

**BOUNDARY COMMISSION  
ST. LOUIS COUNTY, MISSOURI  
TRANSCRIPT OF  
BC1501 PLAN OF INTENT PUBLIC HEARING  
VALLEY PARK “TREE COURT & ARBOR CREEK ANNEXATION” PROPOSAL  
JANUARY 26, 2016**

**COMMISSION ATTENDANCE:**

<b>Commissioners</b>	<b>Present (P)/Absent (A)</b>
TR Carr	P
Rick Dorsey	P
Steve Frank	P
Kathleen Schweitzer	P
Kyra Watson	A
Steve Wegert	P
Carmen Wilkerson	P
Richard Wolkowitz	P

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Michelle Dougherty, Executive Director

John Young, Legal Counsel

**CHAIRMAN DORSEY:** ... call this meeting to order for the Public Hearing BC1501 – Valley Park “Tree Court and Arbor Creek Annexation Area” Annexation Proposal to order. My name is Rick Dorsey. I’m the Chairman of the Boundary Commission. I’m going to ask each of our members to introduce themselves and who appointed them and what they represent. So, start with T.R.

**CARR:** T.R. Carr. I’m a joint appointee between the St. Louis County and the St. Louis County Municipal League.

**WOLKOWITZ:** Richard Wolkowitz, the same as T.R. Carr.

**WEGERT:** I’m Steve Wegert. I was appointed by metro mayors which was the large mayors of St. Louis County. I represent the North County area.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Rick Dorsey. I was appointed by County Executive Charlie Dooley to represent unincorporated North County.

WILKERSON: Carmen Wilkerson. I was appointed by the County Executive to represent unincorporated South St. Louis County.

SCHWEITZER: Kathleen Schweitzer. I was appointed by County Executive Dooley to represent the unincorporated West St. Louis County area.

FRANK: My name's Steve Frank and I was appointed by the St. Louis County Municipal League.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: The St. Louis County Boundary Commission is an independent government body that reviews boundary change proposals in St. Louis County. The Commission's authority derives from State Statute and St. Louis County Ordinance. The Commission consists of eleven members 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. Generally, the Boundary Commission process has two stages: the Map Plan stage and the Proposal stage. The Map Plans had to have been submitted by July 1st, 2012, in order to be considered during this cycle. Actual boundary change proposals will be accepted between April 15, 2013, and July 1st, 2016. Once annexations are established, unincorporated area proposals are submitted. The Commission is required to hold a public hearing regarding the proposal. Ultimately the Commission will vote on the proposals. If the Commission approves an annexation proposal, it goes to the voters where if the area has residences there is both a vote in the unincorporated area and the municipality proposing the annexation. The measure must be approved by a majority in each area, that is the unincorporated area must have a majority as well as the municipality. In reviewing any proposed boundary change, the Commission shall approve ... understood that word "shall" ... approve such proposal if it finds that the boundary change will be in the best interests of the municipality or municipalities and the unincorporated territories affected by the proposal and the areas of the county next to such proposed boundary. There are eleven factors set out in State Law that we must consider in determining whether or not to approve it.

The format for this evening will be a presentation by Valley Park for a 15-minute maximum, then questions from the Commission members. It will be followed by comments from St. Louis County for a 15-minute maximum with questions from the Commission. Then we will open it up to public comment. If you wish to comment tonight, you must fill out one of these Public Speaker Hearing Forms and turn it in to our Executive Director Michelle before St. Louis County closes with their remarks. Every person who submits a comment form will be given three minutes to speak at that time. I would ask ... we have a lot of people in the room, a lot of people have indicated that they wish to speak. If somebody else makes your comments for you and you decide that you just want to say "Yeah, that ... that's my name and I agree with the person ahead of me," that's fine. If you want to use your allotted three minutes, that is also fine. We're going

to give everybody who wants to speak the opportunity to be heard. If you're here tonight and you hear something that you want to make a comment on but you didn't fill out a Speaker Form or you're too shy, you don't want to stand up in public, the Commission will accept public comment for the next 21 days. You may submit them through the mail or on the Commission's website.

Okay, with that, we will now call on Valley Park for their presentation.

ENGELMEYER: My name is Tim Engelmeyer, I'm the City Attorney for Valley Park. I'd like to start by thanking the Boundary Commission, St. Louis County, and all the members of the audience tonight for taking the time to attend our presentation. I'm joined tonight by sort of a team that we've put together to help put this presentation together: Kelly Farrell, Ellen Dunn, and Zak McMichael. And I'm also joined tonight by our Mayor for Valley Park as well the Aldermen, Department Heads, Staff, City Engineer. They're all here tonight. I'm going to provide an overview of Valley Park's proposal to annex a neighboring area. We'll have a PowerPoint going on as I speak which is kind of helpful to see what I'm talking about as far as the numbers are concerned.

The area that we're talking about is laid out right here on the first slide. I will start with why we have planned or proposed this annexation followed by the services we plan to provide and then the financials behind that plan. Along the way, I will address eleven factors and the eleven factors that the Commission President mentioned a few minutes ago which the Boundary Commission will rely on in making their determination. Since some of the eleven factors overlap, I'm not going to go in order, but I promise I will touch on all eleven factors that the Commission needs to hear about.

In the summer of 2012, Valley Park aldermen began to hear from residents of Tree Court. Some showed up at our board meetings. Some reached out directly to aldermen, and what they were telling us crystal clear. "We need help. We are completely neglected by St. Louis County. Can you consider taking us in so we can get the same level of excellent services that we provide our residents." The main complaint was that "County doesn't even know that we exist. We are a pocket out here in West St. Louis County. We don't get our streets taken care of. We don't get our snow plowed. We have to provide for our own trash service. We can't even get the basic services such as mosquito spraying." These are some of the comments that we heard that are up on the board. Those are people that showed up at our board meeting. The bottom line is that Valley Park did not approach Tree Court residents with this idea. It was Tree Court residents that approached the City of Valley Park and we listened.

We believe Valley Park can easily provide the area with a multitude of services offered at a higher level than the County currently provides this area.

First, let me start with the present services provided to the proposed annexation area and what Valley Park will offer. This is the Fourth Factor of the eleven. On this slide you can see how the County provides services to the annexation area; however, as previously noted, many of the

residents in the area are unhappy with the quality and quantity of the services provided. Valley Park will not only provide these services but will provide them at a superior level to what is now provided. We have new equipment. Our Public Works Department is right down the road from the proposed area. City staff can literally be on site in a few minutes. I will also stress that Valley Park will also provide trash and recycling service ... trash twice a week and recycling services which the County does not provide this area.

One example of enhanced services will be the Police Department. Valley Park anticipates adding at least two ... two police officers to its patrol due to this annexation. This is not a hit-and-miss type of patrol where you get an officer only when you call which is the situation now. We'll have regular patrols in a dedicated Tree Court Sector. The residents will know the officers' names who are patrolling this area. By having a dedicated police force that patrols only the City of Valley Park, residents and businesses in the annexation area will see enhanced police protection.

The area will also have access to our city's growing parks and recreation facilities. Valley Park is currently constructing a state-of-the-art recreation facility to which all Tree Court residents, business owners will have access. It has soccer fields, baseball and softball fields, an archery range, a boat ramp to the Meramec River, walking and biking path that connects to Kirkwood, and a dirt bike trail that's currently in use.

The recent flooding is a great example of the services that Valley Park can provide in good times and in bad. When Valley Park and the surrounding areas were confronted with heavy flooding about three weeks ago, the City of Valley Park sprung into action to reinforce ... and that is a slide right there of reinforcements on the levee ... that's plywood that the City of Valley Park workers put up to keep the water in and protect the city. We sprung into action to reinforce the levee and provide support and assistance to its residents. City Hall was transformed into a shelter with food, water, cleaning supplies, and help. Thanks to the efforts of Valley Park and its employees, we minimized the damage to property and we helped residents get back on their feet quicker. After the waters went down, Valley Park also conducted a wide-spread organized cleanup effort within our city where we helped residents by offering bulk pickup for items destroyed by the flood. Tree Court, which also suffered flood damage received no such cleanup efforts that I'm aware of. Those affected in the Tree Court area were left to fend for themselves. No large bulk pickup, no assistance in cleaning out the sewage, no food, no water. The bottom line is that we would have been there for these folks. We would have been there to help them. We would have been there to provide shelter and food during this cleanup process.

The Fifth Factor is when Valley Park will offer these new services to the area. I have met with our Public Works Director and the Board. We are absolutely confident we could have all the services in place six months from the date the voters approve this annexation which is the earliest time allowed by the law.

To provide these services, Valley Park has put together a plan to annex the above area shown in blue. The above area covers 430 acres including an estimated 260 residents, 94 condominium

units, 52 single-family homes, and 38 commercial parcels. These updated numbers vary slightly from our Plan of Intent as we were preparing for this proposal today.

Factor Two requires a legal description of the proposed annexation area which can be found in our official application as Exhibit A.

The Third and Tenth Factors are the creation of logical and reasonable boundaries and the compactness of the area to be annexed. First, as can be seen in this slide, the annexed area is compact and fits perfect with the current boundary for Valley Park. Valley Park is also the most logical municipality to annex the area as it has the longest border with the area. Fenton is separated by the Meramec River. Kirkwood has apparently considered this area but was dissuaded by the fact that the area is already covered by the Valley Park Fire District. The proposed annexation area is covered completely by the green area as well as the yellow area is the Valley Park Fire District. That's what the Valley Park already covers. A portion of ... the green part is also the Valley Park School District ... currently is the Valley Park School District. That little yellow sliver that's at the top of the map is a little sliver of Parkway, but other than that, that entire ... the entire proposed annexation area is already the Valley Park School District, is already the Valley Park Fire District.

Lastly, it has been suggested "Why don't you simply take the residential part of Tree Court and leave the commercial and industrial properties as unincorporated St. Louis County?" Besides the financial implications which I will go over in a minute, carving out the industrial park will leave a small unincorporated island which will violate the stated goals of this Boundary Commission. As that little box that says "SLC", that would be if we left the industrial park out, that's what it would look like. Would St. Louis County haul their heavy equipment to this little pocket to fix streets or to plow snow or to clear streets or to fix streets. This type of little pocket is exactly what the Boundary Commission has tried to avoid through the years. In fact, one of the tests for compactness is whether the annexation would create any unincorporated pockets. Removing the commercial properties from the plan would not meet this Commission's goal to create a compact municipal boundary.

Additionally, the services that we propose for this area that I outlined earlier simply cannot be provided solely from tax revenues generated from residential properties in the area. Based on Valley Park's estimates the residential area will provide about \$15,000 dollars in additional property tax and \$2,000 dollars in personal property tax. Valley Park could not provide additional police, snow removal, flood remediation, trash, recycling, street maintenance, and other services on a revenue of this level. Most of the businesses in the proposed area are in the Industrial Park. As things stand right now virtually all of the heavy industrial trucks associated with this business park literally cut right through the City of Valley Park. The quickest route from I-44 to the Tree Court Industrial Park is smack dab through the middle of Valley Park. The quickest route from 141 to the Industrial Park goes smack dab through the middle of Valley Park. It makes total sense that businesses that run heavy machinery right through the heart of our city should contribute to the upkeep and maintenance of our roads. The bottom line is that from a

common sense standpoint, from a practical standpoint, from a fairness standpoint, and from a financial standpoint, it makes sense to include them in this proposal, and that's why we've included them.

As we've stated from day one, the City is ready, willing, and able to discuss a fair arrangement with the affected commercial properties to cover street maintenance, flood recovery, snow removal, and even trash and recycling. And let's not forget that we will provide a dedicated police presence to Tree Court including the Industrial Park.

Moving on to the financial portion of this presentation, Factor One requires an analysis of the impact of the annexation on various tax bases. First, the impact on the tax base of the proposed annexation area will be a moderate property tax increase for which the residents will receive the many services that we've already talked about. Second, the annexation will not have a financial impact on current Valley Park residents as the services for the new area are expected to be covered by the new revenues from that area. Third, the proposed annexation will have no effect on the surrounding municipalities not involved in the annexation. Finally, as will be seen in later slides, the fiscal effect on the County is minimal and the effect is partially offset by the City assuming some of the expenses for the County.

The Sixth Factor is a list of the tax rates on the area before and after annexation. As can be seen from this slide, the area will see a modest increase in property tax. The County's portion of the real and personal property taxes will remain exactly the same. The utility tax charged by Valley Park is at the same rate as St. Louis County's so Tree Court residents will not be subjected to a higher tax. The area will also be included in Valley Park's capital improvement sales tax and storm water sales tax which are reflected on this slide, but these new taxes will only apply at the point-of-sale for retail so we believe that these sales taxes will not have any effect on the Tree Court area. In fact, Tree Court residents have mentioned to us, and we've talked to Tree Court residents that they are assessed somewhere between \$300 and \$800 dollars per year for street maintenance, snow plowing, et cetera. All in all, Valley Park has estimated that the average tax increase for a single-family home will be only \$135 dollars per year, an increase which is more than offset by the City's commitment to provide additional services to the residents. The average increase in property tax for the condominium unit is \$89.19 per year.

For the Seventh Factor we are required to estimate sources of revenue other than just real property taxes that the city would collect in the annexation area. Other than real property tax, we expect to receive sales tax income from the County Sales Tax Pool of \$25,000 dollars and personal property tax of \$33,000 dollars; however, these estimates rely on information from as far back as 2010 to predict taxes generated no earlier than 2017 and, therefore, they are admittedly estimates. We will also receive utility tax about in line with what the County will lose; however, this number is based on the limited information that we have received from St. Louis County regarding those utility tax numbers. Lastly, the city will receive a small amount of money from [inaudible] which is the State Road Aid Project. As the city will gain 260 residents, we expect this amount to be about \$6,000 dollars. The city will also receive some

revenue from a business license fee it charges the businesses within city limits. As can be seen above, the calculation requires knowledge of the business's gross receipts for some types of businesses. The city does not have this information for the businesses in Tree Court; however, the city has been able to review the County Assessor's records and has determined that many of the properties are labeled as warehouses or research and development facilities. If these businesses do not have gross receipts from the location within Tree Court, we believe they will only owe a \$100-dollar business license fee. Initially, Valley Park has reviewed County records, and we have identified up to 13 commercial properties that may qualify for this \$100-dollar license fee. Valley Park is willing to work with the business owners to help calculate business license numbers if the information is provided, but that is private information. Such a business license is not unreasonable. In fact, many of the other municipalities in our area such as Kirkwood, Clayton, Des Pere all charge similar business licenses taxes or fees as Valley Park. Notably, Valley Park's business license tax has the lowest rate of any of the municipalities I've just mentioned.

As can be seen on this slide, Valley Park expects to spend most of the revenue collected in Tree Court to provide additional services to the area including the cost to maintain County streets which the County has suggested Valley Park will need to take over. Valley Park will be about at a break even on this annexation with a small amount left over for discretionary projects. One such project will be working with the Arbor Creek Condominiums to create a more efficient trash collection service, an area where the trash is actually assembled. We've already met with them and talked to them about these ideas.

For the Eighth Factor, we are required to estimate how the City's boundary change would affect the tax resources of the County. First, it is important to talk about what the County will not lose. Currently the County receives over \$700,000 dollars from Tree Court in the form of property taxes, the commercial surcharge, and utility tax. I've already gone over what these residents get for that kind of money. Post-annexation, instead of receiving the utility tax, the County will receive approximately \$185,000 dollars from Valley Park for the new police officers that we would add to the contract; therefore, the County will still receive \$728,000 dollars from the Tree Court area post-annexation.

Here is our estimate of the tax revenue the County will lose if Tree Court is annexed. These numbers are based off a total loss of \$200,000 dollars which the County has told us is their estimate. Our best estimate of the breakdown of the \$200,000 dollars is laid out in this slide. The largest number within the \$200,000 dollars is the County's loss of utility tax. It is difficult to determine the exact amount of this tax because it requires access to private information; however, this tax is explicitly used to fund law enforcement in the area. That is a St. Louis County Ordinance. The revenue received from utility tax shall be used for police in the area. Post-annexation, law enforcement will be maintained and paid for by Valley Park so losing this revenue should have minimal effect on the County as it will no longer need to provide a police presence in this area. In fact, the County will lose the expense of maintaining law enforcement

but will gain revenue from the contract Valley Park currently has with the County to provide law enforcement in the area including the proposed annexation area. For the fiscal year the County's budget is more than \$679,000,000 dollars; therefore, the percentage of loss compared to their overall budget is less than three/hundredths of 1 percent. In fact, this number is much smaller as the County will lose \$200,000 in tax revenue but gain an additional \$185,000 from its police contract. This small amount ....

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Mr. Engelmeyer, your time's up. If you could just sum up, please.

ENGELMEYER: Okay. Let's go through zoning very quickly. Factor Nine is zoning. We've met with John Bracaglione who is the zoning guru for the Midwest and he as indicated as you can see on the slide that he does not think that there's be any changes whatsoever in zoning, and the Final Factor is the proposed annexation would become effective six months after approval by the voters.

Ladies and gentlemen, I just want to thank you for the time that you've given me. I almost got through my entire presentation. We tried to do the timing. I appreciate your consideration. Missouri law lays out the eleven factors that the Commission president mentioned. As you read each one ... and we can put it all up on the slide ... you'll agree that we have addressed each and every one of the eleven factors and they're checked up on the board. I believe we've provided information, more than enough information to satisfy each one. We asked that the Commission allow us to put this to a vote. If the voters decide they don't want the city to take over the area, then we will live with that decision and move on, but as far as the threshold for today's purposes are concerned, I believe we've met that threshold. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Do any of the Commission members have questions?

SCHWEITZER: Yes, actually I do. I did want to ask the question ... I believe you made the statement that the Valley Park ... the residents of ... the residents had to provide for their own trash and recycling services?

ENGELMEYER: Valley Park ... we have ... Valley Park provides its own trash and recycling, plowing ... we do all that through our municipality. We don't contract that out to anybody.

SCHWEITZER: Right, but I thought you made the statement that the residents in the unincorporated area currently had to provide for their own trash hauling and so my question is are they not in a St. Louis County Trash District?

DUNNE: I'm Ellen Dunne, one of the attorneys. It's our understanding that they contract with a private hauler.

SCHWEITZER: And they're in unincorporated St. Louis County and theoretically, I presume would be in one of the St. Louis County Trash Districts, yes?



(Unknown): Yes.

DUNNE: That's not what our information was.

SCHWEITZER All right. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: With regard to the Trash District, I saw in your presentation that the charge ... does Valley Park charge its residents for trash service?

ENGELMEYER: \$51 dollars a quarter.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: All right. Do you know what the residents are currently paying their trash hauler quarterly?

DUNNE: We thought that was part of their assessment of \$300 to \$800 a year ... annually. That's what we had been informed by some of the Tree Court residents.

ENGELMEYER: The Tree Court residents said that their normal assessment is \$300 a year for streets, trash ...

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: No, I just wanted to know the trash hauling. I live in unincorporated North County. I pay a quarterly charge to Republic for my trash. Do you know what the residents down here ... what trash service it is and what they pay quarterly?

(Background): \$42 dollars

DUNNE: Oh, that is correct. That is right. I apologize. It was ... they did inform us it was \$42 collars.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: So in fact, their charge would go up?

DUNNE: Well, yes, although it's my understanding that they only have one pick up a week and they don't have bulk pick up. [inaudible] Oh, I'm sorry.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Okay. And then another question I had was you had mentioned in your proposal that you would take over street lighting. Are the street lights in the condominiums public or are they private?

DUNNE: They are private as we understand it.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Okay. Would there be any move on the part of Valley Park to see about getting those dedicated so that the condo owners would not have to pay for their lighting?

ENGELMEYER: I've met with the condominium association president ... she's also, I think, here tonight ... and we did talk about that issue as well other issues that are affecting the condominium complex that we could assist with.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Does anybody else on the Commission have any questions? Seeing none. Thank you. We'll now go to the presentation from St. Louis County.

Just another reminder for the people in the audience that if you want to speak tonight by the time Mr. Powers is done with his presentation, you'll need to have turned in one of these Speaker Forms to our Executive Director over here at the end.

There's none left. Michelle, do you have some more forms?

POWERS: I'm sorry ... first of all, my name's Glenn Powers. I'm the Director of Planning for St. Louis County. I usually appear before the Boundary Commission, and we have some confusion about our PowerPoint. We emailed over and I assumed it was just loaded and ready to go, but it's not. Is that what I'm getting? Ouch.

(background conversations)

Everybody, I'm very sorry for the delay. I ... I ... I thought we were set up, but we're not. But I think it's important for everybody to see our PowerPoint. What I'll ... what I'll say about our PowerPoint is a lot of the comments we put together were based on our review of the Valley Park Plan of Intent. A lot of the information that was in Valley Park's slide show, PowerPoint, is new to us. We're actually probably getting a little bit closer on numbers and all so, as I go through, I will kind of make comments to recognize some of the differences in the information. Sounds like ... or looks like we're getting close.

Okay. Here we are. Michelle, thanks a lot. This is ... this is my fault. I made an assumption that something was going to be a certain way. I had no reason for thinking that and ... I'm glad you were able to get this whole thing up.

So, again, my name's Glenn Powers. I'm the Director of Planning for St. Louis County. And I usually represent the County before the Boundary Commission. Not my favorite job, but, you know, we have to do it from time to time. So ... I would say this ... this presentation's divided into two general parts. The first part is just for familiarizing ourselves with St. Louis County services, and many of you may have heard that before, and then we'll get into the specifics, but again, a lot of that, a lot of things I say here were in reaction to the Plan of Intent. So next slide.

St. Louis County ... the point here ... is a large service provider. We're ... we provide local government services for one-third of the County, the unincorporated area that amounts to over 300,000 residents who live in unincorporated areas. But we provide also county-wide services to the entire population of the County and that amounts to, you know, a million people, and then many extensive contract services to the various municipalities including Valley Park. So this slide there are ... are ... are some of the services. The point is that, you know, we are a ... a full service government. We provide all services to the unincorporated area that municipalities do to their ... to their areas and some others in addition. And ironically, one of the services I mentioned was mosquito and vector control. We provide that through our Health Department to most of the municipalities in St. Louis County so I was surprised to learn that people are unsatisfied down in the Breen Subdivision with the ... with services ... that was something that wasn't brought to our attention. With regard to police, the first ... going back, the first item

there, the ... Valley Park has police services through St. Louis County so we can talk a lot about the differences, but they are St. Louis County Police, they will be St. Louis County Police, and I would just say that and perhaps more going forward.

Next slide. In terms of citizen accessibility, we are a large government, but the way it was put together by Lawrence Roos, the County Supervisor, many years ago, was it was set up as ... as a government with excellent professional staff so citizens mainly interact with ... with staff members from different departments depending on their ... their area of expertise. There are seven Council people, but ultimately the good answers come from staff who are not part time and work these problems every day, and we do do extensive outreach to our residents through town hall meetings, neighborhood watches, and the like. And when all else fails, we do have our councilmen. Each one has an assistant who are very keen on troubleshooting things that fall through the cracks, but overall, my sense is ... I spend a lot of time out in the community at different hearings every week is that there is ... there is, you know, there is a high level of satisfaction with County services and County interactions with residents of unincorporated areas and that's borne out in surveys that we do every ... every three or four years. We do customer satisfaction surveys and we chart these things, and our customer satisfaction with our services is just as high as they are with municipalities that we've shown was statistically significant sampling.

Next slide. Now on to a little about the ... the area. I think the numbers differ a little bit but not in any significant way. The area proposed to be taken into Valley Park is 430 acres. We count 133 housing units, 99 of those, the Arbor Creek Condominiums, and the rest being single-family homes. Mostly, but not all in the Breen Subdivision, an estimated population of 220 and you can see the assessed valuation numbers there, \$24,000,000 dollars. You know, one thing I'd say about this area, it's small, it only has 220 people in it, and it was described in the Plan of Intent as a ... as a ... as a pocket, you know, a small area between two ... two municipalities. Well, actually this area is sort of the industrial southern tip of a much larger industrial area that's home to more than 10,000 residents, more that the population of Valley Park itself. So it's not isolated from County services. It's being served very efficiently by County services. And if you were to zoom out, bird's eye view, as far as being surrounding by municipalities, actually Valley Park is surrounded by unincorporated areas by three sides. So, you know, my point here is that it's part of a much larger area that's ... that's ... that's we're able to efficiently serve.

Next slide. Going through the land use ... well, there's primarily the Tree Court Industrial Park, which is the real target of this proposal. The large-lot Breen subdivision, which is a large lot, kind of semi-rural to the east of Tree Court, then areas along Big Bend Road which are really accessible up through the intersection of Dougherty Ferry Road, which is called Forest Avenue in Valley Park and Big Bend Road. So, the numbers I think we already talked about as far as the number of units. And then, of course, yeah, the Grand Glaize treatment plant, which we all watched in recent weeks' battle with the flood situation.

Next slide. Similarly, with zoning, and this is an area we in the Planning Department know ... know a lot about. You have large areas, what we call NU – non-urban zoning under existing County zoning, which is large-lot residential subdivisions and then industrial areas of Tree Court, and then an assortment of other things along Big Bend including some R-6 zoning which is higher density residential zoning that accommodates the Arbor Creek Condo complex. And we also have Flood Plain zoning which is kind of an overlay district and is very important, certainly to this area and all of Valley Park because of the Flood Plain associated with the Meramec River and also Grand Glaize Creek on this side of Valley Park and Fishpot Creek on the other side of Valley Park so Valley Park is really sandwiched between two creeks which feed into the Meramec River and has battled the flood possibilities constantly, and we probably will continue to.

This map is a color-coded land-use map which shows the nature of the land use in the area, largely relates the ... coincides with the zoning categories. The yellow are single-family homes, that big yellow block is the Breen Subdivision. Gray is industrial. Red is commercial. Some of the ... some of the red that you see there around Tree Court Industrial could be coding errors, but it indicates there's some ... some amount of retail activity going on that site ... maybe some retail sales, that's possible or it might have been something that happened in the past. Really the only true commercial ... retail commercially use we have in this area is Westwood Automotive on the south side of Big Bend.

A little bit about County services going back in the detail about our breadth of services with regard to police. Well, we have two things going on in Valley Park. We have the contract police services being provided Valley Park about 12 officers, I believe, involved in that. They're located out of the ... the City Hall location. But just west on Vance Road is the West County Seventh Police Precinct. So there is the ... the benefit of proximity here if something were to happen in Valley Park there is the advantage that the ... the County-wide police precinct is close at hand and we're in a good position to provide excellent police services, and I think we do not only in Valley Park but also the unincorporated areas. Same people. Indeed, the crime rate for the area has been relatively low. You see the numbers there per capita and that's just in the unincorporated area for your information. And the police tell us that's been the lowest in the last five years.

Neighborhood preservation is ... is proactively circulating through the County and identifying property maintenance issues and making sure they get fixed, and we think we do this pretty well. A lot of cities struggle with this. Pretty obvious when you ... depending on what part of the County you're driving in, how old it is, but this area overall is pretty well kept. We haven't had any complaints in the last couple of years phoned in. If there are, I hope people do phone them in. We have one open property maintenance case I note there on the slide which is a vacant house in the Tree Court residential area or Breen Estates. And then there at the bottom there it's our Public Works Department, those are the inspections and the reviews that they provide to Valley Park under ... under contract.

On trash ... going on I think we kind of got through that here at the very end, but the ... the unincorporated area currently is in a Trash District, the District 4. Every five years these things are bid out. We're about to do that again, and the current rate is \$11.81 per month. So there's a little bit of apples and oranges here really. The annual rate in Valley Park if you take their quarterly rate times four is about \$216 annually. That's \$18 dollars a month. That's more than the County, but you get a little more. You get yard waste pickup so if you're interested in having yard waste pickup, that's good. If you're not and you don't have the option of not having it in Valley Park, the County rate is less. And we do have a senior discount there, 10 percent senior discount. So I think we compare pretty favorably. In terms of the County bidding out this under contract, there are only five municipalities at this point that have their ... their own trash crews. In other words, they own their own equipment and city employees are driving the trucks and picking up the trash. The rest of them ... and that's, you know, over 80 do it exactly the same way the County does it is they bid out to the major haulers on an annual basis and drive some pretty good bargains that way.

Now, here's where new information provided [in] Valley Park's slide show we'll have to take back and comment on in the ... in our final written comments that we'll submit. So what I'm showing you here is what we gleaned from review of their Plan of Intent. And while a lot of taxes stay the same there's still a 1 percent County property tax. There would be a new for residences and commercial businesses, a new city property tax; a new city personal property tax such as on cars and other equipment like that; a higher sales tax, which may or may not affect the resident depending of where they shop; the utility taxes are the same, but they flip, all the utility taxes go to the County now and they would go to the newest jurisdiction, Valley Park, if it were to be annexed.

And the last thing I have listed there ... and the utility tax is ... by the way ... is no small thing. On these ... on these industrial annexations, they are big thing ... and I'll show you some numbers. And then on sewer lateral fee, the County charges \$28 dollars a year and the Valley Park is ... is \$50 a year. So there are ... there are increases there.

Moving on to the next slide ... and these are just estimates and this is pretty close I think probably to what Valley Park show ... we estimate the revenue loss to St. Louis County would be in the \$260,000 to \$270,000 dollar area. Now, that's not what Valley Park would take on. I think they would take on substantially more with these new taxes. We estimate about \$360,000 dollars, again close what they showed on their slide.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Mr. Powers, if you could wrap up. Your time's up, please.

POWERS: Sure. Sure. Actually, I will wrap up. Here's my closing comments. That basically we think we provide excellent services. We match up well against Valley Park in the quality of our services, that I'm ... that I'm firm on and say without apology that the proposal would bring additional tax increases without a commensurate increase in the quality of services.

Again, I really dispute that. And that St. Louis County is a ready, willing and able to continue to serve this area and provide excellent services as long as the residents want us to.

Thank you very much. I'd be happy to answer any questions.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Does any of the Commission members have questions for Mr. Powers. Mr. Wolkowitz.

WOLKOWITZ: Is the St. Louis County Councilperson present tonight for this District?

POWERS: She is not.

WOLKOWITZ: And do you know why?

POWERS: They are in a Council meeting tonight. They have their meetings at 6 o'clock every Tuesday.

WOLKOWITZ: Do you know that person's opinion on supporting or being opposed to this annexation?

CHAIRMAN POWERS: I don't know what her opinion is. That is not something we've discussed.

DORSEY: Any other questions from the Commission?

SCHWEITZER Yes. In the County proposal you indicate that streets in the Tree Court residential neighborhood are private?

POWERS: They are. They are not ... that was developed some time ago and the streets are private. The thing about the non-urban district, the large-lot district is that because of lower density of overall housing, there are not the same street requirements as in other subdivisions we see out in the West County area. So example, take any other subdivision, let's just go to the west side of the Valley Park and the subdivisions up on the hill are off Vance Road. They were built ... the streets were built to a County or a city standard that was a requirement of the construction. That was done by the developer at the expense of the developer and cost of those streets reflected in the cost of the homes. But when you get to a low density such as Breen Estates where it's five-acre lots, et cetera, you're not necessarily required to have a paved road. Now when you're building million dollar homes on five-acre lots, people expect that. But people had a choice early on with Breen Estates, and they chose not to take that expense up. So ... and this is ... this is an issue really that we've dealt with in some of the annexations is a city that wants to annex an area to get to the industrial on the other side comes promising gifts. An example of that were the condominiums, Eagle Rock, I believe they are called in the southeast quadrant of 141 and 44. Sounds like similar things are going on with condominium development in this area where promises are being made to spend public money on private property. It's a questionable thing. Normally, the County, and normally, even in their own Plan of Intent Valley Park alludes to this is that basically they're not going to accept any private streets and they're not

going to expend any ... they have no plans for capital improvements in this area. That's in their Plan of Intent, yet you know, promises are being made. So if you go to Eagle Rock now years later, an area that was sort of gerrymandered in so that the old Peerless Park could be ... there would be people to vote in favor of Peerless Park ... the promise was "We'll plow your private parking lot forever and repave it." Well, have a look sometime. See how it turned out. But there is an issue there in summary and that's, you know, you expand your private money ... the people of Valley Park will pay to ... to do all these things.

SCHWEITZER: Thank you. That answers my question.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Any other questions for Mr. Powers? If not, thank you.

POWERS: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: We will now move to the Public Comment Section. I'm going to apologize to all of you if I mispronounce your name. It's not an intended slight, it just means my tongue's getting in the way of my mouth. We will take the speakers in order they were given, and I would ask you to limit your comments to three minutes. First, we have Dave Endres.

ENDRES: Thank you for pronouncing my name correctly. Many people don't do that, but you did a very nice job. I own the property at 3491 Tree Court Lane in the Peter Green Subdivision that you're speaking of. I've owned it for 30+ years. I've been very happy with St. Louis County, and I hear of all the promises being made. Yes, we're struggling with our roads. We have work days, private work days that we get ourselves ... and when I first started it 30 years ago I was in my mid- ... mid-30s and, you know, we could labor all day and not have a problem. Well, all of us are still residents down there, still property owners and, yes, we are struggling, but I don't see that going away, that we're going to have to do something to maintain our own roads. In the one graph by yourself, sir, and I can't remember your name, but the drawing on the [inaudible] there was a large zone that was my property. I am agricultural. I am not listed as a retail sales area. Currently, I am growing ... I run my own business there. We grew trees for a number of years there. We can no longer grow trees there because of the deer population rubbing on the trees so a couple of years I found a really fascinating thing of growing corn and we grow 6-3-1-2-2 product which is the zip code that is that area, and I'm having another large problem with deer in that area. So if we are annexed by the City of Valley Park, we can no longer control our deer population that we have there. There'll be no firearms or projectiles launched, and we can legally do that in the St. Louis County. Any questions for me since I'm the first speaker? Thank you, sir.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Our next speaker, Robert Helmsing

HELMSING: As mentioned, Robert Helmsing. I am with Lawrence Fabric and Metal Structures. We have operated our business in Tree Court Industrial Park for over 20 years. We object to this because we can calculate lots of additional taxes, no additional services. We are

extremely happy with our relationship with the County and with the services they now provide so we see nothing but downturn for us if this goes through. Any questions?

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: No. Thank you, sir. Next, we have Brian Wacker.

WACKER: Good evening. My name's Brian Wacker. I'm here to talk on behalf of approximately St. Louis County residents who comprise the homes and the property at Keyes Summit. Keyes Summit is an area off of Big Bend which is adjacent to the north end of the Tree Court Industrial Park. Most of them are here personally this evening tonight. All of them have authorized me to speak on their behalf especially Steve and Linda Haverberger [sounds like] but none of them have been mentioned at all tonight especially in the City's presentation. These property owners, they are residential property owners. It is our position they have been [inaudible] brought into this proposed annexation to meet the contiguity requirement to get to the tax base at the Tree Court Industrial Park. Really ... really there are two main reasons we're here tonight in opposition. First, the folks on Keyes Summit are not going to benefit at all from any of this. You'll see that their names were never mentioned in the presentation. Their property was never mentioned in the presentation. They are all very happy with the services they get from St. Louis County as it is. This proposed action will only increase their property taxes which we've already seen in the County's presentation which is really the only reason that they're part of this to begin with. It will also decrease their property value. Again, they're not ... no citizens and especially not the folks in Keyes Summit are the ones initiating this process. They have no interest in this whatsoever. In addition, the services that they currently receive, they are more than happy with. They'd have no interest in getting less services for paying more money. Really, I think it's been laid out pretty clear here. I don't think we need to get too into the weeds on this, but this is a cash grab by Valley Park. We have unintended victims in this which would be the Keyes Summit property owners. I will go a little further than what Mr. Powers was artfully avoiding saying. There've been a lot of promises going out there by City officials, former aldermen talking to the folks in Tree Court, saying that things that are going to be done that were well outside what was presented here tonight. We're talking about gravel roads being repaved. Promises that are never going to be fulfilled. We've seen the same thing in the Peerless Park debacle, and it's all going to happen here again. They're being sold a bag of beans to ... to meet the City's ends, but these promises ... we've seen it before and we'll see it again, they're not going to be fulfilled. So, in the end, the folks in Keyes Summit, they're not here as anti-annexation completely; they're here as anti-Valley Park. If a trustworthy municipality came to them and wanted to bring them into the fold, they would be all ears. This is ... this is ... this is not a situation where they have any interest in being part of it. I think you're going to hear the majority of the folks tonight feeling the same way, and the Keyes Summit folks should not be folded into this just because they happen to have property that connects them to Tree Court. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: I want to point out to the audience that it's not out of lack of concern that we're not asking questions of the individual speakers, but our procedures do not



allow for us to ask questions. If you find something that needs to be amplified, please use our written comment process. Next speaker is David O'Shea.

O'SHEA: I'm Dave O'Shea and I'm with Baldor Electric in Tree Court Industrial Park and we object to this annexation attempt because we're not able to vote on it, and we're going to be taking more tax dollars and not being provided any more ... any more services.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you, sir. Next speaker is Kerry Dickey.

DICKEY: Hello. My name is Kerry Dickey, and I work at Global Surgical Corporation. We've been located in Tree Court Industrial for over 20 years. We are happy with our St. Louis County services. We oppose the annexation attempts by Valley Park because we do not have a vote in the matter. We will be receiving less services and we will be paying more taxes.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you, Ma'am. Next, we have Charlie Bonte. I hope I pronounced that correctly.

BONTE: Hello. My name is Charlie Bonte. I am here to represent my company Bausch & Lomb. I object to this annexation attempt because I am not able to vote and it does not provide any additional services to us as well as only increasing the tax dollars. So, thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you. Next we have Craig Lindgren.

LINDGREN: Hi. I'm Craig Lindgren. I'm with Boulder Exhibits in the Industrial Park. We've been there for over 14 years. I too object to this annexation attempt because I'm not able to vote as a business owner. You're taking more tax dollars from us and providing no additional services to the Park or my business. Thanks.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you, sir. Herb Golterman.

GOLTERMAN: I am Herb Golterman with Golterman and Sabo. I am a property owner of 3555 Scarlet Oak Boulevard and 3545 Scarlet Oak Boulevard in Tree Court Industrial Park. We are objecting to this annexation because we're unable to vote and because we're going to have additional costs and receive no more in additional services. And I just want to add that we've been in ... an occupant of the Industrial Park for 17 years and feel like the services we ... that the County provides are just fine. They're great. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you. Judith Wilson.

WILSON: My name is Judy Wilson. I'm the Accounting Manager for Lawrence Fabric and Metal Structures located in Tree Court Industrial Park. We've been there for around 20 years and we're voicing our objection to the annexation because we don't have the ability to vote, and the significant tax increase will not give us any additional services.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you, ma'am. Paul Ganning.

GANINGER: My name Paul Ganinger. We live 3320 Quinette Road. We are probably one of the two largest property owners in this block. We've also owned the property since 1946. We remember when the Industrial Court was started. We remember all the attempts of Valley Park and other assorted people trying to annex it in. However, when you look at this from my perspective, our family's been there for all this time, perfectly happy with the services that we get from Jefferson ... not Jefferson County, but St. Louis County. Somebody said that we don't get any spraying for bugs, mosquitos and whatnot. I see those guys every summer and have for years. So you got to take it with a grain of salt. On January the 6th, I met with two attorneys that were representing the Valley Park annexation and I asked them "What are you do for me?" They said, "Well, we can offer you street maintenance, and sewers and all this stuff, snow removal." Well, it's 900 feet from the end our property lines to my house and it's all private. The Peter Breen Estates that goes down ... the roads that go down there cross our property. That's private. There's a whole lot of things here that don't add up. Why would you take this property in unless you are just trying to get around us and get to the Industrial Court. Our taxes are going to increase every time I buy a car, every month that I pay a cell phone bill and everything else, and what am I going to get for it? Not one blessed thing. In talking to these two folks, it reminds me of talking to my 22-year-old son, and, you know, he'll tell me, "Dad, I'm going to cut the grass for you." Well, you and I all know that ain't going to happen. And that's what's going to happen here. Not a damn thing except for they're going to take our money. And I don't know about you folks, but I think I've paid enough of taxes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you, sir. Kirk Angevine.

ANGEVINE: Hello. My name is Kirk Angevine. I own the Angevine Company and the property at 3380 Tree Court. We've been there for over 40 years. We're very happy with the St. Louis County taking care of the whole property. And I oppose this because we have no vote. Property taxes or taxes are going to increase with no additional services. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you, sir. Richard Zimmerman.

ZIMMERMAN: I'm here representing Chemco Aerospace in Tree Court Industrial. We own our property and we lease another property in the Park. We're very happy with the services provides by St. Louis County. We've never had any problems. We're very opposed to an annexation. The tax increases would de-incentivize any more investment in our plant, and personal property taxes on equipment is the opposite ... it would have a very negative effect on us and I think others in the Park as well. We're very opposed to the annexation.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Warren Sauer.

SAUER: I'm Warren Sauer from Sauer Machine Company and Diana Sauer. We've been in Tree Court for 50 years, and we object to increased taxes with no increase in services. We've been well satisfied with the County for the 50 years we've been at Tree Court. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Dave Forsythe.

FORSYTHE: I'm Dave Forsythe, General Manager at CR Magnetics, 3500 Scarlet Oak. We own the property in Tree Court Industrial. We've been there 16 years. We moved from ... I'm with the rest of the group from Industrial that we don't believe this should happen. Sixteen years ago we moved into the Industrial Park from Fenton Industrial Park because it was such a more attractive location for us, and I can honestly say that we received much better services from the County where we're at now than we ever did in Fenton Industrial Park. The other thing I'd like to say is when we first heard about this and had a public meeting over at the City Hall and the reasons for the annexation were given to us by the City officials, no word was said about services. No word was said about Tree Court residents. The only word I heard was "We want the money." And that's a quote ... and the appropriate or inappropriate giggling after that quote. Stop this covetous action please. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Eric Seiler.

SEILER: My name is Eric Seiler. I represent the Seiler Instrument Company in Tree Court, and I'd just like to add my name to the list that opposes this annexation particularly without ... with the additional taxes and without much representation.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Kennie Stiles.

STILES: My name is Kennie Stiles, and I live on Spindle which is down in Tree Court. I wanted to make a couple of comments about ... I appreciate all these people from the Industrial Park. There's a big difference. They don't live there so they get to go home and enjoy these benefits that you guys supposedly say St. Louis County provides and they get those at their houses. The services that they're talking about in the Industrial Park, they don't live there so they don't need those services. The one thing that I would go through ... and there's a couple of things about meetings. I will say I have talked with Valley Park several times ... by the way, I'm the president of the Trustees for our [inaudible] Association, and a couple of things Valley Park did mention. Someone brought up the question them about money, and they did say and I appreciate your honesty, "If we just annexed you, the funds that come from those taxes would not be enough to support you guys and provide you services." And I felt like they were honest and have not ... the only promise they have given me has been that they would maintain our roads. They also said in the future we would like to see people get water or sewers, but they said, "We don't have the money for that. That would have to come from grants." And so we would have to address it because we are private roads. And I will address ... we pay about ... right now we pay \$300 dollars a year in dues and then when there's work done, our bank account can't afford to have our road chipped or sealed, there's an assessment like last year we have a \$270 assessment. So last year they paid \$570 bucks. Also with [inaudible] police service. I will tell you, other than the flood when the flood was down there people were going down to MSD, I see a police officer maybe once every six weeks. Now I'm not there 24 hours a day. If you want to see them, you need to call them. So when they talk about great police service, I'm sure the police

department is great when I call them, I need them, but they don't do routine police patrol. Also my biggest complaint, you talk about services in the County, the guy from St. Louis County, I'm going to tell you those services I've never seen. He probably doesn't even know where we are. When mosquito spray, you usually have to call them and they will come down if you call them. The other thing with roads, there's never any help with roads, the Public Works Department, I understand they're private roads, but we never get those services when you talk about hauling away stuff if there's a storm or tornados, they don't come down and offer to help us clear that stuff out. Also the biggest thing that I have an issue with is your zoning ordinance. We had a house ... he talked about on Westerman. This guy's mortgage company did in about four months what St. Louis County couldn't deal with in 20 years. And you guys, if you want to you can look it up in the newspaper. There's information about this guy that St. Louis County has been dealing with for 20 years. And even now there's an issue I've been dealing with and I get different answers and nothing ever gets done, and I know we're in the back ... we're a growing community, I mean agewise. The roads are a big deal. I know the Industrial Park they love to use our roads. Their employees walk our roads every day so they ... yeah ... they get benefits from us. And I understand their tax dollars are going to go up, but I also understand that we live there and we're asking for help and so I appreciate your taking the time to listen to me. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you, sir. Steve Hurster.

HURSTER: Hi! My name is Steve Hurster. I'm representing Bohn and Dawson which is member of the Industrial Park and I'm also the Trustee of the Industrial Park organization that's been around since 1966. In 1990, I became an Industrial Park Trustee and this is our third annexation attempt on the property in Tree Court, and we are opposed as you've heard all of our members have come tonight to express their opinions. St. Louis County Police in the Seventh Precinct does a terrific job during the daytime. Mr. Stiles, I'd say that we're there seven days a week, 24 hours a day so we, I think, we kind of live there too at Bohn and Dawson so we get services all day long, all night long from St. Louis County, and we think they do a very good job. But Valley Park Fire District, we're their largest source of revenue, I believe with the Valley Park Fire District. They do a terrific job. We don't have any issues with the Fire Park District, they do a great job. Valley Park School District ... if you look at our tax bill, we're, I think the largest source or one of the largest sources of revenue for ... already for Valley Park School District so we feel like we're doing our fair share. We have Kirkwood Water. I think I can look at my fellow residents and say if we had a complaint, it would have been with Kirkwood Water, but that's not tonight. St. Louis County plows our roads, but we also as an Industrial Park contract with a private plow service because we have to make sure that our buildings are open at the beginning of every work day to make sure that our employees can get to work. So in addition to St. Louis County providing us plowing services, we as an Industrial Park tax ourselves, collect the money and hire an independent contractor to come plow for us in addition to that because it's so valuable to running our businesses. We did reach out to the City of Valley Park once we found out that there was an annexation attempt, and we sat down and met with them with an open mind and suggested to them if you have anything to offer us, now is the time to offer it to

us, and as the presentation concluded, they really didn't have any new services to offer. So we're opposed to it because there is nothing to offer us and they want to take more money from us in the form of taxes. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you. Elkin Kistner.

KISTNER: I'm Elkin Kistner. I represent Tree Court Industrial Park. As you've heard tonight ... well, first of all, all of the members of the Association are adamantly opposed to the annexation proposal. I think the majority of them have either appeared here personally or through representatives tonight to express the unanimous view that this is an attempt to obtain additional revenue for Valley Park without providing any significant additional services to the Industrial Park. The Industrial Park historically has been very self-sufficient with the able support of St. Louis County. If you look at the ... perhaps the most important element is providing security. Your government needs to provide the security through a police force. The Industrial Park has had a negligible crime rate. It has basically been insignificant. They've been very pleased with the police protection that they've been afforded by St. Louis County. And if you look closely at the Plan of Intent, there's really no guarantee that Valley Park, which has not always been very reliable in terms of making its commitments in previous annexation efforts, there's really no guarantee that they're actually going to have additional service through their contract with St. Louis County. The contract doesn't exist yet so again, just to reiterate what my clients have actually told you already tonight, there's next to no services and to some extent, the City has been very forthright in almost admitting that this is simply an effort to obtain revenue from the Industrial Park in order to subsidize another effort or other parts of its effort. We submit that that's not fair. We're going to be making a written submission that will address that very specifically in terms of explaining why it is that the additional services that the Plan of Intent suggests are going to be provided are a [loseery??] with respect to the Industrial Park and explain to the Commission exactly how much money the members of the association have to pay for nothing. Now one interesting ... two interesting points came up tonight. One is that ... by the City ... one is that supposedly ... if I understood their argument, the Industrial Park owes it to the City because trucks come and go from the Industrial Park using Marshall Road. Well, there are other ingress and egress points first of all. Secondly, to the extent that those trucks use Marshall Road, it's maintained by the County. So I don't really understand that. We'll be addressing that further in our written submission. And this argument that somehow can take out the Industrial Park, you lose compactness, you end up with a pocket, we're not so sure that's correct. We'll go ahead and address that too because that certainly was not something that I saw in their Plan of Intent. This is a misbegotten idea and this should be rejected by the Commission. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Charles Rodgers.

RODGERS: I'm Charles Rodgers. I live on Twin Lakes. I've worked for Becker Control for 23 years. I sprayed that whole valley for 15 years every seven to ten days. After I left in '97 I lived in there for 20 years, I've seen two trucks come by. They never got out. They don't

spray. [inaudible] The services you're saying we're getting, we're not. They got a million-dollar budget to [inaudible] look at it, and one has ought to be able to vote for it is the people in there. These factors can't vote. They don't want it. We want it. We ought to be the one to vote for it. That's all.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you, sir. Daniel Garrow.

GARROW: My name is Daniel Garrow. I own property located at 3310 Quinette Road. Thanks for letting me have the opportunity to speak. For full disclosure purposes, I have no vested interest in this matter what so ever other than I'm a home owner in the unincorporated area subject to the annexation proposal. I don't own, work for, or know anyone who owns business in the Tree Court Industrial area. Since the rules of the hearing call for public comments to be limited to three minutes, I will only briefly describe what I oppose about the proposal that we're subject to. First, I'd like to make the following point to the members of the Boundary Commission. As written in the Boundary Commission rules ... I gave you a copy ... most recently revised on June 25, 2013, the rules contain a requirement that clearly prohibits the Commission members from allowing this illegal annexation proposal to move forward. Under the rules the Boundary Commission, Article 11, entitled Decision in Paragraph 4, Section B, it clearly states, and I quote, "For a boundary change proposal the Commission shall not approve any boundary change proposal in which more than 50 percent of the combined land subject to the proposal is unincorporated area or areas unless the combined area subject to the proposal has a population of more than 10,000 persons."

Next, for the record I'd like to note that in the submitted proposal for the annexation, the documents contain several items that don't follow Missouri law or statues regarding annexation. Due to time constraints, I'll leave that for another matter.

Next, I'd like to briefly address my fellow property owners and make them aware of three things. First, and I spent the weekend research things. After research this proposal, it was obvious that what the City of Valley Park is trying to do is basically a land grab in an effort to raise revenue for their City. This would be accomplished by gaining property taxes for all of us owning property and by levying business tax from the business owners down in Tree Court Industrial. As shown in the annexation proposal, Valley Park has a much higher property tax rate than what we currently pay. In addition, my research clearly shows that the property of the City of Valley Park sells for a much lower per square foot rate than the adjacent property subject to this proposal. Ask any unbiased realtor and you'll quickly learn that the property value will decline if this proposal gains any footing.

For the condo owners of Arbor Creek, although you are currently in the Parkway School District, do not think for a minute that if this proposal were to get passed, the next logical step would be an attempt to get those who are set up in the School Districts to redo the school district lines. I urge you to research for yourself how a move from Parkway Schools would negatively impact your property values within your condominium association.

Number three. In corresponding with the attorney at the City of Valley Park, he advised me that the citizens who are requesting this annexation who live in the lower residential area of Tree Court ... and I believe it's referred to as Breen ... the supposed benefit to these property owners would be that the City of Valley Park would do a better job with maintenance of streets, sewer and water and sanitation. In reality, none of these would prove out to be true with Valley Park in control. All you have to do is simply drive down the main street, St. Louis Avenue, here in the heart of town and count the countless potholes and then go on to the side streets which are ... many of which are in disrepair.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Mr. Garrow, your time's up. If you could include that in a written ...

GARROW: One more sentence.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Okay.

GARROW: Why any person in lower Tree Court would believe that unpaved roads would take precedent over the streets should the City be able to ascertain more revenue is probably living in a pipedream.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you, sir. Next speaker is Scott Jepsen.

JEPSEN: Thank you. My name is Scott Jepsen. I'm a new property owner down in the bottom, the valley there, 1331 Twin Lakes Drive. We just bought a piece of property we're tearing down and we're building a house there. My thoughts on this is that we bought this as unincorporated St. Louis County because we wanted to live in unincorporated St. Louis County. We would prefer the services from St. Louis County rather than Valley Park. It's my personal belief that it would decrease the property value, and it would increase my ... the taxes that goes forward. So I would ask you to not let this thing move forward. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Jeanne Angell.

ANGELL: Hi, my name is Jeanne Angell. I'm the president of the condo board at Arbor Creek. I think we have a different situation like the other home owner. We have 96 condos and we have a Kirkwood address, we have Valley Park Fire, we have Parkway Schools, so we don't even feel like we're part of a community. So I know that feeling part of a community is one of the big things that we think this would be a good idea to be annexed into Valley Park. I don't really know ... I don't think we get any services from St. Louis County that I'm aware of because we pay for our roads, we pay private for our trash and we pay a lot for trash a year, but we pay over \$90 per condo for trash, and snow removal we pay a lot also because we use private services. We never see the police, but I'm sure if we called them, they would come. We see the firemen more and they're great. And I think that's about it. It's just we feel like we're the ... sometimes the ugly stepchildren of Kirkwood and don't really belong to a community so that's what we would look forward to. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you, ma'am. Bill Mauller.

MAULLER: Okay. I'm a resident down in the valley. One of the things that we haven't addressed is the people who take care of our roads, it's a voluntary association, and one of the issues we have is not everybody participates so there's a lot of us who put a lot of sweat and work and money into these roads and we get the roads fixed so ... but our big grief is that the worst scofflaw we had down there has moved out and I would have liked ... mainly would have voted for the Valley Park to take over so they could make him pay taxes, but this is the way it goes. I've heard a rumor that the sewer plant is going to expand again. We live right next to that sewer plant. We didn't when we moved in. The sewer plant has moved closer and closer to us as it goes, and next they're going to take our property, and I don't know if it's true or not. But there is a road, a gravel road called Appletree, and I don't know whether it has legal ability to stand against the sewer company because they will gobble it up also. I thought maybe if Valley Park ran the place they could stand and fight for Appletree Court, Appletree Road, and my land too, and several other neighbors along that road. And then I sympathize with the people in the Industrial Park, but I also think where did they ever get the idea that we get tit for tat, we pay tax dollars and we get services. What country do they live in? I wish it was true, but I pay a lot of tax dollars and I get nothing, and this is the way it is where we are so now is a chance for us to vote and maybe get our road fixed. It's not much. We just wanted a little bitty thing, and we didn't get it so now we're coming to this. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Stacy Cantu-Harris.

CANTU-HARRIS: So I live at 1125 Arbor Creek Drive, and I don't think that she speaks for everybody when she says that we want to be a part of Valley Park. I don't think that Arbor Creek Condominiums has a great community feel because I don't think Arbor Creek Condominium owners want to have a great community feel. What I am concerned about though is my property value and I think that if we were to become a part of Valley Park, it would negatively impact my property value in Arbor Creek because currently we are part of Parkway School District and I worry that even they don't say that we're going to become a part of Valley Park today School District, I think that whenever they decide to redistrict, it could negatively impact us because they're going to make us become a part of Valley Park School District and I think that most people know that Parkway School District has a much higher accreditation than Valley Park. When I moved there, it was something that I considered knowing that I would be starting a family shortly so I think that ... that if you do make the decision to make this part of Valley Park, it's kind of unfair to the people who have moved in there because the condo complex has only been there ... I don't know ... ten-eleven years now and so a lot of the people who moved in there were younger, and I think that a lot of people who are younger and moving into a condo complex take that into consideration because they know that either they're start a family there or they're probably going to need it for resale value when they move on to a family home. So I just don't think that all of those things have been taken into consideration for the owners of Arbor Creek, and also whenever it was communicated to us ... or whenever I received



my first communication, they called it “Tree Court Park or Industrial Park.” I didn’t even realize that Arbor Creek was a part of that until much later so for her to say that she speaks on behalf of Arbor Creek I don’t think that’s really accurate, and I never received anything from Arbor Creek that spoke to this where they asked for our input. So I think that that’s a huge thing you guys should take into consideration that I don’t know that all the Arbor Creek residents really understand the impact to them. Thank you. Also, I don’t see any benefit to us because I already pay \$165 dollars a month for my snow removal, water, trash, all that’s stuff already provided from my condo so I don’t see any impact of service to me for paying more property tax. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you. Robert Jackson.

JACKSON: I also live at the Arbor Creek Condominiums. My wife has lived there for nine years. I’ve lived there for a little over a year and half. We do not see any increase in services that we will see. In fact, a lot of the money that they talk about are for services we don’t need like yard waste removal. What we do see is what will probably happen, we actually have our condo on the market right now, and everything that we’re hearing that if this does go through it would definitely negatively affect our property values so we are ... I actually see some of neighbors here. I’m sorry. Maybe you guys should come down to our building. We have a very nice community in our building. Everybody gets along great, and we have no problems with where we live currently, but we are very much against the annexation. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: And our last speaker, Matt Brown.

BROWN: Sorry guys, I get nervous. I’m not a good speaker. First thing, sir, that road you were talking about, St. Louis Avenue, that’s actually St. Louis County road. I just looked it up on my phone so that’s the maintenance you get there. Second thing is I don’t think you guys realize how much money we pay to keep them roads up down there. I’m from 3377 Tree Court. When the flood happened that just happened, MSD used those roads constantly to get out there tearing the roads up so we maintain all these roads and then MSD, which it’s good but they’re helping everybody else, but they’re just tearing the road right back up. Since they drove through MSD when we had those floods, they had all them big trucks coming and there’s new holes and I just paid I think \$2,500 dollars just for my road assessment. So, I don’t know, that’s just what I wanted to say and let you guys know that.

CHAIRMAN DORSEY: Thank you, sir. Now as I said earlier, the Boundary Commission will receive written comments for 21 days from today. I would encourage you who are here that did not speak if you want to let the Boundary Commission know your views, please submit your ... your written comments. We will take it all into consideration and at that, I will conclude this meeting.