

**TRANSCRIPT OF MAP PLAN PUBLIC HEARING  
 GREEN PARK, LAKESHIRE, SUNSET HILLS, VALLEY PARK,  
 & ST. LOUIS COUNTY  
 November 13, 2018**

**COMMISSION ATTENDANCE:**

| Commissioners       | Present (P)/Absent (A) |
|---------------------|------------------------|
| Rick Dorsey         | P                      |
| Steve Frank         | P                      |
| Thomas Mooney       | A                      |
| Ann Pluemer         | P                      |
| Kathleen Schweitzer | P                      |
| Ben Uchitelle       | P                      |
| Kyra Watson         | A                      |
| Steve Wegert        | P                      |

**OTHERS PRESENT:**

Michelle Dougherty, Executive Director

**CALL TO ORDER**

---

**CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER:** I’d like to convene this open meeting for the informal Public Hearing regarding the Map Plans of Green Park, Lakeshire, Sunset Hills, and Valley Park.

My name is Kathleen Schweitzer, and I’m the Chair of the Boundary Commission. Tonight we’re holding an information public hearing to hear presentations from those cities previously mentioned with respect to their Map Plan for possible annexations over the next five years. Generally, the Boundary Commission has two stages, the Map Plan stage, and the Proposal Stage. Tonight’s information public hearing provides an opportunity for the cities to explain and comment on their proposed Map Plans. Map Plans show an area or areas that a city may wish to annex in the next five years but does not comment them to doing so. In addition, for St. Louis County’s Map Plan, it shows what area St. Louis County may wish to declare as an established unincorporated area for the next five years but does not commit them to doing so either.

Public comment will need to be directed toward the Map Plans being presented this evening. Commission staff will be available after the meeting to answer any questions regarding the process.

I’d like to begin with a few introductory comments relating to the Boundary Commission if I may. The Boundary Commission is an independent government body that reviews boundary change proposals in St. Louis County. The Commission derives its authority from the Missouri State Statutes and St. Louis County Ordinance. The Commission is comprised of eleven members and two staff members, our Executive Director, Michelle Dougherty, and our Legal Counsel, Michael Hart. We meet monthly with additional public hearings scheduled as necessary to consider map plans and boundary change proposals.

The eleven Commissioners are all appointed according to the following: Four are appointed through St. Louis County Municipal League on behalf of Mayors of Small Cities, Mayors of Mid-Sized Cities, and Mayors of Large Cities. Four members are appointed by the County Executive, and three members are joint appointees of the Municipal League and the County Executive.

The Commission welcomes your participation in the public comment section of tonight’s public hearing; however, you will need to fill out a comment card form and present it to Michelle. We ask that you do this prior to the end of St. Louis County’s presentation. If you’re speaking as an individual, you’ll be allotted three minutes. If you’re speaking on behalf of a group or an association, you’ll be allotted five minutes. The Commission will also take public comment either by letter or email up until December 31, 2018, and on these or any other submitted map plans so those comments will be part of the public record.

As a reminder, no decisions will be made tonight. This is an information hearing only. Each presenting city will have fifteen minutes and you are listed on the Agenda. We ask that you respect that time guideline please ... and I would like to ask the Commission Members to introduce themselves and include their residence and their appointing authority. I’ll begin with Steve Wegert.

WEGERT: Thank you, mam. I’m Steve Wegert. I was appointed by the Mayors of Large Cities, and I represent the northern part of St. Louis County.

DORSEY: My name is Rick Dorsey. I was appointed by County Executive Dooley to represent Unincorporated North County.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: And I’m Kathy Schweitzer. I was appointed by County Executive Dooley to represent West Unincorporated St. Louis County.

UCHITELLE: Ben Uchitelle. I was appointed by the Municipal League to represent Mayors of Large Cities and the Clayton central area.

PLUEMER: I’m Ann Pluemer, and I was appointed by County Executive Steve Stanger to represent Unincorporated St. Louis County.

FRANK: And I’m Steve Frank. I was appointed by the Municipal League.

PLUEMER: I forgot to say, “South County”, I think.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: That’s okay. All right. Thank you so much, and first up will be Green Park.

MELLO: Good evening. My name’s James Mello. I’m the City Administrator for Green Park. We submitted a Map Plan to tentatively annex the area of roughly between existing Green Park boundaries, Interstate 55, Interstate 270, and Tesson Ferry, effectively all areas to the north of Green Park ... or sorry, to the south. Sorry, turned around. To the south of Green Park across Lindbergh. It’s roughly double our size. We’re not anticipating taking all of the territory. This is just our initial proposal for an area of increased study.

We’re exploring areas that have a similar residential design and structure to currently incorporated areas and commercial areas, and those areas would have to offset anticipated expenditures that we would need to make in those areas to bring them up to our standards over the next five and ten year and even longer timeframes. The City’s interested in revenue neutral growth as well as small expansions in city services and benefits.

We’ve not done an extensive study at this time as to whether or not that would explicitly hold, but we’re confident it would not only from the commercial areas and enterprises and their tax basis that we’d be annexing, but also due to the fact that Green Park currently is hitting up the cap of 50% of our sales tax revenue still going to the pool. Added population would see those revenues grow, and we’d be able to retain more of the revenue we’re already generating at our own borders if we were to annex additional households, so we’re confident that we’ll be able to make that financial ... financial work.

Relative to the phasing of any projects, we considered phasing initially, but due to the fact that even though it’s a relatively large area relative to our existing incorporated boundaries, the ... the ... without taking the commercial and residential areas at the same time, it wouldn’t be as prudent and especially with the unknowing nature of the annexation process and future rounds of annexation, it would be ... it would be difficult to guarantee that we would either get the households we need or the commercial areas we need in any ... any successive phasings, so it’s kind of an all or nothing proposition which we’ve explored in the past and will continue to explore in the future even if we don’t do it during this phase.

As far as the timetable, the City is developing a questionnaire of frequently asked questions mailing to both the residents and businesses in existing Green Park and the proposed annexed areas. The City’s been made aware of some misinformation that’s been circulating both amongst our own residents and the residents of the unincorporated area particularly pertaining to the tax rates that they would experience. We seek ... we hopefully will be able to be able to understand what the residents’ current understanding is and address some of those concerns that they might have based on the feedback garnered from the mailer and the frequently asked questions that we’d be sending out. The City of Green Park plans on hosting at least one if not multiple open house presentations, perhaps either like this and after ... weekday evenings or maybe even Saturday mornings since it’s kind of more of a close-knit community, it might be a little bit more

prudent for that so that we can engage directly with the ... directly with the public and any interested residents and businesses to kind of refine our proposal based on the information we receive.

We believe that the local control of zoning and development plans is critical importance for our residents and extending control across Lindbergh Boulevard would be a great step in the right direction to protect the area as a whole from developments that residents on both sides of Lindbergh might find objectionable especially in the air of, you know, municipal marijuana and all that. Having control of both sides of Lindbergh might be important because we don’t currently have the authority to say what goes in on the other side of Lindbergh, but one could easily argue that that would affect our residents just as much even though it’s in a different jurisdiction. While the City concurrently affects zoning, the powers diminished if the same developments can just relocate across the street so that’s something we’re ... we’re interested in doing to protect our current residents and also extending that local zoning control to our nearby neighbors as well.

We believe that growing the City’s population, specifically to 5,000 people or more, would benefit the residents and businesses in the area both now and in the future by providing for additional options for governance such as potentially becoming a third-class city as well as positioning the city more favorably should there be any forced consolidation or disincorporation relating any new future city/county arrangement that might occur in the distant future, you know, we never know how it is ... how it might proceed, but that’s always a possibility and potentiality that’s been discussed before, and I’m sure will come up again, so we’d like to protect ourselves as best we can moving forward.

Lastly, growing the city population and revenues would not only allow us to expand and improve municipal services and benefits to the newly incorporated residents, but the added revenues would also allow us to improve and increase those services and benefits to our existing residents as well. Recently we’ve taken steps to, you know, increase police protection which is something with the new Prop P revenues that we’re receiving, again additional households would greatly increase that and we could really affect our local priorities with the additional funds.

Presently we’re the only city that has a contiguous incorporated area to the proposed annexation area, but in addition there are two areas that are incredibly similar. The two areas are incredibly similar in the residential and neighborhood design and style as well as the commercial developments; however, they’re non-redundant to a lot of the existing development in the city so if provide a more robust tax base for our residents as well as the residents on the other side of Lindbergh and, again, would provide more opportunity for local zoning control and say in what sort of developments are pursued in the future. Moreover, many of the community groups already in place bridge the gaps between both sides of Lindbergh, most notably that just happen to be located in the City of Green Park, the St. Simon’s and St. John’s communities are both very large in the South County area and in particular in the two areas across the ... across Lindbergh and so sort of being able to bridge that in a more formal municipality we thing would be a benefit and really help some of the communities.

Advantages to both the residents of our area and the proposed incorporated area, first of all, like I mentioned earlier, some of the misinformation that’s going on. The City of Green Park has no property tax on the municipal level. There’s no changes in utility taxes. The only change in sales tax would be a half-cent capital improvement sales tax, which again is probably already being paid by those residents who shop at our, you know, Fresh Thyme, was a Shop and Save, now a Schnucks or any of our other pretty extensive retail along Lindbergh. The revenues are exclusively used for road and bridge projects. The tax is levied on all retail sales transacted in the city, and the revenues are directly benefited the residents.

Unincorporated St. Louis County based on my rough back-of-the-envelope calculations collects about \$105.00 per capita in general sales tax in 2016. Green Park was able to capture about \$145.00 per capita in the same year not counting the capital improvement revenues. So we’re pretty proud of the way we’re able to capture, retain, and then spend the money that gets paid into tax pools locally to benefit the residents.

In addition to the tax advantages, increased neighborhood policing and police accountability to city priorities. As I mentioned we’re able to ... we contract with St. Louis County for our police service currently; however, because of that contractual relationship we’re able to emphasize certain priorities that simply calling a St. Louis County dispatcher might not be able to coordinate as effectively with ... with the residents and their concerns. We’re able to aggregate those concerns and sort of deliver planned priorities and coordinate with the police so that they can address those priorities and we can then respond to the residents and show them that we are working on them.

One of those priorities was to ... to ... to acquire bicycle ... qualified bicycle patrols and we have accomplished that with our neighborhood patrol officers are now both qualified. It was later in the fall, but they have been doing some bike patrols, which is something that a lot of residents’ desire. It gives them a chance to sort of see the police rather than just see police car driving by. It gives them an opportunity to stop and say “hi” to children and stuff like that, and it’s really been a great benefit that we’re looking forward to in 2019 and beyond to see that kind of relationship grow in our neighborhood.

We provide free trash, recycling, and yard waste services for our residents, which is not something that Unincorporated St. Louis County does. It’s a ... you know, it’s your tax dollars at work. You don’t have to pay the taxes and then pay the trash ... trashman as well, and that does include yard waste services year-round as well as two free bulk item pickups free of charge.

Again, there’s a ... there’s also increased local services which includes professional city staff, free public events. Every year we do a Grooving on the Green Concert which has free food and children’s activities and concert in St. Louis County’s Blake Snyder Park. We also provide senior activities. We do senior bingo periodically. Well attended so far, and we could even expand that ... usually about 70–80 people come. There’s prizes, free lunch, and it’s a good opportunity for our seniors who don’t get to get out and see each other that often. A lot of them are neighbors and don’t know each other very well, but they kind of come to these bingos and get a chance to socialize. We do children’s activities in addition to the concert. We do a

children’s Christmas Holiday Party, and then there’s just a lot of other local activities that we try and sponsor to give our residents a little bit more of that services.

There’s access to the community ... the Green Park Community Room, which is booked almost every weekend for birthdays, you know, bridal showers, family get-togethers. Especially around holidays it’s exceedingly popular and we make it very affordable at \$15.00 an hour for our residents compared to some of the other commercial space. They really prefer it, and it books up a year in advance in some cases.

And again, like I mentioned increased zoning and local control over industrial and commercial projects. It gives residents a lot more of a say as to what goes on around their neighborhood and around their community. We really try and support that. We try to make all the voices heard and ... and really have them affect what goes on in their neighborhoods.

We would probably propose based on our estimates and aggressive street replacement ... aggressive street replacement project ... could even be done via bond issue with the new revenues from their annexed area in the first five to ten years. A lot of the roads are not ... in the proposed area are not up to the standards that we would like to see in our neighborhoods so any sort of annexation would probably with some sort of aggressive road project as well, you know, not that it would benefit our residents directly, but that’s something we could accomplish for them and it would definitely be a benefit to the new residents of Green Park were that to happen.

And then there’s also potential upgrades to storm water areas in the residential areas. A lot of our storm water systems are aging and are or subpar design. As we have new developments in the area, we’re able to tackle those, and the city’s able to more directly coordinate with the project managers and see some of those storm water issues tackled and improved upon so that basements and such [don’t flooding] stop flooding. You know, a lot of the older storm waters aren’t inlets, they’re grates that get clogged very easily, and then people end up with backup in their basements and such, and we’ve really been making that a priority and would continue to do so.

Lastly, there’s been discussions both in favor and opposition to an expansion. We anticipate that our mailer and the frequently asked question that we’d be sending out with that would address a lot of the misconceptions and gather a lot more input from the residents both in the areas on both sides of Lindbergh about their opinions on incorporation and any sort of conditions or concerns they might have about incorporated. Like I said, we’d also be looking at least one, perhaps multiple open houses to sort of refine that feedback before refining our own Map Plan and making sure that we’re ... we’re on the right track. So, if anybody has any questions, I’d be happy to answer them.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER:            Questions from the Commissioners? Ben ... Ben Uchitelle.

UCHITELLE:                            Yes. Do you have any property taxes now?

MELLO:                                 No, we have no city ....

UCHITELLE: So you depend solely on sales tax?

MELLO: Sale taxes as well as utility taxes. We get revenues from permits as well.

UCHITELLE: And you now contract with St. Louis County for your police?

MELLO: Correct, and we don’t have a municipal court, so we don’t receive any revenues for court.

UCHITELLE: So if you did annexation, would you continue with the County acting as your police department?

MELLO: For the foreseeable future, that’s probably accurate. You know, we would look at expanding other municipal services first. County provides great police service. Our NPO’s are fantastic, and like I said, they’re really responsive to our priorities so ...

UCHITELLE: So the police department is St. Louis County right now?

MELLO: Correct. Yeah, we contract with them.

UCHITELLE: In your community?

MELLO: Yes.

UCHITELLE: And you talked about if you annexed this area to the south, you’d have to improve the roads. Wouldn’t that impact adversely on your existing residential expenses?

MELLO: No, with a lot of the area ... not a lot, the area that’s incorporated will have ... there’s a significant commercial aspect to it as well. We anticipate that with that commercial ... those commercial ....

UCHITELLE: Have you done any studies of that?

MELLO: Not specifically. We need to refine our plan first.

UCHITELLE: Do you have any idea whether people in the area are interested in being annexed?

MELLO: We’ve heard from ... from people on both sides of it. Again, we think the mailer ...

UCHITELLE: Some are in favor and some are against?

MELLO: Correct.

UCHITELLE: How about in your own residents?

MELLO: The same. I believe you might hear from some of them later.

UCHITELLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Any other Commissioners have any questions? Hearing none, we’ll thank you for your presentation.

MELLO: Great. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Next presentation is by Lakeshire.

UCHITELLE: What is the population of ...?

MELLO: 2,600 [inaudible].

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Thank you very much.

UCHITELLE: Thank you.

UCHITELLE: [inaudible] bother you with one more question. If you did your annexation ... keep saying ... how much additional population would you add?

MELLO: Roughly [inaudible].

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Roughly [inaudible].

BILZING: My name’s Robert Bilzing, and I’m representing Lakeshire this evening for the proposal. And I’d like to introduce the other members for the Agenda. This Wayne Neidenberg; he’s the Chief of Police. Jo Feltmann; she’s the Court ... I mean the City Clerk. Steve Zumwalt; he’s another Alderman. And then we have Charles Funk; he’s the Treasurer. I’m the Alderman, the head of the Aldermen.

So, anyway, if I could start by just briefly ... we went back to the archives to look some of the old minutes and so forth, and so I’m not sure if everyone’s familiar with the history of Lakeshire since we are a small community, but anyway, in 1947 we were created a village, and then in 1951 there was an election held and we became a City of the Fourth Class, and that’s where we have continued from then on. So we ... you might say been in existence for over 70 years.

So, anyway, this is the map. You can see Lakeshire’s in the center, and then the upper portion ... oh, can I do that? I’m weak. So easy. Thank you. Okay, so anyway, here’s Lakeshire in the center. This small portion up here is Area A, and down here is Area B. And then if you can ... you can actually see in the report I gave you, there is a map towards the back.

Okay, but then if you would start here on the first page, I believe the first question is “What criteria?” So on that first page, you’ll see that it talks about to determine the proposal area for maximum size and minimal continuous borders and number 2 would be “To Assess the Potential Financial Impact on the City’s Ability to Extend City Services to the Succession of the Proposed Areas”

So anyway, then if you go down into the lower portion of that first page where it talked about the Boundary Commission Rules. Okay, with the evaluation, which we actually started in 2016, so might say, “Well, that’s two years since have gone by,” but anyway that’s what we ... because there were actually conversations going on for about the last ten years about should Lakeshire expand or whatnot. So we ... because I believe there was an actual meeting a number of years ago with Lakeshire and the Boundary Commission.

DOUGHERTY: Lakeshire submitted a Map Pan in 2006.

BILZING: Yeah. Okay.

DOUGHERTY: [inaudible]

BILZING: But anyway, it kind of laid flat, we’re just a more cautious community, you might say. So anyway, in 2016, we had this study made and then we found out at that time that the rules of the Commission and so forth were that it’s only every four years that we can submit a proposal so this is the year.

DOUGHERTY: [inaudible]

BILZING: Right, so that’s why we’re here. So anyway ... so anyway, if we go down to the Commission Rules, you can see with the last two paragraphs, it gives you the amount of acreage, our acreage, and then it says if both areas were successfully annexed, the added territory would be less than half, 46.7 percent of the resulting city therefore satisfying Criteria #1.

The final paragraph on that page says that the area also reflects that Area A shares 27.3 of its border with the northern border of Lakeshire while Area B shares 18.6 of its border with the southern border of Lakeshire; hence, both proposed annexation areas would meet the continued [stet] requirement criteria for #2 so ....

So, I think the ... what I talked about in the prior comments with the timetable, that’s why we’re here tonight and other timetable would depend your determination.

“Why is it important for the City to implement the various components of your city plan?” The reason, I guess we would state, is that we are stable, incorporated city ... rather, stable, corporated city, and we do have the ability with our community to extend our proven services to the unincorporated areas of borders. These borders are so close to us, they are our neighbors. We sit side-by-side with them in this area. We know each other. We visit the same shopping areas

and we attend the same churches, thus are needs are similar as are our concerns, so I don’t think there would be any lapse in the continuous connection between our neighborhoods.

“Why is our city the best to handle this?” And I guess the answer to that would be is because we have these services already in place. We have department heads who’d handle these services. In the proposed areas, as I pointed out earlier, are very similar so we just all connect, you might say. We sit side-by-side.

Now the only additional change I think primarily for the addition areas would be there would be an additional Lakeshire tax, and it’s quite small, but at the same time there would be enhanced services as far as the new communities that would be added on would find.

So, again, another question I think that was proposed is “What arguments would you make to support your proposal to the residents of these other areas?” And in this I could say we have ... we’re not quite like Green Park, we don’t have free trash service; however, we do have a very cost-effective trash collection which would I think would benefit the added areas.

We have a very quick snow removal on all our streets, and it’s not what I would describe as a gradual determination of which street’s going to be serviced first. All our streets are met the same way.

With street maintenance in our community, we evaluate the streets, all of the streets each and every year. We have both concrete, asphalt; they are evaluated each on the separate basis, and then they are ... the situation is normally taken care within that year. If there is an emergency situation, it’s handled quickly. It’s not put on an agenda to see what timetable we’re going to be following.

As far as our police patrol goes, it is ... will be much more concentrated. Our streets are patrolled continuously, 24-hours, and I think the residents could say that they see the police car go by more than once or twice a day.

And in our community, once a year we have what we call an Annual Easter Egg Hunt. We have only one park, but we use it, and it’s visited by the areas in the co-community.

And one of the biggest pluses is I think for our community and if these other areas would be added is communication. Communication between the residents and the local government, and that would be the Aldermen and the Department Heads. It’s not where you have to go through ... I call it “red tape” to finally find the appropriate person to talk to handle the problem. In our community it’s sent out with all of the people, all the Alderman, everyone is listed with their phone number, and believe it or not, a great many times when you make that phone call, you talk to that person. If not, a message can be left and I believe you will find that that person will be reached by the person he’s trying to reach within that day.

I think there’s been the question the communication between the proposed areas and Lakeshire itself, and parts of B, which is down here, they have actually come to our community center and

asked at one time to be annexed. However, I mentioned that we were cautious, so it didn’t quite too far from there. Area A, there has been rumors because I said there’s been talk going for the last ten years or so. So there have been rumors and there have been inquiries from that area wanting to know what are we going to get out of it? What’s going to be our benefit if we become part of your community?” So that’s the only types of communication I would say that’s been going back and forth.

If you would look on ... we can turn back towards the back, and if you look under where it says “Expenses,” I think that might give you some idea within this study where we talked about ... we checked if there would be increase in cost and so forth and then at the same time it also goes into the question of police protection and so forth. That’s why I asked the Chief here if had any questions in that area.

But anyway, in our city we have six Aldermen, and if you look at the area, it’s not a giant community, so we ... and this study more or less decided if these areas were expanded to these two an adjustment could be made where it would still be six Aldermen so there wouldn’t be any expense further with that.

The Chief has evaluated the situation with the added patrols in these areas and we have at this time about 12 officers on our force, that’s fulltime and part-time, and I think the results of this study was there might be one or so up ... one or two maybe additional officers to handle the patrols in the way, in the same manner that we have it now. So, would be an added expense, but at the same time it wouldn’t be an undue added expense.

The other thing in talking about these two areas, it’s primarily residential so again, this is the type of community we are already, so it wouldn’t be anything unusual for us to add this additional area onto our books. Right down here, this Old Tesson Ferry. This is the only area that you would call business, and we’re familiar with that. It’s not a large business area. It’s a lumber yard, florist, auto repair, and so forth. And our residents do business with them already, you might say.

?: [inaudible]

BILZING: Okay. I’m sorry. I didn’t mean to go on and on. Okay. I’m just going to leave you with we feel that we are local government at it’s best and we think that we could add that to the new communities if they would be added on to us, and we also feel this would be a better partnership for the entire area. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Thank you. I’ll entertain any questions from the Commissioners. Rick Dorsey.

DORSEY: Sir, I ... you’ve obviously done a lot of study on this issue already. Do you have plans for going forward with the ... with one or both annexations?

BILZING: Yes.

DORSEY: Okay. So often what we see are basically the Christmas List of the communities that if everything isn’t perfect in a perfect world, you know, we might do this sometime in the next five years, but you have definite plans to go forward?

BILZING: Like I said, with this study we feel we can handle it, and so ... I mean we’re not hesitant about the situation.

UCHITELLE: Have you done any surveys to see if the people to be annexed ...

BILZING: No, the only thing is, like I mentioned, we haven’t gone to that degree, let’s say where surveys ... you’re talking about both for our community and for the two areas?

UCHITELLE: [inaudible]

BILZING: No.

UCHITELLE: What you’re saying is you have to add several more police persons if you went ahead with this annexation. That’s expensive.

NEIDENBERG: Can I answer that?

UCHITELLE: Sure.

NEIDENBERG: [inaudible] possible. Our police department is very diverse, okay. It’s a police department where a majority of the people have either worked for either St. Louis City Police Department, St. Louis County Police Department, or at least ten years of police work with a large police department . Every one that is hired has a four-year degree, okay? So these are extremely police officers. They weigh in and we’re lucky they retired young from a police department, and they come to Lakeshire because it’s such a great bedroom-community, okay? They all know something about police work, they’ve been there, they’ve done things, and they’re all skilled in different things like crime scene ...

UCHITELLE: But would you have to add more policemen?

NEIDENBERG: Probably one.

UCHITELLE: One?

NEIDENBERG: What I’m looking ... okay ... is the biggest thing I will do is add a supervisor, at least one supervisor more because we want a supervisor on every shift, okay, especially if we expand.

UCHITELLE: I get it. Thank you.

NEIDENBERG: You’re welcome.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Any additional questions from Commissioners? Hearing none, we will thank you for your presentation.

BILZING: Okay. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Next presentation will be given by Sunset Hills.

[inaudible] background conversation Uchitelle, Dougherty ....

SPRICK: I’m Lynn Sprick, Assistant Planner for the City of Sunset Hills. I’m going to be short and sweet because we do have the Christmas Wish List. Our Plan of Intent Map has not changed. It’s the same as it was in 2012. The City’s goal as was stated in the Comprehensive Plan which was adopted in May of 2016 is to facilitate healthy growth in the community through infill redevelopment and reinvestment while strategically evaluating the benefits of any potential annexations. Evaluation of potential costs and benefits of future annexations should be done prior to taking any action.

The City’s not currently pursuing any annexations, but we want to be prepared. If someone would ... if an area would petition the City for annexation, we want to be prepared. And our Map shows those areas that we would consider annexing. They are contiguous to city boundaries and would be a natural continuation of the city. The areas are mostly developed, and annexation would provide uniform application of development standards and enforcement codes pertaining to public health, safety, and welfare. The City would be able to offer police protection, public works services, planning and zoning services, parks and recreation opportunities and relatively low property tax rates. The services that would remain the same would be utility services, water, sewer, fire protection districts, and school districts would not change. So, I’m done unless you have any questions.

UCHITELLE: Well, your brevity is excellent, but ... so you have no plans whatsoever.

SPRICK: We have no plan for annexation.

UCHITELLE: You’re just doing this because the law requires you to do it unlike Lakeshire which apparently is actively considering ...

SPRICK: We are not as aggressive as Lakeshire at this time.

UCHITELLE: So you’re just doing this and this is for the record and that’s that?

SPRICK: This is for the record and, you know, if any of these neighborhoods or these residents would petition the City, we’re prepared to annex, you know, weighing the costs of benefits.

UCHITELLE: So, in other words, you’re not going to do anything further unless these areas ask to be annexed by you?

SPRICK: That’s correct.

UCHITELLE: It’s not going to be the other way around.

SPRICK: Not at this time, no.

UCHITELLE: Okay. Thank you.

SPRICK: Thank you.

?: I have a question. Is this right here the green part that’s next to your’s ...?

SPRICK: Can I come over?

?: Oh, sure. Is that the ... is that the hospital?

SPRICK: Yes.

?: Okay. Have you talked to the hospital?

SPRICK: No.

?: Okay. I won’t tell them.

SPRICK: Don’t tell. No. Anything else?

UCHITELLE: Thank you.

SPRICK: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Thank you for your presentation. Next presentation is Valley Park.

[Background talking]

I’m not sure if I’m supposed to ... should I wait for Michelle?

DORSEY: Well, she’s coming in right now, but go ahead.

?: You can start.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: You can go ahead and start.

ENGELMEYER: All right. I just want to say thank you to the Commission for allowing us to present this tonight. My name is Tim Engelmeyer. I’m the City Attorney for Valley Park, Missouri. I’ve with me tonight is Bill Hanks. He’s in the back corner in the blue

sweater. He’s the City Clerk for ... for Valley Park. The Mayor would be here, but there’s a legislative meeting tonight also so she’s covering that. Mayor Chandra Webster.

As many of you know, Valley Park is in far West County on the southside with a population of around 6,000 residents. The Meramec River cuts through our city, and obviously we’ve been in the news the last few years with some of the epic floods that we’ve had. Fortunately, the ... our levee, which is supposed to be a 100-year levee turned out to be 500-year levy and we’re able to fend off a lot of the ... the waters that would have hit our lower end.

We have industrial areas in the lower end, which is Ward 1. We have numerous professionals call Valley Park home. And we have bustling neighborhoods throughout the city.

I want to address some of the issues that prompted the submission of our Map Plan, and as Commissioner Dorsey asked a couple of folks back, “Is this a Christmas List or is this a specific plan?” I would say that Valley Park’s is a combination of both. For the most part, this is Christmas List; however, there are two projects that we do have in the pipeline. I want to address those briefly and just kind of bring the Commission up to speed on those two ... two areas.

One, the Commission, at least some members of the Commission may be familiar with, and that’s the Tree Court area. The Tree Court area is still sort of in the process right now. The other area is what we call Simpson, which is this area right here [steps away from mic to show map] ... I call it Simpson because there’s only one person that operates or owns that land and that’s Mr. Simpson, Mark Simpson, and he has an asphalt plant there, and he’s got a quarry there. No one lives there. It’s just a big area that he owns, about 400 and some odd acres.

When this particular cycle for annexation Map Plans, et cetera, came up, we were encouraged, and it was recommended to us that since we have these two still sort of in the process that we sort of resubmit them to the Commission just to be sure that we’re covering all of our bases. Neither one of these two are settled yet, but we’re still in the process, and we’re working hard to get an answer on both.

First, Tree Court. Tree Court, we presented our Map Plan to the full Commission back in 2016, and again, I can’t remember who was on the Commission or who wasn’t on the Commission, but I know there are several members that were there, and that was at the Lion’s Club in Valley Park. And we had a long night, and we presented our plan. St. Louis County presented their position. We heard from a lot of businesses. It was a long and very informative evening. The ... the elements that night were presented to the Commission. Ultimately it was rejected, and that proposal is still pending in the Circuit Court of St. Louis County. There’s been no determination, and right now the next thing we have over there I believe is a status conference, so we don’t even have a trial date set. We did have one earlier this year, but Counsel had some conflicts, so we had to postpone it. So we hope that will at least bring that to a head one way or the other, and our hope is that we can get that done in 2019.

Secondly is Simpson. And Simpson is a little bit an easier ... it’s an easier project, but Simpson is a large quarry, asphalt plant. It’s operated by Simpson Materials. The Simpson family has been



these areas so that’s obviously a big issue for some folks, and in the Tree Court area especially, you’re talking some very ... an elderly community that lives in the Tree Court area that needs help and so that’s what sort of prompted that area. Mr. Simpson, a little bit different. He’s the only person that ... that’s ... owns that part.

We also provide obviously, just like others have mentioned tonight, we provide police services. We pay ... it’s our largest budget item for our city. It’s an enormous budget item, but we contract with St. Louis County and ... so we don’t have the hit-and-miss police patrols that there are in a lot of these little pickets in remote St. Louis County. They’re regular patrols. They’re not just showing up when they’re called. They’re actually going up and down these neighborhoods so that is a big deal for especially people that live in some of these remote areas of St. Louis County.

Second issue is phasing. Yes, we’ve considered it. Obviously, you can see by our Map Plan, but again on the Christmas List type of thing [inaudible] so as far as that type of phasing, of course, we’ve put some thought into that, but as far as the grand scheme on phasing, I can say to the Commission, and I can say to anyone here that our focus in going to be Tree Court and the Simpson property, and the rest of the properties that are listing on here are, as Mr. Dorsey says, sort of the Christmas List. The City has no plans right now to address any of the other issues on this in the near future. Really, our focus in on ... in the two that we have in the pipeline now, and that is going to devote ... that’s what we’re going to devote our time and resources to in the near future.

Timetable for submission. Tree Court is in the Circuit Court and already submitted so that’s just going to be determined whenever the judge frees us up for a trial. Simpson could be presented to the Commission ... and I’m not sure how often the Commission meets ... I thought I heard once a month. As soon as St. Louis County passes the Ordinance for the Simpson property, we’re going to come back to the Commission so I will coordinate with Miss Dougherty to find a night that we can present that to the Commission.

Why is it important for the city to implement the various components of your plan? We want to grow. Just like every city, we want to expand. We have people that want to be a part of our community, and that’s a good thing.

Why is Valley Park the best community to serve in this area? Well, for one, we’re the closest. It’s about proximity for all these areas that we have on our ... on our Map. St. Louis County does want to send a crew again to far west St. Louis County to spray for mosquitos; they would rather have Valley Park do it or have people pay for it on their own ... or fix a pothole, or pick up trash, or plough snow. These areas are forgotten to a large extent and that is why people are coming up to our city hall that are living in unincorporated St. Louis County and asking us to take up this issue. Just as others have mentioned, it’s ... it’s ... really, it does boil down to, you know, whether or not our current city services, our current budget can support these areas. We’ve come to the conclusion that obviously the two that we have in our pipeline right now, we’re very confident with, and we’ve provided those documents to this Commission, and we’re going

provide them to the Circuit Court. The other ones, quite frankly, we haven’t done those studies yet, so I’m not in a position to be able to answer questions with regards to the other areas.

Our Public Works Department, we’re very proud of in Valley Park. We’ve done just a tremendous job. We’ve got great equipment. We’ve budgeted appropriately for it, and I can’t tell you how proud the Valley Park community is with our Public Works Department. Many of them ... in fact, most of them live in the City of Valley Park. Most of them have been there for many, many, many years. It’s a sense of pride with ... for the community, and I can tell you that we get very few compliments as elected officials or people serving the community, but I can tell you that the one thing that there’s no debate about in Valley Park is the job that our Public Works Department does. And I think people that are right outside our community see that, and that is one of the big things that people really want is really bang for their buck, bang for their tax buck, and I think a lot of folks right around the Valley Park feel like they’re not getting that and want to be a part of our community.

With regard to Mr. Simpson, like was mentioned a couple of minutes ago, that’s a nice large piece of land. He has a very good business there. It’s a thriving business. He does recycling, he does asphalt, and he does quarry, and St. Louis County, I think, really just wasn’t interested in taking on another quarry, and so that was one of the reasons why they were open to the idea of having this become part of Valley Park, so like I said, I do anticipate that we’ll be able to present that to this Commission in the near future, hopefully before June is what I’m hoping. It just depends on quickly the County Council, the St. Louis County Council passes their Ordinance.

What advantage do you offer the residents of these areas? I think I’ve kind of touched on that on my other ... the other five points.

What arguments would we make in support of the proposal to the residents? You know, we would make the same arguments that we’ve made in Tree Court. Do you feel underserved at this point? Do you want your trash picked up in a prompt and affordable fashion? Do you pay taxes, yet get little if nothing in return? These are the questions that we ask the people. When you need to talk with an elected official about something, do you want to go to Clayton or do you want to go right down the street? If you want services, we can provide them. If you want personal service, we’ll provide that. If you want to speak with the Mayor, here’s her number ... I mean, that’s the way we operate in Valley Park. That’s not what ... the way things are operated in St. Louis County.

Has there ever been any expressed interest by residents of the area to the Map Plan? Of course, of course. The folks of Tree Court are looking very closely. The residents of Tree Court are looking very closely at it; however, the businesses, they’re looking at it also. Obviously, the business ... the businesses, you heard from them in the Public Hearing. They were not real excited about becoming a part of Valley Park. But to make it financially feasible for a City of Valley Park, it would have to be the entire section of Tree Court, not just an area split down the middle, and that’s just dollars and cents.

With that, I don’t have anything else to present, and I’m open for any questions that the ... that the Commission may have. Yes, mam.

PLUEMER: I’m curious as to why you’re in court?

ENGELMEYER: So, the process, the process, the way it works is that we presented the proposal after going through all the initial Map Plan, we presented the proposal to the Boundary Commission back in 2016, I think it was in late 2016 ... for some reason I remember it being cold and kind ...

DOUGHERTY: Like January 2016 or 2017.

ENGELMEYER: Oh, 2017. Okay, it was early 2017. We presented it to the Commission. The Commission heard from the City. The Commission heard from residents, but the Commission also heard from businesses that are in the Tree Court area, and there was some strong opposition from the businesses to our plan to annex Tree Court. The Commission felt that we did not meet our burden of meeting the eleven factors, so the Commission rejected our proposal. The next step is that if you want it reviewed, if you want the Commission’s decision reviewed, you go to the Circuit Court, so that’s where we’re at. It’s just the next step in the process. If the Circuit Court, you know, decides that we didn’t meet our burden, then ... then the Commission’s decision is affirmed. I think Mr. Dorsey ...

DORSEY: Mr. Engelmeyer, you were referring to the Simpson property, and I notice that there is a finger to the north of that between the city limits and Area 3. Is that also Mr. Simpson’s property and if so, will ... if not will that be included in the annexation proposal?

ENGELMEYER: I believe ...

DORSEY: There’s a little finger that looks like the state of New Hampshire.

ENGELMEYER: I think that that is not Mr. Simpson’s property, and I think was a glitch on the County ... the mapping process. That should actually be a part of ...

DORSEY: Area 3.

?: Area 3, right.

DORSEY: Okay.

ENGELMEYER: Right. I saw that also. There’s another one down here, I saw too, and they say ... our engineer said that when they sometimes pull the data from the County Mapping System, you get these little weird quirks.

DORSEY: Okay.

UCHITELLE: So it’s a wish list with respect to everything other than Simpson and Tree Court which is in litigation. Is that right?

ENGELMEYER: As Sunset Hills mentioned, you know, it’s one of those things that if ... this is a five-year process and ...

UCHITELLE: Simpson is the only one that we’re interested in right now at this meeting right this second because Tree Court is ...

ENGELMEYER: Yes.

UCHITELLE: ... already ruled on. And why would ... why are you interested in Sim ... why do you want those 400 ...? It’s a quarry and the other is going to remain green.

ENGELMEYER: Well, not all of it ... that’s a really great question. We’ve been asked that. There are several reasons. Number one, Mr. Simpson’s been a valued member of our community for a long time, and he wants to be a part of Valley Park. Number 2, he does have a very, very good business going on on the northside of that property and, you know, Valley Park, like many communities, can use, you know, a good thriving business.

UCHITELLE: [inaudible]

ENGLEMEYER: He plans on ... He plans on expanding that business also which he ... like, for example, the recycling part of his business up there apparently has just been booming, and he plans on expanding it every further. The asphalt part of things, the closest asphalt plant if they’re not going there apparently is miles and miles and miles away, so this is a very popular growing area for a lot of the construction crews. There is area to the south that still could be someday developed, but there is that buffer. So, why do we want it? I hope those elements, you know, answer your question. For us, it’s just having a good thriving business part of our community. It’s also a beautiful area back there.

UCHITELLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: I do have a question. You indicated there was recycling activity on his property. What kind of recycling is he doing?

ENGLEMEYER: I’m not positive, but I believe what he does is he takes some sort of recyclable products in and he reduces them ... I don’t know if it’s a grinding process, separates, reduces, and then I don’t know if he resells or ships it to a reseller, but it is a business that he has told me that he has told me that has ... you know, he put it in there, he did it on that property, and it’s just exploded, and he plans on expanding that part of ... of his business. I don’t know the ins and outs. I probably should know more. I did see it over there, but ...

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: I’m just curious as to what he’s recycling. Is it comingled? Is it plastics? Is it ...

ENGLEMEYER: I got the impression from him that it was all different types of recyclable materials. It just wasn’t limited to like tires or something like that. It was ... it was everything.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Okay. Thank you.

DOUGHERTY: It was 2015 [inaudible] submitted the Tree Court proposal. Just wanted to clarify that.

ENGLEMEYER: Okay. But the hearing was ...

DOUGHERTY: The January of 2016.

ENGLEMEYER: Okay.

DOUGHERTY: [inaudible] Just wanted to make that clarification.

ENGLEMEYER: Any other questions?

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Any other questions from any Commissioners? All right. Thank you for your presentation.

ENGLEMEYER: Thank you. Thank you very much.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: St. Louis County. If anybody wants to make a comment, we ask that you please fill out a comment card. Michelle has them, I guess, or are they on the table in the back, and give that to Michelle before the end of St. Louis County’s presentation.

TRIMBLE: Good evening, Commissioners. My name is Jacob Trimble. I’m a planner in the Department of Planning and I bring to you tonight for the fourth and final time the St. Louis County Map Plan. So what’s different about St. Louis County’s Map Plan from my colleagues, my municipal colleagues, is while their plans define a geographic area in which they can pursue annexations over the next few years, ours is sort of the inverse of that. We are defining the geographic areas in which we are seeking to preserve the rights of unincorporated citizens to petition and create established unincorporated areas. You will see on our map that there are two colors. There is a green color and a rust color, and there is a State Statute requires that any area where there is going to be one of these established unincorporated areas has to have a population of greater than 2,500 residents. So what you see are these green areas have greater than 2,500 residents, whereas the orange areas do not. So this document is sort of two-fold. It’s both a legal document that seeks to sort of preserve the rights of unincorporated residents to create these established unincorporated areas as well as sort of a policy document that shows the County is willing, able, desires to maintain unincorporated County as it currently stands unincorporated and that we be continuing to provide all local services to all residents of St. Louis County including those sort of ... those areas where there are fewer than 2,500 residents.

So, talking a little bit about the services that St. Louis County provides. We’re sort of a ... we’re in a unique position. We provide services to all one million residents of St. Louis County. You know, we provide the election services. We provide health and, you know, aging adult services through like our core, so we provide things that touch on all one million residents of St. Louis County, but additionally, we are also the service provider for 320-ish thousand residents that live in Unincorporated County, so we are their local service provide. And to sort of put that into perspective, if Unincorporated St. Louis County were a municipality, it would be the second largest municipality in the state of Missouri. We actually have more residents in Unincorporated St. Louis County than the City of St. Louis. We would only be behind Kansas City. So, we have sort of a scale ... sort of this economy of scale that we’re able to offer, you know, excellent local services in addition to the sort of county-wide services that we provide.

One the services that the County is particularly proud of is the police services that we do provide. County police are one of only 7 percent of law enforcement agencies in the United States that are CALEA accredited and additionally we are one of only 15 law enforcement agencies in North America that have received a Tri-Arc designation from CALEA, and what that means is that independently our police division, our police academy, and our communication divisions have all received independent audits indicating that they conform to best practices in law enforcement practices today. So we are particularly proud of what our law enforcement has been able to accomplish. Additionally, I would note that St. Louis County Police is divided geographically, that we provide patrols throughout all of unincorporated area, and additionally I would assert, the County would assert that our response times would be very favorable to the response times of any municipal police department in St. Louis County, and we believe that we provide a very excellent police service. And, in addition, we provide specialized police services to many of the jurisdictions in the County including canine services, specialized crime services and that’s because we’re such a ... again because we’re the largest sort of police provider in the region we have the ability to have these specialized services.

Another thing that the County does is that the County does not provide trash service through itself, but it has created through ordinance that all residents of Unincorporated St. Louis County do receive trash service that includes recycling, weekly trash pickup. Also there is periodic yard ... yard waste pickup and bulk pickup. The County is divided into multiple trash districts and each trash districts because it has so many residents in each of these trash districts we’re able to solicit bids from multiple trash haulers providing what we believe to be very excellent services for unincorporated residents at a very cost effective price.

Additionally, we are one of the largest road service providers in the state of Missouri. Besides taking care of the arterial road system that does cross both our municipal boundaries as well as, you know, through Unincorporated County, we’re also taking care of your local road system, your subdivision roads. We provide what we would assert is a, you know, snow removal services that are comparable to our municipal partners and we believe that our road services are, you know, are excellent.

In addition to those sort of three services that residents really sort of have the day-to-day sort of interactions with, we also provide local services, you know, zoning controls, the St. Louis

County Planning Commission. We do have professional planning staff to ensure that zoning and development is done and conforms the highest standards of development. We also have, you know, the sewer and lateral water ... water line repair program, mosquito and vector control, human services, so we offer a full range of local services to all residents of Unincorporated St. Louis County.

You know, one thing that St. Louis County is very aware of is that by its size there can be the misperception that the County is not responsive to the needs and desires of residents; however, the County is and does do a resident survey every few years. We’re getting ready to do a new resident survey in 2019, and previous surveys have shown consistently that unincorporated residents are in general pleased with the services that the County is able to provide especially at the lower cost that the County is often able to provide those services. You know, many of the municipalities that wish to annex areas of Unincorporated County do have additional taxes to pay for essentially the same services, and the County is very proud of the fact that because of its size, it’s able to offer its services at a very ... at a very good rate.

So to counter some of these sort of concerns that the County is not as ... does not ... is not response to citizen concerns, very recently the County established a new 311 program. It’s both you can call and also do a phone so that you’re sort of going step-by-step with one person picking up the phone and being able to work through your problems with you and ensuring that you meet or you do get with the right sort of department to ensure that any sort of needs that you have are ... are addresses, and that system is brand new and it is ... sort of the goal for that is that it will be sort of ... it can be a one-touch sort of thing where someone on the either end is able to ensure that your needs are addressed instead of you playing phone tag with various county departments.

So, at a large scale, you know, the County seeks to maintain all of Unincorporated County as it currently exists unincorporated, but as a policy the County also would ask the Commission to ensure that, you know, further annexations are balanced and when annexations take large commercial areas, they sort of remove the ability of the County to provide the services to residents so any annexations in the future, you know, we just continue to ask that they be sort of a balance, that there ... that they sort of be if you’re taking a large revenue area, you take sort of a corresponding sort of area that does not. So, with any questions, I would be happy ... happy to answer any questions from the Commission.

Yes.

PLUEMER: How do you plan to roll out 311?

TRIMBLE: So, I wish that I were better able to answer that question. Well, that is actually ... so, some of the staff from Clayton has actually all been moved to the Northwest Crossings. So right now they’re starting up a new phone center where they’re essentially bringing people from multiple ... that had been sort of stationed at various places in County government and bringing them all to the same place, and so then each of these individuals that had been doing some sort of customer service previously have all be trained sort of together as a

group to start doing this instead of just being this piecemeal, oh, you know, call comes in to County government, sends you someplace else. They’re starting to be taught, you know, sort of how to get those problems addressed more ... more cohesively. So, starting there, the app ... I don’t know whether it’s been released or whether it’s to be released within the next year, but that’s also coming so that you have a pothole instead of having to call County government, you can just be on your phone and say, “There’s a pothole on Tesson Ferry Road” ... that’s a state route, but you know what I mean.

?: [inaudible]

TRIMBLE: You know what I mean. “My road has a pothole. Could County DOT please, you know, come out here?” Because we do have a large network and we do often times rely on our ... on our residents to ... to bring any sorts of issues to our attention.

UCHITELLE: Is it correct to say that it’s the County’s position to oppose any annexation?”

TRIMBLE: I would say that the County will ... is open and willing to look at any annexation Plan of Intent that is proposed after the Map Plan phase and to very deeply ... take a very deep dive into whatever the Plan of Intent from the municipality ...

UCHITELLE: Has the County opposed to date every annexation?

TRIMBLE: The County asserts that it is the best service provider to Unincorporated County.

UCHITELLE: So, it has opposed every annexation?

[Several talking at once]

TRIMBLE: I don’t want to ... I don’t want to say that ...

DOUGHERTY: They’ve not opposed every annexation [inaudible]

UCHITELLE: Well, like Simpson’s, you’re not opposing.

TRIMBLE: That is a ... there are negotiations that are ... that the City of Valley Park and the County engaged to work on that together.

UCHITELLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Any other questions from the Commissioners? Hearing none, we will thank you for your presentation and see if we have a public comments.

?: [Speaking at same time as CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER]  
annexations in Green Park, I’d like to use that [inaudible]

TRIMBLE: Sure, can I give you my card, and then I’ll ... let me give you my card and then I can email you.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Did we have anybody fill out any Public Comment cards?

DOUGHERTY: We did.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: We have one. All right. Fred ... is that Hone or Haine [sounds like] or .... All right.

[inaudible]

DOUGHERTY: Would you mind holding the microphone for our recording.

HAINÉ: Sure. Can you hear it?

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Yes.

HAINÉ: Well, that’s good. I’ll be very brief. There are pros and cons for any annexation just like the Democrats and the Republicans. I incorporated this, okay, many years ago. It needs to expand to increase the size of the city. I’ve already run preliminary financials on it. It’s viable. And I’m sure they’ll be able to present that.

UCHITELLE: What cities?

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Is it Green Park?

HAINÉ: Green Park. Okay, that’s this little dot here in this see of green, okay? The major reason I did this was flexibility, flexibility to make decisions, flexibility to make our own thoughts and put them in process and complete them. I’m not going to hold up bobble, shiny bobbles for you, okay? But I want you all to do two things, okay? I want you to get in your cars when you have time, and I want you to drive the streets of Green Park, and then I want you to drive the streets of the proposed area, and then I want you to decide which is best.

The other thing is flexibility. The people in Green Park argue about things. They don’t like certain things, but that happens everywhere, but down this area, down in the Oakville area, it’s a continual madness where those people have to go over to the County Center at beg not to have certain things done in zoning. The people in Green Park and the proposed people can come right to city hall and they can do that right there, and they are the ones that control that. I think that’s, you know, I could bring up trash, that Green Park whoop-de-do has free trash. They have many shiny balls to look at, lots of things for the people. They’ve got something called Groovin’ on the Green. They get a band out once a year and they have a good time in a County Park, okay. The fact is that they control their own destiny, and they don’t want St. Louis County to control it for them, and I think the other thing is simply this ... and I don’t really have any feeling one way ... well, I do have a feeling, but not real strong. I keep hearing this term “Better Together” and I know a lot of people in the South County oppose that. What Green Park’s proposed is not “Better

Together,” but “Stronger Together” and that’s the reason that this thing should move forward, and I’m done and you can ask all the questions you want.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: Thank you for your comments. Do the Commissioners have any questions?

DORSEY: Mr. Haine, do you understand that we do not approve anything at this stage, that Green Park will have to come to us with the specific annexation proposal.

HAINÉ: I understand the Boundary Commission perfectly. I [inaudible].

DORSEY: Okay. All right.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: All right. Thank you again. Since there are no other requests to speak by the public.

DORSEY: Move we adjourn.

?: Second.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: All those in favor.

ALL: Aye.

CHAIRMAN SCHWEITZER: All right. Thank you.