

**CITY OF BRENTWOOD, MISSOURI  
BOARD OF ALDERMAN SPECIAL MEETING  
JUNE 11, 2012**

**MEETING CALLED TO ORDER**

Mayor Pat Kelly called the special meeting to order at 6:04pm, in the Brentwood Recreation Center Room #104 located at 2505 S. Brentwood Blvd., Brentwood, MO 63144, and immediately led the Pledge of Allegiance.

**Roll Call**

Deputy Clerk Pittman performed roll:

Alderman Saunders	Present	Alderman Robertson	Present
Alderman Manestar	Present	Alderman Wynn	Present
Alderman Leahy	Present	Alderman Harper	Present
Alderman Toohey	Absent	Mayor Kelly	Present
Alderman Kramer	Present		

Members present constituted a quorum. Also present were City Clerk/Administrator Bola Akande, City Attorney Frank Albrecht, City Treasurer Gregory Reynders and Deputy City Clerk Octavia Pittman.

**CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**

As requested, Alderman Kramer made a motion to amend the agenda, moving the Excise Commissioner's report to Item #3B. Motion seconded by Alderman Leahy. Unanimous vote in favor taken; **MOTION PASSED.**

Alderman Leahy made a motion to approve the **Board of Alderman Special Meeting Agenda June 11, 2012**, as amended. Motion seconded by Alderman Wynn. Unanimous vote in favor taken; **MOTION PASSED.**

**Excise Commissioner Report**

Commissioner Clements reported the request for temporary licenses to participate in Brentwood Days September 14<sup>th</sup> and 15<sup>th</sup>. He also announced the annual liquor license renewals. Unfortunately 2 applicants did not renew this year; Sports Attic is no longer open due to fire and Applegate's chose not to renew

Alderman Leahy made a motion to approve **Temporary Liquor Licenses** for **Emily Seitz (Brentwood Optimist Club) – 2443 Cecelia Ave** and **American Legion Goff Moll Post 101 (2721 Collier)**. Motion seconded by Alderman Robertson. **ROLL CALL:** Alderman Saunders – yes; Alderman Manestar – yes; Alderman Leahy – yes; Alderman Toohey – absent; Alderman Kramer – yes; Alderman Robertson – yes; Alderman Wynn – yes; Alderman Harper – yes; **MOTION PASSED.**

Alderman Saunders made a motion to approve **Liquor License Renewals for American Legion Goff Moll Post, Arch Energy (Mobile), Bommarito Wines, Buffalo Wild Wings Grill & Bar, Cost Plus World Market, Dierbergs, Double D Lounge, Frank Papa's Ristorante, Houlihan's, Hunan Wok Restaurant, Ionia Atlantic Imports, Mai Lee Restaurant, OB Clark's, Romano's Macaroni Grill, Schnucks,**

**Sideline Bar & Grill, Springhill Suites, Target Store (T-1102), Trader Joes (692), Twin Oak Wood Fire Fare, Walgreens (6432), Whole Foods Market.** Motion seconded by Alderman Leahy. **ROLL CALL:** Alderwoman Saunders – yes; Alderwoman Manestar – yes; Alderman Leahy – yes; Alderman Toohey – absent; Alderman Kramer – yes; Alderman Robertson – yes; Alderman Wynn – yes; Alderman Harper – yes; **MOTION PASSED.**

### **DISCUSSION OF COMMUNITY CENTER**

Mayor Kelly stated as a follow up from the last meeting and for the public that's attending, it was brought to the last meeting the discussion on the future of the facility. We've been working on this plan for 4-5 years and it's important to make the final decision on how to move forward with this facility. In order to do so, the decision needs to be made at this level to proceed; we seem to keep going in circles at the committee level. The basic question is do we want to keep the ice rink as a part of our facility as we move forward, a lot of the other discussion and planning would be built around or without the ice rink. One thing we have been hearing back and forth is the cost of the rink in general and the benefits. As requested, a report was distributed that outlined that the rink generated approximately \$76,000 in 2011 after revenues and expenses; the overall parks department which includes all maintenance, fields, and playgrounds, is subsidized by the City at about \$600,000 per year and the majority of that revenue comes from the parks and storm water sales tax that generated \$2.1 million last year.

Alderman Robertson forwarded for discussion and requested that it be entered into the record, minutes from the 5/2/11 Public Works Committee and recommendation to the full board to keep the ice rink and to move forward with a community center which would serve more of the citizens of the City of Brentwood. (They will be attached to the minutes).

Alderman Leahy stated I would like to request that other minutes are included as well: 7/13/11, 12/14/11, 1/11/12, these minutes recommend that the City not take action on the May minutes and to consider hiring a consultant to evaluate which steps to take. In the January minutes, I raised the issue that if we are going to address this building, that we have 2 buildings that needed to be studied and that's when everything stopped. We are now here in June and I think the City needs to evaluate the 2 buildings. My suggestion to the board is to consider moving everyone out of city hall, remodeling city hall to give us the best performance we can get from it, move back into city hall and then sell the parks facility if it can be sold as is with the skating rink as a viable commutative entity, more power to the city for working in that direction. I do not see that if we use the numbers from the May 2011 committee meetings minutes, you are looking at a \$9 million bond issue. Based on the fire fighters remodeling that we did 2 different RFPs on, you're looking at somewhere between \$3 mill; if you pick the new firefighters building as the base line you are at \$4.2. Let's assume that you tear down and remodel city hall you're at \$5 mill. Now we're spending \$14 mill and we still have street bond issues coming at us. I don't know that the City of Brentwood has all the money in the world and I think that the City needs to physically look at what it can financially afford.

Mayor Kelly stated that's why we need to decide if we should keep the ice rink or not and move forward.

Alderman Leahy stated I'd like it to be done in a full picture, not just as an isolated action.

Mayor Kelly stated, again, I think my concern is we can't all seem to get on the same page. Once we start to put some building blocks together and make some decisions on what we want to do and then we can move on. If we decide to keep the ice rink then we can move on to how we renovate the rest of the facility, do we update the meeting room, do add workout facility, consider cost for maintenance; then we decide if we want to do an addition and so forth. The facility isn't getting any newer, there is still maintenance that's needed; if we do it in a piece by piece process then we should get through it and be able to present something to the voters.

Alderwoman Saunders – it seems to me that there's a disconnect in the process, I say that because when you started the process we went and got public input. We have a draft but I don't know that we received a final report; from the draft the public input says swimming pool, workout facility not ice rink. I stated even when I was campaigning that then reality sets in and we have to ask if we can really afford these things. The disconnect is that this survey finished up in 2008 and then it stopped, perhaps due to the economy but then in 2011 it was picked back up in the direction that we are going with the ice rink and there was not transition from what the public said they wanted, pool and workout facility, to we are going with the ice skating rink. I feel that an integral part would be to take this information and go back to the residents because a lot of the residents remember filling out their survey and then they just remember it dropping and never getting any feedback. I see the interim step and I know it's a delay and not something we like but it's spoken to in this \$60,000 study that we paid for that we need to go back to the residents and say here are the scenarios with costs and numbers and if we go this route what user fees and taxes are involved and tell the public we are thinking along this line and bring the public on board. Have the public weigh in. I was a proponent of keeping the ice rink but we need to know the costs. the draft the public input says workout facility not ice rink. The disconnect is that this finished up in 2008 and then it stopped, perhaps due to the economy but then in 2011 it picked back up in the direction that we are going with the ice rink and there was no transition from what the public said they wanted to we are going to the ice skating rink. I feel that an integral part would be to take it back to the public and go back because residents remember filling out the survey in 2008 and then its just dropped; I know it's a delay and not something that we would like but its spoken to in the \$60,000 study that we paid for to bring the public on board.

Mayor Kelly reiterated that it was talked about at the commit level and was there were a number of discussions. It did ask questions to the public of if you want swimming or a workout facility but it didn't ask do you know you already have access to that which is a huge question because we have an agreement with Richmond Heights. Over the last few years I heard people say they would like us to keep the ice rink; its important to put a plan together and present it to the voter to get going in the right direction. The mayor stated surveys can be slanted. Alderwoman Saunders agreed with the comment that surveys may be slanted and this survey was dream big and we didn't give costs but you learn from that and then give a measured response. You are

~~asking the public for input and then you are not using it. The survey doesn't have to be complicated and the information would be helpful in marketing the bond issue. Alderwoman Saunders agreed that the comments may be slanted but you learn from that. You are asking for public input but not using it. The survey doesn't have to be that complicated but would also serve helpful for the bond issue.~~

Alderman Robertson commented that the survey was presented by professionals and because of the consideration of cost, capitol and operational, it was decided that the swimming facility was not feasible and that's why they came up with the decision to keep the ice rink. After questions of a final report and financial analysis, Mayor Kelly stated there was a final report but even after that an engineer was hired and they did an analysis of what the projected cost would be and that's when it was determined that a community of our size could not support a swimming pool on it's own. If built out the total was about \$19 mill, and the membership fee would be over \$50 per family. Ultimately, we would almost have 2 bond issues to present to the voters; that's the ultimate survey when voters vote to support or not support a bond issue. One would be to upgrade this facility with the things that are required to be done (new roof, fire suppression, update meeting rooms and ice rink) and the other of there being an addition on the building. They would then have the choice on how they want us to proceed on the building; the longer we wait the more expensive it's getting.

Alderman Kramer stated that the topic goes back; in 2005 we had the initial discussion of the focus groups and discussions of the comprehensive plan, in 2002 was the needs assessment study by the parks department to get a feel of what the residents used, why and how often they used it and what they would like to have. At that time there was no cost to give it was just a sampling of the idea. 2005 and 2006 was the first opportunity we got to speak with the residents to find out what they wanted. It seemed overwhelmingly that the residents wanted to have a sense of place, they wanted to have a Brentwood Town Center, or a place where they can gather and the current facility is not conducive to that; it's a very old building that's becoming a financial hardship, has never been qualified as an emergency shelter. I think the topic that came to the April 19, 2011 Public Works Committee meeting that was voted on and passed was the advance for the aldermanic approval and the \$9 mill plan that contained keeping the ice rink and the existing building which was to extend and square off to the east in front of the ice rink entrance making a larger foot print and taking advantage of the additional parking on each side and making arrangements with nearby commercial agency; it was the most cost effective way with the smallest bond request giving us a lot of what we wanted including workout and multipurpose rooms but excluding a swimming pool. What many should understand is that we have a balance to make as both a delegate and trustee. We have to look at the results of the survey and interpret them. I had some reservations about the ice rink in the past but if there's a way to have it as the plan stipulates that was voted on in 2011 with the workout facility and all other upgrades including those required for shelter purposes, I'm in favor of that. But if it's just the ice rink all by itself with nothing attached to it then I think discussion as Alderwoman Saunders could very well be remote. But I am in favor of the cohesive project that was voted on but never really advance to the aldermanic level because as we all discussed at that time the votes from the public because of the economy and the bond amount, where probably not going to give us any direction. I think that has changed, the stock market is now over 12,000, we haven't exactly seen a robust inflation of our property values, I hope that's going to

happen within the next decade. In the meantime I think a lot of folks are anxious for us to have that sense of place. Alderwoman Saunders stated her agreement with a lot of those thoughts but she didn't see were the City responded within that time frame back to the public. The residents that she has talked to that said they remember taking the survey but they remember it just being dropped and nothing happened. She spoke with her husband who was previously on the committee which is why she believed she was put on the committee to benefit from some of his perspective and he also believed that the project just died. But we have some public here and we have some public input to see if maybe I'm wrong on that perception. Alderman Kramer added that we originally had the recreation center study committee that had a mission statement going back to 2007 and that took into account the needs assessment study and the items in the comprehensive plan which wasn't really adopted until 2006. From that point it was advanced to the ways and means committee and they studied it for a good period of time. We got past what we thought were the fiscal issues and went over to the public works committee; they studied if for a period of time. There were times that the agenda was made known at the aldermanic level that the meetings were coming up, there was some public attendance and there was some public comment taken into consideration. But in my opinion, everything did stop at the end of 2011 when the economy said if you guys want a bond issue for the perfect amount and the perfect place it's still not going to pass because we go bigger things to worry about; now is the time to advance this discussion.

Alderwoman Manestar stated she remembers taking the survey and because there was no cost included she had the idea of the height in mind. Some of the survey said if we had this facility would you use it and I thought, sure, I would rather pay to use it in Brentwood instead of Richmond Heights. But I think knowing the cost and knowing the cost to use a facility like that in Brentwood would be much greater than using a facility we have available to use in Richmond Heights might change things; I like what I pay to use the Heights and to use the pool. Do we have the population to support such a facility? Mayor Kelly added another thing that was in the survey and it important to note is that we have about 1100 memberships from Brentwood that are members of the Heights. In the financial analysis moving forward the assumption was made that all of those members would come over to this facility. But keep in mind, those rates for a family that are currently \$27per month would double. If I were Richmond Heights and I had the potential to lose that many members, the first thing I would do is offer a discounted rate; then our facility would be that less viable. I think on the big picture, communities have to look at ways to share these facilities because we can't all support our own. I think it would be unconscionable for Brentwood to try to build a facility to try to compete with the Heights; not only would it be a money pit for us, it would also hurt their facility and cost their residents at the same time.

Alderman Robertson stated this is a compromise, there was a lot of hard work and analysis. The work out facility is the cheapest part; that combines with the town center as mentioned by Alderman Kramer. These meeting rooms are not income producers and are not all that popular I don't believe as a favorite function; in combination with the ice rink which is a favorite use and three, we got it right now, we decided it would be best to recommend to the voters to decide for themselves. Everybody who votes in the City of Brentwood would get the chance to decide whether our plan is good or not; whether to spend approximately \$7mill to bring this building up to code and fix it and keep what you have right know exactly as it is. Or to spend

\$9 mill and expand the facility so we have the gym purpose, the multifunction, the workout, and really improve the town center feel and tie in the buildings appearance; making the building noticeable from the street. I think we can guide our direction at this point to let the people decide. For a long time I think I was that said we can not have this ice rink, we are not going to use it, its not going to pay for itself but with the information we were able to develop and with the help of the professional consultants we hired to look at the building and the property, they came up with a plan that allowed us to fit all these uses together and to really utilize our own property with the best value for the City. I strongly propose that we stay with our May 2<sup>nd</sup> Public Works Committee recommendation to go forward.

Alderman Leahy stated, we just had the nice Friends of the Park presentation in March/April of this year. In slide #13 of the 31 slides in the presentation, per the parks department of the City of Brentwood, 16% of Brentwood residents use the skating rink. In May 2, 2011, the Public Works Committee recommendation; in that committee we wrestled very hard with the \$7 mill proposal that the consultant in front of us had presented, it was decided that those \$7 mill was underestimated. With the help of the Committee Chairman, Mr. Kurtz and the Parks Director, the numbers were massaged to get us to the \$9 mill bond issue. I raised the issue that in pressing the bond issue we had no operating cost and we were duplicating facilities that we already had and what were we going to do with the Richmond Heights facility agreement. The Public Works Committee of December 14<sup>th</sup>, City Administrator Akande stated that Alderman Robertson, chairman of the committee had asked the staff to invite Bond and Wolfe Architects to find out what will be the approximate cost and whether they would be able to assist the City. Mr. Wolfe went over the outline presented as an attachment page. Following the presentation Alderman Robertson made the motion to staff to develop a scope of work of service for the renovation and expansion of the Brentwood Community Center. That was motioned by Mr. Robertson, seconded by Mr. Wynn, roll call was 2 yes, Alderman Leahy voted no, the scope of services will presented to the Board of Aldermen at the February 6<sup>th</sup> meeting to work with. The scope that was pushed out and worked hard on for January 11<sup>th</sup>, it's a 2 page document to establish the breakdown of cost and everything because we found out that in our May minutes we were working on numbers that maybe we were being more conservative but still not being more cost justified. So going back to May I think is a mistake. You've got to look up the proposal to hire services to have this thing done right that the committee wanted to push forward but seemed to be overlooked and you're using a cost that you have not established what your bond cost would be to the residents as to the cost on property taxes. The committee did not address what the membership fee, if any, would be if both the citizens of Brentwood and/or the other 2 communities that are involved. We did not resolve what we would do with the Richmond Heights agreement as it stood. There was a suggestion about looking at seismic which was not in our numbers. So, I'm sorry, as I've got my history here we are still piece meal and not in a good arrangement and I think it's premature for the board to throw something on a bond issue for the voters to vote on if we cant honestly explain what's in front of them. Mayor Kelly added, and that's why I'd like to have a motion of whether we should keep the ice rink or not so we can start putting a plan together. Every time we try to get someplace we end up in circle. I can tell you when we did talk about it with Bond and Wolfe, he had great reservations with the information he was given he felt like they didn't have enough information to put a plan together for the City. They needed more guidance on what direction we wanted to go

because there was still questions of do we want a work out facility, do we want to have a gymnasium, there was just too many questions. I will go back to my question of the last Board of Aldermen meeting, do we want to keep the ice rink; from there we can move forward and try to build on that on what direction we want to go and put a plan together for our residents. I do appreciation what Alderwoman Saunders is saying but at some point we have to take the information we got, we have to take the comments that the residents have given us, put a plan together and let them vote.

Alderwoman Saunders asked if it was possible to hear from the public, that will help her, as a new Alderwoman, with the disconnect. She is also disappointed in the fact that we have not had a Public Works meeting since joined the board where we can hash out some of these details. Our first Public Works meeting is Wednesday of this week; I feel like if we had one earlier in the month I could have done a quick survey. I understand what you are saying that yes/no is the ultimate survey, but what if there is one piece missing and someone really campaigns negatively against it. If its so final yes or no, it is what it is, if we got a little feed back between what happened 2008 and now, we could really hone in on what want and we are only talking a month or two more. I'm having trouble understanding it. If I we go out and do the bond issue and people aren't certain how many treadmills and where they are going, that could kill it. In good faith I would have to say if you brought that to a resident then you probably don't want to vote for this because we don't know for sure if we are going to get that and I think that additional information would be helpful. But I would like to here from some residents.

Mayor Kelly responded his hope to here from residents under public comment; but this portion was set aside for the board to discuss.

Alderman Kramer asked, since we do have some newly elected officials one of which is absent tonight, if it would be agreeable to take it back to the Public Works Committee and if nothing else, reopening and making available all of the data that was collected and discussing how we arrived at the motion that was made, while also entertaining Mayor's topic as well; then coming back to the board with the discussion that we all newly agree upon. Mayor Kelly replied that's fine. I just want to be very open that we are not just going to let this issue die. I think I'll schedule the next meeting at 6pm and we can have this open discussion again as part of our meeting; but have a time limit on it so we can try to put a plan together.

Alderman Robertson pointed out the Alderman Leahy was not correct; the cost analysis does take into account a very hefty amount of money for seismic upgrades and earthquake protection. Another thing mentioned is the rec center in Richmond Heights. If they are considering expanding, it proves my point that they are oversubscribed. I've been there many times and it's impossible to get a machine going. If they are expanding I think its possible to get some of our people back. If we are going to speck \$7 mill, why not spend \$9 mill and get some functions that we would have for ourselves that are too busy. Mayor Kelly agreed that sometimes the facility is busy but some were built like that; if you're not busy at 5pm then you over built. To the percentages of people that use the ice rink, things tend to go in cycles, what was useful for some then may be different for others now. And considering that, you would also then have to ask, what percentage of our residents use the baseball

fields or one of the 8-9 playgrounds. I am open to taking it to Public Works to talk about it but I will also plan on have the discussion at our next meeting as well.

Alderman Kramer made a motion to have a special public works meeting ahead of the next aldermanic meeting specifically to address this topic; the agenda could also include the fashioning of the survey deemed necessary. Motion seconded by Alderman Robertson. **ROLL CALL:** Alderwoman Saunders – yes; Alderwoman Manestar – yes; Alderman Leahy – yes; Alderman Toohey – absent; Alderman Kramer – yes; Alderman Robertson – yes; Alderman Wynn – yes; Alderman Harper – yes; **MOTION PASSED.**

Mayor Kelly requested a 5 minute recess at 6:55pm before convening the remainder of the meeting; the meeting reconvened at 7:03pm

### **CONSIDERATION AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Alderwoman Saunders requested to include her statements on page 5 of if all of the firefighters now have their suits and on page 3 where Alderman Toohey offered comments of the Swap Agreement and the fixed rate and Mayor Kelly replied that we have a variable rate. Alderman Kramer made a motion to approve the **Board of Aldermen Regular Meeting Minutes May 21, 2012B**, as amended. Motion seconded by Alderwoman Saunders. **ROLL CALL:** Alderwoman Saunders – yes; Alderwoman Manestar – yes; Alderman Leahy – yes; Alderman Toohey – absent; Alderman Kramer – yes; Alderman Robertson – yes; Alderman Wynn – yes; Alderman Harper – yes; **MOTION PASSED.**

### **PRESENTATION/RECOGNITION**

Fire Chief Jury introduced the 2 newest Fire Fighters; Dan Schafer and Marcus Herman. Dan Schafer was previously a volunteer in Afton and has spent 8 years in the Marine Corp. Marcus Herman was previously with the City of Olivette. Both were welcomed to the City of Brentwood.

### **PUBLIC HEARING**

#### **A Petition To Grant A Conditional Use Permit For A Pet Care Facility At 2615 Hanley Road (7:07pm)**

Director Rottjakob announced Jeremy King, owner of The Watering Bowl, a pet care facility in South County and his interest to expand to an additional location at 2615 N. Hanley Road.

The site is .41 acres in the Light Industrial District and pursuant to the last adopted text amendment, a pet care facility is allowed with an outdoor play area as long as it is 300 feet from the adjacent property; this does meet these conditions but is a conditional use. It has been reviewed by the Planning & Zoning Commission in which they have recommended approval of the pet care facility with an outdoor play area including a stipulation that it will be fenced by a white vinyl fence.

There were no comments from the public. Alderman Leahy addressed Mr. King, questioning what type of maintenance will be used to alleviate the urine smell that will accumulate on the artificial turf. Mr. King replied that he will used a chemical called the Terminator which is sold by a company call Buck Eyed in Maryland Heights; some information was provided to Planning and Zoning. It is specifically intended for pet

care, is biodegradable, and used nightly; staff also immediately cleans behind pets with a similar chemical each time they go to the bathroom. After additional questions, he also responded that someone will be at the facility 24/7 but the dogs will not be out at night. He also stated during the day they are allowed to run free but will be kept in individual kennels at night. Alderwoman Saunders questioned how the hearing was advertised and Director Rottjakob replied that notices were mailed to all property owners and residents within 300 feet of the property prior to starting the Planning and Zoning process and all the meeting dates are given at that time; the public hearing notice is then scheduled in the St. Louis Countian. Alderman Kramer verified that the location is near the intersection of Manchester and Hanley and there are currently some sensitive hearing issues in that vicinity; how will the noise from the dogs enjoying themselves be address. Mr. King replied that the dogs are supervised at all times; they are let out in groups of maximum 15 and those with excessive barking are required to go back inside. There were no further comments from the Board.

The public hearing closed at 7:12pm.

### **BIDS**

None

### **HEARING OF ANY MATTER OF PUBLIC INTEREST UPON REQUEST OF ANY PERSON PRESENT**

**Jim Pozzo, 2211 St. Clair**, stated his surprise and shock that the Board of Alderman are entitled to receive insurance benefits; he doesn't think its right as they are not employees you are elected to volunteer your time. He stated he does not understand how receiving the benefit improves the service to the citizens; he relates it to the issue the firemen had in receiving something they thought was approved but no one knew. He remembered the increase in compensation but this was not included.

**Patricia Nations 98 Yorkshire Ln**, added that she received a letter that referenced Mayor Kelly stating the City has the money and that there were no issues from the residents. She questioned if it was budgeted in a place where it was authorized to be done without the citizens knowledge, but it it's not, it's something where the City might have the money but from the taxpayer's standpoint, its our money as well. She complained that there is a big discrepancy with municipalities and the difference in their salaries; she thought it was something worth looking into.

**Tom Martin** supported the last 2 speakers. He is shocked that the Mayor and Board are receiving benefits. He feels it was kept secret and has taken the recently elected officials to bring it to light. He questioned if the Board's salary was included in the budget adopted. He assumed the answer is no, it wouldn't be a secret if they had been properly authorized by ordinance or resolution; if not, why not. He asked for an explanation of why the Mayor and Board sees fit to pay themselves, who's to say they won't double their salary and expenses next month. On top of other recent financial issues and scandals that have hit the City, he thinks the Mayor has a lot of explaining to do.

**William Nolen, 75 York Dr**, commented that he was tipped off when he learned of the salary of the Superintendent of the Brentwood School District; \$240,000-250,000. He found that to be overwhelming considering there are only a little over 800 kids in the district. He stated his thought of there being a transparency issue and little of a PR issue. He thinks the board should pass a bill that residents should know well in advance of any expense that will cost the taxpayers in excess of \$10,000; also allowing citizens an opportunity to offer comment of the proposal. This proposal should provide a clear delineation of all of the officials of the City of Brentwood, including the Superintendent's salary. Mayor Kelly clarified that this Board has no authority over the Superintendent's salary; that would be the School Board. He reiterated that Taxpayers should be informed in advance of future proposals.

**Melanie Hancock, 2627 Lewis**, questioned which Board members have jobs in which offer benefits and which members are taking advantage of those benefits and which members are taking advantage of benefits through the city. She also questioned how it can be justified that the Mayor's salary is more than that of the City of Clayton's Mayor and how the job is different to justify that salary as well as the Board of Aldermen.

**Kathryn Boyd, 8935 Martin** noticed the significant increase from what other area Mayor's make and questioned what justifies the jump. She also questioned how the Board does not view this as mismanagement of funds; she thinks the citizens should be able to vote on this issue.

**Julie Pozzo, 2211 St. Clair**, commented the Mayor and Board are elected not hired; she hopes that officials were interested in serving the community, not for their own personal benefit. It is her understanding that there is no written policy or public document authorizing this benefit. It is also her understanding the city sought legal counsel advising on the matter and the public has the right to see that opinion. Legal or not, it just isn't right, especially at this time when many are out of jobs and have to pay large amounts for medical insurance. In addition to the legal opinion, she asked for a list of elected officials that received this benefit since it began, the years there were in office and the years they received it and the cost to the city for each. Firemen were penalized for taking unearned overtime pay and had to pay back the City by giving up 3% of their raises. I think in fairness to them, there should also be consequences for this indiscretion; the City needs to be paid back.

**Barry Williams, 9001 Pine**, suggested the Board treat themselves to nice automobiles at the residents' expense.

**Susan Ryan, 9324 Pine**, stated she has about \$12,000 in legal fees that she will be asking for an egregious error the City made as well as some major violations. She thanked the City for trying to make amends for an egregious issue; Bola, Ellen and other members of the committee were trying to be very supportive. She is very angry that she spent all of this money trying to protect her home and to understand the process. She stated she will be submitting a bill asking the Board for reimbursement of almost \$10,000. She thanked the City because they have been very responsive to her questions and supported the problems behind the scenes.

Mayor Kelly closed public comment at 7:35pm. He also commented that there is a lot of misinformation being presented to the public and addressed comments he made that were taken out of context. He was asked by a reporter (Channel 4 News who is here this evening) if in these economic times the City of Brentwood officials should be receiving health care benefits with the way the economy is today. My response was that it wasn't a financial issue with the City of Brentwood, that we've been very fortunate that we have been able to afford these benefits and I greatly appreciate the benefit that the City has afforded to me as an elected official. I also said, which they didn't comment, was the fact that if it was a financial issue and it was between the benefit for me and the employees I would be the first to give it up and it is on their tape from when they recorded it last week for the news. The other thing was the comment that I hadn't gotten complaints from residents; that again was taken out of context in that in the conversation I said that I have talked about this publicly before, most recently at the last Coffee With The Mayor that I had, which there were probably 20-30 residents there and I talked about the fact that we do receive these benefits and this has become an issue for the City and I didn't have any comments back from those residents. With respect to the salary of the elected officials, that is set by ordinance within the City of Brentwood, in early 2000, the Board of Aldermen elected to raise the salary of both the Aldermen and the Mayor because it hadn't been raised in more than 20 years. At the time the only deciding factor was the fact that City Judge, who meets twice a month, had had a salary of \$12000 per year. The Board thought the Mayor's salary should be higher than the judge. The Judge's was \$1000 per month and the Board decided to make the Mayor's \$1200 per month. Those increases for elected officials didn't go into effect until the next elected officials in those positions. So when it was passed by the Board of Aldermen via ordinance, it didn't take effect until I was re-elected 2 years later. This has been public; people have talked about it in the past. A number of you people that are here this evening were at those meetings when we were talking about increasing the salary of the elected officials, because you were against them when we were doing it at that point. With respect to the benefits, to my recollection, those benefits go back to the early 1990's. They have been offered to elected officials throughout the years. Why some people didn't know about them, I'm not going to speak to them. As I know a number of Aldermen had the benefit back in the 90's. I personally have health insurance through the City; I didn't have it as an Alderman. I was always under my wife's insurance but when she had to start paying for me, I knew the benefit was offered here to the elected officials because we are considered to be full time employees when it can to the benefits and I took advantage of it. I have never signed up for the eye care or dental. I don't think anything has been hidden; it's just that nothing had changed since the early 90's. How it came into effect, I don't know; I wasn't part of that decision at that time. I was an Alderman, but I don't remember discussing it; I don't know if it predates those boards. I think the confusion is if we can't find the record, or we haven't had time to go back and look, we are trying to cover something up. I've talked about the fact that I appreciate the benefit of health insurance on a number of occasions to different people in the community. Again, it's never been hidden; especially the salaries that are set by ordinance. You can go around and select the salaries of elected officials that are near us, but the range in elected official's salaries in St. Louis County goes from \$0 to \$150,000 (Florissant Mayor).

Alderman Wynn commented that he came on the Board from 78-82 and had no benefits and came off the Board because his children were growing up. I taught

Brentwood School for 33 year and has been an Alderman for 21 years. When I came back on the Board in 95 I was informed that we had retirement benefits. I completed the form and turned it in, I didn't go look up to see who passed it because it didn't mean that much. At that time you had to wait 5 years to even be vested. I never tried to hold it from anybody it was just never discussed. He commented that he wouldn't throw away 50 years of hard work for this. It's being made to sound like we are criminals and we are not; I loved the people in this City..I work for you. I never kept anything hide, there was nothing to hide. He added that his heart is broken, and he apologized for whatever has occurred but he would never jeopardize his good name for \$10 - \$20 per month. He pleaded that he didn't think he was doing anything wrong.

Alderwoman Saunders commented that Alderman Wynn is referring to the pension that's \$4.50 per month, but the residents are referring to the health benefits that start at \$416 per month. The problem I have is when I came into the office I did not know about the benefits and I had asked and I was told about the salary. I kind of got an inkling when I was doing the audit but you know you hear a lot of things from the residents and I was just making a list. I asked one of the alderman and he said that you have to pay for it; that he paid for all of it and his paycheck was peanuts. I thought this must not be true, I think it creates a little bit of a bias; if you are on a board and your working and administration wants to change something and you're supposed to be voting down from residents and administration and what's best for the City. I think if you have protect insuring your family and yourself, it creates a bias and that's my personal opinion. However; I did know, because I was at the meeting when the compensation was set, the ordinance says that in public session we do set the compensation and that is salary and benefits in my opinion. I think anyone that interviews for a job looks at the compensation package not just your salary. I did have a difficulty, I wanted to find out how did this come to be and I asked for the ordinances and I asked for the minutes and I was waiting and run around; and finally I was going to get a legal opinion but not from our attorney. I just wanted to know was this right, could I sign up for this. Let me tell you I'd love to sign up for it, it's great insurance but I didn't know for sure if it was right. I have a hard time with that question; we are part time, we are not employees so I didn't see how we would ever be on the insurance and I thought how did this get worked around. Again, I go back to that vote, when we voted the salary you didn't mention benefits. And in those minutes when happens, public people asked was there a travel benefit or anything more to the salary and the answer was no. I do believe that it is misleading. Then not only do I get here then I find that I can't have it. They decided in 2009 when they moved to this new thing that SLAIT wasn't going to offer it to elected officials so they grandfathered in the ones that were already on it. In my estimation, in 2010 when the next election happened that was a new term and they are new hires, they should have all rolled off in 2010. In the interim, it has taken me forever to get an answer to this solution. I am sorry that it came to this, I thought I had been resolved before I left from Cincinnati and everyone on this Board was going to be going off of this insurance. Give them a couple of months to find new insurance; pay for your insurance premium while you are looking from your paycheck and then find your own insurance and we'll all be on equal footing. But then to tell me in addition that some of you earned more pay than I do too is a little hard to swallow. I take this job very seriously and have been coming to meetings and public works meeting and have not missed since the day the embezzlement hit the newspaper. I love this community, I said I would do this job for nothing, I'm not in it for pay, put I'm honest, transparency and accountability and

it should not be difficult for me as an Alderwoman to get information. I will be moving that we terminate this benefit tonight under new business.

Alderman Leahy commented that he is the Alderman the Mrs. Saunders is referring to that gave her bad information. I am on the insurance policy; I started in November 2008 and was first elected to the board in April 2001. I had no idea that there were benefits until one day in visiting with Mr. Seemeyer to go over things we were dealing with on the legislative side. I sounded off that I didn't like the way my company, Sieler Instruments, was shopping our insurance benefits around and what they came back with. That's when Mr. Seemeyer advised me that I had an option; I took it. At the time I also registered my wife, that's where the benefits came in that I had my paycheck deducted to cover for her; that's the information I passed on to Maureen but I didn't make it very clear and gave her bad information. Is it a bad thing, no. The board of Aldermen didn't actually vote on this issue since 2001 because it has never come up for discussion. Under Robert's Rules of Order, the Aldermen cannot vote on an issue that financially benefits or subtracts from them. We must recuse ourselves and we are supposed to do so before any discussion. In 2001 forward the discussion never happened and no one ever recused themselves from it. I think Pat's right, it happened many years ago and probably happened with the City Administrator making a decision that this is what we're doing for the employees and looped the elected officials in on it. Thus finding records is real tough to do. Make in 2010 we had a witch burning arrangement and we buried Mr. Seemeyer because of his bad acts. We hire Bola to take over the system and you're asking her to come up instantaneously with years and decade's worth of records to figure out what and how something happened; it's kind of tough on her. She's not trying to avoid the issue, she's honestly giving you the right answer. In front of her she doesn't have the information directly at hand. You want to go back and ask Mr. Seemeyer, his attorney will inform him that for his well being, he is to say nothing. Thus, Bola is left with a hodge-podge of trying to figure out how to connect all of the dots. I think a little patience to give her a chance to pull it together would be in order. Is it a bad issue that you all felt cheated and short come that we are spending too much of our money maybe on us, then Mr. Wynn is correct. We apologize, we shouldn't have done that. I think it was Mr. Nolen that wanted to know if we think we are not getting our well pay that we should let somebody else run. For the last 10 years the majority of the elections has no oppositions to them because nobody else would come forward or step forward to do the job; it's all been in the public record. You're here tonight and you're upset, I think that's fine; don't make it a one issue arrangement, stay involved. Pat holds "Coffee With The Mayor" every month and I hold Ward 3 Meetings; you have everyone of our phone numbers and I'll tell you I get 6-9 phone calls in an entire month. Most of it is why didn't they pickup my trash or how about fixing my sidewalk. But I don't think a single member of this board has ever ducked any question you all would like to ask them; rather its on the parking lot at city hall or the church or school playground. As for the pay raises, yes, it went out we decided it and you all had a chance to vote to put the person you elect in the seat.

Alderwoman Saunders asked to reference that Alderman Leahy always knows the statutes and codes; you know how compensation is set. You found it when you were speaking and agreed that you didn't know about it for the first 6 years and thought this was something we should look into with the audit and now you say this is fine. Alderman Leahy rebutted that he agreed it was something we should look into with

the audit; no I didn't know about it the first 7 years I was on the board. Is there an illegal act here, not that I'm aware of. Alderwoman Saunders retorted that she is not saying it's illegal, just right and wrong. You had brought up compensation so you knew, when the issue was brought up again at one point you didn't have benefits and at one time you did. You didn't think that was part of the conversation. Alderman Leahy replied that the conversation that you and I had, you asked about whether I knew that benefits were available. At the time that I became an elected member of the board, nobody came to me and said here's the whole package. I got a 6 inch black notebook and that said here are your codes, sit down and read them. I also got a thank you note from the Aldermen in the position before and an elected official sticker for the car. Other than that, everything else was read the book then ask questions, it took me 7 years to get around to asking the right question to find out this information was available to me. Alderwoman Saunders asked but the only thing you thought that the reason the benefit was okay was you told me was because you paid for it, but you only paid for 50% of your wife's portion. Alderman Leahy responded that he was under the impression that he got the benefits and he contributed to it. In further researching, the benefit they took out was for my wife, the elected official benefit was at 100%.

Mayor Kelly stated we will move on with the introduction of bills.

#### **INTRODUCTIONS, READINGS, AND PASSAGE OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS**

Alderman Leahy made a motion for 1<sup>st</sup> and 2<sup>nd</sup> readings of Bill #5679 and 5680. Motion seconded by Alderman Harper. Unanimous vote in favor taken; **MOTION PASSED.**

#### **Bill #5679 – An Ordinance Of The City Of Brentwood, Missouri, Granting Approval Of A Site Development Plan And Conditional Use Permit For A Pet Care Facility At Property Numbered 2615 S. Hanley Road Which Permits Under The Provisions Of Chapter 25 Of The Brentwood City Code The Development Of That Site; Providing The Conditions Of Such Development; And Providing For The Effective Date Of This Ordinance – 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading**

Attorney Albrecht read Bill #5679 by title only. Alderman Kramer provided the synopsis; this bill is for an ordinance approving a site development plan and conditional use permit for a pet care facility at 2615 S. Hanley Road. The Watering Bowl (petitioner) submitted a request for site development plan and conditional use permit for a pet day care facility with overnight board of pets and outdoor exercise area at 2615 S. Hanley Road. The planning and zoning commission recommended approval at its May 16 meeting. This item was forwarded to the board of aldermen by the P & Z commission. Attorney Albrecht read bill #5679 by title only. Alderman Wynn made a motion to perfect Bill #5679 into ordinance form. Motion seconded by Alderman Leahy. **ROLL CALL:** Alderwoman Saunders – yes; Alderwoman Manestar – yes; Alderman Leahy – yes; Alderman Toohey – absent; Alderman Kramer – yes; Alderman Robertson – yes; Alderman Wynn – yes; Alderman Harper – yes; **MOTION PASSED.**

**BILL #5679 IS HEREBY PASSED AND ORDINANCE #4355 IS ASSIGNED TO SAID BILL.**

**Bill #5680 – An Ordinance Authorizing The Mayor Acting On Behalf Of The City Of Brentwood, Missouri, To Enter Into A Contract With Grimes Consulting Inc., For The Purpose Of Obtaining Engineering Services; Providing For The Effective Date Of This Ordinance And Providing For The Repeal Of All Conflicting Ordinances – 1<sup>st</sup> & 2<sup>nd</sup> Reading**

Attorney Albrecht read Bill #5680 by title only. Alderman Kramer provided the synopsis; this bill is for an ordinance authorizing the mayor to act on behalf of the City of Brentwood to enter into a contract with Grimes Consulting Inc., for engineering services. Approval of this bill would grant an exception to the bidding process, so that staff could select an engineering firm to provide city-wide professional engineering services until we undergo a Request For Qualification (RFQ) city-wide engineering services this summer and/or fall. Attorney Albrecht read Bill #5680 by title only. Alderman Leahy made a motion to perfect Bill #5680 into ordinance form. Motion seconded by Alderman Robertson. **ROLL CALL:** Alderwoman Saunders – yes; Alderwoman Manestar – yes; Alderman Leahy – yes; Alderman Toohey – absent; Alderman Kramer – yes; Alderman Robertson – yes; Alderman Wynn – yes; Alderman Harper – yes; **MOTION PASSED.**

***BILL #5680 IS HEREBY PASSED AND ORDINANCE #4356 IS ASSIGNED TO SAID BILL.***

**Resolution #980 – A Resolution Amending Resolution No. 953, Adopting A City Vehicle Policy For The City Of Brentwood Employees**

Alderman Kramer provided the synopsis; this resolution authorizes positions specified in categories 3 ,4 and 5 the use of a city vehicle for city business purposes (and not for personal use) to and within all continental states not bordering the state of Missouri with written authorization from the City Administrator prior to leaving the State of Missouri. The request would specify the anticipated dates of travel, the destination or destinations of such travel, and the business purpose of such travel. In the case of such travel by the City Administrator, the request would be made to, and approved by, the Mayor. The ways and means committee has recommended approval of the amended city vehicle policy. Alderman Leahy stated his interest in making an amendment to Resolution #980. He requested the Board consider changing the 8 states bordering the state of Missouri to a 100 mile radius to the City of Brentwood. Accepted as a motion, Mayor Kelly asked if there was a second, hearing none the **MOTION DIED.** Aldermen Leahy explained the rationale was that the City changed the policy to allow the 8 states that connect to the state of Missouri when then Chief Knight needed to go on vacation outside the state of Missouri. The Ways & Means Committee, I think, voted and made that approval and thus to change the policy. Prior to that the policy was 100 miles radius to the City of Brentwood and I would like to go back to that policy because I think it was more prudent. Mayor Kelly commented that it is actually being changed now to out state, it was 100 miles previously and we are changing it now at the request of the police department primarily because of our DEA Officer to give the ability to use the city vehicle if they were to be called out of state. After questions by Alderman Leahy of the categories, Administrator Akande replied that this section relates to categories 3 and 5; category 4 also allows other specified positions to be able to use the city vehicle to go on city business. We have, for instance, people in the police department that have to go to Quantico for training, and in times they would like to drive there; there are also at times people in the fire department that would like to travel together in groups to training and this would

allow them the opportunity to do so. If you limit it to 8 states then we start to incur airline tickets to fly them all out when it would be cheaper to take the city vehicle. If you allow it to be 100 miles radius of the City of Brentwood you authorize written permission to go outside that on a case by case basis, you accomplish the same thing. Alderman Kramer made a motion to approve Resolution #980. Motion seconded by Alderwoman Saunders. **ROLL CALL:** Alderwoman Saunders – yes; Alderwoman Manestar – yes; Alderman Leahy – no; Alderman Toohey – absent; Alderman Kramer – yes; Alderman Robertson – yes; Alderman Wynn – yes; Alderman Harper – yes; **MOTION PASSED.**

### **ACCOUNTS AGAINST THE CITY**

Alderman Kramer stated the Ways & Means Committee is proud to present the warrant list the City in the amount of \$198,548.73 and opened the floor for questions or a second to the motion to approve. Motion seconded by Alderman Robertson. Unanimous vote in favor taken; **MOTION PASSED.**

### **REPORTS OF COMMITTEES AND DEPARTMENT HEADS;**

**Mayor Kelly** stated his error in omitting appointments to the Human Relations Committee and his understanding of the need for the committee as part of the Community Development Block Grant applications. The committee should be in place to resolve or hear any discrimination type issues within the community or any other kind of racial or social type issues. As part of the requirement, he asked that City Administrator Akande, as well as Alderwoman Manestar, and Aldermen Wynn and Robertson serve as representatives. Alderman Kramer made a motion to approve the recommendation of members to the Human Relations Committee. Motion seconded by Alderman Robertson. Unanimous vote in favor taken; **MOTION PASSED.**

At the request from a resident from the last meeting, he asked the Board to consider submitting Barry Williams' request that the name of the Brentwood Days Celebration includes the Maddenville name in some way is referred back to the Parks Department in memory of Former Alderwoman Lorraine Krewson and in honor of it's original heritage. Alderman Wynn made a motion to allow the Parks Department to come up with a name. Motion seconded by Alderman Kramer. Unanimous vote in favor taken; **MOTION PASSED.**

Lastly, Mayor Kelly announced interested in appointing Mike Damming as the provisional judge in the event the Municipal Judge is unable to hold court. Alderman Kramer made a motion to appoint Mike Damming as the Provisional Judge. Motion seconded by Alderman Robertson. Alderwoman Saunders questioned Mayor Kelly's choice based on his legal involvement with the Brentwood Forest ongoing controversy and stated she knows the residents were still upset. Alderman Kramer stated his understanding that Attorney Damming is no longer employed by the Brentwood Forest Condominium Association as their regular attorney handling their delinquencies. He stated the litigation brought against the managers as failing to act on their own bylaws had nothing to do with Attorney Damming advice or counsel and his opinion that this is a benign situation. Mayor Kelly clarified that Attorney Damming would serve the municipal court as a backup to Ron Hill and he has also served on P&Z for a number of years. **ROLL CALL:** Alderwoman Saunders – no; Alderwoman Manestar – yes;

Alderman Leahy – no; Alderman Toohey – absent; Alderman Kramer – yes; Alderman Robertson – yes; Alderman Wynn – yes; Alderman Harper – yes; **MOTION PASSED**

**Public Safety Committee**

Alderman Wynn had no new report.

**Public Works Committee**

Alderman Robertson reported the next committee meeting will be held June 13<sup>th</sup> at 4:00pm.

**Director of Planning & Development**

**Board Appointments – 8750 Manchester Rd CID**

Director Rottjakob announced the Community Improvement District in place to help fund the improvements made to redevelop the site at 8750 Manchester with Office Depot, Ace Hardware and Arby's is requesting approval to appoint their proposed members as done annually per the indentures giving the mayor and board the authority to appoint and approve the CID members. As requested by the Board, Director Rottjakob will research the current CID value and report it back to the board. Alderman Leahy made a motion to approve the CID members. Motion seconded by Alderman Kramer. **ROLL CALL:** Alderwoman Saunders – yes; Alderwoman Manestar – yes; Alderman Leahy – yes; Alderman Toohey – absent; Alderman Kramer – yes; Alderman Robertson – yes; Alderman Wynn – yes; Alderman Harper – yes; **MOTION PASSED.**

Director Rottjakob updated that the insurance check in the amount of \$86,101 has been received from the Sports Attic. Per the city's code, when the insurance company issues a check to the owner 10% is due to the City to be held in escrow to ensure proper clearance and demolition. The check has been deposited and will be refunded once the process is complete. The owners have also been asked to install a 6ft chain link fence to added security. After questions from the Board, she added that the owners have made contact in regards to the feasibility of clearance a variances but there is no definite decision to rebuild.

Mayor Kelly also added that he has spoken with Larry Hasselfield with Drury, they are on track and have plans to close at the end of the month.

**Ways and Means Committee**

Alderman Kramer reported the next meeting is scheduled July 12<sup>th</sup> at 4:30pm. The major topic of discussion is the employee handbook and all are welcomed to attend.

**City Attorney**

Attorney Albrecht had no new report.

**City Clerk/Administrator**

Administrator Akande had no new report.

**Library**

Alderman Wynn reported the Library Board is meeting this evening at city hall. Mayor Kelly also announced the library board voted to place a 5¢ tax increase on the August

election ballot. Alderman Wynn announced the board has been conservative and has not requested an increase since early 1980's.

### **Municipal League**

Mayor Kelly reported that the St. Louis County Municipal League recently held its annual installation dinner and awards show. The City was recognized for its collaboration with Maplewood and Richmond Heights for sharing communities with respect to the parks department, facilities and programming.

### **Communication**

Alderman Kramer had no new report.

### **Historical Society**

Alderman Wynn had no new report.

### **UNFINISHED BUSINESS**

None

### **NEW BUSINESS**

Alderwoman Saunders made a motion to terminate the benefit policy for elected officials; the policy should have been terminated in 2010. When SLAIT made their change allowing elected officials, aldermen should have at that election fallen off. I would like to reinstate that we currently end the benefits for elected officials. The policy was incorrectly put in place by Chris Seemeyer; it wasn't voted on along with the compensation and should be terminated effective immediately. She questioned, we can't vote on our compensation, it will be included on the next term? Attorney Albrecht replied, no, you can reduce your benefits. Alderwoman Saunders restated her motion to eliminate benefits for elected officials allowing a grace period of 4 months so that individuals may have an opportunity to find replacement insurance. Alderman Leahy called for the point of order, he read from the Roberts Rules of Order Revised Edition #11 (the current edition); page 407 paragraph 20-25-30 which spoke to Board Members being required to recuse themselves from voting on an item in which they would directly benefit. Mayor Kelly called for the second to the motion before discussion. Motion seconded by Alderwoman Manestar. Mayor Kelly suggested having more research to find out if there was some discussion in the early 90's by the board or ways and means; without that information we are making accusations that this was put in place wrongly. Alderman Wynn suggested the Board wait one month to determine if this information is found. Mayor Kelly followed up with his agreement that citizens have that right to know and also with Attorney Albrecht that there would not be an issue reducing the benefit. Alderwoman Saunders stated she is not certain that gathering the information is necessary, the problem is that SLAIT will not allow any new elected officials on. It should be terminated, there should be no grandfathering in, it should have rolled off in 2010 with the new election after 2009 and they decided that elected officials go off. After the new election they are new hires and should have rolled off, so even if we find out that it was okay we as new board members will not be offered the same so I think we should go with the motion. Mayor Kelly explained so that the public understands that a few years ago a numbers of cities got to go self insured on workman's compensation insurance in order to have

control of the cost and have a bigger pool. Over the years they had talked about going self insured for health insurance but because every City was different and offered benefits and timing, it was very difficult to get a consensus. But in the early-mid 80's when health insurance costs started sky rocketing for municipalities anywhere from 10%, 15%, 25% on an annual basis it kind of force cities to get together to form a pool and become self insured. There were originally 6-7 that saw the true benefit of that and it actually has been a great success, I think over the last few years the highest increase since we've formed has been about 4%. In doing so, the City of Brentwood was the only City that did offer it and SLAIT and the other communities wanted to be consistent and the others didn't want to offer insurance to their officials. What they decided to do was grandfather in the existing elected officials but would not allow any new officials to come into the plan and at some point it would phase out officials. Alderwoman Saunders is contending that after the elections they should have all fallen off but I don't think that was the intent but again that's just an interpretation. After questions, Alderwoman Saunders clarified that they should be allowed 6 months. Alderman Harper commented that he was offered the benefit when he came on in 07 but he did not take them. Out of fairness for those that have them, he is in favor of waiting for the information. Alderwoman Manestar withdrew her second to the motion. Alderwoman Saunders withdrew her motion.

Alderman Leahy announced the Ward 3 meeting will be held Tuesday, June 26<sup>th</sup>, at 7pm in the Council Room.

**PUBLIC COMMENTS – HEARING OF ANY MATTERS OF PUBLIC INTEREST UPON REQUEST OF ANY PERSON PRESENT**

**Susan Lee, 8611 Eulalie** expressed concerns with the traffic and problems on Eulalie that has been going on for years. She and her neighbors have experienced several incidents of damages from the traffic and speeders. She asked if the City can do something to make a change, she suggested speed bumps, street signs or making the street one way.

**Karen Smith 8930 Harrison** encouraged that the benefits are used as a benchmark to other communities; this is not customary with other municipalities. Members' contributions are admirable and that's not being questioned. What's heard tonight is the discrimination that is it not uniformly offered and how it was determined who go the offered and who didn't and if it is really the right thing that we should be doing. She asked for clarification of the employment status, she was previously told that the board is not and requested information. She agreed that in previous budgets it was hard to tell that benefits and pension were being paid out to the board of Aldermen because the budget was so thick and hard to get through. She also questioned if there are any other benefits being offered that citizens do not know about like discounts to rec center; what is the methodology used in determining what the compensation should be and why we feel it should be calculated off what the judge makes; based on Alderman Leahy's comment, she questioned if the residents voted on the increase in compensation in 2000. She also asked that the Board consider putting it on the ballot in August or November.

**Susan Ryan 9324 Pine** stated she has lived in Brentwood for 14 years and it seems to be a nice community. She has become very involved within the past few years, will

stay involved and encouraged others to become involved as well. She stated her appreciation for Alderwoman Saunders being on the Board and being open, honest, fair and transparent, which is the way we should govern. Perhaps when we have long standing government things happen. When we have a broader government with more community involvement it will open our eyes to practices that should not have been happening. We are all good people and have to ask the right questions, and be respectful a part of the solution.

**Don Blanding Beimdiek 33 Sussex** expressed opinions of it being time to revisit the objectives of the comprehensive plan because it does not include the rec center. He found a study online and questioned if it is the current study. (It is believed so) Within this study it states that only 8% of households use the ice rink. He stated that the 70% of the households are composed of 1-2 people; 38% are single, and 32% were 2 person households and asked that the board consider this in making the decision.

**Denise Soebbing 2612 Porter**, feels that having the additional compensation creates a bias. She also offered comments that there was an approval of a pet place close to her and she is already dealing with a noise issue. She asked how the board would like to live next to dogs barking 24-7; how sound proof is it going to be. She asked before the board finalizes it that it be taken in consideration that ordinances need to be put in place and enforced.

#### **CLOSED MEETING/ADJOURNMENT**

Alderman Harper made a motion to adjourn the meeting and enter into closed session at 8:44pm to discuss real estate matters pursuant to the litigation, real estate, and personnel exemption in RSMo. 620.021. Motion seconded by Alderman Wynn. **ROLL CALL:** Alderwoman Saunders – yes; Alderwoman Manestar – yes; Alderman Leahy – yes; Alderman Toohey – absent; Alderman Kramer – yes; Alderman Robertson – yes; Alderman Wynn – yes; Alderman Harper – yes; **MOTION PASSED.**

Mayor Kelly called the closed session to order at 8:46pm, with the following members present: Alderwoman Saunders; Alderwoman Manestar; Alderman Leahy; Alderman Kramer; Alderman Robertson; Alderman Wynn; Alderman Harper; Mayor Kelly. Also present were City Clerk/Administrator Akande; City Attorney Albrecht, Finance Director Jarvis, Financial Advisor Jim Lahay and Deputy Clerk Pittman. Alderman Toohey was absent.

Closed session included discussion of real estate matters; no action was taken.

Alderman Harper made a motion to adjourn the closed session at 9:04pm. Motion seconded by Alderwoman Manestar. **ROLL CALL:** Alderwoman Saunders – yes; Alderwoman Manestar – yes; Alderman Leahy – yes; Alderman Toohey – absent; Alderman Kramer – yes; Alderman Robertson – yes; Alderman Wynn – yes; Alderman Harper – yes; **MOTION PASSED.**

**Approved, with corrections, the 20<sup>th</sup> day of August, 2012.**

---

Mayor Pat Kelly

Attest:

---

Bola Akande,  
City Clerk/Administrator