

**BOUNDARY COMMISSION
ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI**

**MINUTES OF MAP PLAN PUBLIC HEARING
ST. LOUIS COUNTY, CITY OF CLARKSON VALLEY,
CITY OF ELLISVILLE, CITY OF EUREKA AND CITY OF WILDWOOD
November 16, 2000**

COMMISSION ATTENDANCE:

Commissioners	Present (P)/Absent (A)
MATT ARMSTRONG	A
TED ARMSTRONG	A
JANE ARNOLD	A
BOB FORD	P
AGNES GARINO	P
TOM HAYEK	
DEE JOYNER	A
GREG KLOEPEL	A
ILENE ORDOWER	P
JOHNNIE SPEARS	P
DON WOJTKOWSKI	P

OTHERS PRESENT:

Daniel Krasnoff - Executive Director
David Hamilton - Legal Counsel

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Wojtkowski called to order the meeting of the Boundary Commission at 7:00 p.m. on November 16, 2000. The meeting took place at the LaSalle Springs Middle School, Wildwood, Missouri. The purpose of the meeting was to conduct a public hearing on the map plan

submissions of St. Louis County, the City of Clarkson Valley, the City of Ellisville, the City of Eureka, and the City of Wildwood.

1. Opening Remarks by Chairman

Mr. Wojtkowski began the hearing by stating the jurisdictions that would present information at the hearing. He introduced himself and the other Commission members who were present: Agnes Garino, Ilene Ordower, Bob Ford, and Johnnie Spears.

He said Commission was established by House bill 1967, which was passed into law on June 27, 2000. Part of that law required municipalities interested in pursuing annexation proposals anytime between 2001 and 2006 submit map plans by July 1, 2000. Map plans designated areas in which municipalities plan may want to pursue annexation in the future. Beginning April 15, 2001 municipalities may proceed with annexations within the map plan boundaries they previously submitted. If proposals were submitted at that time, the Commission will conduct a separate review of those plans and hold new public hearings about the proposal(s). The sole purpose of the Commission in reviewing such proposals is to determine whether the proposals should go on the ballot for the voters to consider. The purpose the hearing, therefore, was not to hear actual annexation proposals, but instead to hear descriptions of the map plans submitted to the Commission.

Mr. Wojtkowski said there would be an opportunity for citizens to comment on the map plans after the presentations had ended. Those who desired to speak were instructed to fill out speaker cards. Cards would be accepted through the completion of Wildwood's presentation. Cards were to be handed to Mr. Krasnoff. The municipalities were allowed fifteen minutes to speak. Those representing groups were allowed five minutes to speak while those speaking for themselves were allowed three minutes to speak. He noted there was informational material about the Commission on the table at the back of the room.

2. Presentation of St. Louis County

The Director of Planning, Mr. Glenn Powers, presented St. Louis County's map plan. He noted that the map showed areas in red and green were unincorporated. Those in green contained more than 2,500 residents. There were two areas, one southeast and one southwest of Eureka with less than 2,500 residents that were not displayed on the map. The northeast area of the West County portion of the map plan would not be discussed that evening. The southwestern area, with approximately 31.5 square miles and the area had approximately 19,000 residents. Most of that population was on the east end of the area. The west end, along the I-44 corridor, was largely parkland and open space, including the Tyson Research Center. Most of the zoning regulations in the western area were "non-urban," rural zoning in which lot sizes were a minimum of three acres. Mr. Powers said the area not shown on the map, south of Eureka, had eighty residents and the area southwest of Eureka had approximately 250 residents, a figure that excluded the prison population.

He said residents who desired to remain unincorporated had some options. Residents who opposed annexation could simply vote against annexation proposals, or, residents could submit petitions to remain unincorporated to the Boundary Commission for areas with more than 2,500 residents. If approved, an election would be held. If a majority voted in favor there would be a five-year moratorium on annexation proposals. Also, St. Louis County could file a petition on behalf of residents who desired to remain unincorporated. The County was willing to make such proposals for those in the green areas of the map. He said St. Louis County was the provider of local services and would be happy to remain the local service provider if that was what residents desired. Mr. Powers said St. Louis County would work closely with residents to advocate their position if they desired to remain unincorporated. The primary criteria for including areas was a desire to allow residents of West County to remain in unincorporated St. Louis County if that was their desire.

The County had no definite phasing plan. This was a complicated matter because there were many different areas identified in the map plan and how the County responded would be influenced by the activities of many municipalities. The County wanted to hear from both the public and municipalities before committing to a phasing strategy. Mr. Powers said there was no timetable for the submission of proposals.

As the provider of services to unincorporated portions of West County, it was important for them to implement its map plan because the County placed a premium on meeting residents. So long as those residents desired to have the County continue to provide the services. Also, the County provided excellent services on a par with any municipality.

Mr. Powers then discussed why the County was the best jurisdiction to provide services and the arguments it would make to residents in its favor. The County had a large staff and sound financial management, one of only eighteen counties in the country with a AAA bond rating. Taxes had not been changed since 1989, when taxes were lowered. He said the County Police Department was the standard-bearer for police departments in the St. Louis County area. The West County precinct had over 100 officers working in incorporated and unincorporated areas. Police services were provided for Wildwood, which was treated as a separate precinct and for Fenton.

Mr. Powers said County's Public Works Department had a large, professionally trained staff with many engineers. Many municipalities in West County contracted for public works and other services. All the cities under discussion that night: Wildwood, Eureka, and Ellisville contracted for County services.

The County highway Department maintained and plowed arterial and minor roads in St. Louis County and had a large staff. He said the Public Works Department operated three substations in the far west area. The County also had a large park system with over 2,200 acres in eleven different parks. The Planning Department had been protective of the non-urban zoning because of the narrow roads and lack of sanitary sewers. The County resisted development in areas

without the necessary urban infrastructure.

Mr. Powers said residents had expressed some support for remaining unincorporated. They would gauge the desires of the public at the evening's meeting and at future meetings.

Questions from the Boundary Commission

Mr. Ford asked the population of the red area of the map just west of Ellisville. Mr. Powers said the area was largely characterized by small-scale commercial activity with some light industrial uses west of the roadway. There were probably fewer than a dozen families. He said that unincorporated area was made progressively smaller because of annexations by Ellisville and the creation of Wildwood.

Mr. Ford said he recognized the County could not submit a proposal for that area, but asked if the County would help residents in any way possible if they desired to remain unincorporated. Mr. Powers said the County would help those residents.

Mr. Wojtkowski said he saw green and gray colors on the map. He asked Mr. Powers to distinguish the meaning of the coloring of different areas of the map plan near Eureka. Mr. Powers said the area east of Eureka had more than 2,500 residents. Although, the Crescent area had far fewer than that number. If submitting a proposal to the Commission, the proposal would have to include a much larger area than Crescent, which had much fewer than 2,500 residents. In the two areas south of Eureka, which were largely not shown on the map, there was not enough population to support the County making proposals to remain unincorporated.

3. *Presentation of Clarkson Valley*

The Mayor, Mr. Scott Douglas, presented Clarkson Valley's map plan. He said the city was going to square off the boundary to better identify the line between Clarkson Valley and the City of Ballwin along Clarkson Road. The Boundary was to be moved to the other side of Clarkson Road. At the north end of the road there was a bank that had been the subject of some discussion. There was an agreement with Ballwin to change the jurisdiction of that parcel that was not completed in time to be considered by the previous Boundary Commission. There was no contention regarding the future of the bank parcel and Ballwin included no aspect of that portion of its border in its map plan. Further south on Clarkson Road was a single parcel in unincorporated St. Louis County. That property had a new owner who had been told that because the property was not in Clarkson Valley they would not have trash pickup services provided by the City. That lot was included in the map plan. He said Clarkson Valley was responsible for enforcing traffic laws on Clarkson Road and there was concern someone would argue that the City had no jurisdiction.

Mr. Wojtkowski asked for an explanation of the boundary with Ballwin. Mr. Douglas said in 1970 the property at the northwest corner of Kehrs Mill Road and Clarkson Road was annexed by Ballwin. That owner also owned the property at the southwest corner of the intersection.

That property was included in the annexation. That was an oversight and the map plan sought to rectify the matter.

Ms. Garino asked the length of the Clarkson Valley map plan. Mr. Douglas said it was about one mile in length.

Ms. Garino asked if there was agreement with Ballwin for a transfer of jurisdiction. Mr. Douglas said such an agreement was in place.

Ms. Garino asked what was on the east side of Clarkson Road. Mr. Douglas said Clarkson Valley's border was on the east side of Clarkson Road extending south. The area up to that point was in Ballwin. Clarkson Valley's boundary was at the south end of the map plan.

Mr. Wojtkowski asked how soon Clarkson Valley would proceed with a transfer of jurisdiction. Mr. Douglas said soon after April 15, 2001 a proposal would be submitted.

4. Presentation of Ellisville

The City Manager, Daniel Mears, presented Ellisville's map plan. Attending the meeting with Mr. Mears were the Mayor, Mr. Jefferey Khoury and the Assistant City Manager, Ms. Pat Cook. Mr. Mears said he thought it was a good thing that the Commission provided a forum for cities to inform residents of unincorporated St. Louis County in what areas annexation was feasible. He said Ellisville had not contacted anyone in the map plan area. The City felt it could provide services to the areas in its map plan and that the City was available to discuss potential annexation with residents in the map plan area.

Mr. Mears addressed the criteria for including areas in the map plan saying there were seven sections to the map plan. Some of those areas included no residential population and were actually boundary adjustments necessary because of errors in previous annexations. The areas were selected to "clean up" the borders. A couple of the areas were pockets entirely within Ellisville's borders. By implementing these small areas of the map plan, the City's borders would be made more compact and understandable. The largest portion of the map plan, colored orange on the map, was bounded by Wildwood on the west, Ballwin on the north and by the Meramec River to the south. The ability of Ellisville to provide services to the area was the primary criteria in creating determining the map plan boundaries.

Mr. Mears said Ellisville had no phasing plan. Annexation of the small pieces of the map plan could be executed at any time. Annexations in the larger area of the map plan would be determined the desire of residents in those areas to become part of Ellisville. He said Ellisville had no timetable and annexation proposals would be determined by citizen interest. There were a couple of reasons why it was important for the City to implement its map plan. Mr. Mears said Ellisville desired to make its boundaries more logical. Also, Ellisville wanted to offer the residents of neighboring areas the opportunity to be part of the City that was their desire. He did not necessarily feel Ellisville was the best community to serve the map plan area.

Citizens would decide if they would rather be in Ballwin, Ellisville, Wildwood, or unincorporated St. Louis County. There was a community of interest with residents in the map plan area, who used Ellisville's shops, roads, and recreational facilities. There was a sense of community with Ellisville.

Ellisville had a number of programs that could benefit residents in the map plan area. First, the City completely funded trash and recycling services for its residents. Secondly, there was annual leaf pick-up and twice per year brush pick-up along with free mulch. Thirdly, the City fully funded a sewer lateral program and within the previous year had developed a police residential patrol, in which officers patrolled only residential streets. Fourthly, residents were closer to government. Each elected representative had fewer than 1,500 constituents.

Mr. Mears said the City would tell residents it offered quality municipal services and encouraged residents and non-residents to take part in its parks and recreation programs. It was important to allow people to become part of Ellisville. He said the City had received some interest from residents in annexation by Ellisville. He also noted residents had expressed such an interest to Wildwood and Ballwin as well.

Questions from the Commission

Ms. Garino asked Mr. Mears how much of the large portion of the map plan was adjacent to the Ellisville borders. Mr. Mears said the City had not figured the percentage of adjacency. Ms. Garino said she assumed Ellisville would need to phase annexation proposals to the Commission in order to establish 15% adjacency. Mr. Mears said that was correct.

Ms. Garino asked if the proposal included all adjacent pockets to Ellisville. Mr. Mears said all pockets within the City and bordering the City were identified in the map plan. Pockets existed with all neighbors, Wildwood, Clarkson Valley, and Ballwin. Mr. Mears said some of the pockets contained residents while others did not. Mr. Mears said there were four or five pockets. Ms. Garino asked him to characterize land uses in the pockets. Mr. Mears said there were businesses and multi-family dwellings were in the pocket on Old State Road. Two of the pockets were only roadways. One pocket was a single parcel and one was a single subdivision. He said all areas were quite small. Ms. Garino asked if there were service barriers to any of the pocketed areas. Mr. Mears said there were none, and that all those areas could be accessed from major roads in Ellisville.

Ms. Garino asked Mr. Mears to explain the unincorporated pocket on Ruck Road. Mr. Mears said that pocket was within Ellisville. Mr. Mears said the parcel was vacant.

Ms. Ordower asked how many residents lived in Ellisville and the map plan area. Mr. Mears said slightly more than 9,000 people resided in Ellisville and he had population figures for the area, but there had been a good deal of development there. He guessed that a few thousand people lived in the area.

Ms. Ordower asked what the tax structure was Ellisville's tax structure. Mr. Mears said the City had a one-and-a-half cent sales tax, a one-cent general tax, and half-cent tax for storm water improvements. The City had a \$.15 per \$100.00 valuation property tax which was offset by the fact that the City provided free trash services. The next year, property tax revenue was estimated to be \$235,000, while the City would pay \$362,000 for trash and recycling.

Ms. Ordower asked if Ellisville had discussed map plan boundaries with Wildwood or Ballwin. Mr. Mears said there were discussions with those cities.

Mr. Ford asked for a description of the small finger shaped area not included at the southwest corner of Ellisville's map plan. Mr. Mears said the area in question was difficult to service from Ellisville. The area was better served by Wildwood.

Mr. Wojtkowski asked if anything substantive had resulted from conversations with Ballwin and Wildwood. Mr. Mears said there were thorough discussion that dealt with service delivery and defining the community of interest for various areas adjacent to the three cities. He said Wildwood had large acre lots, Ballwin had small acre lots, and Ellisville had a mixture of both. There was no overlap between Ballwin and Wildwood because no areas adjacent to those cities had a mutual community of interest. That was not true for Ellisville. He said there would not be competition to annex overlapping areas, but that residents of those areas would have a choice as to whom they would like to provide local government services.

Mr. Wojtkowski said the 15% of the total boundary of an annexation had to be contiguous with the city proposing annexation. Mr. Wojtkowski said Ellisville would have to phase any annexations, and it looked as though at least three annexations would be required to fully implement the map plan. Mr. Wojtkowski asked what would be the first step in making annexation proposals. Mr. Mears said the first step was dependent on the desire of those adjacent to the City wanting to be annexed. The City Council had decided only to pursue annexation if residents in unincorporated areas requested to be annexed.

Ms. Garino asked what was the west boundary and how was it established. Mr. Mears said there were no roads in that area. Access would come from the further development of roads, or from St. Paul Road. Ms. Garino asked if the west boundary was the boundary of Wildwood, south of the boundary with Ellisville.

5. *Presentation of Eureka*

The City Administrator, Mr. Craig Sabo, presented Eureka's map plan. Mr. Sabo began saying Eureka was a fourth class city of approximately eight square miles located in southwestern St. Louis County. Portions of the City were contiguous with Wildwood to the north, Jefferson County to the south and the City of Pacific/Franklin County to the west. He said the population was approximately 7,600. The City had full service Police, Public Works, and Parks/Recreation departments. Eureka had its own sanitary sewer system, meaning it was not served by St. Louis County Water or the Metropolitan Sewer District. The City had negotiated a trash pickup

service and it was served by the Eureka Fire Protection District and was mostly in the Rockwood School District.

Mr. Sabo said Eureka had a 1% general sales tax, .5% capital improvement tax, .5% storm water and parks tax which would be effective the following April. The City also had a 5% utility tax and a property tax of \$.48 per \$100.00 of valuation. The Board of Aldermen was considering lowering the property tax since the storm water and parks tax was approved.

He said St. Louis County provided commercial building permit inspections, residential and commercial electrical inspections, and police dispatching services. He did not anticipate those relationships would change based on any annexation proposals.

Mr. Sabo said Eureka's criteria for submitting the map plan were the elimination of unincorporated pockets, which accounted for the inclusion of sub-areas A and B. The City used natural boundaries such as the Meramec River and the existing county limit lines. The City was careful not to split subdivisions. The overall objective was to identify areas that allowed for controlled, orderly growth, which allowed the City to phase in municipal services without having to lower the quality of services to existing Eureka residents.

Sub area A was between the southern and western limits and the Meramec River, which is the border with Jefferson County, the City of Pacific border and the Franklin County border, to the west. The boundary of area B was bounded by the Meramec River, and the southern boundary of the City of Eureka. Sub Area C was northeast of the Eureka city limits. The eastern edge were parcels adjacent to Beaumont/Antire Road, north to parcels adjacent to the Meramec River and to the south to the Jefferson County line. The east boundary of sub area C was based on the maximum area where there was a community of interest with Eureka. The closer residents were to Eureka, the more it was assumed they would have a community of interest with the City.

In 1998, Eureka annexed approximately 430 acres adjacent to sub area A. There was an assumption at the time that the City would annex more land in that area. He said the City had been contacted by a landowner who was interested in an intense, multi-unit development. Eureka chose not to pursue the annexation of that non-contiguous land because it did not like the development plan.

Although the City had not calculated the size or population of the area, he said Eureka was not targeting the areas for tax revenue. Mr. Powers had borne out the low population densities in many of the sub-areas Eureka was interested in.

Mr. Sabo said initial activities would be concentrated in sub-area A in the area near where the 1998 annexation had taken place. The City had not assigned priority to the rest of area A or to the other sub areas. The phasing would be based on resident feedback from public forums, which the City would hold, or from solicitation by interested parties. The City assumed phasing would need to take place. Although there was not a general timetable, Eureka estimated it would submit a proposal for the portion of area A by the end of the next year.

Eureka was the best community to serve the area because it shared similar characteristics with the areas designated in the map plan. The sub-areas represented reasonable growth for the City based on the considerations of compactness and contiguity. Many had to travel through Eureka to get to their property while residents in the sub areas identified with Eureka by being served by the Eureka post office, Eureka Fire Protection District and use shopping opportunities, churches, institutions and parks and recreation programs in Eureka. He noted there were no overlapping proposals with Eureka.

Eureka offered residents local representation, local services, local police protection, snow removal, sanitary sewer and water services, given the natural limitations of the area. Much of the soil composition and typography in the area made it difficult to expand water and sewer rates. There would be trash pick-up based on municipally negotiated rates and residents rates for parks and recreation programs.

Questions from the Commission

Mr. Spears asked if there was an isolated, unincorporated area between the Eureka and Valley Park map plans. Mr. Sabo said there would be an area of unincorporated St. Louis County between them.

Mr. Ford asked what Eureka's motivation was to annex such sparsely occupied areas. Mr. Sabo said half of the map plan area had low-density development similarly to the City of Eureka. Like other municipalities, the City desired a high level of input if those sparsely developed areas were developed.

Mr. Ford asked if the City would actively court annexation or if it would wait for residents to come forward desiring annexation. Mr. Sabo said for sub areas A and B the City would initiate annexation proposals. In sub area C, which included the area known as Crescent, however, there was significant citizen opposition to annexation. The City would work closely with residents to identify opposition and determine the compatibility of the City and Crescent for potential annexation. If there were a great level of opposition, the City would not pursue annexation.

Mr. Ford asked if residents of sub areas A and B had expressed a desire to be annexed by Eureka. Mr. Sabo said there had been some support expressed, particularly in sub area A.

Mr. Wojtkowski asked how much of the sub areas was flood plain. Mr. Sabo said substantial areas were flood plain and flood way. In sub area A, nearly half of the area was flood plain. Development would be limited in that area.

Mr. Wojtkowski asked if the interest in annexation in sub areas A and B was from a desire for commercial and/or industrial development. Mr. Sabo said some interest in area A was for commercial development. A recreational facility would soon be proposed. Mr. Wojtkowski asked if a TIF had been discussed. Mr. Sabo said discussions were informal. However, the development would not generate sufficient revenues to support annexation. Any public subsidy

would probably be from a chapter 353 corporation or a transportation development district.

Ms. Garino asked what the white area on the map was. Mr. Sabo said that was the east edge of the City of Pacific, along a roadway.

Ms. Garino asked what the zoning was for sub-area A. Mr. Sabo said the zoning was non-urban.

Ms. Garino asked why the north boundary was a railroad track instead of the Meramec River. Mr. Sabo said the railroad was chosen because the City could not identify a parcel north of the river that had a regular boundary. The parcels in that area crossed the river, something the City did not want to do. Ms. Garino asked why they did not go to the river. Mr. Sabo said no lot lines stopped short of the river. The City did not want to split parcels.

Ms. Garino said due east of area C was a large area in Valley Park's map plan. She asked if there was any discussion with Valley Park. Mr. Sabo said there were no discussions with Valley Park and they did not know the Valley Park map plan would extend so far west south of the Meramec River. He said the law allowed for adjustment of map plan boundaries and Eureka was happy to engage in such discussions with Valley Park.

Ms. Garino asked what was the east boundary of the map plan. Mr. Sabo said the boundary followed lot lines.

6. *Presentation of Wildwood*

The City Administrator, Mr. Carl Ramey, presented Wildwood's map plan. He said Wildwood was five years old, having been incorporated in September 1995. With sixty-seven square miles, it was the third largest city in Missouri, based on total land area. While the population of the City was officially 16,742, the revised census lists the population at nearly 31,000. The City grew in population and had a great deal of land area.

There were 274 parcels of land with approximately 2.7 square miles of land area in the map plan. A majority of the parcels were undeveloped, with a population based of 350-400 residents in the map plan area. The City considered many factors in submitting a map plan. First, was there interest by residents in the area? Dating to 1998 residents near St. Paul and Kiefer Creek roads had shown interest in annexation. That interest was again shown when the City prepared its map plans. Also, meetings were held with Ballwin and Ellisville. The City considered the ability to provide services to the area, the compactness of the area, the adjacency to Wildwood and whether or not there was a community of interest. Was the area similar to the City of Wildwood? Access to the map plan area was another consideration. Were there natural boundaries to the area and were there watersheds that required consideration. The City wanted to make sure no unincorporated pockets were left and that it had the financial capacity to serve areas shown on the map plan.

Mr. Ramey referenced a map he had brought which showed the boundaries of Wildwood, the Wildwood map plan area and the cities of Ballwin and Ellisville's as well as other unincorporated areas not within Wildwood's map plan. There was a common boundary between Wildwood and Ballwin. It was Wildwood's intention to include the high water mark of the Meramec River in its map plan. Mr. Ramey said it was possible that the high water mark was further north than was shown on the map plan. Therefore, the City might have had to revise its map plan to reflect that a portion was under water.

The City was a dependable provider of services. There was no timetable or phasing plan. The purpose of the map plan was to allow map plan area residents a chance to consider annexation later. St. Louis County, could evaluate its ability to serve the area. The City would consider annexation requests from map plan area citizens in accordance with the relevant state statute. The City would not seek involuntary annexation. Any phasing would be driven by citizen interest. The map plan allowed all parties a chance for dialogue on future annexation issues and a chance to evaluate who was the best entity to provide municipal services to various areas.

It was important to implement the map plan because it offered citizens the option of considering annexation. Mr. Ramey said access to Sherman was only through Wildwood, along St. Paul Road. A portion of the road already extended through the City. It was logical to extend responsibility for the right-of-way to the north and south of Wildwood. Because of the ridgeline on the east and Meramec River on the south, those in the Wildwood map plan used St. Paul Road as their main arterial road. Public safety and public works access could also come through St. Paul Road.

There was a community of interest in the area. Development patterns in terms of size and age were similar between Wildwood and the map plan area. Sherman was an historic community with much pride. Wildwood had similar areas with similar characteristics.

Mr. Ramey said the City had the financial capacity to serve the map plan area. Police and public works functions in the area could be easily extended. The City's master planning offered stability and the land use and planning helped to preserve fragile eco-systems and water sheds. The City offered responsive government. With 32,000 residents, the City had sixteen council members, a high ratio.

Questions from the Commission

Ms. Garino asked the population and characteristics of Sherman. Mr. Ramey said it was an older community with approximately 200 residents. Mr. Ramey said the area was non-urban or flood plain. The flood plain was along the river.

Ms. Garino asked what defined the eastern boundary of the map plan. Mr. Ramey said the eastern boundary was a ridgeline with access to the properties off St. Paul Road.

Ms. Garino asked Mr. Ramey to define the north boundary of the map plan. Mr. Ramey said the

boundary was consistent with Ellisville, but that the Ballwin map plan boundary was along Kiefer Creek and not St. Paul Road.

Ms. Ordower said the north part was the area where resident interest was expressed. Mr. Ramey said the City had received negative comments from Sherman regarding annexation and comment opposing annexation in the north area.

Ms. Ordower asked if Wildwood used MSD and County Water. Mr. Ramey said Wildwood was served by MSD to Highway 109. Most of the community was on individual service and “package” plants. Wildwood was working with MSD and the Army Corps of Engineers on a West County sanitary sewer study. The County water is not extended through the community. Some residents received water from wells.

Mr. Wojtkowski asked Mr. Ramey to identify Sherman on the map. Mr. Ramey did so. Sherman was included so as not to leave an unincorporated pocket.

Ms. Garino asked how Sherman received services. Mr. Ramey said access was through St. Paul Road, north to Kiefer Creek to Manchester and Clarkson roads, or, Ridge Road to Old State Road to Highway 109 to I-44. Ms. Garino asked if services were provided through Wildwood or other municipalities. Mr. Ramey said services could come through Kiefer Creek Road, which was in unincorporated St. Louis County.

Ms. Ordower asked if there had been discussions with those in Sherman. Mr. Ramey said he had some individual conversations with Sherman residents. The City wanted to finish the map plan process then it could determine interest once the map plan was completed. The City had not created a strategy to address areas of the map plan. The City would react to the interest of residents.

Mr. Wojtkowski asked if Wildwood contracted with St. Louis County for any services. All services were contracted. Contracts were for police, building inspection and for a variety of public works with private companies. Wildwood was unique in that it had not created a staff. Services were delivered on a contract basis. Mr. Wojtkowski asked how streets were dealt with. Mr. Ramey said there were contracts with private sector companies.

7. Public Comment

Ms. Donna Roark, 110 South Dr.

She was a homeowner in Sherman for the previous twenty-eight years. She found out about the map plan from her neighbor. She was quite satisfied with the services from St. Louis County, including, police protection, streets, and the park. She did not desire to be annexed and saw no benefit from annexation by Wildwood.

Mr. Phil Rodenbaugh, 555 Plymouth Terrace

He lived in Crescent for forty-five years and his wife had lived there sixty years. Although there

were a couple of landowners who wanted to create commercial development on their properties, they had failed to succeed with the County government or in annexation by the defunct city of Times Beach. He was the last president of the dormant Diecke-Crescent Improvement Association which made him familiar with the feelings of those in Crescent. He said Eureka had been mismanaged, including congestion at Six Flags, Fifth Street, which was commercial business with no room for expansion and gridlocked traffic. Also, the Mayor wanted to build a “mega-mall” in Alorton, where traffic was already heavily congested. When annexed Alorton was promised water and sewage, none of which had occurred. He said Mr. Sabo should keep his hands off Crescent. Greedy landowners should not sway the Commission in allowing the annexation of Crescent.

Mr. John Powderly, 346 Lewis Bluff Circle

He lived in Crescent for eleven months. He did not believe utilities could be brought to Crescent in an efficient manner. Those who lived in the area already provided their own services of that type for themselves. He had his own well and septic system. Also, Eureka did not see eye-to-eye with Crescent regarding development. Crescent was unique, bordered by golf courses and a County park. The only access was from Lewis Road. The area was like a peninsula near the Meramec River. There had recently been two proposals to change land uses and population density. He did not trust Eureka to represent the interests of Crescent residents.

Mr. Neil Ferretti, 491 Lewis Road

Mr. Feretti asked if the residents of Crescent and Sherman could band together and have the County submit a proposal to have them remain unincorporated. Mr. Wojtkowski said that was possible.

Mr. Gordon Schnitzler, 59 Stevens Farm Lane

He had purchased a lot, built a house in Crescent, and moved in about three weeks before the hearing. In the spring, residents attended a meeting regarding commercial development near the entrance to Route 66 State Park. He was impressed by the number of people who attended the meeting and voiced opposition to re-zoning. He could not understand how annexation by Eureka would help residents of Crescent.

Mr. Norman Cole, 968 St. Paul Road

He had lived in Crescent for forty years and owned land from Kiefer Creek to St. Paul Road. He was opposed to annexation for many reasons. First, the police protection would not change with annexation. Second, the County Highway Department was better. He was opposed to annexation by Wildwood.

Ms. Pat Boever, 142 Crescent Bluff Drive

She had lived in Crescent for over twenty years. She said Eureka was pro-development. In those development trees had been removed unnecessarily. The development by the high school had destroyed a pretty hill to only build houses. Also, the Eureka Park Department had never built a swimming pool despite the Six Flags revenue. She was confused because she did not think Crescent was contiguous with Eureka. The only way they were contiguous was if Eureka also

annexed the Route 66 State Park. She said Route 66 State Park was between Eureka and Crescent. Mr. Wojtkowski said there would have to be a large annexation proposal for Eureka to annex Crescent. She thought 90% of residents would be opposed to the annexation of Crescent by Eureka.

Mr. Tim Daher, 402 Crescent Bluff Court

He was concerned that with 7,600 Eureka residents he was concerned how much of a voice 200-300 Crescent residents would have if annexed by Eureka. He was opposed to pay taxes for City water and sewer systems from which the residents would never benefit. Also, there were plenty of state and local parks in the area. So, the Eureka parks Department would not offer more than the County already offered. He said under the status quo he could hire the trash vendor who did the best job. He was not told who would collect his garbage. The same was true for snow removal. He liked the current police and snow removal service. He thought annexation would not provide services and would lead to higher taxes.

Mr. Wojtkowski said Crescent was not contiguous with Eureka. Annexation of Crescent by Eureka would require Eureka to annex the area to the east before it could annex Crescent. Or, Eureka could propose to annex both the area to its east and Crescent in one large proposal.

Mr. Dennis de Jong, 5810 Horneker

He lived in sub-area A of the Eureka map plan. He said Eureka had a horrible track record regarding development. The reason Eureka wanted to annex sub-area A was to increase economic development activity in that area. He said Don Breckenridge and a business partner acknowledged to him their intent was to annex the area and develop it. He was not opposed to development in general, but did not support development on a flood plain or in areas that were zoned agricultural. He felt those were the best uses for the land in sub-area A. He referenced a large rainfall in the recent past in which floodwaters from Fox Creek left 33% of the area under water. The fisheries biologist from the Missouri Department of Natural Resources said Fox Creek was the most ecologically diverse stream in St. Louis County. Development of the land would negatively impact the creek and the surrounding water shed. He said Eureka and the developer would not be deterred. Eureka had much less stringent requirements of developers than did St. Louis County. He noted Eureka failed to control traffic near Six Flags, failed in its “mini” mall development, and failed to deliver on promises to Allenton.

Mr. Tim Jones, Eureka, MO

He was a resident of Eureka, although his family still lived in Crescent having lived there for the past twenty-five years. He said sub-area C was not merely an area with a sparse population but instead was a community with a long history. The only access to Crescent from Eureka was to leave the Eureka city limits and drive for two miles on I-44, crossing the Meramec River and traveling north to Lewis Road into the community. The area’s secluded nature would make service provision by Eureka very difficult. Except for the three golf courses, the land should remain residential and non-urban in nature. At a community meeting a few months before, the owner of a large tract of land, who did not live in the community, was proposing development in Crescent. He felt the Eureka map plan was motivated by an arrangement with that property

owner.

Mr. Doug Bingley, 405 Diecke

He owned land in Crescent for twenty years and his family owned land in the community longer than that. He saw no advantage in being annexed by Eureka and saw no advantage in the various types of taxes stated by Mr. Sabo. He did not like the development pattern of Eureka. They had a good relationship with St. Louis County. He said new development had caused an increase in property values and could understand Eureka's interest but he remained opposed to annexation.

Mr. Wojtkowski reiterated for the audience that St. Louis County could submit a proposal to the Commission that ensured an area would remain unincorporated. It was the responsibility of residents with that view to engage Mr. Powers from St. Louis County regarding the potential submission of such a proposal.

8. *Adjournment*

At that point, the meeting was adjourned.

Respectfully submitted,

Daniel Krasnoff
Executive Director

Approved: