty-five?

A. Yes, and it's also fifty-five in Maplewood. So I guess that could be something that you might want to talk about; however, you also have a bit of a recruitment advantage right now because you can retire at fifty.

Mayor Crow stated that he would agree with that, and noted that he had found the comment he was referring to regarding the tension, at bullet point no. 9 on page 5. It says, *"There is also tension between uniformed and non-uniformed representatives, particularly around perceived inequities and how changes can be made."* He stated that he is trying to figure out the background for that comment, and if someone could provide him with that, it would be helpful, because he can understand that there would be tension if one plan can make a change and the other one can't.

Mayor Crow stated that he's been hearing about the pension plan for eighteen years, and would love to get this addressed for the benefit of their employees and their citizens. But, he does think that they at least have a map here, and he's hoping that they are going to be closer to 80% than they were, although we'll see how we do by the end of the year. He stated that they also have the benefit of some institutional knowledge because he was the pension liaison before Councilmembers McMahan and Brenner. So, he's wondering if his two colleagues would not mind sitting down with the City Manager to start going through some of these options to get the process started. Because this is kind of another item on Ms. Sharp's list that she's got to get her hands around since stepping into this role. Once we reach some conclusions, the next step would be for Ms. Sharp to have conversations with the Chiefs of both departments.

Ms. Sharp stated that is correct, especially since the City is currently in negotiations with the police and fire unions. So she thinks now is the prime opportunity to have those conversations.

Mayor Crow stated that he is okay with someone else replacing him or if another member wanted to participate in these conversations, although a fourth member would make it a quorum, and you may not want that, but perhaps the Chair of the Pension Board might want to join in. The bottom line is that he is appreciative of the roadmap Mr. Belknap has provided, and even though he's kind of volunteering Councilmember Brenner and Councilmember McMahan's time, he thinks this would be the shortest route to get from A to B.

Councilmember Brenner stated that she would be happy to help with these discussions, and since there are already discussions going on with the Union, her other thought was that maybe the first step should be for the administration and the Union to come up with some shared goals. That way, everyone will be on the same page about what we are trying to achieve. Of course, there may be some differences of opinion on how we get there, but at least we'll all be in agreement on the specific points that we want to get to. Councilmember Brenner stated that she thinks everyone would love to be able to provide a COLA each year, so perhaps that could be one of the goals established between both sides.

Mayor Crow stated that they probably have not done a good job of educating their citizens. The public safety numbers from the Citizen Satisfaction Surveys are always off the chart, yet they probably would not be nearly as happy to learn that our retirees have not had a COLA adjustment since 2007.

4. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Crow adjourned the Study Session at 6:05 p.m.

LaRette Reese
City Clerk, MRCC

DRAFT

MEETING OF THE CITY COUNCIL
CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY
CITY HALL, Fifth Floor
6801 Delmar Blvd., University City, Missouri 63130
Monday, February 9, 2026
6:30 p.m.

AGENDA

A. MEETING CALLED TO ORDER

At the Regular Session of the City Council of University City held on Monday, February 9, 2026, Mayor Terry Crow 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 Stacy Clay
Councilmember John Tieman
Councilmember Steven McMahon
Councilmember Lisa Brenner
Councilmember Dennis Fuller
Councilmember Bwayne Smotherson

Also in attendance were Interim City Manager Brooke A. Sharp, City Attorney John Mulligan, Jr., Lee Szyzborski of MGT, and David Lowell, Senior Project Manager for Navigate Building Systems.

C. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

Mayor Crow stated that during the Study Session, the Interim City Manager asked that Item K (4), Ratification - MGT - Budget Consultant, be moved to the City Manager's Report.

Councilmember Tieman moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember McMahon, and the motion carried unanimously.

Councilmember Smotherson moved to approve the Agenda as amended, it was seconded by Councilmember Brenner, and the motion carried unanimously.

D. PROCLAMATIONS (Acknowledgement)

None

E. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

1. January 26, 2026, Draft Regular Meeting Minutes was made by Councilmember Fuller, it was seconded by Councilmember McMahon, and the motion carried unanimously.

F. APPOINTMENTS TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None

G. SWEARING IN TO BOARDS AND COMMISSIONS

None

H. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION (Total of 15 minutes allowed)

Request to Address the Council Forms are located on the ledge just inside the entrance of the Council Chamber. Please complete and place the form in the basket at the front of the room.

The public may also submit a written comment ahead of the meeting. Comments must be received **no later than 12:00 p.m. on 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 the City Council prior to the meeting. Comments will be made as part of the official record and made accessible to the public online following the meeting. Please note that when submitting your comments, a **name and address must be provided.** Please also note if your comment is on an agenda or a non-agenda item. If a name and address are not provided, the comment provided will not be recorded in the official record.

Citizen Comments

David Sandel, 6910 Washington Avenue, U City, MO

Mr. Sandel stated that last week, he was notified by the Stormwater Commission that his business, iNeighborhoods, had been awarded a sole-source contract to complete the Stormwater Monitoring System along the River des Peres, which is fantastic. This is fantastic, so tonight he wanted to share some of the history, highlights, and challenges surrounding this project.

In April of 2022, he and another U City High School graduate, who used to work together as dog catchers, decided to work on developing a flash flood detector that, when completed, was placed by Groby Road. On July 22, 2022, they got their first flood alert at 1:30 in the morning, which in fact resulted in the big flood. Thereafter, they continued building the system and made numerous attempts to inform the Stormwater Commission about the work they were doing. Mr. Sandel stated that those attempts turned into a two-year stent that only materialized after they made a presentation at a public meeting where the link, graphics, and actual live data coming from the river were presented on the screen. From that point on, they started working together, developed a strong collaboration, and began to develop more features for the system.

One of those features was the Code Red Alert. It consists of a link that can be retrieved on your phone that allows you to see four live camera feeds and the analytics from the River des Peres. That connection can also be mirrored on your TV, where you can see a full screen of everything going on at the River. This capability exists today, but it is the Stormwater Commission's Monitoring Committee that decides if the technology and its features should be provided to the public or is a standard Code Red Alert with a message.

Mr. Sandel stated recently that they were on a webinar with the University of Michigan, which has studied flood monitoring for three years with Intel and three government agencies. At the end of that webinar, what the University concluded was that U City's system had some unique features that made it far more interesting, and that it was more cost-effective. This is a big win for U City and the Commission, and while they both look forward to continuing their work together, one of the big challenges is that it has taken so long to get this done. There needs to be a way to accelerate the final phases of funding, which will allow them to replace the old equipment with the new equipment.

The Commission is currently working on these proposals, and it would be fantastic to get all this done by the spring so that they can present it to the Commission and the Council, rather than waiting for another year to go by. Mr. Sandel stated their future developments are far more than what anyone has heard about, and he thinks residents will be very delighted to hear about the story of two dog catchers that beat the University of Michigan and Intel.

Jerrold Tiers, 7345 Chamberlain, U City, MO

Mr. Tiers stated that recently there was a big snowstorm, and he could not have asked for better service in his area, which is near the high school on Jackson. He stated that he has been living in U City for forty years and does not think he has ever seen a better snow removal process. So, his compliments and thanks go out to the City and all the workers who made that happen.

Mayor Crow thanked Mr. Tiers for the compliment and stated that his comments might be the highlight of tonight's meeting.

I. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Councilmember Smotherson stated that the correct date of the big flood was July 26, 2022, which he vividly remembers because he woke up at 4:30 in the morning with sewage backing up in his basement.

J. PUBLIC HEARINGS

None

K. CONSENT AGENDA - (1 voice vote required)

1. Replacement Trash Transfer Trailer (Fleet)
2. Firehouse No. 2 Kitchen Repair/Replace
3. Contract with Monster Tree Service for the Annual Tree Trimming Project - PRF26-10-0019
4. Ratification - MGT - Budget Consultant; *(moved to City Manager's Report)*

Councilmember McMahon moved to approve Items 1, 2, and 3 of the Consent Agenda, it was seconded by Councilmember Fuller, and the motion carried unanimously.

L. CITY MANAGER'S REPORT – (Voice vote on each item as needed)

1. Ratification - MGT - Budget Consultant

Ms. Sharp stated that staff is recommending that Council ratify her actions to sign an agreement for a budget consultant. Shortly after Mr. Rose announced his retirement, the Director of Finance announced his resignation, which happens to be at the beginning of the City's budget season. She stated that after speaking with staff in the Finance Department, she quickly learned that they were not 100% equipped to assist her in preparing the budget. Therefore, since the City already had a Master Services Agreement with MGT for interim services, she reached out to them, and they were able to identify a candidate to act as an interim consultant. This individual is a retired City Manager who has also served as a Comptroller and Treasurer in areas with much larger budgets. The City's budget process is slated to begin on January 31st, so she signed the ratification based on the need for the consultant to gain access to the necessary documents so that she could get started immediately. Ms. Sharp stated that while she does not anticipate needing the full \$100,000 for this position since the consultant will be working approximately 20 hours a week, she made the request to ensure that they would have enough funding to cover her three months of service.

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

Councilmember Smotherson asked if Council could be provided with a breakdown of each department's budget request on an individual basis, rather than receiving the entire package all at once? Ms. Sharp stated that the Charter requires the City to submit its budget by a certain date, and since they are on such a tight schedule, she is not sure at this point whether they will be able to do that. So, she would like to give his request some thought and get back to him with an answer.

Voice vote on Councilmember Clay's motion carried unanimously.

2. City Manager Updates

City Manager Executive Search Update by Lee Szymborski

Mr. Szymborski stated that he has been with MGT and its predecessor, GovHR USA, for about twelve years, performing executive recruitment extensively in the St. Louis area and throughout the Midwest. Prior to that, he was a City Administrator and Deputy City Manager. So, what he thought he would do this evening is talk about the process and the calendar they have developed for recruitment and opportunities for input from the public.

Milestone Dates:

- **Stakeholder Meetings** - This afternoon, he conducted meetings with several members of Council, and tomorrow will be a full day of meetings with staff, the Mayor, and Council as a whole. These meetings are designed to help him gain an understanding of the community, the organization, the challenges, and opportunities everyone believes will be presented to the next City Manager. Tomorrow at 7 p.m., there will be a community forum at Heman Park. He stated there will also be another opportunity for people to weigh in on the best attributes you want us to look for through an online survey in a couple of weeks.
- **Online Survey** - By next week, there should be another opportunity for people to weigh in on the attributes they want MGT to look for, which will be available for two weeks.
- **Recruitment Profile** - Garnered from the stakeholders' input.
- **Position Announcements** - Next week, the recruitment process will kick off. Since this is a national search, this process will include a number of different formats and personal contacts with folks he knows in the field to give them a heads up about this opportunity.
- **Application and Resumes** - The deadline for submission will be the end of March.
- **Resume Portfolio** - In mid-May, he will meet with the Council to present a portfolio consisting of eight to twelve resumes for their consideration. It will be Council's job to narrow that group down to several applicants they would like to interview.
- **New City Manager** - The goal is to have your new City Manager retained by mid-July of this year.

Councilmember Clay thanked Mr. Sandel for his presentation and the very pleasant exchange they had earlier today. He stated that he and Councilmember Smotherson sent something out to the folks in their Ward informing them about the community engagement forum, and was curious to know what they should expect? Mr. Sandel stated that for the most part, it will be similar to the meetings he conducted today. But, what he will be looking for from a community perspective is what they see as some of the City's challenges and opportunities, both in the short-term and long-term, and then within that context, what they think would be the appropriate attributes in terms of hard skills and soft skills that the next City Manager should possess.

Q. Councilmember Fuller asked if the community engagement forum would be live-streamed?

A. No, it will not be livestreamed.

Mayor Crow posed the following questions to Mr. Sandel:

Q. How do you see the number of vacancies throughout the St. Louis area impacting this search?

A. *It's typical to see several vacancies in larger metropolitan areas, and in this case, he is aware of vacancies in Kirkwood, Webster Groves, and Crestwood, so he is not unfamiliar with these kinds of challenges. The opportunity is to make sure applicants are aware of the unique circumstances that U City presents versus what you know about the other communities. U City has a great story to tell, and Mr. Rose has been a great ambassador for his role as City Manager. So, that's what you really have to pitch because all of those things go far in terms of communicating to the world of city management and elsewhere, what a strong community and organization U City represents. Mr. Sandel stated that he's not saying this to comment on any of the communities with open positions, but in the greater world of things, some communities don't tell as great a story as he thinks U City has, and he can say that because he has been involved with U City for several years.*

Q. I presume that Ms. Sharp and her staff will receive enough information on your online survey to market it to our citizens, because if it's only going to be available for two weeks, we need to get that message out?

A. *I will mention the survey at the community forum. However, what I didn't explain is that the survey will also be available to your employees, and in order to have a clear breakdown of who is responding, participants will be asked to identify what constituency they are related to.*

3. Ruth Park Driving Range Proposal

Ms. Sharp stated staff is recommending that Council consider an engineering and design proposal from Horner Shifrin. David Lowell, Senior Project Manager for Navigate Building Systems, the City's representative assisting with this project, is here to provide an update and answer any questions.

Mr. Lowell stated that there has been some deterioration through erosion at the driving range portion of the golf course, and there have been some failed attempts to fix it. He stated that they obtained all of the old documents pertaining to this issue, provided them to all of the applicants, and are recommending the proposal from Horner Shifrin, which takes a holistic look at getting the range repaired and back in service.

Councilmember Clay stated that perhaps he's missing something, but he thought some of the things being focused on in this proposal were addressed in previous repairs? Ms. Sharp informed Councilmember Clay that while she would not say his statement was incorrect, the City was simply not provided with a thorough explanation of what occurred last year. She stated that there was a request for dirt to be relocated from the Market at Olive development to the driving range, which did happen, but unfortunately, there was no plan in place, and it made a bad situation even worse. Conversations about the stockpile of dirt resulted in the dirt being spread further than it should have been, and that created additional issues: erosion, and the disturbed area being increased beyond what had initially been submitted in the plan. So, this proposal will take a holistic look at everything and tell us not only what we need to get the range back open, but to keep it open.

Mayor Crow stated he believes that two of the challenges most folks will want to deface are Pershing Avenue and the Driving Range.

That said, and because of how long this has taken, he's certain that everyone would like to move forward with this project appropriately and with a little bit of well-paced speed. Councilmember Brenner moved to approve, it was seconded by Councilmember Clay, and the motion carried unanimously.

M. UNFINISHED BUSINESS - (Roll call vote required on 2nd and 3rd readings)

None

N. NEW BUSINESS

Resolutions - (Voice vote required)

None

Bills - (No vote required on introduction and 1st reading)

None

O. COUNCIL REPORTS/BUSINESS

1. Board and Commission appointments needed
2. Council liaison reports on Boards and Commissions
3. Boards, Commissions, and Task Force minutes
4. Other Discussions/Business

P. CITIZEN PARTICIPATION - (Continued if needed)

None

Q. COUNCIL COMMENTS

Mayor Crow stated that he hopes everyone will join them tomorrow night at the Community Center for Lee's presentation on the City Manager's search and Q & A with citizens.

Councilmember Fuller moved to adjourn the City Council meeting, it was seconded by Councilmember Tieman, and the motion carried unanimously.

R. ADJOURNMENT

Mayor Crow thanked everyone for their participation and adjourned the meeting at 6:58 p.m.

LaRette Reese
City Clerk, MRCC

**CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM**



NUMBER: <i>For City Clerk Use</i>	CM20260223-01
---	----------------------

SUBJECT/TITLE: City Manager General Updates			
PREPARED BY:		DEPARTMENT / WARD Administration - All	
AGENDA SECTION:	City Manager's Report	CAN ITEM BE RESCHEDULED?	
CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION OR RECOMMENDED MOTION:			
FISCAL IMPACT:			
AMOUNT:		ACCOUNT No.:	
FROM FUND:		TO FUND:	
EXPLANATION: General updates as provided by the City Manager.			

STAFF COMMENTS AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

CIP No.	
RELATED ITEMS / ATTACHMENTS:	

LIST CITY COUNCIL GOALS (5):			
RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED:	Interim City Manager, Brooke Sharp	MEETING DATE:	Feb 9, 2026

**CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM**



NUMBER: <i>For City Clerk Use</i>	CM20230223-02
---	----------------------

SUBJECT/TITLE:
Interfund Borrowing from General Fund to Solid Waste Fund in the amount of \$600,000.

PREPARED BY: Brooke A. Sharp	DEPARTMENT / WARD Finance / All
--	---

AGENDA SECTION: City Manager's Report	CAN ITEM BE RESCHEDULED? Yes
---	--

CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION OR RECOMMENDED MOTION:
City Manager recommends City Council approve the Interfund Borrowing from General Fund to Solid Waste Fund.

FISCAL IMPACT:
General Fund cash reduced by \$600,000, and Solid Waste Fund cash increases by \$600,000.

AMOUNT: \$600,000	ACCOUNT No.: 1001
-----------------------------	-----------------------------

FROM FUND: Gen Fund (01-1001)	TO FUND: SW (01-1001)
---	---------------------------------

EXPLANATION:
The Solid Waste Fund is experiencing cash flow challenges. Until a detail review of the cash challenges is performed, it has not been determined if this is a short-term or long-term challenge. With that said, it was deemed necessary to borrow the funds from the General Fund in order to make payroll while we assess the cash flow challenges.

STAFF COMMENTS AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:
Total amount to borrow is \$600,000. The term of the loan is as follows: Interest Rate - 1.25%; Years - 5 (60 months); Monthly Payment - \$10,263.29
The interfund activity can be categorized as reciprocal which includes interfund loans and interfund services. Interfund Loans often described as advances and are reported as an asset of the lending fund (receivable) and as a liability of the borrowing fund (payable).

CIP No.	
----------------	--

RELATED ITEMS / ATTACHMENTS:
1 - Amortization Schedule - Solid Waste Fund from General Fund

LIST CITY COUNCIL GOALS (S):
Prudent Fiscal Management

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED: Brooke A. Sharp, Interim City Manager	MEETING DATE: February 23, 2026
---	---

**City of University City
Solid Waste Fund from General Fund**

Loan Amount: \$600,000
Interest Rate: 1.25% annually
Monthly Payment: \$10,263.29
Final Payment Date: June 1, 2031

Pmt #	Payment Date	Payment	Interest	Principal	Balance
1	Jul 1, 2026	10,263.29	625.00	9,638.29	590,361.71
2	Aug 1, 2026	10,263.29	615.38	9,647.91	580,713.80
3	Sep 1, 2026	10,263.29	605.74	9,657.55	571,056.25
4	Oct 1, 2026	10,263.29	596.10	9,667.19	561,389.06
5	Nov 1, 2026	10,263.29	586.45	9,676.84	551,712.22
6	Dec 1, 2026	10,263.29	576.78	9,686.51	542,025.71
7	Jan 1, 2027	10,263.29	567.11	9,696.18	532,329.53
8	Feb 1, 2027	10,263.29	557.43	9,705.86	522,623.67
9	Mar 1, 2027	10,263.29	547.73	9,715.56	512,908.11
10	Apr 1, 2027	10,263.29	538.03	9,725.26	503,182.85
11	May 1, 2027	10,263.29	528.32	9,734.97	493,447.88
12	Jun 1, 2027	10,263.29	518.59	9,744.70	483,703.18
13	Jul 1, 2027	10,263.29	508.86	9,754.43	473,948.75
14	Aug 1, 2027	10,263.29	499.11	9,764.18	464,184.57
15	Sep 1, 2027	10,263.29	489.36	9,773.93	454,410.64
16	Oct 1, 2027	10,263.29	479.59	9,783.70	444,626.94
17	Nov 1, 2027	10,263.29	469.82	9,793.47	434,833.47

Pmt #	Payment Date	Payment	Interest	Principal	Balance
18	Dec 1, 2027	10,263.29	460.03	9,803.26	425,030.21
19	Jan 1, 2028	10,263.29	450.23	9,813.06	415,217.15
20	Feb 1, 2028	10,263.29	440.43	9,822.86	405,394.29
21	Mar 1, 2028	10,263.29	430.61	9,832.68	395,561.61
22	Apr 1, 2028	10,263.29	420.79	9,842.50	385,719.11
23	May 1, 2028	10,263.29	410.95	9,852.34	375,866.77
24	Jun 1, 2028	10,263.29	401.11	9,862.18	366,004.59
25	Jul 1, 2028	10,263.29	391.25	9,872.04	356,132.55
26	Aug 1, 2028	10,263.29	381.39	9,881.90	346,250.65
27	Sep 1, 2028	10,263.29	371.51	9,891.78	336,358.87
28	Oct 1, 2028	10,263.29	361.62	9,901.67	326,457.20
29	Nov 1, 2028	10,263.29	351.73	9,911.56	316,545.64
30	Dec 1, 2028	10,263.29	341.82	9,921.47	306,624.17
31	Jan 1, 2029	10,263.29	331.91	9,931.38	296,692.79
32	Feb 1, 2029	10,263.29	321.98	9,941.31	286,751.48
33	Mar 1, 2029	10,263.29	312.05	9,951.24	276,800.24
34	Apr 1, 2029	10,263.29	302.10	9,961.19	266,839.05
35	May 1, 2029	10,263.29	292.15	9,971.14	256,867.91
36	Jun 1, 2029	10,263.29	282.18	9,981.11	246,886.80
37	Jul 1, 2029	10,263.29	272.21	9,991.08	236,895.72
38	Aug 1, 2029	10,263.29	262.22	10,001.07	226,894.65
39	Sep 1, 2029	10,263.29	252.23	10,011.06	216,883.59

Pmt #	Payment Date	Payment	Interest	Principal	Balance
40	Oct 1, 2029	10,263.29	242.22	10,021.07	206,862.52
41	Nov 1, 2029	10,263.29	232.21	10,031.08	196,831.44
42	Dec 1, 2029	10,263.29	222.18	10,041.11	186,790.33
43	Jan 1, 2030	10,263.29	212.15	10,051.14	176,739.19
44	Feb 1, 2030	10,263.29	202.10	10,061.19	166,678.00
45	Mar 1, 2030	10,263.29	192.05	10,071.24	156,606.76
46	Apr 1, 2030	10,263.29	181.98	10,081.31	146,525.45
47	May 1, 2030	10,263.29	171.91	10,091.38	136,434.07
48	Jun 1, 2030	10,263.29	161.82	10,101.47	126,332.60
49	Jul 1, 2030	10,263.29	151.72	10,111.57	116,221.03
50	Aug 1, 2030	10,263.29	141.61	10,121.68	106,099.35
51	Sep 1, 2030	10,263.29	131.49	10,131.80	95,967.55
52	Oct 1, 2030	10,263.29	121.36	10,141.93	85,825.62
53	Nov 1, 2030	10,263.29	111.22	10,152.07	75,673.55
54	Dec 1, 2030	10,263.29	101.07	10,162.22	65,511.33
55	Jan 1, 2031	10,263.29	90.90	10,172.39	55,338.94
56	Feb 1, 2031	10,263.29	80.73	10,182.56	45,156.38
57	Mar 1, 2031	10,263.29	70.55	10,192.74	34,963.64
58	Apr 1, 2031	10,263.29	60.35	10,202.94	24,760.70
59	May 1, 2031	10,263.29	50.15	10,213.14	14,547.56
60	Jun 1, 2031	10,263.29	15.73	10,247.56	0.00

**CITY OF UNIVERSITY CITY COUNCIL MEETING
AGENDA ITEM**



NUMBER: <i>For City Clerk Use</i>	NB20260223-01
---	----------------------

SUBJECT/TITLE:
A RESOLUTION IN RECOGNITION OF THE INDISPENSIBLE ROLE OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT IN THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

PREPARED BY: Councilmember John Tieman	DEPARTMENT / WARD: Legislation
--	--

AGENDA SECTION: New Business - Res 2026-01	CAN ITEM BE RESCHEDULED? no
--	---------------------------------------

CITY MANAGER'S RECOMMENDATION OR RECOMMENDED MOTION:
Resolution 2026-01 is requested by Councilmember John Tieman and seconded by Councilmember Dennis Fuller

FISCAL IMPACT:

AMOUNT:		ACCOUNT No.:	
----------------	--	---------------------	--

FROM FUND:		TO FUND:	
-------------------	--	-----------------	--

EXPLANATION:
General updates as provided by the City Manager.

STAFF COMMENTS AND BACKGROUND INFORMATION:

CIP No.	
----------------	--

RELATED ITEMS / ATTACHMENTS:
Resolution 2026-01

LIST CITY COUNCIL GOALS (5):

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED: LaRette Reese on Councils Behalf	MEETING DATE: 2/23/2026
--	-----------------------------------

RESOLUTION NO. 2026 – 01

A IN RECOGNITION OF THE INDISPENSIBLE ROLE OF MUNICIPAL GOVERNMENT IN THE DEMOCRATIC REPUBLIC

WHEREAS, the City Of University City, Missouri, has delivered to its citizens 120 years of stable and effective governance; and

WHEREAS, municipal governments are the closest and most intimately connected form of government to the people, and are uniquely positioned to enact policies, direct resources, and provide services that reflect the lived realities, priorities, and values of their residents – not those imposed by distant state or federal offices; and

WHEREAS, the preservation of local control and the protection of our 250-year-old federalist structure – a structure designed intentionally to prevent the concentration of power and to safeguard democracy at the municipal level – remains essential to the duties of this city; and

WHEREAS, recent federal and state actions, including new laws, administrative directives, and unprecedented reductions or cancellations of funding, have stripped local governments of the authority and resources necessary to do the job voters elected them to do; and

WHEREAS, self-governance is explicitly recognized in the Declaration of Independence as essential to “government of the people, by the people, and for the people”; and

WHEREAS, our representative democracy functions best when elected officials at all levels work together, and not when higher levels of government impose unilateral restrictions, shift burdens downward, or substitute political ideology for community-driven decision-making; and

WHEREAS, the recent actions of state and federal leaders will directly obstruct the City Of University City from effectively serving its residents in the following ways:

A) Infrastructure, Housing, and Public Safety: The City relies on federal and state grants to maintain infrastructure, support law enforcement, and expand affordable housing. The curtailment and cancellation of grants – including provisions of the Inflation Reduction Act – diminishes the ability to repair roads and public buildings, support emergency services, reduce utility costs, and combat rising housing insecurity.

B) Economic Stability and Sales Tax Revenue: Sales taxes constitute over a quarter of the City’s annual operating budget. Recent federal tariffs and rapid inflation have undermined household purchasing power, discouraged consumer spending, and negatively impacted University City's local businesses and commercial districts. These policies directly threaten our ability to fund core municipal services, maintain vibrant business corridors, and support economic development.

C) Support for Vulnerable Residents: Cuts to social services and earned benefits reverberate across every demographic group, especially those already struggling. As state and federal governments withdraw support, municipalities like University City are forced to fill the void, stretching local resources thin while responding to needs that higher levels of government once recognized as their responsibility.

D) Threats to Women’s Rights: University City is home to women of all backgrounds, ages and identities. Attacks on reproductive autonomy and civil rights restrict the individual's ability to participate fully and equally in social and economic life. It harms families, impedes workforce participation, and weakens our community’s long-term economic outlook.

E) Impacts on Children: The health, education, and nourishment of our children are fundamental. Cuts to state and federal agencies, public servants, and funding jeopardize education, threaten civil rights, and increase food insecurity.

F) Protection of Our Public Library: To quote John Quincy Adams, “To furnish the means of acquiring knowledge is ... the greatest benefit that can be conferred ...”. The University City Public Library stands as one guardian of our community, for it guards free expression, diversity and inclusion by giving our citizens access to knowledge. State and federal funding cuts – alongside ideological attacks on public libraries nationwide – undermine the democratic republic and threaten the very existence of America’s library system.

G) Disaster Preparedness, Emergency Response, and Community Resilience: The elimination of federal disaster-mitigation programs – such as Building Resilient Infrastructure And Communities – combined with reductions to the federal disaster-response workforce and increased unfunded mandates on municipalities, will leave communities like University City less resilient, slower to recover, and more financially exposed during future disasters.

H) Homophobia: Homophobia, in all its forms, undermines the dignity, safety, and well-being of individuals and communities. Discrimination based on sexual orientation or gender identity is incompatible with the principles of equality, human rights, and social justice. University City fosters an environment of respect, understanding, and inclusion that strengthens the social fabric and benefits all members of society. This city condemns all acts, expressions, and policies that perpetuate homophobia or discrimination against LGBTQ+ individuals. The City affirms the right of every person to live free from fear, prejudice, and violence, regardless of sexual orientation or gender identity.

I) Anti-Semitism: University City is approximately 21% Jewish. Much of our city is in an eruv. Recent years have seen a shocking rise in anti-Semitic rhetoric, vandalism, harassment, and violence. Such acts undermine equality, religious freedom, and mutual respect. The City Of University City condemns all forms of anti-Semitism as being antithetical to the values of the pluralism necessary for the functioning of this democratic republic.

J) Racism: About 45% of our citizens are people of color. Racism causes harm to individuals, families, and communities. Such harm can be measured. It contributes to disparities in health, education, housing, employment, and justice. It undermines entire populations. This City has recognized, in the past few years, a sharp increase in racism in our country. We further recognize that addressing this racism requires sustained action across all sectors of society, including policy reform, education, and community engagement.

K) Climate: Climate change denial, at the federal level, endangers our health and the environment. It ends the federal government’s legal authority to control the pollution that is heating the planet. Because it fails to take action, protection against climate loss becomes the ethical responsibility of local and regional governments that may, or most likely may not, have the means to adequately deal with this problem.

L) Immigrants: Slightly more than one in ten of our neighbors in University City are foreign-born. About 6.6% identify as Asian, and 3.9% identify as Hispanic. Roughly 12.3% of our residents, aged 5 years and older, speak a language other than English at home. Immigration policies based on white supremacy and discrimination have tarnished our nation. There are numerous practical consequences to such racism. For the moment, however, let us simply consider this. The violent, disproportionate, and near-military use of force against these vulnerable populations violates the most elemental of humane values.

WHEREAS, these actions collectively represent an erosion of federalism, a weakening of democratic norms, and the intentional shift of burdens and unfunded mandates onto local governments, the above-mentioned actions undermine the vibrancy, resilience, and safety of this community while ignoring the will of the people that this Council is sworn to serve; and

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

That the City Council of the City Of University City, Missouri, calls upon the Missouri General Assembly, the Governor of Missouri, the United States Congress, and the President Of The United States to cease actions that undermine municipalities; restore funding and authorities critical to local governance; and respect the constitutional balance that has made American local government one of the most effective democratic institutions in world history.

PASSED and ADOPTED this 23rd day of February, 2026.

MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK