

BOUNDARY COMMISSION  
ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI  
MEETING MINUTES

August 31, 2004

ROLL CALL

Commissioners Present: Ted Armstrong, Christine Bredenkoetter, Marvin Gelber, Tom Hayek, Mary Schuman, Johnnie Spears. Commissioners Absent: Greg Kloeppel, Betty Marver, Don Wojtkowski. Late Arrival: Bob Ford 6:15PM, Matt Armstrong 6:50PM

Commission Staff Present: David Hamilton, Boundary Commission Legal Counsel, Courtney Irwin, Executive Director, Boundary Commission. Others Present: Lori Fiegel, St. Louis County Planning Department.

CALL TO ORDER

Mr. Hayek called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m., August 31, 2004. The meeting was held at the Woerther Elementary School in Ballwin, Missouri.

ROLL IS CALLED – QUORUM DECLARED

Roll was called and a quorum declared by Mr. Hayek.

APPROVE AGENDA

Mr. Hayek proposed amending the agenda to include under New Business by adding item D. Scheduling. Mr. T. Armstrong moved to amend the agenda. Mr. Spears seconded the motion. Voice vote: Ayes, All. Nays, None. *The motion passed.*

APPROVE MINUTES

There were no Minutes to approve.

PUBLIC COMMENT

There was no public comment.

ANNOUNCEMENTS AND COMMUNICATIONS

Mr. Hayek welcomed new Executive Director to the Boundary Commission, Courtney Irwin.

STAFF REPORT

Mr. Hayek noted the recent inquiries by citizens wanting information about how the process of annexation is going. He also pointed out that the Notice of Public Hearing postcards have been taking up a significant amount of time to get out. Ms. Bredenkoetter said she received a phone call from residents of Florissant Area 6, who received postcards for the August 17, 2004 public hearing the day after the actual hearing took place. Ms. Bredenkoetter wanted to know why the Election Board was getting the mailing labels to the Boundary Commission on the Friday's before the public hearings. Mr. Hayek explained that the Commission was operating under time constraints, and that the Commission is

going beyond the rules in having to notify the public. Ms. Bredenkoetter expressed concern over spending money for this service if the post office is unreliable in delivering the mail in a timely fashion. She also questioned when the agendas for the public hearings were being posted. Ms. Irwin said that she posts them on the Fridays before the public hearings and Mr. Hayek noted that the minimum posting requirement is 24-hours before the hearing.

## NEW BUSINESS

A. Leslie Tiepelman, from the St. Louis County Election Board, gave a presentation regarding the Petition Gathering Process. Mr. Hayek asked if there were any type of requirements for the people gathering petitions. Ms. Tiepelman said she was not aware of any such requirements. Mr. Hayek then asked what type of review process takes place within the Board of Elections when the petitions come in for verifying the signature. Ms. Tiepelman replied that when the petitions are received they are logged into their computer. She said the staff tells the computer which township and precincts to accept. If the signature does not match up with the specific township and precinct, then the computer records the signature as invalid and it does not account for that petition. She stated that if an individual has transferred into the district after signing a petition, then it is not considered a valid signature.

Ms. Tiepelman said that there have been petition drives where people have been collecting registrations and signing petitions at the same time. She said that is legal, but those individuals need to get the registrations into the Election Board as soon as possible so that they can be processed. She went on to say that all the signatures are scanned in St. Louis County. The computer automatically brings up the signature and the individual operator has discretion as to whether to accept the signature.

Mr. T. Armstrong asked Ms. Tiepelman to elaborate. She said, for example, that she would type a code into the computer and then type "Armstrong, Ted." The computer would pull up Ted Armstrong's information and address. Next, she performs a process where she would "scrape the screen" to bring Ted Armstrong's signature into the petition and automatically Ted Armstrong's signature would pop up. Mr. T. Armstrong asked where this signature comes from and she replied from the person's original registration. Mr. T. Armstrong then asked her if there is a visual match made of those two signatures for every single one and she answered yes.

Ms. Tiepelman said that the operators give the petitioners the benefit of the doubt when examining their signatures. Mr. T. Armstrong remarked that as a non-handwriting expert neophyte, he noticed that some signatures of husband and wife had been made by one of the two. Ms. Tiepelman explained that in an instance where the petition is signed "Mr. and Mrs. Armstrong," the operator looks at the signature and determines which one of the two actually signed it. They will then give that person credit, but not the other. Mr. Hayek asked what they do when the petition is signed "Catherine Hayek", "Tom Hayek", with clearly the same handwriting for both people. Ms. Tiepelman said they would again review both signatures and give credit to the person who signed it and reject the other signature. Mr. T. Armstrong asked how the officials know when a signature has been rejected or accepted. Ms. Tiepelman replied that after the operators reject or accept a signature, they

manually enter it into the computer and generate a report telling how many were rejected for signatures or for errors. Mr. T. Armstrong asked if he were to look at the raw data, would he be able to tell which were rejected or accepted. Ms. Tiepelman said the operators do write on the actual petition page if the person is a registered voter. She provided the Commissioners an example of a petition and noted that on line 16 of the document an operator wrote "NR" which stands for Not Registered. Mr. T. Armstrong asked what the hand written numbers 19 and 20 at the bottom of the page meant. Ms. Tiepelman said it stood for 19 pages and 20 signatures. She went on to say that the supervisor in the department uses those handwritten figures as a way to double check their work. When the computer generates the totals, the operator can look back and make sure the numbers are balanced.

Mr. Hayek asked how an operator would annotate a rejected signature and Ms. Tiepelman replied "SR" for signature rejected. She said they do that in cases where a person has printed their name, but not signed. Mr. T. Armstrong asked when there are multiple petitions, how does the Election Board know when a registered voter has not signed five of them? She said that if it is a requirement that a voter can only sign one of the five petitions, then they link them together. Mr. T. Armstrong clarified that he was talking about the same petition, but there were multiple copies of it. Ms. Tiepelman said the computer will automatically tell the operator that it is a valid duplicate and it will only accept it as a registered voter once.

Mr. Hayek noted that the Election Board writes on the top of the page "these are done to the best of our ability" and asked Ms. Tiepelman to expand on that comment. She said that means on a particular petition, for example, 369 signatures are registered voters and are in good standing. They are eligible to vote or were eligible at the time of signing the petition. She said the Election Board is not stating whether the petition in itself is valid or not, rather that "X" amount of people who signed it are registered voters. She replied that it is up to the given entity to make the determination of accepting the petition.

Mr. Hayek asked if someone filled out a registration card, would the signature have to show up on the Election Board's computer system in order to be a registered voter. Ms. Tiepelman answered yes and explained that when a person fills out a voter card, it is just a registration application. She said an individual is not considered registered until the Election Board enters the card in the system and processes it.

Ms. Schuman explained to Ms. Tiepelman that the reason the Commissioners are interested in the process is because of one petition they encountered that had been contested. She said it came down to exactly the number of signatures needed, but as the Board looked through the names of several couples it definitely looked like they had been signed by the same person. She mentioned that there had been no indication that those names had been rejected. Ms. Tiepelman said that an operator uses his/her discretion and when humans are handling it instead of the computers, there is a risk for human error involved. Mr. Hayek thanked Ms. Tiepelman for her presentation and for supplying the Boundary Commission with mailing labels every week for the Notice of Public Hearing postcards.

**B.** Mr. Hayek brought up the next order of business which was the renewal of the Directors & Officers Insurance policy. He asked Ms. Irwin if she had any information regarding the liability/small business insurance. Ms. Irwin stated that the renewal on that insurance policy was not until January 2, 2005.

Mr. Hamilton said that he reviewed the D&O policy and that the company was essentially binding the same coverage as last year. He said the insurance company was offering the general liability coverage and the ELTI practices liability insurance coverage which is a non-monetary coverage. He noted that the chances of the Boundary Commission being sued for a non-monetary on the employees' practices and liability were slim to none and that it is no-cost rider.

Mr. T. Armstrong asked how the premium from this year compared to last year and Ms. Irwin did not know. Mr. Hayek said that his reading from the budget was that the new premium was close, if not slightly increased, from last year's. Mr. T. Armstrong made a motion to accept the coverage as set forth in the correspondence from the Boundary Commission's broker, the Crane Agency. Ms. Bredenkoetter seconded it. Voice vote: Ayes, All. Nays, None. *The motion passed.*

**C.** Mr. Hayek asked the Budget Committee, Mr. Armstrong, Mr. Ford, & Ms. Schuman, to comment about the proposed 2005 Budget. Mr. Ford stated that they did not make very many changes from the 2004 budget. He said the Committee, along with Ms. Irwin, budgeted a potential 7% increase in Ms. Irwin's salary. Mr. Ford also noted that Ms. Irwin investigated any increases in areas such as Professional Services and Special Funding. He said the Committee wanted to allot **\$3,000**, instead of the proposed **\$5,000**, for new tables in the Boundary Commission office. Mr. Hayek asked if the cost for the Boundary Commission office lease was an estimate. Ms. Irwin said yes and that she called the Sansone Group and asked if there would be any increases. They did not give a firm "yes" or "no", so she decided to tack on five percent for potential increases.

Ms. Bredenkoetter asked if the Boundary Commission was planning on upgrading the website because it does not turn up in a Google search. Mr. Ford thought the site should be kept up to date, but that task could take place after the map cycle when things slow down.

Mr. T. Armstrong made a **motion**, with the adjustment of the office furniture outlay reduction to \$3,000 from \$5,000, to approve a budget of \$176,615 for year 2005, and with five percent increased for the two successive years. Ms. Bredenkoetter seconded the motion. Ms. Irwin then called the roll to approve the budget.

Matt Armstrong  
Ted Armstrong – Yes  
Christine Bredenkoetter – Yes  
Bob Ford – Yes  
Marvin Gelber – Yes  
Tom Hayek – Yes  
Greg Kloeppe

Betty Marver  
Mary Schuman – Yes  
Johnnie Spears – Yes  
Don Wojtkowski

*The budget was approved.*

Ms. Schuman suggested that a portion of the budget be spent on hiring a professional transcriber to immediately write out the public hearing minutes. Mr. Hayek acknowledged Ms. Schuman's request and assured her that the meetings would be transcribed before the Commission began deliberating on the proposals.

**D.** Mr. Hayek recognized Mr. T. Armstrong's suggestion that the Commission begin reviewing some of the proposals while the information was fresh in their minds. Mr. Hayek said he wanted to first discuss Florissant 2A because it was a small and straightforward proposal. Mr. T. Armstrong moved to have a special meeting of the Boundary Commission on Tuesday, September 7 at 6:30 p.m., prior to the 7:00 p.m. Manchester public hearing, for the purposes of discussing BC0407. Mr. Spears seconded it. Voice vote: Ayes, All. Nays, None. *The motion passed.*

Mr. Hayek brought up a future financial presentation by St. Louis County regarding their finances. He said he would like the County to give their presentation before the September 20<sup>th</sup> public hearing on Valley Park. Mr. M. Armstrong asked if there was an urgency to have that presentation in September. Mr. Hayek said he wanted the Commissioners to hear the presentation before some, if not all the rest of the public hearings, to facilitate a better discussion. Ms. Bredenkoetter then suggested that the Municipal League also give a presentation to give their side of the proposed annexed areas. Mr. Hayek acknowledged that a presentation by the Municipal League would be informational, but he did not want to set up a debate. He also acknowledged that it would be okay with him to move St. Louis County's financial presentation to October. Mr. T. Armstrong asked Mr. Hayek when he was going to schedule a meeting about Florissant Area 6 and reminded the Commissioners that they have until November 1 to vote on it. Mr. Hayek said he would set a debate on the Florissant Area 6 proposal for the September 20<sup>th</sup> Boundary Commission monthly meeting at 6:00 p.m.

#### OLD BUSINESS

There was no old business.

Mr. T. Armstrong motioned to adjourn. Voice vote: Ayes, All. Nays, None. *The motion passed and the meeting was adjourned.*

Respectfully submitted,  
Courtney Irwin  
Executive Director

Approved:

