

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

**TRANSCRIPT OF MAP PLAN PUBLIC HEARING
CITY OF BRIDGETON, CITY OF HAZELWOOD, & ST. LOUIS COUNTY**

September 26, 2006

COMMISSION ATTENDANCE:

Commissioners	Present (P)/Absent (A)
Matt Armstrong	A
Ted Armstrong	P
Christine Bredenkoetter	P
Bob Ford	P
Frank Kenney	P
Greg Kloeppe	P
Betty Marver	P
Mary Schuman	P
Johnnie Spears	P
Edward Thibeault	P
Don Wojtkowski	A

OTHERS PRESENT:

Michelle Dougherty, Executive Director
David Hamilton, Legal Counsel

CALL TO ORDER

Vice Chair Spears: Good evening. Welcome to the St. Louis County Boundary Commission public hearing. Tonight's public hearing is an informational hearing providing an opportunity for municipalities of St. Louis County to explain submitted map plans. Public comments should be directed towards the map plans. Discussion tonight ... the commission staff is available to answer questions before and after the meeting.

The Boundary Commission is the independent government body that reviews boundary change proposals in St. Louis County. The Commission is derived from the state statute in St. Louis County ordinance. Eleven commissioners serve with two staff members, an executive director, and legal counsel. The Boundary Commission meets monthly. Public hearings are scheduled to consider map plans and boundary change proposals. In brief, the Boundary Commission works in two stages. We have what we call the map plan and the proposal plan.

The map plan is a plan that is set up by state statute that runs in five-year increments. And we are beginning our second five-year plan where any municipality wishing to change their boundaries must submit a map plan, and we must hold a public hearing within a certain time span. The commission is not required to act upon this map plan. Later on, if a municipality wants to submit a proposal, then that's when the commission is required to really act upon the proposals and go into other information.

The commission is appointed by St. Louis County joint committee and a committee of the Municipal League and by the municipalities based on population size. They gather cross reference from ... throughout St. Louis County.

One of the ... they always ask, "What is the role of the Boundary Commission?" The primary role of the Commission is to review proposals from municipalities to county or county residents seeking various types of boundary changes of area holding a portion within the county.

Another question, "Who defines the work of the Boundary Commission?" The work of the Boundary Commission is defined by the state legislature and is found in Chapter 72.400-72.423 RS Missouri.

I'd like to go around the table and introduce the commissioners. Frank.

Kenney: I'm Frank Kenney, I'm mayors of large cities representative.

Thibeault: I'm Ed Thibeault, representing municipalities of over 30,000 people.

Schuman: My name is Mary Schuman, and I was appointed by a joint committee of St. Louis County and Municipal League.

Bredenkoetter: I'm Christine Bredenkoetter, and I'm a large cities representative.

Marver: I'm Betty Marver, appointed by the executive county director.

Spears: And I'm Johnnie Spears, first-vice chairman appointed by the St. Louis County Joint Committee.

Armstrong: I'm Ted Armstrong, and I represent small cities in St. Louis County.

Ford: I'm Bob Ford; I was appointed by the County Executive.

Kloepfel: I'm Greg Kloepfel, and I was appointed by the St. Louis County Executive.

Spears: Tonight we'll be reviewing presentations of Bridgeton and the City of Hazelwood. Each city will be given 15 minutes to give their proposals, whereas ... followed by questions from the Boundary Commissioners.

St. Louis County will give their proposal, and then we will go into public comments. First on the agenda we have presentation by the city of Bridgeton.

Haun: Good evening, my name is Tom Haun, and I serve the city of Bridgeton as the Administrative Assistant to the mayor. We have a strong mayor. I received a letter with eight points of information that you'd like me to talk about on the ... on a map plan that the city of Bridgeton submitted ... I guess it was in May, 2006.

I'll just go through your list ... the list of questions real quick, and it probably won't take the full 15 minutes, but ... you want to know what the city's criteria ... "What were your city's criteria for including this area?" This is just a small history. A couple of years ago, actually in 2002, 2003, the city was approached by the Greater River Greenway District with an intention to spend some of the tax money that they'd been collecting on a pilot project on a trail head at the old Missouri River Bridge, at the Route 115.

A citizen's committee was formed and discussed and came up with a plan that Greenway wanted to do. The plan was presented to the park board of the City of Bridgeton, and they made a recommendation to the city council to accept the plan for a walking/biking trail between the Earth City Levee and the Missouri River, with parking and some lookouts over the river, and the City of Bridgeton found this quite attractive.

As a result of this, the Greater River Greenway District through Missouri Department of Natural Resources presented the city of Bridgeton with 123 acres, plus or minus, of land to do this project on. Some of it was in Bridgeton, but it extended along the levee between the river and the Blanchette Bridge, which consumed 123 acres of unincorporated St. Louis County.

Since the project was initially proposed, Greater Rivers Greenway has got the funds. They let the bids, and they're starting construction of the project. That's our interest in Earth City. That's it right now. Of course, you have your regulations regarding the requirement for the map plan, if a municipality ever intends to annex an area of unincorporated county or change its boundaries. Bridgeton may see the need in the future to include the park in its jurisdictional boundaries within the corporate limits of Bridgeton, obviously our agreement with the Greater Rivers Greenway requires Bridgeton to maintain and provide security for this park. We have to do that in cooperation with the St. Louis County police and other things now, but it may be in the best interest to absorb that particular 123 acres into the corporate limits of Bridgeton.

Point number two has phasing ... "The order in which a municipality would proceed with specific proposals within the map plan boundaries been considered?" No, we have not considered a timetable or phasing in which to maybe proceed with the intention of annexing this particular area. The map was drawn to include the entire area simply to put forth the requirement with the map plan that should this council or any following councils ever see reason to make another attempt to annex Earth City, the map plan is included and is on file. There's no intention to proceed with any incorporation of Earth City area, other than maybe the possibility of 123 acres. So there's no phasing, and there's no plan and no timetable at this time to go after any part of Earth City.

Number four, "Why is it important for your city to implement various components of your plan?" I think I've pretty well laid that out with the ... our partnership with the Greater River Greenway District. There's really nothing else to say on that.

"Why is your city the best community to serve this area?" Obviously we own the land, and we're in the business to provide public services, including this park.

"What advantages do you offer the residents of this area?" There are no residents, so there's really no one to satisfy or displease in the category of residents. There are, of course, corporate businesses ... a lot of businesses and a lot of property owners in that area, but we have no intention at this time to file for any annexation involving any other property owners in the city of Bridgeton. There are no arguments to make ... support of my proposal to residents, since there are no residents.

"Has there been any expressed interest by the residents of the area in your map plan?" Other than the Greenway District, placing so many requirements or ... asking us to be the ombudsmen and provide maintenance and security for that park, no. The council has passed a resolution on ... I believe it was May 3, 2006, supporting the map plan with the primary interest being the 123 acres that belongs to the city of Bridgeton which will be the Riverwoods Trail Park, and it's almost under construction. They've just let and awarded the bids for the construction of the park.

The only other whereas is that ... if the City Council or future City Councils would be denied the right to pursue a proposal for annexation of Earth City unless we had the map plan on file through 2011.

That's basically my presentation.

Vice-Chair Spears: Thank you. Questions from the commissioners starting to my right.

Kenney: Just so I understand ... the real focus of your map plan was the 123 acres of this green park area?

Haun: Yes.

Kenney: But you also included in your map plan ...

Haun: The entire unincorporated area.

Kenney: The entire unincorporated area of Earth City?

Haun: Yes.

Thibeault: I have no questions at this point.

Schuman: Now I want to make sure I understand too. So the city of Bridgeton owns the 123 acres?

Haun: That is correct.

Schuman That was given to you by the Greater Rivers ... Great Rivers ...

Haun: It was given to us by Missouri Department of Natural Resources who received it from the Ford Motor Company, and there's a stipulation that that land could only be used for park land purposes, which we intend to keep and honor.

Schuman: Okay, so when I'm looking at this map ... the 123 acres is the land between the levee and the ...

Haun: And the river.

Schuman: Okay. So ...

Haun: And that can vary depending upon flood stage you know.

Schuman So ... I guess my thing is ... if the city of Bridgeton is proposing a map plan because they are ... with the main focus being those 123 acres, those are not contiguous to the city of Bridgeton.

Haun: They are on the north end of it, yes.

Schuman: Oh, up on the north end?

Haun: Yes. We own that property in white.

Schuman: Up here?

Haun: Yes, all ... that's all Bridgeton ...

Schuman: And over here?

Haun: Right. So this ...

Schuman: So Earth City is right there in the middle?

Haun: Correct.

Bredenkoetter: I don't have any questions right now, thanks.

Marver: I'm just curious how you see ... if you do not get approval for this ... how do you see this being managed and what would be the collaboration with the three units ... be the county, you and the Green trail ... the Green River ...?

Haun: Well the Greenway people is a turn-key operation. They complete the park and they turn it over, so it's strictly between the city of Bridgeton, who will maintain the grounds and then provide security. If there is any major incidents, we'll; of course, we'll have to work with the county police.

Marver: Thank you.

Vice-Chair Spears: I have no questions.

Armstrong: Will you show me on this map where the 123 acres is?

Haun: It runs from the Earth City levee to the river ... this section there.

Armstrong: Is this the river?

Haun: Yes. That's the river in white. There's the key ...

Armstrong: What is this line out here?

Haun: That's the center line for the county ... between St. Louis County and St. Charles County.

Armstrong: In the middle of the river?

Haun: Far as I know, I [Inaudible].

Armstrong: So the piece ... the 123 runs from the high water mark, I guess that is, to the ... is it to the edge of the levee?

Haun: As far as I know, yes sir. I don't have the specific land descriptions with me. This key right here ... points to this land as the 123 ...

Armstrong: This strip right here?

Haun: Right.

Armstrong: I don't recall the requirements. See if maybe you do ... of the amount of contiguous touching between the unincorporated ... the area to be annexed and the city ... what is that relationship?

David Hamilton: Fifteen percent.

Armstrong: Fifteen?

David Hamilton: Yes. So the area ... the area being annexed, must be 15 percent contiguous with the existing boundaries in the city of Bridgeton. So it looks to me like ... I haven't done

calculation ... but they have to phase in even the 123 acres probably. Yeah, because the area of contiguity doesn't appear to me to more than probably two or three percent, five percent ...

Armstrong: That's precisely the point I wanted to make to you. That will be a problem for you, because the statute requires that we have that kind of contiguous nature of the parcel to be annexed. So keep that in mind as you ...

Haun: I will write it down, sir. Thank you.

Armstrong: You want to study that, I think, and try to figure out how to handle that if that ... if that is your intent later on. That's the only question I have.

Spears: Commissioner Ford.

Ford: Just so I understand, the map plan goes up to the edge of the river, or does it go out to the center of the river like St. Louis County?

Haun: Where the county line is ... I don't precisely know where that is, whether it's ...

Ford: You're going all the way to the county line?

Haun: Yes.

Ford: Okay. Thank you.

Kloeppel: I just have one question ... how would this proposal affect Bridgeton one way or the other if we approve it or not approve it? What position would Bridgeton be in differently if it was approved or not approved? I don't see a difference in your position.

Haun: Well primarily, it's just jurisdictional, as far as enforcement of laws ... of our ordinances in this particular area that we're maintaining and providing security for ... it's an important thing. If our police are going to be down there, and we have ... we can set the hours of the park to be open and closed, but we also have other ordinances considering littering and trespassing and things like that that would have to be ... that we would like to see enforced by our own entity.

Kloeppel: Thank you.

Bredenkoetter: So can I ask ... so basically your issue is that in order to get to what ... to where the park is ... you're going to have to go through unincorporated St. Louis County?

Haun: No.

Bredenkoetter: To get ...

Haun: The entrance to the park will be in Bridgeton.

Bredenkoetter: Okay.

Haun: In this area here, right off the Missouri Bottom feed in to St. Charles Rock Road.

Bredenkoetter: Okay. All right.

Haun: And please understand that there is no proposal in front of you now to do this. This is one of the reasons why the map plan was put together for you.

Bredenkoetter: Okay.

Vice Chair Spears: Any other questions? Thank you, sir. Next on the agenda we have a presentation by the City of Hazelwood.

Carlstrom: My name is Ed Carlstrom. I'm the city manager in Hazelwood. It's nice to come before this commission where Bridgeton and Hazelwood isn't going after the same property. [Laughter]. During the 1990's, we had quite an ordeal there between the two cities. Well we're friendly ... it's just that I'd like to not have competition with Bridgeton again.

So basically I'm here to talk about an area ... and I want to make a note for the record that the maps that I forwarded down to ... your staff here today is the maps that I'm talking about tonight. This is the maps that I really started back in 1990. I brought it to the Boundary Commission sometime in the nineties and submitted it last time for the five-year plan, which the chairman had pointed out five years ago, and I'm submitting it again, and that's the plan that the City of Hazelwood is wanting to do. And the reason for that is ... this is an area that is really staying out of the airport directly, and it really is an unincorporated pocket south of the City of Hazelwood.

The City of Hazelwood is around 17 square miles in its present existence. The area that I have in the blue on the southern boundary is the area that I'm talking about, and we refer to it as the south industrial area. In this particular area there is approximately around 170 acres in that area. We ... but of this area, only about 70 acres is really a taxing entity.

History of this particular site ... a lot of this area was owned by the United States Government back in the 1940's when the war was going on and McDonnell Aircraft Corporation used it as ... building aircraft. It's basically on the south side of Banshee and then on the ... later years the Harrier program came in there, and right now, it's really vacant. That land south of Banshee, again, I've looked on the records ... it still says it's kind of owned by McDonnell Douglas, or Boeing as it is right now, but some of that property has really been donated maybe through the airport authority, but anyway, we'll work on those kind of issues when ... if we become serious about this area.

The City of Hazelwood is a type of city, just to get you familiar with Hazelwood, we have around 26,000 people who live in the city, of which we have about 22,000 people that are

employed in the city, and I think that's important. We have also over ... around 1,000 businesses in the City of Hazelwood. So when we talk about ... talking about an area like this, we're not talking about an area that the City of Hazelwood is not familiar with as far as administration of that kind of land use and development ... the future potential development of that area.

Okay Earl. What we use as the city's criteria for including this area in your plan ... the proposed area is directly south of the City of Hazelwood and is part of that unincorporated pocket and north of the St. Louis International Airport. By annexing this pocket, the city boundaries of Hazelwood would be more rounded off and more uniform.

There are no residents in this south industrial area, but there are really ... I put two up there, but really there's one main industrial business really left in this area now, and that is GKN, and actually I worked out an agreement with GKN a couple of years ago to provide the fire service for GKN and I'm charging them right now \$110,000 for that mutual aid agreement, and I provide fire, ambulance, and confinement space rescue service for GKN. Now half of GKN is in the city of Hazelwood, and half of it is in this pocket. And they are very familiar with our operation, and since it was taken over, Boeing has sold that operation to GKN and GKN came to us to help them out, because Boeing's Fire Department wouldn't do this area. So we have a good relationship with GKN.

Again, I kind of gave you a little summary about phasing in ... it's only 170 acres ... this particular area would not be a problem with us extending our boundaries and also extending the services immediately. We have fire, ambulance, police, street department. We also have a parks department, recreation department where any employees or any corporation that is in the City of Hazelwood has a right to rent or utilize our facilities, the same as a residential cost that everybody else enjoys.

I do not have a timetable right now for this, but I am going to definitely consider it within the next five years. It's an area that we feel belongs in the city of Hazelwood, because it is right next to the City of Hazelwood, and it's easy for us to extend our services.

We feel what's important for the city ... or why is it important for us is that ... again, anytime you can extend your services this increases the overall efficiency of government. It's very hard for St. Louis County probably to drive wherever they're coming from to provide police or any kind of support in this area.

Basically, when you have a larger tax base, it also improves the financial capacity of the community, but also this is a very important area that I think has future growth potential if an entity would take some real good time and develop that potential.

"Why is your city the best community to serve this area?" The City of Hazelwood is a charter form government. The mayor ... it's a city-manager form of government, or I wouldn't be up here right now. We have a mayor, elected at large, and we have eight elected officials, and each one of them ... we have eight wards. They're very responsive, and we can take issues up like we have with all of the rest of the corporations that we have in the City of Hazelwood as of right now.

We're used to dealing with industrial problems, helping businesses, and we feel like this is a very logical place for this particular area to belong as part of our community.

"What advantages do we offer the residents of this area?" Or I'm referring to no residences, but also what I consider residents as corporations, we can provide the level of services ... and I've already kind of highlighted some of those. And actually, I think if we work the numbers ... which I have not done in a real detailed form, but I believe if we would annex this area, with the \$110,000 contract we have with GKN right now, I believe that most of this area could be annexed to the city ... probably pretty revenue neutral but, again, I'm not in the area here to talk about all those detail ideas, but I know that we're real close as far as not costing those corporations in that area any additional money.

Again, I would like to highlight that we are providing services for this area. We're charging for that service. I came up with that cost based on the cost of the City of Hazelwood's Fire Department, and my total budget, and then we used an assessment against ... of that around \$1.39 per hundred, based on what was in GKN's area ... not in the City of Hazelwood . They agreed to that plan and that's basically how we've come up with that little mutual aid agreement there.

We would entertain for St. Louis County, if they would be interested, that we could take over that part of Banshee Road that goes through this area, if the St. Louis County would be willing, or if they want to be collaborative in that effort.

GKN approached the city, as I talked, about fire service, and they also brought up at that time about the possibility of arranging for an annexation. But, again, I had not had time to develop this, and with the changes going on on the south part of Banshee Road, there's been so many ... with Boeing having trouble with the aircraft production, and then they were going to give it to the Air National Guard, part of this area ... well the Air National Guard was moved out, and now the Airport Authority has it. We need time to communicate with them and just figure out what we can do on that part of the city. I know they are going to tear down a big part of the boiler rooms ... the boiler that they have over there ... it's a big heating area that's been heating that whole area, and they're going to tear that down actually next week, so it kind of changes the whole configuration of that area.

Again, these are the ones that were in that area ... but, again, that was on the tax rolls that I was given for 2005. There's been some changes in those, and McDonnell Corporation, as my understanding, has really given that land up ... that area up and then given it to the port of the City of St. Louis, but GKN's assessed valuation, which is approximately 43 acres in this area is around \$5 million. Now if McDonnell Douglas Corporation has it done, what I'm hearing they have done ... their assessed valuation in that area is around \$5 million. So when you look at the total assess valuation which is around \$25 million, but the only taxing entity is the two corporations in there around ten million six. That gives you a little idea of what we're doing here, but I believe that McDonnell Corporation is really not operating in this area ... or Boeing.

Again, this is just a summary of some of the things about the City of Hazelwood. I've already gone over them. I just had it in your report just for reference purposes tonight.

That basically finishes my presentation. I appreciate the time that the Boundary Commission has given for us to make a presentation and introduce you to why we believe that this south industrial area really belongs to the. Thank you.

Vice-Chair Spears: Thank you. Questions from my left

Kloeppel: I do have a couple of questions with regard to increasing the efficiency of the services that the city provides to this area. If this proposal does go through, hypothetically, does the city intend to hire any additional police officers to help service this area?

Carlstrom: I don't believe this little area of 170 people will require additional staffing ... additional staffing at this time. Now if we find that there's something unusual there, we'll have to look at it, but based on the surface and our sectors are set up ... we have six sectors ... we think there's not really going to be a big problem of handling this because they're so close already.

Kloeppel: Okay. With regards to the ... "The City of Hazelwood is the only logical city to annex this area ...", what about the city of Berkley? Why wouldn't they be logical?

Carlstrom: Well the reason I ... quite honestly, I changed the map here to get away from ... if you look at the map and look at that map that we originally submitted ... that kind of tails off into Berkley ... I'm trying to stay away from that issue. And this was the map that I've been submitting for the last three times before, so I just want to make sure you're ... you can see that ... if you look at the map I have presented before you tonight, and you look at the map there, I am trying to stay away from Berkeley as far as a conflict that could come up on that. Okay?

Kloeppel: Currently does the charge like a business license fee to businesses located within the city?

Carlstrom: Yes, we do.

Kloeppel: And what is that fee, and how is that based?

Carlstrom: Well based on sales and also the value of machinery and equipment, and we have gone through several modifications of that over the years. There's some caps on how high the machinery and equipment would be assessed at like ... we have a cap maybe no more than \$80 million ... and then I think it's ... I really can't remember that formula, but we do have a manufacturer's license for businesses.

Kloeppel: Is there a way you can provide the commission ...

Carlstrom: I can give you that. Yes.

Kloeppel: Appreciate it. That's all.

Ford: I have no questions, Mr. Chairman.

Armstrong: I'm confused, so help me. I don't quite understand ... I'm looking at your chart here that has the assessed values. I don't understand where the City of St. Louis piece is on the ... included in your proposed area.

Carlstrom: Earl's my planner.

Earl: It's a ... there are some McDonnell Douglas properties in here, but most of this right in here is City of St. Louis property.

Armstrong: So in the area that you've outlined, you've included approximately a third of it is ... more than that ... 40 percent of it is city of ... owned by the city of St. Louis.

Carlstrom: That's correct.

Armstrong: Why have you excluded the rest of the airport?

Carlstrom: Well it's getting away from my boundary there ... that one boundary that comes ... it goes up ...

Armstrong: North/south?

Carlstrom: North/south ... that pink area that comes south there ... I've tried to kind of tail off right there, because I felt like Berkley would have better access to it than the City of Hazelwood, and so that's kind of the way I did that. It's ... it wasn't ... we did stick with boundaries of property owners to come up with our boundary, but it's really ...

Armstrong: Well let me ask you in a different way. Is any of the unincorporated area that's left in that pocket ... the airport ... is any of it taxable?

Carlstrom: No.

Armstrong: Is that perhaps the reason you excluded it?

Carlstrom: No ... well I'll tell you what ... what happens here ... the city of St. Louis and the federal government ... they can have buildings on the property, there's not really a taxation of the property. It depends on who owns the building. If it's owned by private corporations, then there can be a tax on the building. The way that area south of Banshee is kind of set up, it's commingled with United States Government, the city of St. Louis, but yet it's not really part of the airport operation, okay? It's not part of Lambert International, it's like a ...

Armstrong: There are runways that are included in the pieces ... portions of the runway that are included in the area that you proposed there.

Carlstrom: I think I'm out of the runway area. I'm north of the runway area.

Armstrong: Am I looking at the wrong one?

Ford: Yes. That's the ...

Carlstrom: There's a big building located on that, but I'm not ... that runway runs south of that building.

Armstrong: Where is that? ... Wait a minute ... hang on here, just a minute, and let me see if I can get squared off. So they cut out the runway by going up here, is that it?

Ford: Correct.

Bredenkoetter: Does this include the McDonnell ...

Armstrong: And eliminated this?

Carlstrom: That one big building that they used to build ... the harrier ...

Armstrong: Okay. The county map then is not right.

Carlstrom: That is vacant now. There's nobody there.

Armstrong: Okay. I'm trying to ... that's why I'm confused. There are two different maps floating around here. These two maps over here are a prior version? Is that correct?

Carlstrom: Um ...

Armstrong: The annex proposal area on both of those drawings over there is not what you propose?

Carlstrom: No, it's that map right here.

Armstrong: It's this?

Carlstrom: That's it, right there.

Armstrong: And what ... and is this 170 acres?

Carlstrom: Yes, that's 170 acres.

Armstrong: And what portion ... okay ... and you were telling me that this piece down here is the city ... the City of St. Louis?

Earl: There are a few parcels that are McDonnell Douglas' and are [Inaudible - too far from mike] and the majority of that is the city of St. Louis.

Armstrong: Well it looks to me as if what you've done here is to capture the tax revenue portions of the airport, or the surroundings.

Carlstrom: It's not really part of the airport, okay?

Armstrong: That's fair. One of the things that you said was ... that it's hard for the ... for St. Louis County to provide service to the area that you propose ... this area.

Carlstrom: Yeah.

Armstrong: It's also hard to provide service to what's left.

Carlstrom: Yes.

Armstrong: And in fact, it may be complicating their efforts by losing the north portion of it.

Carlstrom: I ... I don't know what Berkley has done at all on the eastern side of it.

Armstrong: I'm interested in St. Louis County.

Carlstrom: Or St. Louis County ... I'm not sure.

Armstrong: Give me the ... tell me what the history ... you ...

Carlstrom: The issue of the city of St. Louis and Hazelwood ... right now we're going what we call the old Robertson area. It's called the Lambert Commerce Center. The city of St. Louis owned a lot of property in there that they purchased under the noise abatement program of 75LDN, airport noise abatement. The City of Hazelwood annexed into that area knowing back in 1975, knowing that the City of St. Louis owned property in the City of Hazelwood, but they had no problem with us doing that, because they were not utilizing that property.

It's pretty hard for the city of St. Louis to operate properties our here in St. Louis County, so it's not really ... I don't want to get too complex about this, but I mean ... whoever owns that property, it could be the City of St. Louis, it could be some other entity, the United States Government, and that doesn't really give ... we can utilize that land as we see fit, it's just that the way the structure is set up, the way the business component would be set up, the way developers would look at it, we would have to adapt to what kind of ownership there is in that area.

Armstrong: That changes the tax impact though, doesn't it?

Carlstrom: Well it really would not receive too much impact as far as revenues off property taxes or personal ... well primarily property taxes in this area ... is almost going to be non-existent anything south of Banshee.

What I'm hoping to do down the road is like ... right now they had Building Number One, which was a huge production site at one time, but we're looking at other ways that we can get corporations to actually build on the property and work with the City of St. Louis, do maybe a 99 lease program ... a 99-year lease for the land, get a per diem. The city can do that, but yet we get a building there that is to be functional. You know, there are a lot of ways we can deal with those kinds of issues. We've done it before, and I know we can do them again.

Armstrong: What's ... give me some of the history. You indicated ... I think you said that this is the third time you filed this plan? Tell me what the history is. I'm not familiar with it.

Carlstrom: I've been a manager in Hazelwood for 28 years, and there's a lot of history that transcends annexation in the city since I've been here, but I ...

Armstrong: I'm interested in ... I'm interested in the history with respect to the area that you are proposing.

Carlstrom: We brought this plan to St. Louis County Boundary Commission when we were trying to annex the western part of the City of Hazelwood and Berk City and basically the Boundary Commission turned us down at that time, and there was a competing ... I believe a competing plan against, for that ... which was, I believe at one time might have been Berkley.

The reason was at that time there was a tremendous amount of manufacturing in that area, because Boeing ... or at that time, McDonnell Aircraft Corporation ... was building airplanes out of that one big hangar there. Since that time, the Boundary Commission thought that we were going to take in too much money based on our manufacturer's license, okay? So we got turned down and really I didn't do anything with it, because we had so much trouble with the other annexations in the time, so ... back in whenever it was ... 1999/2000 where we submitted the first map, I made a presentation that I'd be interested in annexing this area, but I haven't done anything with it, because I think the same issue was going to be there for the City of Hazelwood based on the production that was being there. Okay? Now with the production and the utilization of that not being manufacturing primarily, then I think ... and we made great modifications in our business license ... I believe that this area here, and I believe if you get further into this ... I believe the St. Louis Boundary Commission, maybe St. Louis County might look at this application that it would benefit not only the City of Hazelwood, but also would benefit St. Louis County as a whole, as a community.

Armstrong: Well we'll hear from them, so we'll find out in a few minutes.

Carlstrom: Okay.

Armstrong: Thank you very much.

Vice-Chair Spears: The only question I would have ... along, I guess, Banshee Road, McDonnell Boulevard ... does this boundary proposal go all the way up to the Cold Water Creek? That creek that runs ...

Carlstrom: No, I really wasn't planning on going to ... let me take a look to make sure. No. That boundary ... the City of Hazelwood is really north of the white line there, right now. Okay? So you see the Cold Water Creek coming through in the middle there, and it goes through kind of Hazelwood and it goes through Berkeley?

Vice-Chair Spears: Uh-huh.

Carlstrom: Then that ... my boundary is going right there right now, so that's the reason I came south right there to tie into all this. Okay? Now we're hoping with all of the radioactive material that's been in those two sites north and south of Cold Water Creek ... we feel like there could be some potential construction in that area within the next two or three years, and we think that's going to get cleaned up and ready for construction. Okay? So that is in the City of Hazelwood right now.

Vice-Chair Spears: Okay. Thank you.

Marver: No questions.

Bredenkoetter: I have several questions. First ... I'm sorry ... I'm trying to get my boundaries here. This is McDonnell Boulevard, correct? U.S. 67 McDonnell Boulevard?

Carlstrom: No, that's Lindbergh Boulevard.

Bredenkoetter: This is Lindbergh.

Carlstrom: Yeah.

Bredenkoetter: What's this?

Carlstrom: That's McDonnell.

Bredenkoetter: Okay, so what you're basically proposing in taking all the old ... engineering campus, building 27, building 1, the hangar that you see with the Boeing sign on it as you come into the airport, isn't ... this is the radioactive field, is it not?

Carlstrom: That is correct.

Bredenkoetter: Okay. There is comment being taken right now about that radioactive field, about either totally remediating it, or just putting two foot of dirt on top of it. So how does that influence long-term plans to build on this area, because all of this drains into Cold Water Creek ...

Carlstrom: I wasn't planning on building on the radioactive ... the big pile that is south of McDonnell Boulevard ...

Bredenkoetter: And that's this area here?

Carlstrom: That's a place where there could be some real long-term storage of that material. The two sites north is in Hazelwood right now, it's not very deep and they're cleaning it up. They're working on it right now, and they're giving me 100 percent compliance at some point in time, which they think will be two or three years, but it's nothing ... it's just superficial dirt on the ground and maybe a foot deep or whatever, if that deep, for those two sites to be ready for development, but the other site there, south, that is a huge, long-term ... will be ... it will probably be like that forever. Okay? Now I've dealt with the dirt over on Laddie ...

Bredenkoetter: Right.

Carlstrom: ... and they cleaned that up and moved that over there, but it's just ... it's a long-term process, but we've been dealing with it for years.

Bredenkoetter: I was going to say, because the people with moon suits have been there forever.

Carlstrom: Yeah.

Bredenkoetter: Cleaning that up, so doesn't that ... that radioactive field basically starts about here?

Carlstrom: It's not ... just about.

Bredenkoetter: Isn't this the road that goes under the railroad bridge?

Carlstrom: No, that's Cold Water Creek.

Bredenkoetter: This is the creek. Okay, all right, all right.

Carlstrom: It's just a little bit this way. Okay?

Commissioner: And ... the property that is presently generating revenue along McDonnell Boulevard ...

Carlstrom: Is primarily GKN.

Bredenkoetter: Is primarily ... what about the engineering campus? The computers?

Carlstrom: Well part of that is in the city already, and part of GKN is already in the city.

Bredenkoetter: Right, right.

Carlstrom: So we ... part of the building is in Hazelwood and St. Louis County ... and part of Boeing's Engineering and then part of GKN is in Hazelwood and part of it is in St. Louis County.

Bredenkoetter: All right.

Carlstrom: It's very complex.

Bredenkoetter: Well the only thing I could suggest that would have been nice if you would have labeled a few more things to help people get the perspective of where we are and what's planned.

Carlstrom: Okay.

Bredenkoetter: Okay. Thank you.

Thibeault: I guess I have a question. I can see where Hazelwood would be the beneficiary of incorporating this into your city. Who loses in this process? What is the downside if this were to be granted to Hazelwood?

Carlstrom: Well, I mean. St. Louis County will have ... Glenn will have something here to say on whatever ... but I don't know how St. Louis County is going to look at it. From my standpoint, I really feel like I can benefit those businesses because I can eliminate the \$110,000 ...

END OF SIDE A

SIDE B

Carlstrom: And if I turn that back into the assessed evaluation side and started taxing it, our tax rate, I think I would be very close. Okay? They do not have a very large manufacturing capacity in this area but, again, I really haven't studied every fine detail on that financial side, but I believe that you as a board would make that decision if you thought that anyone was really going to get hurt financially, you wouldn't grant the City of Hazelwood the right to annex this area, but based on my preliminary numbers, I think they'd change enough that it would be beneficiary for both parties. Okay? Both the City of Hazelwood and the businesses in that area.

Thibeault: Have you had any discussions with the city of Berkeley about your intent?

Carlstrom: Not really. I haven't talked to them too much on this.

Thibeault: Thank you.

Kenney: A couple of questions, the original map that you submitted this year, actually includes the larger area and this map two is just a map with regard to the area that you are really serious about. Is that a fair statement?

Carlstrom: I would like to pull off the first map.

Kenney: I understand, but I ... but this is included in map one, but that's what was submitted originally?

Carlstrom: That's correct.

Kenney: Okay. And what you're telling us tonight is that this is the area that you're really serious about?

Carlstrom: That's correct.

Kenney: Okay. With regard to everything but the 43.67 acres, who provides governmental services to those areas, such as fire, ambulance?

Carlstrom: Well I tell you what ...

Kenney: Well first of all, are they part of the fire district?

Carlstrom: No.

Kenney: Okay.

Carlstrom: Boeing Aircraft Corporation has ... McDonnell Douglas had a fire department. It's located very close to this area. They have a 25-man fire department. They like to have that kind of fire protection on their own property ...

Kenney: So they provide their own fire protection?

Carlstrom: That is correct.

Kenney: Okay. And that area, the 75.99 acres that's owned by the City of St. Louis, who provides fire protection in that area?

Carlstrom: Well I really don't know ... I found this out three or four days ago about ... they ... well I have a mutual aid with the city of St. Louis ...

Kenney: Do you know the answer? Who provides the fire protection for that 75.99

Carlstrom: I would ... right now I really don't know. I would imagine the city of St. Louis, but I'm not going to speak for them. Boeing is pulling out of that, and they don't like to have full responsibility for that, especially if the City of St. Louis, they don't have any buildings there now, okay?

Kenney: Nothing further.

Carlstrom: It's complicated because private corporations are in the fire service, too, and something else, so ... anyway.

Ford: Just so I understand, your revised plan ... map plan, is now your entire map plan?

Carlstrom: That is correct.

Ford: Okay.

Vice-Chair Spears: Any other questions? Thank you. Next on the agenda the presentation of St. Louis County, Mr. Glenn Powers.

Powers: I'm thinking maybe we should re-position some of these maps. We have some stands I think will help.

Good evening, I'm Glenn Powers; I'm the director of planning for St. Louis County. Normally I start with a run-through of county services. We're a large agency; we have a broad range of services. I'm going to spare you that tonight. I also conclude because of our normally residential properties in these areas, I would restate our normal position that we would be happy to continue to serve as the local government service provider for these areas, but as has already been noted, and I'm talking about both of the proposals tonight; there are no residences in either areas. They're entirely industrial and commercial.

In the case of Earth City, there are over ... that's home to over 300 businesses, 11,000 jobs, and by our estimate, an assessed value totaling approximately \$163 million. There have been previous attempts in the case of Earth City to annex in '84 both by the city of Bridgeton, and surprisingly, the city of St. Charles across the river.

In the case of the ... what I'll call the Boeing area, the airport north industrial area ... I don't have a good estimate right now on what the number of employees are in that area, but we estimate the assessed valuation to be \$31 million, and we're basing our numbers and my comments tonight on the map information that we got from the Boundary Commission, which includes an area to the east that was not part of the city manager's presentation. And as was also noted, that has been the subject of previous annexation attempts, both by the city of Berkeley and Hazelwood.

Regarding services, obviously St. Louis County provides a full range of services ... police, permits of all various types, permitting activities and inspections, zonings, street maintenance, et cetera. I would mention in particular, with regard to the Earth City area, which is the larger of the two areas, while both areas are in the second precinct, but in the case of Earth City, there is a business police officer that has been dedicated to the Earth City area who works with the businesses in Earth City, so that's sort of the industrial/commercial equivalent of neighborhood policing, if you will. And also there is being conducted a business police academy for business operators who want to participate in the Earth City area, so we do have close ties with the business community down there that's helped quite a bit by a strong set of trustees in Earth City. I would also note in the case of Earth City, that most of the roads down there ... the Earth City Expressway and major roads within the park are on the county arterial system.

In the case of the Boeing area, McDonnell Boulevard is on the county arterial system, Banshee is not. So in the case of those arterial roads, if these areas were to be annexed, we would retain the responsibility and the costs to maintain those roads.

Regarding fiscal impacts ... and this has probably been the great unspoken so far tonight ... it would be a pretty considerable swing in revenues. A loss of revenues for the county, and most of that would be in the ... in the area of utility taxes. When Hazelwood last attempted to annex in the Boeing area ten years ago, they estimated the utility taxes to be \$500,000 per year. I don't have any exact figures, but between the two areas, the swing in utility taxes alone could be as much as a million dollars. And I think that's a pretty conservative estimate.

Also, there would be increased taxes for business. Both Hazelwood and Bridgeton have property taxes. Hazelwood has a personal property tax which the city manager talked a little about and, obviously, there are business license fees which can amount to a considerable amount.

The ... in regard to the boundary issues, as I ... some of the boundary issues ... again, we based our map, the lower one for the Boeing pocket, on the information we got from the commission offices, which includes an area apparently that's been thrown out now to the east, but we thought it was odd, because at least in one way, because it did cut across, and I can ... I think you can see clearly ... as long as that proposal is in effect, it did cut across a runway. It didn't follow property lines, and that was probably because in order to capture those areas to the east, without getting into a contiguity issue, you had to come across there somehow.

Again, in the case of the Boeing north area, I would remind you that that by itself is not a pocket, it's part of a larger pocket. And, finally, as far as our position on both of these ... I'd just sum it up by saying that because of the large revenue swings that would result and the large amount of ... well it's 100 percent commercial/industrial in both cases ... that it's our position that if these areas are to be annexed, that they should be probably the last areas in St. Louis County to be annexed.

I'd be happy to take any questions.

Vice-Chair Spears: Let's start to the right.

Kenney: No questions.

Thibeault: No questions.

Commissioner: No questions.

Schuman: I listened to all of the revenue loss, et cetera, but I didn't ... I kind of lost you right at the end here when you said, "That these properties should be the last ... if they were to be annexed, they should be the last properties in St. Louis County to be annexed." What did you ... do you want to explain that a little bit for me?

Powers: That they're not balanced proposals from a revenue standpoint. They shift revenues from one jurisdiction to another without any appreciable ... that I can see ... change in the level of services.

Bredenkoetter: I have no questions.

Marver: No questions.

Spears: No questions.

Ford: No questions.

Kloeppel: I just had one, Mr. Powers, you heard Bridgeton's presentation tonight, and you also heard Hazelwood's presentation about ... in regards to Bridgeton and how they only want that small area ... they don't want the whole area of Earth City population within that ... and with Hazelwood now changing that ... taking out that whole eastern section, that original map plan ... does that change the county's position with regards to these two proposals?

Powers: No, it wouldn't. One point I would make ... with regard to the Bridgeton proposal running between the levee and the river, there would be a contiguity problem doing that, I would think. But also, we believe that under state law ... and we're checking on this ... that St. Louis County has the ability to enforce ... or Bridgeton has ... I should say Bridgeton has the ability to enforce Bridgeton regulations on property they own outside their jurisdiction, and we will get you the ...

Armstrong: You mean without annexing it?

Powers: Yes.

Kenney: Do they have to provide services to it?

Powers: Do they have to provide services to it?

Armstrong: Yeah.

Powers: If it's not annexed, or if it is annexed?

Kenney: If it is not annexed. If they own it, while they can enforce their ordinances, do they have to provide services?

Powers: Well if they own it, I guess ... I'm not sure I understand ... If they own it like I would own my property, yeah ... they have to take care of their property, yes.

Kenney: No, they have to take care of their property, but if that property is located in St. Louis County, do they have to provide police and fire?

Powers: No, St. Louis County would be responsible in their jurisdiction for providing those services.

Vice-Chair Spears: It's kind of confusing, but up under that situation, liability-wise, who's responsible for that? Hazelwood? I mean Bridgeton or St. Louis County? Liability-wise ... when you come to think in terms of insurance and ...

Powers: As a property owner, I would assume Bridgeton would have liability for anything that happened on property they owned.

Vice-Chair Spears: Okay.

Marver: I'm just curious, so that ...

Powers: But I don't think annexation changes that.

Marver: St. Louis City would be the same situation? City owns property around the airport. We were just talking about that, so we're saying that distance ... Bridgeton owns property and the city owns property, the county does not have responsibility?

Powers: Well they ... I think they have responsibility for enforcing the laws in their jurisdiction, but by liability I think ... I think we're talking about if someone gets hurt on the property and there's some finding of negligence who's responsible ... I would think the property owner. I'm probably getting way out beyond my field here. [Laughter].

Marver: I think so.

Powers: I need my law degree, but I think we can all kind of think of this in layman's terms.

Vice-Chair Spears: Any other questions? Thank you, Mr. Powers.

Powers: Yes, sir. Thank you.

Spears: We have one ... Mr. John R. Basilico?

Basilico: My name is John Basilico and I represent the Earth City Board of Trustees.

Dougherty: Can you please come to the microphone?

Basilico: My name is John Basilico, and I represent the Earth City Board of Trustees. A brief history ... I've been involved with the management and development of the Earth City business park actively onsite since 1980. On behalf of Ford Motor Credit Company, my prior employer, I've been involved with Earth City away from here in Dearborn, Michigan, since

1974. So I have 32 years of experience with Earth City. I know where all of the skeletons are buried.

Let me make one particular ... the Earth City board of trustees are six in members, elected ... they are property owners elected by other property owners, and each serves a term of two years.

I would like to make one correction to a previous comment made by Tom Haun. The 123 acres that Bridgeton owns, I gave on behalf of the Ford Motor Credit Company to the Department of Natural Resources in 1984, with Congressman Bob Young standing by my side, with a photographer. He never heard of it until the photographer showed up. But anyway ... so much for politicians.

We find it interesting ... and when I say, "We," the board of trustees, and several property owners who have called us ... is if they're only interested in 123 acres, why the other 175 acres, which is really Earth City, because the 123 acres is not ... why it appears on the map?

Let me also correct St. Louis County ... annexation attempts twice by Bridgeton ... once when the law said that you had to have a simple majority of the people in residence, being annexed, and the residence of the people doing the annexing. The vote was 80 to 20. Eighty percent to 20 percent in Bridgeton to annex Earth City. A 100 percent of zero ... we had no residents ... was zero, so the court threw it out.

A Boundary Commission met, and a member of that Boundary Commission called me a few years later and said, "Did you know that tomorrow morning at 7:30 in the county we're going to vote to annex Earth City into Bridgeton?" I said, "We never heard of it. No one has ever notified us." When I showed up at 7:30 in the morning, I found out that it had been advertised like legally it was supposed to be in the St. Louis Countian. For those of you who are attorneys, you know what that paper is. Only attorneys read it and those looking for cheap foreclosures to buy. So the vote, I understood was going to be almost unanimous in favor of annexation. When I left, it was near unanimous against it.

So to say the people in Earth City are a little suspicious to see 1,175 acres on a map adjoining 123 acres ... makes many of the people in Earth City uneasy.

Let me give you also some figures and facts. There are 350 businesses in Earth City, not 11,000, but 17,000 people working there. The value of the real estate ... the real value of the real estate, not the assessed value of the real estate ... is over \$600 million dollars. That's the brick and mortar value. There's probably at least that much in value inside those buildings. So about \$650 to \$700 million of value in all of those properties.

The property owners in Earth City are very pleased with the services provided by St. Louis County for the last 30 years. Of the 1,175 acres, 950 acres are available for development. That's when you take all the lakes, the levee, all the roadways and that. Of that 950 acres, 35 acres remain to have buildings put on them. It doesn't mean they're for sale, it just means the current owner has not put a building on that particular site. So 97 to 98 percent of the land that could be developed with buildings, has in fact, been developed.

I tell people Earth City has been a 35-year instant success, and that's how long it has taken to do that. And St. Louis County has been a partner with the developers of Earth City which primarily was my employer, Ford Motor Credit Company from 1974 until the time they sold the last parcel in 1973 ... I was part ... I was chairman of the board of trustees for 13 years, and since 1993, after I retired from Ford, I've been a special management consultant to Earth City, the last four years as a senior consultant for the board of trustees in Earth City. Also involved with the Earth City Levee District. I founded that and managed that activity also.

So we're very pleased with what St. Louis County has done. As far as their commitment, for example, the last four or five years they spent over \$3 million repairing the roads, building new shoulders in Earth City and things of that nature. The last 14, 15 years, we've have dedicated police officers of St. Louis County. So we have had all the services and all good services of St. Louis County.

The issue we have is why would we want to change something that has satisfied the majority of the property owners in Earth City for the last 35 years? Why would we take the chance to roll the dice that we may in fact have to pay more to the City of Bridgeton for those services? We have nothing against the City of Bridgeton; they're a fine community. They have been good neighbors. They have been good support to us. When I wear my other hat with the Earth City Levee District, the levee district includes all of Earth City and 700 acres in Bridgeton, so we deal with Bridgeton all the time. They're a good community. They just ... we just don't need to be part of the City of Bridgeton.

Vice-Chair Spears: Thank you, sir. This concludes our public comments. I'll go around the table to each commissioner to see if they have any problems or comments, or recaps.

Marver: Not at this time.

Kenney: No comment.

Vice-Chair Spears: I'll leave the legal comments to David Hamilton.

Hamilton: My back is still bothering me, I apologize. He has to have me say something, because they're paying me to be here, so ... [Laughter]. Just briefly, to kind of summarize and echo what Mr. Spears said before the meeting started, the Boundary Commission works in five-year planning cycles. We're at the beginning of our second five-year planning cycle, and that requires any municipality that has any intention of doing an annexation to file a map plan that must include any areas they hope to annex. If they do not include an area in their map plan, they cannot proceed with an annexation during this five-year planning cycle. I only emphasize that to point out that to the extent that some of these proposals seem to be over-inclusive; they have to be at this point, because if it's not included they can't subsequently file a plan of intent.

Under the five-year planning cycle, starting April 15 of 2007, municipalities can file plans of intent to actually incorporate portions of the area that had been included in their map plans.

Nothing final comes out of this map plan review process in terms of the actual annexation. All it is, is to give the public notice of the intent to potentially annex an area and to hopefully get additional information about what the cities have planned, and most importantly, to let the public know what's on the drawing boards as far as potential annexations.

None of us, whether it's the public, or the Boundary Commission, or the municipalities, will know anything about what property is actually going to be subject to an annexation proposal until the municipality actually files a plan of intent, which will be a much more detailed document and will provide much more information about what the city intends to do and why it believes that annexation is reasonable.

When that process starts there will also be a public hearing on the plan of intent, and so that will be subject to public notice. There'll be another public hearing, and everybody can come to that hearing at that time, and present additional comments to the Boundary Commission, so the Boundary Commission will have that information before they actually vote on whether or not any given annexation proposal as outlined in a plan of intent will or will not be approved.

Speaker: How will the public be notified?

Hamilton: Same way it was in this case, which is publication in the newspaper.

Speaker: Not the St. Louis Countian.

Hamilton: I don't believe it's in the St. Louis Countian. I believe we do it in the ...

[Inaudible speakers - too far from mike].

Spears: Thank you. Thank you, everyone for coming tonight. This concludes our public hearing meeting.

END OF RECORDING