



Agenda
Public Safety Committee
Meeting
St. Louis Board of Aldermen
Thursday, March 12, 2026 - 2:00 PM
Kennedy Room

President Megan Green
Alderman Bret Narayan, Chair
Alderman Rasheen Aldridge, Vice Chair
Committee Members:
Alderman Thomas Oldenburg
Alderwoman Shameem Clark-Hubbard
Alderwoman Alisha Sonnier
Alderwoman Daniela Velazquez

Order of Business

I. Call to Order

II. Roll Call

III. Approval of Minutes

The approval the minutes from Thursday, February 12, 2026, committee meeting.

IV. Board Bills for Review

(The committee will discuss and take public comment on the following)

Board Bill Number 151

Introduced by Alderman Rasheen Aldridge An Ordinance to amend the Public Nuisance Ordinance by repealing certain sections and adding new ones to create a Nuisance Review Board.

V. Resolutions for Review

(The committee will discuss and take public comment on the following)

Resolution Number 258

Introduced by Alderman Rasheen Aldridge, Daniela Velazquez Megan E Green
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we further direct the Clerk of this Board of Aldermen to spread a copy of this Resolution across the minutes of these proceedings and to prepare a commemorative copy of this resolution to the members of the Missouri House Committee on Crime and Public Safety, the Missouri Senate Committee on

Transportation, Infrastructure and Public Safety, and to others as she sees fit.

VI. Committee Discussions

None

VII. Acknowledgment of Any Written Testimony

VIII. Announcements

IX. Excused Members

X. Adjournment



**Minutes
Public Safety Regular Committee
Thursday, February 12, 2026
2:00 PM
Kennedy Room**

Minutes are preliminary and may change until finally approved

I. Call to Order

The Chair called the meeting to order at 2:19pm.

II. Roll Call

The Chair directed the Associate Clerk to call the roll and the following members answered with their names: Mr. Oldenburg, Ms. Velazquez, Mr. Aldridge and Chair Narayan. **4 members were present. A quorum was established.**

III. Approval of Minutes

Approval of the minutes from Thursday, January 29, 2026, committee meeting.

The Chair entertained a motion to approve the minutes of the Thursday, January 29, 2026, committee meeting.

Mr. Aldridge moved to approve the minutes of the Thursday, January 29, 2026, committee meeting.

Seconded by Ms. Velazquez.

The Chair directed the Associate Clerk to call the roll on the motion to approve the minutes of the Thursday, January 29, 2026, committee meeting.

The Associate Clerk called the roll and the following votes were recorded: The following voted Aye: Mr. Oldenburg, Ms. Velazquez, Mr. Aldridge and Chair Narayan. **4 Ayes votes were cast.**

The following voted No:
None

The following abstained:
None

The following were present but did not vote:
None

A total of 4 votes were cast. The motion carried.

IV. Board Bills for Review

(The committee will discuss and take public comment on the following)

Board Bill Number 145

Introduced by Alderman Bret Narayan An ordinance repealing Ordinance 62579 and removing Chapter 25.10 of the Revised Code of the City of St. Louis codifying such ordinance.

Chair Narayan turned the meeting over to Vice-Chair Aldridge to introduce Board Bill Number 145 before the committee.

Mr. Narayan presented Board Bill Number 145 before the committee.

After no further discussion, the Vice-Chair opened the discussion up to members of the committee for questions and comments.

Members of the committee asked questions and made comments.

Hearing no further questions or comments from members of the committee, the Vice-Chair stated that Board Bill Number 145 passed out of committee with a **Do Pass Recommendation**.

Ms. Velazquez moved to pass Board Bill Number 145 out of committee with a **Do Pass Recommendation**.

Seconded by Mr. Aldridge.

Mr. Aldridge requested the previous roll.

Hearing no objection to the request for previous roll, the Chair stated that Board Bill Number 145 passed out of committee with a Do Pass Recommendation.

The Associate Clerk recorded the votes from the previous roll.
The following voted Aye: The following voted Aye: Mr. Oldenburg, Ms. Velazquez, Mr. Aldridge and Chair Narayan. **4 Ayes votes were cast.**

The following voted No:
None

The following voted Present:
None

The following Abstained:
None

A total of 4 Aye votes were cast. The motion carried.

After no further discussion, Chair Narayan resumed the meeting.

Board Bill Number 146

Introduced by Alderman Matt Devoti An amendment to Ordinance 56736, requested by the Interim Sheriff of the City of St. Louis, modernizing the manner in which the Sheriff's Office issues parking identification identifying deputies operating personal vehicles during the performance of their official duties.

Chair Narayan recognized Mr. Devoti to introduce Board Bill Number 146 before the committee.

Mr. Devoti presented Board Bill Number 146 before the committee.

After no further discussion, the Chair opened the discussion up to members of the committee for questions and comments.

Members of the committee asked questions and made comments.

Hearing no further questions or comments from members of the committee,

the Chair stated that Board Bill Number 146 passed out of committee with a **Do Pass Recommendation**.

Mr. Aldridge moved to pass Board Bill Number 146 out of committee with a **Do Pass Recommendation**.

Seconded by Mr. Narayan.

Mr. Narayan requested the previous roll.

Hearing no objection to the request for previous roll, the Chair stated that Board Bill Number 146 passed out of committee with a Do Pass Recommendation.

The Associate Clerk recorded the votes from the previous roll.
The following voted Aye: The following voted Aye: Mr. Oldenburg, Ms. Velazquez, Mr. Aldridge and Chair Narayan. **4 Ayes votes were cast.**

The following voted No:
None

The following voted Present:
None

The following Abstained:
None

A total of 4 Aye votes were cast. The motion carried.

V. Resolutions for Review

None

VI. Committee Discussions

None

VII. Acknowledgment of Any Written Testimony

VIII. Announcements

None

IX. Excused Members

The Chair entertained a motion to excuse Ms. Clark-Hubbard and Ms. Sonnier for necessary absence.

Mr. Narayan moved to excuse Ms. Clark-Hubbard and Ms. Sonnier for necessary absence.

Seconded by Mr. Aldridge.

Mr. Narayan requested the previous roll.

Hearing no objection to the request for previous roll, the Chair stated that Ms. Clark-Hubbard and Ms. Sonnier were excused from the meeting for necessary absence.

The Associate Clerk recorded the votes from the previous roll.
The following voted Aye: The following voted Aye: Mr. Oldenburg, Ms. Velazquez, Mr. Aldridge and Chair Narayan. 4 Ayes votes were cast.

The following voted No:
None

The following voted Present:
None

The following Abstained:
None

A total of 4 Aye votes were cast. The motion carried.

X. Adjournment

Having no other business to discuss, the Chair entertained a motion to adjourn the meeting.

Ms. Velazquez moved to adjourn the meeting.

Seconded by Mr. Aldridge.

Mr. Aldridge requested the previous roll.

Hearing no objection to the request for previous roll, the Chair stated that the meeting was adjourned.

The Associate Clerk recorded the votes from the previous roll.

The following voted Aye: The following voted Aye: Mr. Oldenburg, Ms. Velazquez, Mr. Aldridge and Chair Narayan. **4 Ayes votes were cast.**

The following voted No:

None

The following voted Present:

None

The following Abstained:

None

A total of 4 Aye votes were cast. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 2:28pm.

Summary
Board Bill Number 151
Introduced by Alderman Rasheen Aldridge Jr.
February 13, 2026

An Ordinance to amend the Public Nuisance Ordinance by repealing certain sections and adding new ones to create a Nuisance Review Board.

BOARD BILL NUMBER 151 INTRODUCED BY RASHEEN ALDRIDGE

1 An Ordinance to amend Ordinance No. 69730, as amended by Ordinance No. 70390, in order to
2 establish a Nuisance Review Board.

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

4 **SECTION ONE. Repeal And Replacement.**

5 Ordinance No. 69730, as amended by Ordinance No. 70390, is hereby amended by repealing
6 Section Five in its entirety, including all references to the Administrative Hearing Officer, and
7 replacing it with the following:

8 **SECTION FIVE. NUISANCE PROPERTY REVIEW BOARD AND COMMUNITY**
9 **PETITION PROCESS**

10 **§ 5.100 – Establishment; Authority**

11 A. The Nuisance Property Review Board (“Board”), as established by Ordinance No.
12 70390, as amended, shall have exclusive authority to hear and determine public nuisance
13 property matters arising under this Ordinance.

14 B. The Board shall function as an administrative, quasi-judicial body and shall exercise all
15 authority previously vested in the Administrative Hearing Officer, including conducting
16 hearings, making findings of fact and conclusions of law, and issuing remedial orders.

17 **§ 5.110 – Jurisdiction**

18 **The Board shall have jurisdiction to:**

19 A. Hear cases referred by the Department of Public Safety, Building Division, Health
20 Department, or other City agencies expressly authorized by ordinance, executive order, or
21 written designation of City Counselor;

22 B. Hear cases initiated through a community petition process pursuant to § 5.200;

1 C. Determine whether a property constitutes a nuisance under this Ordinance, Ordinance
2 No. 56705, and/or 82.1027(3) RSMo; and

3 D. Issue orders requiring abatement of the public nuisance including corrective action,
4 compliance plans, timelines for remediation, restrictions on sales of products if those
5 projects are contributing to the public nuisance and any remedies allowed in sections
6 15.42.010 to 15.42.090 or as otherwise authorized herein.

7 **§ 5.120 – Composition and Appointment**

8 A. The Board shall consist of **seven (7) members** appointed by the Mayor and confirmed
9 by the Board of Aldermen.

10 B. Membership shall include:

- 11 1. One attorney licensed in Missouri with experience in municipal or administrative
12 law;
- 13 2. One representative with experience in building or housing code enforcement;
- 14 3. One representative with public health or safety expertise;
- 15 4. Four community members who are residents of the City of St. Louis.

16 C. Members shall serve staggered three-year terms and may be reappointed.

17 **SUBSECTION II. COMMUNITY PETITION PROCESS**

18 **§ 5.200 – Purpose and Limited Effect of Petition**

19 A. A community petition shall serve as a mechanism to request administrative review by
20 the City and provide evidence of the existence of a public nuisance that the Board can
21 consider at its discretion; but a community petition alone shall not constitute a
22 determination that a nuisance exists.

1 B. Submission or verification of a petition shall not shift the burden of proof from the City,
2 compel enforcement action, or create a private right of action.

3 **§ 5.210 – Eligibility to Petition**

4 A petition may be submitted by Persons (defined to include individuals and legal
5 entities) who, at the time of signing, fall within one (1) qualifying class within a three
6 hundred fifty (350) foot radius of the subject property, drawn from the center of the
7 front entrance of the premises projected to the street; when a multi-floor building falls
8 within the petition circle, the petition circle shall include the main floor, the two
9 floors immediately above the main floor, and the floor immediately below the main
10 floor; if any part of a building or parcel of real property falls within the petition circle,
11 the entire building or parcel shall be considered within the petition circle; with respect
12 to a condominium created under Chapter 448 RSMo. 2000 (as amended), “Persons”
13 shall mean one head count applied to the applicable unit owners’ association’s
14 authorized representative and not to each unit owner within the condominium:

- 15 1. Registered voters whose voter registration address is located within the radius;
- 16 2. Owners of record of real property located within the radius; or
- 17 3. Owners or operators of businesses physically located within the radius.

18 **§ 5.220 – Threshold Requirement**

19 A petition shall be deemed sufficient only if it contains signatures from not less than fifty-
20 one percent (51%) of the total number of eligible persons within a single qualifying class
21 identified in § 5.210. Signatories from different classes shall not be aggregated to meet the
22 threshold.

23 **§ 5.230 – Form and Content**

1 Each petition shall be submitted on a form prescribed by the Department of Public Safety
2 (“DPS”) and shall include:

3 A. Identification of the subject property by address and parcel number;

4 B. A concise statement of the alleged conditions constituting a nuisance, based on
5 observable conduct or conditions;

6 C. The printed name, signature, address, and qualifying status of each signatory; and

7 D. A sworn affidavit by the petition organizer attesting, under penalty of perjury, that the
8 information provided is true and correct to the best of their knowledge.

9 **§ 5.240 – Verification and Screening**

10 A. DPS, or its designee, shall independently verify petition sufficiency, including
11 geographic eligibility and qualifying status of signatories.

12 B. The City may decline to docket a petition that is facially insufficient, duplicative of a
13 matter resolved within the prior twelve (12) months, or unsupported by objective indicia
14 of nuisance activity.

15 **§ 5.250 – City Control of Proceedings**

16 Upon verification, a petition shall proceed to the Board only upon authorization by the City
17 Counselor, which shall retain sole discretion over prosecution and presentation of evidence
18 before the Board; however, Persons who are eligible to sign the community petition shall
19 have the right to testify at the hearing in front of the Board.

20 **§ 5.260 – No Private Right of Action**

21 Submission or verification of a petition shall not create standing to compel enforcement,
22 entitlement to a hearing, or entitlement to a particular outcome.

23 **SUBSECTION III. NOTICE, HEARING, AND DETERMINATION**

1 **§ 5.300 – Notice of Hearing**

2 A. Written notice of a Board hearing shall be posted in plain public sight at the subject
3 property and be provided to:

- 4 1. The property owner of record;
- 5 2. Any lienholders of record; and
- 6 3. The petition organizer, if applicable.
- 7 4. The Alderman, or their designee, for the area in which the subject property is
8 located;
- 9 5. The SLMPD Captain for the district in which the subject property is located;
- 10 6. Any active neighborhood associations for the area in which the subject property is
11 located.

12 B. Notice shall be sent by first class United States mail or served in person not less than
13 twenty-one (21) days prior to the hearing. A copy of the Hearing Notice shall also be
14 posted in a prominent place on the premises, and shall include:

- 15 1. The alleged nuisance conditions;
- 16 2. The legal authority for the proceeding;
- 17 3. The date, time, and location of the hearing; and
- 18 4. A statement of the right to appear, present evidence, call witnesses, and be
19 represented by counsel.

20 **§ 5.310 – Hearing Procedure**

- 21 a. Hearings shall be conducted by the Board and recorded.
- 22 b. All testimony shall be given under oath or affirmation.
- 23 c. The case for the City shall be presented by the City Counselor.

- d. Petitioners may testify as to observed conditions and impacts.
- e. The Owner shall have the right to appear personally or through counsel, present evidence, call witnesses, and cross-examine witnesses.
- f. An attorney who appears on behalf of any Owner must file a written appearance with the Director of the Department of Public Safety.
- g. The Board may grant continuances only upon a finding of good cause.
- h. The Board may issue subpoenas to secure the attendance and testimony of relevant witnesses and the production of relevant documents.
- i. The record of all hearings before the Board shall include: (i) a record of the testimony presented at the hearing, which may be made by tape recording, digital recording or other appropriate means; (ii) all exhibits submitted as evidence at the hearing; and (iii) a copy of the Order.
- j. Hearings shall be deemed and conducted as contested cases within the meaning of Chapter 536, RSMo.
- k. In determining the presence of a public nuisance, the Board can consider evidence presented of public nuisance activity associated with the alleged public nuisance property.

§ 5.320 – Findings and Orders

A. The Board shall issue written findings of fact and conclusions of law.

B. If the Board finds that a public Nuisance, as defined in this Ordinance, or Nuisances exist, the Board shall issue an order requiring the Owner to abate the public nuisance within a reasonable timeframe.

C. Such measures may include, but are not limited to:

- 1 1. Security improvements to the premises;
- 2 2. Hiring of licensed and insured security personnel;
- 3 3. Implementation of property management or access-control plans;
- 4 4. Required on-site management presence during identified high-risk periods;
- 5 5. Restriction or prohibition of specific activities contributing to nuisance conditions;
- 6 6. Conditional limitations on property use until compliance is achieved;
- 7 7. Removal of trash, debris, or abandoned personal property;
- 8 8. Closing and boarding of the premises for a period not to exceed one (1) year.

9 D. Orders shall be proportional to the severity and duration of the nuisance and shall
10 consider documented good-faith compliance efforts.

11 E. The Board shall specify reasonable deadlines for compliance with each ordered
12 corrective action and may schedule follow-up hearings or reviews to assess compliance.

13 **§ 5.330 – Judicial Review**

14 Any final order of the Board shall be subject to judicial review pursuant to Chapter 536,
15 RSMo.

16 **§ 5.340 – Summons For Violation of Nuisance Abatement Order**

17 Failure to comply with an order of the Board shall be a violation of this ordinance and any
18 person who fails to comply with such an order shall be subject to a fine of not less than
19 One Hundred Dollars (\$100.00) nor more than Five Hundred Dollars (\$500.00) for each
20 day the court finds such person to be in noncompliance. In addition to a fine, the court may
21 sentence such person to not more than ninety (90) days imprisonment.

22 **§ 5.350 – Condemnation, Revocation of Permits, Licenses, and Nullification of**
23 **Exemptions**

1 If the Board determines that a nuisance exists and orders that the abatement of the
2 nuisance requires closure of the subject premises, the following shall apply:

3 A. If the building is at any time occupied during the order of closure the building
4 shall be deemed a "Nuisance" in accordance with the City of St. Louis Property
5 Maintenance Code and "Condemned" in accordance with the laws of the City of
6 St. Louis that apply to Condemned buildings. All the remedies to the City of St.
7 Louis allowed through those Ordinances shall apply to the violation of a Nuisance
8 Abatement Order.

9 B. Prior to occupancy of the premises, whether commercial or residential, the
10 property shall be inspected by the appropriate City, State and Federal Inspectors.
11 The subject premises must be in compliance with all applicable city, state and
12 federal, health, safety property maintenance and building codes. No occupancy
13 shall occur unless all code violations are abated.

14 C. Any property, commercial or residential which had previously been exempt from
15 or "grandfathered in" and not subject to compliance with current health, safety,
16 zoning, property maintenance and building codes will be deemed to have forfeited
17 that status and must be in total compliance with all applicable City, state and
18 federal, health, safety property maintenance and building codes. The property
19 shall be subject to a Full Occupancy Inspection. No occupancy shall occur unless
20 all code violations are abated.

21 D. Any licenses, variances, permits or certificates, whether business, occupancy or
22 building code which pertain to the subject premises and were in effect at the time
23 of an Order of Closure of the premises are deemed revoked or abandoned.

1 **SECTION TWO. CONFORMING AMENDMENTS**

2 All references in Ordinance No. 69730, as amended, to the “Administrative Hearing
3 Officer” are hereby deleted and replaced with references to the “Nuisance Property Review
4 Board,” where contextually appropriate.

5 **SECTION THREE. CONTINUITY OF LAW**

6 Except as expressly amended herein, all definitions, enforcement authorities, penalties, and
7 remedies contained in Ordinance No. 69730 and Ordinance No. 70390 shall remain in full
8 force and effect.

9 **SECTION FOUR. RULEMAKING**

10 The Board is authorized to adopt rules of procedure consistent with this Ordinance and
11 applicable law.

12 **SECTION FIVE. SEVERABILITY**

13 It is hereby declared to be the intention of the Board of Aldermen that each and every part,
14 section and subsection of this Ordinance shall be separate and severable from each and
15 every other part, section and subsection hereof and that the Board of Aldermen intends to
16 adopt each said part, section and subsection separately and independently of any other part,
17 section and subsection. In the event that any part, section or subsection of this Ordinance
18 shall be determined to be or to have been unlawful or unconstitutional, the remaining parts,
19 sections and subsections shall be and remain in full force and effect, unless the court
20 making such finding shall determine that the valid portions standing alone are incomplete
21 and are incapable of being executed in accord with the legislative intent.

22 **SECTION SIX. EFFECTIVE DATE**

23 This Ordinance shall take effect and be in force from and after its approval.

FISCAL NOTE
BOARD BILL NUMBER 151

Board Bill No. 151

Preparer's Name Cheryl Campbell

Phone Number or Email Address (will be available publicly) campbellch@stlouis-mo.gov

Bill Sponsor Alderman Rasheen Aldridge

Bill Synopsis:	<i>A bill amending the Public Nuisance Ordinance by repealing provisions related to the Administrative Hearing Officer and establishing a seven-member Nuisance Property Review Board with authority to hear and determine nuisance property matters; establishing community petition procedures; defining notice and hearing processes; authorizing rulemaking; and providing enforcement and judicial review mechanisms.</i>
Type of Impact:	<i>Potential Increase in Costs (Indeterminate)</i>
Agencies Affected:	<i>Department of Public Safety; City Counselor's Office; Mayor's Office; Board of Aldermen; Other City agencies referring nuisance matters.</i>

SECTION A

Does this bill authorize:

- An expansion of services which entails additional costs beyond that approved in the current adopted city budget? X Yes No
- An undertaking of a new service for which no funding is provided in the current adopted city budget? X Yes No
- A commitment of city funding in the future under certain specified conditions? Yes X No
- An issuance of bonds, notes and lease-purchase agreements which may require additional funding beyond that approved in the current adopted city budget? Yes X No

(01/2017)

- An execution or initiation of an activity as a result of federal or state mandates or requirements? Yes No
- A capital improvement project that increases operating costs over the current adopted city budget? Yes No
- A capital improvement project that requires funding not approved in the current adopted city budget or that will require funding in future years? Yes No

If the answer is yes to any of the above questions, then a fiscal note must be attached to the board bill. Complete Section B of the form below.

SECTION B

- Does the bill require the construction of any new physical facilities? Yes No

- If yes, describe the facilities and provide the estimated cost:

- Is the bill estimated to have a direct fiscal impact on any city department or office? Yes No

- If yes, explain the impact and the estimated cost:

The bill establishes a Nuisance Property Review Board and associated administrative procedures replacing the Administrative Hearing Officer structure. Departments may incur administrative workload related to coordination of hearings, petition verification, notice processing, recordkeeping, legal participation, and staff support.

The bill does not specify staffing models, operational workload volume, or implementation approaches; therefore, estimated costs cannot be determined.

- Does the bill create a program or administrative subdivision? Yes No

- If yes, then is there a similar existing program or administrative subdivision? Yes No

- If yes, explain the how the proposed programs or administrative subdivisions may overlap:

The bill replaces functions currently performed by the Administrative Hearing Officer with a Review Board structure. Adjudicatory responsibilities are transferred rather than eliminated, resulting in functional overlap during transition and structural modification of existing administrative processes.

- Describe the annual operating, equipment, and maintenance costs that would result from the proposed bill, as well as any funding sources:

Potential operating costs may include administrative coordination, hearing documentation and recording, mailing and notice requirements, and departmental participation in proceedings. The bill does not identify appropriations or funding sources. Fiscal impacts may vary depending on implementation decisions.

Complete the chart below to list the total estimated expenditures required of the City resulting from the proposed board bill and any estimated savings or additional revenue.

Financial Estimate of Impact on General Fund			
Fiscal Impact	<u>Year 1 (current)</u>	<u>Year 2</u>	<u>Year 3</u>
Additional Expenditures	<i>Indeterminate</i>	<i>Indeterminate</i>	<i>Indeterminate</i>
Additional Revenue	<i>None Identified</i>	<i>None Identified</i>	<i>None Identified</i>
Net	<i>Indeterminate</i>	<i>Indeterminate</i>	<i>Indeterminate</i>
Financial Estimate of Impact on Special Funds			
Fiscal Impact	<u>Year 1 (current)</u>	<u>Year 2</u>	<u>Year 3</u>
Additional Expenditures	<i>None Identified</i>	<i>None Identified</i>	<i>None Identified</i>
Additional Revenue	<i>None Identified</i>	<i>None Identified</i>	<i>None Identified</i>
Net	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>	<i>None</i>

- Describe any assumptions used in preparing this fiscal note:

This fiscal note evaluates potential impacts based on structural and procedural requirements described in the bill.

Implementation details such as staffing models, compensation provisions, workload volume, or departmental resource allocations are not specified in the bill language. Fiscal impacts may vary depending on administrative decisions made during implementation.

- List any sources of information (including any City officials, agencies, or departments) used in preparing this fiscal note:

Board Bill (Public Nuisance Ordinance Amendment — Aldridge)

Review of existing Public Nuisance Ordinance structure

Preparer analysis based on bill language

- Have the financial estimates of this bill been verified by the City Budget Division?
 Yes No
 - If yes, by whom? _____ .

RESOLUTION 258
OPPOSING MISSOURI HOUSE BILL 3066/SENATE BILL 1657 AND THE RECENT
UNACCOUNTABLE ACTIONS OF THE POLICE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

WHEREAS, the St. Louis Board of Police Commissioners (“Police Board”), a body where 4 of the 5 members are appointed by the Governor, has demonstrated a pattern of reckless fiscal behavior that threatens the financial stability of the City we all want to see thrive; and

WHEREAS, in February 2026, the Police Board submitted a proposed budget for that exceeded the State’s mandated amount by \$72 million; and

WHEREAS, this proposed budget included a near-doubling of officer salary, which accounts for an increase of more than \$30 million, which was submitted to the Mayor's office with less than a day’s notice before the Board voted to certify it. This denies the Mayor, who is the only member of the Board who represents the voters of the City, from providing a meaningful opportunity to review, analyze, or respond to its contents; and

WHEREAS, the City of St. Louis strongly supports its police officers and believes they deserve competitive salaries and the respect and investment that the essential nature of their work demands, which is why the City has been pouring a significant amount of resources into them; and

WHEREAS, The Police Board's approach does not represent a good-faith effort to lift up officers given that it more closely represents a power grab that bypasses the elected officials, the taxpayers, and the community partnerships necessary to make any raise sustainable and lasting; and

WHEREAS, St. Louis will never be made safer by a Police Board that operates as though the rest of City government does not exist; and

WHEREAS, Public safety is not achieved in isolation, but through streets that are maintained and give the residents pride in living there, youth who have opportunities to thrive instead of opportunities to get into trouble, families that are housed in buildings that are dignifying, and communities that are wholly invested in; and

WHEREAS, as it stands now, every dollar the Board seeks to take beyond what the City has budgeted, and what the State has mandated, is a dollar taken from the holistic approach to what makes us safe; and

WHEREAS, Mayor Cara Spencer has stated that the Police Board's proposed budget would force massive layoffs across Streets, Refuse, and every other City department. The Police Board's fiscal recklessness threatens the livelihoods of thousands of City employees and the services that residents depend on; and

WHEREAS, on January 21st, 2026 Missouri State Representative Brad Christ, who does not represent anyone who lives in the City of St. Louis, filed House Bill 3066 (“HB 3066”), which would remove all ability for the municipally ran Board of Estimate and Apportionment to deny line-item transfers for the Board, as well as transfer litigation cost for police misconduct from the State to the City; and

WHEREAS, on February 10, 2026, Missouri State Senator Travis Fitzwater filed Senate Bill 1657 (“SB 1657”), which is identical to HB 3066; and

WHEREAS, HB 3066 and SB 1657 would dramatically accelerate and entrench the City’s problems by allowing the Police Board to hide tens of millions of dollars from the City’s budget while also stripping the Board of Estimate and Apportionment of its authority to approve transfers within the police budget, eliminating a critical check on how public dollars are spent once appropriated; and

WHEREAS, If HB 3066 or SB 1657 becomes law, the liability for police-related lawsuits, settlements, and judgments would be transferred to the City of St. Louis, meaning St. Louis taxpayers would bear the full financial risk of police conduct while simultaneously being denied full visibility into the true cost of the department they are funding; and

WHEREAS, HB 3066 and SB 1657 would grant the Police Board the unilateral authority to move money between budget classifications without seeking approval from any elected or appointed oversight body, a power granted to no other City department; and

WHEREAS, the City has been working for several months in good faith with the Missouri Attorney General's Office on a Memorandum of Understanding to resolve the important legal issues of representation, liability, payment, settlement authority, and other key issues, making these pieces of legislation both unnecessary and potentially counter to this collaborative effort that all parties believe is close to being resolved; and

WHEREAS, the City of St. Louis faces profound and layered public safety challenges that cannot be solved by budget increases alone, they require violence prevention, behavioral health response, trauma-informed services, neighborhood investment, and the kind of trust between residents and officers that is built through community engagement and accountability, not state mandates by an unaccountable Police Board. HB 3066 and SB 1657 make every one of these proven solutions harder by constraining the City's fiscal flexibility and concentrating decision-making power in a board that answers to Jefferson City rather than to the people of St. Louis.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Board of Aldermen of the City of St. Louis that we pause in our deliberations to oppose Missouri HB 3066 and SB 1657; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this Board calls on the Police Board of Commissioners to immediately return to the table in good faith partners in order to develop a police budget that honors our officers, respects our residents, and reflects the realities of a city that must invest in all of its residents; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that we further direct the Clerk of this Board of Aldermen to spread a copy of this Resolution across the minutes of these proceedings and to prepare a commemorative copy of this resolution to the members of the Missouri House Committee on Crime and Public Safety, the Missouri Senate Committee on Transportation, Infrastructure and Public Safety, and to others as she sees fit.

Introduced this 6th Day of March 2026 by:

The Honorable Rasheen Aldridge, Alderman of the 14th Ward

Cosponsors:

The Honorable Megan Green, President of the Board of Aldermen

The Honorable Daniela Velázquez, Alderwoman 6th Ward

Adopted this 6th Day of March 2026 as attested by:

Sharita Rogers
Clerk, Board of Aldermen

Megan Green
President, Board of Aldermen