

001

003

006

008

Summary

Board Bill Number 153

005

Introduced by Alderwoman Alisha Sonnier

December 13, 2024

009

An Ordinance 004mmended by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, and establishing the **TRANSFORM STL Act**, authorizing and directing an appropriation in the total amount of Two Hundred Seventy-Seven Million Two Hundred Forty Thousand Sixty-One and 56/100ths (\$277,240,061.56) Dollars of Rams Settlement Funds for deposit into various new special funds to support Citywide infrastructure, affordable child care and postsecondary educational and training opportunities, City and community workforce, and development efforts, with amounts as described herein; and containing a severability clause and an emergency clause.

002

011

010

#001

Posted by **John Nowotny** on **12/15/2024** at **10:04am** [Comment ID: 252] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: -3

Public safety should be included as a major component of this bill. It affects all residents and visitors. Without public safety, all the other good works in this bill will be greatly diminished.

#002

Posted by **John Sadlo** on **12/11/2024** at **7:16pm** [Comment ID: 201] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 3, Disagree: -3

I think we should be focusing the funds on public safety so people will feel safe staying in St. Louis and moving to St. Louis. And, funds should also be spent on long term infrastructure improvements to prepare the city for the future. Any other use of the funds would be a waste of a good opportunity.

#003

Posted by **Susi Blatz** on **12/12/2024** at **9:02pm** [Comment ID: 221] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 2, Disagree: -3

I believe that %100 of the funds should be spent on making St. Louis better as a whole; safety, infrastructure, development. Nothing should be earmarked to benefit an individual; child care, education. If St. Louis becomes a destination then there will be increased residency and business. Those increases can then fund programs to aid the individual needs of the community.

#004

Posted by **Diana M** on **12/14/2024** at **3:58pm** [Comment ID: 242] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 2, Disagree: -4

Do Not think Rams \$ should be spent to subsidize daycare or college education—those items should be subsidized elsewhere. Rams \$ should be used for streets, water updates etc. CRIME—is what everyone has told you about!!! Social service programs should be helping with daycare and college—the city government is not a social service agency.

#005

Posted by **Chris Dailey** on **01/09/2025** at **5:32pm** [Comment ID: 312] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 23, Disagree: 0

Can we please add funding for Public Health? On behalf of being a proud citizen, I know this will help our community be fully able to contribute as citizens in St. Louis;

whether that be to work, live, learn, serve, build healthy relationships, enjoy our beautiful city, find purpose and directly lower rates of violence.

#006

Posted by **Jaime Staengel** on **12/14/2024** at **7:46pm** [Comment ID: 244] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: -3

It is frustrating to see a lack of compromise within the city on how to use the Rams funds. The City needs action now, which would come from the suggestions in the Greater St. Louis Inc plan. This plan also has many positive sides, but with such a large windfall, it is frustrating that the best parts of both bills are not coming together for a more holistic bill that offers some immediate help to the city. It would be better for politicians to put their pride aside and their need to be seen as a "hero" and to work together to make immediate changes to Downtown first, then keep some money for the infrastructure parts of this bill. Please, listen to constituents and don't just ram this bill through without compromise with the other vision.

#007

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/14/2024** at **11:10pm** [Comment ID: 245] - [Link](#)

Endorsement

Agree: 3, Disagree: -1

This bill, while not perfect, clearly emphasizes the need to address issues that can be felt widely across the city. I endorse this approach.

Ideas such as water infrastructure and transportation infrastructure are some examples of ideas with wide ranging support across many wards.

We should not be supporting corporate plans that totally disregard the interests of city residents as a whole.

This money does not inherently belong to downtown businesses. If they wanted a share, they should have sued the Rams themselves.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/15/2024** at **6:34pm** [Comment ID: 259] - [Link](#)

Endorsement

Agree: 2, Disagree: -1

I should note that it takes nothing more than a simple google search to find that many of the people complaining that this is not BB131 are just corporate leaders with ties to Greater St. Louis Inc.

The voices of residents overall did NOT prioritize downtown over issues such as water or mobility infrastructure... and many of these goals are not mutually exclusive to improving Downtown.

#008

Posted by **Carmen Ribaud** on **12/13/2024** at **10:15pm** [Comment ID: 230] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 7, Disagree: 0

The people of St. Louis want better infrastructure for pedestrians and bicycles, and less infrastructure toward cars. The Mobility Infrastructure Fund outlined does not address this need. Please allocate more funding toward improvement of streets to make them safer for pedestrians and bikers.

Also, this commenting system is very difficult to use. If you genuinely want to connect with people and hear a wide representation of feedback, please make this language easier to read and create fewer barriers for people to understand the legalize by translating this document into something more legible.

#009

Posted by **Mark Wei** on **12/14/2024** at **1:28pm** [Comment ID: 240] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 1, Disagree: -4

Residents advocated for dedicated funding for Downtown, we cannot pretend this didn't happen. Ignoring their demand undermines the process.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/14/2024** at **11:15pm** [Comment ID: 246] - [Link](#)

Agree: 5, Disagree: -1

During one of the engagements, investing in Downtown was only popular in the wards for downtown. I think the goal with the bill is to address issues with wider support and impact.

#010

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **3:22pm** [Comment ID: 182] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 4, Disagree: 0

Why is there not a summarized version of this bill in non-legalese language for those who do not write legislation for a living? Just a thought - it would be better for transparency and engagement.

#011

Posted by **Jane Reed** on **12/11/2024** at **1:47pm** [Comment ID: 168] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 1, Disagree: -5

Doesn't the city need to replace lead water pipes? Why not just focus on that and get it done?

**BOARD BILL NUMBER 153 INTRODUCED BY ALDERWOMAN ALISHA SONNIER
COSPONSORS: PRESIDENT MEGAN GREEN**

012

An Ordinance recommended by the Board of Estimate and Apportionment, and establishing the **TRANSFORM STL Act**, authorizing and directing an appropriation in the total amount of Two Hundred Seventy-Seven Million Two Hundred Forty Thousand Sixty-One and 56/100ths (\$277,240,061.56) Dollars of Rams Settlement Funds for deposit into various new special funds to support Citywide infrastructure, affordable child care and postsecondary educational and training opportunities, City and community workforce, and development efforts, with amounts as described herein; and containing a severability clause and an emergency clause.

014

WHEREAS, in 2021, St. Louis City, St. Louis County, and the Regional Convention and Sports Complex Authority signed a \$790 million settlement agreement with Rams owner Stan Kroenke and the National Football League, resulting in the City negotiating receipt of \$280 million as its share from the settlement agreement, of which \$30 million was appropriated to invest in the Convention Center; and

013

WHEREAS, at the time of filing, the amount of Settlement Funds, including accrued interest, that are available for appropriation totals \$277,240,061.56; and

WHEREAS, the taxpayer dollars of residents across the City funded the litigation that resulted in the City receiving these Settlement Funds, and the Board of Aldermen finds that this legislation satisfies the strong public purpose of ensuring these Settlement Funds are appropriated such that they will benefit all residents across the City; and

WHEREAS, on February 10, 2023, as one of its final acts of the 2022-2023 Legislative Session, the Board of Aldermen unanimously passed Resolution Number 171 committing the Board, the Comptroller, and the Mayor's Office to conducting a comprehensive community input and engagement process to establish community-driven priorities for investing the Rams Settlement funds; and

Page 1 of 26

Board Bill Number 153

Sonnier

December 13, 2024

BB153 Combined.pdf

#012

Posted by **PETER SMITH** on **12/12/2024** at **2:59pm** [Comment ID: 218] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: -4

There are many worthwhile objectives outlined in the proposal. However, I feel that the single most important one is missing - making the City of St. Louis a safe place for residents and visitors alike. Without that, none of the other initiatives will make a lasting difference. If I had the answer to how that is done I'd be happy to suggest it here, but I am not an expert on crime and its impact on people. Those who are expert need to be tasked with this vital requirement to make St. Louis a viable place to live, work and play.

I also believe that a majority of the settlement money should be invested rather than being spent outright- this would allow the funds to continue providing for projects in the decades to come.

#013

Posted by **Coach Elvin McFarlin** on **01/11/2025** at **12:32pm** [Comment ID: 313] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

While every idea has merit, however we will not achieve our long range goals for growth and sustainability until we address the core issues that plague our city. They are, not necessarily in this order, Crime, Youth Development Programs, Housing and Jobs Creation. I have reached out to Mayor Jines and Alderperson President Green, no response to date. 314-458-7585 or via email vetmcfarlin@gmail.com. Thank you. God bless!! Coach Elvin Douglas McFarlin

#014

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **3:18pm** [Comment ID: 180] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 3, Disagree: 0

All recipients, institutions, transactions, and related should be made public lest we repeat what SLPS just went through. Any funds must be competitively applied for and not just handed out. Competition is sorely lacking and incentivization is one way to steer this successfully.

1 **WHEREAS**, the City of St. Louis launched its community engagement for the Rams Settlement
2 on August 14, 2023 by providing a platform for residents to submit ideas and a survey of city
3 residents' priority challenges that reached nearly 3,200 residents; and

4 **WHEREAS**, based on the results⁰¹⁷ from that survey, the Board of Aldermen passed Resolution 159
5 on November 17, 2023 to declare their intentions of using the funds to address the following
6 common priorities: attracting and retaining City workers, increasing public safety, improving City
7 finances, upgrading water infrastructure, increasing access to affordable childcare, improving
8 community mobility, and catalyzing downtown reinvestment; and

9 **WHEREAS**, in 2024, more than 12,000 residents participated in the second phase of the
10 community engagement process, voting on ideas to address top priority challenges, as well as
11 interacting with and commenting on others' submissions, and the Board of Aldermen committed
12 to holding hearings on the most popular and feasible ideas; and

13⁰¹⁵ **WHEREAS**, those ideas included improving City infrastructure services like streets, sidewalks,
14 and water; strengthening the City workforce; supporting affordable and quality childcare; and
15 catalyzing downtown⁰¹⁶ reinvestment; and

16 **WHEREAS**, the extensive, transparent, and responsive community engagement process reached
17 over 15,000 unique participants as of December 2024; and

18 **WHEREAS**, over several legislative sessions, the Board of Aldermen has committed to ensuring
19 that these funds are allocated strategically and responsibly to maximize their impact by leveraging
20 matching funds, balancing competing priorities, and creating a generational⁰²¹ legacy; and

21 **WHEREAS**, as the top priority expressed⁰¹⁸ by St. Louis City residents, the Board of Aldermen is
22 committed to competitively compensating⁰¹⁹ city employees⁰²⁰ and recognizes the value of ensuring

#015

Posted by **Jonathan Scalpone** on **12/21/2024** at **10:52am** [Comment ID: 298] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

The Rams settlement money should be spent on improvements for the quality of life of residents, particularly those who live in the downtown area. This area was most impacted by the Rams leaving the city. This bill has little mention of what would actually be done to help the residents of downtown. Additionally, there is little mention of how we will try to attract new residents, new businesses, and visitors to the city.

#016

Posted by **James Duda** on **12/15/2024** at **10:21pm** [Comment ID: 264] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

Page 2 has the only mentions of downtown in the bill. Meanwhile, beautifying downtown streetscapes and improving the pedestrian experience downtown were in the top five for citizen priorities.

I think its important that we make the pedestrian experience really good downtown. Wider sidewalks, more plants, water features, and road diets will make visitors want to stay downtown instead of spending the night in the county and commuting in for the Convention Center, Busch Stadium, Enterprise Center, etc.

Following through with what these citizens, like me, wanted can save lives from traffic violence, set the stage for business/residential development, boost civic pride, and bring in tax revenue.

#017

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **3:20pm** [Comment ID: 181] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Please make available all raw, meta, and summary data of this survey since it was rolled out to tax-paying citizens. There should be a reference to this either at the bottom/end of the document or in a hyperlink.

Reply by **SiteAdmin** on **12/12/2024** at **12:45pm** [Comment ID: 208] - [Link](#)

Answer

Agree: 2, Disagree: -1

Mr. Easter, the results of that survey was presented in October 2023 and has been available on the portal in several places, including Meeting Recordings and the Vote on Priority Ideas page: <https://stlouis.govocal.com/en/projects/rams-settlement/2>

Reply by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/18/2024** at **9:39am** [Comment ID: 269] - [Link](#)
Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Hi,

Thanks for providing the link to the reports. I've reviewed those summaries and found them useful summarizing the information at a broad scale. I am more interested in the data files that were used to generate those reports. For example, there should be some sort of database that pooled these data leading up to report generation. Please provide that information as a tool. Further, can the survey/experimental design on how the values were arrived at be made available? Perhaps I'm overlooking where to find these bits of information. Thanks as always for your help.

#018

Posted by **David Crafts** on **12/12/2024** at **6:15pm** [Comment ID: 219] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Raises may be needed, but is the "top priority" of city residents really to spend this one time windfall money on paying city employees more?

#019

Posted by **Jonathan Ferry** on **12/12/2024** at **12:01pm** [Comment ID: 204] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 1, Disagree: -2

Employee expenses are ongoing in nature, and this is a one-time fund. How is the city going to ensure financial sustainability of any raises if they are not affordable today?

Many cities have found themselves in financial trouble for accepting grants to build infrastructure, without having a means to fund the ongoing maintenance. Using Rams Funds to commit to ongoing pay raises poses a similar problem.

Reply by **J K** on **12/17/2024** at **6:11pm** [Comment ID: 266] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Well, this year there was a \$42+ million surplus. Fox 2 reported, "This underspending was largely due to numerous vacant positions across city departments." (1) Half of this money goes toward capital improvements (on top of ARPA and these Rams Funds!) and half goes toward general revenue.

Don't forget, as reported by KSDK, in 2023, the aldermen essentially doubled their pay unchecked and provided an increase of \$800 to \$5,000 (!) to their expense account [why do they have an expense account???]. (2) Their reasoning was that the wards were halved, as voted by the taxpayers! The budget surplus this year was reported to be due to a lack of employees which

resulted in an increased workload for many. City employees did not even get a cost of living increase this year... in a period of very high inflation (no source needed!).

City employees see this.

For starters, they could set up an investment account with the \$42+ million to offset the added costs of simply paying their people an appropriate wage. Just because folks work for the public sector [for YOU!] shouldn't mean they shouldn't be compensated on par with their private sector counterparts.

(1)

<https://fox2now.com/news/missouri/st-louis-city-finishes-fiscal-year-with-42-4m-surplus/>

(2)

<https://www.ksdk.com/article/news/politics/st-louis-mayor-approves-bill-nearly-doubling-pay-for-board-of-aldermen/63-d7e89160-3945-4c77-bc8e-c00521cf110e>

#020

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **3:37pm** [Comment ID: 184] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

Is this applying to all employees? I fear perhaps low-performing employees who do not have a good work ethic, have poor performance, do not get along well with colleagues, etc., receiving raises will not be an effective use of this money. Oppositely, upper management should not receive these funds - those out on the streets picking up our trash, planting trees, paving roads, cleaning bus stops, installing lights/street signs, among other workers (the labor pool of city employees) should be prioritized. This would immediately change morale.

#021

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **3:25pm** [Comment ID: 183] - [Link](#)

Endorsement

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Generational legacy is key, tough, but not impossible. A major change in how we think about moving forward learning from other cities' and our own mistakes will be valuable. I would also suggest tracking 'case studies' to show progress and making these available to the public (e.g. families before awarded money and after with results).

1 that workers have every enrichment opportunity available to them, as nearly every city department
2 currently struggles with attracting and maintaining full staffing capacity; and

3 **WHEREAS**, the investment of funds as outlined within this legislation also supports community
4 justice-centered priorities identified by the Reparations Commis⁰³¹ and numerous other City
5 boar⁰²² commissio⁰²³ and other public entities, including dedicated funding for housing,
6 homeownership, home repair, and affordable housing development specifically targeted to support
7 marginalized, disinvested, and redlined communities, to mitigate displacement, community
8 instability, and other legacies of institutional discrimination against the City's Black residents.

9 **BE IT ORDAINED BY THE CITY OF ST. LOUIS AS FOLLOWS:**

10 **SECTION ONE. Public Purpose Satisfied.** It is hereby declared to be the intention of the Board
11 of Aldermen that the funds created by this ordinance and their purposes as defined herein serve a
12 public purpose, because the City can achieve its full economic and social potential only if every
13 City resident has the opportunity to contribute to the full extent of their capabilities and only when
14 financial barriers to their economic, social and educational goals are removed, and because these
15 funds will achieve that public purpose by:

16 A. Improving public⁰²⁴ structure a⁰²⁵s the City, so that⁰²⁷ residents will have access to and
17 benefit from clean drinking water and quality streets and sidewalks;^{026 030}

18 B. Supporting economic growth by improving access to capital for in⁰³³ative community
19 development initiatives for both affordable housing and commercially vibrant neighborhoods
20 across the City; and⁰²⁹

21 C. Retaining and attracting residents, through investments available to all such as housing and
22 homeownership, economic and career opportunities, and ability to raise⁰²⁸ ^{032 034}; and

#022

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **3:40pm** [Comment ID: 186] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

please provide references to this statement

#023

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **3:41pm** [Comment ID: 187] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

please provide reference to this statement

#024

Posted by **Riisa Rawlins** on **12/30/2024** at **6:52pm** [Comment ID: 302] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

suggestion: I recommend considering the City's Public Health Department as part of the critical infrastructure for our city's vibrant future

#025

Posted by **Jonathan Ferry** on **12/12/2024** at **12:06pm** [Comment ID: 205] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 1, Disagree: -1

"Across" the city? Let's please not make the same old mistake that St. Louis has repeatedly made in the past by spreading resources out so thinly that they end up making no real impact at all. That would truly be a catastrophic waste of this opportunity.

#026

Posted by **Donna Agah** on **12/12/2024** at **2:46pm** [Comment ID: 214] - [Link](#)

Endorsement

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

This is what the money should be spent on--our infrastructure existing in the city.

#027

Posted by **Jonathan Ferry** on **12/12/2024** at **12:09pm** [Comment ID: 206] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

It is mathematically impossible, even if we used 100% of the money in the Rams Fund, to fix the water and street infrastructure for "all" residents in the city. This language is setting up the public to have unreasonable expectations of what it will accomplish.

#028

Posted by **Donna Agah** on **12/12/2024** at **2:46pm** [Comment ID: 213] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 1, Disagree: -1

Disagree. There has been extensive federal HUD funding and subsidies for public housing. We still have failures at the St Louis Housing Authority in enforcing problems in our public housing--some so extensive that units are unavailable. Address these problems before creating more bureaucracy.

#029

Posted by **Donna Agah** on **12/12/2024** at **2:44pm** [Comment ID: 212] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Eliminate B. This should be part of annual budget and SLDC.

#030

Posted by **David Crafts** on **12/12/2024** at **6:31pm** [Comment ID: 220] - [Link](#)

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

Infrastructure may be listed first, but gets lesser amount of money. Some comments say water rates should cover it, but the water system is old and breaking down. Lead pipes, which affect poor children most of all, should be replaced as soon as possible. The water main breaks can be repaired on a patchwork basis, but that is inefficient, and becoming more frequent. Also, one can see the results with infrastructure; B,C and D sound good, but we've been doing many things like that, and we seem to have a habit of money bleeding off to the sides--see the recent business development grants

#031

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **3:40pm** [Comment ID: 185] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

please provide a reference to this claim

#032

Posted by **Riisa Rawlins** on **12/30/2024** at **7:01pm** [Comment ID: 304] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

continued improvement in critical health indicators (including STIs) as well as access to information and resources to support family planning are critical factors in this regard - each critical roles of the DOH

#033

Posted by **Jonathan Ferry** on **12/12/2024** at **12:15pm** [Comment ID: 207] - [Link](#)

Endorsement

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Let's make sure that these innovative community development initiatives effectively attract additional capital by unlocking lending from banks, and investment from institutions, companies and individual investors. There is every reason in the world to believe that we can transform this fund into a collective investment in the city in the billions of dollars, which will truly move us toward financial sustainability, while achieving economic justice objectives.

#034

Posted by **Riisa Rawlins** on **12/30/2024** at **6:55pm** [Comment ID: 303] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

please consider including access to information and resources necessary to achieving optimal individual and community health (critical to maintain resilience in the event of future pandemics or public health crises)

1 035 Providing additional investments supporting the City’s workforce, with a prioritization of City
2 workers' ability to benefit through investments 039 professional training, education,
3 certification, and accreditation as well as providing support for housing and homeownership, 041
4 and ability to raise a family 038 .

5 **SECTION TWO. Definitions.**

6 A. **Available Monies.** “Available monies” shall mean the sum of interest and the principal
7 accessible for such distribution as indicated for each respective fund. 040

8 B. **Board of Public Service.** The “Board of Public Service” shall refer to the St. Louis City Board
9 of Public Service, including the Office of the President of the Board of Public Service.

10 C. **Community Development Innovation Funds.** The “Community Development Innovation
11 Funds” shall mean the Citywide Housing Fund and the Citywide Neighborhood Development
12 Fund. Both the Citywide Housing Fund and Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund shall
13 be administered by the Community Development Administration with oversight provided by
14 the Community Development Innovation Fund Board.

15 037 **Citywide Infrastructure Funds.** The “Citywide Infrastructure Funds” shall mean the Citywide
16 Water Infrastructure Fund and the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund. The Water Division
17 shall have general oversight over and administer the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund. The
18 Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund shall be administered by the Board of Public Service
19 with oversight provided by the Capital Committee.

20 E. **City workers.** “City workers” shall mean workers who are employed by the City of St. Louis.

21 036 **The St. Louis Future Funds.** “The St. Louis Future Funds” shall mean the Children and
22 Families Endowment Fund and the City Workforce Fund. The Treasurer’s Office shall
23 administer the Children and Families Endowment Fund with oversight provided by the

#035

Posted by **Riisa Rawlins** on **12/30/2024** at **7:02pm** [Comment ID: 305] - [Link](#)

Endorsement

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

this is such a worthwhile investment across all of our city's departments

#036

Posted by **Riisa Rawlins** on **12/30/2024** at **7:08pm** [Comment ID: 307] - [Link](#)

Endorsement

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

appreciative of this visionary investment that will have immediate and long-term impact

#037

Posted by **Riisa Rawlins** on **12/30/2024** at **7:07pm** [Comment ID: 306] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Curious whether infrastructure can be broadened to include strengthening of critical departments to ensure resilience in the face of unanticipated crises (including, but not limited to, DOH in the event of future outbreaks or pandemics, etc.)

#038

Posted by **J K** on **12/17/2024** at **6:37pm** [Comment ID: 268] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: -1

What about the City employees who choose to not have children? What are you going to do for them? Equal treatment!

#039

Posted by **Donna Agah** on **12/12/2024** at **2:48pm** [Comment ID: 215] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

The city has millions unused at the end of our fiscal year. This indicates that some of these city jobs are vacant and unneeded. Only when a full review with published public findings is concluded by an independent organization, funds should be expended on the City workforce.

#040

Posted by **Donna Agah** on **12/12/2024** at **2:50pm** [Comment ID: 217] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

The funds available for expenditure must be limited to 50% of the annual interest. If unused in the annual budget, it should be returned to the fund. If the principal is to be accessed, the Board of Aldermen would approve with 2/3 vote outside of the annual budget process.

#041

Posted by **J K** on **12/17/2024** at **6:32pm** [Comment ID: 267] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: -1

Ok. What about City employees who had to live within the City limits to keep their employment? Up until late Summer 2023, City employees had to live in the City to keep their jobs. (1) Then Governor Parson came along and abolished it, even though City Residency was voted for time and time again by the taxpayers.

What is the plan for City employees who have already purchased property here? Look at the real estate market since the pandemic: it's rather cost ineffective to move right now. Are you going to help employees with their mortgages? What about those who have lived here long enough to own property? Are they going to see a reduction or elimination of real estate taxes? We need to see equal treatment here, people who have already applied themselves need not take a back seat here.

(1)

<https://www.stlpr.org/government-politics-issues/2023-08-28/residency-requirement-lifted-for-st-louis-city-employees>

Children and Families Endowment Fund Board. The City Workforce Fund shall be administered by the St. Louis Agency on Training and Education with oversight provided by the City Workforce Fund Board.

G. **Settlement Funds.** "Settlement Funds" shall refer to the funds the City received as a result of the City's settlement of litigation against Rams Football Team owner Stan Kroenke and the National Football League.

SECTION THREE. The Citywide Infrastructure Funds.

A. The Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund.

1. *Establishment of the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund.*

a. There is hereby appropriated the sum of Forty Million and 0/100ths Dollars (\$40,000,000.00) from Settlement Funds into a special fund to be known as the **Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund**, created pursuant to this ordinance, and to be held in a fund maintained in the Office of the City Treasurer.

b. Upon the passage and approval of this ordinance, the Comptroller is authorized and directed to establish a fund to be designated as the "Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund" for the purpose of supporting City water infrastructure and improvements. The fund shall be eligible to accept additional monies from other City appropriations, private donations, or other sources. All interest earned by the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund shall be retained in and for the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund. All expenditures from such fund shall be appropriated in accordance with this ordinance and other applicable law. Appropriate sub-accounts may be created.

c. The purpose of the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund is to support City water infrastructure maintenance and improvements. Funds deposited and held in the Citywide

#042

Posted by **Creighton Brinson** on **12/11/2024** at **2:53pm** [Comment ID: 178] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: -1

This amount sounds very low considering the amount of deferred maintenance and updates needed to the water system.

#043

Posted by **Jonathan Ferry** on **12/12/2024** at **12:59pm** [Comment ID: 209] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

The water infrastructure investment need is clearly far greater than the Rams Fund. To fund these repairs, the city should look at raising the revenue stream(s) that the city's water services generate, and then use funds like the Water Infrastructure Fund to lower the cost of capital on the revenue bonds issued (for example by structuring the bonds using the \$40 million as a sinker).

Given the size of the need, lowering the cost of capital for the entire loan amount may be far more financially impactful than if the Water Infrastructure Fund were injected directly.

Also, the city should speak to deep-pocketed companies (especially those who directly rely upon the city's high water quality - like Anheuser Busch), and ask them to consider buying the water infrastructure bonds at a below market interest rate. If, for example, the city could shave 2% off the interest on their water infrastructure bonds, over the course of 30 years, on a \$500 million bond, that would save the city over \$225 million in interest expense over 30 years.

Water Infrastructure Fund may be appropriated and expended only as provided under this ordinance.

2. Eligible Uses of the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund. Monies within the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund shall be used exclusively for providing appropriations to the Water Division for the purposes of:

- a. Supporting City water infrastructure maintenance and improvements, including emergency repairs;
- b. Providing matching funds for federal and state grants that support City water infrastructure maintenance and improvements;
- c. Providing debt service payments for loans received by the City to support City water infrastructure maintenance and improvements; and
- d. Procuring goods and services, compensating staff, and incurring other administrative costs, provided that such costs do not exceed 5% of the fund balance on an annual basis.

3. Restrictions on Use of Funds.

- a. No monies may be appropriated from the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund for any purpose other than that authorized pursuant to this ordinance.
- b. No monies may be appropriated from the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund to any entity other than the Water Division.

The Water Division shall develop and recommend appropriations from the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund, and any recommendations for inclusion in the City's annual budget shall be finalized by the March 1st preceding the fiscal year for that budget.

- d. No monies may be appropriated from the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund in excess of available monies within that fund.

#044

Posted by **Jonathan Ferry** on **12/12/2024** at **2:28pm** [Comment ID: 210] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I recommend adding that the funds can be used as a debt reserve or sinker for a water infrastructure revenue bond (or loan), as a means of securing a lower interest rate / cost of capital on the money borrowed.

#045

Posted by **Jonathan Ferry** on **12/12/2024** at **2:43pm** [Comment ID: 211] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

Where residents and businesses are capable of supporting water rates that are sufficient to cover the debt service on a loan to fund infrastructure repairs, that should be the primary source of funds for those repairs.

What the Water Infrastructure Fund allows the city to do is to lower the debt service cost for those areas, and then to use those savings to afford repairs in parts of the city where water service revenues are less able to afford the repairs needed.

As an example, consider a neighborhood where residents could afford the water rates necessary to do the improvements needed to their neighborhood, and another neighborhood, where they cannot afford their repairs. The city should calculate the annual debt service payment needed for the former neighborhood at market interest rates and set the water rates at the level needed to cover the cost of the loan for those repairs. Then, using the Water Infrastructure Fund as a debt reserve, secure a lower interest rate on those funds (without lowering the rate on water service). This would free up revenue from the neighborhood which can afford higher water service rates to help support infrastructure repairs in the neighborhood which cannot afford the higher rates.

If the city cannot legally have different rates for different neighborhoods, consider using a CID or NID for collecting the necessary revenues from the neighborhoods which are better able to afford the repairs needed in their areas.

#046

Posted by **Cheyenne Lovellette** on **12/13/2024** at **4:58pm** [Comment ID: 229] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

Please take a look at the Beyond Plastics Report, "The Perils of PVC Plastic Pipes." The EPA is currently reviewing a possible full on ban on Polyvinyl Chloride (PVC) and cities looking to replace lead pipes should be taking notice so that we can invest in non-toxic alternatives like copper. Please do not replace one poison water line with another!

<https://www.beyondplastics.org/publications/perils-of-pvc-pipes>

Reply by **Ousmane Gaye** on **01/01/2025** at **4:41pm** [Comment ID: 310] - [Link](#)

Endorsement

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

Agreed, lead pipes should be considered an emergency repair and replaced with a SAFE alternative. Time to move St. Louis into the 21st century ahead of the curve this time.

#047

Posted by **Teresa Turin-Lis** on **12/14/2024** at **1:04pm** [Comment ID: 239] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

It's scary to me that, although the description of the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund says it's for maintenance and improvements, the eligible uses section seems to be focused on emergencies. I understand the water infrastructure in our city is aging, but is it inadequate for current demand? Are we aiming to implement best practices for a city our size or are we held back by obstacles within our current infrastructure/water systems? I hope we can focus on the future and not just play catch-up.

#048

Posted by **Creighton Brinson** on **12/11/2024** at **2:52pm** [Comment ID: 177] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 3, Disagree: 0

Emergency repairs should be out the normal operating budget of this dept. These fund should be used only for needed updates and improvement, not for normal emergency repairs.

4. *Determination of Uses of the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund.* The Water Division shall (i) have general oversight over and administer the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund; (ii) recommend to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment any appropriations from the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund for inclusion into the City's annual operating budget for the Water Division; and (iii) recommend to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment any appropriations from the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund for any emergency repairs.

5. *Fund Accountability.*

a. The Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund shall be included among the funds subject to regular audits of City funds as required under law.

b. As part of the annual update provided for in Ordinance 71683, the Water Division shall include information on any appropriations made from the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund in the immediately preceding fiscal year implemented to support projects.

The Water Division shall submit an annual report to the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen no later than May 1 of each calendar year detailing (i) the long-term plan for the stewardship, management, repayment, and investment of monies within the Citywide Water Infrastructure Fund; and (ii) how available monies within the fund may impact the Water Division's capacity to provide water services.

B. The Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund.

1. *Establishment of the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund.*

a. There is hereby appropriated the sum of Sixty Million and 0/100ths Dollars (\$60,000,000.00) from Settlement Funds into a special fund to be known as the **Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund**, created pursuant to this ordinance, and to be held in a fund maintained in the Office of the City Treasurer.

#049

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/19/2024** at **9:52am** [Comment ID: 271] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

Among the top ten issues suggested, there were many ideas related to improving transportation and mobility by walking, cycling, or public transit. These ideas included the following: (1) traffic calming and pedestrian-friendly street design, (2) improve downtown street/sidewalk infrastructure, (3) support the northside-southside Jefferson Avenue expansion of MetroLink, and (4) protected bike lanes and bike network.

St. Louis, unlike cities in other US states, does not have the privilege of being in a state that meaningfully invests in infrastructure that prioritizes walking, cycling, and transit.

After all, Missouri ranks 49th among all states regarding cycling infrastructure. Meanwhile, our neighbor in Illinois, i.e., Madison County, invests more in cycling infrastructure alone than the entire state of Missouri.

Furthermore, our city bears the costs for MetroLink expansion without state support. Currently, we look to the federal government for support, but with the upcoming administration's cabinet picks, it is very unclear how likely they are to support transit projects.

Despite this, there is clear support from residents for projects that improve mobility in ways that do not prioritize cars. We must seize this moment, and do something truly transformational.

That is why I believe this fund should act first and foremost as a "Sustainable Mobilities Fund" which should be used to provide matching funds for projects that improve walking, ADA, cycling, and transit infrastructure. These funds should be reserved for truly transformational projects, but open to the city as a whole. Furthermore, it should have clear fund matching requirements whether from city revenue (e.g., from taxes), state or federal governments, or from donors. This would ensure that these funds go further and lessen concerns of depletion. Last, it should support popular initiatives to be determined by popular vote.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/20/2024** at **8:08pm** [Comment ID: 292] - [Link](#)

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

I should modify my comment, initiatives should be determined by popular vote or they should be required to prove great need in actually improving safety and access... such that we don't have funds going toward projects that do nothing to meaningfully increase mobility (e.g., Loop Trolley)

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/20/2024** at **9:47pm** [Comment ID: 297] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I'm wondering if this fund should directly fund pilot programs or if projects requesting these funds should require that big permanent projects have proven themselves with pilot programs. A pilot program could allow us to use more temporary infrastructure to make the initial steps towards accessibility to gauge usage prior to investing money in a project before knowing its likelihood for success. This would particularly be possible for cycle tracks, pedestrianized streets, and bus lanes which could use temporary infrastructure such as paint and flex posts before more permanent infrastructure. Could the board navigate this discussion with relevant departments and organizations?

#050

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/20/2024** at **1:42pm** [Comment ID: 288] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

I would love for the board to explore how effectiveness of infrastructure projects using these funds could be measured. Modal share, air quality, and traffic fatalities or injuries, should all be considered as measures for effectiveness of infrastructure.

#051

Posted by **James Duda** on **12/15/2024** at **10:36pm** [Comment ID: 265] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 5, Disagree: 0

Very disappointing that "traffic calming" and "pedestrian safety" do not come up at all in this legislation.

As I previously mentioned, downtown should be the top priority for beautification, traffic calming, and pedestrian safety, but we should also emphasize traffic calming and pedestrian safety all throughout the city. "Traffic Calming and Pedestrian Friendly Design" was the second most popular priority idea. It is really disappointing that the generational infrastructure changes that we voted for aren't being directly mentioned in this bill.

#052

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/20/2024** at **1:13pm** [Comment ID: 287] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

What options would the board of aldermen be open to considering to ensure these funds can make a notable impact to our built environment while also lasting for many years to come? I think requiring these funds to be matching would help, but I'm wondering if there needs to be other protections.

#053

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/20/2024** at **11:17am** [Comment ID: 286] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

There should be language that emphasizes a few key priorities in relation to mobility: environmental sustainability and public accessibility. Accessibility should include access regardless of socioeconomic class.

#054

Posted by **Adam Treaster** on **12/11/2024** at **11:50am** [Comment ID: 158] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 9, Disagree: -2

This Fund would really make more sense as an endowment. \$60mil is a lot of money to spend within a short number of years, in addition to the annual general budget and existing Capital Improvements fund. The City does not have nearly enough staff in house to design and construct these projects, so a good portion of this money will be wasted on paying for-profit contractors 2-3X for jobs that the city could handle in-house.

Streets and sidewalks need maintenance annually, forever. This fund would likely dry up within 10 years, and we'll be back to square one.

Reply by **Adam Treaster** on **12/11/2024** at **11:54am** [Comment ID: 159] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 12, Disagree: -1

Also nothing in this bill explicitly mentions traffic calming or bike/ped safety as a priority use of funds.

An annual endowment income from this \$60mil could conservatively bring in \$2-3M each year, which could pay for a small team on in-house staff to install many "quick-build" style traffic calming improvements. Many miles of protected bike lanes, hundreds of bump outs, etc.

#055

Posted by **Clayton Meyer** on **12/11/2024** at **12:46pm** [Comment ID: 162] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 11, Disagree: 0

As mentioned, nothing is brought up regarding developing safe pedestrian infrastructure. Creating a bi-modal, healthy downtown can bring millions of dollars to the city; allowing smaller businesses to thrive and further grow the culture of the metro area.

#056

Posted by **Jonathan Ferry** on **12/12/2024** at **2:49pm** [Comment ID: 216] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 3, Disagree: 0

I agree with another comment that this money should not be used for operational purposes, including emergency repairs. That is what the revenue from water service rates are for, and if they are too low to cover these expenses, then they need to be raised.

These funds should be used to make our investments in water infrastructure go farther than they otherwise could, by lowering the cost of capital to do strategic, necessary repairs.

Any appropriations from the Water Infrastructure Fund should align with expenditures called for in our strategic water infrastructure investment plan.

Please change this language to reflect that these appropriations are for strategic purposes, and not for operational purposes or emergency repairs.

#057

Posted by **Matthew Naglich** on **12/11/2024** at **12:03pm** [Comment ID: 160] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 16, Disagree: 0

No where in this part of the bill is safety even mentioned. It looks like this would just increase the budgets of the streets department and BPS and the 'Priority Ideas' that advocated for traffic calming, bike lanes, and Pedestrian-Friendly Street Design have all been completely ignored.

I would really like to see the eligible uses of the funds be more specific and focus on improving the safety of Mobility for all users.

#058

Posted by **Liz Kramer** on **12/15/2024** at **2:11pm** [Comment ID: 257] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 4, Disagree: 0

There's plenty of language to draw from other recent bills (including Complete Streets) to address safety, vulnerable road users, etc.

#059

Posted by **Liz Kramer** on **12/15/2024** at **2:15pm** [Comment ID: 258] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 6, Disagree: 0

It would be helpful if this fund aligns with the goals, priorities, and recommendations of the ongoing Transportation and Mobility Plan. As others have mentioned, there's hardly any mention of safety and there's a need for clarity that this funding is to improve conditions for people using our roads via all sorts of modes — not just making it easier to drive.

#060

Posted by **Noah Goldman** on **12/18/2024** at **1:52pm** [Comment ID: 270] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

To accomodate the priority needs established by the traffic calming and pedestrian safety need highlighted in earlier stages of the Ram's settlement public engagement, this bill needs language that earmarks money towards projects that improve safety on St Louis streets. We need to ensure that this money goes towards traffic calming and not just status quo street repavings.

#061

Posted by **Creighton Brinson** on **12/11/2024** at **3:08pm** [Comment ID: 179] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 3, Disagree: 0

This is windfall money and should be used for grant matching and not normal operational funds from the city budget. This is "extra" money for upgrades and improvements, not to fund the dept. itself. I do not like this language at all.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/20/2024** at **8:23pm** [Comment ID: 293] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I totally agree with this! This fund should be reserved for transformational projects while also being used strategically. Matching funds is the way to go! Normal operations should be covered by taxes.

b. Upon the passage and approval of this ordinance, the Comptroller is authorized and directed to establish a fund to be designated as the "Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund" for the purpose of maintaining and improving City infrastructure that supports the mobility of its residents across the City. All interest earned by the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund funds deposited in such designated account shall be retained in and for the Citywide Mobility Fund. The fund shall be eligible to accept additional monies from other City appropriations, private donations, or other sources. All expenditures from such fund shall be appropriated in accordance with this ordinance and other applicable law. Appropriate sub-accounts may be created.

c. The purpose of the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund is to support City streets and sidewalks infrastructure maintenance and improvements. Funds deposited and held in the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund may be appropriated and expended only as provided under this ordinance.

2. *Eligible Uses of the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund.* Available monies within the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund shall be used exclusively for providing appropriations to the Board of Public Service or the Department of Streets, or their successor entities, for the purposes of:

- a. Supporting City streets and sidewalks infrastructure maintenance, improvements and accessibility;
- b. Providing matching funds for federal and state grants for projects that support City streets and sidewalks infrastructure maintenance, improvements, and accessibility; and

#062

Posted by **Deborah Holmes** on **12/11/2024** at **1:52pm** [Comment ID: 169] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: -4

Will there be an intentional design that includes speed bumps and intersection roundabouts? In traveling throughout the world, many metropolitan areas have reduced traffic problems with these strategies- which prevent speeding and reduce police involvement in traffic related accidents. I have even seen speed bumps on highways.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/14/2024** at **11:22pm** [Comment ID: 248] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 3, Disagree: 0

I do not believe the bill needs specific language about speed bumps or roundabouts per se... but I would like specifications that funds should improve safety from (other) vehicles and reduce traffi-related casualties.

#063

Posted by **Paul Nauert** on **12/15/2024** at **6:39pm** [Comment ID: 261] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 6, Disagree: 0

Glad to see infrastructure addressed. I would suggest prioritizing walking/biking/public transportation options when modernizing city streets.

#064

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/13/2024** at **3:59pm** [Comment ID: 227] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 4, Disagree: 0

There should be more clear language that addresses what "accessibility" means.

#065

Posted by **Cheyenne Lovellette** on **12/13/2024** at **4:54pm** [Comment ID: 228] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 9, Disagree: 0

How is there no mention of street calming and initiatives to support bike and pedestrian traffic when there has been so much public support for these measures? There is tons of local energy around alternative transportation and these funds could be used to accomplish something great that would not only set our city apart but support cyclists and pedestrians while fighting climate change by prioritizing alternative modes of transportation. I want to see calm, green streets that are more accessible for all and this money could help us get there but we need to be clear about that goal otherwise cars will continue to pollute our air with fumes and noise and cause accidents. I have to cross Grand on my bike trip to work and it scares me

every time. Where is the plan so we can feel safe on our streets??

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/14/2024** at **11:25pm** [Comment ID: 249] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

Agreed. Sustainability and Safety need to be highlighted.

#066

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/13/2024** at **3:09pm** [Comment ID: 224] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 6, Disagree: 0

This bill waters down many of the requests that were made from residents longing for the city to center walkability, cycling infrastructure, and transit. Please consider emphasizing that funds ought to be used for plans that prioritize and improve these.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/20/2024** at **3:48pm** [Comment ID: 291] - [Link](#)

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

I think it is important to highlight a comment from the Improving Community Mobility section by Patrick Cuba:

"I think I've hit the point I would like to deprioritize cars completely in a theme like this. Cars are in the way downtown and only make it easier for people outside of St. Louis to get into it. Improving public transit or non-car individual mobility is like giving everyone in the city a \$10k raise, as they avoid a host of costs, lost time, and crime risks. We don't need to force money into "revitalization" to open businesses and lofts until there is a place for people established. I love the Armory, but next time you go, consider how you would walk or bike to it. A new "urban" Target store just added yet another stoplight on Grand instead of better access to the existing transit there. (<https://www.highwayherodrivingacademy.com/post/what-is-the-cost-of-a-traffic-light#viewer-22q5h>)

I do not want a single dime of this on crosswalk painting, new designated bike lanes, or (car) traffic calming that is not a complete redesign of the street to align it with the intended use by the neighborhood. If we aren't planning something transformative, let's just cut out the posing."

#067

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **4:01pm** [Comment ID: 189] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 6, Disagree: -3

Since trees are likely in the place between streets and sidewalks, is there going to be monies earmarked for maintaining our urban forest assets? I see absolutely no language with respect to this (Forestry Department) who are also severely short-staffed and overwhelmed with backlogs of work. If 'generational legacy' is a motive and desired outcome of this bill, trees and environment need to be included

as well.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/19/2024** at **10:55am** [Comment ID: 273] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I do not believe that street trees need to be specifically earmarked in this fund. I think this fund should be very specific to infrastructure improving mobility by way of walking, biking, and public transportation. I believe once we start earmarking for other departments, we get too deep in the weeds and stray away from the top ten issues that folks selected as priorities.

#068

Posted by **David Cunningham** on **12/15/2024** at **8:00pm** [Comment ID: 262] - [Link](#)

Agree: 8, Disagree: 0

The ideas that were proposed and voted on in earlier stages specified that streets should be redesigned for pedestrians, cyclists, and transit specifically, therefore the language in this bill should reflect that priority. It doesn't need to go as far as prescribing specific design elements (e.g. bump outs, speed humps), but absolutely should specify that this fund is intended to improve safety and access for pedestrians, cyclists, and public transit.

From Traffic Calming and Pedestrian-Friendly Street Design:

"By redesigning our streets to slow down drivers, the City could not only protect pedestrians and bicyclists, but also improve quality of life for all residents. Traffic-calming design elements include better lighting, narrower lanes, pedestrian-only areas, wider sidewalks, crosswalks, curb bump-outs, reflective painting, and street trees to shade sidewalks. The City could establish a dedicated team within the Streets Department to pilot street redesign."

From Improve downtown street & sidewalk infrastructure:

"These infrastructure improvements would increase walkability and bike access, boost foot traffic, promote public safety, and contribute to Downtown revitalization."

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/15/2024** at **8:40pm** [Comment ID: 263] - [Link](#)

Endorsement

Agree: 3, Disagree: 0

I second this.

Reply by **Aleck** on **12/20/2024** at **2:18pm** [Comment ID: 290] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 3, Disagree: 0

I agree with this, I don't find "support City streets and sidewalks infrastructure maintenance and improvements" to be specific enough to reflect the issues that were so popular when we voted for traffic calming and pedestrian friendly street design, bike lanes, and transit improvements. Would love to see pedestrian and bicycle safety mentioned.

#069

Posted by **Annette Nowakowski** on **12/20/2024** at **8:30pm** [Comment ID: 294] - [Link](#)
Agree: 3, Disagree: 0

Streets and sidewalks need to be safe for people with disabilities. As a blind person, I can hardly walk on my sidewalks in North Hampton because sidewalks are so uneven. In many places, there are no sidewalks, just grass. As a blind person, how can I walk on grass? I use sidewalks to navigate with my guide dog. I have to go to the curb and try to follow with my guide dog in the street. Funds should be provided to put in sidewalks where there is grass in front of people's houses. There are curb cuts for wheelchairs at intersections which angle into the intersections which are dangerous for blind people. They do not provide an accurate crossing because they angle into the intersection and into traffic. See example at Hampton and Chippewa, northeast corner by Walgreens. Funds should be used to fix this problem.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/21/2024** at **3:37pm** [Comment ID: 299] - [Link](#)
Agree: 0, Disagree: 0
Thank you for sharing your experiences Annette! This is so important.

#070

Posted by **Michael Phelan** on **12/11/2024** at **9:33pm** [Comment ID: 202] - [Link](#)
Suggestion
Agree: 9, Disagree: 0

Can street and sidewalk improvements be elaborated or defined? To a transportation engineer, improving a road may mean increasing its vehicle efficiency. While to a neighborhood resident it may mean increasing pedestrian safety, providing bike lanes, landscaped medians, ect.

#071

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/13/2024** at **2:56pm** [Comment ID: 223] - [Link](#)
Agree: 7, Disagree: 0

This fund should prioritize *sustainable* forms of mobility that move forward socioeconomic and climate justice.

#072

Posted by **John Nowotny** on **12/15/2024** at **9:57am** [Comment ID: 251] - [Link](#)
Agree: 5, Disagree: 0

Maintenance of city streets and sidewalks is very important. There also needs to be priority however on providing safe and convenient access for pedestrians, bicycling, public transportation.

080

c. Providing matching funds for City streets and sidewalks infrastructure maintenance, improvements, and accessibility projects which demonstrate private funding support or other local funds; and 078 081 082

d. Procuring goods and services, compensating staff, and incurring other administrative costs, 074 provided that such costs do not exceed 5% of the fund balance on an annual basis.

3. Restrictions 075 Use of Funds.

a. No monies may be appropriated from the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund for any purpose other than that authorized pursuant to this ordinance.

b. No monies may be appropriated from the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund to any entity other than the Board of Public Service or the Streets Department, or their successor entities.

c. The Capital Committee, as provided under Chapter 5.35.040, shall develop and recommend appropriations from the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund, and any recommendations for inclusion in the City's annual budget shall be finalized by the March 1st preceding the fiscal year for that budget.

d. No monies may be appropriated from the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund in excess of available monies within that fund.

4. Administration of the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund. The Board of Public Service shall 073 077 administer the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund.

5. Fund Accountability 076 079

a. The Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund shall be included among the funds subject to regular audits of City funds as required under law.

#073

Posted by **Adam Treaster** on **12/11/2024** at **11:37am** [Comment ID: 156] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 2, Disagree: -3

This fund should be managed by the new DOT, not BPS.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/14/2024** at **11:28pm** [Comment ID: 250] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

In the interim, who should manage this fund since DOT would not be expected to be in place until 2029 at the latest?

#074

Posted by **Adam Treaster** on **12/11/2024** at **11:40am** [Comment ID: 157] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 4, Disagree: -4

This restriction shouldn't exist. Especially if the staff/board/committees feel it would be best for the funds to be spent growing the Streets Department into the DOT by hiring additional staff.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/19/2024** at **10:49am** [Comment ID: 272] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I personally endorse this section. I think the primary function of this fund should be to address the needs of physical infrastructure, but I also believe it should require matching funding from other sources which may address procurement of goods or compensation.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/20/2024** at **11:08am** [Comment ID: 285] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I should add that I think anything relating to staffing should be primarily addressed by the proposed City Workforce Fund which focuses on improving pay and benefits for workers.

#075

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/13/2024** at **3:54pm** [Comment ID: 225] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

What stops these funds from being used to build a tesla hyperloop or increase infrastructure that will increase reliance on vehicles??? This does not clearly address the majority of the issues brought up regarding mobility...

#076

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/13/2024** at **3:57pm** [Comment ID: 226] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 4, Disagree: 0

Projects using these funds should be required to explain how they will use funds to increase overall safety AND increase the percentage of those using sustainable modes of transportation.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/20/2024** at **9:00pm** [Comment ID: 296] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

Projects using these funds should also address connectivity to other projects. Any interviews and discussions that I've had, connectivity has come up frequently as bike lanes or sidewalks simply disappear. Projects using these funds need to prove how they will improve connectivity to existing infrastructure.

#077

Posted by **Creighton Brinson** on **12/11/2024** at **2:49pm** [Comment ID: 176] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 1, Disagree: -5

This fund should be managed by the New DOT dept, not the Board of Public Service.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/14/2024** at **8:57am** [Comment ID: 231] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Since the Department of Transportation will not exist until 2029, what department do you believe should handle this in the interim?

#078

Posted by **Peter Rothermich** on **12/14/2024** at **11:17pm** [Comment ID: 247] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 8, Disagree: 0

I would like to see something about safety, specifically for bike and pedestrian use. Traffic calming measures and protected bike lines would be ideal.

#079

Posted by **rorke chhouk** on **12/15/2024** at **11:32am** [Comment ID: 255] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

Can this be more specific on what the fund will actually be used for and not be used for? This is so vague it's not very helpful

#080

Posted by **rorke chhouk** on **12/15/2024** at **11:30am** [Comment ID: 253] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 3, Disagree: 0

What do you mean by streets and sidewalk infrastructure maintenance. can this be more specific? There is nothing about funds actually prioritizing real ways to make sure it's easier to move around St. Louis without a personal vehicle

#081

Posted by **rorke chhouk** on **12/15/2024** at **11:31am** [Comment ID: 254] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 3, Disagree: 0

There is nothing clearly stating that sustainability is a focus.

#082

Posted by **Charles Williams** on **12/11/2024** at **5:47pm** [Comment ID: 198] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 3, Disagree: -5

I do not trust our BOA President or Mayor to lay out this spending program and implement it fairly. This bill will not fix the issues that are plaguing our city.

Reply by **Anonymous** on **12/14/2024** at **4:12pm** [Comment ID: 243] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: -4

I don't trust them either!

- b. The Board of Public Service shall submit an annual report to the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen no later than May 1 of each calendar year detailing (i) the long-term plan for the stewardship, management, and investment of monies within the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund; and (ii) the implementation of any appropriations made from the Citywide Mobility Infrastructure Fund in the immediately preceding fiscal year.

SECTION FOUR. The St. Louis Future Funds.

A. The Children and Families Endowment Fund.

1. *Establishment of the Children and Families Endowment Fund.*

- a. There is hereby appropriated the sum of Fifty Seven Million Two Hundred Forty Thousand and Sixty-One and 56/100ths Dollars (\$57,240,061.56) from Settlement Funds into a special fund to be known as the **Children and Families Endowment Fund**, created pursuant to this ordinance, and to be held in a fund maintained in the Office of the City Treasurer.
- b. Upon the passage and approval of this ordinance, the Comptroller is authorized and directed to establish a fund to be designated as the "Children and Families Endowment Fund" for the purposes of supporting the recruitment and retention of families in the City of St. Louis by providing residents with increased access to affordable child care services in the City of St. Louis, with priority consideration for access to such services being given to City workers, and increasing access to post-secondary educational opportunities at institutions located in the City of St. Louis for youth who have attended school in the City of St. Louis, as provided under this ordinance. The Children and Families Endowment Fund may accept any other proceeds from contributions, gifts, or grants made available for the purposes of the fund or the accounts within the fund. Moneys in the Children and

#083

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/19/2024** at **11:58am** [Comment ID: 278] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I'm concerned that the Children and Families Endowment Fund attempts to do too much. Among the top ten ideas, residents wanted support for (1) Free or Municipally Subsidized Child Care for Residents, and (2) Before- and After-School Care. I believe all the issues presented here matter, but not all of them were present during earlier engagements related to the Rams Settlement.

#084

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **4:56pm** [Comment ID: 192] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

This is rather vague. Contracting outside sources can become a money-drain as well as procuring goods. What we do not need any more of is second- and third-party consulting entities providing studies and 'services' describing problems where we already are all aware of causes and the solutions thereof. If capital, procurement, services are mentioned, then these should be made available and tracked for the public on a quarterly basis for sake of transparency. It seems the latest bruise with SLPS would be reason to have utmost transparency lest we want a virtual fleecing of the Rams Settlement money.

Back of envelope math with this fund if begun today in 2024, raising a child from infancy to 18 years, is ballpark \$300K. Right out the gate, with the fund alone (assumes no accrued interest), this fund would only see less than 200 children through a program. It seems the burn rate will be faster than the replenish (money influx) rate. Are we anticipating sustained growth through interest alone? Coupled with grants and donations? This seems very high-risk and a very expensive proof of concept.

Families Endowment Fund at the close of a fiscal year shall not lapse but shall be carried forward to the next fiscal year.

085 The purpose of the Children and Families Endowment Fund is to support the recruitment and retention of families in the City of St. Louis by 091 (i) providing City residents with increased access to affordable child care services, by giving first priority consideration for access to such services being given to City workers, and by giving priority consideration to funding programs which will maximize 088 these City funds by alleviating child care costs on residents in partnership with employers who are located within the City of St. Louis; and (ii) increasing access to postsecondary educational and training opportunities at institutions and programs located in the St. Louis reg 090 for youth who live in and have attended school in the City of St. Louis for an amount of time to be determined by the City Treasurer's Office, and who have demonstrated academic achievement throughout high school as determined by the City Treasurer's Office, with first priority for access to such services being given to children of City worker 089 and by giving priority consideration to funding 086 programs which will maximize these City funds by (1) securing private funding support for such efforts; (2) securing partnerships with regional postsecondary institutions and programs to facilitate increased access to postsecondary educational and training opportunities; and (3) providing last-dollar funding to eligible students. Funds deposited and held in the Children and Families Endowment Fund may be appropriated and expended only as provided under this ordinance.

d. The Children and Families Endowment Fund shall contain two (2) accounts:

- i. One (1) to be known as the "**Affordable Child Care Account**," shall be assigned to maintain funds to support the availability of affordable child care in the City as

#085

Posted by **Riisa Rawlins** on **12/30/2024** at **7:13pm** [Comment ID: 308] - [Link](#)

Endorsement

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

appreciative of this commitment to our city's present and future as well as the opportunity to supplement and grow this fund through private investment

#086

Posted by **Nathaniel Farrell** on **12/14/2024** at **10:08am** [Comment ID: 232] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

I agree with most of the criticisms of the language here prioritizing City Workers: doesn't look great. I further worry that this language privileging programs is a recipe for nepotism. For instance, based on the way the grant awards have gone, I could imagine a situation here in which the money for this provision was delivered to private providers with connections or with favor.

#087

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **4:41pm** [Comment ID: 190] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 1, Disagree: -1

I have two opinions on this:

Not in favor:

Retention is and has been an issue in this City since the end of WWII due to poor policy- and decision-making that has only ended up benefitting a very small group of people.

Though well-known, people, families, individuals leave the city due to crime, the perception of crime, neighborhoods running down, abandoned buildings, systemic decay, slumlords like Paul McKee, overall lack of cohesive neighborhoods, lack of reliable and consistent security and safety, and near complete absence of comprehensive city-wide urban planning.

I absolutely do not agree with the 'Free Childcare for only some' as there is no guarantee of success. Further, there are no references here to show examples of similar programs in other cities. Sure, this would be a wonderful thing - free childcare not for only some, but free childcare for all. This is not the way to go about it, though, IMHO. A tax levy - or similar - voted on by the people should be the true measure of approval of such a bold, controversial, yet abstract idea. Further, where is there a benefit for the single low-income individual? Where is there a benefit for the advantageless or family who does not have nor cannot have children?

In favor:

Create daycare/childcare academy. The building between City Hall and Stifel Theater (1300 Market) could be renovated inside and turned into a daycare/childcare academy for all city workers and others children to attend. This takes care of the empty building by repurposing it for a laudable cause, where kids and workers would be virtually between each other downtown. The visual appeal of having families downtown working and at daycare/school would have psychological, economical, monetary and myriad other benefits - traffic creation - is what you want. Consolidate services, use the buses, and help regrow downtown. Or, any of the other many high-rise buildings downtown that sit empty at this moment. Just a thought.

#088

Posted by **Tiffany Clay** on **12/11/2024** at **2:05pm** [Comment ID: 173] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 10, Disagree: 0

The section should explicitly focus on children aged 0-3.

SLPS already provides free pre-kindergarten to all children aged 3-5.

Any additional funding for childcare access for ages 3-5 should be used to support the existing free program, such as through recruitment, staff training, or program improvements.

In Missouri, the average annual cost of childcare for children aged 0-3 exceeds \$10,000, making it a significant burden for families.

Redirecting funds to facilities outside the existing program doesn't make childcare more affordable—instead, it competes with the St. Louis Public Schools (SLPS) system.

Reply by **Ousmane Gaye** on **01/01/2025** at **4:52pm** [Comment ID: 311] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Additionally, how will these programs work if there are not enough trained childhood professionals to care for more children that we hope to access this type of care?

#089

Posted by **Katherine Thomas** on **12/11/2024** at **1:41pm** [Comment ID: 165] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 4, Disagree: -1

This might help attract talent to work for the city, but won't attract new residents or retain our existing population. It seems this is simply a way to line the pockets of the city workers who drafted this document by prioritizing the city workers, including our mayor and alderman. Doesn't look great. A better solution would be to offer this benefit to all city residents equally, thereby attracting new residents interested in

these amenities and reducing crime by improving the job prospects for our poorest neighbors through educational opportunities,

#090

Posted by **Deborah Holmes** on **12/11/2024** at **1:57pm** [Comment ID: 171] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

Line 20 of 1b above suggests support is for institutions in the City. This line says Saint Louis region (which I support). This distinction need to be clear and consistent.

Additionally, there needs to be some kind of quality control regarding the education/training the institutions provide.

#091

Posted by **Jarred Irby** on **12/11/2024** at **2:01pm** [Comment ID: 172] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 3, Disagree: 0

The language is rather vague. Because of student/teacher ratios, there is not much money to be made with infants and young toddlers. It's hard to provide quality childcare for this reason unless you have a way to offset total costs.

A targeted subsidy to help lower the costs at the younger child (under 3 level) would be much preferred. Additionally, if there is a way to access funds and not provide a service where it is most needed, childcare and educational facilities could then use this as a way to make money without fixing the need by just pumping dollars into preschool.

provided under this ordinance, and into which Thirty Seven Million Two Hundred Forty Thousand and Sixty-One and 56/100ths Dollars (\$37,240,061.56) of the funds appropriated under this section shall be allocated; and

- ii. One (1) to be known as the “**Youth Opportunities Account**,” shall be assigned to maintain funds to support increasing access to post-secondary educational and training opportunities for youth as provided under this ordinance, and into which Twenty Million and 0/100ths Dollars (\$20,000,000.00) of the funds appropriated under this section shall be allocated.

- e. Interest earned earnings from the Children and Families Endowment Fund shall accrue to such fund and be distributed into the accounts created within such fund pursuant to this ordinance on a basis proportional to the original fund allocation amounts within each account.

2. Eligible Uses of the Children and Families Endowment Fund.

- a. *Affordable Child Care Account.* Monies within the Affordable Child Care Account shall be used exclusively for:
 - i. Providing appropriations for the purpose of increasing City residents’ access to affordable child care. City workers shall be given first priority for access to such services. Priority consideration shall be given to funding programs which will maximize these City funds by alleviating child care costs on residents in partnership with employers;
 - ii. Providing matching funds for federal, state, and local grants that support increased access to affordable childcare; and

#092

Posted by **Matt Vitale** on **12/11/2024** at **1:19pm** [Comment ID: 163] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 13, Disagree: 0

This section should explicitly address children aged 0-3. The city of St. Louis already provides access to all children aged 3-5 in the city to free pre-kindergarten. Therefore, any funding aimed at granting access to childcare for children aged 3-5 should be directed solely toward supporting the existing free program available to all residents, such as for recruitment, staff training, or program enhancements. Allocating funds to facilities serving the 3-5 age group outside of the current program merely creates competition with the St. Louis Public Schools (SLPS) system, without actually making childcare more affordable.

As one of the original authors of this initiative, I do not support this section in its current form.

Reply by **Matthew Naglich** on **12/11/2024** at **1:21pm** [Comment ID: 164] - [Link](#)

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

I agree with Matt's points above.

Reply by **Anonymous** on **12/11/2024** at **5:57pm** [Comment ID: 200] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: -3

Do not spend this money. Invest it and spend the revenue from the investment only. It has already generated \$25 million. Once it is all spent it is gone forever.

Reply by **Nathaniel Farrell** on **12/14/2024** at **10:49am** [Comment ID: 236] - [Link](#)

Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

I also agree with the points made here by Mr. Vitale.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/20/2024** at **2:04pm** [Comment ID: 289] - [Link](#)

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

I agree. I think we should focus on existing public institutions such as our public schools where possible. I would love to hear more about public accountability measures for the institutions outside of SLPS. Unless private institutions work with the local district and have clear public accountability measures, I would not support funding going directly to them.

#093

Posted by **Heather Gasama** on **12/12/2024** at **7:05am** [Comment ID: 203] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 3, Disagree: 0

SLPS provides childcare for all of our younger kids 3 to 5. So many kids in this age group need care before and after and in the summer to help the parents with the

changing school times that don't work with the average work schedule. Please offer help to the largest district in your area!!

#094

Posted by **Hannah Reinhart** on **12/11/2024** at **2:08pm** [Comment ID: 174] - [Link](#)

Endorsement

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

LOVE this. This "St. Louis promise" concept was one of my initial suggestions. My only concern is regarding first priority for City workers and want to be sure the amount allocated will meaningfully impact all eligible city residents.

1 iii. Procuring goods and services, compensating staff, and incurring other
2 administrative costs, provided that such costs do not exceed 5% of the account
3 balance on an annual basis.

4 b. *Youth Opportunities Account.* Monies within the Youth Opportunities Account shall be
5 used exclusively for:

6 i. ⁰⁹⁵Increasing access to postsecondary educational and training opportunities at
7 institutions⁰⁹⁶ and programs located in the St. Louis region for youth who live in and have
8 attended school in the City of St. Louis for an amount of time to be determined by the
9 City Treasurer's Office and who have demonstrated academic achievement throughout
10 high school as determined by the City Treasurer's Office, with first priority for access
11 to such services being given to children of City workers, and by giving priority
12 consideration to funding programs which will maximize these City funds by (1)
13 securing private funding support for such efforts; (2) securing partnerships with
14 regional postsecondary institutions and programs to facilitate increased access to
15 postsecondary educational and training opportunities; and (3) providing last-dollar
16 funding to eligible students; and

17 ii. Procuring goods and services, compensating staff, and incurring other administrative
18 costs.

19 3. *Restrictions on Use of Funds.*

20 a. No monies may be appropriated from the Children and Families Endowment Fund for any
21 purpose other than that authorized pursuant to this ordinance.

22 b. The Children and Families Endowment Fund Board shall develop and recommend
23 appropriations from the Children and Families Endowment Fund, and any

#095

Posted by **Duncan Carson** on **12/13/2024** at **2:39pm** [Comment ID: 222] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

Rather than giving this money to postsecondary institutions, this money should be given directly to graduating Saint Louis students. An endowment of this size could pay out roughly \$1,000 each year in perpetuity to every graduating public school senior. This would be much more popular and effective, and would help make kids in Saint Louis feel like the city believes in them.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/19/2024** at **1:21pm** [Comment ID: 284] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I am pretty open to this especially since I'm skeptical of giving funds directly to private institutions.

#096

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **5:10pm** [Comment ID: 193] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I think St. Louis could be uniquely poised to develop a tradeschool to teach late and post-high school students trades that are amenable with redeveloping this city. As an example, we have our famous brick built environment. Bricks are durable and we have exemplary examples of this city-wide. Rather than tear the salvageable brick homes down, use them as on-the-job or in-the-field training. Priority for reduced housing cost could go to the bricklayers/trades people.

Idea: Masonry and Brick Arts Trade School

Teach the dead art and science of durable building construction (that ends up being more green and sustainable long-term) and restoration. St. Louis could be a leader in re-pioneering technology that has proven durable, beautiful, and coveted by many. Through this trade school idea alone, a crop of trades people would graduate and be able to fill a major gap in this region creating jobs by becoming masons/bricklayers. There is no reason we cannot have this as a program, nor is there not a reason this city cannot become an architectural gem on the Mississippi. Everyone wins: child/teen learns skills, they can start business through small business loan (perhaps from these funds), they fill economic gap while tangentially drumming up business from other trades. Obviously, modern codes and standards would need to be considered.

#097

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/19/2024** at **1:13pm** [Comment ID: 282] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I think this is a noble and lofty goal... but I don't think it really connects to the items

addressed in the previous Ram's Settlement engagements. I think we should go all in on childcare and youth services.

#098

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/19/2024** at **1:15pm** [Comment ID: 283] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Is there any existing examples from other cities that prove a youth opportunities account could improve resident retention?

recommendations for inclusion in the City's annual budget shall be finalized by the March 1st preceding the fiscal year for that budget.

c. No monies may be appropriated from the Children and Families Endowment Fund: Affordable Child Care Account in excess of interest and other proceeds accrued within that fund.

d. No monies may be appropriated from the Children and Families Endowment Fund: Youth Opportunities Account in excess of available monies within that account.

4. *Endowment Fund Protections.* Any amendments to this ordinance in relation to the purpose, eligible uses, or restrictions on eligible uses of the Children and Families Endowment Fund shall require a vote of two-thirds ($\frac{2}{3}$) of the full Board of Aldermen.

5. *The Children and Families Endowment Fund Board.*

a. *Board Responsibilities.* The Children and Families Endowment Fund Board shall:

i. Have general oversight over and administrative responsibility for the management and utilization of the Children and Families Endowment Fund;

ii. Annually recommend to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment by means of a majority of voting members any appropriations from the Children and Families Endowment Fund or accounts contained within the fund for inclusion into the City's annual operating budget for the Office of the Treasurer;

iii. Submit an annual report no later than May 1 of each calendar year to the Mayor's Office and Board of Aldermen detailing (1) the long-range plan for the stewardship, management, and investment of monies within the Children and Families Endowment Fund or accounts contained within the fund, and (2) the implementation of any

#099

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **5:17pm** [Comment ID: 194] - [Link](#)
Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: -2

This should be quarterly and not annually for transparency's sake.

1 appropriations made from the Children and Families Endowment Fund or accounts
2 contained within the fund in the immediately preceding fiscal year;

3 iv. Follow the most current edition of Robert’s Rules of Order for the conduct of any
4 meetings; and

5 v. Make all necessary rules for the exercise of its powers and performance of its duties.

6 b. *Board Membership.* The Children and Families Endowment Fund Board shall be comprised
7 of nine (9) members. The following members shall be appointed by the Mayor and shall
8 serve as voting members:

9 i. Two (2) representatives from the City Treasurer’s Office, who shall serve as chair;
10 ii. One (1) representative from the St. Louis Agency on Training and Employment;
11 iii. One (1) representative from the Department of Personnel;
12 iv. One (1) representative from the Department of Human Services; and
13 v. One (1) representative from the St. Louis Mental Health Board.

14 The following members shall be appointed by the Mayor, subject to the approval of the Board
15 of Aldermen, and shall serve as voting members:

16 vi. One (1) representative from an institution of higher education; and
17 vii. One (1) representative from either an in-home or center-based child care facility.

18 The following member shall serve as voting member:

19 viii. The Chair of the Health and Human Development Committee for the Board of
20 Aldermen, or its successor committee, or their designee.

21 c. *Board Terms.* Each member of the board that is appointed by the Mayor and subject to the
22 approval of the Board of Aldermen shall hold office for the term of three years and until their
23 successor is appointed. Members of the first board shall be appointed for terms of from one to

#100

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **5:28pm** [Comment ID: 195] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Where are the checks and balances in this proposal for the board? If all these are mayor appointed, it seems rife with possible conflict of interest. If you have asked the citizens for feedback on how to use the Rams Settlement money that will benefit as many as possible, then why is there not any ward/neighborhood citizen representation on this board? For each appointee, you really need to have an equal number of representatives who are non-gov/citizens with no connections. To that end, is having yet another government body really going to equate to progress? The approach in this proposal is very undemocratic in design IMO and rings very same to business as usual in this town.

#101

Posted by **Matt Vitale** on **12/11/2024** at **1:54pm** [Comment ID: 170] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 6, Disagree: 0

SLPS is the largest childcare provider in the city, offering a free program for all children aged 3-5. A representative from SLPS should be included on the board.

Reply by **Liz Kramer** on **12/15/2024** at **2:10pm** [Comment ID: 256] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

There may also be a benefit of including a third public member who is an advocate for youth and families in a different format. I'm particularly thinking that this board representation may not include someone with an understanding of the needs of new Americans or families with more specific needs.

three years so that the term of one shall expire at the end of the first year, one at the end of the second year, and one at the end of the third year. The succeeding appointment shall be made for terms of three (3) years.

d. *Board Compensation.* The members shall serve on the Children and Families Endowment Fund Board without compensation.

6. *Fund Accountability.* The Children and Families Endowment Fund shall be included among the funds subject to regular audits of City funds as required under law. The City Treasurer's Office shall submit an annual report to the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen no later than May 1 of each calendar year detailing (i) the long-term plan for the stewardship, management, and investment of monies within the Children and Families Endowment Fund; and (ii) the implementation of any appropriations made from the Children and Families Endowment Fund in the immediately preceding fiscal year.

B. City Workforce Fund

1. *Establishment of the City Workforce Fund.*

a. There is hereby appropriated the sum of Twenty Million and 0/100ths Dollars (\$20,000,000.00) of Settlement Funds into a special fund to be known as the **City Workforce Fund**, created pursuant to this ordinance, and to be held in a fund maintained in the Office of the City Treasurer.

b. Upon the passage and approval of this ordinance, the Comptroller is authorized and directed to establish a fund to be designated as the "City Workforce Fund" for the purpose of providing City workers with increased access to professional training, certification, accreditation, or education. All interest earned by the funds deposited in such special account shall be retained in the account to be appropriated according to provisions of this

#102

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/19/2024** at **12:36pm** [Comment ID: 279] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I want to support this, but I need to learn more about how this can sustain decent worker wages or benefits while considering potential growth in the city work force if this fund achieves its goal of drawing more workers to the city. Would it need to be focused toward employees in specific departments for the city such as waste management or another department to really focus impact in specific areas? Would love to hear more on this.

#103

Posted by **Katlyn Shelar** on **12/11/2024** at **2:24pm** [Comment ID: 175] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 7, Disagree: 0

The idea proposed and voted on was to increase pay and wages for city workers. This section mentions nothing about that. A job study was just performed and the city has the results so i advise they use the data from that to appropriate these fund if they actually want to retain their current employees and attract future ones.

Reply by **Nathaniel Farrell** on **12/14/2024** at **10:51am** [Comment ID: 237] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I share a preference for a pay and wages way of addressing workforce development. It would seem more straightforward, more fair to all City Workers, and less prone to possible abuse.

#104

Posted by **Creighton Brinson** on **12/11/2024** at **3:44pm** [Comment ID: 188] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 3, Disagree: 0

I believe these funds should be used for some City work development programs for sure, but the first consideration should be to completely revamp the entire personnel, hiring, and worker benefits all under a normal functioning Human Resource or Human Capital dept. as any large company would have. One umbrella, does all hiring and firing, annual reviews, sets competitive wages, and provides a new job description for every city position. The only way to improve & train workers, motivate them, and provide a system for successful happy employees is a complete overhaul of the current system. This Rams settlement money is a windfall and would allow improved wages, better benefits, structure, new HR computer systems, and identify relevant new positions, eliminate paper pushing positions, and encourage employee growth and the ability to move around the city government. One silo for all HR functions and top leadership recruited from outside the current employee base.

#105

Posted by **Stephanie Herbers** on **12/11/2024** at **12:38pm** [Comment ID: 161] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 9, Disagree: 0

Benefits like this are great, but please commit to increasing starting pay for City positions. There are way too many positions that have much too low starting pay to recruit and retain employees.

1 ordinance. The fund shall be eligible to accept additional monies from other City
2 appropriations, private donations, or other sources. All expenditures from such fund shall
3 be appropriated in accordance with this ordinance and other applicable law. Appropriate
4 sub-accounts may be created.

- 5 c. The purpose of the City Workforce Fund is to strengthen the City's workforce, by
6 providing City workers with increased access to opportunities that include but are not
7 limited to professional training, education, certification, and accreditation. Funds deposited
8 and held in the City Workforce Fund may be appropriated and expended only as provided
9 under this ordinance.

10 2. *Eligible Uses of the City Workforce Fund.* Available monies within the City Workforce Fund
11 shall be used exclusively for the following purposes:

- 12 a. Supporting and expanding workforce training and education programs and opportunities
13 offered by the City of St. Louis, with priority consideration for access to such opportunities
14 being given to City workers;
- 15 b. Supporting and expanding existing and establishing new community workforce training
16 programs and opportunities, such as child care and early childhood workforce training
17 programs;
- 18 c. Increasing individuals' ability to access existing workforce training and education
19 programs, such as by providing supportive services to individuals receiving training
20 through the City of St. Louis;
- 21 d. Encouraging employees to participate in City workforce development efforts, such as
22 apprenticeship programs;

#106

Posted by **Nathaniel Farrell** on **12/14/2024** at **10:16am** [Comment ID: 233] - [Link](#)

Suggestion

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

"But are not limited to" raises concerns here. What type of caps and conditions will be placed on this to prevent from exorbitant out of town travel costs for conferences that do not provide an educational or accreditation purpose and merely provide "networking" opportunities. Those should not be able to be funded by this. Leaving this "not limited to" open-ended wording permits abuse of the purpose of the fund. It should be re-written in such a way as to anticipate such abuses.

#107

Posted by **Nathaniel Farrell** on **12/14/2024** at **10:20am** [Comment ID: 234] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Incentivizing is pretty vague -- what kind of incentives are we talking here? I share the concern that this would not be limited to the city as the employer and if it is only the city, why do we need such language and wouldn't it be more "supervisor."

#108

Posted by **Katherine Thomas** on **12/11/2024** at **1:44pm** [Comment ID: 166] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 3, Disagree: -1

This should be an equal opportunity for all residents, not prioritizing one group.

#109

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **5:45pm** [Comment ID: 197] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

Are these non-govt employers from the private sector?

#110

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **5:44pm** [Comment ID: 196] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: -1

Isn't the early childcare workforce training component already described in Section 4-A above? This seems like it's double-dipping. How about investing in the City Workforce by investing in better tools and automation of redundant jobs? Hate to say it, but that is the reality and the future. Isn't there also the risk that throwing money at training could backfire when the employee(s) decide to walk away and move on to other jobs out of the city? That doesn't help everyone.

Reply by **Teresa Turin-Lis** on **12/14/2024** at **12:45pm** [Comment ID: 238] - [Link](#)

Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

Yep, it's possible the city of St. Louis may lose workers we invest in; you can't control people. That doesn't mean we shouldn't offer them a workforce-support program. There's a lot of room for improvement in the work environment we offer our 5,000 city workers. In spending Rams settlement funds the way this board bill outlines in section B, we'd be attempting to help city workers thrive in, not merely tolerate, their jobs. I bet we'd all be happier with city services that are delivered by city workers who feel valued and supported.

- e. Providing matching funds for state and federal grant opportunities that support workforce training and education; and
- f. Procuring goods and services, compensating staff, and incurring other administrative costs, provided that such costs do not exceed 5% of the fund balance on an annual basis.

3. *Restrictions on Use of Funds.*

- a. No monies may be appropriated from the City Workforce Fund for any purpose other than that authorized pursuant to this ordinance.
- b. The City Workforce Fund Board shall develop and recommend appropriations from the City Workforce Fund, and any recommendations for inclusion in the City's annual budget shall be finalized by the March 1st preceding the fiscal year for that budget.
- c. No monies may be appropriated from the City Workforce Fund in excess of available monies within that fund.

4. *The City Workforce Fund Board.*

- a. *Board Responsibilities.* The City Workforce Fund Board shall:
 - i. Have general oversight over and administrative responsibility for the management and utilization of the Workforce Fund;
 - ii. Annually recommend to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment by means of a majority of voting members any appropriations from the City Workforce Fund for inclusion into the City's annual operating budget; and
 - iii. Submit an annual report no later than May 1 of each calendar year and provide to the Mayor's Office and Board of Aldermen detailing (1) the long-range plan for the stewardship, management, and investment of monies within the City Workforce Fund; (2)

the implementation of any appropriations made from the City Workforce Fund in the immediately preceding fiscal year; and

iv. Follow the most current edition of Robert's Rules of Order for the conduct of any meetings; and

v. Make all necessary rules for the exercise of its powers and performance of its duties.

b. Board Membership. The City Workforce Fund Board shall be comprised of five (5) voting members consisting of:

i. Two (2) representatives from the St. Louis Agency on Training and Employment, one of whom shall serve as chair;

ii. One (1) representative from the Department of Personnel;

iii. One (1) representative from the St. Louis Development Corporation; and

iv. The Chair of the Budget & Public Employees Committee at the Board of Aldermen or their designee.

5. *Fund Accountability.* The Citywide Workforce Fund shall be included among the funds subject to regular audits of City funds as required under law.

SECTION FIVE. The Community Development Innovation Funds.

A. The Citywide Housing Fund.

1. Establishment of the Citywide Housing Fund.

a. There is hereby appropriated the sum of Seventy Million and 0/100ths Dollars (\$70,000,000.00) from Settlement Funds into a special fund to be known as the **Citywide Housing Fund**, created pursuant to this ordinance, and to be held in a fund maintained in the Office of the City Treasurer.

#111

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/19/2024** at **11:23am** [Comment ID: 275] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Does the housing fund try to do too much?

While I personally support many of these individual ideas, I think it is important to look to the suggestions presented during the "Vote on Priority Ideas" session which are as follows: (1) Establish a Revolving Redevelopment Loan Fund and (2) Support real estate development in Downtown and/or near North St. Louis.

I think many of the ideas presented here are worth revisiting, but I believe that this fund should remain focused on the issues that were presented as options in previous phases. This is important to maintain the trust of residents.

I support investing in dense affordable housing for Downtown and the city as a whole. I support investing in development projects that improve walkability and transit connectivity in our city.

Again, all the issues listed matter, but since they were not presented in previous engagements, we should consider keeping this section more focused.

b. Upon the passage and approval of this ordinance, the Comptroller is authorized and directed to establish a fund to be designated as the "Citywide Housing Fund" for the purpose of supporting the accessibility and availability of affordable housing located within the City. All interest earned by the funds deposited in such special account and all repayments on loans shall be retained in the account to be appropriated according to provisions of this ordinance. The fund shall be eligible to accept additional monies from other City appropriations, private donations, or other sources. All expenditures from such fund shall be appropriated in accordance with this ordinance and other applicable law. Appropriate sub-accounts may be created.

c. The purpose of the Citywide Housing Fund is to support the accessibility and availability of housing that is affordable to St. Louis residents and is located in the City of St. Louis. Funds held in the Citywide Housing Fund may be appropriated and expended only as provided under this ordinance.

2. *Eligible Uses of the Citywide Housing Fund.* Available monies within the Citywide Housing Fund shall be used exclusively for providing appropriations to the Community Development Administration, or its successor entity. The Community Development Administration may use such funds over the life of the fund for the purposes of:

a. Providing repayable or forgivable loans for the purpose of production of affordable housing located within the City, with priority consideration being given to housing-focused community development corporations;

b. Providing revolving loans for the purpose of supporting the conversion of large square foot vacant properties located within the City into residential units, with qualifying square footage to be determined by the Community Development Administration;

- c. Increasing first-time¹¹³ home ownership in the City, such as through matching down payment funds and repayable mortgage loan¹¹⁴ assistance, with City workers¹¹⁷ given first¹¹⁸ priority for access to for such opportunities;¹¹⁵ ¹¹⁶
- d. Increasing the City's ability to provide for home repair and preservation services, including but not limited to home modifications made to improve accessibility for people with disabilities;
- e. Providing tenant¹¹² support through the Impacted Tenants Fund and Right to Counsel, or their successor programs;
- f. Providing matching funds for state and federal grants that support the production or preservation of affordable housing located within the City;
- g. Providing debt service payments for loans received or bond issuance by the City to support the production or preservation of affordable housing located within the City; and
- h. Procuring goods and services, compensating staff, and incurring other administrative costs, provided that such costs do not exceed 5% of the fund balance on an annual basis.

3. *Restrictions on Use of Funds.*

- a. No monies may be appropriated from the Citywide Housing Fund for any purpose other than that authorized pursuant to this ordinance.
- b. The Community Development Innovation Fund Board shall develop and recommend appropriations from the Citywide Housing Fund, and any recommendations for inclusion in the City's annual budget shall be finalized by the March 1st preceding the fiscal year for that budget.
- c. No monies may be appropriated from the Citywide Housing Fund in excess of available monies within that fund.

#112

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/19/2024** at **11:42am** [Comment ID: 277] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I support increasing funding for tenant support programs; however, I do not recall seeing this come up during previous engagements or discussions. I really believe we should focus on items that were included in the public input process to ensure the successful passage of this bill.

#113

Posted by **Mitchell Easter** on **12/11/2024** at **5:54pm** [Comment ID: 199] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 2, Disagree: 0

Why is the priority all for city workers? Did only city workers respond to the surveys? The more I read into this proposed bill, the more myopic and fail-prone it becomes. If you really want people to move or stay here, these types of legislation are a surefire way for that to not happen.

#114

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/19/2024** at **11:00am** [Comment ID: 274] - [Link](#)

Endorsement

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I benefited from a variety of first-time homebuyer programs from various sources including from SLDC, my employer, and other entities. Without these programs, homeownership would not have been possible for me. I think that expanding existing programs is a good potential use.

Reply by **Malik Lendell** on **12/19/2024** at **11:34am** [Comment ID: 276] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I should note, that while I endorse this idea generally, I still think that each of these line items should be looked at individually. Please look at which of these are most in alignment with the issues residents overall showed support for, and go all in with those.

#115

Posted by **Katherine Thomas** on **12/11/2024** at **1:46pm** [Comment ID: 167] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 4, Disagree: 0

City workers should not be prioritized as they aren't the most housing insecure.

#116

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/19/2024** at **1:06pm** [Comment ID: 281] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I'm wondering if we should choose between the City Workforce Fund or City Worker priority for these proposed funds. I would love to hear more discussion on this.

#117

Posted by **Joel Prior** on **12/24/2024** at **1:09pm** [Comment ID: 301] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

This sentence should be removed. If there are funds already being set aside to recruit and develop better city employees, they should have more wages to secure housing in the city. This would be considered a pseudo repayment into the increased employment opportunities they captured from other parts of this money.

#118

Posted by **Nathaniel Farrell** on **12/14/2024** at **10:35am** [Comment ID: 235] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 1, Disagree: 0

I am concerned here about the potential for abuse here due to the City Worker priority. For instance, what if one city employee sells a house to another city employee or a family member of? How would the potential conflict of interest be navigated in such a sale? Most of the City Worker language does not adequately anticipate the appearance of favoritism or the potential for abuse or policy drift. If this is about new hires who have never worked for the city, then these prioritizing language need to have conditions. Of course, if I were a current city worker and a new hire got something I didn't I would be frustrated, so the net is widened to retention. But if the purpose is new hires and retention, both would be addressed through HR and compensation alone which would remove the potential abuses that these city worker priorities seem to introduce along with the expectation of oversight and administration costs to ensure fairness even among City Workers, some of whom may benefit more from these than others.

- d. Appropriations in the form of grants or forgivable loans from the Citywide Housing Fund shall not exceed the annual interest generated by the Citywide Housing Fund.

4. *Fund Accountability.* The Citywide Housing Fund shall be included among the funds subject to regular audits of City funds as required under law.

B. The Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund.

1. *Establishment of the Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund.*

- a. There is hereby appropriated the sum of Thirty Million and 0/100ths Dollars (\$30,000,000.00) from Settlement Funds into the **Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund**, created pursuant to this ordinance, and to be held in a fund maintained in the Office of the City Treasurer.

- b. Upon the passage and approval of this ordinance, the Comptroller is authorized and directed to establish a fund to be designated as the "Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund" for the purpose of strengthening the City's neighborhood economic environment. All interest earned by the funds deposited in such special account shall be retained in the account to be appropriated according to provisions of this ordinance. The fund shall be eligible to accept additional monies from other City appropriations, private donations, or other sources. All expenditures from such fund shall be appropriated in accordance with this ordinance and other applicable law.

2. *Eligible Uses of the Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund.* Monies within the Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund shall be used exclusively for providing appropriations to the Community Development Administration, or its successor entity. The Community Development Administration may use such funds for the purposes of:

#119

Posted by **Malik Lendell** on **12/19/2024** at **12:45pm** [Comment ID: 280] - [Link](#)

Question

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

Do we need to include the term "city-wide" if it is already a given that these funds function to serve city-wide needs?

- a. Supporting the redevelopment, capacity building, and facilities improvement of local businesses, education providers, healthcare providers, or nonprofit organizations located in neighborhood commercial corridors and districts, including but not limited to providing low interest repayable and forgivable loans to (i) small businesses, (ii) nonprofit organizations, and (iii) community development finance institutions;
- b. Acquisition, environmental remediation, predevelopment, public improvements, repairs, or site assembly undertaken by the City's development agencies in order to bring quality jobs to the City, rehabilitate or stabilize vacant property, or develop community assets, provided that Community Development Administration may not authorize expenditures in excess of five hundred thousand dollars (\$500,000.00) for a single parcel or building without prior approval from the Community Development Innovation Fund Board; and
- c. Procuring goods and services, compensating staff, and incurring programmatic and administrative costs, provided that such costs do not exceed 5% of the fund balance on an annual basis.

3. Restrictions on Use of Funds.

- a. No monies may be appropriated from the Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund for any purpose other than that authorized pursuant to this ordinance.
- b. The Community Development Innovation Fund Board shall develop and recommend appropriations from the Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund, and any recommendations for inclusion in the City's annual budget shall be finalized by the March 1st preceding the fiscal year for that budget.
- c. No monies may be appropriated from the Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund in excess of available monies within that fund.

#120

Posted by **Teresa Turin-Lis** on **12/14/2024** at **1:56pm** [Comment ID: 241] - [Link](#)

Concern

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

\$500,000 per parcel/building seems very high. What percentage of the cost is this for a typical (if there is such a thing as typical) project on a SINGLE parcel or building? Would it be better to set a maximum percentage, rather than a dollar amount, this fund could contribute to a project, with funds not to exceed \$500,000?

d. Appropriations in the form of forgivable loans from the Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund shall not exceed the annual interest generated by the Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund.

4. *Fund Accountability.* The Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund shall be included among the funds subject to regular audits of City funds as required under law.

C. The Community Development Innovation Fund Board.

1. *Board Responsibilities.* The Community Development Innovation Fund Board shall:

a. Have general oversight over and administer the Community Development Innovation Funds, which include the Citywide Housing Fund and the Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund;

b. Annually recommend to the Board of Estimate and Apportionment by means of a majority of voting members any appropriations from the Community Development Innovation Funds for inclusion into the City's annual operating budget;

c. Submit an annual report no later than May 1 of each calendar year to the Mayor's Office and Board of Aldermen detailing: (1) the long-term plan for the stewardship, management, and investment of monies within the Community Development Innovation Funds, and (2) the implementation of any appropriations made from the Community Development Innovation Funds in the immediately preceding fiscal year;

d. Follow the most current edition of Robert's Rules of Order for the conduct of any meetings; and

e. Make all necessary rules for the exercise of its powers and performance of its duties.

1 2. *Board Membership.* The Community Development Innovation Fund Board shall be composed
2 of eleven (11) voting members. The following members shall be appointed by the Mayor and shall
3 serve as voting members:

- 4 a. Two (2) representatives from the Community Development Administration, one of whom
5 shall serve as chair;
- 6 b. Two (2) representatives from the St. Louis Development Corporation;
- 7 c. One (1) representative from the Affordable Housing Commission; and
- 8 d. One (1) representative from the Department of Human Services.

9 The following members shall be appointed by the Mayor, subject to the approval of the Board
10 of Aldermen, and shall serve as voting members:

- 11 e. One (1) representative from a community organization representing the local business
12 community;
- 13 f. One (1) representative from a nonprofit development organization or an organization
14 representing the nonprofit development community, such as a community development
15 corporation;
- 16 g. One (1) representative from an organization advocating for the needs of tenants; and
- 17 h. One (1) representative from a housing advocacy organization.

18 The following member shall serve as voting member:

- 19 i. The Chair of the Housing, Urban Development, and Zoning Committee for the Board of
20 Aldermen, or its successor committee, or their designee.

21 3. *Board Terms.* Each member of the board that is appointed by the Mayor and subject to the
22 approval of the Board of Aldermen shall hold office for the term of three years and until his
23 successor is appointed. Members of the first board shall be appointed for terms of from one to

#121

Posted by **Annette Nowakowski** on **12/20/2024** at **8:33pm** [Comment ID: 295] - [Link](#)

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I support the Citywide Neighborhood Development Fund. The bill lists a number of participants on Community Development Innovation Fund Board. My main criticism here is that this process and this board do not include the neighborhood association. Each neighborhood must give its input into this process because it knows best what it need. I know we have SLACO and it may serve in some capacity. However, some form of input from each neighborhood is essential to make residents feel included in how these funds are distributed. The Neighborhood Development Fund should live up to its name.

1 three years so that the term of one shall expire at the end of the first year, one at the end of the
2 second year, and two at the end of the third year. The succeeding appointment shall be made for
3 terms of three years.

4 4. *Board Compensation.* The members shall serve on the Community Development Innovation
5 Fund Board without compensation.

6 **SECTION SIX. Severability Clause.** It is hereby declared to be the intention of the Board of
7 Aldermen that each, and every part, section and subsection of this Ordinance shall be separate and
8 severable from each, and every other part, section, and subsection hereof and that the Board of
9 Aldermen intends to adopt each said part, section, and subsection separately and independently of
10 any other part, section, and subsection. In the event that any part, section, or subsection of this
11 Ordinance shall be determined to be or to have been unlawful or unconstitutional, the remaining
12 parts, sections, and subsections shall be and remain in full force and effect, unless the court making
13 such finding shall determine that the valid portions standing alone are incomplete and are incapable
14 of being executed in accord with the legislative intent.

15 **SECTION SEVEN. Emergency Clause.** This being an ordinance for the preservation of the
16 public peace, health and safety, it is hereby declared to be an emergency measure within the
17 meaning of Sections 19 and 20 of Article IV of the Charter of the City of St. Louis, and therefore,
18 this ordinance shall become effective immediately upon its passage and approval by the Mayor.

123

122

#122

Posted by **Riisa Rawlins** on **12/30/2024** at **7:26pm** [Comment ID: 309] - [Link](#)

Endorsement

Agree: 0, Disagree: 0

I appreciate the thoughtfulness and inclusivity of this approach as well as the transparency and intentionality of community engagement efforts. This was no small feat. My strongest recommendation is to apportion funds specifically for the strengthening and enhancement of our public health infrastructure as a vital factor in our City's overall wellbeing.

#123

Posted by **CHARLES DEAL** on **12/11/2024** at **4:46pm** [Comment ID: 191] - [Link](#)

Endorsement

Agree: 1, Disagree: -1

I approve of this proposal. Clearly you have listened and addressed important issues.