

**TRANSCRIPT OF MAP PLAN PUBLIC HEARING  
DES PERES, GREEN PARK, SUNSET HILLS, TOWN & COUNTRY,  
TWIN OAKS & ST. LOUIS COUNTY**

**November 13, 2012**

**COMMISSION ATTENDANCE:**

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

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Michelle Dougherty, Executive Director  
John Young, Legal Counsel

**CALL TO ORDER**

---

**CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN:** ... Map Plans by three municipalities. We are the St. Louis County Boundary Commission, which is an eleven-member Commission whose tasks include conducting hearings on proposed boundary changes and annexations by any municipality in St. Louis County. At this time I'd ask the individual members of the Commission to introduce themselves starting with Rick.

**DORSEY:** Rick Dorsey. I represent Unincorporated North County.

**BERGELD:** Bill Bergfeld through the Municipal League.

**SCHUSTER:** John Schuster, Unincorporated area.

**SAUERWEIN:** I'm Bill Sauerwein. I was appointed by the Mayors of Small Cities in St. Louis County.

**SCHWEITZER:** I'm Kathy Schweitzer. I was appointed by the County Executive, and I represent the Unincorporated West St. Louis County.

**WILDING:** Janet Wilding. I was a joint appointment.

**WILKERSON:** I'm Carmen Wilkerson. I was also appointed by the County Executive to represent South Unincorporated St. Louis County.

YOUNG: I'm John Young. I'm the Attorney for the Boundary Commission.

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

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Thank you, everyone. The Boundary Commission's established by State Statute which also sets out a five-year planning cycle for cities that may want to undertake boundary changes. We are near the beginning of this lengthy planning cycle wherein municipalities submit to the Commission a proposed Map Plan. That's a map proposed by the city which shows the limits of any potential boundary change, an annexation of an unincorporated area, or the establishment of an unincorporated area. Tonight's Hearing is an informational public hearing which allow these three cities and St. Louis County to present their Map Plans and the public in St. Louis County to comment on the Map Plans. We are not approving or disapproving of any boundary change by a city, only listening to the presentation, soliciting public comment, and possibly asking questions ourselves in this public forum. The Commission later issues written comments and continues to engage the proponents or opponents of any plan in this process.

You'll see on the ... if you don't have an Agenda or would like an Agenda there are some in the front row to my left. Also, if you're a member of the public and you're going to be or you plan on speaking with regard to any boundary change tonight, there is a card or a form that we ask that you fill out with your name and address and hand into Michelle before the beginning of the presentations tonight. Each city is asked to limit their presentation to 15 minutes. I will time it on my iPhone; I won't be checking my email. I'm actually running a stopwatch up here. So you'll have 15 minutes to make your presentation, and following the cities presentations, St. Louis County will also make its presentation. At the conclusion of St. Louis County's presentation, we'll invite anyone from the audience who wishes to make a comment or statement on the record about any proposed map change to do so ... and limit the time for those comments to three minutes. For those of you who want the opportunity to speak, again please fill out a form and deliver that to Michelle. If you do not want to deliver any public comments in this forum, you can also log on the Boundary Commission's website or submit your comments in writing and they'll be considered by the Commission. With that, we will go ahead and begin the presentations tonight with the City of Twin Oaks.

SLAMA: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen. I'm Chairman of the Board, Village of Twin Oaks. And I believe you have probably already received our map, and I'm here to tell you that the Village has, at the moment, absolutely no intention of doing any annexation. We submitted the map because it's a five-year planning cycle. Our concern is changes in sales tax law or other changes that may affect the Village would then encourage us to do annexation. And those could be anything from the County requiring the size of cities to be a certain population. The Village is only 392 at the moment. We were incorporated in 1938 so it's not like we've done this recently. We celebrate our 75th anniversary next year; however, we are also the highest per capita, I believe, in the County at the moment because we are fortunate to be at the intersection of Big Bend and Highway 141 right now. And we took a change in '77 and created a couple of commercial districts and we have succeeded in providing tremendous services for our residents; however, because of our size, we feel that we could be threatened at some point and want to opportunity to expand if the laws change. So, that's my presentation.

CHAIRMAN: Does anyone on the Commission have any questions about the plan submitted by Twin Oaks? Are there any other further details you'd like to give or anything?

SLAMA: None.

CHAIRMAN: And no one has any questions. Thank you for your keeping it brief and thank you for your presentation. Next on the Agenda is the presentation by the City of Eureka.

SABO: Good evening. My name is Craig Sabo, City of Eureka, City Administrator. Eureka's a fourth-class city, a little over 8 square miles in area, located in the southwestern most of St. Louis County as you no doubt learned during your drive. Our corporate limits are depicted in red on the annexation Map Plan. Portions of our city are contiguous with the City of Wildwood to the north with the Meramec River to the south, which is also the Jeff County line. We have contiguity with the City of Pacific to the west, and we're also close to the Franklin County line. Our 2010 census was 10, 189, and has increased by a few percent since that time. We offer a full complement of municipal services such as police, public works, parks and recreation. A few months ago we commenced the development of a recreation center. To the best of my knowledge, we're the only remaining municipality in St. Louis County, entirely located within St. Louis County, that is the purveyor of water and sanitary sewer versus Missouri American Water and MSD. We also have city-negotiated trash collection services. The entire city and all the proposed subareas are served by the Eureka Fire Protection District, and they are a separate jurisdiction as opposed to be a department of the city. The city and all the proposed subareas are mostly within the Rockwood School District with the exception of the western portion of Subarea A which is in the Meramec Valley School District.

Our current real property tax rate is \$.39 cents per \$100 assessed valuation. Personal Property tax \$.38.8 cents. Our utility rate is 5%. Sales tax is 7.925%. And we have a park/storm water and CIP sales tax as part of that. While there are a few pool areas within our city as the result of some annexations and boundary adjustments, we are a point-of-sale city for the most part.

As is the case with many municipalities, we contract with the County for various services such as police dispatching; computer-assisted report entry; electrical, mechanical, plumbing and the like. The services for which we contract with the County would not change with the annexation proposals.

With respect to the criteria we use for including the various areas, we largely looked toward the elimination of unincorporated pockets utilizing to the greatest extent possible the natural boundary of the Meramec River. Our overall objective was to identify areas which will offer controlled orderly growth in such a manner that will enable us to phase in our municipal services without negatively impacting the quality of service to our current residents.

To look toward the Map Plan, Subarea A in beige bounded by the Meramec River, east and south, and by the eastern boundary of the Pacific Palisades Conservation area to the west and by Old 66 to the north. A few years ago we had conversations with the City of Pacific and agreed in principal to develop our respective boundaries so as avoid overlapping submissions. I recently observed that it appears that both of us omitted a strip of Old Highway 66 along the northwestern border of our Subarea A and we would certainly extend any proposals to include that strip as allowed or directed by the Commission to close that which would otherwise be a remnant strip.

Subarea B, in green, depicts the area between our present southeastern city limits and the Meramec River which, again, is also the Jefferson County line. We recently completed a

boundary adjustment procedure with St. Louis County via the passage of reciprocal ordinances for a portion of the pocket to the west which is the site for our forthcoming recreation center.

Subarea C depicts the area east of our city limits to the Meramec River and also an area adjacent thereto accessed off of Lewis (Louis?) Road and north of that area is a golf course so while it appears as if we're using Lewis Road as a boundary, it is because of the golf course that we defined the line on.

Subarea D depicts a remnant of MODOT right-of-way, presumably left in error from past incorporation or annexation efforts.

All the areas are either low density or unpopulated. I don't have an exact population analysis, but we provide such in conjunction with any proposals.

We presently have no plans to submit proposals as is the case with most everyone before you, we are just reserving our rights, however. While we may submit a proposal-based Plan of Intent, I presently anticipate that our annexations would be driven by petitions. Open for questions.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Is there anyone ... thank you, Mr. Sabo. Is there anybody on the Commission who has any questions for Mr. Sabo about the plans?

WILKERSON: I do. You said that you recently completed boundary adjustments through St. Louis County.

SABO: Yes, 'mam.

WILKERSON: Where are those on your map?

SABO: It would be the pocket in the western section of Subarea B. Over here.

WILKERSON: Okay. Right there. So your boundary adjustment includes that area now or is that not included?

SABO: The boundary adjustment took place after this Map Plan was submitted.

WILKERSON: Okay. All right. So this is already part of your ... the green here then is the pocket ...?

SABO: Not all of it. One-third to one-half.

WILKERSON: One-third to one-half. Okay. You said that you don't have any plans right now to submit a Plan of Intent. As you know, following the last two plan cycles, legislation has been proposed which would provide exclusions and pretty much enable you to bypass the process here. Do you have any plans for any legislation to be introduced that would adjust your boundaries in any way after this cycle or during this cycle?

SABO: I can't comment to what our Board of Aldermen may direct.

WILKERSON: Okay, but you haven't heard anything, any plans of that to date?

SABO: I'm unaware of any plans presently.

WILKERSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Thank you. Are there any other Commission members who have questions about the plan? No other questions? Thank you, Mr. Sabo, for your presentation tonight.

SABO: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: And the next city that will be presenting tonight is the City of Pacific.

SELBY: My name is Harold Selby and I'm the City Administrator for the City of Pacific and, if you're not quite sure where that's at, you're in it. This is the City of Pacific, right here. Our Map Plan is the same as it was six years ago, and I was talking to Craig and I can't believe it's been six years that ... that time has flown by. And six years ago a lot of the questions I got about our Map Plan was what kind of density housing would be in there? And six years ago, we didn't know what was going to happen with housing and so there hasn't been any requests for housing to go in there, but what has happened in that six years, probably, at least, probably, six or seven times, I've had companies come to me that wanted to locate there. Everything from large pharmaceutical-research type companies to come manufacturing companies, and they reason why they like this area ... and there's about 80 acres here that is in the middle of this northern part of boundary plan here ... the reason that they look at that area is they want to be close to an Interstate, but I think a lot of it too ... and like the pharmaceutical research company, they want to be kind of isolated, more of a research park where they didn't have a lot of houses around them, but I think too, a lot of it they want to get probably lower wage workers further away from the city because it seems that a lot of companies are looking at that area and in Franklin County. And we've had a real good ... we've had real good luck in drawing a lot of manufacturing. But the City of Pacific has been here since 1859, and we've worked close ... probably starting seven years with our friends in Eureka to develop a plan that would work for both of us and why it's so important, it's like Craig said, they as us, we have our own water and sewer. We're the only ones that can provide those services to these properties, and that's really important for somebody who wants to come onto this property and either provide jobs or housing or recreation, whatever would happen here, they're going to need either Eureka or us to provide those services.

The other thing is police protection. Just to the west of here out of the city limits, there's a company that sells bottled gas and ... propane and they have this chemicals that used with this meth and all that ... well, they get broke into and if St. Louis County police have to come there, they have to come from somewhere near this gentlemen's town, near Big Bend and 141 is where they're coming from. They can't come from Wildwood. Those officers have to stay over there. So this gentleman wants to come in and I say, "Well, you just can't come in. We have to go through the Boundary Commission." And that's why we're submitting this plan. So it's about police protection. It's about water. It's about sewer.

This summer you seen on TV where there was a child that had drowned at the Pacific Palisades river access area. That little piece there is to the south of 44, that's all Conservation land, never have a house on it. The reason that we would annex that is so that our police officers can

protect it. I mean, here you had an incident ... and this happens a lot ... where you have people down there, they're partying, and even minors getting beer and everything else down there. St. Louis County can't control that. The Conservation Department can't control it. We could control it, and that's why we want that in our city. The same reason, I think, that the City of Eureka would like to see 66 State Park in their city so that we can as municipalities patrol those areas.

So our Map Plan is the same as it was six years ago. The population in this area is very low. Again, just like Eureka and like Craig said, the only way we'd annex this was by petition only, and we have no plans at this time to do any annexation. Wanted to submit the same plan, we think it works for us. We think it works for Pacific. We think ... and more importantly, it works for St. Louis County. I wait to get some type of a ... like a research park and use the St. Louis County Economic Development people to help getting something done here because that's a good tool to use. Those of us who are in municipalities and work with the RCGA, just today I got notified of companies that are looking in the Midwest and there's not too many areas like this. This is all ground that is not flood plain. Again, it's by Interstate 44, six lanes of Interstate 44. Then on the south side, you've got the Business Route 66 where you've got intersections at both ends of that so it's a good area that maybe we can try to get some good jobs in. And I'll be open for any questions.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Thank you, Mr. Selby. Anyone on the Commission who has any questions for Mr. Selby?

WILKERSON: I would pose the same question to you about the proposed ... is there any proposed legislation that would kind of bypass this process to adjust your boundaries?

SELBY: I haven't been contacted about any pre-filings of any bills or anything like that.

WILKERSON: Okay.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Anyone else have any questions about the proposed plan? Thank you, Mr. Selby.

SELBY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Next we'll hear from St. Louis County.

POWERS: Good evening. I'll keep this short again. I'm Glenn Powers. I'm the Director of Planning for St. Louis County. We have jurisdiction over all the unincorporated areas of the County. Large western-most area here is along Old Route 66. We are a large jurisdiction, collectively 300,000 people so we have a large highway department, large police department, all of our departments are very competent and provide excellent local government services and our attitude is that as long as the residents of the unincorporated areas want us to be their service provider, we're happy to do that, and that should be the determining factor.

In terms of boundary proposals, specifically we will submit written comments in the following weeks, but in general as I've said ... I think some comments were made tonight, we would hope that the splitting of rights-of-ways would be avoided and splitting of subdivisions or municipal lines going down through lots, that kind of thing. And as was also said, we would endeavor to

avoid the creation of pockets and all. That's all I'll say for tonight. Be happy to answer any questions about this area in particular.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Thank you, Mr. Powers. Does any member of the Commission have any questions for Mr. Powers? Thank you for coming tonight.

POWERS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Michelle, has anyone filled out a card for public comment?

DOUGHERTY: [inaudible]

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: Is there anyone here that wishes to make a public comment on any of the plans that have been discussed? There being no public comment, is there a motion to adjourn tonight's Public Hearings?

BERGFELD: So moved.

DORSEY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: All those in favor of adjourning, say "Aye."

VOTE: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SAUERWEIN: All those opposed? We are adjourned.