

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

**MINUTES OF PUBLIC HEARING-BC0404
SEPTEMBER 7, 2004**

COMMISSION ATTENDANCE:

Commissioners	Present (P)/Absent (A)
MATT ARMSTRONG	P
TED ARMSTRONG	P
CHRISTINE BREDENKOETTER	P
BOB FORD	P
MARVIN GELBER	A
TOM HAYEK	P
GREG KLOEPEL	P
BETTY MARVER	P
MARY SCHUMAN	P
JOHNNIE SPEARS	P
DON WOJTKOWSKI	P

OTHERS PRESENT:

Courtney Irwin – Executive Director

David Hamilton – Legal Counsel

Chair: Folks, if I could have your attention I'd like to welcome you to this public hearing, conducted by the St. Louis County Boundary Commission and to a proposal which has been submitted to us by the city of Manchester to annex a certain area which is currently within St. Louis County Unincorporated. Everybody hear me okay? All right, first thing we have to do is call the roll of the Commissioners. David or Courtney?

ROLL CALL:

Hamilton: We have a quorum.

Chair: All right. Again, folks, I'd like to welcome you to the public hearing tonight. I'll tell you a little bit why we're here, a little bit about who we are, and then we'll get on with it. We're here because the city of Manchester has proposed to annex a certain area currently unincorporated St. Louis County. That map of the area is up on the wall to your right. There's been some in the entryway. As I understand, what is in yellow is the area proposed to be annexed. Hopefully, you all received notification in one form or another. You live in this area and are potentially subject to this annexation. Why are we here? Who are we? We're the St. Louis County Boundary Commission. We are an entity created by ordinance of St. Louis County pursuant to a Missouri statute passed in 1999. We're here because under that ordinance if an area of the County is proposing to transfer its jurisdiction, whether it be from unincorporated county to a city, to incorporate itself, that it wants to remain unincorporated potentially, we're the ones who conduct sort of the initial review of it. And then we will either approve or disapprove the proposal and if we approve it, then potentially, at least in this situation, it would go to a vote. And I will explain that process in just a minute. Anyway, that's why you all are here tonight is because the city of Manchester submitted to us a proposal wanting to annex this area, and we have to conduct a review of that and part of that review involves a public hearing. The reason

we have a public hearing is because there are two, really, principles by which we are guided in our decision-making. First, we want to have a meaningful planning process going on in the County. We want the ... as best we can, have the boundaries of municipalities in the County be guided by good planning principles. The second principle that really guides our decision is we want to maximize citizen self-determination. In other words, if you live in a certain area, we want to maximize your ability to be governed by who you want to be governed by in conjunction also with the planning principles that we look at. There are 11 members of this Commission. We are appointed by a number of different groups. Some of us are appointed by the County Executive. Some of us are appointed by a commission, a joint group between the St. Louis County and the St. Louis Municipal League. Several of us are appointed by cities of populations over 20,000, some by over 10,000, some by under 10,000. So what I'm going to do right now is ask for each Commissioner to introduce themselves and tell you by which group they are appointed by so you kind of get an idea of where we all come from and who appointed us. I'll start over here, Greg Kloeppe.

Kloeppe: My name is Greg Kloeppe. I'm a resident of unincorporated St. Louis County, and I was appointed by the County Executive.

Bredenkoetter: My name is Christine Bredenkoetter. I was appointed by those cities in excess of 20,000 population, and I happen to be a resident of the city of Florissant.

Spears: My name is Johnnie Spears. I live in St. Louis County unincorporated. I was appointed by the County Executive.

Wojtkowski: My name is Don Wojtkowski. I was appointed by the County Executive. I live in unincorporated North St. Louis County.

Chair: Again, my name is Tom Hayek. I'm the Chairman. I was appointed by cities over a population of 20,000, nominated by the city of Ferguson.

Marver: I'm Betty Marver. I live in University City and was appointed by the County Executive.

Schuman: I'm Mary Schuman. I also happen to live in University City. I was appointed by St. Louis County and the St. Louis County Municipal League.

Ford: I'm Bob Ford. I live in St. Louis County and was appointed by the County Executive.

M. Armstrong: I'm Matt Armstrong. I live in Webster Groves. And I was a joint appointment by the County Executive and the Municipal League.

T. Armstrong: My name is Ted Armstrong, no relation to Matt, to my right. I represent cities of less than 10,000. I live in Frontenac.

Chair: All right, well, we're here tonight as the city of Manchester has proposed what is known as an annexation. In other words, they want to ... for this area to become the local government service provider for the area. The statute, which created us, which governs our review, states that we will ... we shall approve the proposal if we make a determination that the proposal is in the best interests of the citizens within the area, if it's in the best interest of the city of Manchester, the proposing authority, and if it's also in the best interest of the unincorporated

County bordering the area that's proposed to be annexed. There are 10, maybe 11, different factors in the statute which we look at in determining whether or not it's in the best interest. I'm not going to go into all those, but they have to do with things like, do the boundaries look like they make sense? How is it going to affect the taxing of various entities? How is it going to affect the services provided to the citizens? When we have completed our review and voted on the proposal, there is a time limit involved. For this one I believe it is April first of next year. We have to have completed our review and made a decision on this. And we have two ways ... two results can come out of our decision. We can disapprove it. And if we disapprove it, that's the end of it. It goes no further. If we approve the proposal, it will go to a vote and an election date to be determined by the city of Manchester and the Commission together. That election for this area to then become part of the city of Manchester, it will require a majority vote of the citizens within the area and a majority of the citizens of Manchester, voting independently, to approve that proposal. If either area does not approve it, the matter will fail and the area will still remain in unincorporated St. Louis County.

Our agenda for tonight is a standard agenda, which is part of our rules. The proposing authority, in this case, the city of Manchester, will be given 15 minutes to make a proposal. After that, St. Louis County will have an opportunity, 15 minutes, to make a proposal. We will then go to the public speaker portion. If you want to speak, again, another warning, please fill out a speaker form and give it to Mr. Hamilton at the end of the table. I will call your name up in the public speaker portion. You will have three minutes. And we have a lot of people who want to speak, and so I'm going to be very definitive on the three minutes. If you plan before you get up here, three minutes is plenty of time to tell us what you think about this, so please do so. You can get five minutes if you are someone who is here to speak on behalf of a group and you are the designated person to speak on behalf of the group. Just living in a subdivision doesn't really give you the permission to speak on behalf of the subdivision, okay? You've got to be the person appointed to come up here and speak on behalf of the group. I ask everybody to be courteous in here. We conduct these meetings in a very friendly manner. We try and hear from everybody. So, no catcalls, no laughs, no hoots, everybody gets shown respect while they're up here talking because if you want to come up and talk you expect them to show you respect. I apologize for the temperature in here. With this many bodies, it's probably going to get a little warm. We did our best to try and get the air conditioning going but this is as good as we can do, I guess. So ... oh, one last thing. If you don't want to speak to us tonight that doesn't mean you can't tell us something. Twenty-one days from the date is the cutoff by which you can send us written comments. So if you don't want to get up and talk to us, but you want to say something, send us a letter. If one of your neighbors couldn't make it tonight and wants to say something, tell them to send us a letter. Twenty-one days from today is the cutoff when we will accept written comments. So that's still your last chance to get something on the record with us, okay? All right. Folks, we're going to be here for a while. I apologize to those of you who are standing. We'll do the best we can to keep it moving along. Without further ado, the city of Manchester will go first. We've got a couple of seats up front, kind of like school, they don't fill up ... or church, I mean.

[background conversations]

Kraintz: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and members of the Boundary Commission for giving us the opportunity to make our presentation concerning Manchester's proposal to annex unincorporated area east of the city limits. My name is Franz Kraintz. I'm Planning and Zoning Director with the city of Manchester. And tonight, with me, I have Mayor Larry Miles, members of the Board of Aldermen and department heads, to help answer any questions you have after the presentation. First, let's get to the boundaries. If you will direct your attention to the slide, the

area in tan is the existing city limits. The slightly yellow or green area is the proposed area for annexation. Just to orient you, the Highway 141 runs north/south through the city limits. Manchester Road bisects both areas in an east/west fashion, and Carman Road is the common boundary between both areas down here. Up to the north, the boundaries for the proposed area follow Miremont and Wickstead Road, west of Weidman, then across Weidman to the southern boundary of Queeny Park and the southern boundary of the city of Town and Country as it parallels Manchester to an unnamed tributary of the Grand Glaize Creek. And follows that unnamed tributary down to the Grand Glaize Creek, all the way to Dougherty Ferry and then down Dougherty Ferry back to Carman Road and the existing City limits. These boundaries reflect the borders that we submitted in our Map Plan of Intent in the year 2000. However, we have learned that these boundaries overlap with the city of Des Peres. Ours initially went to the Barrett Station Road and Des Peres' annexation Plan of Intent overlapped ours by going to Grand Glaize Creek. Part of the Boundary Commission's recommendation was to resolve these conflicts with our neighboring communities, which we did. We met with the city of Des Peres and since their western border was the Grand Glaize Creek, in deference to their wishes, we pulled ours back to this natural boundary. Now we did try ... we wished we could have avoided this pocket. But we have no control over what Des Peres will do. To the north, we didn't go any further along Weidman because we wanted the area to remain contiguous to the city limits.

What are the characteristics of this area? The proposed area is roughly just under two square miles. This would add about 40 percent territory to the existing city limits. It's about 5,600 residents, which would add 29 percent to our population. There's about 2,600 dwelling units of which 1,000 are apartments or renter-occupied units. There are 240 businesses in the area of which 25 percent are retail. So there is quite a mixture of businesses and different types of residential uses in this area. The rationale for annexation, at least from the city's perspective, is to grow, to become stronger and to get the opportunity to provide more services to our residents. The city ... this area ... these two areas demonstrate some shared community interests in that children from both areas attend the same school district. In some ways the area is served by the same service providers. Neighbors share or attend places of worship together as well as memberships in civic organizations. And it's likely that neighbors shop together or at the same places of business and do business together. After all, 45 percent of this area is contiguous to the existing city limits. There are no obstacles to the delivery of services. And this annexation will confirm what many already believe, and that is that they are already a part of Manchester. Of course, when they find out that they're not, they wonder when they will be. And to that end, the city of Manchester for the better part of this year, has undertaken an outreach program into the area. First by conducting a survey, of which we have a copy of those responses that were favorable to the annexation. We've had two informational meetings at which 200 residents attended. We spoke with numerous subdivision trustees and residents. And there have been numerous newspaper articles as well. We also understand that there is a citizen committee that favors annexation that's now forming. This growing ground swell of support is not unusual in that the earlier annexations in 1997 and 1999 started out in the very same way and turned out a favorable vote of about 70 percent.

To Manchester, a larger city means more revenues to add or expand services. It means getting more grants and access to resources. A larger city means more regional, legislative and political influence. And being larger means that we can achieve certain efficiencies and economies of scale in providing services. With annexation, the city expects to extend the same level of services that the current residents enjoy such as, starting with the police. We currently have 38 police officers and we intend to add eight more state-certified police officers. This is the same training that St. Louis County officers go through. And with the 46 officers, we hope to maintain the two officers per thousand of population that we currently have now and which is about the

same as St. Louis County. But where Manchester's services will be better is that the officers will be concentrated in this area and not spread all over St. Louis County. The 46 officers equates to about seven officers per square mile. Now, by the County's figures, they have about one and a half officers per square mile. Now, even if you take just the unincorporated area, and the 16 municipalities that they serve, this is still just under three officers per square mile. The bottom line is the city will have double the protection and coverage of this area than St. Louis County. This will enable the city to provide a faster response time of three and a half minutes on average. It provides greater rapport and contact with area residents and allows us to maintain one of the lowest crime rates in the state. For parks and recreation, with annexation the city will provide five parks totaling 58 acres. The largest park, Paul Schroeder Park, has a signature Aquatic Center as well as various tennis and basketball courts, soccer and baseball fields. With annexation, residents will enjoy the residential rates to the Aquatic Center as well as the recreational programs and facilities. Next slide. Thank you. As for community maintenance, public works provides storm water and street improvements as well as the sewer lateral program, street lighting, street cleaning and tree trimming. We also have property maintenance and code enforcement. And as every community boasts, we have prompt snow removal. Probably the biggest service that the city offers is the trash recycling and yard waste. At no direct charge to the residents we offer once a week residential trash service by one provider, thereby eliminating the three to four haulers that currently ply the unincorporated streets. We also have recycling pickup every two weeks, the weekly yard waste for up to nine months of the year. And then tree limb chipping and Christmas tree removal. With annexation there will be closer representation where there will be one alderman per 3,000 residents. So they're more accessible and available as well as staffed. We also expect to ... or intend to expand the number of wards from three to four so this area will be served by two aldermen. Citizens will also enjoy more influence in community affairs such as their zoning and solving neighborhood problems. What the description of these services serves to underscore is that the quality and quantity of Manchester services have all combined to improve the lives of residents in this area in the city. For the large annexations of 1997 and 1999, the city went in immediately and began to fix the problems that were left to the residents by St. Louis County. Therefore, the city has established a successful track record in elevating and providing superior services, even with these large annexations. We have no doubt we can be successful again. Recognizing our success, the County has begun to pay attention to this area and, to its credit, has made long overdue improvements. But we also know that this started not long after we announced our intent to annex this area. I only ask that residents reflect and remember what conditions were like three to four years ago. The point is, the city of Manchester is consistent in providing its services and is not responding to the threat of annexation. For zoning and land use issues, we expect to match the existing zone districts with the city zone districts as closely as possible. Any legal non-conform uses, those that are grandfathered, will be honored. The city does have a comprehensive plan recently adopted this year, and it does recognize this area as becoming a part of the city and we have proactive code enforcement which helps to enhance property values.

Through our financial analysis, we have identified that there will be \$3 million to spend in this area. Hopefully, we'll hear from the County how much they intend to spend in this area and what is their plan for servicing this area once this process is over. Right now, we have no idea whether they can meet this level of expenditures. Granted, a certain amount of this \$3 million is going to have to go to the personnel and equipment needed to serve the area. But the remainder of the \$3 million is going to go towards anticipated capital improvements such as storm water channel improvement, concrete and asphalt public street repair and replacement, concrete public sidewalk repair and replacement and new public street lighting installations where requested. Remember, \$3 million a year. Part of what we had hoped to spend the \$3

million on was at Love Park. In our meeting with County officials, we felt they were receptive to Manchester's donation of large amounts of money to the County to help upgrade the park. Now, whether we misunderstood their response or they misunderstood our offer, we apologize. But if this park and this area were to become a part of Manchester, we would like to forge a partnership with them in order to help make the necessary improvements at this park. Manchester is more than willing to help in this endeavor because the city, because of the dedicated park and storm water sales tax that we have, is the only one in the position to make these necessary improvements. I say this because of the recent failure of the St. Louis County Park Sales Tax and their discussion about possible closure of the facility only clouds their ability to make future improvements, let alone keep up with regular maintenance.

There are tax considerations. Excuse me ... What does this effect have on the individual homeowner? There are certain tangible benefits and intangible benefits. The tangible benefits are the one ... the savings which are directly attributable to the city-paid services, such as the trash and recycling, the residential rates for recreational programs, the reduced subdivision assessments because the city will be picking up the street lighting costs and the lower utility tax rate. Now the intangible benefits, the ones that you can't quantify but are no less important, are the improved police and public works response times and the more intimate representation on local issues and needs. Next slide, please. There are tax considerations. The city does have a nickel per hundred dollars of assessed value of real property tax. This has been the same for the last seven years. And actually has been reduced steadily over a number of years in order to reduce the tax burden on property owners. This nickel is one quarter of the 19 cents that St. Louis County charges. And that tax is not going to go away. And neither is the 42 cents per a hundred dollars of assessed value that they currently charge. The city does have a special tax to pay for the police facility bonds which the voters approved in the year 2002. And there is 18 years left on that. For retail purchases in Manchester, and Manchester residents purchasing automobiles and boats, there is a one and a quarter percent additional sales tax. And for personal property tax there is an additional 25 cents per hundred dollars of assessed value.

The next table shows the summary of the typical cost with three representative home values. For the \$200,000 home value, the additional real property taxes are going to equate to \$95. For a \$400,000 home value, it will be \$190. And for the \$600,000 home, \$285. This bar chart shows the difference in the potential savings for someone who owns a \$200,000 home. The bar on the left, the red one, represents the additional real property tax. And the potential savings ... or the savings are in yellow for just trash service alone, which we estimate between \$250 or \$400 per year. So you can see that's quite a difference. Excuse me. For what little it costs you get this basic bundle of services: city-paid trash service, city-paid recycling, city-paid limb trimming and mulch, city-paid snow plowing, street and slab repairs, city-paid street lighting and street cleaning, half a percent less tax on your electric usage, police and emergency protection, parks and rec. and storm water improvement. All told, you pay far less for what you get and in some instances you will actually be saving money on your annual bills.

To conclude, the city of Manchester is definitely the little guy or the underdog in this process. As you will see, the County is going to try to compare the resources of a major metropolitan county to the resources of a small, suburban community of 19,000. In order to try to serve one million people and over 520 ... 500 ... thank you. . .

[background conversations]

Kraintz: Thank you very much. We feel that we can provide more services and at ... so you can enjoy savings. We provide more improvements, particularly if we can help St. Louis

County. And we're just very excited about the opportunity for this area to become a part of Manchester because of our shared community interests, our ability to serve the area, and the additional services and representations we think will improve your daily lives. Since we're at the beginning of this process, we only ask that the Boundary Commission put the decision in the hands of the residents to decide the outcome of this proposal. Thank you.

Chair: Okay. Thank you. We'll start with questions of the Commissioners. I'll start down on my right. I'll start down on my left on the next round. Greg?

Kloeppel: Thanks for the presentation. When you filed your 2000 Plan of Intent, what steps did you take to get the residents' feelings on the proposed Manchester annexation at that point in time?

Kraintz: I think I'll have to defer to the City Administrator to answer that question. I was not with the City at that time.

Kloeppel: Okay.

Blattner: When we completed our annexation in 1999, we had contact with a number of residents in this area. The former previous administrator, Mr. Michael Levitt [spelling?], had made some overtures in writings and letters to individuals in that area. Several regarding their streets, whether the City would take over. So we had planted some earlier seeds back in that time to find out what interest there was in annexation. When we filed our Plan and Map of Intent with the Boundary Commission and the deadline became nearer this past year, we did send out a survey questionnaire to all of the residents in March to get survey results.

Kloeppel: And what were those survey results?

Blattner: The survey results were statistically dead even, 50 percent roughly, yes or no. And then there was about 18 percent undecided.

Kloeppel: And the survey results that were presented tonight, were those residents that are in the targeted area?

Blattner: Those are residents in the targeted area. Those are the ones that had listed their names and addresses on the cards that were mailed back to us. We asked them to give us their name and address if they would. About 185 people out of the 500 cards we received back gave us their name and address. There were numbers that did not give their names and addresses. There were about 170 that did say no, with their names and addresses. But there were a lot of them that didn't put any names on at all.

Kloeppel: So did you do a survey for the current residents of the city of Manchester at this point in time regarding this annexation?

Blattner: Our current city, since 1997 has tripled in size from around 6,500 to nearly 20,000 people. And the two areas that we annexed in '97 and '99 comprise two-thirds of our city. And I think we have overwhelming response from the residents indicating that they are much better off being in the city of Manchester than they were in unincorporated County for a number of reasons, the trash pickup and so on.

Kloeppel: Did you do a survey for them with regards to how would they feel about taking in an additional 41 percent of geographic size?

Blattner: We didn't do a formal survey mailing like we did for these residents over here but we had enough verbal ... from our aldermen, from planning and zoning members, we feel pretty comfortable that we have support from our own residents.

Kloeppel: With regard to that geographic size and the additional 1,260 acres and additional 5,600 people, how is that going to affect your overall city of Manchester employees? Let's start with the police department. What do you plan ... how many additional officers do you plan on hiring for the city of Manchester?

Blattner: We plan to hire eight additional officers. We're currently almost ready to go out for bid for our new police facility which will be able to house these extra officers. Right now we have part of our officers at City Hall and part of them at a rented commercial area at the western edge of town. And this will unify our police department, streamline our services. Our new facility will also be our new Board of Aldermen meeting room, Planning and Zoning Board of Adjustment. It will be a state-of-the-art type of facility. And able to accommodate a lot more people than we can now.

Kloeppel: How does the city of Manchester police officers' wage and benefit package compare to the officers in St. Louis County?

Blattner: I'll let the Chief of Police address those issues on exactly ... on wages, if you'd like.

Quinn: I really can't say how our department compares with St. Louis County as far as salaries. I believe we're in the upper third of starting salaries and they run as high ... from around \$37- to \$38,000 coming in the door to about \$50,000, \$52,000 for a long-term patrolman.

Kloeppel: That's all I have on that issue. I've got a couple more questions. In your presentation you said the rationale was to grow and become stronger. How does that philosophy affect St. Louis County though? By your rationale, grow and become stronger, wouldn't that also have the adverse affect on St. Louis County?

Kraintz: The St. Louis County boundaries do not change. I mean they're an entity unto ... those boundaries will not change. The only way we can grow is to extend our boundaries, become larger. St. Louis County will still have to provide their level of services whether it's unincorporated or incorporated. For example, the police. Part of their mandate is to enforce state statutes county-wide. So they'll be covering ... just because of annexation their services will not go away.

Kloeppel: With regards to your outreach program, you said you conducted ... was it two surveys?

Kraintz: One survey and two informational meetings.

Kloeppel: Now those two informational meetings, when were they conducted?

Kraintz: On August seventeenth and August twenty-fourth.

Kloeppel: And what was the response at those meetings?

Kraintz: We had a fairly good turnout. I think most ... generally I think there was both questions and comments. There were some positive as well as some negative.

Kloeppel: And with regards to contacting trustees in the subdivisions, how did you go about doing that?

Kraintz: Actually, they contacted us. I think back in the early part of the summer when word was getting out that we were submitting a Plan of Intent and I think the people had heard through the grapevine that we were interested in annexing. We actually got the calls and were invited to come speak to their meetings, speak at their meetings.

Kloeppel: So you didn't contact every trustee in every subdivision that was out there? Is that correct?

Kraintz: That's correct.

Kloeppel: To get their viewpoint?

Kraintz: Correct.

Kloeppel: All right. That's all I have at this point.

Kraintz: Thank you.

Bredenkoetter: I'm going to pass at this point.

Spears: I have one question, Mr. Chairman.

Chair: Yeah.

Spears: If you could sum it up from the survey you did in the area, what would be some of your positive feedback as to why those citizens want to become part of Manchester?

Kraintz: I think the positive reasons that we noticed, that people mentioned, were the fact that the services, the recreational opportunities that they had. I think as well as we ... some of the comments we heard as well had to do with the difference that people felt between what they saw in the unincorporated area versus what they saw in the city of Manchester. So I think for the little that they were going to get ... I mean, for what they were going to spend, they saw a lot that they were going to get.

Spears: No other questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chair: Don?

Wojtkowski: Yes, could you go back to your annexation map real quick because you need to educate me on a few things. I'm a little slow this evening. Okay, your boundary along the Creek ... and I guess that would be your eastern boundary?

Kraintz: Yes.

Wojtkowski: Am I to understand that your Map Plan did not include the area between that boundary and the city of Des Peres?

Kraintz: Actually, our boundary in this showed going up to Barrett Station, which is over here. Just a little bit further east.

Wojtkowski: In your Map Plan boundary?

Kraintz: Yes.

Wojtkowski: Okay. So essentially that area between Manchester and Des Peres would formally fulfill the definition by state statutes of an unincorporated pocket. Is this not true?

Kraintz: I can't say I know the exact definition of an unincorporated pocket but I . . .

Wojtkowski: Well you should look it up.

Kraintz: It's in the Plan of Intent. It's in the . . .

Wojtkowski: You're the planner, right? Let me make my point. What happens here is if, in fact, that area does fulfill the definition of an unincorporated pocket, then the citizens within that area by default will lose the opportunity to ever vote on whether they should be St. Louis County, Des Peres or Manchester. You will take that away from them the way you have structured your annexation proposal. Do you feel comfortable with that?

Kraintz: Well as I look at ... as we showed going to Barrett Station, these remaining areas, to me, were pockets. Now there is a corridor through this area. One of the ... I thought as I read the Boundary Commission rules, was that those areas of conflict, we had to work out with our neighboring communities, which we did.

Wojtkowski: No, you didn't because now we're going to wind up taking the vote away from people. I mean, my goodness, we go through this two and half year Map Plan process to try to get everybody to coordinate their efforts, and we're going to wind up with junk like this?

Kraintz: I don't know if the city of Des Peres has a Plan of Intent that's going to take in all of this area. They may. Their Plan of Intent showed that. Those residents, from what we learned, want to be a part of Des Peres. Is that right [inaudible]?

[background conversations]

Wojtkowski: My question is answered, thank you.

Kraintz: Okay.

Wojtkowski: Bad question. In your proposal you indicate that you will participate in the Manchester Road Corridor TGA and Trust Fund. Will you be doing that via a passage of ordinance in the city of Manchester or do we just take your word for it?

Blattner: Whatever was necessary to do as far as we know ... the County TGA, we would enforce that for them. When we annexed in '97 and '99, I don't believe there was any conflict with that at all.

Wojtkowski: Did you pass an ordinance? We probably required you pass an ordinance on that.

Blattner: I can't say for sure we passed an ordinance but I know we've always worked closely with the County on. . .

Wojtkowski: Would you look it up and let us know?

Blattner: Yes, we can do that.

Wojtkowski: Thank you. Are there a lot of private roads in this area being annexed? Or are they all pretty much St. Louis County dedicated roads?

Kraintz: There are St. Louis County arterials. There are public streets and there are private streets.

Wojtkowski: Okay. Your position with street lighting was that you were going to take over all the street lighting. That's where the subdivisions are usually contributing to an annual assessment. What will your position be on the dedication of the private roadways if, in fact, the residents within that subdivision desire that Manchester take over the maintenance?

Blattner: Any private drive that meets the standard specifications, and we adopt St. Louis County standard road specifications. If the roads meet that, then we can accept them. And that means the setbacks, with the right-of-ways, and the surface street improvements. There are a lot of private streets in the existing city of Manchester now that we do not maintain, either, for those very reasons. Any street that is public in this area will be accepted by the city as public. And those street lights will be taken over by the city if they're in a public street right-of-way.

Wojtkowski: Just so people understand that if they are in a private subdivision, with private roadways and they have private street lighting, you will not be taking over the cost of that street lighting.

Blattner: That's correct and we told them at an information meeting of that fact.

Wojtkowski: Okay. I had one other question, but I've lost it so we'll have to come back to me.

Chair: I understood in one of your slides up there to say that you would be spending \$3 million on this area, this annexation area, in various improvements. Is that right?

Kraintz: The \$3 million includes the personnel and equipment and then the remainder of that \$3 million will be devoted to those anticipated capital improvements.

Chair: All right. So is this \$3 million the roughly, what, 2.9 something I see in the financial statements contained in the packet?

Kraintz: Two point nine in the first year, yes.

Chair: Okay. So that \$3 million isn't \$3 million for improvements. It's the \$3 million that it's going to cost to operate the area.

Kraintz: That's correct.

Chair: So when we're ... because you kind of threw out a question there ... gee, is St. Louis County going to be spending \$3 million in the area? I guess we'd have to look at what they're all doing now, like providing police service and road maintenance and all the things they're currently doing, right?

Kraintz: Yes.

Chair: So then we're going to evaluate the numbers, \$3 million, okay?

Kraintz: Yes.

Chair: All right. I want to ask about that pocket because I still don't ... I apologize, I don't understand. You drew the eastern boundary along this tributary of a creek, I guess it is? This Grand Glaize Tributary ... is that where that eastern boundary comes from?

Kraintz: Correct.

Chair: Okay. And on the Map Plan it went all the way up to Barrett Station Road?

Kraintz: Correct.

Chair: And how far over did Des Peres' come?

Kraintz: Des Peres' came all the way over to the center line of this tributary and creek.

Chair: Okay. When was the last time you talked to Des Peres any about whether or not they were going to be submitting any type of proposal to us, to cover sort of this area?

Kraintz: I believe early spring.

Chair: Early spring of...?

Kraintz: This year.

Chair: Of '04?

Kraintz: Of '04. Yes.

Chair: Okay. Did they indicate that they would not be submitting any type of plan?

Kraintz: I think they had to go back and talk with their elected officials and see what they were interested in doing at the time. The best that we could ascertain is that it was a mixed feeling, at least according to Mr. Harms, the city manager there.

Chair: Were you aware that the Commission is able to adjust boundaries in certain ways if there are conflicting proposals being put before us ... two municipalities wanting to go within the same area?

Kraintz: I am aware of that, yes.

Chair: Okay. I have a question about growth of a municipality. And as I explained at the start, we're supposed to examine the best interest of the municipality, the area being annexed and the surrounding county. I guess what I'm trying to grasp on is how is annexing this area and growing Manchester by ... I don't know what, a third? ... in the best interest of the current residents of the city of Manchester? How does that benefit them?

Kraintz: Well, as we tried to explain, we think by being larger will open up more doors for us in terms of receiving grants and also in providing efficiencies and economies of scale when we go out to bid for a trash contract. By having that many more people perhaps we can drive ... we can drive a lower cost per unit on these services.

Chair: Okay. The trash contract I understand. I guess you'd agree then, if we're going economies of scale, St. Louis County would win the economies of scale battle. [Laughter, applause]. No, no, we're not going to do that, all right? We're having a discussion here so let's ...

Kraintz: I would counter that first of all, the County is spread pretty far and wide. Being the size that it is, it can marshal tremendously more resources than we can. But, as the County insists, its size really does matter as a measure of anyone's ability to provide municipal services. We feel we have to become larger as well.

Chair: Okay. And the last one and I think you may have been asked this by Mr. Kloepfel, and I apologize if I didn't hear all of the answer ... one of the comments was, we're sort of a big city with a small city, you know, approach to government, very much contact with citizens, have a good contact ... in growing this, have the citizens of Manchester been surveyed or groups talked to about, "Gee, we want to grow this amount? Are you, the citizens, comfortable with us growing this amount?" And, potentially, at least maybe in the short term, having growing pains which I would expect, not critical, but any municipality to have if they're going to grow this amount.

Kraintz: The initial part of your question as Mr. Blattner explained, he's the City Administrator, we have not done a formal survey of the existing city residents. But I think as our mayor eloquently spoke in one of the informational meetings how he sees, at least from those he talks with, the importance that the constituents he's talked to, of the importance of growing and becoming a larger city so that we can provide more services and become a better community for our residents.

Chair: Okay. I understood earlier that growing would allow you to potentially get more grants, to provide economy of scale, specifically with the trash pickup, I guess just so the citizens understand and so I understand, other than those two, what are the ... why is growth a good thing for the city of Manchester? What's it going to be able to do a year from now that it can't do if we let this happen?

Kraintz: Well the ... enlarging this area, as you know, includes a number of businesses as well as residences. The city, because of its reliance on sales tax, in a lot of ways

this helps open doors for programs and services that we can't offer right now. So, in that respect, we think by gaining this area ... and we're not just doing a commercial grab here, we're including this area because of the community interests that we share, that the incorporated area shares with the unincorporated area. We want this to become a part of our community.

Chair: Thank you. Betty?

Marver: Yeah, I just wanted to go back to what this means to the people that would be annexed, in the survey that you took. There are 5,600 people living in this area and 2,600 dwellings. In that survey did they understand that you were proposing to change the zoning? And I'm just curious what that means to change parks and scenic area to single family residential area and that the lots would be smaller so that more residences could be built, created in that area. Do the residents of the area to be annexed understand that this is a potential of what would happen to their community?

Kraintz: I see. The survey, I don't believe addressed zoning directly. As we looked to try to match the city's zone districts with that of St. Louis County, we took our largest lot size, which is the R-1 single-family zone district and matched it to the NU or the parks and scenic. Perhaps if we had already a one-acre minimum lot size for our residential zone district, we would have tied it closer to that. But without making those amendments to our zoning ordinance before the fact, we did the best that we could to try to match them.

Marver: So you will be taking park areas and building residences?

Kraintz: No, no. In our ... even in the city limits, parks are in the R-1 zone district. It is allowable use. Parks, other recreational facilities are considered an allowable use in the R-1 zone district.

Marver: So it's not in the plan, it's just ... it's possible.

Kraintz: It's not ... usually these parks are dedicated or deeded in a way that they remain park forever. We don't anticipate changing that.

Marver: Okay, thank you.

Chair: Mary?

Schuman: Thank you. I was rather intrigued on the growth potential and development potential of the area to be annexed. You said in your presentation that this area has been included in the city's comprehensive plan. And I assume ... there's a lot of emphasis on the fact that this is a built-out area, with the exception, you know, of a couple of large lots. I think what I first want to ask is, what intrigued me was, you were talking about the potential for redevelopment, but you did ... the proposal does not elaborate on that. Could you give us a little bit more insight into that, please?

Kraintz: I think, as in the existing city limits of Manchester, there are certain areas that we ... that have been identified for potential redevelopment. I think as we looked at this area, we anticipated that there would be similar possibilities, particularly along Manchester Road. I don't think that that will be the case in any residential area. But certainly along the commercial corridor, as values get higher, there'll be developer interest in trying to maximize their return and

maybe taking some of the underutilized properties and turning them into more productive or higher values.

Schuman: Okay. So this is not addressing any residential areas?

Kraintz: No.

Schuman: Okay. That's what I wanted to clarify. I guess the other part ... the other area of interest would be that you mentioned a large parcel at Manchester Road and Mason ... is it Mason?

Kraintz: Yes.

Schuman: Mason Lane. Are there specific proposals pending on that? Can you elaborate on that?

Kraintz: I'm afraid I don't know. That area is the largest lot that we identified. It's behind the Dave Mungenast Dealership there. He does own it, at least, the last that we checked with St. Louis County records. I expect that that would be available for their expansion should they have one. But I'm not aware of any specific proposals of development on that lot at all.

Schuman: Thank you.

Chair: Bob?

Ford: Yes. What services, if any, do you get from St. Louis County right now? Inspection services, permits, whatever?

Kraintz: We do have a contract with St. Louis County to provide building, permitting and inspection services. That includes ... we do the zoning review, and St. Louis County conducts the review for building code compliance basically on all types of development. They also conduct the rental unit inspection program, the re-occupancy inspection on rental units for us as well.

Ford: If the annexation took place, do you foresee getting rid of that service and create an in-house service, or what are your plans?

Kraintz: Not right now. I think, while the city is growing, we don't anticipate large amounts of new development to warrant starting our own building department. I think so far we've been fairly satisfied with what St. Louis County provides in that area for us. It works pretty well.

Chair: Matthew?

M. Armstrong: Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, I'll pass.

Chair: Ted?

T. Armstrong: Most of my questions have been addressed already but I have a couple more. First, I have a request. I would like to ask the city of Manchester to provide to us a written report on the survey results that have been discussed here this evening. We had a previous ...

and the reason for that is, we had a previous situation where the discussion of similar survey orally didn't really comport with the facts as presented by a more detailed look at the survey. So I would ask you to prepare for us a report which would indicate the questions that were asked, the numbers of questionnaires that were sent out, the responses that were returned, the percentage of for or against or whatever answers were requested. I don't know whether we've covered all the things that were asked. And, if possible, I would like to see a map showing the positive and/or negative responses plotted by location within the area to be annexed. And if you can't do that, I understand, but that would be very helpful to us if you could.

The two questions that I have ... and I don't think that this has been covered before ... have there been previous efforts to annex this area or parts of it?

Kraintz: Yes, I believe that there has been a previous effort.

T. Armstrong: Tell me about it.

Kraintz: I'm afraid I can't. I'll have to defer again to the Administrator, Mr. Blattner.

Blattner: I believe in 1986, '87, in that area, there was an annexation of part of that area which did not pass. There were several issues on the ballot at that time and that was one of the annexations we proposed by the Administration at that time, but it did not pass.

T. Armstrong: Do you recall roughly the percentage of positive and negative?

Blattner: No, sir, I really wasn't involved back at that time.

T. Armstrong: That was a long time ago.

Blattner: Yes sir.

T. Armstrong: Secondly, do you all have any estimate of what it would cost the city of Manchester to have an election, to go forward with this process and have an election, both within the city and within the area to be annexed?

Blattner: Whatever the charge from the St. Louis Election Commission would be is what we would expect to pay. We ...

T. Armstrong: Well it's more than that. Obviously, if you intend to seriously pursue this effort, you all are going to have to do a heck of a lot of politicking in the area to be annexed to encourage positive votes, are you not?

Blattner: That would be true, sir.

T. Armstrong: Have you set a budget for that?

Blattner: Not an exact budget at this time, no.

T. Armstrong: I would hazard a comment that it sounds like you're not really serious about it.

Blattner: No, sir, I don't think that's the case at all. I think the case is before you tonight to determine whether or not these residents get a chance to vote on it or not. That's all we're asking for is to let the people decide. I would point out that, as again, in 1997 the city of Manchester was like 6,500 people. In those short period of years, we have tripled the size of the city and have provided the services to those residents that before were in unincorporated county. And I would gather to say that most people today are better served ... not knocking St. Louis County because we have a good working rapport with St. Louis County, but I think we have brought to those people ... we've taken care of their trash, they don't have five trash trucks coming down their streets anymore, they have one trash service. They have immediate street repairs. If there's a pothole they call my office or our Street Superintendent's office, they get that taken care of. If there's a dead animal out in the street, they call us, we come pick it up. If there's storm damage and tree limbs off a tree that blow down from all these storms, we go out and chip them ... we take care of the residents. We provide them individual care that St. Louis County is not really geared to do. Nothing against St. Louis County. I used to work for St. Louis County. But when it comes to municipal services and helping the residents, I think the municipality does a far better job.

T. Armstrong: That's a very nice summary and on that I'll rest also.

Chair: All right. That concludes the questioning. Thank you very much.

Kraintz: Thank you.

[end of tape 1, side B]

[start tape 2, side A]

Baker: Yes, actually while we are waiting for that to get done, I'm told that there is a red Mazda, license plate 1-4-8-G-F-H, with their lights on. So if that's you ...

Chair: And I don't want to see more than one person get up. [laughter]

Baker: Tell you what, while they are working on getting the electronics taken care of, let me go ahead and get started in the interest of time.

Chair: Okay.

Baker: If that's okay?

Chair: Okay.

Baker: Okay, My name is Jim Baker. I'm the Chief of Staff for the County Executive. And I'm going to make a presentation on behalf of St. Louis County. Just by way of introduction, the County Executive and the Chairman of our County Council are here tonight. They weren't here initially because Tuesday is our County Council night, but I believe they have gotten here during the period of time that we have been working. We also have our Directors of Public Works, Parks, and Major Tim Fitch, our Commander of Operations from the Police Department. Pat Palmer from our Highway Department and Glenn Powers, the Director of our Planning Department. We also have people here from our Neighborhood Preservation Unit. I'm going to speak to you tonight and kind of outline a couple of things. When they get the slideshow up and running, because they had to switch upstairs, we'll go through a couple of things early on.

But while we are waiting for that and rather than delay you, let me give you a couple of points. I'm really going to be focusing on just a few things tonight. Although we will run you through County services real quickly, that's not the focus really here. I want to make several important points on behalf of the County. First of all, St. Louis County is a willing and capable service provider for this area as we are throughout the unincorporated area. We are very happy to serve the public there, and we'd be happy to continue serving in that capacity. Now in instances where there are elections, we believe it's the will of the people, and we are very comfortable with the people deciding those issues. But the Boundary Commission is here tonight in part to listen to presentations and decide whether it's appropriate to take that to the ballot and that's one of the things that I'm going to focus on here tonight. Glenn, if you want to go ahead, you can move to the next slide. You need to back up a little bit, you're ahead of me. Okay. We want to make a couple of points very clear. Residences and businesses will be financially impacted by this annexation, there are significant tax increases that are involved here, both in personal property ... both in property tax and in sales tax and you need to be aware of that.

Secondly, the County efficiencies will be affected and our tax base reduced. Now I want to focus on that less in terms of the overall unincorporated County, but especially in this particular annexation proposal. There is a big block of unincorporated County in this area of some 10,000 people. It's the size of Town and Country, and we think we can efficiently and very capably provide services to that area. But this proposed annexation takes a swath right out of the middle of that. And as part of that swath, it takes out the significant commercial properties along Manchester Road. We believe that if this annexation goes forward, it's going to seriously cripple our ability to provide quality, cost-effective services to the pockets that remain. So we don't think it's appropriate for those reasons. It creates these isolated, unincorporated pockets, in addition to the people that are going to be affected here. You can go on. Now this is just kind of our good feel thing. We do provide county-wide services to over a million people and we are very proud of that. We are also very proud of the fact that we are, in fact, the single largest provider of municipal services. We provide municipal services to 324,000 people in the unincorporated areas. And, and this is very significant as well, we contract with 90 percent of municipalities for either police, public works or other services. So in many of the communities that we don't directly provide municipal services as part of the unincorporated area, we in fact provide many of their services by contract, because of our economies of scale, very frankly.

We're ... I'm going to jump through this really quickly, and I apologize to you folks that are sitting with your backs to this. It wasn't the scenario that we envisioned, but these are just some of these services that we routinely provide to unincorporated areas. Go on Glenn, if you would. We'd like to emphasize the fact that although our headquarters are in Clayton, we in fact, provide decentralized services and we have satellite centers in both North, South and West County. The West County Center is at 74 Clarkson Wilson Center and we have 45 employees on staff there, which is as big a number of municipal offices that are around the County. Let me go to the County police services really quickly. Yes, we are a large police department, but we're also a very effective police department. We have 1,000 personnel, 756 officers, and our people that are on patrol are backed up by 150 detectives and crime scene investigators, CIT Officers, those are specially trained in Crisis Intervention Teams, and our units include tactical operations, helicopters and other things. And very frankly, and this is not to discourage any municipality, they simply cannot afford to provide those types of services. We provide those for the unincorporated area, and in many cases we provide those as backup support for the municipalities like Manchester and everyone else. Next slide. We're very proud of the fact that we are internationally accredited with CALEA. We received the accreditation in 1998 as it indicates there. We are the largest department in Missouri to be accredited. There are 446 different standards incorporating facilities, incorporating policies and incorporating every aspect

of policing. And it's one of the things that we believe is a real guarantee that we give to our citizens that we've obtained this accreditation and intend to maintain it indefinitely. The West County Precinct is on Big Bend Road. One of the things that we do as part of our service delivery and as part of the fact that the unincorporated County does change over time, is that we work through rented precinct headquarters and substations as well because our emphasis is getting the patrol officers on the street. There are 68 commissioned police officers at the West County Precinct. We have eight officers assigned to this specific annexation area. Now again, I don't know where ... I'm always confused when I listen at one of these meetings to how somebody is going to provide twice the service we do with the same number of officers that we do in the same area. And by the way, the one thing that really concerns me is somebody ... I spent the first 11 years with the County in the Prosecuting Attorney's Office dealing with all 65 County municipal police departments. The notion that the size of your department or the area you serve somehow spreads out your officers is a silly notion. That's not the way police services are provided. When a police department, whether it's Manchester or the County provides services, you don't want all of your officers up in the northwest corner of town. So you define specifics, what are called beats. We remember this back even from the fifties in television programs when you hear about beat cars. That's an area where a specific officer patrols and that ... the officers in that beat stay in that beat. So the people that are in this annexation area don't go to South County, they don't go to North County, they don't go anywhere else except in that beat area that they are assigned to. So whether this is ... area is annexed or not, it's going to have the same number of police officers there, period. Our ratio of police officers per thousand is 1.9. So anything that you hear about lesser amount of police in your neighborhood, that's just not the case. It's just not the case. We do have, as Manchester has, many of these same things. We have neighborhood watch groups. Obviously we have more because we serve a broader area. We have biweekly meetings and a number of other things. Let's go on, rather than spend a lot of time on that. The county road services, obviously we have the road services ... we're the second largest provider behind the State of Missouri in ... the state of those and we're very proud of those as well. Go on, and let's get to some specifics, Glenn.

Okay, one of the things that we wanted to tell you here and highlight for you is ... there are 40 ... only 14 miles of centerline local roads. We maintain the arterial roads no matter what would happen with the annexation or not. We've invested about \$1,275,000 in repairs of the local roads in 1999. That doesn't include the arterial roads. And one of the things that we want to highlight for you, because it's a concern for us ... in 2006 we plan to replace the Braeshire Road bridge project. We spent ... we plan to spend about \$300,000 next year doing the design and the balance of that to do the construction. But that's on a local county road. If the annexation goes through, that won't be our road anymore. So the question is going to be what plans does Manchester have to follow through with that if the annexation occurs before we do the replacement in 2006? Code enforcement ... code enforcement services, we have all over the incorporated county. We actually provide those services to Manchester. Okay, we provide those under contract to Manchester, so I would say that your public works response time will probably be pretty close to the same. Go on. Yeah, and 90 percent of the municipalities contracted ... the County of Manchester contracts with us for a comprehensive set of services which is indicated there. I want to give you an illustration, because I want to come back to this. There's been a discussion of economies of scale. We both provide sewer lateral programs. We both get \$28 per household per resident. That comes from ... it comes from your tax bills every year. Their parameters are different. These parameters aren't different because the County does a wonderful job and Manchester doesn't do a good job. The parameters are different because of the economies of scale. Right now the total balance that Manchester has to work with the sewer lateral program is about \$95,000 a year. That's why there's a maximum amount. I understand that. If they get a bunch of sewer lateral repairs over \$10,000, there's not much money left in

that fund very quickly. And they have to be worried about having enough money to take care of other services. We don't have a deductible amount or a maximum amount, because county-wide we generate \$3 million worth of revenue in this fund. So, we can handle the few isolated issues that go over budget. We also get a better typical cost of repair. Again, we do a lot more of these, we have a staff that's dedicated, that does nothing but sewer lateral repair programs. We are able to bid out those processes and therefore, we get very good costs. Again, my point is, this is one of the advantages the County gets for our economies of scale. To the extent that the unincorporated County diminishes, it also diminishes our economies of scale and our ability to deliver on some of these types of programs. Go on.

Park Services. Yes, we have 69 park sites and there's 10 county parks in this area of about 1,500 acres within five miles. Love Park is one of the major ones. It's been talked about here. Queeny Park is even much bigger and larger, and it's in the immediate vicinity as well. By the way, we don't have any concerns. We work cooperatively with a lot of municipalities. We'd love for Manchester to work cooperatively with us to make improvements in Love Park because whether this area is annexed or not, a lot of Manchester residents use Love Park. What we are not real thrilled about is their idea of capturing our revenue to give us the money to improve Love Park. No, we don't think that's very fair. But, we'd be more than happy to talk to them about making improvements in Love Park. We also do planning and zoning services. Go on. I want to cover one real quick thing. I'm not going to hit on this. It is very true that municipalities have fewer citizens per elected official, and we can't do much about that in the County mechanism because we wouldn't be very effective governing. If we had one county councilor for every three to four thousand residents, we'd have 100 county councilors to debate every resolution that went in front of the County, and we'd never get anything done. Our service delivery mechanism is different. We don't expect to filter complaints, comments, suggestions, through our elected officials. We expect that to go to our professional staff. And we think that is a good service modality. And so, in our case, we have to take a little bit different approach. Go on. I want to cover this real quick for you. This is our estimates of what the County would lose if the area was annexed, about \$1.5 million. I think the importance of this thing is to highlight something I said before to you. The difference between this number and the number Manchester projects to generate \$2.9 million, that's the extra taxes that are going to be taken out of this annexed area. That money comes from the residents, it comes from the businesses and it comes from people, non-residents that shop in the area. But don't be fooled by anything. There is no free lunch, there is no free trash service. The difference between these numbers is that every year Manchester is going to generate \$1.4 million dollars more in tax revenue than the County is generating from that same area. Go on to the next slide. Again, this is 25 cents per hundred dollars assessed valuation that applies to your real and personal property. And keep in mind, right now, actually our tax rate is higher than they told you. The County tax rate total in all four funds and debt services is 58.5 cents. If the annexation goes through, that will raise to 83.5 cents for local government. Now there's a lot of other things, school district, so on and so forth, but your taxes for local government will go up 43 percent, your property taxes. Sales tax, similarly. The sales tax in the unincorporated area right now is 6.075. But 4.225 percent of that goes to the state. The percentage that applies to local government is 1.85. If you get annexed that goes up an additional 1.25 percent or 67 percent increase in the sales taxes going to local government. Merchants also pay an additional business license fee based on gross receipts. In the County they pay a flat fee. Go on. We want to emphasize again this unincorporated area that we serve, that you are a part of right now, has 10,338 people. That is roughly the size of Town and Country. It's a size that's certainly sufficient for us to very effectively and efficiently provide services. Glenn, if you can go to the next slide. This is a little bit bigger map and you can see it. The light colored swath down the middle between Manchester on the west and Des Peres on the east and Town and Country on the northeast . . .

Chair: Mr. Baker, I'm sorry sir, we're about at 15 minutes, and we need to wrap it up quick.

Baker: I will very simply. As you can see, this annexation cuts off a pocket to the north which becomes completely isolated for the County to get to and it makes this long narrow swath to the south and to the east. We don't think that's a good way and we don't think this is in the best interest of those residents, or in the residents of the proposed annexation area.

Chair: Thank you, sir. All right. We'll start on the other end this time. Mr. Armstrong, Ted.

T. Armstrong: Well first of all, I want to compliment you, Mr. Baker, on the first clear view of the County's position on any annexation proposal that we've had. Thank you very much. You have actually answered my questions regarding the financial impact on the ... of the proposal, and I think you have covered it very well in terms of the impact not only on the County but on the residents to be potentially annexed. So I have no questions, thank you.

M. Armstrong: And I'd only underscore what Ted said and I have no questions either, Mr. Baker.

Chair: Robert.

Ford: Would you get your determination of the tax effected of the ... effect of the annexation area in writing to us, please?

Baker: Yes.

Ford: Thank you.

Schuman: I also want to compliment you on your excellent presentation. I followed it very carefully, but I did get lost on one point. You were talking about the number of officers who are assigned to a beat. And you made the comment near the end of that the number of officers will stay the same whether the area is annexed or not. And I didn't know exactly what we were talking about here.

Baker: What I was saying ... Manchester has said that they are going to add eight officers in order to serve this annexed area. And we have eight officers assigned to this annexed area now. So whether there is an annexation or not, there's going to be the same number of people directly serving this particular annexed area.

Schuman: Good. I didn't pick that up. . .

Baker: I'm sorry. I probably got lost more than once. . .

Schuman Great. Thank you.

Chair: Betty M.

Marver: No questions.

Chair: I got lost more than once. In all fairness, I guess I want to ask about this unincorporated ... this pocket area a little bit. As I'm looking at the streets, they all seem to come off of ... I guess that's Barrett Station Road and go in and stop. So I mean now, I see it as a pocket and all that, but how are services currently provided? Don't they really just come up Barrett Station Road anyway? How will that really change?

Baker: Well, it's not the way you travel. Let me ... this is actually a good illustration. If you look up in the top area, the unincorporated area above the blue annexation area, that's roughly, you know, kind of a square type of shape. That's a very good area in general for police type of services to serve because if I have a car that is traveling in that area, anywhere they are, they have about the same distance to get to the other side of the area. If I'm in this long elongated one in the south, okay, and I've got to cover that whole territory because it's about the same area as the one at the top ... If I'm down at the far south extreme, my response time to get to the far north extreme is long, much longer than it is if I'm in a more contiguous area. So for instance, when we look at this annexation area now, we would have to ... we would essentially not save any resources if we were going to provide the same effective police services, because we have to keep people in that northern area even though it's a little small for a beat, because they couldn't also serve the southern area, if you follow what I'm saying. So, that's where it becomes very inefficient, both the elongated area, if that's the only County area we serve, that becomes difficult to manage and get good response times and because of the separation between the two of them. We have to maintain our presence at both ends without the intervening middle that we could cover from parts of both ends if that makes any sense to you. So essentially, our feeling would be to serve this with police, we'd have to have the same number of police in those two remaining sections as we would have to cover the entire area in order to get the same response time, in order to get the same efficiency. If we cut back the number of police, which you would normally do with an annexation, we wouldn't be able to adequately service the two remaining pieces.

Chair: So you are saying if this annexation would go forward, you wouldn't reduce the number of officers in serving that area?

Baker: Right. We don't feel we can and still maintain quality service.

Chair: Okay. Kind of a related question on the police services, and this came up a couple of years ago, and I guess I forgot the answer... How are services like the helicopter, the bomb squad, something all municipalities really have to use, are they not really paid for by everyone all the way?

Baker: Yeah, well, and that ties you back ... that ties back to part of our concern that we talked about, not just in specific with Manchester but in terms of annexations overall. Yes, there are a lot of services that we provide that come from ... that we really apply, not just to the unincorporated area, but also just as equally in municipalities. And those are things like the helicopter program. Our TAC services are available on demand, and so are some of our specialized investigative units like the sexual assault unit, and so on and so forth. Not every municipality uses them, but if they request them, we go in and provide those services because we think it's in the interest. Now, how do we get the money for that? Well, we get the money for that from a combination of property tax revenues that come from everywhere in the County and sales tax area that come only from the unincorporated County. And that's actually our number-one, single-revenue source. So as sales tax erodes globally from the unincorporated area, because we get no sales tax revenues generated from the incorporated area, that begins to jeopardize our ability to provide these services ... not just to municipalities, but to ourselves ...

but to the unincorporated area as well. So that's why we're concerned about having a sufficient body of unincorporated area in order to support those types of services, not just for us, but the ones we share.

Chair: Well, and on some of those services that are provided throughout the County, the property tax income would not change to the County should this annex. . .

Baker: That's true. . .

Chair: And, really the sales tax, if I understand that Manchester's part of the pool, then if the ... well let me ask this, I guess the question is, if their tax rate goes up, will the County receive more money then?

Baker: No, that's an error in their presentation. We ... actually we would receive a slight difference. There's a ... among their tax rate increases are a 50 cent capital improvement sales tax, and a local 25 cent or .25 percent local options sales tax. The ... they've indicated in their Plan of Intent, that we would share 15 percent of that capital improvement sales tax. That's actually not correct. That pool is only shared by municipalities that have opted into the capital improvement sales tax formula, and we're not allowed to opt into that. So they would share 15 percent with other municipalities that have opted into that, but not the County. They've also indicated, and this is true short-term, that when you have a new annexation and impose a local options sales tax ... a quarter cent sales tax, that that is shared 50 percent ... would be shared 50 percent with the County for the first five years. After the first five years, we'd get a pool share which right now would run about 7 percent. So, we get a five-year share of some of the additional taxes they would impose, and we would get a ... and we would get nothing for the half cent capital improvement tax. But, our net figures, the 1.5 million is basically our estimate net loss after factoring in those things.

Chair: Okay. Last one, and I'm trying to word this the right way. As you are aware, we've had certain proposals given to us that were by petition drive and percentages and all that. And we've heard information that there's been a survey done, and we're going to get some more detailed results about it. If the survey results given to us ... and I know it's hypothetical ... but if the survey results given to us give an indication of a significant majority in favor of annexation, gets to around 75 percent or more, would St. Louis County's position concerning this proposal change any in light of their ... if there is an indicate of a real large majority of the citizens wanting to do this and change their local government service provider?

Baker: Well, it would change in this, but only in this respect, okay. If this proposal irrespective of a couple of the points that I brought up where I think there's some fundamental flaws in this, as far as the rest of the County, okay, in these unincorporated pockets. Certainly if the annexed area said ... was clearly saying, we want to be a part of that, it would be our intention to try to help effectuate that. However, I still think you're looking at some very practical problems, because part of your mission is not just the city and the annexed area, but it's the surrounding area. I honestly can't think of any possible argument that could be made that the people left in that northern pocket would be benefited by this annexation or that the people on the east side and down to the south would be benefited by this annexation. And in addition, if you recall, Manchester has identified that northern area close to Queeny Park as part of their intent to annex, but they've chosen not to do it at this time. And that creates the pocket. If that was included as part of this, it would be a more logical proposal in front of the Boundary Commission because it wouldn't leave that northern pocket. Now we know ... I can tell you why that's not there, because there's no commercial, valuable property along Manchester Road up

there. But that also creates a problem in the future, because what remains up there is not very attractive to anybody to annex because it doesn't ... it's not balanced by any good revenue-producing property. So we not only create a pocket, but we create a pocket that has little chance of really being picked up except for the County continuing to do it on an inefficient service delivery. So for those reasons, I think if the people in the annexed area wanted to be annexed, we should try to find a way to accommodate them. But this is not the proposal to do it, because it just doesn't make good practical sense for the County as a whole, or for the people who are left out of this proposal.

Chair: Thank you. Donald.

Wojtkowski: Jim, the bridge replacement you referenced, is that an officially funded '06 project?

Baker: There's funding in line for that, I mean we don't ... the Council hasn't actually appropriated that, but it's part of our plan funding based on projected revenues in future years.

Wojtkowski: Okay. Could the County perhaps get us some population figures for those ... for the northern pocket and the one to the east as well? Because we're going to have to ... at least on the east, I have a very significant concern, that the definition will change in that area.

Baker: We'd be happy to give you some real detailed information in our written response.

Wojtkowski: Very good. Thank you.

Chair: Johnnie?

Spears: No questions, Mr. Chairman.

Chair: Christine?

Bredenkoetter: I have a couple of questions. First of all, what's the number of beats that you have in the area today?

Baker: Basically one beat in that annexation area.

Bredenkoetter: And so since Manchester wants to annex this area, what you're telling us is that eight officers would not lose or be reassigned within St. Louis County, because you would need them, because of this anomaly that's being. . .

Baker: We'd have to shift those officers both north and south to cover the other areas.

Bredenkoetter: Okay. And I asked this question at the last public hearing. Out of your thousand officers, how many of them are on Department of Justice grants at the moment that are. . .

Baker: Do you know? Not enough of them anymore.

_____ : We'd be happy to answer that. I wish we would have had an opportunity before to let you know, but this is Bill Howell [spelling?] from our planning department. He takes care of all of our grants.

Bredenkoetter: Okay.

Howell: Currently we have seven officers assigned to Cops' grants in schools and in highway safety teams. Over the years, over the last ... since the Clinton administration and their Cops' initiative, we've added 70 officers. Those grants have expired and the County has continued to fund those positions. And my belief is we will continue to fund the existing positions ...

Bredenkoetter: With the decreased revenue and you're still able to do that?

Baker: It's been our priority because, as you may know, on those grants you are required to indicate at the time that it's your intention to continue providing those services, and you will to the best of your ability to do that. And we have, to date, never dropped one of the positions we had in pursuant to a federal grant. Now, can I tell you that that will never happen? Obviously, I can't tell you that will never happen. I can tell you because we are preparing the 2005 budget right now, that it's not going to happen in 2005.

Bredenkoetter: And so that's why there is one lady answering the phone at the Health Department. I called St. Louis County Health, and she is the only person answering the phone, so I guess we're redirecting it to the Police Department ... It's a joke. . .

Baker: I kind of figured that was a joke.

Bredenkoetter: Okay. The Braeshire, for 2006. You said it's in the pipeline, but those funds have not actually been committed, so a lot of that depends upon what revenue is generated by the County. Is that correct?

Baker: Well, that's true. However, we actually project out on a capital program about five years based on current revenue. So unless there would be a dramatic drop in revenue, that's part of our plan.

Bredenkoetter: Okay. And the last question, I think that's very informative because I did not know this before I was on the Commission. How many other counties in the State of Missouri function as a municipality ... perform municipal functions as St. Louis County?

Baker: I don't know. Lori, do you know?

Bredenkoetter: I think if you'll do your homework, you'll find that the answer is zero.

Baker: Well, you'll find a lot of them that provide many of the services that we do. I don't know that you'll find any of them that provide. . .

Bredenkoetter: As a municipality.

Baker: Yeah.

Bredenkoetter: So, thank you.

Chair: Folks, this is the last warning about the speaker cards, okay? Because we're going to start the public comment portion in about a minute or two. So if you want to talk, speaker card to Mr. Hamilton. Thank you. Sorry.

Kloeppel: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr. Baker. I have a couple of questions in regards to the citizens' reaction to this proposal. Has St. Louis County received any telephone calls, letters with regard to this proposal?

Baker: Yes. Lori will probably ... could address that. Lori Fiegel from our Manager of Contracts and Planning.

Fiegel: It's a large annexation area. I think the Manchester representatives indicated there are quite a few articles in the paper. So yes, we have received calls. And we also held a town hall meeting for County residents last week so that it wouldn't conflict with the public hearing schedule and Manchester's town meetings for the area. We had about 130-40 people out at Queeny Park attend that meeting.

Kloeppel: And what was their sentiment with regards to this proposal?

Fiegel: I would say at that community meeting there was a fair amount of skepticism. And I am aware that some subdivisions and condo associations have begun to circulate opposition petitions. And I believe there is an opposition group that has formed as well.

Kloeppel: That's all I have at this point.

Chair: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Baker. Okay folks, we're going to start the public comment portion of this meeting. If you see one ... a couple of our Commissioners seem to go out and come back every so often and I think we understand what is going on. So if you need to leave, come back in, feel free. What we're going to do is, I'm going to get the public speaker cards. I'm going to arrange them. I'm going to call you up, and I will announce the name of the person who is going to come up and talk. And I will announce the name of the person who is coming up next ... the on-deck batter, if you will. You have three minutes to speak, that's it. I'll tell you when the three minutes is up and I'm going to need you to stop because I think we have a whole lot of people wanting to talk tonight. And I'm going to do this ...

M. Armstrong: Mr. Chairman, could I indulge your ... just before we start the public speaking could we see a show of hands. . .

Chair: Uh, uh, uh, all right. No hooting, no hollering, no great. . .

M. Armstrong: Just a quiet show of hand. . .

Chair: A quiet show of hands for anyone in the crowd who is in favor of the annexation proposal. Just to give us sort of a general idea of the crowd. If you could be so kind. Who is in favor? And we are not holding anybody to this, okay. Now, if you could be so kind, quietly a show of hands of those who would be against the annexation proposal ... uh, uh, uh, all right, thank you.

M. Armstrong: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Chair: My pleasure. All right, we've got the cards. And I'll let you all in on a little secret. If buried in this stack there is a speaker card by someone by the city of Manchester, I will call that last because they have sort of the burden of proof, if you will. And if I have any ones in here by a representative of St. Louis County, I will call that second last, okay? It's not a big coincidence, I do it on purpose. All right. First up tonight, Bob Tullock, Alderman of Ward One.

[inaudible - too far from mike]

Chair: Okay. Sir, if you're not speaking on behalf of the actual city, like the Mayor or somebody, you can go now, and then after that would be Catherine Chay. I hope I pronounce that ... and I apologize for butchering anybody's name tonight. All right. Mr. Tullock, three minutes.

Tullock: My name is Bob Tullock, I'm one of the Aldermen of Ward One in Manchester. There was a question that was addressed here at the meeting this evening. I can tell you from personal experience whenever I went through campaigning, I spoke to about 2,000 of the 3,000 residents in my Ward as I was campaigning. And one of the things that I did ask the people, and you have to keep in mind that two-thirds of my Ward were recently annexed back in 1997 and '99 time frame. I was a little surprised at the responses. They were overwhelmingly in favor and in support of the annexation. There were three reasons given and I kind of summarized them here. Better, faster police response time. They were talking from a half-hour response time to less than a few minutes now. Local control of our tax dollars. Your tax dollars are being spent locally, not in the North or South County areas. If you have a problem that needs to be addressed, you have two aldermen that you can call from your ward, as opposed to trying to find out who in St. Louis County you can get hold of to address any issues or concerns. That's pretty well all I had, but like I said, I wanted to let you know that these are feedbacks from people who were recently annexed. And it was like 95 percent of the people that I spoke to were very happy with becoming part of Manchester at that time. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up is Catherine Chay. And after Catherine Chay will be Wayne Weaver. Yes ma'am.

Chay: I'm just a resident, but I'm opposed for a couple of reasons. One, I don't think the city of Manchester has been very open about the reasons for wanting to annex us, which makes me not want to add another layer of government for our area. Two, I think the benefits ... that there are benefits to being served by the County police force that the city force doesn't have. And that I think that ... I don't think that it makes economic sense in the short-term or the long-term. So to address the first one, the literature from the city and their public presentations have told us that they wanted to annex us because we were in the same sphere of influence. We had shared community interests, which had to do with shopping, schools and places of worship. It wasn't until the last few minutes of the last public meeting that the Mayor elaborated on that and said that municipalities of less than 25,000 aren't economically viable and it's difficult to maintain independent parks and police departments with smaller populations. So, they currently have 19,000, we're 6,000, and I don't think it's a good argument for why we should become residents of Manchester. If they borrowed six and a half million dollars for a new police facility when their population wasn't large enough to support it. If they think that it takes that large of a population. The police force ... I can see the need for independent police in towns where the populations are physically isolated from other areas, but in the County, we're all connected. Accidents and emergencies in one area affect other areas and they aren't separated by municipal boundaries. So now more than ever I think it's important for police services to be connected and not be independent. I think that a response time of 4.3 minutes by the County is

good enough, and Manchester can't really measure their response time currently in our area because they don't serve our area. And then, finally, in the Plan of Intent, the city projects revenues and expenditures for the area until 2008. The excess of revenue over expenditure over the next four years are first of all, very small, so \$76,000 out of \$3,000,000 in 2006. And secondly, this number gets smaller over the next three years until it's only \$58,000 in 2008. So to me, this means that small decreases in revenue of only like 1% and a small ... and increases in expenditure would mean that there wouldn't be any excess any more. So it's a very small margin of intake versus expenditure. And even now the garbage service will be paid for by our real property ...

Ford Time.

Chay: And personal property taxes.

Chair Ma'am, that's three minutes.

Chay: That's it? Okay.

Chair: Thank you very much. And folks, I'll remind you that when you come up, please speak close to the microphone. We're recording this session and it's important to get it out on the speakers also. Mr. Weaver. And after Mr. Weaver it will be Scott Branto, I believe. B-R-A-N-N-O-T? Yes sir.

Weaver: My name is Wayne Weaver. I'm a trustee for the Glyn Cagny subdivision and a member of a grassroots movement to defeat this proposed annexation. Here are a few reasons why we do not want to be annexed. Mr. Baker talked about the sewer lateral program. In one case, the County paid \$23,000 to repair a sewer lateral. If he or she lived in Manchester, it would have cost them \$17,000 out of their own pocket. As it was, when they lived in the County, all they had to pay for was for a plumber to do camera work on that lateral, and Cathy talked about the difference, the small margin of income over expenses that Manchester expects to spend in our area. They don't have that bridge budgeted in there, that's \$3.5 million, I don't know how they are going to come up with that. If we are annexed, the County is not going to handle that, and that cost will have to be spread over us and the present citizens of Manchester. The city promised the residents of the last area that they annexed that they would correct some serious storm water problems. They commissioned a study and an estimate for this work in July 2001. The estimate was around \$3,400,000 dollars, no work has been started. They have \$412,000 in the parks storm water fund. Keep in mind that they are talking about spending money out of that fund to improve Love Park. Manchester's new Aquatic Center has a serious leak and apparently the contractor's warranty has expired. The City has yet to determine how much it will cost to correct. We feel that this proposed annexation is not in the best interest of our area, the city of Manchester residents, or the unincorporated County outside our area. One of you asked about the last annexation. The other day I ran across an old yellow newspaper article, and in our area, when it went to a vote, 355 residents voted no and 61 voted yes, and there was a 44 percent turnout. I have a copy of that here if you would like a copy. We urge you, the Boundary Commissioners, to deny Manchester's annexation proposal. In support of this, I tendered petitions signed by 396 people in the targeted unincorporated area as well as petitions signed by 20 residents of the city of Manchester, all who oppose this annexation. I want to take this opportunity to thank all of the people who came together to support and work for this cause. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, sir. It's Scott Brandt, I'm sure. I was misreading that. Mr. Brandt, you're up, and then after Mr. Brandt it will be Jeffrey Chenoweth.

Brandt: I want to thank you all for coming tonight. It's an important matter for all of us in the unincorporated area. I have two residences in the unincorporated area. First ... and I've lived here for 16 years now. And this is kind of déjà vu in that approximately 14 or 15 years ago Town and Country tried to do this same ... very thing. And if we are talking about property values, I would much rather have the Town and Country zip code than the Manchester zip code, and I think we already know the answer to that. Also, furthermore, I get my trash picked up twice a week right now, and I'm very happy with the way that that happens. Furthermore, I would ask how much it is to attend the Manchester Pool now as a resident opposed to how much it is for an outsider coming in. I think you'll see the difference would be well worth your while to pay the extra difference just to go to attend either that one or any of the other 1,600 that we have around the St. Louis area now. I want to thank the St. Louis County Commission for coming so well prepared, and furthermore, if Manchester came prepared the way that they did tonight, and this is any indication of the way that they run their government, I think I'll stay unincorporated.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up, will be Jeffrey Chenoweth. And folks, I guess I'll comment, if other people have sort of said what you think, you can say "Me too" and what you think about it and we'll get through the meeting a little quicker. Anyway, Mr. Chenoweth. And after Chenoweth will be Bill Chambers.

Chenoweth: I'm a homeowner at Ridgeview Place. I'm a former member of the Board of Directors of our condominium association. I'm a past vice-president and I'm currently the chair of our long-range planning committee. Our committee, and I'm speaking on behalf of myself and our committee, not the board of directors, is charged with developing our long-term goals and plans for our community in order to improve and protect our homes and our property. Our committee has studied this annexation proposal and we are convinced that it is not in the best interest of our homeowners of Ridgeview Place. Even though we own our homes, and would pay taxes to the city of Manchester under this proposal, we quite frankly would be treated as second-class citizens. Manchester has already told us that even though they will collect our taxes, they will not provide the same level of services that they provide to the other residents of the city of Manchester. In particular, many of the services that we heard about earlier we will not be provided. For example, Manchester has told us they will not plow our streets of snow. Manchester will not maintain our streets. Manchester will not repair our streets. Manchester will not install sidewalks or maintain sidewalks. Manchester will provide not street lighting in our community. Manchester will collect our taxes, but they will not provide us any kind of rebate to make up for these services that we will not be provided and for the services we will be paying for in other areas of Manchester. I do not know how many other communities are in the same situation as this that will be provide ... that will not be provided the many services that we've heard about tonight. Because of this, our committee has decided that annexation is clearly not in the best interest of our 200, nearly 200 homeowners. This annexation proposal seems to be driven by the Manchester's desire to expand. We've heard no one in our community expressing a particular desire to be part of the city of Manchester, and this goes back in the years before this proposal came up. Our nearly 200 homeowners have all voluntarily decided that they wanted to live in St. Louis County. And we ask that the Board give us the opportunity to continue to do so. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up is Bill Chambers, and after Mr. Chambers will be Alan Lester.

Chambers: I have three comments. First comment is that if this should proceed and go forward there is an election held and we are annexed, no one has talked about how quickly there would be a vote as to when we would have Board of Alderman representation. There would probably have to be an election maybe six months later. During that time, all the people in the annexed area will not be represented in Manchester's government. I have a concern with that. Secondly, I went to a Planning and Zoning Commission meeting by the city of Manchester two weeks ago, and I don't know what the qualifications are to be on any committee in any municipality, but I was a little alarmed that three of the people on the Planning and Zoning Commission started their comments by saying, "I'm not an engineer, but. . ." But what? Why are you on this committee? And finally, I'm a trustee of a subdivision that borders Carman Road. We have a north side of Carman Road where I live in the unincorporated area. There's a south side that was annexed five years ago, there are three trustees. The two trustees that live in the annexed area, if they took a vote today, would vote to be un-annexed. And if you like, I can provide you with their names and addresses. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up is Alan Lester, and after Mr. Lester will be Daniel O'Brien.

Lester: Good evening, I represent the Braeshire subdivision, which is part of unincorporated St. Louis County. From our association, we feel it's important to consider the level of services with which we are now provided with the cost of receiving these services and the impact of future costs regarding the annexation. We now have weekly trash, recycling, and yard waste pickup. In the winter, after nightly snowfalls, our streets are plowed and salted by eight in the morning. And I seriously doubt that the city of Manchester can provide any faster service, since they have a number of public streets that need that maintenance as well. The concern of many residents is the ability of the city of Manchester to maintain the same level of service now provided by the County without an increase in taxes or fees. The officials of the city have stated and written that they can do this, and maintain this level of service or better service at the same or lower cost. Our review of the city of Manchester's Comprehensive Plan and other information provided by the city indicate otherwise. To wit: city of Manchester Comprehensive Plan, page 12 regarding general operating fund balance, the revenues and expenditures for 2002, the revenues exceeded expenditures \$989,000 dollars. In 2003, the difference was \$559,000. In 2004, the difference is \$111,000. So that's a decline of more that \$800,000 in three years. Page 15, tax resources, references made to the implementation of additional city taxes, with additional sales taxes within the proposed annexation area. Local option sales tax, one fourth of 1 percent, capital improvement sales tax one half of 1 percent, parks and storm water sales tax, one half of 1 percent. Other information provided by the city, the proposed 2004 budget reflects an operating deficit of approximately \$59,000 from the Aquatic Center. The property tax levee for trash collection may need to be raised if the city is to maintain the current level of service for the collection of household trash, recyclables, and yard waste. The five-year financial forecast indicates minimal growth in the general fund revenues and continued increases in operational cost. Got the projects fund, the proposed revenues for 2004 are slightly more than \$1 million dollars while the fund expenditures are \$2.8 million dollars, a deficit of more than \$1.8 million dollars. The five-year financial forecast indicated that revenues from the one-half cent capital improvement sales tax will be insufficient to meet the city's projected capillaries. Without a change in the city's tax structure, there will be minimal growth and general fund reserves. There will be insufficient revenues to support all projected capital needs. It's also been brought to the attention of the Mayor and the Board of Aldermen that an additional levee of nine cents is needed in 2005, with an additional levee of six or seven cents required in 2006 and 2007. As a representative and speaker for residents of the Braeshire subdivision, we are opposed to the annexation proposal. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up will be Daniel O'Brien, and after Mr. O'Brien will be Michael Caramanna.

O'Brien: Members of the commission, you know I have a new respect for my trash because all I heard from the people of Manchester is trash, trash, we're going to get trash. If you go and look at the area to be annexed, there's no trash in the street. We have trash service, we pay for it, but we don't pay as much as we would pay if we were part of Manchester. Originally, and they said ... the one alderman said he talked to a lot of the people in the annexed area and God, they are so happy. I don't know who he talked to. The friends we have in that area, they say the biggest mistake they made was when they voted to go into Manchester. Now, as I say, we have police, we have snow removal, we have every service that Manchester is going to provide for us. The one big thing is we're going to get free trash. It keeps coming down to trash. Now the expense that we are all going to bear to get rid of our trash is astronomical. Let's call it what it is ... the city of Manchester needs money. They need money. They are not operating right now in the plus. They need the money. Do you think that those 240 businesses along Manchester Road are happy to go into the city? No, they're not. You can talk to any of the merchants there, they're all against it. We, who are the residents, we're against it because our taxes are going to go up. And believe me, our services aren't going to be any better at all. Now, I remember when they annexed the area before, they were getting two pickups of trash. You know they are only down to one now. I don't know when it's going to be zero trash collection in Manchester, and they are going to have to pay for it like we do. We are against the annexation, and I think if you saw all of the hands raised here, 95 percent of these people are against annexation. Now the postcards that Manchester sent out and got the return, if you didn't sign your name and everything on it, it didn't count. But even the least that they did, the people were still against it. And I say today, as you can see from all the people here, we're against it. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up will be Michael Caramanna ... hope I pronounced that right, and after that will be Rob Wetzel. Okay. Thank you, Rob.

Caramanna: Yes, you did pronounce it right, thank you. Ladies and gentlemen of the Commission, I thank you for your time. And I will not try to rehash some of the things that have been spoken to here already. However, I do want to make some points. First of all, my name is Michael Caramanna. I officially represent Ridgeview Place. We have 192 dwellings, and we have a board of directors and citizens that have charged me with the responsibility tonight to visit with you. Again, in the essence of time, I will give you a little overview of where we are located. We are off of Carman Road on Huntley Heights and our main roads are Ridgeview Circle Drive, Highview Circle Drive and Highview Circle Place, plus some ancillary courts. We have, as I might have mentioned, 192 residences with about 500 individuals in those residences, give or take a few. We have studied the issue for about a year and a half. We have had our subdivision meetings in this very room, and we have had the Mayor of Manchester and officials from Manchester address our group. In our studies, we have tried to find a positive issue so that we could, if you will, rally around and support it. We can find none. So it is the overall view of our association that it doesn't make sense, and we don't want it. We unequivocally don't want it. We want to remain where we are in unincorporated St. Louis County. We are very happy with the services we get now and we are pleased with everything that surrounds us. We think Manchester is a lovely town, and we not only do not want to be annexed by Manchester, we don't want to be annexed by Des Peres, Town and Country, Kirkwood or Florissant or anybody else. We are happy where we are. So it is my charge tonight to share with you emphatically that all of our residences are against the proposed annexation. If

anyone has any questions, I'd be happy to address them. Otherwise, thank you very much for your time this evening. Thank you, folks.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Mr. Wetzel votes no. Next up will be Debbie Mizerany. I should have called this earlier. And after that will Lee Sanguneng.

Mizerany: Good Evening. I'm Debbie Mizerany and I'm a resident of Big Bend Station, which is a community near the intersection of Big Bend and 141. This area is part of the recently annexed area that happened in 1999. At the time I was a trustee in my neighborhood, was invited to a grassroots organizational meeting, and ended up campaigning for the annexation because we very much wanted that to happen for our neighborhood. I won't rehash a lot of what has already been said, and I'm sure that the city is going to talk about some things when they are able to, but my ... I have two points that I want to make, and the first point is basically responsive local government. Having been in my home now for 11 years, and out of that time five ... well 2004 ... it's been five years since we were annexed. I spent six years as a County ... unincorporated County resident. The services that our neighborhood received of 150 homes was by no means the level of services that we now receive as being part of Manchester. There were many of times when we had problems with the roads, problems with the sidewalks. When we would call and try to ascertain who we needed to talk to, I can tell you personally I spent more time on the phone with different clerks and different offices and nobody could tell me who it was I needed to talk to, to get to a manager and finally found who I was supposed to be talking to, but he was out off in the field somewhere. Left a message for him and two months later, I never heard back from him. So I understand that things may have improved in the area, and for that I'm thankful for the people who are still in Saint ... unincorporated St. Louis County, but we were very happy to become part of Manchester. As a result of being in Manchester, and having gotten to know a lot of the staff and the officials that were there, I have since become very involved in the city including homecoming and planning and zoning. And no, you do not need to be an engineer to be a planning and zoning commissioner. Just like you all, you are representatives of your areas, and just because you are on the board, I don't think every single one of you have a planning and zoning degree in order to help make a decision on this. You just basically go with what makes common sense and one of the reasons why you have professional staff is to be able to rely on them. But basically, responsive local government is my big point, but the main point, and this is the one I cannot stress the most, there are a lot of people ... unlike all of you are here tonight, and I applaud you for being here ... but there are a lot of people who are very hesitant to get up and speak in public. There are a lot of people who have very busy lives ... okay, thank you. But I was just going to say that the only true and fair way is to put this to a vote, because you aren't going to get a true picture unless you do that. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you ma'am.

[end of Tape 2 - side A]

[start of Tape 2 - side B]

_____: On the northern boundaries of this bounded by the north side of Manchester Road in the Way Cliffe Estates subdivision, part of my concern has always been services and I've lived in the area all my life. One of my issues that I do have is the Boundary Commission, as I see this, has a decision to make. We have 5,600 people in a proposed annexed area. We have 19,000 plus in the existing city of Manchester. Let's let those people have a chance to vote on it, and give those people the opportunity. We've had issues in our subdivision for a number of years, and it seems like the squeaky wheel gets the oil. And police service has always been a

concern to me. We don't have street lights, we don't have sidewalks. We have issues on the northern side of the fringes that people at Barrett Station and Big Bend have that they're fortunate enough to have a county police station near. Our county response is more than 10 minutes, in some cases and it's 20 to 25 in many cases. It has been a very difficult situation. We've worked with the county earlier this year and for the first time, we saw county police officers out in our subdivision for the first time in weeks ... in months ... in a year. I'm very concerned about that. And I do believe that the squeaky wheel gets the oil. We on the northern fringes of this don't want to be that squeaky wheel. We want fair service. So at this point, I would have to say that I'm ... for this annexation attempt. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up is John Hanpeter. John Hanpeter, going once, twice ... gone. Next up will be Mary Ann Miles. Miss Miles. Is Mary Ann Miles here? Wow, we're getting boring. Oh, I'm sorry. After Mary Ann Miles will be Susan Zweifel.

Miles: I must travel around in different crowds than a lot of people here do. I have more than 25 friends that live south of Carman Road who were going to be annexed in '87 and they didn't get to be. And now they are residents of Manchester and they adore it. They wouldn't want to live anywhere else, and that's all I have to say.

Chair: Thank you, ma'am. All right, next up is Susan Zweifel. And after Ms. Zweifel will be Cliff Kurrus ... K-U-R-R-U-S.

Zweifel: I live in the subdivision of Way Cliffe Estates. We have 144 homes and I'm part of the volunteer organization, it's our improvement association. Two years ago we went to Manchester, this group of 15 representatives of our subdivision, to ask them what it would take to be annexed by Manchester. A year and a half ago, we went door to door with 89 percent response. The response received was 40 percent yes, 30 percent no, and 30 percent needed additional information. In the last couple of weeks, knowing I was probably going to speak tonight, I went in a very unofficial capacity around my neighborhood and found the percentage to be approximately the same. The key of my unofficial survey was 100 percent of the residents perceive that this is going to a vote. I would not have known it was not going to go to a vote had I not gone to that meeting last week at Queeny Park. And the people ... the 30 percent who needed more information, still feel that they have plenty of time to receive additional information. Another issue that I have is with the police department. Way Cliffe Estates recently ... we have this big brick edifice in the front of our subdivision. A couple of weeks ago it was hit by a car. The wall itself that was knocked down is four feet by five feet, the sign that it knocked down was wood, five feet by four feet, and the pole was totally knocked down. It took the police ... twenty minutes, I am told, to get there. And I appreciate the fact that perception is not reality, and I'm requesting the official police report, but that is a long way from a four and a half-minute response time. I talked to Officer Dolman [spelling?]. She said that she looked at the report, could not remember what the time was, but it wasn't 20 minutes. So I'm going to get that official report. The problem I have with that is that the police did absolutely nothing to try to identify that car. A rocker panel was found, a handle to the car was found, that car had plenty of time to get away, and they did. There must have been substantial damage to that vehicle, and the police department did nothing. Because the officer was on midnights, she informed me that they were not able to canvas the neighborhood to see what the neighbors found. I find that very distressing to me. And the bids we received to have that repaired, in our very modest subdivision, the average bid was \$2,000. That's a significant amount to our little subdivision. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you ma'am. Next up will be Cliff Kurrus, and after that, Kathy Thayer, T-H-A-Y-E-R.

Kurrus: My name is Cliff Kurrus. I've been designated by the president of our association to talk. And being in the unincorporated area of 63011, I prefer to use Manchester instead of Ballwin. My wife and I live in Mason Green Condominiums. We are on the north side of Manchester, behind the commercial area there, just west off Mason Road. Our west boundary is the shopping center with Wal-Mart and Home Depot and we adjoin the south boundary of Town and Country. We have 29 units and 49 residents. We have 12 acres of land, no sidewalks, we maintain our streets, maintain our street lighting, take care of our forest. We have two trash collections a week. We maintain our own ponds and grounds. And I am one of the younger members of the condominium, and we don't need Manchester's recreation facilities either. About two years ago, our president of the association wrote a letter to the city of Manchester objecting to a possibility of being annexed by Manchester. That letter was dated November 12, 2002, and our president will send that in a letter to the County Commission here. We are satisfied with St. Louis County. I speak for practically every one of our residents, and we are strongly opposed to the annexation. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up is Kathy Thayer, and after Kathy Thayer will be Grant Leslie.

Thayer: Good evening. I think I'm in the minority here, but I am in support of the annexation. I think from what I understand from listening to the speakers previously, I may be the only one who has spoken who does experience both inside and outside of Manchester. I was born and raised in unincorporated north St. Louis County. Lived there for about 25 years, moved to Manchester in 1986. Moved outside of Manchester, just outside the city limits in 1991 to build a different house. I was annexed into the city of Manchester, again, in '97. Moved out again in December of last year, and now I'm part of the proposed annexation area. So I can definitely speak to both sides of the unincorporated St. Louis County issue versus Manchester. And I can tell you that everything in my experience that Manchester had on its side in terms of services to the residents is very much true. The response time for the police is much faster in the city of Manchester. The St. Louis County officers are great officers, don't get me wrong, but the Manchester officers are there not only in a quicker response time, but they are also more readily accessible. I can call their business office at any time with a question. I raised two teenagers in Manchester, I certainly had a lot of curfew questions, and they would send an officer to my house to talk to me if one was available and not on an emergency call. The city officials were also very responsive. There were two aldermen who live in the area who are responsive at all times. The subdivision that I lived in was privately maintained prior to the annexation and after the city of Manchester took over that subdivision, the assessment fees were decreased by 60 percent as Manchester took over the subdivision lighting and all the snow removal and maintenance. I again saw Manchester grow, so I've been on the other side of the annexation as a Manchester city resident when the 1999 annexation occurred. And I had my concerns about, you know, how was it going to affect me as a Manchester resident now. Are my services going to be diluted as a result of the annexation? And I can tell you that they were not. In fact, they stayed exactly the same, if not increased. The area that was annexed in '97 included the subdivision called Big Bend Woods which was right next to my development. And that's the streets in Big Bend Woods were in horrible disrepair until Manchester took over that area during the annexation and they immediately, and I mean within the first three months, starting repairing and improving those streets. So I have seen a definite difference in the maintenance of Manchester city streets versus St. Louis County. Again, I think the benefits of

Manchester are local representation, the much quicker response time by the police department and much better, in my opinion, street maintenance and repairs. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you ma'am. Next up is Grant Leslie, and after Mr. Leslie will be Bruce Heintz H-E-I-N-T-Z. Sir.

Leslie: I'm Grant Leslie. I live in Lochhaven subdivision. I've been out here for 38 years. You ask how many times this has been brought up. I've been ... in 38 years I can recall at least twice, if not three times that we have been proposed to be annexed. And each time, needless to say, it's been turned down. Unless things have changed in the past 30 days, I asked one of the county officers who dispatches for Manchester. They checked it out, come to find out, Ballwin does. So anybody in Manchester, if you want a cop, it's got to be dispatched apparently, through Ballwin. When I call for a county police in unincorporated, I talk to the horse's mouth. This is what I want. Talk about road repair, I drive a Ford pickup, a 250, and I invite any of you to take a vehicle other than your pleasure car and go bounce through Country Lane Woods to see what kind of road repair there's been. Well, I don't go through Country Lane Woods anymore. I'm scared of it, because it's as rough as my roads on my farm out in the country. I think the sign of the show of hands pretty well spoke the whole story tonight. I'm going to keep it short, and I'm going to say, if it ain't broke, why try to fix it? And why try to fix it with something less? Gentlemen, thank you all very much.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up is Bruce Heintz, H-E-I-N-T-Z. Mr. Heintz, are you here? Raise your hand if you could let me know. Okay, moving on. Next up then will be Mayor David Karney, I believe of Town and Country. Sir, are you here? There you are. And after Mayor Karney will be Arthur Beckman.

Karney: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. Thank you for having this public hearing. Thirteen years ago I sat in an audience just like you all because I lived in an area that was going to be annexed. And through diligence and a lot of studying and a lot of communication, we all learned a lot. A year later we voted to be annexed. Six months later, I ran for office. I've been an elected official for 12 years, I'm not an engineer. Town and Country does not provide trash pick up so you don't want to be annexed by us. It's very important, I believe, to have local government. It is more responsive, the city hall is closer. St. Louis County does an incredible job. I don't want to say anything bad about St. Louis County. The elected officials are outstanding people, and their staff are very professional. Smaller is better. I've worked with the Manchester mayor for many years. I've worked with all of the emergency services. I'm chairman of the 9-1-1 dispatch centers for all of St. Louis County. It's an excellent partnership. It works. We are all very receptive to the people. In Town and Country, when I was annexed into this area, we were serviced by St. Louis County. We had good police protection, but when we were annexed into Town and Country, we had better police protection. Manchester has an outstanding department. It works hard, they're very professional, they're responsive. All of you people who have apprehension, I don't blame you. All I can say is that I hope the Boundary Commission allows the people to decide what they want to do. And to all you people, read all the information, study the work, communicate with the elected officials, don't listen to hearsay. Any municipality government has hearsay that overbears the true facts. If you want the facts, go to city hall. Thank you very much and have a great evening.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up is Arthur Beckman, and after Mr. Beckman will be Steve Hoven.

Beckman: I'm Arthur Beckman, the president of the board of directors for Ridgeview Condominiums. The majority of our owner/residents do not want to be annexed by the city of Manchester. We will receive very ... no services except once a week trash collection. We now have twice a week. And will see no benefits from the annexation. If there is some way that the Commission can carve out the condominiums ... the Ridgeview Condominiums, from this annexation, we'd appreciate you looking at that. But we do ... we want to remain in unincorporated St. Louis County. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up is Steve Hoven and then Michael Flynn.

Hoven: Thank you members of the committee. My name is Steve Hoven. I live in Ridgemont Subdivision, and I do appreciate your time. I know you are volunteering here tonight, so thank you so much. I just really like to make a few statements about tonight's event. Number one, it's very, very clear, Manchester, this is greed. There's no question, it's greed, it's money. The motivation behind this is strictly coming from Manchester, not to help us as residents, but to help themselves. This was driven by Manchester. There was no poll come to me and say, "Do you want to be a member of Manchester or any other community, or would you like to stay part of St. Louis County?" This is something that Manchester felt they needed the dollars, and they've come out and reached our group and now it's trying to sell this to us, and it's disappointing you would take these efforts. We have a good, effective and efficient county government. I don't need more levels of government. I don't need more government, period. And I don't need to pay more taxes. I think we've all learned in this community, in this region, that we have enough government. And we have a very good county government. It's been recognized many times. St. Louis County has treated me, personally, very well. I'm extremely pleased with our county services. Our county parks, Love Park, Queeny Park are second to none. I don't even know the name of the Manchester park and preferably right now I don't want to go to a Manchester park. We also have good county police and county maintenance of our roads. I live in Ridgemont, and I don't know about the demographics, but ... or the terrain, but we do have problems with our roads. Since I've lived there 12 years, the county has come and made sure our roads were brought back to new. I don't think Manchester has that in their budget to do that. So who gains? Well, it's simple, Manchester, to a tune of \$2.9 million. Who loses? St. Louis County to a tune of \$1.5 million and us as residents, who have to pay more, for a bigger government, that we have not even asked for. We should probably be here today talking to Manchester residents and asking them, "Do you want to become part of ... lose saved dollars and become part of St. Louis County Government again?" I ask two ... there are two formal comments I would like to make. First, I would ask the city leaders of Manchester to respect us residents of our unincorporated County and remove your request to be for this money grab. Secondly, I would also like to ask you as members of the Boundary Commission to save our public dollars. You've heard our comments, you don't need to send this to a vote, save everyone's time. We don't need another campaign. Please, let's move on and let us live and be part of St. Louis County government. Thank you again.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up is Michael Flynn. Michael Flynn, last call Michael Flynn. Okay. Next up is Maryann Mace, M-A-C-E. Maryann Mace, are you here? Nope. All right. Next up then will be Chuck Bono. Mr. Bono, are you here? All right. Chuck Bono is up, and after Mr. Bono will be Rick Bender. Mr. Bender, are you here? Just so I know, okay. Thank you, sir.

Bono: I'm a 28-year resident of the area. I've lived in Country Lane Woods, Dougherty Estates and a half-mile up the road here in Dietrich Oaks. I am a CPA, an MBA and I was a CFO of a public held company, and I understand analyzing numbers. But after listening to all of the numbers tonight, I remain confused and undecided about the financial impact on me

personally. I understand that there are some things I'm going to gain. I understand that there are some things I'm going to lose. But if somebody asked me to put it on paper and prove that it's going to help me or hurt me, I can't do it. And as I look around I see an awful lot of people with the same hair color I do, and I'm guessing, not all of them are CPAs and MBAs, so I'm guessing that there is still some financial confusion on what the individual impact is to each of us. If there could be an executive summary, a one-page summary of what the impact is on each household for all of these taxes, I think it would be very useful, and I remain undecided. Thank you.

Chair: All right, thank you, sir. Next up is Rick Bender. And after Mr. Bender it will be Gary Jacks.

Bender: Thank you. I appreciate you being here tonight. And it's a good open forum. I am in favor of annexation by Manchester. I have been a trustee in two different developments, both in unincorporated St. Louis County and as a trustee representing hundreds of people that lived in developments, I've had the occasion to call St. Louis County on numerous occasions to ask from the simple question to the most difficult, and it is very difficult process to get through St. Louis County government. I'm sorry. I have had opportunities to work with policemen and I have the utmost respect for the St. Louis County Police Department, but not for county government. I have talked to people who live in Manchester. I heard people speak tonight who talk about smaller representation, and I look forward to that very much. I have lived in other states, other cities in this country, and I have always found smaller cities to be more responsive and for some reason, I always get elected to be trustee of these little municipalities, and so I have some knowledge of that. Secondarily, as I've been through some of the financials ... and again, I do find it confusing, but trying to do it myself based upon the information that I have available to me, I think I save money. I'm not an accountant, either, but I think I'm pretty good with numbers. I find myself to save a little bit of money. Last, but not least, we will receive services from Manchester that we don't get from St. Louis County. We are a private street, a private section and St. Louis County will not take our streets. The developer made it private, don't know why he did. St. Louis County will not take over the maintenance of our streets, Manchester will. Yes, they will ... I have it in writing.

[background conversations]

Chair: Uh, uh, uh . . .

Bender: Sorry, I have it in writing.

Chair: Just stick to the comments.

Bender: Four years ago when I talked to the man ... two weeks ago and he is willing to sign it again. Facts. Don't listen to what people tell you, get facts for yourself. I've got the letters in writing, and I will respectfully submit to you, please put this to a vote. I don't find, or I don't know, but people tell me is not necessarily a representative group, let the people decide. Thank you very much.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up is Gary Jacks, and after Mr. Jacks will be John Wootten, W-O-O-T or L-E-N.

Wootten: Wootten, as in, I wouldn't do it.

Chair: Thank you.

Jacks: Good evening and thank you for this opportunity. I want to encourage the Boundary Commission to let this come to a vote. I'm in favor of it, but win or lose, I think that all of the people are entitled to have a vote on this and be the ultimate authority. As far as that pocket along Barrett Station Road goes, I understand you have the power to adjust the area. And if that's really a problem to you, then I would ask you to make an adjustment to the proposed boundaries to take care of that. You can address it. And I want to address police protection, that's an important issue to me. The county police say their average response time is four and a half minutes. Now I only have a little statistics, but as best I can tell, that means that there are crime scenes somewhere else before the crimes occur, because their average response time in the Braeshire subdivision is 20 minutes, and that includes four one ... excuse me, 9-1-1 calls from multiple residents with teenagers fighting in the street using garden implements. And the only reason nobody was hurt was that when all the residents came out of the house, the kids ran. Twenty minutes after the calls were placed, two police officers showed up. By then, the kids were over at the high school, Parkway South, fighting. And so then they had to drive over there. Now they say they have eight officers and figuring 24 hours a day, seven days a week, you need about eight officers to cover one beat allowing for vacations and sick days and so forth. And they say they have one officer in the proposed annexation area at all times. Now two ... roughly two weeks ago my mailbox met an untimely demise at the hand of a baseball bat and the officer that responded to the call told me they had to come from the other side of Highway 44. Now the only way into Braeshire subdivision is off Manchester Road, so that's a long run, and I don't want to wait 30 minutes in an emergency because the only officer available is on the other side of Highway 44. No Manchester officer is going to be on the other side of Highway 44. As I say, I've never seen them respond in less than 20 minutes into my subdivision, no matter what, 9-1-1 call or otherwise. As far as other county services, we have a creek that crosses under a road, and in this area, the County Highway Department is responsible for those storm water run-off creeks, not MSD. The culvert developed a leak and the water was coming out underneath the pipe. Now the pipe used to be large enough in diameter that I could squat down and walk through it. To repair that leak, the County filled it in and put a smaller diameter pipe, without regard to the possible consequences. The consequences were that in '93, which you all remember was a very wet year, the house next to the creek had several feet of water in it because the water could not get through that smaller diameter pipe.

Chair: That's. . .

Jacks: Thank you.

Chair: Thanks for your time. Next up, Mr. Wootten. And after that will be Gary Hoeferkamp. We're into the home stretch, folks.

Wootten: Thank you. I'm also in favor of taking this to a vote. I live in ... I'm a resident of Dietrich Ridge subdivision across the road here. We have a very nice subdivision, but we do have a private road. That private road has been refused service by St. Louis County. And we do have documentation that says Manchester will take it ... take our street lights and provide the services we need. Besides that, I am a retired president of a company and I am an engineer and I've done the math, and it ... my costs will go down if we are part of the annexation. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up is Gary Hoeferkamp. And after Mr. Hoeferkamp will be Michael Pfister.

Hoeferkamp: Hi. Gary Hoeferkamp, I'm a resident of Country Lane Woods in the city of Manchester. We were annexed in 1999 and I started living there in '97. So I had two years before the annexation and some of the marked improvements and services that I saw were tree trimming along the street, the snow removal, the street slab and sidewalk replacement. Someone else had mentioned the roads in Country Lane aren't the greatest. You should have seen them before. It's a 35-year-old subdivision, and they are making definite improvements. Police coverage has increased. The street sweeping, I don't recall seeing that in the past. The tree limb removal program with the chipping, the assistance with neighbors not keeping up their property. Perhaps St. Louis County does that, but I know the city of Manchester helps out with that. The coordination of subdivision trustees, and I also feel an identity with the city. Whether it's Manchester or some other municipality that I didn't feel as being in an unincorporated pocket. And also the local planning and zoning control ... in the middle of the subdivision, it doesn't affect me as much, but I know some of the other residents, especially along Dietrich at Manchester, might be more affected by that. And to the County I would ask, I don't know if you had heard from any residents that complained after being annexed in '97 or '99, but the people that I'm aware of are happy with it as am I.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up will be Michael Pfister. And then after Mr. Pfister we will have Mr. Mange, Mr. Dooley, and last the Mayor of Manchester, Larry Miles. So Michael Pfister. Michael Pfister going once, going twice. Okay. Well, Mr. Mange, you're up now. And welcome to the Boundary Commission, sir.

Mange: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you for having this meeting and having us here. I just want to go over a couple of points real quick. Number one, in my estimation, nobody in St. Louis County provides better police service than St. Louis County. Nobody provides better local public service than St. Louis County. We do it well, we do it professionally. We do it well. Second point is, relative to the representation. I represent 150,000 people and aldermen represent 3,000 people, but ... I will match our response to St. Louis County to complaints against any municipality in St. Louis County. Our professional staff is there to respond to citizen complaints. And if those complaints aren't issued, then they call my office and we address those complaints. I have been a councilman for three years now and I have had no complaints regarding the service that we have provided. We have addressed consistently all of the issues that have been brought forward to us. We don't need another layer of government. There is no such thing as free trash. They pay for it out of their general revenue, and trash costs are going up. They know that. Everybody knows that. The costs are going up every day for trash pickup and sooner or later they are going to have to go back to the voters or back to the city and ask for more taxes to cover increased trash costs. There is no free trash pickup. Trash companies get paid one way or another, direct or indirect. The last thing I really want to zero in, however, is under Section 72403.3 of the Code talks about the Commission has to find three things. You have to make a physical finding of three things. You have to find that this annexation is the best interest of the city of Manchester. Well, it's pretty easy to say that when they are going to get tremendous amount of revenue as a direct result of it. But you also must find that it's in the best interest of the people in the unincorporated area being annexed. And I will ask you to think about the commercial owners. They don't have a vote. You all are the voters for the commercial property owners in the area being annexed 'cause they are not registered voters. Think about the impact on those businesses along Manchester Road with increased personal property tax, with increased property tax, with increased sales tax, with increased business and license fees, all of that is going to be levied unto those businesses along there and that is not in their best interest. And certainly then, I believe you can make a very good argument, that it's not in the best interest of the area being

annexed. But the third one, is it the best interest in the people that are left behind? Just look at that map up there. All of that blue area, plus the white to the north and south is what is currently unincorporated. The city of Manchester has reached out and grabbed the heart of that area. They've gone down Manchester Road and taken all of the commercial, all of the industrial, all of the strong tax base and have grabbed it and ripped the heart right out of that area. And what's left? Just residential areas with very little tax base. That's not in the best interest of those residents left behind in the unincorporated area, and by basis of that alone it should not even be allowed to go to a vote. They have just taken the heart out of that area, and I just believe that it's incumbent upon you all to see that ... and you're the voter. Those people don't have a vote either. The people who live north and the people who live south along that thin strip, they don't have a vote either. You are the voters for those people. You are the voters for the commercial property within district. And I just urge you to vote against this annexation and not permit it to go to a vote. Thank you, sir.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Next up the County Executive, Mr. Dooley. Welcome to the Commission, sir.

Dooley: Good evening to all of you, to the ladies and gentlemen of the Planning Commission, to all the constituency. Tonight, I really had a very encouraging time. We talk about local government and I think this was local government at its best, giving people the opportunity to address their concerns. There's a couple of things I think that need to be brought up. First of all, Skip Mange and I both are from municipalities. We both were mayors of municipalities. So I truly understand that concept, but what you won't hear is that you never hear about a municipality talking about the economy of scales with each other. If it's such a great idea, it's such a wonderful thing, then why don't more municipalities join together and say, "Let's put together and make it an economy of scales?" That does not happen. Secondly, I think it's important to understand that the people here in unincorporated St. Louis County ... they are at a tremendous disadvantage. Municipalities can urge and encourage a lot of things, but those individuals in the unincorporated St. Louis County ... they don't have that opportunity from the viewpoint that they want to be left alone. Well, city ... the city government itself can petition you. But in order for unincorporated County to do it, on a consistent basis, all the time, becomes an effort because what happens if, for example, if the unincorporated areas say no to annexation at a vote? In two years the municipality can bring it right back again. And the whole concept is, we're going to bring it back at you, time and time again until we wear you down. And that is unfair to unincorporated St. Louis County. If they really were interested, they would have a list of petitions to that city, this is not the case. So I implore you to understand that concept. They are at the mercy of the municipalities in this respect. The other thing is I think is important, and I think it's unfortunate, but County does not want to get put in a position where they are against the municipalities and against the County. That is not a great thing to be in that position. They put us in that position because we have respect for the ... for those municipalities that can provide services with those municipalities. It's not about us and them, it's about us as a community. And to put a municipality in comparison to the County services is unfortunate, because they cannot compare. It's different, but yes, this County does provide quality, municipal services. And we took a roll count just earlier, it's not scientific, it's not rocket science stuff, 90 percent of the individuals raised their hands. And what I'm interested in is those individuals that live in an unincorporated area. It's not that ... what happens to the incorporated areas, it's those individuals in these seats tonight in unincorporated areas. The city has already got what they want, and for us to say that we got the best thing going in our municipality, it is not necessarily true. You can find good points and bad points in all areas. I'm quite sure you could find someone in the municipalities that can say the same thing that you can say in unincorporated

areas. So I implore you this evening, if you listen to those individuals that's immediately affected by this change, your vote would be no. Thank you for your time.

Chair: Thank you, sir. Larry Miles, Mayor of the city of Manchester.
Welcome to the Boundary Commission, sir.

Miles: Thank you, ladies and gentlemen. I guess I'm here for the rebuttal of a whole bunch of things that have hit ... that you have heard tonight. First I would like to clear up one thing that was talked about is the northern area up there in the northern part of our area towards Clayton Road. I talked to the former mayor of Town and Country, and he agreed that he wanted those three subdivisions up there. They were very well, big homes, beautiful places, but he wanted ... and most of those people up there think they belong to Town and Country, so that was one reason why we never went north, any farther than what we did. The area to our east, towards the creek and Barrett Station Road, there's a fire district dispute there between Des Peres Fire Department and West County Fire Department on who's collecting the taxes. And I believe that if we would annex that area they would have a dispute over what fire department should have to pay for what area and who would collect the taxes. That was one of the reasons why Des Peres wanted to stop at the creek. As I heard, two aldermen wanted to stop at the creek, two of them were okay with the road, at Barrett Station Road. But the reason we stopped at the creek is because that was the farthest to the west that they wanted to go. So that's why we stopped at the creek. We weren't trying to make a pocket there for the St. Louis County Department to have to put services in there. That was not our intention, it was the fire district's problems. And we never wanted to get into a dispute with the fire departments.

Secondly, we had police grants. We had 18 officers we hired back in 2001 or 2000, '97 and '99. And we've run out of those grants, and we still have those police officers. We have around 39 to 41 officers on staff. And dispatching ... we do dispatch from Ballwin, but we save between \$200 and \$250,000 a year because their dispatching cost is cut in half because we are paying for part of it. So instead of each of us paying a half million dollars a year to have dispatching departments, we go in partnership with them on that and they charge us and they pay the rest of their balance. So we both make out. Ballwin saves about \$250,000 a year, and we save \$250,000 a year by sharing that dispatching services, and that's what we partnership with a lot of things like that. I'd like to say one thing, this area down Manchester Road, there are places in there ... my personal bank account that I have, they use Manchester, Missouri, and they are on Weidman and Manchester Road. That's their return address. And there's a lot of other businesses that I get circulars from they say they are in Manchester, and they're not in Manchester. They are down on Manchester Road, going east. So, I think a lot of people think that they are in the Manchester area, and they'd like to be because why would a company say, we're in Manchester and put out a big pamphlet if they weren't in Manchester? I mean, they consider themselves to be part of Manchester.

As for this, a \$200,000 home pays \$19 and this one gentleman says "Well, why don't Manchester give us a rebate?" Well if he's only paying us \$19 a year, how much rebate does he expect to get? I mean, it's some of those things are just pulling out of the air. Another point that I would like to make is the ... if this annexation passes, we will ... our Board has agreed that we would have another ward. And we will appoint two aldermen out of that ward until the next election. So they would have representation the first time that we took over this area. There would be no un-representation people at all. They would be represented immediately. And most of our wards are around 6,000 people, okay. And this is around 5,700, so it will work out just right. We probably wouldn't have to readjust our wards at all. We'd just appoint two more aldermen until the next election and then they'd be elected.

I have one other point, that Manchester has a proud past and a bright future, and we hope you recognize that and give us a chance to have an election after your answer. Thank you. I appreciate your time. Thank you.

Chair: Thank you, Mayor. That concludes the public speaker portion of this meeting. I believe it also concludes this meeting. Folks, thank you for coming, grateful for your attendance. Good night.

[end of tape]

Approved: November 16, 2004