

MEMORANDUM

TO: Mike Geisel, City Administrator
FROM: Craig White, Finance Director
DATE: July 10, 2017
SUBJECT: Finance & Administration Committee
June 26, 2017

The Finance & Administration Committee met on Monday, June 26, 2017. Those in attendance included: Chairman Tom DeCampi, Ward IV, Councilmember Barb McGuinness, Ward I; Councilmember Ben Keathley, Ward II; and Councilmember Randy Logan, Ward III.

Those also in attendance included: Mayor Bob Nation; Councilmember Guy Tilman, Ward II; Councilmember Michelle Ohley, Ward IV; Chris Graville, City Attorney; Mike Geisel, City Administrator; Craig White, Finance Director; Jim Eckrich, Public Works Director; Matt Haug, Information Technology Director; Steve Wicker, St. Louis Area Insurance Trust; Mike Hennessey, Smith McGehee; and seven members of the public.

Chairman DeCampi called the meeting to order at 5:30 p.m.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Councilmember Logan made a motion to approve the minutes of the May 8, 2017 Committee Meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McGuinness and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

II. NEW BUSINESS

A. 2018 City Council Proposed Meeting Schedule

Mike Geisel, City Administrator, presented the proposed 2018 City Council meeting schedule noting that it had been prepared with the same considerations as previous years. **The proposed schedule passed by unanimous consent.**

B. Budget Workshop Calendar

Craig White, Finance Director, presented the budget workshop calendar noting that there was a conflict for the second meeting scheduled on Monday, October 23. Mr. White recommend rescheduling to Monday, October 30, noting that there were no other City meetings scheduled on that date. **The amended budget workshop calendar passed by unanimous consent.**

C. Selection of Ex Officio Liaison Member to the Management Information System Citizens Advisory Committee

Councilmember McGuinness motioned to approve Councilmember Logan to serve as Ex Officio Liaison Member to the Management Information System Citizens Advisory Committee. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Keathley and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

D. Review/acceptance of FY2016 Audit and “Comprehensive Annual Financial Report” (CAFR)

Mr. White presented the 2016 financial statements noting that audit procedures were substantially completed in April but all signoffs were just finalized on Friday. The audit was performed by Daniel Jones & Associates who issued a clean opinion on the City’s financial statements and federal grant compliance as part of the single audit. There were no material management letter comments. Mr. White indicated that City Ordinance #10 requires approval of the audit. **Councilmember Logan motioned to approve the audit.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember DeCampi and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

E. BuyBoard Purchasing Cooperative

Mr. White discussed an opportunity to join the BuyBoard Purchasing Cooperative. This is a large co-op formed between the National School Boards Association and several state school boards to streamline the buying process for schools, municipalities, and other public entities. The co-op was developed to comply with state laws that require governmental entities to make purchases from an approved list of vendors who have gone through a competitive procurement process. In the past, the City has identified opportunities to buy furniture (such as chairs) at favorable rates through BuyBoard but had been unable to move forward because it was not a member. Joining a co-op does not cost the City anything and there is no requirement to make purchases.

Mr. Geisel indicated that it joining a co-op requires Council to pass ordinance or resolution authorizing the City to participate. There being no further discussion or dissent, **the motion for Council to pass a resolution authorizing the City to join the BuyBoard Purchasing Cooperative passed by unanimous consent.**

F. Public Officials Insurance Renewal

G. Public Officials Insurance Discussion

Discussed concurrently

Mr. Geisel began the conversation by providing a brief overview of the City's current Public Officials Insurance. SLAIT acts on the City's behalf as our insurance broker. This item was placed on the agenda for informational purposes as Mayor Nation had asked to see the City's Public Officials Insurance Policy. Mr. Geisel indicated that no action was necessary from the Committee or Council in order to renew the City's Public Officials Insurance.

Chairman DeCampi introduced Mike Hennessey, an insurance broker from Smith McGehee, who was on hand to discuss municipal D&O issues.

Steve Wicker from SLAIT was also on hand to discuss the City's D&O coverage. Mr. Wicker indicated D&O coverage insures the City, elected officials, and employees from wrongful acts and employment practice liability. Generally, wrongful acts come from zoning issues where the suing party claims that the City did not properly follow their zoning laws. Employment practice liability arises when a current or former employee disagrees with the manner in which the City handled an issue(s).

Mr. Wicker alluded to an ongoing City concern related to insurance coverage and how it relates to claims for inverse condemnation. He clarified that the City has a right to condemn properties, but there is a very rigid process that must be followed. Condemnation awards are not typically covered by any insurance because, if a court ruled that a property was inversely condemned, the remedy is that the City would take possession of the property.

Councilmember Logan also noted that Darwin International, the City's current D&O provider, will no longer be offering such coverage after June 30, 2017. He asked if there was any indication that the City's new carrier, XL Catlin, will exit the practice in the near term. Mr. Wicker indicated that many insurers come in and out of the municipal D&O insurance area but there was no reason to suspect that XL Catlin will be leaving anytime soon. Part of the City's new coverage will include coverage for monetary claims.

Mr. Geisel reminded the Committee that the City believes the current Darwin coverage does, in fact, provide coverage in the specific instance and the City is currently pursuing legal remedies related to this.

Mr. Wicker noted that the 25 cities that make up SLAIT operate similar to a purchasing cooperative with similar coverage and costs based on the size of the participating municipalities and claims history.

Councilmember McGuinness asked Mr. Wicker if there was any D&O related coverage that he felt the City was missing. He said no however the City does have the option to increase coverage from \$2 million to \$5 million and also has the option to include coverage relating to FMLA issues. He clarified that the FMLA issues predominately pertain to issues at fire departments due to complexities with their employment practices. He indicated that there has only been one FMLA related suit in the history of SLAIT.

Chairman DeCampi asked if the downside to leaving SLAIT would be the loss of purchasing power. Mr. Geisel indicated that historically, cities that left SLAIT experienced short term gains that quickly evaporated, lost the equity which comes back to the cities with the return of excess premiums, and were barred from reentering SLAIT for three years. Mr. Wicker clarified that SLAIT is a trust that directly provides coverage for property, workers compensation, and general liability. It is run by a board of City Managers/Administrators from the group. The trust has its own deductible and pays claims like an insurance company. The plus side of membership is the return of excess premiums which separates it from a typical insurance company.

Councilmember McGuinness asked if Chesterfield was currently represented on the board. Mr. Geisel indicated that the former City Administrator was on the board and he expected the City to be on the board again in the future.

Councilmember Logan indicated his opposition to leaving SLAIT and Chairman DeCampi clarified that his intention was to identify any downside to leaving. Mr. Wicker and Mr. Geisel noted that SLAIT's administrative costs were well below the industry average which were enabled as the trust operates without profit.

Mr. DeCampi then asked Mr. Hennessey if he had anything to add to the discussion. Mr. Hennessey indicated that he was long time resident of Chesterfield and was grateful for the opportunity to contribute to the discussion. His focus was on D&O insurance and not on SLAIT. He clarified that the D&O was not a mandatory SLAIT offering like workers comp and property and suggested that what makes D&O different from other City coverages is the elected officials' personal exposure from such suits. Mayor Nation and Councilmember Logan clarified that the City's elected officials were indemnified from such suits. Mr. Hennessey stated that the underpinning of D&O coverage is risk management and that elected officials' personal assets are at risk unlike

all other insurance coverages. This particular policy is not an off the shelf policy and requires clarity on the coverage.

Mr. Hennessey indicated that the Darwin insurance business was purchased by another insurer which was not retained by the City. He suggested that this type of discussion should be part of Council's decision making process.

Councilmember McGuinness asked if we would be leaving SLAIT if we purchased D&O through a separate provider. Mr. Geisel indicated that pursuing a different coverage would not terminate the City's relationship with SLAIT. He went on to state that SLAIT acts as our insurance broker with expertise and history with both Chesterfield and area municipalities. The City has the ability to utilize SLAIT for advice and guidance when looking at options and to let us know what we don't know. That said, we could go outside of SLAIT to purchase D&O if advantageous. Mr. Wicker indicated that there were no SLAIT cities that had found it advantageous to purchase D&O insurance from a different provider.

Mr. Graville asked Mr. Hennessey if Smith McGhee would be looking at the same pool of D&O insurance providers as SLAIT. Mr. Hennessey indicated that this was the case. He clarified that the difference would be analyzing the risk management for Chesterfield as compared to the rest of the SLAIT cities.

Mayor Nation asked if the premium would be fully reimbursed if the insurance renewed and then a different carrier was selected. Mr. Wicker indicated that the City would not be able to get a full pro-rata reimbursement and the best method would be to review the options further in advance next year.

Mr. Hennessey suggested that SLAIT might be the best choice for the City but he could not verify without reviewing the proposed coverage. He offered to review the City's insurance options and provide feedback.

Councilmember Keathley asked when the indemnification of public officials would come into play relative to D&O insurance. Mr. Graville responded that the insurance policy is the primary protection with indemnification being secondary. Councilmember Keathley then asked if elected officials could be personally covered for their exposure as a city official. Both Mr. Wicker and Councilmember McGuinness recalled reaching out to their personal insurance carriers about such coverage and being told that none existed.

Councilmember Logan directed Staff to bring a review of City insurance coverages to the F&A Committee three months prior to them coming up for renewal.

Mr. Geisel asked Mr. Wicker if the timing requested was feasible keeping in mind that most insurance renews on 7/1 and there are new elected officials each April. Mr. Wicker indicated that it was difficult to provide detailed bids with more than 30 days before the renewal is due. Health insurance is the exception to this rule, with rates known in April, because it is needed in advance of each cities' open enrollment period. He clarified that the policies as they are could be reviewed for appropriateness three months in advance of the renewal, but the financial terms would not yet be available.

Mr. Graville asked Mr. Hennessey what other cities that Smith McGhee handles D&O insurance for. Mr. Hennessey responded that the Company does not handle any municipal policies at the current time, although both staff and the firm have past municipal experience.

H. Process for setting Council Meeting Agenda

Chairman DeCampi introduced the topic and referenced a discrepancy between City Code and Ordinance.

Mr. Graville stated that when the ordinances were codified, Council effectively adopted the codification over the ordinances. As the Code is currently written, it is the City Administrator's job to set the Council Agenda as an administrative function. Council can change the manner in which agendas are set if they choose.

Chairman DeCampi suggested that there should be a vote to adopt the agenda before each meeting. Mr. Graville indicated that some Cities vote to adopt the "tentative agenda" as the first order of business at each meeting but it this is not a requirement to move forward. Mr. Geisel asked if items could be added to the agenda. Mr. Graville responded that this may not meet the statutory notice requirements. He suggested that new items can be added with less than 24 hours notice only under certain specific circumstances.

There was a brief discussion regarding the approval of the agenda via email. Such approval would constitute a meeting that would need to be open to the public.

Councilmember Logan recapped the current process in which most items come from committee, via vote, to the Council Agenda. He suggested that it would not be a good practice to put items on the agenda that had not been approved at the committee level and then vetted by Staff.

Councilmember DeCampi cited Roberts Rules, as the standard for the City's parliamentary procedures, and suggested that it was clear in that the agenda should be set and approved by the entire assembly. He suggested a possible step to be in alignment with Roberts Rules would be to require a vote to adopt the agenda at the beginning of each meeting. This would give the Council the opportunity to air any grievances such as in a hypothetical instance in which a member was blindsided by one of the items on the agenda.

Mr. Geisel noted that the City Code established Roberts Rules as the parliamentary authority to govern the conduct of all meetings in all cases where they are not inconsistent with statute or with the rules of procedures adopted by the City Council.

Mr. Graville suggested moving the approval of agendas to the first item in the agenda reviews. Chairman DeCampi indicated support of this practice. Mr. Geisel suggested that this would require taking minutes of the agenda review and changes to the order of business as it would constitute a City meeting.

Mr. Graville clarified that, as is, the "tentative agenda" becomes the agenda once it is acted upon. Under Roberts Rules, if no one objects, it becomes the actual agenda. Councilmembers do have the opportunity to object the agenda as a point of order issue under the current practice.

Councilmember Keathley suggested that if someone has the opportunity to object to the agenda it should be clearly established and a step in which the agenda was adopted would allow this.

Discussion ensued about the guidance from Roberts Rules and the requirement that the City follows them in its meeting process.

Councilmember McGuinness suggested that the Mayor, as an elected official, was the appropriate person to set the agenda as was indicated in the original ordinance.

Mr. Geisel stated the four ways in which an item is added to the Council Agenda:

- 1) It comes from a Standing Committee of Council
- 2) It comes from the Mayor
- 3) It is added by the Council under new business
- 4) It is an administrative item included on the agenda from the City Administrator

Mr. Graville asked the Committee if there is a problem with the way items currently get onto the agenda. He suggested that the notion that the City

Administrator has significant power or discretion in “setting” the agenda is somewhat misleading due to the limited ways in which an item can get on the agenda.

Councilmember McGuinness suggested that if three or more Councilmembers wanted an item on the agenda they should have the ability to add it. Mr. Geisel responded that this can be done by bringing up an item during new business in which it can be added to the next agenda. Mr. Graville indicated that he has seen Councilmember McGuinness’ suggestion in practice but only at cities with limited Committee involvement/authority.

Councilmember McGuinness asked if it was the appropriate time to change the Code to have the Mayor set the agenda. Mr. Graville reminded the Committee of the administrative aspects of creating the agenda and limited ways in which items can be added. Councilmember Logan stated that, under existing City Code, the Mayor is the only one that can add items to the agenda and that the City Administrator works for the Mayor.

Councilmember McGuinness discussed a situation where the City Administrator was not working with the Mayor. Chairman DeCampi suggested that approval of the agenda would give the Council the opportunity to publicly state their agreement/disagreement with the agenda should this occur. Mayor Nation suggested that a process in which the agenda was adopted would not have affected any of the referenced issues that occurred in the past.

Mr. Geisel stated that under the current practice, the general public knows that if an item is not on the agenda then it will not be discussed. It can be brought up during new business and discussed at the next meeting. By making the agenda a tentative agenda in which items can be added, it reduces transparency to the general public who may rely on the published agenda.

Discussion ensued over what would be accomplished/prevented by approval of the agenda.

Councilmember Logan asked what would happen if five Councilmembers voted to not approve the agenda and if they would need to state a reason. He indicated that there was a reason for the current process and questioned if it was appropriate for Councilmembers to prevent the designed process from occurring without a reason.

Chairman DeCampi made a motion to postpone the discussion to the next F&A Committee meeting. The motion was seconded by Councilmember McGuinness and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

I. Human Resources Responsibility

Chairman DeCampi introduced the discussion and expressed concern about the lack of an HR position in light of the complexity and potential liability of certain issues currently facing the City.

Mr. Geisel provided an overview the City's HR function. The City previously had an HR Director position which was defunded by a previous City Council. The City currently has a decentralized HR function with many of the traditional HR responsibilities handled by the City's Employee Services Administrator, with City Directors handle the hiring process, and the City Administrator handles top level authority as described in the personnel manual and other City documents. The Employee Services Administrator is a sub-Director administrative position within the Finance Department. The position manages employee files, coordinates benefits, assists with payroll, processes payroll taxes and annual filings, handles onboarding, etc.

Chairman DeCampi expressed concern about the volume of the City Administrator's HR responsibility in light have evolving rules and laws.

Mr. Geisel responded that while he concurs with concerns related to the lack of a designated centralized Human Resource Director, he is more concerned with the lack of an Assistant Finance Director to provide a backup for the Finance Director to ensure continuity of operations and to provide secondary oversight. Such a position would improve the City's financial oversight, continuity of operations, and expand the Department's ability to produce transparent and timely managerial analysis.

Councilmember Keathley asked if each department had policies and procedures to handle employee complaints. Mr. Geisel answered affirmatively and briefly described them.

Councilmember Tilman asked if the ongoing compensation study would make any recommendations about the appropriateness of staffing levels and/or the need for an HR Director. Mr. Geisel indicated that this was beyond the scope of the compensation study but that the City would learn how many other cities have this type of position.

Councilmember Ohley asked if additional training would be beneficial for each City Director. Mr. Geisel responded that each Director is trained and the City continues to compile and communicate issues as they arise. He agreed with Councilmember Ohley that additional training would help supplement the City's existing HR function/capabilities.

Mayor Nation asked if the City has had many problems in this area. Mr. Geisel indicated that he felt the City has had a below average level of significant issues for an organization of its size.

Mr. Graville indicated that he was not aware of any significant HR related issues and that he had been impressed with the Employee Service Administrator's documentation, knowledge and professionalism when handling a recent workers compensation issue.

Councilmember Logan expressed a reluctance to add an additional budgeted position at this time. Mr. Geisel suggested, as a possible alternative, rather than hiring a Director level Human Resource employee, to hire an assistant Director of Finance position and to commit time and resources to provide training to the current Employee Service Administrator, in an effort to raise existing competencies.

Councilmember McGuinness asked how much an Assistant Finance Director would cost to which Mr. White estimated a beginning salary of approximately \$70,000 for a CPA who can help produce a CAFR and perform the higher level accounting functions. This position would handle high level reporting (sales tax by location), internal audit functions and reviews, performance management/analysis (productivity comparisons versus industry standards), etc.

Councilmembers Logan directed staff to propose multiple options related to the potential addition of an Assistant Finance Director and/or expanded HR function, including potentials job descriptions and additional training, as part of the 2018 budget preparation process.

J. Ash Tree Removal Program

Chairman DeCampi introduced the topic indicating that the City was in the process of removing the diseased ash trees located in Chesterfield with an annual cost of approximately \$400,000/year. He then handed the discussion over to Mr. Eckrich who went into further detail by describing the project manager, that the 6,700 ash trees have been reduced to approximately 5,200, and that the cost breakdown was approximately \$300,000 for sidewalk repairs and \$140,000 for tree replacements.

Chairman DeCampi indicated that he had spoken to Mueller Brothers, a local sawmill, that is potentially interested in using the lumber that would be removed as part of this project for cabinetry. Mr. Eckrich noted that there was essentially no value for trees which are 12 inches or less which represents approximately 2,600 of the remaining ash trees in Chesterfield with the rest primarily falling in the 12-18 inch range. Logs over 18 inches in diameter might be worth 50 cents per board foot if the City removed and transported the trees. Mueller Brothers

suggested speaking to a logger about the removal which Mr. Eckrich had scheduled for the next day.

Mr. Eckrich noted discussions that he had with other cities about their respective efforts noting that none had found an opportunity to profit from the trees' removal. While mills will take the wood, none will pay for it.

Councilmember Logan asked if the wood was quarantined and if that would limit the City's ability to move it. Mr. Eckrich responded that we are following all legal requirements and the mill that the City has been talking with is within in the quarantine area. Mr. Eckrich expressed concern that most of the Chesterfield ash trees are not large enough to make it worth the City's efforts.

Councilmember Logan expressed concerns about the quality of the wood in question and ensuing that the City is transparent about it to avoid any potential liability.

Mr. Geisel indicated that any financially beneficial opportunities would be pursued and Mr. Eckrich noted that he would keep Council up to speed regarding his ongoing discussions.

Councilmember Tilman expressed a desire to use the timber for something other than mulch if possible.

Councilmember Ohley asked how many trees were healthy. Mr. Eckrich could not provide a definite answer but indicated that once the disease was in the area, all trees were likely to become diseased.

K. Discussion RE: Transparency Portal

Councilmember McGuinness noted that the contractual salaries for the City Attorney, Prosecuting Attorneys, and Judge were not included with the employee salaries included on the City's Transparency Portal. She recommended adding the actual amount paid during the prior year, budgeted amount for the current year, and a note indicating that these positions are contractual.

Mr. Geisel suggested purchasing a module that would enhance the public's access to the City's financial records.

Councilmember Logan noted that, unlike the salaries of actual City employees, these amounts could not be automatically uploaded from our personnel records which increased the potential of a manual error.

Councilmember McGuinness made a motion to recommend to Council that the City add to the Salaries included on the Transparency Portal, the prior year and current year budgeted payments to the City Attorney, Prosecuting

Attorneys, and Judge with a note indicating that these are contractual salaries. The motion passed by unanimous consent.

Additional New Business

Councilmember Logan indicated that he was concerned about recent trends in the monthly Financial Updates and would like additional information. **He directed Staff to add a review of the line items in the Financial Update to the next F&A Committee Agenda.**

Councilmember McGuinness referenced a report that used to be distributed detailing the highest sales tax businesses and asked if it contained proprietary information. Mr. White clarified that the dollar amounts could not be disclosed but a sequential listing of businesses, with the sales tax figures omitted, was permissible.

Mayor Nation asked if we could report revenues from specific locations such as Chesterfield Mall. Mr. White indicated that this was a time consuming endeavor that could be performed if directed to do so. Mayor Nation indicated that he would not need this information on a monthly basis but it would be beneficial to receive periodically.

There was no additional new business.

III. UNFINISHED BUSINESS

A. Live Streaming

Mr. Haug introduced the topic noting that he was following up on Council's various requests relating to the feasibility and cost of live streaming Council meetings. Mr. Haug discussed his research of live streaming which included discussions with other municipalities and vendors which had supported his initial cost estimates. Based on these discussions, Mr. Haug was recommending a high quality streaming approach that would require the installation of hardware at an initial cost of approximately \$33,000, streaming services at \$550/month, and to contract with CC Media to professionally film the meetings at \$250/meeting (for up to three hours) and \$50 for each additional hour.

Mr. Haug indicated that the video would be streamed directly on both our Facebook and YourTube channels. As proposed it would only include Council meetings held in Council Chambers.

Councilmember McGuinness motioned for the committee to recommend this service to Council. Further discussion ensued about the long-term requirements and costs of maintaining the hardware/service. Mr. Haug noted that the files were too large and complex to maintain on the City's servers. Councilmember Logan expressed concerns related to the cost and necessity in light of information already made available to the public. Councilmember Keathley expressed concerns about the cost noting the potential value for residents that could not physically attend the meetings. Mr. Haug indicated there would be limited cost savings if the video was made available the next day rather than streamed in real-time. The motion was seconded by Councilmember DeCampi and **failed by a voice vote of 2 to 2 with Councilmembers McGuinness and DeCampi voting in favor. The issue will move to City Council without a recommendation.**

B. Review of City Code: Ordinances 3082-3089

Mr. Geisel introduced the topic which has been ongoing since April, 2016. At the time, Staff and the City Attorney were directed to address any inconsistencies between the City Code and Ordinances. Mr. Geisel walked through issues pertaining to each of the noted Ordinances.

3082 – An ordinance amending Ordinance 7 pertaining to the Mayor's obligation to perform the City Administrator's duties. Mr. Geisel recommended deleting this ordinance which is already excluded from City Code. By deleting it, the Ordinances will agree with the City's current practice.

Councilmember Logan made a motion to recommend to Council to oppose Bill No. 3082. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Keathley and **with a voice vote of 2 to 2 with Councilmembers Logan and Keathley voting in favor.**

Chairman DeCampi verified that if the motion failed at the Committee level, a conflict between City ordinances and the City Code would continue to exist. Opposing the bill would have essentially no impact in practice but would reconcile an issue between the City's ordinances and Code.

Chairman DeCampi made a motion to reconsider. The motion to reconsider was seconded by Councilmember Keathley and **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 1 with Councilmember McGuinness voting in opposition.**

Councilmember DeCampi made a motion to recommend to Council to oppose bill 3082. The motion was seconded by Councilmember Logan and **passed by a voice vote of 3 to 1 with Councilmembers McGuinness voting in opposition.**

3083 – An ordinance amending sections 2-74 and 2-80 of the City Code pertaining to the City Administrator's duties and authority. It formerly indicated

that the City Administrator was to serve subject to the review of both the Mayor and City Council. The proposed amendment removes “and City Council”. **Councilmember Logan made a motion to recommend the proposed modifications (to section “L”) of Bill No. 3082 to Council.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember McGuinness and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

3084 – An ordinance amending section 2-5 of the City Code pertaining to notice of liability claims. The proposed change requires written liability notices to go to the Mayor, rather than the City Administrator, as required by state law. **The recommendation to Council of the proposed amendment to Bill No. 3084 passed by unanimous consent.**

3085 – An ordinance amending section 2-29 of the City Code pertaining to duties and powers of the Mayor and City Council. The proposed change eliminates “The Mayor shall execute on behalf of the City all contractual and legal documents approved by the City Council.” This change was recommended as it is not be practical for the Mayor to sign everything for a City of Chesterfield’s size. **The recommendation to Council of the proposed amendment to Bill No. 3085 passed by unanimous consent.**

3086 – An ordinance amending ordinance 12, ordinance 528 and section 2-47 of the City Code pertaining to scheduling of regular meetings of City Council. Replaces language defining regular meetings with the following to be compliant with current practices:

Regular meetings of the Chesterfield City Council shall be on the First and Third Mondays of each month beginning at 7:00 p.m. The meeting place of the City Council shall be at the City Hall unless otherwise ordered by the City Council. The City Council may cancel or rescheduled meetings if City Council determines it to be in the best interest of the general public. Notice for all meetings shall be provided in accordance with RSMo 610.

The recommendation to Council of the proposed amendment to Bill No. 3086 passed by unanimous consent.

3087 – An ordinance amending section 2-50 of the City Code pertaining to rules of procedure for the Mayor and City Council. Mr. Geisel recommended deletion of the proposed ordinance as the rule it would strike regarding roll call votes that is required by state law. **Councilmember Logan made a motion to recommend to Council the deletion of Bill No. 3087.** The motion was seconded by Councilmember McGuinness and **passed by a voice vote of 4 to 0.**

3088 – An ordinance amending section 2-82 of the City Code pertaining to the appointment of the City Administrator during temporary absences. **The**

recommendation to Council of the proposed deletion of Bill No. 3088 passed by unanimous consent.

3089 – An ordinance amending section 2-91 of the City Code pertaining to the appointment of the City Clerk. Mr. Geisel noted that the City Clerk could only be appointed by the Mayor and termination of this position required 30 days written notice. Mr. Geisel recommended updating this language to reflect the requirements for any City Director:

The City Administrator shall appoint the City Clerk with the consent of the City Council. The term of the City Clerk shall continue from the date of appointment for an indefinite period of time not to exceed four (4) years. The City Clerk may be removed from office by the City Administrator with consent of the City Council.

The recommendation to Council of the amendment to Bill No. 3089 passed by unanimous consent.

C. Victims' Rights Bill

No discussion at this time.

D. Unfinished Business

The following *Unfinished Business* agenda items were not reviewed.

- 1. Business License Overview**
- 2. Review of City Council Policies: 22, 24 & 29**
- 3. City Attorney, Prosecuting Attorney, and Municipal Judge Reform**
- 4. Review of City Code: Chapter Two Administration – Volume 3**

IV. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:56 p.m.