

**TRANSCRIPT OF MAP PLAN PUBLIC HEARING  
BALLWIN, ELLISVILLE, VALLEY PARK, WILDWOOD  
& ST. LOUIS COUNTY**

**August 28, 2012**

**COMMISSION ATTENDANCE:**

<b>Commissioners</b>	<b>Present (P)/Absent (A)</b>
Bill Bergfeld	P
T.R. Carr	P
Rick Dorsey	P
Thomas Freesmeier	A
Frank Ollendorff	P
Bill Sauerwein	P
John Schuster	P
Jack Schwartz	A
Kathleen Schweitzer	A
Janet Wilding	P
Carmen Wilkerson	P

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Michelle Dougherty, Executive Director  
John Young, Legal Counsel

**CALL TO ORDER**

---

**CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN:** All right. We will get started with tonight's open meeting of the St. Louis County Boundary Commission. [inaudible] an eleven member commission whose tasks include conducting hearings on proposed boundary changes and annexations by municipalities in St. Louis County, and we have four such municipalities who are going to make presentations tonight and St. Louis County will also be making a presentation tonight. If you are a member of the public or anyone else that's interested, over on this table are ... is information about the Boundary Commission. There's an Agenda for tonight's meeting and, certainly, if you desire as a member of the public to ask questions about any of the presentations tonight, there is a Speaker Form that we ask that you fill out and give to Michelle, our Director.

Tonight's hearing is an informational public hearing which is going to allow these four cities and St. Louis County to present their proposed Map Plans and others to comment if they wish to. We're not approving or disapproving any boundary change by a city tonight, only listening to the presentation, soliciting some comment and questions, and asking questions ourselves if members of the Commission feel as though they need to. We'll later issue some written comments, I believe, on the plans and presentations.

You'll see from the Agenda the order of the presentations to be made tonight. Each city we ask limit your presentation to 15 minutes ... that's 15 minutes, and I'll time you. Following the cities presentations, St. Louis County will also make a presentation and they are limited to 15 minutes as well. And anyone wishing to make a statement or a comment or a question about any of the

presentations will be entitled to do so at the conclusion of those presentations, and we would ask that you limit your time to three minutes in those questions.

If you do not to publicly deliver any comments tonight and you are a member of the public wishing to comment about a presentation, we accept those comments through the mail until December 31. You can submit the comments or question in writing. We also have a website and any member of the general public can comments through the Boundary Commission's website. The Commission's web ... address ... website address is on the documents over on the table.

With that being said, we'll begin the presentation tonight with the Map Plan by the City of Ballwin.

KUNTZ: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My name is Bob Kuntz. I'm the City Administrator for the city of Ballwin. Welcome you all [inaudible] and making our presentation will be Tom Aiken, the City Planner for the city of Ballwin.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Excellent. Thank you.

[background discussions]

AIKEN: Good evening. My name is Thomas Aiken. I'm the Director of Planning for the City of Ballwin, and the map that I've got on the easel over here is substantially the same one that you were provided in your packets so all it is is a larger version. As you can see on the map as a brief description, you can see the city of Ballwin shown in yellow there and the surround municipalities. For the most part, the city of Ballwin is pretty well landlocked to the north side actually and to the east and west. Most of the land that would be available potentially for annexation lies to the south of the city. A couple of areas I do want to point out through. In the extreme northwest corner of the city where we have bought Clarkson Valley, there is a strip of right-away. It's Clarkson Road right-of-way there with one single residence. It's kind of a golf-club shape that is an area that we have been attempting to annex for some time, but the resident that owns that property isn't interested and as a result we haven't been able to get off ... kind of off going on that one. To the southwest corner, there is one parcel there ... sort of in the middle there. It stands by itself. Kylewood. I think is the name of the street there. It's a single subdivision. We show it on our map because it wouldn't be appropriate to leave it as an un-annexed area, and we would certainly be willing to take it in, but quite frankly, it's the city's position that it makes a lot more sense for it to be part of the City of Ellisville because it's surrounded on three sides by Ellisville.

There are similar situated small parcels along what is the Kiefer Creek Road. That's again in the southwest corner of the city there. I refer to it as a string of pearls because you've a parcel, a little strip of right-away and parcel and a little strip of right-away. This sort of happened as the result of adjoining annexations from the two municipalities. Historically, a couple of parcels there might make more sense to be part of the City of Ellisville or perhaps the City of Wildwood as well, but again, I didn't want to leave them as unincorporated or un-annexed holes for the next five-year period so we went ahead and included them on our Map Plan, but clearly, I think they could easily be annexed by any of the adjoining municipalities successfully.

There were several items that you asked that we address as part of this presentation in a letter that you sent out, and one of them was the criteria that the City uses to decide what areas it

would like to annex, and the truth of the matter is we wanted to eliminate unincorporated pockets and when you started looking to the south, the only really logical boundary was the Meramec River. To stop short of there somewhere sort of creates an artificial line, especially given the criteria that the Commission looks at so our feeling was it was best to go all the way down. That does, of course, include Castlewood State Park, and all the areas of the adjoining municipalities on both sides. So when this is gone, if it's annexed, there is no longer an unincorporated pocket in this part of St. Louis County. I take that back ... if you get extremely south and west of the area there, it kind of runs off into an area that really gets awfully far removed from the City given the nature of the roadway system and would probably make more sense for it to be part of the City of Wildwood at some point in the future over in the Glencoe direction, but because of the roadway patterns and all, providing services by the city into that area would be virtually impossible, so it didn't make much sense to go any farther down in that direction.

Phasing. Ballwin has traditionally ... we don't really have a phase approach here. Ballwin has traditionally considered annexation on the basis on inquiries to the city from people that want to be annexed. We have very rarely taken a pro-active position in attempting to annex an area but rather have reacted to requests that we have received from ... from folks that live in these areas, and we would very much assume at the same proposal or same series of events would occur here. We would get an inquiry from somebody there, we would look at it, and if it makes economic sense, it makes planning sense, it makes sense under the rules of the Boundary Commission, then we would consider moving forward with it.

As a result, there is no specific timetable associated with this area. Obviously, we've got a five-year timetable and we have to put this on or we're precluded from the possibility for the next five years, but again, it would be a matter of what interest is received from the area, and then moving forward as that comes in. And obviously, if we get a request, say from a subdivision and they really want to go, and now you have to start looking at what makes sense. If it's not going to be the entire area, you can take a smaller piece of it, you have to start drawing lines on a map and you have to do it in a manner that makes some sense according to the rules that the Commission uses and in a manner that makes economic and service provision sense for the City of Ballwin, so that would have to be done as a part of that procedure, but it has not been spelled out at this point. It would not be done until such time as we actually an active request from one of the areas that are in that green blob right there.

Importance. For Ballwin, annexation is very much a matter of our community character. We've spent a lot of time and effort over the years to develop a series of land use regulation and encourage development patterns and transportation and service provision to maintain the community in a certain manner, a certain character, and the area, much of this area is already developed. There are single-family subdivisions throughout much of that although there are some areas that still have some development potential, and there character is very much in keeping with the way the city of Ballwin is to the south end of town today. So it's not so much the development side of things that we're concerned, but we are very much with the long-term property maintenance issues. Ballwin has a very active property maintenance program. It has had it in place since 1971, and we feel very strongly that that program has been instrumental in maintaining Ballwin as the type of community that it is and we feel that some of these subdivisions are getting to the point now where this is a concern for them as well ... the folks that live there that own property there ... and Ballwin's program would be very beneficial and

both we believe to the area that potentially could annex but in maintaining the overall character of our community as well.

Is Ballwin the best city to serve this area? Well, as I said earlier, there are some parcels here that could very well be served by other adjoining municipalities. I wouldn't dispute that for a moment. Clearly, some of them would best be served by adjoining municipalities, but the folks that live in this area already have a Ballwin mailing address. Ballwin is their post office so they certainly have a community of interest they share with us. On top of that, a lot of utilization of our recreation facilities comes from folks that live in this area. There's always ... already a very strong tie between this area and the City of Ballwin.

Advantages. I mentioned one. I think that the property maintenance program that the City actively pursues is very important to the city and to the surrounding areas, but Ballwin will certainly offer police protection. As I mentioned, parks and recreation, these folks that live there are using it today. If they were annexed, they'd get to use it at the city resident rates rather than non-resident rates. Ballwin does a superior job of snow removal in the winter. I think it's routinely considered probably being among the best at that particular effort throughout the County. So there's a lot of advantages that come to being in a town like the City of Ballwin.

Arguments. Pretty much the arguments are the same as the advantages that I just listed for you. I think that there's a lot of valid reasons that make for this sense for this area to a part of the City of Ballwin. Clearly, some people may just feel that an extra level of government just isn't necessary, and I understand that. I mean that's certainly a viable perspective that some people have. But I've been ... I'm a veteran of many annexations in the City of Ballwin, maybe 10 or 15 over the last 20 years or so, so I've had a lot of experience in talking with people that are considering annexation, and it's been my experience that a very large percentage of the folks that live in these areas are favorably disposed toward annexation into the City of Ballwin.

Finally, why is Ballwin interested here? The interest is as I explained initially is that we do have come concerns that the area continues to thrive and be vital as it has been as we move into the future because what happens here is very important to the City. But as I also said there is very intent on the City's part to aggressively pursue annexation. That has philosophically been the City's position for at least the 30-some years that I've worked here, and I don't have reason to believe that it's probably going to change. But, if the folks that live there do express an interest, it's been a willingness on the part of the City to ... to consider that and proceed accordingly.

To keep under the 15 minutes, I'm done with my short presentation, but I'd certainly be happy to answer any questions that anybody's got.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Thank you, Mr. Aiken. Just one point of clarification on the area that's on the map. The green areas on the west side, they are unincorporated, right? They're not part of Ellisville or Wildwood.

KUNTZ: None of the area I've shown in green on this map ... it's all unincorporated. These are some pockets that have happened over the years as municipalities out here have grown and grown. Nothing shown on this map is in another municipality.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Thank you. Commission members, is there anyone that has any questions or any points they'd like to clarify from the presentation made by the City of Ballwin?

COMMISSIONER: What's the population of the area, the total area you proposed to annex?

KUNTZ: Afraid somebody was going to ask me that. I don't really know. I can certainly get that. I would probably ... it's probably in the 2,000 to 2,500 range, somewhere around there. Maybe a little bit larger, but I don't think ... there's a lot of undeveloped ground, you know. Castlewood State Park is in there and there is some ... a lot of large lot development so the density of population isn't as much in the southern parts as you get down more toward the river compared to the City of Ballwin has as it's been developed.

COMMISSIONER: Other than that one area to the northwest, has Ballwin attempted to annex any of these other areas?

KUNTZ: Not recently. Not within the last five-year map plan period. Prior to that, we did. We looked at annexing [inaudible ... walked away from microphone]

COMMISSIONER: That's all right.

KUNTZ: We look at this area here and coming down along the subdivisions that adjoin Kiefer Creek Road on the south. [inaudible] Kiefer Creek Road is basically this line here that this follows so there was a logical service provision consideration for taking the subdivisions that are served off of that roadway. Simultaneously, [inaudible] Wildwood and Ellisville submitted overlapping petitions and the Commission felt it was inappropriate to let Ballwin or Ellisville move forward. Wildwood was the lucky one that time.

COMMISSIONER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Commission members, are there any other questions? With that, we'll thank the City of Ballwin for the presentation and that will end that.

The next item on the Agenda is a presentation by the City of Ellisville and ... while the City of Ellisville is setting up for their presentation, I would for the record ... Michelle's asked us all to introduce ourselves, and we'll start down there with Rick to my right.

DORSEY: My name is Rick Dorsey, and I'm a representative for unincorporated North County.

WILDING: I'm Janet Wilding, and I'm a representative both for the County and the Incorporated Areas. I'm a joint Commissioner.

SCHUSTER: I'm John Schuster, resident of Glendale, and I was appointed by the County Exec to represent unincorporated St. Louis County.

OLLENDORFF: Frank Ollendorff. I represent ... I'm appointed by the Mayors of Large Cities. My home and work was in University City.

WILKERSON: And I'm Carmen Wilkerson, and I represent the south unincorporated County.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: My name is Bill Sauerwein. I'm the Chairman of the Commission, and was appointed originally by the Mayors of Small Cities, and I'm from Oakland, Missouri.

CARR: T.R. Carr. I live in the City of Hazelwood, and I represent the St. Louis County Municipal League and appointed by the County Executive.

BERGFELD: Bill Bergfeld, former mayor of Warson Woods, member by reason of St. Louis County Municipal League, appointment of Charles Dooley.

YOUNG: My name is John Young, and I'm the attorney for Commission.

DOUGHERTY: And I'm Michelle, the Executive Director.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: And thanks for putting that bug in my ear, Michelle. We should have done that at the beginning of the meeting so ... and, if we can, maybe it is better since that's a wireless microphone, to take that closer to the screen and the map. It might be a littler easier to present for you.

[background conversations]

BOOKOUT: Mr. Chairman and Boundary Commission Members, my name is Kevin Bookout. I'm the City Manager for the City of Ellisville, and with me this evening is our Planning and Community Development Director, Ada Hood. We certainly thank you for this opportunity this evening. The City of Ellisville is essentially landlocked and there are certain opportunities within the community and we've included that in our Map Plan. It's pretty conservative, and we'll go through each one.

The first area that we've included in our Map Plan, is a single-family residential property at 740 Old State. It is currently within the City of Wildwood so we certainly understand the change of jurisdiction would be required here. We would not initiate that process without it being initiated by the property owner and the City of Wildwood. This is something that we've talked with Wildwood about. Again, we don't plan on pursuing it, but we think in the interest of the Boundary Commission and your goals, we think it would clean up that line essentially because it's surrounded on three sides by the City of Ellisville.

The second area that we've looked at, Mr. Aiken mentioned earlier. This is a string of parcels along Kiefer Creek Road. Some of these are still vacant; some have homes, and we've included these because we believe (1) it's going to clean up the boundaries in that area, and (2) we think it makes the most sense from a delivery of service aspect for the City of Ellisville to include this and this become part of the City of Ellisville. Again, we don't anticipate initiating this without the interest of those property owners along that area.

The third area that we included in our Map Plan is another area that Mr. Aiken with the City of Ballwin mentioned. This area consists of 23 ... excuse me, 26 single-family homes and a common area which is located towards the northwest area of the property. Again, this is surrounded on three sides by the City of Ellisville, and we believe it makes the most sense to be part of the City of Ellisville, and it would clean up some of the adjoining rights-of-way along Reinke Road there to the west of the subdivision.

We've combined some of the questions into answers that we felt covered all of the areas in those questions. We believe the City's criteria for including the three described areas in the Map Plan are that we have common boundaries and interests with those properties. We believe there's mutual community interest between the subject areas and Ellisville and all of the areas about Ellisville and receive services through our parks programs, enjoy our parks and trails, or commute through our jurisdiction. We recognize our limits to future annexations and at this point we are interested in cleaning up the unincorporated area that's adjacent to the City of Ellisville.

Questions 2 and 3, "Has phasing been considered, and do you have a timetable for making those proposals?" Our phasing, the first area would be Reinke Road, that's the area, the 26 homes, that is surround by Ellisville. We think that would probably be the first area that we would initiate the annexation for and then moving west, the properties along Kiefer Creek Road and, of course, the one single family property on Old State would probably be our last simply because of the transfer of jurisdiction and working with the City of Wildwood and the property owner.

Number 4 question is "Why is it important for your City to implement the various components of your Map Pan?" The City of Ellisville is interested is interested in cleaning up the unincorporated pockets again, and all of those subject areas are residential in nature and there's essentially no benefit financially to the City. Because we're a pool city, we do provide ... excuse me ...because we're a point-of-sale city, we do provide a high level of services to all of our residents and we would do that for those properties as well and ... what we would receive would certainly not compensate for the services that we would provide to those ... to those residents.

Five, six and seven questions are "Why is your city the best community to serve the areas? What advantage do you have ... do you offer the residents of this area? What arguments will you make in support of your proposal to the residents of the area?" Again, as I mentioned, I believe we provide a high level of municipal services. I think it makes the most sense for cleaning up those boundaries again, and the delivery of services would be through our own community. We not would have to go outside of our community to provide services.

Question 8, "Has there been expressed interest by the residents?" We have not, the City of Ellisville, initiated any annexations in these areas nor have we heard from any of those residents in the area. We just wanted to include those over the next five years in case there was interest by either the property owners or in the case of the property on State Road, the City of Wildwood.

In closing, again, we believe this is a good Map Plan. It's very conservative and we think it does ... or covers I think the one interest that the Boundary Commission has and that is cleaning up some of the areas. Some of you will remember that we did just that with a subdivision on Old State Road a number of years back. It was actually surrounded on all sides by the City of Ellisville. Those residents came to the City of Ellisville requested to be annexed. I think the annexation went well, and those residents have been extremely happy with ... with the City of Ellisville and the services that they've been provided. I'll certainly take any questions that the Commission has, and again, we're open to any comments or changes that the Commission would have regarding our boundary or our Map Plan.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Thank you. I just have one comment. If I understood you correctly, you said that the Commission might be interested in cleaning up unincorporated boundaries or cleaning up boundary lines. Was that a correct statement?

BOOKOUT: That is correct. I remember a number of years back that comment was made and that's one of the goals that we've worked towards.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Okay. Well, let me alleviate that conception. We are not in the business of cleaning up boundaries and we're not concerned about that. We're a reviewing commission only, and we review annexations that are proposed by cities so I do want to clarify that in case that's part of a presentation that you intend to make in the future.

BOOKOUT: No ...

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: That's not really our role.

BOOKOUT: ... I certainly appreciate that and that comment was made a number of years back and may not be the case anymore so thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Does anybody else on the Commission have any comments or questions that they'd pose for the City of Ellisville? Okay. Thank you very much. I think that will conclude your presentation.

Again, if there's any member of the public that's here that intends to comment on any of these five proposals that we have before us, we'll have time at the end of all the presentations to do that, and if you intend to do that, if you'll please fill out a form that we have sitting over there and hand it to Michelle, that would be great.

At this point we will hear the presentation of the Map Plan by the City of Valley Park.

[background comments]

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Yeah, please bring that closer if you'd like.

ENGELMEYER: Did you want me to move this over closer to the map?

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: I think you're ... you're fine there.

ENGELMEYER: Okay. Mr. Sauerwein and the Commission. First I want to thank you for the opportunity to speak with ... in front of you today. My name is Tim Engelmeyer. I'm here on behalf of the City of Valley Park. With me tonight is our Board President, Mike Pennise, right here. And our City Engineer is on his way. His name is Tom Weis and he's on his way, and he has ... we have a Map Plan that we would like to present to the Board that is just slightly different than what was submitted originally, and all we're doing is basically flip-flopping a couple a couple of numbers, and I spoke with Michelle earlier and asked her if it was okay if I simply submit that to you when I got here, and she didn't think that would be problem so that's what ...

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Okay.

ENGELMEYER: Well, let me point out for you on the map the differences and then we can move on and when Mr. Weis gets here, if I could just simply submit the Board with a copy of that, we'll do that as soon as he gets here.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: That would be fine.

ENGELMEYER: Okay. The only changes that will be on the new map is that instead of this being a 2, this will be a 1. [inaudible] part of our phasing. This remains a 1. These will be changed to 2. So we're basically flip-flopping making this 2's and this is a 1. It's no more complicated than that, and I'll go over the reasons any why we've made that decision here during my presentation. But I would like to focus on this, which will be a 1. This is what we term or what we call as the Tree Court area. It is an area that is in between the City of Kirkwood and the City of Valley Park. It is an area that is unincorporated. And we looked at different criteria. I'll kind of go through all the things that were requested of me as I'm presenting this. I'd like to start with the Tree Court area and then I'll kind of move clockwise and give you our thoughts on why this makes sense in our eyes.

First the proximity to City Hall and the ease of governing this Tree Court area, handling the streets, handling the maintenance issues, responding to emergencies by our city crews and our police department. First and foremost, this is not going to be a problem for the City. We are less than a mile from our ... sort of our maintenance area to this Tree Court Industrial area. It's very close. It's literally right down Marshall Road. Right now, this area, this Tree Court area is in the Valley Park Fire District so it's really a part of Valley Park Fire District. I would also point out that this area in Tree Court is also part of Valley Park schools right now. So we already have a connection to this area, you know, starting out and I grew up right at the top of the hill. Quite frankly, I always thought growing up that that was a part of Valley Park. It's next to Valley Park. It fits in right here as you can see, and until I learned recently that it wasn't part of Valley Park, I always thought it was Valley Park because I used to go to the Tree Court pool back when I was younger which is a part of that. So anyway ... anyway, the Streets Department ... I've met with the head of our Streets Department, asked them "Is this a problem?" And he takes great pride in the fact that our maintenance crew in the City of Valley Park is we feel one of the top crews for cleaning streets, cleaning snow, in the St. Louis metropolitan area. And I said, "How do you judge something like that?" And he told me "We judge it on how many days the school has to be called off." And he said, "Traditionally, Valley Park School District really never has to call of school because we do such a good job of cleaning our streets." We feel like this would be a perfect fit for our City. We feel like we could supply this area with those type of services. I don't believe this area is a part of any other plan. I don't think ... I haven't seen it as being a part of any other plan so I don't think there's any crossover or conflicts there.

Another thing is that this area right now is obviously covered by the St. Louis County Police Department. Valley Park, we contract through St. Louis County. That's who does our policing also. Two of the precincts that serve the Valley Park area as well as the precinct that covers this area here in Tree Court is in Valley Park. In other words, the precinct, the police department that covers that area right now is located right now in the City of Valley Park. So we feel that that there would be absolutely seamless for us to transition to ... to enforcing the laws or whatever in that particular area. I just don't think it would be an issue since St. Louis County is already doing both ... both areas.

And I would also ... we like the contiguous nature of the plan. We tried to look at areas as while you were driving, are you going in and out of cities? Are you entering a city and then exiting a city and then entering that city again? We feel that this takes care of a lot of these little ins and outs through there. And we feel that ... we feel that this section already looks like it should be a part of the City.

Moving on to our other number 1, which would be down in the bottom right quarter.

Oh, and as far as population of this area ... because I know that question was asked a few minutes ago ... this is ... there's a business, Tree Court Industrial, so this is a business park mostly, this area. There are some residents in here, and I can tell you I have not had any conversations with the residents. I don't know what their feelings would be on this proposal, but there are a few families. Mike would probably be able to tell you how many total, but ...

[background comments]

Twenty-five to thirty residents in that area.

This area down here, again, is a sliver of property that's in between Fenton and Valley Park. When the City annexed the former Peerless Park area, it left basically a strip here that's in between the two cities. A lot of the same arguments I'd make for number 2 are kind of the same thing with down at the bottom is that it's an area that's smack dab in the middle of cities, Fenton and Valley Park, so ... and, again, if you look at the City of Valley Park, which is in orange right here, if you add this quadrant here, it does kind of fit. Right now, the City of Valley Park has three out of the four corners of the river and 141 so what we would be doing is simply adding the fourth quadrant so we would have all four sides of that intersection. And I call it an intersection. One of the roads is a river so ....

This area right here also is when Peerless Park was annexed, this is ... I don't know if anybody remembers the old Wet Willy's that used to be on that bluff up there. That's right here. These businesses here were a part of the annexation of Peerless Park; however, that bluff area for whatever reason, and I'm not sure because I wasn't a part of the decision, was kind of left out. This road that runs along the south side here is actually called Valley Park Road so it's named sort of after our city, but it's not even in our city. Our proposal would actually take in the road that is named after our city, and that's that bluff area. So that would just run up to the ... more or less to the top of that bluff because right now, it just runs along the bottom part of that bluff there.

Moving on to these areas down here which will be number 2's. This little tiny corner here, this is a little triangle, this is actually a property owner. I went down there and looked at it. It's a barn. The property owner who has that barn actually owns this property over here and for whatever reason this little corner was left out of the Peerless Park annexation, and therefore, our inclusion of this little corner is more of a cleanup than anything. I think the home owner thought ... and we all thought I guess that it should have been included the last time we went around. So I included that little corner. There's no residence there, it's just a barn in that particular area.

This area right here is also kind of wedged in between ... from what we understand and what my research and getting ready for today ... this area is owned mostly by the Drury folks. And the Drury Hotel is a part of the Valley Park city limits, the Drury Hotel. There has been some interest

in having some corporate or executive offices there related to the Drury Hotel, and my thought was that, you know, it wouldn't really make a lot of sense to have the hotel within the city limits and then have their executive offices right outside the city limits so that's why we have this section here delineated. Now, I don't know if there's been any decision made on that. It was just an idea that was floated out so we thought we'd better at least lay that out in the Map Plan and protect that particular area if we want to talk about that further down the road. So that's that section.

To the far left, which is the west side, is what's called Simpson Quarry. Simpson Quarry is a huge limestone quarry. Again I had the pleasure of driving out there. I'd never ... I didn't even know it was back there. It is a gigantic limestone quarry that has a big lake in the middle. It's a beautiful, most crystal clear, beautiful lake you'd ever want to see. My understanding is that these quarries run their ... sort of run their course after they get all the rock and the quarry company then will move on to their new project site. We feel that this may be getting close to that point, and the reason why we included it on the Map Plan is that we don't know what's going to happen with that property. It's a beautiful piece of property. It's got a big lake in the middle. They're still mining or taking rock out of there right now. There is an asphalt plant that they have set up in that particular area too, but we've included it in our Map Plan because we just don't know what Simpson's plans are. There is another Simpson Park that's, I believe, a St. Louis County Park which is on Marshall Road. I've gone there many times. It is a former quarry from the same exact company who when they were done with that site turned it over to, I believe, St. Louis County for a park, and it's a beautiful park. So we can anticipate that once they get done pulling whatever rock they want to pull out of this area that, you know, maybe the same thing could happen, which would be either a sale to the city or a donation to a park or whatever. It is a beautiful colored lake. So that's that.

I really don't want to focus a whole lot of attention on 3 and 4. They are sort of way down the road for us. The phasing, what Valley Park is interested in and what Valley Park would like to stress, the ones that I have gone over with you today, which will be labeled 1 and 2 in a map that will be presented to you probably in five minutes by Mr. Weis ... so I anticipate he'll be here any minutes.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Good.

ENGELMEYER: If no one has any questions ....

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Do you anticipate that Mr. Weis might have additional things to add to your presentation?

ENGELMEYER: I don't think so. I did talk with Mr. Weis and he said ... what is it? 7:40. He said he'd be here I think ... so got to be pretty close. I don't believe so. No, I think this covers basically our thoughts on these particular areas.

COMMISSIONER: [inaudible] entire city covered by a fire district or a fire department?

ENGELMEYER: It's covered by the Valley Park Fire District. And we do cover this area right now for what it's worth.

COMMISSIONER: So the District is independent of the City?

ENGELMEYER: Yes. Yes. I didn't want, you know, it's not the ... Valley Park doesn't run the Fire District obviously, but we do obviously streets and all that. They are part of the Valley Park School District too I would point out.

COMMISSIONER: Can you explain for me there, that Section 1 just south of Valley Park, no, no, you were there, that little area there appears to be excluded. Is that correct?

ENGELMEYER: Yeah. I'd like to also point out that I didn't draw this.

COMMISSIONER: Okay.

ENGELMEYER: I have tried to get that answer from numerous people. What I think it is I believe that's a White Castles there. Mike may be able to see. It's this little sort of hammer-looking spot, but I think it's a White Castles and as far as an explanation on why that's excluded, I don't know.

COMMISSIONER: Okay. Thank you.

COMMISSIONER: A White Castle, like the hamburger place?

ENGELMEYER: I think so. There's a Commerce Bank and a White Castle I believe right where this is at, and I don't know why ... I do not know why that was excluded.

[background comments]

Yeah, it's a White Castle.

COMMISSIONER WILKERSON: You said that the areas that's now a 2 that's going to become a 1, has 25 to 30 residences in there and a business park. Any idea how many businesses and is it industrial or is it office?

ENGELMEYER: It's a ... it's kind of a mix. I think there is some industrial, light industrial. There's a lot of offices in there. It's not heavy-duty factory, you know, machinery type of offices. They're more light industrial and just regular offices that ... and there's a road that kind of runs up to Big Bend through that ... through that office park sort of back behind the Kirkwood Khoury League fields back there, Marshall Fields.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: I'd compare it to Hanley Industrial Court. Are you familiar with that? It's got a ... similar to that area. Would you agree with that?

ENGELMEYER: Right. Yes. And as far as the number ... do you have any idea how many businesses are in there? I don't.

[background conversation]

When I was in college, I used to sell stamps, like rubber stamps. And that was my territory, so I know ... I know ... but that was a long time ago. It's light industrial and office.

COMMISSIONER: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Does anyone else ...? Yes, please.

COMMISSIONER WILDING: Has there been any correspondence from residents asking to be incorporated into Valley Park?

ENGELMEYER: Not to my knowledge.

COMMISSIONER: Have you attempted to annex any of these areas before?

ENGELMEYER: No. In fact as that was being asked early, I asked Mike and no, no. Not that I'm aware of. And this right here, I don't know why that wasn't included in the Peerless Park. For some reason that was obviously supposed to be a part of this, but somehow it fell through, and I believe that homeowner actually contacted us, but other than that, we haven't been contacted by anybody else, pro or con.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Any other Commission members have any questions? Thank you very much ...

ENGELMEYER: Thank you. Obviously I'll have that material for you here in a few minutes.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Okay.

ENGELMEYER: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: The next item on the Agenda is to hear a presentation of a Map Plan by the City of Wildwood.

DUBRUIEL: This microphone is moving around more than the people are in the room. Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is Dan Dubruiel. I'm the City Administrator for the City of Wildwood. I'm here alone tonight. Normally, Mayor Woerther or come other city officials would be with me, but we have three other important meetings going on and, no, I did draw the short straw. I'm here of my own choice. [inaudible] passed on a brief little synopsis of the presentation tonight. It also addresses the questions that the Commission has.

Wildwood's proposed Map Plan is broken into two rather distinct components. The first area and, certainly, perhaps the most unique is that which comprises the City of Clarkson Valley. And in that regard the City is doing so in anticipation of the possibility, however slim and unlikely it may be, that the City of Clarkson Valley over the next five years were to dissolve itself as a municipality either by choice or by other action by the legislature. Interestingly, it was the mayor of Clarkson Valley who approached city officials with Wildwood on three separate occasions because we didn't believe him the first two times requesting that we include the area comprising Clarkson Valley in our Map Plan because he is concerned that any significant modification to the St. Louis County Pooled Sales Tax Distribution Formula would ... could very easily make Clarkson Valley fiscally distressed and also there have been a number of rumblings around the Legislature and different bills introduced to try and force the consolidation of many of the smaller municipalities in St. Louis County into larger units or adjacent municipalities. So it's kind of in

that backdrop that Mayor Douglas requested that the City include Clarkson Valley in its Map Plan so that its residents, if the City were to be dissolved, would have the option of voting to annex to the City of Wildwood. Now obviously there are other alternatives that would be available including consolidation between the two municipalities, but I think it was in everybody's best interest we thought to have as many of the options available for the citizens of Clarkson Valley as legally possible.

Therefore, Wildwood has Clarkson Valley in its Map Plan for consideration in the future to annex in whole or in part. So that regard to the City, as addressed in our synopsis there, believes we are in a uniquely advantage position to be the good alternative for the citizens of Clarkson Valley. We have a lot of commonality, a lot of mutual interests, and a lot of compatibility and, consequently, we believe that we would be the preferred municipality to continue forward with the kinds of traditions that have built the City of Clarkson Valley over the years. Consequently, our interests in this quite frankly, quite candidly, is as a contingency plan, and it would not be the City's intention to initiate or try and force the issue. Obviously, we are not in a position legally to do so, but we do want the legal ability in the future of certain circumstances, however unlikely, were to occur to be able to consider an annexation of that area.

The second annexation area that the City has presented as part of its Map Plan is a bit more traditional and, again, it is located here in the southeast corner of the City of Wildwood in the area that in part was described earlier this evening by the City of Ballwin and actually this area that is proposed here is a significant reduction by the City of Wildwood in its Map Plan designation for the two previous rounds of Map Plans in which case we had indicated our interests in annexing a large portion of the area previously described by Ballwin including the Kiefer Creek area, Castlewood and Sherman. However, we have re-evaluated our position on that and have decided to reduce our desire for future annexation in that vicinity to a large part, quite frankly, due to our perceived ability to provide quality municipal services in an efficient manner. The area that previously had been indicated is a rather difficult for us to service just from the standpoint of accessibility. You have to drive through half of Ellisville to get there from Wildwood so consequently it struck us as not making much long term sense for us to consider future annexations in that larger area. However, there are a number of properties on the south side of Kiefer Creek Road near the intersection of St. Paul Road and also along the east side of St. Paul Road that the City would be interested in annexing in the future if there is a corresponding interest or desire on the part of the property owners. And in that regard, we believe that all of those properties are primarily accessed off of St. Paul Road, which is now a City of Wildwood jurisdiction street in light of annexation we conducted back in 2006 and, consequently, the City would ... feels it would be appropriate for us to annex those properties in the future or at least consider annexation of them in order to facilitate providing municipal services on the east side of St. Paul Road. Although it's not easily depicted on a map of this nature, those properties are not readily accessible further to the east than St. Paul Road. So again, we are contemplating requesting that area be designated and approved for future annexation should parties come together. We believe it would have a very de minimis effect on St. Louis County either from a fiscal standpoint or for service standpoint since we're only dealing with 10 households total and, consequently, we believe that this an annexation plan that can easily be supported and the character and development on the Wildwood side adjoining those properties is very similar to the households which exist there and, therefore, we feel it would be a natural fit.

And so again in summary, we have a rather diverse set of annexation plan ambitions for the future, and we'll certainly ask for your support at the appropriate time, but in the meantime should you have any questions, I'd be happy to answer them.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: I see you've included with this with the new package of information that you passed out some of the answers to the some of the questions ...

DUBRUIEL: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: ... submitted to you in writing. If the Commission's had a chance to review that, are there any additional questions from Commission members for the City of Wildwood? Well, that will conclude the presentation of the City of Wildwood.

DUBRUIEL: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Thank you very much. For our last presentation tonight we will hear from the persons from St. Louis County who will be making presentation to the Commission as well.

POWERS: Justin's bringing our map forward. I think you'll recognize it. I'm Glenn Powers. Good evening. I'm the Director of Planning for St. Louis County. I've been before you in the past and my message is ... won't take 15 minutes first of all ... but I think it's fairly simply, and it hasn't changed.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Glenn, could I ask you to hold on just one second, and Justin, if you could just turn that just a little bit so that the audience may have a clearer view of it. There may be people who are interested in that.

[background comments]

I think so, and if anybody has trouble seeing it if they want to come around here to the side, they can feel free to do that as well. Sorry to interrupt. Please proceed.

POWERS: No, not a problem. St. Louis County is the local government service provider for the unincorporated areas of St. Louis County. By land area and population that's approximately one-third of the entire County. So we have over 300,000 people residing in unincorporated portions of the County. And if we are considered a city, we very much consider ourselves a city in terms in provision of the services to those areas, we'd be the third largest in the state. So we have a large Police Department which we think sets the standards for other police departments in the County. We have a large Health Department. We have very capable staff and resources which are very efficiently employed so our costs of government services per capita is quite reasonable yet the level of satisfaction with services provided in the unincorporated areas is just as high from our own recent polling as they are for municipal residents how they feel about their services provided by cities. So we're a large service provider. We have efficiencies of scale and, in fact, we contract with 90% of the cities out there and some who have presented tonight. And our basic message that we're also a willing service provider for these areas. We're perfectly happy to continue to provide those services to these areas should the residents in these areas wish to continue in the future. And in many cases we've found that that's the case for many of the unincorporated areas that remain.

Now we haven't provided specific comments for the proposals you've heard tonight. We'll do that in writing, you know, we'll ... there are probably small comments we can make on each of those, but we'll do that separately. In general though, I think we're ... we probably try to observe the same guidelines. We're leery of boundary proposals that split roads or leave roads out that really should be in proposals. We get odd situations where we have to drive far into municipal area to take care of an accident. We're not happy about proposals that split subdivisions as they occasionally do or provide inefficient service areas as they occasionally do. We don't like to create pockets; that happens sometimes or sometimes, you know, there's an opportunity to eliminate a pocket and that opportunity isn't taken. So those are just some of the general things I would say, but again, we're a good service provider. We provide a very high level of services including property maintenance services, proactive property inspections to the unincorporated areas, and would be most happy to continue doing that if residents choose that options. And with that, I'll answer any questions you have.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Thank you, Mr. Powers. And I do want you to clarify between the ... on your bottom map there just for the Commission so that we're clear on your proposed unincorporated areas, the light green verses the dark green. What is part of your Map Plan and what is not part of your Map Plan?

POWERS: Well, the green areas are the unincorporated areas. We have two shades of green. The lighter green are areas that have populations above ... the number is 25,000. So that's that pocket cutoff where the procedures change as far as whether it's a split vote or combined vote. So these green areas are ... you can tell, they are low population areas. They don't have a lot of residents in them. The airport obviously, Earth City, some pockets in the Normandy area. Obviously, the area south of Eureka is horse farms, very rural. So these are areas that don't have the population threshold for the split vote. But in total all the green areas on our map encompass all the currently unincorporated areas.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Okay. Thank you for clearing that up. Are there any other members that have questions for Mr. Powers? And you'll be ... you'll provide separately written comments to the Commission that you wish to make on any of the other cities' Map Plan presentations that they've made.

POWERS: Yes, but in listening to the presentations I thought they were all pretty good and everybody was ... made very good comments about, you know, pocket areas and their attitude about taking odd parcels and all.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Well, thank you. That will conclude St. Louis County's presentation. And at the next point in the Agenda we can hear public comments. Michelle, did anyone fill out a form or card? Does anyone wish to make a ... have a question or wish to make a comment? If so, we'll be happy to pause for a second to allow you to fill out a form.

[background comments]

Can I ask you, sir, to go ahead and fill out the form so that we can ... and we'll just take a break and pause for a couple of minutes if you don't mind.

So the gentleman's question [inaudible] if we could have some quiet in the room, we do have one question from the public from Mr. Young. Mr. Young.

YOUNG: When you're looking at the County, is it my understanding that it will come back to you folks for the actually annexation proposal at that time, that this is just a generality of it?

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: This is just a generality. This is just the County and the cities setting their limits of things they might propose to annex in the future. This is a long ... this is a five-year cycle that we're on, and there will be ... if any city decides to annex a part of that area or St. Louis County wants to dispute or contest an annexation of a proposed area, they will have an opportunity to do so and so will members of the public.

YOUNG: But that's at the time that you're trying to actually set up the annexation and come before the Board and talk to the people about that particular area, not the generalities that was presented tonight.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: That is correct. Generally correct.

YOUNG: That's all.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Thank you. Are there any other questions from any member of the public? And before we ... before I entertain a motion to adjourn the Commission, I know the City of Valley Park's brought their revised map to us all. I think their speaker, Tim ... remind me of your last name ... Tim Engelmeyer did clear up the changes in the numbers adequately. Unless there's any Commission member that has an additional question for Valley Park, I would think we could that presentation tonight.

COMMISSIONER: [inaudible] one question that you had that we could possibly address regarding that [inaudible].

COMMISSIONER: My question is I'd like an explanation at some point in time.

WEIS: Tom Weis, the City Engineer for Valley Park, and I believe that's probably a hatching error on CAD system, and that line should continue straight down.

COMMISSIONER: You're sure?

WEIS: Yes, sir. And if there's any other changes that might need to be done, we'll certainly clarify those for you.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Thank you very much. Do we have a motion to adjourn tonight's hearing.

COMMISSIONER: So moved.

COMMISSIONER: Second.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Is there anything else we need? That will conclude tonight's hearings on the Map Plans. Thank you very much.