

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

**TRANSCRIPT OF
BC2201 PLAN OF INTENT PUBLIC HEARING
CITY OF MANCHESTER ANNEXATION**

JUNE 29, 2022

COMMISSION ATTENDANCE:

Commissioners	Present (P)/Absent (A)
Rick Dorsey	P
Tom Mooney	P
Ann Pluemer	A
Stephanie Robinson	A
Tom Schneider	P
Kathleen Schweitzer	P
Ben Uchitelle	P
Steve Wegert	P

OTHERS PRESENT:

Michelle Dougherty, Executive Director

Michael Hart, Legal Counsel

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: If we could get folks to take their seat and settle, we'll be starting in just a moment. This is our first hybrid Public Hearing so those of you that were here for our business meeting, you might have seen some of the technical glitches that we came across so first thing I want to find out are the microphones working? Can you hear me all right? I sometimes have a tendency to ramble on, so I'll have to force myself to slow down a little bit, but the sounds ... the audio sounds good. If anyone can't hear during the meeting, please signify something ... throw something at us. We'll take care of the issue.

So we're going to call this meeting to order and convene the Public Hearing of the Boundary Commission 2201, A Proposal from the City of Manchester for Annexation of the Manchester Annexation Area.

I'd like to begin with a just few introductory comments relating to the Boundary Commission. The Boundary Commission is an independent government body that reviews boundary changes proposals in the St. Louis County. We get our authority from the State Statute and from St. Louis County Ordinance. The Commission is comprised of eleven members along with our two staff members, our Executive Director, Michelle, and our Legal Counsel, Mike Hart. The eleven Commissioners are all appointed according to the following: four are appointed through the St. Louis County Municipal League on behalf of Mayors of Small Cities, Mayors of Mid-Size Cities, Mayors of Large Cities. Four members are appointed by the County Executive, and three members are Joint Appointments of the Municipal League and the County Executive. We meet monthly with additional Public Hearings scheduled as necessary to consider Map Plans and Boundary Change Proposals. Tonight's informational public hearing provides an opportunity for the City of Manchester to explain and comment on the proposed annexation.

The area is assigned File Case No. BC2201. Public comment will be directed towards the annexation being discussed tonight, and the Commission staff will be available after the meeting to answer questions regarding the process.

Tonight's public hearing is unique, as I mentioned. We have several options for participation. We have those of you who are attending in person. We have members of the Commission and the public attending via Zoom, and we're live streaming this hearing to the Commission's YouTube channel so we're all ... we're all famous at this point. We ask for your patience should we encounter any technical issues which pretty much a guaranteed situation here.

We welcome your participation in the Public Comment section of tonight's Public Hearing; however, for those present in person, you will need out and present to Michelle a Public Comment Form ... many of you have. It can be found at the back table. We ask that you do this prior to the end if ,,,, [echo] we ask that you do this prior to the end of the St. Louis County presentation.

For those of you connected by a Zoom, we ask, that you indicate via the Message Feature if you wish to make a comment and make sure it happens before the end of the St. Louis County Presentation. As a reminder for those of you that are attending via Zoom, please mute your microphones and turn your video off until called upon to speak.

For those of you watching the Live Stream, we invites you to send your comments to the Commission by email or US mail. The contact information will be found in the

information box on our channel. Although all comments are allowed five minutes, we ask that you keep your comments brief and try to avoid repeating what the previous . commenter has stated. We're up against a time limit requirement from our host. Manchester United Church requires everyone out by nine ...

DOUGHERTY: By 10 ...

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Oh, by 10, so the Hearing will conclude no later than 9:30. If there are members of the public who signed up to speak but couldn't because of time restrictions, please note that the Commission will also take public comment either by letter or email for up to 21 days after tonight's meeting. Deadline for public written comment is July 9th ...

DOUGHERTY: ... July 19th ...

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you, 19th, 2022. And those comments will be part of the public record. You can get our comment contact information by our visiting our website, www.boundarycommission.com or picking up an information sheet in the back. It's a reminder no decision will be made tonight. I can't emphasize that enough. No decision will be made tonight. We will review the information and the Proposal by Manchester and your comments and any comments that we receive within the next 21 days. Then we have nine months to consider all that and make a decision, but those nine months have already began with the acceptance of this proposal which was May 17. So the decision date is February 17, 2023.

Manchester will have 15 minutes followed by a question an answer from the Commission and St. Louis County will have 15 minutes for their presentation followed by Q&A from the Commission after which we'll begin Public Comments section. There will be no question and answer from the Commissioners during Public Comments and I think we've also decided that we will let any comment ... any commentators from Zoom can go first, is that correct, Michelle?

DOUGHERTY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: We expect everyone to respect the time, and I will now ask the Commission members to introduce themselves, include their residence and their Appointing Authority so we'll begin with you sir.

DORSEY: All right. My name is Rick Dorsey. I represent Unincorporated North St. Louis County, and I was appointed County Executive Charlie Dooley.

SCHWEITZER: My name is Kathleen Schweitzer, and I represent Unincorporated West St. Louis County, and I was appointed by Charlie Dooley.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: You, sir.

MOONEY: My name is Tom Mooney. I'm appointed as a representative from an incorporated city in Clarkson Valley, and I was appointed by the County Executive.

SCHNEIDER: My name is Tom Schneider. I'm appointed by the St. Louis County Municipal League for Cities over 20,000.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Michelle, you want to invite our Zoomers?

DOUGHERTY: Ben.

UCHITELLE: [sound too low] I have represented Mid-Size Cities, appointed by the Municipal League.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: We're down to one Zoomer. Correct?

DOUGHERTY: What?

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: There's no other person on ... Commissioners?

DOUGHERTY: We got Tom.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: All right. I'm Steve Wegert. I was appointed by the Mayors of Large Cities. I represent the North County, and as I mentioned this is our first hybrid public hearing so as you can see, we have a little bit of things to work out so we appreciate your help in shaking this out.

That ends it for the Introductory Comments. That brings us to the presentation of Manchester. And where ... who's our presenters?

CLEMENT: Thank you. Is this on? Can you hear? There are some seats if anybody is looking for seats, there's a block of four in the second row, and there's a few single seats as well, so if anybody comes in later, there are seats up this way.

Good evening. Thank you, St. Louis County Boundary Commission for your presence here and your thoughtful review of Manchester's Plan of Intent. I'm Mike Clement. I'm Mayor of the City of Manchester, and with me is City Administrator, Justin Klocke. Tonight Justin and I acknowledge with thanks our city staff, our community leaders, and all those present here that seek to learn and offer a perspective on our annexation effort. I'm here because I became a Manchester resident as a result of the 1999 annexation. There were 8,000 of us that joined the City then. And two years prior, 3,400

residents were annexed to Manchester. Today, about 62% of us are residents because of the annexation over the last 25 years.

The City, with few problems, added those 8,000 of us in 1999. Services were better and my wife and I saved money when we became Manchester folks. That statement is still applicable today.

In 2004, Manchester sought to annex about the same area as we are discussing tonight. That effort did not have a vote. I reviewed that plan, and I will say that our plan today is much better and more thorough and save residents money. Today, Manchester, we are a much different community, stronger in all ways. St. Louis County is different too.

Our Plan of Intent is built to answer the important questions found in the eleven factors ... we're not getting a slide switch ... there we go ... thank you. These are the key factors that our Plan of Intent was built around and as the Commissioners will note, we have even put the pages on there that ... where they can be referenced.

Okay, we need some help back there. Okay. Other factors ... that's not the one ... switch back. Okay. Thank you very much.

Other Factors for Annexation, Commission members, today there are other factors that we hope will be weighed in Manchester's annexation efforts. These are the qualitative factors that make life and governance in a community more workable and successful. They exist in Manchester today.

First one. Local Representation with a population of about 6,500, I believe the annexed area will be a new city ward. It would have two elected representatives with new appointees to other commissions and boards.

Easy Access to Resources. City staff and elected officials are all answerable to our residents. Staff and I meet regularly in open conversations with ... with residents. Our role is to help and serve others.

Highly Responsive Services. Staff are on the street early and quickly to respond to concerns or initiate things like snow plowing, a tree removal. Three years ago Manchester's Public Works Department was voted the best if all of St. Louis County in a contest sponsored by the Municipal League. While there hasn't been any more contests, they're still the best.

Financial Strength of Manchester. We are fortunate to host one of the country's largest Costco and Walmart's. Much of our City's funding comes from sales tax. Our General Fund continues to add to its reserves. In two years, our TIF Bonds will be paid off and another strong stream of revenue will supplement our growing sales tax receipts.

Financial Strength of St. Louis County. If you read the Post-Dispatch, you will read under the St. Louis County that continues to face stress in its budgets and costs. In the October 21st, 2021, paper as the County was building it's 2022 budget, we learned that ... and this is a quote ... "Page's budget plan for 2022 hinged on the use of much of nearly \$193 million in federal money from the American Rescue Plan Act to shore up safety and health budgets." Another quote from the paper was "Page conceded the budget didn't meet a range of other needs including facilities and street repairs and upgrades. The County Budget appropriated \$1 million for facility maintenance leaving a backlog of \$150 million in estimated infrastructure updates" The article noted that Paul Kreeler, [sounds like], the County's Director of Performance Management" ... and it was during the budget and other County officials had discussed the need to find new revenues through tax hikes or other means or make major cuts in services. I hope we'll hear how St. Louis County is planning for those years 2024 and beyond.

Next, Non-Partisan. Manchester's elected board is non-partisan. Better delivery of services result when boards and staff all work together. St. Louis County government is highly partisan.

Collegial Boards and Staff. This just says we get along and that's good, and we are a better city because of our collegiality.

Efficient Allocation of Resources. Quite simply this means that Manchester government responds to anticipated and unanticipated needs. When Manchester needed to raise salaries, we did it in the middle of the year. We didn't wait for the next year's budget to face the problem, and we do similar things whether it's in storm water needs, residential needs, or even retirement needs of the city.

Regional Collaboration. Manchester, Ballwin, Town and Country, all of the communities that are along Manchester Road, we work together and that's our staff, our police departments, the Mayors and the City Administrator.

Finally, Identity with Community. We've heard from residents who acknowledge that they don't identify as being residents of unincorporated St. Louis County. They miss being part of an identifiable community. Manchester works in many ways to build a sense of community that is a sense of belonging.

Next slide, please. Thank you.

Annexation Listening Tour. This very briefly shows the extent of our engagement with the unin ... the residents in the unincorporated area. We've had lots of meetings. We've had ten town halls. We've met with the businesses. We have meetings still coming up, and we've had several since this slide put together, so we have really reached out, and we've talked, and we've listened to a lot of residents.

Next slide.

KLOCKE: This slide represents the boundaries of the unincorporated area that the City is seeking. It is bounded by Carmen Road, Dougherty Ferry, Barrett Station Road, Manchester Road, and two areas north of Manchester that meet at the boundary of the City of Town and Country.

Next slide.

As indicated in the Plan of Intent, the City does not intend to change the existing zoning in the proposed annexation area. The approach was chosen to cause the least disruption to the existing property owners and to minimize any non-conformities post annexation.

Next slide.

The proposed annexation area is connected to the City through numerous points as indicated by the circles on the map meaning that delivery of services will be effective in the expansion of the City's boundaries, this area is logical.

In the County's 2004 response, they claimed that an annexation of this size would create problems for them to service the areas that will remain unincorporated after the annexation. While we anticipate the County will make the same argument for this annexation, it is important to note that the County would use the same routes to service the unincorporated areas post annexation as they do today. Fire and ambulance services will not change. In other words, the annexation of the proposed area will not create significant barriers or cause service disruption as the County already provides these areas with service as they will argue. Should the County request assistance in servicing the three areas to the east of Barrett Station Road and the City of Des Peres continues to express disinterest in annexing those areas, the City of Manchester will open ... will be open to a conversation with St. Louis County to explore the best way to support these three areas.

A new development, however, on Monday, the City of Town and Country passed a resolution Monday evening expressing an interest in the area north of Manchester Road surrounding Mason Road. Should the annexation proceed, we have discussed this resolution with the Town and Country leadership and acknowledge that should the Boundary Commission give us the green light to proceed with the vote and on the question of annexation and if it is successful, we will meet with Town and Country leadership and affected residents to discuss the potential transfer of boundary at that time.

Next slide.

CLEMENT: This slide allows really everyone to see that city services, police, public works, parks, aquatic center, city hall, are probably five minutes or less from every resident that lives in that proposed annexed area, and that really has benefit to all.

If you're in the County, most of the county services ... one's down in ... in Valley Park, one is in Wildwood, and if you're going to need to visit the County Government Center, figure two hours and probably some frustration.

Next slide, please.

KLOCKE: The current slide reflects the current tax rates and fees should the proposed area incorporate as Manchester. As you can see, once annexed to the City, current unincorporated residents will have an overall reduced cost burden with the addition of superior services. This is done by nominal increase in property taxes and sewer lateral fees. This reduction in overall cost is caused by the offset residents would have in significantly reduced trash fees.

To put the reduced cost burden into actual figures, for a resident that owns property valued at \$300,000.00 and owns personal property valued at \$40,000.00, the resident is estimated to save just over \$145.00 per year. This reduced cost burden is the result of the City's Property Tax Rebate Program. The Program acknowledges that newly annexed residents will see little benefit from Prop S Street Improvements which is currently being paid off by general obligation bonds issued for concrete street and sidewalk improvements approved by Manchester voters in 2018. When utilized by the unincorporated residents in the proposed area, they will receive a rebate for a portion of the tax levy that is collected for the retirement of those general obligation bonds.

Finally, it's important to note that St. Louis County and the State of Missouri continue to receive the lion's share of the overall sales tax bill while Manchester will receive the smallest portion of 1.25%. Note at the bottom of the slide, St. Louis County's 3.51% tax is almost three times the sales tax when a resident makes a purchase at our Costco while the City's tax is levied at 1.25%.

Next slide. Another question you may ask is how will this annexation affect the tax base and ability to raise revenue? As indicated in the Plan of Intent, St. Louis County's loss of revenue as the result of this annexation is about \$2.3 million dollars. In 2022, the County's budget totaled nearly \$890 million dollars. The loss of revenue for this annexation would only represent one quarter of one percent of County's total budget. What the loss of revenue fails to account for is the redistribution of services that this annexation causes. With Manchester providing all the major services to the proposed area, the County can redirect critical resources to other areas of the County that need it. Furthermore, elimination of maintenance and policing services will significantly offset the loss of revenue that is anticipated.

DORSEY: All right. I made notice that you made mention in your proposal that you would consider taking over private streets if so requested, but I also notice that you've already had your Public Works staff inspect those streets.

KLOCKE: Correct.

DORSEY: What is the likelihood that if it was requested that any of those streets would actually be accepted?

KLOCKE: Well, I mean there's ... there's a procedural process for it that they would go through. Obviously, we would reach out to the subdivisions that were requesting to become public. I think their input would be the most important thing that we'd want first of all. But we have insisted in our Listening Tour to folks who have asked that that question "If our street could become private or part private to public if they wished to do so. I believe our Board of Aldermen in our Plan of Intent would say that we'd be seriously considering it and it would happen.

DORSEY: Well, here's what I'm getting at. Okay. I'm an attorney. Years ago in St. Charles there was a subdivision built by a developer and his feet ... his streets were two feet narrower than the city code, and we went through a devil of time getting those accepted by the City of St. Charles. Ultimately, we prevailed, but it took a great deal. So you've already inspected them, you know if they are non-conforming. Are there non-conforming that no variance would ever be granted?

CLEMENT: No. We would grant ... we would accept as is and that would be part of our legal conversation with the Trustees of those areas and, obviously it would take our Board. But we have looked at it a lot, and if residents are not looking to replace asphalt street that's well maintained with concrete, which we wouldn't do. We would consider taking in non-conforming private streets.

DORSEY: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Anything further?

DORSEY: That's it for now.

SCHWEITZER: I don't have any questions at this time.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: All right.

SCHNEIDER: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Question for you. You mentioned a lot of positive feedback that you've received. Have you received any negative feedback and how would you categorize that?

KLOCKE: I'm sorry. The negative feedback and how much?

SCHNEIDER: What are the concerns that you're hearing?

KLOCKE: Yeah, I think one of the questions ... feedback that we've received for ... from residents who want to keep their street private. They want to keep it private, and we would acknowledge that and we're not forcing any neighborhood or association to bring their street private to public. So I mean, there has been feedback where they've had those kind of questions, and once we sat down and answered those, I believe that they've come to an understanding so that's been part of our Listening Tour in that negative feedback and in talking to the Board.

CLEMENT: I would say one of the other concerns initially was ... was ... was the personal property and the real property taxes. Our rebate program has really kind of come of over the last four months so some of our initial early conversations with homeowners, the cost would have been higher. With changes and our belief that a rebate program is viable, those costs come down. So concerns initially about me paying more living in Manchester and being part of Manchester have been diminished. Manchester offers trash for \$6.00 a month which is considerably less than any unincorporated area, so I agree. Some concerns about street maintaining them. Some concerns about ... there's one street where residents ... it is gated and they would want assurance that it would remain gated and we would go along with that, and then the initial concern about cost.

SCHNEIDER: You categorize the Manchester government as non-partisan. How to you measure that? I'm curious.

CLEMENT: We don't run as Republicans or Democrats. When I run and somebody says, "Are you a Republican or a Democrat?" I say, "That is not the question you ask me. You ask whether I'm willing to work my tail off for the City?" And I have said that many times to people so ... we do run as non-partisan, I guess.

SCHNEIDER: Okay. That makes sense. All right. And then of the increase in revenue, what percentage of that has come in from commercial tax and what percentage from residential tax?

KLOCKE: Don, would you answer?

YUCUIS: Thank you. Don Yucuis, Director of Finance.

DON: The majority of the sales tax comes from commercial. Residential, I mean property taxes would be a smaller portion of that because our tax rate is ... is fairly low for property taxes on both commercial and residential.

SCHNEIDER: So when we look at the big bucket of money that you're going to get ... that you would potentially get from this, what percentage of that is going to be commercial?

YUCUIS: I don't have that exact percentage, sir. I don't have that exact answer, but commercial on sales tax would be the larger portion

SCHNEIDER: Okay. That's a good answer. Thanks. That's all I have.

MOONEY: Could you clarify your discussions with Town and Country and repeat your discussions or lack thereof with Des Peres.

KLOCKE: Well, I mean, I'll address the first point and then the second point. The first point you asked about Town and Country, we were informed that they had ... or they had talked with member ... with Michelle from the Boundary Commission about the area ... the proposed area that we have just north of Manchester Road and Mason that they believe that would part of Town and Country. I believe that was actually submitted in their Map Plan that they had issued ... sent to the Boundary Commission several years ago so we had reached out to Bob Shelton, the City Administrator, to understand what exactly he was talking about and what he was wanting to pursue. It's our understanding that he had a conversation with the neighborhood ... and you have an individual from that neighborhood here tonight ... who ... they were wanting to ... they prefer to be in the City of Town and Country and so Bob Shelton from Town and Country had introduced a resolution to their Board of Aldermen on Monday of this week that stated that the City of Town and Country was neutral in this case before the Boundary Commission today, but if it comes to a point where annexation is successful, they would be interested in meeting with the City of Manchester to talk about a simplified boundary change in that area. And I would also emphasize though while the City of Town and Country has communicated with some of those folks in the area, we have as well, that's part of our Listening Tour. We've met with trustees and residents in that area, so we really want to emphasize that if this annexation moves forward, we would want not only from the input from the City of Town and Country but I think the residents in that area as well.

As for the second point, I think you mentioned with the lack of conversations of ... with the City of Des Peres. We did meet with their mayor and city administrator to discuss those little three areas that are east of Barrett Station Road. Those were in their Map Plan that they had submitted to the Boundary Commission several years ago, but they expressed to us that due to the Fire District and the State Statute that would require them to pay in lieu of taxes certain revenues to the Fire District, as I'm sure you are very well aware of, that they were not going to seek annexation so ... and, again, that they had communicated with their Board and Mayor that the City of Des Peres was neutral on this question as well.

MOONEY: And so with Town and Country, I might understand ... maybe I misunderstood you so if your plan is successful and voted on then you would revisit a portion of that with them.

KLOCKE: Yes, sir.

MOONEY: ... and to do a mutual swap?

KLOCKE: Well, again, it would be ... it would be a conversation we would have with them because we've had residents that ... in that area that have expressed a desire to be part of the City of Manchester and then there's residents who have a desire to be part of the City of Town and Country. So, once, if annexation is successful is. Boundary Commission gives us the green light to go to the vote of the people and it is a successful vote, we would do just that, meet them at the table, hear what they're proposing and then work with the residents in that area to do ... to do some sort of simplified boundary change. Of course, this would have to go through ...

MOONEY: ... come back before this Commission?

KLOCKE: Correct. Right, I mean, but I think at that point it would be a joint proposal, if I'm not mistaken, and so that's what I would ... I would say if that's an agreement that became a _____ deal.

MOONEY: Thank you.

KLOCKE: Yes, sir.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: All the questions? Anything else? Ben, do you have anything?

UCHITELLE: [talking, no sound]

COMMISSIONER: Yes.

COMMISSIONER:: Yes.

UCHITELLE: [no sound]

KLOCKE: Turn the mic on.

Thank you. So, sir, I think in that area, the City of Manchester would take the position that that area is contiguous simply because our northern boundary does extend north of Manchester Road at that point and so does on page 20 ... 22, the point that's labeled 2,

that ... I mean would go directly east for our boundary so in our opinion and as we've stated in the Plan of Intent, that would make sense since they would adjacent to the current City of Manchester limits.

CLEMENT: I'd like to add just a bit. We really do have a lot in common with the area that we currently are seeking to annex. We... we share schools and churches with them and ... and those areas that overlap with Ballwin, I would say right now we ... we probably don't share as many ... many events and things doing together so for us the ... the area that we're talking about right, we really do have a lot in common with those that live there in many, many ways, and we have less in common with the areas that you've identified in ... as ... in 2, and that's not to say that at some point we might reconsider that in the future, but right now ... but we went with the area that we share many, many similarities.

UCHITELLE: [No sound.]

KLOCKE: It is, sir, it is in our Plan of Intent, but we'd be happy to supplement it as well with an official letter from my office.

UCHITELLE: [No sound.]

CLOCKE: Correct. The rebate would go until the point that our debts or this obligation was retired.

UCHITELLE: [No sound.]

CHAIRMAN: I believe that's it for the questions.

DORSEY: Mr. Chairman, I have one follow-up question.

CHAIRMAN: Yes sir.

DORSEY: Gentlemen, I notice that if this annexation is approved, you will be annexing a good part of Manchester Road in the shopping areas. What's the estimate on the increase of sales tax revenue for the City?

KLOCKE: Quickly I'll flip to that page. Don, do you have that number? Well, right now the sources of revenue that would no longer ... I believe one area that we can look at is ... Don, do you have that figure on top of your head ... that figure?

YUCUIS: For a half year, we were estimating approximately \$1.1 million in sales tax, and then that's just for the six months. So it doubles for the next year for sales tax.

DORSEY: Thank you.

DOUGHERTY: We have a question that some on the Zoom did not hear how long the rebate would last?

KLOCKE: Until the retirement of our debt obligation bonds, debt service bonds, which would be roughly about 2040.

UCHITELLE: [No sound]

CLOCKE: Correct.

UCHITELLE: [No sound]

KLOCKE: Correct.

UCHITELLE: [No sound]

KLOCKE: Correct, but ... or until it's paid off. It would be possible that at the rate that we're paying off, that obligation could be before 2040 as well, but it would go through the length of that debt service levy to pay off those general obligation bonds.

UCHITELLE: [No sound]

KLOCKE: That's a great question. We did meet with quite a few businesses along Manchester Road, and they did ask ... one, for example, and I won't give the business's name, but they ask what our neighboring city's sales tax rate was, and we provided them with those figures, and it was more or less the same. And at that point they did not have any concerns. We've had other businesses who acknowledged that the sales tax would go up, that was part of our Business Town Halls. They acknowledged that, but they said that's the price for better services.

UCHITELLE: [no sound]

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Any other follow up questions from the Commissioners? All right. Gentlemen, thank you for your presentation.

CLOCKE: Thank you, Commission.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: That will bring us to the County's presentation.

DOUGHERTY: Just a reminder: If you haven't filled out a comment card and you want to speak at the Public Comment time, you need to give that to me before St. Louis County finishes their presentation and that's about 15 minutes from now.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you, Michelle.

TRIMBLE: Good evening, Commissioners, and thank you for letting me come before you this evening to present the initial analysis of St. Louis County's analysis of this request. I'd like to thank my colleagues from the City of Manchester for their presentation and I would like to thank everyone that is here this evening to learn more about the proposal before the Commission this evening as well as the individuals on Zoom and to make their voices heard this evening.

So first when St. Louis County receives a Plan of Intent, we seek to route our analysis of any request in the rules of the Boundary Commission and the eleven criteria State Statute. So, Article 10 of the Boundary Commission's Rules that stand to review do declare that the Commission shall determine if the boundary change will be in the best interest of the Municipality that is proposing the boundary change, the unincorporated area that is proposed to be annexed, and additionally the areas of the County next to the proposed boundary change. So it's a three-pronged analysis that the Boundary Commission is asked to make, and if any of those three legs of the analysis fail, the entire proposal is unbalanced. So that three-pronged analysis is based on the eleven criteria as found in the Revised Statutes of the State of Missouri. They're listed up here, and we categorize them into four sort of large general areas. There's geographic concerns. There are financial impact concerns. There are concerns regarding service provision, and there are concerns regarding zoning and land use.

So, before I jump into that proposal, to that proposal and our analysis of it to date. I want to take you a little bit about St. Louis County. St. Louis County is the most populous County in the State of Missouri with approximately one million residents. And St. Louis County government provides local services to approximately a third of our residents or 315,000 individuals who live in unincorporated St. Louis County. In addition to our provision of local services to unincorporated residents, we also provide services to all one million residents of St. Louis County including elections, animal control, any number of services that we do provide to all one million of our residents. And because of our size, we have a depth of knowledge and an expertise that municipalities frequently cannot match because we have so many of these types of things that we deal with that we have the fiscal sound ability to have more experts on staff, and as part of that to sort of note that, more than 90% of municipalities in St. Louis County have some form of contract with us ranging from provision of police service to permitting and sort of inspection services. The City of Manchester in fact contracts with St. Louis County for nearly all of their permitting services. So it shows the depth and expertise of our ... of what St. Louis County's able to provide to residents. And our service philosophy is based on the direct contact of our residents with professional experts in the field.

So before I jump into the annexation area which is, you can see, I'm sorry on this map, it's hatched in purple, you can't disentangle their request from the fact that it is a much larger existing unincorporated area. This area is approximately 36-hundred acres with a population approaching 11,000 residents and 46-hundred housing units. That means that if this larger un-contiguous unincorporated area were to incorporate, it would be the 21st largest municipality in St. Louis County nestled between Berkley and Town and Country. So that would make this large unincorporated area larger than Richmond Heights, more populous than Brentwood, Ellisville, and you can't disentangle their request from part of this larger unincorporated area.

So going down into the actual annexation area to match as much of what the City of Manchester. It is approximately 15-hundred acres, a population of 6,500 residents, 29-hundred housing units. It home to Love Park; additionally two Parkway Schools, Piermont and Carmen Trails Elementary Schools.

So, diving into the criteria that the Boundary Commission is charged with when looking at these items. First off, the City's Plan of Intent does include a legal description. We have a very minor issue with one section of it, but it's not necessarily of that much interest, and it does meet the requirement under Revised Statutes of Missouri that it be at least 15% contiguous. But the more interesting and the more meaty question before the Commission is does this create logical and reasonable municipal boundaries? Does ... the City has indicated and has visualized up here what their boundaries would be; however, you can see outlined here in black, this would create a highly fragmented geography for St. Louis County. What this does is this creates five orphan unincorporated areas, three of which meet the statutory requirement to be defined as an unincorporated pocket under the Revised Statutes of Missouri, which does have a definition. It is an area where the residential density is great than one dwelling for three acres, and the population is fewer than 500 residents. Additionally, one of the orphaned unincorporated areas would become too small to be eligible for consideration as an established unincorporated area, and so by creating these definitions, the State is explicitly stating and noted that there are in fact practical difficulties in providing services that become this small when they are isolated from larger unincorporated areas.

So moving to the unincorporated three pockets that would be created east of Barrett Station Road. The City's Plan of Intent does indicate that they find that the City of Des Peres is the more appropriate municipality to take those on; however, at Public Hearing, the Map Plan Public Hearing, the City of Des Peres has indicated they have no indication or no desire to annex ... and in the presentation you just heard, that had been echoed by the City of Manchester. So the question is, you must review this in determining do these create logical and reasonable municipal boundaries for the City of Manchester, but does it also create logical boundaries for St. Louis County as it attempts to provide services? And the County's response to that is on it's face, no, that that creates a fragment to our jurisdiction and would lead to increased difficulty as we seek to provide services.

So moving on to zoning and land use questions. So this is a map of the overall larger area and outlined in black as the unincorporated ... as ... excuse me ... as the area that is of interest to the City of Manchester. You can see in red is the area along Manchester Road, that's the commercial, highly productive area of the annexation area that really is ... really takes up the northern half of their request. As stated in their presentation just provided as well as in their Plan of Intent, Manchester is proposing to amend their zoning code to allow for zoning classifications and regulations as authorized by St. Louis County's Zoning Code. However, what I will say as a Director of Planning, it is ... the adoption and administration of two zoning codes for one municipality could really prove to be very difficult for the City to do. Additionally, you can't simply take St. Louis County's designations without taking all of our underlying design criteria along with it. Zoning ordinances do not ... they stand together as a holistic whole, so the City is essentially indicating that they are going to adopt St. Louis County Zoning Ordinance and administer two zoning ordinances in the area, and we find that would be ... could be onerous for the City to do.

Additionally, concerns about Floodplain regulation. It should be noted that St. Louis County's Floodplain overlay does match FEMA maps whenever FEMA does update the maps, we update our zoning and additionally Chapter 1008 of the County's Revised Code of Ordinances is also our floodplain management, and we have a very robust and strong regulatory framework for protecting the floodway, the floodplain, and protecting residents.

So, moving on to Financial Considerations. These are the tax rates before and after annexation, and I apologize my eyes are not good enough to see it anymore, but this is every taxation layer that every property is subject to. Most of these will not change no matter what happens. So when you dive down into the taxation rates that are the entities when they want to ... local governments when they want to provide local services, St. Louis County's rate of the overall property rate is only .4180 for residential and Manchester's as it stands today is .3510. Really not that much lower than St. Louis individual rate, and this will lead for the provision of services to a significant increase in the sort of taxation rate and the sort of ... to provide those local services.

So this is an estimate for how it could affect residential properties, and this presentation will be online, and I'll slide through some of these. This is how it could affect commercial property tax rates in the area. This is how it could personal property taxes in the area, and one of the things you've heard discussed this evening is Manchester's Bond Issue which was called Prop S. So, back in 2018 the City of Manchester did go through a ... a process to issue bonds, approximately \$17 million dollars to ... And it was passed by voters, which was to repair streets and sidewalks. Prop S resulted in a fairly significant increase in the tax levy in the City of Manchester. The Missouri Constitution requires that uniform application of taxes occur in a local jurisdiction so the annexed area will be subject to this taxation. What the City of Manchester is proposing is that after residents have paid their taxes, the City will then offer a rebate to residents. The County has at

least two strong concerns about this. One is merely the sort of administration of this. This would be very difficult and onerous for any local jurisdiction to administer. Additionally, there is no legal ability or legal instrument that require future councils of Manchester of continue with this rebate program. This is a twenty-year until at least 2024, so there is a strong concern that this rebate may not stand, and it may not stand the test of time.

So, thinking about sales tax. Sales tax will increase significantly. It will increase by at least 1.25% so that will hit residents as a shock along Manchester Road. But what's more interesting is how that's going to hit residents when they go to purchase vehicles and other large items. Particularly when you purchase a new vehicle, the average price in the United States according to Kelley Blue Book today is \$47,000.00, and when take that out, that reaches an average additional taxation on our residents of at least \$600.00 every time that they purchase a new vehicle. And if you're the average American purchasing a new vehicle every five to seven years that may mean that you're being hit with this additional taxation twice a decade. And this doesn't even bring up the significant increase if you're buying a recreational vehicle, watercraft, any of those natures, this will hit residents with additional taxation.

So, when it comes to Revenue Lost by St. Louis Count, we are estimating initially a loss of \$2.5 million. We are going to dive deeper into that over the next 21 days.

In the Plan of Intent, the City asserts that this is a negligible amount, but it is not. They indicate that the County's total budget is approximately \$900 million, and they're not wrong; however, \$900 million dollars most ... a various large amount of that money is actually is set aside for set items that are not touchable. They are not general revenue. So when you take the County's budget, account less 60% is available for general revenue so of that ... so what ... and that's what you see on my left, so when it says Total County Budget. So then on the right, when you go to General Funds only, even of that amount only about 69% of that amount is available to St. Louis County Government to provide local services meaning that in essence that our ability is really \$350 million dollars is our outlay for public local services. The loss of \$3 million or for close to \$3 million dollars makes a difference to St. Louis County. That means the Planning Department may not exist ... not really, but you know what I mean. The St. Louis Planning Department has a smaller budget than \$3 million dollars. The new comprehensive plan, the St. Louis County 2050 Inequitable and Sustainable Comprehensive that we are getting ready to undertake, those kinds of funds could take a hit. So \$3 million dollars is a real and true cost to St. Louis Count.

Additionally, the City is silent about additional costs to businesses in the annexation area. So Manchester has emergent license fee whereas St. Louis County does not. Merchant license fees are calculated as a percentage of gross receipts and those are calculated on a sliding scale based on your gross receipts and your business type. That does not currently exist in the annexed ... in the area that in unincorporated, and that is

a cost that would be burdensome on those businesses, particularly small businesses in the annexation area that do not currently budget for this additional cost.

So moving on to Service Provision. St. Louis County operates as the local service provider for this area. So moving on through our services, St. Louis County Police Department is the largest and highest capacity police department in the St. Louis Metropolitan Area. It is of the few agencies that is triply accredited, and the average response time to calls in the annexation area are 1.75-minutes. The Plan of Intent indicates that the City estimates it's an 8-minute response time; however, they base that on how quickly vehicles could leave the West Precinct and get to the annexation area, which is not how St. Louis County actually operates its Police Department. Police are constantly patrolling the area, and this 1.75-minute is the actual response time from the Police Department. Additionally, the Police Department has excellent connections with neighborhoods here in the annexation area.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: [time warning – voice level low] ... left in your presentation?

TRIMBLE: Three to four minutes.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Go ahead.

TRIMBLE: Thank you. I appreciate it very much.

So this is a map of the precincts, just to give you an idea. This is a crime and call for service map to show this is a very low crime area, and additionally, our police do have extensive relationships in the annexation area, walk-and-talks, neighborhood watches, things of that nature.

Additionally, the Department of Transportation/Public Works currently provides all permitting services in the annexation area and provides almost all permitting services for the City of Manchester today, and that will continue into the future.

Since 2016, the annexation area has seen 37,000 permits, nearly 800 of which would require some sort of zoning approval.

Additionally, when it comes to snow removal and road maintenance, the County does have a target of removing snow within a 24-hour time period, but remember we also provide for arterials, collectors, and residential streets. The City of Manchester is not charged with removing snow from the arterials and collector streets at this time.

So going to the Street Conditions in the annexation today, we go through, and we use a pavement condition rating system where 1 is rubble and 10 is excellent. Of the 16-miles of road that will be conveyed to the City, approximately 80% have a PCR of 6 or better which means the roads are rated in good condition.

Additionally, St. Louis County Parks is the largest provider of parks and recreation in our area. Love Park is located in this annexation area, and after annexation, Love Park will continue to be owned and operated by St. Louis County.

Our Department of Public Health also provides vector control services which is mosquito and rat abatement to the annexation area, but we also have contracts with the City of Manchester where we provide those services to the City as well.

We provide animal control county-wide, and we provide waste collection services to the proposed annexation area.

To jumping to that our monthly costs are \$15 a month with a 10% senior discount. That includes once a month bulk trash items as well as three seasonal yard waste pickups, and additionally, residents can later add additional services as they deem necessary.

One of the areas where the County shines is the Sewer Lateral Program. This is an issue where if your sewer lateral breaks it could cost significantly thousands of dollars so the County does not have a cap on what ... on what we will do for a Sewer Lateral Program whereas the City of Manchester does. It's \$6,000.00 dollars.

So, Miscellaneous Concerns. It was addressed in the ... in the presentation by the City of Manchester is that their Plan of Intent is silent of elected representation. They are a fourth-class city, they have no maximum on the number of wards, but their Plan of Intent is silent on how they would do so.

So, in summary, geographically, the proposed annexation creates three unincorporated pockets and two other unincorporated orphans. The State of Missouri has identified these types of areas as creating a practical difficulty for the provision of services. The claims in the Plan of Intent that those areas will be annexed by other municipalities because they reflected on their Map Plans cannot be assumed. The only action in front of the Boundary Commission is what is in their Plan of Intent. Additionally, Map Plans, and Michelle can correct me expire tomorrow until the next Map Plan Cycle.

And again so moving on to planning and zoning issues, they are essentially saying they are going to adopt a second zoning ordinance, and we have strong concerns about the administration of such a thing.

Financially, property taxes will go up for residents and businesses in the annexation area. Personal property taxes will go up. Businesses will see a significant increase in costs through the business license fees and the County will lose approximately \$2.75-million dollars in revenue.

And Service Provision, there will be a diminished presence of the St. Louis County Police, and this will have a negative effect of the annexation area.

There will virtually be no change in permitting services, and the Department of Transportation will continue to maintain our major roads in the annexation area, and Manchester would assume waste collection. There will be a nominal decrease although it is lower than what Manchester states in their Plan of Intent.

So in closing, approval of this request represents a significant tax increase for property owners. Businesses will see a large expense that had previously been accounted for. Property owners will not experience an increase in the quality of their services that is commensurate with the increase in their taxation. St. Louis County will lose a significant amount of revenue that will negatively affect our ability to deliver high quality services. And this effort has not been initiated by residents or businesses in the proposed annexation area at least to our knowledge. And I thank you for indulging me and giving me a few extra minutes. I appreciate them.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: That brings us to questions and discussion from Commissioners. Rick, we'll start with you.

DORSEY: It's my understanding that the County Police respond to all emergency calls whether it's a police call, a fire call, or an EMS call. Is that correct?

TRIMBLE: I would have to confer with the Police Department. I can respond to that in writing.

DORSEY: It's been my personal experience. In that case, when you're talking about the statistic on police calls, were those all police calls or were those just for crime.

TRIMBLE: So they indicated that that is their response time.

DORSEY: No, I'm talking about the number of calls. You showed us a map with a bunch of dots on it.

TRIMBLE: Oh, sure.

DORSEY: And were those for crimes or were those all police calls which would include EMS and fire.

TRIMBLE: No, those are the calls for St. Louis County Police. That is not all just for EMS and Fire.

DORSEY: Okay. Can you provide us with an estimated cost saving to the County if they don't have to answer all of those calls.

TRIMBLE: Could I provide that? Yeah ...

DORSEY: In the 21 days can you talk to the County Police ...

TRIMBLE: Absolutely.

DORSEY: ... and find out the total number of calls and what the estimated cost savings to the County ...

TRIMBLE: Absolutely.

DORSEY: ... would be if they didn't have to respond.

TRIMBLE: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you, sir. _____.

SCHWEITZER: I don't have any questions.

SCHNEIDER: Are there any other municipalities in the County that operate a dual zoning system like you were advocating against?

TRIMBLE: Not that I'm aware of.

SCHNEIDER: There's no precedent?

TRIMBLE: Not that I'm aware of, and as a Director of Planning, that actually did sort of make me ... I was very interested in that ... in that aspect.

SCHNEIDER: That's all I have. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Let's jump to Ben because Tom went to grab a ...

UCHITELLE: [no sound]

TRIMBLE: I think I missed part of your question, but if I'm understanding the question is being the City's bond issue.

UCHITELLE: [no sound]

TRIMBLE: My comment on that I think will reflect what ... you know, would reiterate what I said which is that every property tax or every property owner in the annexation area will be subject to the taxation rates. They will see it in their property tax, and they will then have to pay it. The City is then indicating and stating as in their Plan of Intent that they will rebate that. I think some of those questions are probably directed to how they intent to do so, but the County is just from an administrative situation, the County, from our experience to do so could be very difficult and additionally it's a 20-year time horizon that they have to ... that they are promising to do so, and they're tying the hands of future councils and executives in the City of Manchester so that is an open question for the City of Manchester to address.

UCHITELLE: [no sound]

TRIMBLE: I can respond to it in writing after Public Hearing if that's ... I'm comfortable to do so. ... needs to tell us.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: If Ben has any other questions. Give him time to respond.

?: He's gone.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Tom, any questions from you?

MOONEY: I don't know if this is a question for you or for Manchester, but has it been determined whether the tax on Manchester will be continued to be in a pool or would be point of sale?

TRIMBLE: Ah, any portion would be ... so they are a combination city. That remains. It would not move. It would stay apparently. It would just be allocated differently. It's a very complex formulation. Don't ask me without going back and reviewing it.

MOONEY: Thanks.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: And my questions have nothing to do with the Plan that have been answered. I'm curious are any of the elected officials in the audience here listening to this and make themselves available to the public?

TRIMBLE: As far as I know, I know the Assistant for Councilman Fitch is in the audience today, and what I will say is that I've had extensive conversations with the County Executive and this is a reflection of his concerns and additionally, you know, I am very open to, you know, having as much conversation about this with residents as possible. We're very concerned about this, about this proposal.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Very good. Any other follow-up questions from council? Is Ben back with us?

UCHITELLE: No further questions from me.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you, Ben. Thank you for your presentation.

TRIMBLE: Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: I think brings us now to our portion of Public Comment, is that correct, Michelle?

DOUGHERTY: That is correct.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: And the way this will go we're going to deal with our Zoom folks first, correctly?

DOUGHERTY: Yes.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: And Public Comments will be limited to five minutes.

DOUGHERTY: Yes. And I have one comment from this Mr. Bill Newbert. He wrote it in the Chat, and I'm just going to read it out, and he's on Zoom: Today he says, "Thank you for the opportunity to comment. I ask if the incorporation goes forward that the City of Manchester allow existing home businesses continue to do business from the newly incorporated homes." That is his comment.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you.

DOUGHERTY: I'm to call your name ... actually I'm going to three names in a row and then if you could just lineup over by the podium and then you'll each have five minutes. I am calling the names in the order that they were given to me, and then after those three, we'll call three more, and I know as Chairman Wegert said if there's a pretty big stack here and if everyone has five minutes, we may be here until 2024 and so if you are just repeating the same thing that the person in front of you said, you can "ditto" or "Thank you very much, I don't need to speak." But the first three will be Sam Taha [sounds like], and I apologize in advance if I mispronounce your name. Greg Smith and Reverend David Bennett.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: And there's about an hour and twenty minutes left before we're having to wrap things up and leave, is that correct?

DOUGHERTY: Ah ...

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: 9:30.

DOUGHERTY: Yes.

SAM TAHA: Can I begin or ...?

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Yes, go right ahead.

SAM TAHA: Okay, I don't even think I'll take five minutes. My name is Sam Taha. I'm here to represent Mason View Estates. We're located on Mason Road at the most northern part of the annexation map. We're a very small subdivision with only nine homes, and I'm here today to request a map amendment to exclude our small subdivision. The reason for the request is the annexation would divide our tiny nine-home subdivision amongst two municipalities so in an effort to make your ambitious plans easier to obtain, we've already reached out to Town and Country because of the size of our neighborhood, the unification of our neighborhood, and the fact that it's all residential, there's no need for Town and Country to prepare an annexation plan nor would a change in jurisdiction be necessary. Town and Country can simply request a boundary adjustment. So again, our request at this time is a map amendment for Mason View Estates to be removed from the annexation plan. We are adamant that this makes the most sense for all parties involved. And just as a side note, I heard schools mentioned, and it almost feels like it was a mistake, like you went up one street too high because we're actually Mason Ridge. So we're not in any of the schools that were discussed previously. So that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you, sir.

SAM TAHA: Thank you.

GREG SMITH: Thank you. My name is Greg Smith, and I am a resident of Manchester 70 subdivision where I've been a Trustee for 22 years now. We were annexed in 1999. I would just say that prior to the annexation we experienced serious storm water issues for numerous years, got a lot of acknowledgement, never any action from the County. I would say four years ... within four years after annexation, the plans were drawn up and they have been addresses throughout the City, and we're very thankful for that. I'd also comment on Police and snow removal. I would say prior to annexation when we called the Police they would come, but I can't say we ever saw patrols. I can tonight how many officers you see in the audience. We see them in our subdivisions all the time on routine patrols. And then I would add one comment on responsiveness. Today we have Carmen Road that's adjacent to our subdivision. It's actually a County right-away. Four months ago we reported a series of dead trees, the County acknowledged it and said there's a 14-month wait list. If you go there today, those dead trees are still there. If you go there 10 months from now, I suspect they'll still be there as well so, you know our feedback from our subdivision would ... it was nothing

but good. Came from the annexation and I would encourage you to consider. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you, sir.

REVEREND BENNETT: Good evening. My name is Reverend David Bennett. I'm an affiliate pastor here at Manchester United Methodist Church. I want to welcome you first, and I want to say I can't remember seeing a congregation this size for a little while. It's wonderful. I was tempted to pass and collect an offering. I won't and I'll also try to be brief even though I'm a preacher. I have been in the ministry for 49 years. I retired four years ago and after that retirement I found myself wanted to be engaged and involved as I was before but in less administration, and more in community and in the last four years I've found that this has been a wonderful community to live in where I can be involved and engage in our community. I have a saying "If you ain't dead, you ain't done" and I'm not done yet. And I suspect you're the same. I've been a resident of Manchester for 24 years. My wife and I live here. My wife has taught in elementary school nearby, and in that time, we've enjoyed our neighborhoods. We've enjoyed the many services that are provided here in the community. You know sometimes we think being a good citizen mainly means to be a resident to vote and pay taxes and that is a good resident and a good citizen, but I think there's more to being a good citizen than only voting and only paying taxes. I think it has to do with enhancing quality of life in our communities. I dare say probably fewer and fewer people today know their neighbors two or three doors away. Now you may have lived here a long time and you may know all you neighbors in your block, but that's not true for a large segment of our population. We are in need of raising our quality of life in community and I've been very impressed especially in the last four years as I've gotten more involved in this community and working with our city government how this administration cares for this community. A couple of years ago our cities we saw into some pretty great turmoil and our mayor and senior administration got together and asked me if I would be a part of this gathering and explored how we might be prepared to deal with some cultural civic unrest that may occur in our community, quality of life. Out of that there was a conversation between the Mayor, the Chief of Police, the Deputy Chief, Alderwoman, and the City Administrator and I as a kind of convenor. We got together and began talking about what is quality of life mean. Services are so important, and they're done well here, but we wanted to reach beyond just services to a quality of life, and out of that we had some conversations. We decided to study a book ... yeah, these five people, came together, and as it turned out, we started out and went to the next July, eleven months meeting once a week for a week for an hour in Zoom to explore ways in which we can enhance quality of life, not just transaction of business, which is important, and I believe the City does it so well, but also establishing meaningful relationships and caring about people.

Out of that our police officers, 32 of our officers gathered together for four hours of conversation around some of these topics of how to lessen the distance and how to create community. Our city employees, 14 got together for six hours to have these

conversations as well. Our Mayor has had Conversations with the Mayor” and our Chief of Police has also had such a conversation ... I think that was “Chat with the Chief.” Our Mayor has also initiated Faith Leaders. Whether you have observed it or not, I’m sure you have, we have a diversity of faith folks in our communities, Muslim, Jewish, Chinese, Christian, at least as one Christian, you know, not all Christians think alike either as you know, how is it how we can all live together and improve the quality of life. It’s through conversation and our Mayor has brought together a time of conversation. Most recently ... and I’m finished ... but most recently our Mayor is proposing to establish a new not-for-profit organization called Manchester Cares to pull together the folks who are gifted and want to contribute to the quality of life ...

DOUGHERTY: Time.

REVEREND BENNETT: ... in Manchester. Thank you. I love my city and I hope all of you will be a part of that.

DOUGHERTY: The next three are Michael Caramanna, John O’Toole, and Lee Presser. Before Mr. Presser, I’m going to name off the following three.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Michael, go ahead.

CARAMANNA: Good evening and thank you for letting me speak this evening. My name is Michael Caramanna, and I’m a resident, a long-time resident of the area to be annexed. To give you folks a little history, I’ve been at my current location for about 25 years plus, and I was involved in the 2004 annexation attempt by Manchester to annex the same area. I was on the board of an organization, I represented 193 units at that time, 193 properties at that time. Not one wanted to become a resident of Manchester. The action against the former annexation proposal, which is essentially the same proposal redone. I can’t find anything different in it, but the action against it was enormous. In a Boundary Commission meeting, the Commissioners asked people who were for the annexation to raise their hands. One person raised their hands and the room was filled with as many people here if not more. One people raised their hand and that was the gentleman that worked for the City of Manchester that wanted the proposal to go through. And then they asked who didn’t want it to go through, and everybody else in the room raised their hands. It’s going to increase my taxes. It’s going to increase the amount of money I spend out of my pocket every day, and we don’t want it. I don’t want it. I know any one of my neighbors that wants it. There was so much opposition to it last time, and it’s the same proposal ... let me reiterate that ... there was so much opposition to that the Boundary Commission decided not to take it too a vote. So that’s why we’re here tonight ‘cause they’re trying it again. Now people talk about the police. I can tell you that I’ve been policed by the St. Louis County Police which is an international accredited organization for 25 plus years. They do a wonderful job. I don’t have one item that I could share with you that I have a question on about the St. Louis County Police, and their response times are

phenomenal. We had people at our swimming pool two weeks ago and there were three police cars within three minutes.

In summation, we don't want this to go through. I don't know anybody that does. There's a couple of people here that have spoke positively about it. It would be most beneficial if the Boundary Commission decided not to take it to a public vote and do it what it did last time and just stop the whole process. We're happy with our services. We have private streets and there was conversation from the City of Manchester about the private streets and how open they are. Well, we tried that in 2004 and they were absolutely adamant that they wouldn't take our streets and they never backed down from that so as far as we're concerned there is absolutely no benefit to the people in the annexation area, absolutely none. The only benefit is to the City of Manchester from the monetary standpoint. It adds another layer of government, another layer of politics that we don't need, and we don't want. I'll be happy to answer anybody's questions if you have any,
...

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: No discussion [talking over each other]. Appreciate ...

CARAMANNA: ... otherwise, thank you very much for your attention, folks. I appreciate it.

O'TOOLE: My name is John O'Toole, and I'm a resident of Manchester and I live in the Seven Oak Subdivision so thank you for hearing me today. Years ago we moved into our home on Killiney Drive and it was unincorporated at the time. I grew up in unincorporated at the time and have always loved St. Louis County so it's very much a part of who I am. When Manchester wanted to take us over and annex us, I thought at that time I also was of the same that I did not want another layer of government. I definitely didn't want anymore taxes, and to be honest, you know, having a mortgage and young kids, I was not looking for that additional expense. And I also thought maybe the services would not be beneficial. I have to change my mind on that because since Manchester's been a part our life now since '99, I will say the responses for all of these community services have been incredible. When I was in a Trustee in the early days of Seven Oaks, I knew we had a very difficult issue ahead of us with a creek issue through our neighborhood as part of the Grand Glaize Creek Branch, and I knew that the Trustees prior to me had a difficult to get through St. Louis County and trying to get the different public organizations to help us from MSD to DNR, and when I inherited that, I inherited that same belief and made some efforts to reach out to St. Louis County, and it was very difficult. There was just a labyrinth of professionals that I thought I was ... as beyond me, but that was actually only part of it. What was most applicable was that when Manchester took us over, I took out to Manchester after we had some flooding, and I approached them and said "We've got an issue here that I think needs to be addressed, and I think it starts with our creek and erosion. It's eroding property and I think it also is [siltating] our pond, I think we need help that I don't think

we know what we're doing. The City Administrator and the Alderman that we had at the time. They worked with us very closely. They held our hand. It was not an easy process, but through that entire process we were able to restore our creek and we were able to have our pond dredged. We worked with ... they worked getting bigger culverts and bigger spillways. It was addressing the problems that we needed. It took a little bit of time, but it was a very complex situation and a very complex problem, and it was resolved. _____ happy and I don't know if everybody was completely happy, but everybody was happy that there were no more flooding issues, and I think overall it was a benefit for us.

Just on a smaller note, recently we had a concrete destroyed in our cul-de-sac and within three days it was repaired. But that's just not recently. That's been since '99. Every time I call about a light standard or anything, it's resolved and its resolved quickly, and I know who to call and it's easy. And the fractional increase of our taxes has been money well spent. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you sir.

DOUGHERTY: The next three after Mr. Presser is going to be Keith Weldon, Megan Heather [sounds like], and Gary Hoeferkamp. If you guys would go ahead and line up.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Go ahead.

PRESSER: Thank you. Members of the Board and excuse me, I thought that I'd come here, and I would be talking to you guys, but, in fact you're the folks that I really need to be talking to. My name is Lee Presser. I'm a former Naval officer and I have dealt with large bureaucracies, and I have with dealt with small organizations. As a civilian I have become a Trustee, the lead Trustee in my subdivision, Big Bend Station, a subdivision which is near 141 and Big Bend Road. I moved here in 2002 from Illinois; this would be about three years after my subdivision was annexed in and I have to say that it has been a real pleasure to be part of a smaller organization like Manchester. I've had dealings as have all of you with large organizations like St. Louis County, and I don't want to speak badly about St. Louis County, because you're all political appointees and it doesn't do any good to talk negatively about your bosses, so I won't do that, but I will say this that the gentleman over there who presented the case for St. Louis County had a couple of interesting things to say that just sort of went right overhead. Among the things that he said was that St. Louis County unincorporated has about 300,000 people in it. That's a lot of folks. When I want to speak to the Mayor of Manchester, I can get him on the phone. When I want to speak to my Alderman, one here, one there, I can get them on the phone. Now occasionally I can get Tim Fitch on the phone for a couple of minutes ... occasionally, and Mark Harder too who doesn't represent me but he's nearby and somebody that I know and can talk to. Three hundred thousand verses 18,000. For those that live in the unincorporated areas I think you will

find that it's a whole lot easier when you actually have a problem that you need to deal with, and I don't mean somebody breaking into your house or some police issue. I'm talking when you want to talk to somebody about how you're going to go about building a fence and getting some advice as to how that is best done. Yes, you have to have a county permit, but you're going to get more advice quicker from talking to the Manchester fellow right here who's in charge of Public Works than you are going to go down to Clayton or get somebody on the phone and speak to them. I believe that the governments that are closest to the people probably govern best, and for those of you who live in cities yourselves as opposed to unincorporated probably can see the point that I'm making. I hope that what you folks will do will at least give the folks sitting here who have ... who are living in the area being proposed for annexation would at least give them an opportunity to express themselves through a vote rather than taking it on to yourselves to say, "No, no, they don't even get to vote on this issue." It's important that they be given this opportunity. Now they may say "No" as that gentleman two ahead of me is obviously going to say, but at least and the others, like the ladies I was sitting next to that I've never met before who live in the area of proposed annexation at least they'll have the opportunity to think this through for themselves and that is what I'd like you to consider is let them think this through for themselves, and I would hate to think that the decision would be made by you because of some financial benefit or lack of benefit for St. Louis County by allowing the homes that are in the annexation area to move into the column of Manchester.

I thank you very much for the time that we've had here together, and I hope that I've made my point. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you sir. I do want to take just a second and break with a traditional a little bit, even though we have St. Louis County within the name of our organization, we are independent of the County. Most of us are appointed by actual municipalities. There is some County appointments. There is a blend, so we are independent of the County. We're not answerable to them.

Yes, sir.

WELDON: My name is Keith Weldon. I am a current resident and Trustee at Barrett Chase Circle or Barrett Chase Villas which is right off Barrett Station Road next to Kirkwood Gardens. I've been there a total of six years. My wife and I have. We lived in Des Peres for 27 years before that so didn't move too far away, and we are as Trustees in our neighborhood have been studying the proposal as it exists today. I wouldn't say that we've gone into, you know, the third layer of detail yet, but we've given kind of a pretty good review, and we feel like for our residents it's going to be pretty close to a wash financially. There are, you know, some additional expenses, there's some savings that are going to accrue for us. There are some new services that are going to be available to us that really realistic aren't coming from the County today. In particular, we have some issues with creek erosion which others have talked about. I've

personally been working on this issue for the last four years. We are bordered by Grand Glaize Creek on the west and bordered by a tributary to Grand Glaize Creek to the north. The Creek comes within about 25 or 30 feet of my patio and so I personally took on the issue of creek erosion after we'd been there for a couple or three years, I realized that the bed was eroding. Actually met with a couple of other residents a little further down from my place. So we've got two significant areas of creek erosion. We met with the lead engineer at MSD, talked with him in detail about potential fixes for that. He was not optimistic that there would be funds available from the County to help with the project. So have made some modest investments there, we don't have the financial capability to do it right at this point and so having discussed this with the Director of Operations in Manchester, we feel pretty confident that they are going to be able to help us over time with this problem which without them would, you know, sap a lot of our, you know, financial resources.

The other think I'd like to say we've been meeting with the folks from Manchester, the Mayor and his team. They've been very profession. They haven't been pushy about this. They've been very, I would say, open and encouraging us as Trustees and our residents, you know, to look at all the information and make a decision, and so we've invested already some time in looking at this, and I'm sure we'll invest more time going forward to look at this, and as a result of us making that investment of our time, we should have the right to vote on this, you know, when the time comes. That's our view.

So, I want to thank you for letting me speak, and I'll turn it over to the next speaker.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you.

DOUGHERTY: Can I just make a point? We have 17 more people who have signed up to speak tonight and that goes over the hour we have left here, so if you can make your comments in a shorter amount of time. You don't have to wait for the buzzer to go off. You don't have to fill all five minutes. We would like for everyone to get through. We don't want the people at the end to have to write in if they don't have to. Okay?

HUETHER: My comments are actually less than two minutes.

DOUGHERTY: Okay.

HUETHER: Hello, I'm Megan Huether. I'm an Alderman, I'm a Trustee, I'm a proud Parkway mom, and tonight I'm here as a resident. Thank you for the opportunity to speak. We are already neighbors. The folks that live in this area in current Manchester and the area of annexation, we are already doing life together. Our kids go to school together. We attend church together. We pass each other on the sidewalk walking the dog. In fact our kids are currently swimming at the park in a swim meet together. Go Sting Rays. We are community and now we ask for the opportunity to

determine what is best for our community by sending the annexation proposal to a vote of the people. Look, it's common sense that folks that live in the area are able to best determine the needs that are there. We drive our roads. We walk our sidewalks. We are fluent in our neighborhoods and then our region. If these areas were to come together under Manchester's local and accessible government, we would be able to make important decisions with the expertise that can only come from the people that live in the area. With local representation we'd be able to have a real voice. By working together we could have a greater impact on the improvements for this region: infrastructure, roadways, sidewalks, park, all things that we currently share, but areas where decision making, funding, and advocacy locate, that is fractured between Manchester and St. Louis County. Just think what we could accomplish if we were speaking as one voice, reinvesting in this community the funds that are raised here. That would benefit the annexation area, Manchester, as well as the residents adjacent to the area that would remain in unincorporated St. Louis County. They too would benefit from improved infrastructure in this region. A strong voice, local decision making, and a reinvestment of the tax dollars raised here to address the needs of this area benefit all three groups and the region as a whole.

Again, I encourage you to move this annexation proposal forward to a vote of the people. Allow us, the residents in the annexation area and the City of Manchester to determine the future of our community. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you.

DOUGHERTY: The next three will be after this gentleman will be Kelly Messmer, Todd Steinbruek, that right? And Scott Will.

HOEFERKAMP: Hello, I'm Gary Hoeferkamp. I am a resident of Manchester. I've been in the area of the annexed in '99 just off Carmen Road, and at the time I just moved in and _____ with my family, we didn't know what to think about that. Is it good? Is it bad? We talked to the neighbors. We went to the public hearings. I voted for it as did all my neighbors that I can recall, and we're very happy with the yes vote. I would vote again as a current resident of Manchester for the proposed area. I remember the difference. Streets were maintained better after. Sidewalks, trees along the street being cut. Patrols from the police. I saw Manchester Police. I don't ever remember seeing an unincorporated officer. I'm sure they're great, but I just didn't see them. Bulk trash. We talk about trash, but we don't talk about all the little parts of trash. There's recycling, there's yard waste. I think St. Louis County said three seasonal pickups. Does mean once a month? We get every week and it's like 15 bags in the fall so all the time. And bulk, I think that was once a month for St. Louis County. We get it any week we want it. You just call and they come, they get it. It's free. Well, it's part of our \$6 dollars a month. That's all.

So, also subdivision meetings. I don't know that's been brought up yet. We have ... it's been talked about a smaller government area. We have Police Chief Will ... oh, there he is. He shows up at meetings. Now I can't promise he's going to go to every meeting, but he comes to meeting that I go, my subdivision. My Alderman Heather, Mayor Clement. Does unincorporated area ever have the County Executive come to their subdivision meeting? I tend to doubt it. So, I mean, that's government in action. And I don't see it as an extra layer. When I was annexed, there was no extra layer of government. It was a government that actually saw. A government that was responsive. It took the place of St. Louis County; it was not an extra layer. So, I was very happy and am a very in Manchester. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you.

MESSMER: Hi. My name is Kelly Messmer. I'm a resident of unincorporated St. Louis County for Glyn Cagny and I agree with most everything people have said to be in favor of the annexation. One of my concerns with Clement is we are private street that is gated, and our main concern for our resident is the safety and keeping our street closed with our gate which is up to code for fire and police to remained closed and for that to be documented legally and run with the land, not our current mayor. So, if some how that can be guaranteed that, that would be fantastic.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Let's have no ... I'm sorry, let's not have any conversations.

MESSMER: I also want to say with the children on our street, it would be really nice for them to be able to be a part of Manchester that they go to school with and be able to belong to the pool without having to pay double the amount to do so. Since we all play together, we'd like to be able to afford to be together. So, that's all. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you for your comments. Call on three?

DOUGHERTY: The next three will be Don Podrasky, Michael Willis, and John Lancaster.

STEINBRUECK: Hello, my name is Todd Steinbrueck. I am a former resident of Manchester, Missouri, 13 years ... and for ... sorry ... already moved ... Seven Oaks. Thirteen years in Seven Oaks, 2008 to 2021. I am now in the Forest Oaks subdivision which is at the corner of Weidman and Carmen right behind E-Free Church. My personal opinion and belief is that local taxes are well spent and governed locally. Manchester will be a very good steward of your local taxes. I lived there for 13 years, and they did great thing. Now I'll just use a few examples here.

One. Trash, people have talked about that already. Agreed. Trash service is excellent and it's cheaper.

Two. Police. My wife and I are dog walkers. We walk all the time. We've got friends here from the old neighborhood and we miss their dogs. But along those walks we often saw Manchester Police cruise the neighborhood. I've been at my new residence for nine months. Not once have I seen a County Officer cruising the neighborhood.

Snow removal. Very good in Manchester. I don't really have enough data at my new residence to talk about the County, but I'm sure they do a good job there too.

And the last thing I'd like to talk about is the street Prop S. That is another example of local taxes staying local, and those taxes go to the streets, but the people that are paying the taxes, the streets are great. They're good for property values. Bottom line is local taxes should be governed locally.

And lastly, this meeting here is not to decide whether to annex or not. This is just to decide whether the people should get a vote, and I believe the people should get to vote on this issue. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you sir.

CHIEF WILL: I think I threw you a little bit of a curve. I'm Scott Will. You called my name so I'm coming up to talk real quick. Just going to be a moment because I don't want to take any time away from the folks here that want the citizens, but there are a couple of things that I want to address real quick. Wherever our County friend is back here. There were just a couple of things that he said that I just have to address. When he talked about the depth of knowledge and expertise of St. Louis County being something that we cannot match. See these men and women back here, they are simply the finest individuals and police officers that I've worked with and we have that through our Police Department, and so I dispute respectfully ... dispute what this gentleman had to say concerning the professionalism of these men and women. We have major case squad detectives, we have investigators, we have CIT or folks that go out to folks that are having mental issues or disorders. We have all the things that St. Louis County has including we have access to the helicopters. We have access to all those things. Those are things that the entire county has access to.

The other quick issue that I want to touch upon is the 1.75 minutes response time. If that's accurate, then we have about a 5-second response time. It's just not ... it's not accurate. I know that because I get calls from folks occasionally in which they ask me why a police officer isn't there after 20-30 minutes and come to find out that they live in the annexation area, and I have to explain to them "You're not Manchester residents. You actually call the County Police."

I want to stress County Police, I have a lot of friends ... as the other gentleman said, they are good. They are professional, they just have too much land and not enough

resources unfortunately right now. And our Police Department is one that can address these issues.

So, again, I don't want to take so much time, but as, I think the Mayor mentioned, we did go on a Listening Tour and there were two issues I think one of the Board members brought up ... what was the negative things that were brought up? One of the questions had to do with our accreditation. The Gentleman rightly sited St. Louis County is a COLEA, which is an accredited agency, which means that they have passed certain standards. They have certain policies in place such as use of force, pursuits, things like that. We in Manchester are going thought the accreditation process ourselves. We are going through the Missouri process, and we anticipate we'll it done in December of this year so we will be a Missouri accredited agency. Without going into all the differences between the two, the one that they are part of is an international one, and the one that we are going is a local one, but it has and addresses local issues.

I came from Maryland Heights where I retired after 32 years as Captain. I was in charge of it, and it's our attempt to go for COLEA after we get the Missouri Accreditation. That is something that's a good point. It is something that I think all agencies should have.

The other thing I want to talk about real quick is hiring. I see some people that actually asked me this question when we were on our Listening Tour, and they questioned in this day and age of having a hard time filling these positions, how we going to do it? And we've come up with really a four-pronged approach as I think the Mayor talked about earlier, the City recognized that the pay that our Police Officers were getting and actually all the employees was significantly lower that other like-size agencies throughout the County. So they did a study, and we had a change in salary rates that began, I think, in November of last year. The lower was 7.5%, the highest was 21% depending upon the position to make us a competitive agency.

The other thing the Board did is they authorized us to become what's called "loggers" which is a type of retirement plan that most police officers seek out. In fact we had some candidates come in that backed out after that we didn't have loggers. Now we're getting it. Goes into effect in two days, I think.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Chief, 30 seconds.

CHIEF WILL: Thank you, sir. I'm just about done. And then we are going to look at sending recruits to the Academy, which is something that's not done, and we're also going to initiate a bonus system for hiring people. The point being is I don't anticipate any issues in being able to hire the 12 officers that we're going to get for this position. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you sir.

PODRASKY: My name is Don Podrasky, and I lived at Dougherty Oaks Subdivision. First I want to thank Justin Klocke for responding immediately emails, and my questions were when I looked at the map, there's three areas on Barrett Station Road that were annexed by Des Peres when the annexation took place, and I wondered why. And I think people here should ask also. Manchester wants to annex, but they're going to skip those three little parcels and there is a reason, and I talked to Des Peres, and I asked them if they had any plans on annexing west and they said it wasn't very fiscally responsible. Now, also I'll just real quick say I grew up in Manchester. I remember when the Manchester Police Department operated out of little hole by the ballpark, and so when I go to Costco, I keep going by this big building up here. Tonight I stopped to see what was there. The lady told me and I was surprised that they'd have a meeting hall, but the police department's come a long ways since the '70s.

But anyway, my other big question was ... the response was it says the property tax must be applied uniformly to all Manchester residents. Now, I just wonder if some of these streets in unincorporated area, these street repairs, what the residents of Manchester are going to think if they say, "Well, wait a minute, these people are getting a rebate and still getting the full service." So I think these are the kinds of questions that should be answered. I'm happy with all the County Services. I'm happy with the County Police. I'm happy with the _____ yard pickup. I'm not in a mood for any change, but if there is a change, I'll live with it. I just think some of these questions should be answered rather than chop it up little areas. You know, if you look at the ____ Big Ben, Valley Park annexed one little piece which happened to be financially income for them because it was a business. Twin Oaks annexed a little piece. All these people grabbing a little piece for the money, and I just think somebody should look at the overall picture what's happening to these little areas that are getting skipped 'cause somebody has to take care of them. Thank you.

DOUGHERTY: After this gentleman, we have Carl Wood, Cindy Nouri, and Errol Tate.

LANCASTER: My name is John Lancaster. I looked over to the financial piece, and I found it somewhat astounding that they had no clear numbers on what kind of revenue would generate from commercial from sales tax and from residential. If they can't provide adequate numbers like that, how much else in their financial plan is missing or winging on a hope and a prayer. They didn't cover Merchant's Licenses, other things.

As far as some of the services: Streets – that's a major concern for me where we live. We have a private street. When asked if they would take care of the street, what I heard was a politician's promise that we're going to see rose petals, rainbows, and unicorns and they just might take over our street.

Oh, a park. I've got one pool already I don't need. Now to have ... if the annexation went through, I'd have two pools that I'm paying for, don't need.

Services. Police Department. Right now in Country Lane Woods, they have a tremendous problem with car cloutings [sounds like] that the Police Department seems unable to deal with. I don't have any problem where I live, and I have St. Louis County. I seem them through there maybe once a week, but I don't need to see them anymore since I don't have problems over there.

Finally, the Listening Tour. They were very proud of about the time spent talking to businesses. I got my brochure about two days before the first meeting. I talked to a business owner today in the proposed annexation area. He had not heard that he was in the area to be annexed. He didn't receive the brochure. No one came by to talk to him about it.

I think this whole thing should just be nipped in the bud. It's not ready for prime time. Thank you.

WOOD: I'm Carl Wood. I live in Glyn Cagny Subdivision. We've looked at that subdivision for many years before we finally bought there. The road at one time where there's gates now to keep people from coming through but was accessible, but not actually was a street at that time, and traffic was horrible. We considered not buying because of it at one point. But I'm going to get down to it . I looked at the Internet and it's considerably different than this. They say on there that they're going to combine Glyn Cagny and Carmen Meadows. Well, the end of the street, we consider that common ground for many years, but it's probably a lot because _____ extended, but nobody in the subdivision knows that I don't believe because I've talked to quite a few people and they say they're not going to open the gates or extend the street. They also say that part of the subdivision is in Manchester County. I believe the gates down there you go 10, maybe 20 feet further, that's where Manchester is.

I looked on the Internet. They say their considering extending eight streets. Well, I wish they'd put out a publication to the Glyn Cagny residents saying where they're going to the easements are and where they're going to put them. I could go down to the County, I know, and I could get the easements for them, but if they're going to take us in, they should explain what they're doing. I don't think they're being fully open about it.

And Manchester's a good place. I worked for the State, and I was in Manchester an awful lot on State business. It's a good place. I'm not going ... just don't think this is being handled right.

And when you talk about not going to open the gates, this administration might not open it, but what are the aldermen next ... say five years from now going to do. Who knows? Another thing that concerns me is Manchester is allowing Rehabilitation Center,

sometimes called a Nursing, sometimes called ... they got one building in. The gates are right within probably 50-feet of their driveway.

I lived in Eureka when they opened up that nursing home out there on north street. I was surprised at the semi's coming down the street, just boom, sheets. I would have expected vans. I didn't expect that.

Now I know about our street, it's about 14- or 15-feet wide. It's asphalt. We can't afford to bring it up to standards right now. We don't want to bring it up to standards right now. Who's going to replace that when they open those gates and, you know, sooner or later some politician is get behind it and open those gates and they're going to have traffic through that subdivision. The subdivision in the midsection slopes downhill from east to west. If you widen that street, some of the driveways are going to be almost impassible. Too steep to go up, too steep to go down. So it's going to be a hardship for us. There are some advantages, but I don't see where it is overall it's going to be that much.

And when it comes to the County Police, Bob Wall came up. I called him and said, "I was missing one _____ my ID." Hung up the phone, walked past the door, and it was knock, knock. There was a County Policeman there already. I mean probably less than a minute from my hung up. So I just say that I wish that would permit more information out there are what they intend to do with Glyn Cagny like they talk about extending streets, extending Glyn Cagny Road into Grayshire Street, I believe it's called, Country Middles ... whatever it is over there. I don't think they're being truly clear with us. They're not showing us the full picture. And we're very small, we're small potatoes, I know, and I guess I could go through, go down to the County and get all the easements and I could back and print out everything on the Internet, and I'm hoping that these comments in this meeting is on the Internet so some people who can read it because I'm sure there are some people who think if they don't vote, we're not in. If you do vote, we're in anyway. Some people say we have no control because most people will go for it even those who are not in our subdivision. So the clarification would be nice. And I'm sorry. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you.

DOUGHERTY: Mr. Chairman, I do have one comment from the Zoom that I need to read into the record.

CHAIRMAN: Go right ahead.

DOUGHERTY: This is from Dimana Teneva My family and myself are not agreeing with the proposal. We live along Wissman Road. We chose to buy property in [incorporated] St. Louis County. We are happy with County Service and we do not want to be part of Manchester. I personally contact County for a few issues and was so easy to get my answers. I had to call 911; police were by my house for a minute. Besides

financial benefits for Manchester City, I do not see benefit for our area.” That’s her comment.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you.

NOURI: Hi. I’m Cindy Nouri and I live in Mason Manor Condos. We’re in that area that is at Mason and Manchester. It’s just a little jut up of Manchester, and I can say that myself and our neighbors moved there because we moved there because we have a lot of green space. We have a lot of trees. We back up to the creek, and it’s absolutely beautiful and pristine back there. And I am president of the Board of Trustees and we have not had a Listening Tour. We haven’t had anybody read out to us about what ... why they want to annex our area.

But I’m here on behalf of myself today to say a lot of the comments about revenues that Manchester get are sales tax. So the majority of the income comes from sales tax and that is a huge red flag for me because why would Manchester choose to go up above and grab our little area yet not want to take these other areas. And, you know, I remember I had a friend who had a successful business on Manchester Road, and it was taken over by eminent domain and TIF, and I am very concerned as are many of my fellow neighbors that this area that Manchester is trying to go up and grab because it’s on Manchester Road could be taken over and re- ... redeveloped and so and I along with the first gentleman here tonight who’s on the street above us would like to request a map amendment to ask that we become part of Town and Country. When I leave my ... when I ... I can see within 20 feet the Town and Country sign from our property is, and, you know, I don’t think it’s fair that a city can decide to want to annex areas and go up and grab areas north of Manchester to get that area along Manchester Road yet they’re going to leave orphaned areas. It just doesn’t ... it doesn’t make any sense. It’s not logical and reasonable, which is exactly what the Boundary Commission’s criteria are. And I’m requesting that there before it’s even decided whether it can be taken up to a vote. Thank you.

DOUGHERTY: Next three people. We have 23 minutes left. Carissa Anderson, Dennis Oats, and Casper Kovarik.

CHAIRMAN: Did we lose Errol Tate?

DOUGHERTY: It looks like it.

ANDERSON: Hi. I’m Carissa Anderson, and I am here in an individual capacity, but I’m also the President of the Board of Trustees for a small subdivision, Laura States Drive, and Laura States Court which is at the intersection ... close to the intersection of Dougherty Ferry Road and Carmen Road. So we’re right across from Barrett.

I support the opportunity to vote on this annexation proposal. We were part of a Listening Tour from Manchester, and we had mixed feedback from our residents so I think we would all like to have more information and be able to make that choice for ourselves in a vote.

One of the reasons why I'm intrigued personally by the annexation is because my mailing address right now is Ballwin, but we actually live between Des Peres behind us and Manchester in front of us, and it's rather confusing to explain where we live. It takes many sentences or a paragraph to explain that to people and moving here from the DC area it took us awhile to even understand why houses that were like back-to-back would be in different, you know, mailing address cities. And so, just from a matter of convenience, post office, things like that I think it would be helpful if we were part of a city from our mailing address perspective that is at least adjacent to us rather than one that is 15 minutes away.

In addition to that, I also wanted to mention that before I came here tonight, I thought that the report that we were going to be getting on the Boundary Commission and this entire proposal that came from St. Louis County, I found informative and I thought it would be more objective, and I just wanted to make sure that everybody understood, didn't make the same mistake that I did, that that was a subjective proposal that basically needs to be considered a counter to the Manchester proposal. There were a lot of great objective criteria that were part of that proposal and the analysis that's going into that. That's very clear, but I thought there were also some very subjective conclusions. Things like what was ... what was... I think that the County had said there was going to be a significant tax increase, and I would just like to know, "Well, what is significant? What is the threshold for significance here? Is it a percentage? Is it an amount of money? What is the actual amount of out-of-pocket cost that a property owner would be expected to pay? So that was just one example.

The other piece of this that I would say was sort of a subjective, maybe biased way of presenting one of the particular issues is with regard to the orphaned areas in Des Peres. I felt like the ... the County would have ... it was like a dammed if you do, dammed if you don't. If you include areas that might be annexed by Des Peres because they more logically would belong to Des Peres if they were interested, then perhaps it would be a difficult problem because those points should be part of that logical Des Peres City but Des Peres does not want them so they would have had sort of a mark against them for that, and if they don't include those orphaned areas then it seems like the proposal is being discounted because it's not including those areas. So I would just include everyone to consider the pros and cons of each of the aspects that you're presenting as a disadvantage or reason why the proposal should be rejected because if there isn't a reason, if there isn't an answer to something, I feel like it becomes a wash rather than being a reason to not allow the people to vote on something.

How much ... do I have enough time to do one more point here? Okay. Let me go ... I'll just stop my response now and let somebody else have some time. Thank you.

DOUGHERTY: And we've got five more.

OATS: [change of mic – my sound on high, but still cannot hear]
... way on the eastern side of this annexation plan, it's actually, it's the number 3 on Map A-10 if you've been looking at the Plan of Intent. And a lot of my question have ... or really comments have been addressed already by prior people speaking tonight, but the reason I asked to speak is I was really kind of confused by the Plan of Intent that is listed on the website. I really didn't see a lot of good reasons for voting for it. We see some comments like "We've had a successful annexation history." Well, guess that's good. And "We have a shared community" and everyone in the St. Louis area has probably heard about the "Better Together" Proposal for the City and County and probably has thumbed their nose at it, and so it just reminds me of that when I read these comments.

The taxes ... there's been a lot of discussion about the taxes tonight and that was one of my concerns too. Especially the 28-cent or percent or whatever it is rebate. How long does that last? How long do we get that benefit? Otherwise our property taxes go up quite a bit. Same with sales tax. The Plan said that "Well, we're going to take a lot of businesses into our plan and we're going to apply the one and-a-quarter percent tax, but you already shop in Manchester". Well, that's not really true of me. I live way over on the eastern part of this area, so a lot of the places where I shop are going to be incorporated and the sales tax is going to be increased. There's also a comment about "closeness to government." Well, I mean actually when you look at the different municipality maps that's in the Plan of Intent, in my little area, Number 3 on Map A10 is much closer to the government in Des Peres than it is to Manchester. And there's other comments like "Well, it naturally fits because now we're L-shaped and then we'd be a square shape" or "We're adjacent ... it logically fits 'cause we're adjacent. Vladimir Putin could say that about Ukraine. It's ... I just ... I'm not saying it's a bad thing. I'm just saying that I didn't see anything in the Plan of Intent that really convinced me that I'd be better off doing this. So thank you for giving me the opportunity to talk, and I thank all the people who spoke before because I got a lot of good information from you, so thank you.

DOUGHERTY: The next three will be Todd Streiler, Nancy McClintock, and Donald ... Director of Finance. Okay. Then Jamie Driemeyer and Paul Rost, you guys are the last ones. So, we'd like you to speak with a one-and-a-half-time rate versus a half-time rate.

KOVARIK: My name is Casper Kovarik. I live at Barrett Road Estates off of Barrett Station Road. Been there since 1999. And my main concern is added cost, and especially the cost of buying an automobile. As far the St. Louis County, I've been

there since '99. I think the services have been great. Trash pickup has been good. It is good now. Police, I think have been doing a great job. We have a few cameras out in our subdivision, and I see them patrolling two or three o'clock in the morning and on occasion I've left my garage door open, and they've given me a letter saying "Hey, you left your garage open, you shouldn't be doing that at night." And street repair, our subdivision is pretty new, 20 years old, and St. Louis County, they fixed up the streets recently in the last three or four years, and our streets are excellent. So I'm very happy with St. Louis County. Thank you.

STREILER: I'm Todd Streiler, I'm the Director of Planning for the City of Manchester. It's been a couple of hours, but I'd like to go back to my colleague, Justin or Jacob Trimble's comment about the zoning. As you can read in our Plan of Intent, we are proposing no changes in the zoning. And we are ... we appreciate the concerns from county staff and my colleagues over there, but our concerns are really for the residents in the annexation area and our intent is not to create any non-conformities to basically bring them in under their current zoning. We're not creating a new zoning code. Any new zonings would, of course, would revert to our current zoning code. So we feel like this will streamline the process and create minimal non-conformities and provide no ... no change as the folks would annex in.

MCCLINTOCK: I'm Nancy McClintock and I live in Thomas Mason Place which is at the ... right off Weidman Road, right by Queeny Park. And this is not organized in any way, but I do have a few comments. One, I loved hearing that this Listening Tour, but nobody's asked for my comments, nobody's listened to me so thank you for listening to me tonight.

Community Services. I've lived in unincorporated County for over 40 years. I've lived off of Weidman for over 33 years. I've had no problems. Police Service, wonderful. Everything. I have no complaints. I see no reason for us to move into the annexed area in Manchester.

You talk about the quality of life. Let me tell you, I've been a member of this church for over 40 years. You don't have to be a member or a resident of Manchester to belong to this church or any church. It's been happy. We have a private street. The only benefit I see really from being annexed by Manchester is for you to help us with our street, and from what I'm hearing is that's probably not going to happen. Have you been over and looked at our street? Have you said "Oh, yeah, we'll do that?" I don't think you have. The only way we were notified of annexation was I read it in the West News Magazine. None of our Trustees knew about this only really until I told them, "Hey, I took a picture of it in the newspaper, and I said "What in the heck is going on?? So there's a lack of communication. I'm upset that we live ... we have 15 homes on our street, and all the people living in the annexation area, to be honest, you get to decide what happens to me and my house, you know, and I don't think that's right. You know, I don't know what to do for now. Obviously, we're going to look into what our recourse is to this

annexation. There are several people on our street who are definitely against it and they want their voices heard too.

Questions about the rebate. Another question I have, I went to the meeting that you had Mike, you talked about the future and annexing Love Park. Well, that's great. So that's St. Louis County Parks and Recreation. Is that what's going to happen to Queeny Park? Is that what's going to happen to all of our parks?" You talk about community, let me tell you Queeny Park is a ... it's just a wonderful area, it has so much opportunity ... that's a community right there. You know, they have a lot to offer and if you haven't taken advantage of it because it's a wonderful and that's why we built our house over there.

You talk about services. I taught in Rockwood for 18 years. I had a mentor from the St. Louis County Parks and Rec mentor my students over at Queeny Park for over 10 years. Voluntary, no money because he loved it.

Okay ... what ... I look at this and I look at the map and I look at the commercial and what I see is that you are looking ... Manchester is looking at basically as a money grab. You want money from the commercial, and I don't think that's right.

There are other things. I could go on. Things have been said tonight, but I have a question: Where's the Manchester Post Office? I don't know. Thank you.

DOUGHERTY: There are no more. One more. Oops. Sorry. I didn't see you back there. You're the final one.

?: I'm the last one. All right. And this is for those people that are

DOUGHERTY: Would you ... state your name.

DRIEMEYER: Oh, sorry. And I happen to live down the road from Nancy. The individual who talked about the taxes. You over there with the glasses from the County. You said that if you bought a new car and you lived in Manchester you would be paying more than unincorporated county. That is not true, because when we bought a new car, we got charged the rate as if it was based on our zip code. Wrote to the State and said "Hey, what's going on here?" Because the last time I bought a new car that wasn't the case. And they said, "It is totally based on your zip code. You have a choice. You can pick Ellisville, Wildwood, or Manchester as to where your taxes go." So, you might want to check that one out.

And the other thing is, you know, I think people should have a choice and, you know, please don't get rid of Queeny Park. But, you know, I mean that's, you know, nothing against Manchester, you know, you can live ... I've never lived in a town since I've lived in this state. I've always lived in unincorporated, and I've always been told that there

would be no more unincorporated St. Louis County in 10 years, and I kept hearing it and hearing it, hearing it, and I've lived here for over 40 years at this point. So, thank you all.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: And that is our last one?

DOUGHERTY: That is our last one.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: And what opportunities do folks that didn't get to speak still be able to get their comments on the record?

DOUGHERTY: St. Louis County Boundary Commission will continue to take written comments. You can email us: info@boundarycommission.com or you can send it to us using the US mail at whatever post office you choose, and you can get that information on our website too: www.boundarycommission.com or if you have picked up an information sheet on the back on either side table, contact information is there as well.

Thank you guys for coming.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you all very much. I do appreciate it.

DORSEY Mr. Chairman, I move we adjourn.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Thank you sir. Is there a second?

SCHWEITZER: I second that.

CHAIRMAN WEGERT: Gavel.