

BILL NUMBER: HB 2065				DATE: 2/13/2024
COMMITTEE: Local Government			•	
TESTIFYING:	✓ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LO	DBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: CHARLES HINDER	RLITER		PHONE NUMB 314-576-0 0	
REPRESENTING: ST. LOUIS REALTO	ORS®		SVP OF GAFFAIRS	OVERNMENT
ADDRESS: 12777 OLIVE BLVD)			
CITY: ST LOUIS			STATE: MO	ZIP: 63141
EMAIL: chinderliter@stlrea	altors.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 2/9/202	ATE: 4 1:02 PM
THE INFORMAT	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610. RSMo.



BILL NUMBER: HB 2065				DATE: 2/13/2024
COMMITTEE: Local Government	t			
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: DALE SWEET			PHONE NUMB	ER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO	DN NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:			·	
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:		ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT D 2/13/20	ATE: 24 12:00 AM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECORI	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610, RSMo.



BILL NUMBER: HB 2065				DATE: 2/13/2024
COMMITTEE: Local Government			•	
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LO	BBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: DAVID WINTON			PHONE NUMB 573-230-4 (
REPRESENTING: ST. LOUIS COUNT	Y		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: PO BOX 1805				
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY			STATE: MO	ZIP: 65102
EMAIL:		ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT D 2/13/20	OATE: 24 12:00 AM
THE INFORMAT	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610, RSMo.



BILL NUMBER: HB 2065				DATE: 2/13/2024
COMMITTEE: Local Government			•	
TESTIFYING:	✓ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORG	ANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: FELICIA CRAWFO	RD-RANDLE		PHONE NUMB 314-590-2 3	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO ST. LOUIS REALTO				R OF DIVERSITY, INCLUSION
ADDRESS: 12777 OLIVE BOUL	LEVARD			
CITY: CREVE COEUR			STATE: MO	ZIP: 63141
EMAIL: fcrawford@stirealt	ors.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 2/12/20	OATE: 24 2:33 PM
THE INFORMAT	TION ON THIS FORM	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610. RSMo.



HB 2065				DATE: 2/13/2024
COMMITTEE: Local Government				
TESTIFYING:	IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO		ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORGAN	IIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: GERALD E. SMITH			PHONE NUME 314-615-7	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: ST. LOUIS COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE; ST LOUIS COUNTY RECORDER OF DEEDS OFFICE		RECORDS	R OF DEEDS	
ADDRESS: 41 SOUTH CENTRAL	AVENUE, 4TH FL			
CITY: ST. LOUIS COUNTY			STATE: MO	ZIP: 63105
EMAIL: GSmith@stlouiscoun	tymo.gov	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 0 2/12/20	OATE: 24 9:33 AM
THE INFORMATION	N ON THIS FORM	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTFR 610 RSMo



BILL NUMBER: HB 2065				DATE: 2/13/2024
COMMITTEE: Local Government			•	
TESTIFYING:	☑IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORG	ANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: GERALD E. SMITH			PHONE NUMB 314-615-7	
	N NAME: Y DEPARTMENT OF RE ER OF DEEDS OFFICE		TITLE: RECORDE	R OF DEEDS
ADDRESS: 41 SOUTH CENTRA	AL AVENUE, 4TH FLOO	DR .		
CITY: ST. LOUIS COUNT	Y		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63105
EMAIL: GSmith@StLouisC	ountyMo.Gov	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT D 2/12/20	ATE: 24 9:23 AM
THE INFORMAT	ION ON THIS FORM	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610. RSMo.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2065			DATE: 2/13/2024	
COMMITTEE: Local Government		•		
TESTIFYING : ✓ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES	
	WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:				
WITNESS NAME: JASON A. GAGE		PHONE NUMB 417-864-10		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: CITY OF SPRINGFIELD, MISSOURI TITLE: CITY MANAGER				
ADDRESS: 840 BOONVILLE AVE.				
CITY: SPRINGFIELD		STATE: MO	ZIP: 65802	
EMAIL: jgage@springfieldmo.gov	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT D 2/13/20	ATE: 24 5:51 PM	

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

The City of Springfield asks that you support HB 2065 in its current form for the following reasons:1)

Missouri continues to struggle with low incomes and high poverty rates. This is certainly a concern for Springfield. A significant impact of poverty is the continued decay and neglect of housing stock and other properties due to a lack of repair, upkeep of basic building systems and occasionally, outright abandonment. These property conditions are fairly widespread and plague most Missouri cities, like Springfield, that desire to have healthy, safe and desirable neighborhoods.2)

The Springfield City Council has established the revitalization of declining neighborhoods as a key objective of its Quality of Place priority and the City's Renew SGF initiative.3)

Land banks are very common across the country and provide an essential tool to help cities improve aging, dilapidated housing stock and other properties. Most Missouri communities are in desperate need of the Land Bank tool, but are not currently allowed to utilize it under current State law.4)

HB 2065 allows land banked property to be redeployed for its best neighborhood and community use. It also provides for a judicial hearing process to address back taxes, fines, etc. and to ensure a clean title.5)

By allowing our community to create a Land Bank, we can better stabilize our failing neighborhoods by leveraging public-private investment into our declining building structures. We truly believe this tool can get us one step closer to significantly benefitting our community's health, safety and quality of place. 6) Certain organizations have opposed the use of land banks in Missouri. There is really no incentive for a municipality to hold onto land banked property for a long duration of time. Doing so would extend the time the property does not generate local taxes and would increase maintenance costs. For Springfield, a land bank will not be a staff-intensive endeavor, nor will it be a panacea for neighborhood revitalization. It is simply another basic tool offered to many cities across America that can be effective for neighborhood revitalization when used correctly. It is for these reasons we respectfully ask the House Local Government Committee to support HB 2065 in its current form. Thank you for serving and for your consideration of our request!!



BILL NUMBER: HB 2065				DATE: 2/13/2024
COMMITTEE: Local Government	İ			
TESTIFYING:	✓ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LO	OBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: JASON ZAMKUS			PHONE NUM 573-291-6	
REPRESENTING: MISSOURI ASSOC	IATION OF REALTORS		TITLE: LOBBYIS	Т
ADDRESS: 1320 ELMERINE AVENUE				
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY			STATE: MO	ZIP: 65101
EMAIL: jzamkus@gmail.co	om	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT 2/13/2 0	DATE: 024 8:03 AM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FORM	I IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610. RSMo.



BILL NUMBER: HB 2065				DATE: 2/13/2024
COMMITTEE: Local Government	İ			•
TESTIFYING:	☑IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	IATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
BUSINESS/ORG	ANIZATION:			
WITNESS NAME: JD KEHRMAN			PHONE NUM 660-886-2	
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATIO			TITLE: CITY ADN	MINISTRATOR
ADDRESS: 214 N LAFAYETTE	AVE			
CITY: MARSHALL			STATE: MO	ZIP: 65340
EMAIL: jdkehrman@marsh	hall-mo.com	ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 2/9/20 2	DATE: 24 1:13 PM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FORM	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610, RSMo.



BILL NUMBER: HB 2065				DATE: 2/13/2024	
COMMITTEE: Local Government	t				
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO		ATIONAL PURPOSE	S
		WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORG	ANIZATION:				
WITNESS NAME: KEVIN POE			PHONE NUME 314-368-3		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION THE HOUSING PA			TITLE: EXECUTIV	/E DIRECTOR	
ADDRESS: 729 LEMAY FERRY RD.					
CITY: ST. LOUIS			STATE: MO	ZIP: 63125	
EMAIL: kevin@thpstl.org		ATTENDANCE: Written	SUBMIT 0 2/9/202	OATE: 4 1:33 PM	
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FORM	I IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610. RSMo	



BILL NUMBER: HB 2065				DATE: 2/13/2024
COMMITTEE: Local Government	t			
TESTIFYING:	☑IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO		ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
REGISTERED LO	OBBYIST:			
WITNESS NAME: PAT KELLY			PHONE NUME 314-252-1	
REPRESENTING: MUNICIPAL LEAG	UE METRO ST. LOUIS		TITLE:	
ADDRESS: 11911 DORSETT R	RD.			
CITY: MARYLAND HEIGI	нтѕ		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63043
EMAIL:		ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT 0 2/13/20	DATE: 124 12:00 AM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECOR	D UNDER CHA	PTER 610. RSMo.



BILL NUMBER: HB 2065				DATE: 2/13/2024
COMMITTEE: Local Governmen	t			
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES
		WITNESS NAME		
INDIVIDUAL:				
WITNESS NAME: RACHEL WATERN	//AN		PHONE NUME	BER:
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION	ON NAME:		TITLE:	
ADDRESS:				
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:
EMAIL:		ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT I 2/13/20	DATE: 124 12:00 AM
THE INFORMA	TION ON THIS FOR	M IS PUBLIC RECORD	UNDER CHA	PTER 610, RSMo.



BILL NUMBER: HB 2065				DATE: 2/13/2024	
COMMITTEE: Local Government	İ				
TESTIFYING:	☑ IN SUPPORT OF	☐ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORM	ATIONAL PURPOSES	
		WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:					
WITNESS NAME: RICHARD SHEETS	3		PHONE NUME 573-635-9		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: MISSOURI MUNICIPAL LEAGUE		TITLE: EXECUTIV	VE DIRECTOR		
ADDRESS: 1727 SOUTHRIDGE DRIVE					
CITY: JEFFERSON CITY			STATE: MO	ZIP: 65109	
EMAIL:		ATTENDANCE:	SUBMIT DATE: 2/13/2024 12:00 AM		
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.					



BILL NUMBER: HB 2065			DATE: 2/13/2024	
COMMITTEE: Local Government				
TESTIFYING: ✓IN SUPPORT	OF IN OPPOSITION T	O FOR INFORM	MATIONAL PURPOSES	
	WITNESS NAME			
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:				
WITNESS NAME: RODNEY CRIM		PHONE NUM 314-615- 7		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: ST. LOUIS ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PARTNERSHIP			TITLE: CEO & PRESIDENT	
ADDRESS: 120 S. CENTRAL, SUITE 200				
CITY: ST. LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63105	
EMAIL: rcrim@stlpartnership.com	ATTENDANCE: Written		SUBMIT DATE: 2/12/2024 8:28 AM	
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610. RSMo.				



BILL NUMBER: HB 2065				DATE: 2/13/2024	
COMMITTEE: Local Government					
TESTIFYING:	☐IN SUPPORT OF	✓ IN OPPOSITION TO	☐FOR INFORMA	ATIONAL PURPOSES	
		WITNESS NAME			
INDIVIDUAL:					
WITNESS NAME: ARNIE C. AC "HONEST-ABE" DIENOFF-STATE PUBLIC ADVO			PHONE NUMBER:		
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME:		TITLE:			
ADDRESS:			·		
CITY:			STATE:	ZIP:	
EMAIL: arniedienoff@yaho	oo.com	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DATE: 2/13/2024 11:53 PM		
THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.					

I very Opposed to this Bill. Government shall NOT be in the business of "Real Estate." This a private matter. To see more of my On the Record Testimony, Please view the House archived under "Media" and the Committee Hearing.



MISSOURI HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WITNESS APPEARANCE FORM

BILL NUMBER: HB 2065			DATE: 2/13/2024			
COMMITTEE: Local Government						
TESTIFYING : □IN SUPPORT OF	☑ IN OPPOSITION TO	FOR INFORMA	ATIONAL PURPOSES			
WITNESS NAME						
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION:						
WITNESS NAME: DAVID STOKES		PHONE NUMBE 314-276-63				
BUSINESS/ORGANIZATION NAME: SHOW-ME INSTITUTE	TITLE:					
ADDRESS: 7220 GREENWAY AVE.						
CITY: ST. LOUIS		STATE: MO	ZIP: 63108			
EMAIL: david.stokes@showmeinstitute.org	ATTENDANCE: In-Person	SUBMIT DA 2/12/202	ATE: 2 4 2:43 PM			

THE INFORMATION ON THIS FORM IS PUBLIC RECORD UNDER CHAPTER 610, RSMo.

Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today. My name is David Stokes, and I am Director of Municipal Policy at the Show-Me Institute, a nonprofit, nonpartisan Missouri-based think tank that supports free-market solutions for state policy. The ideas presented here are my own. This testimony is intended to summarize research that the Show-Me Institute has conducted and reviewed regarding local land banks in Missouri.St. Louis is home to the oldest land bank in the United States. The St. Louis land bank, also known as the Land Reutilization Authority (LRA), has been in existence for five decades. It owns more than 7,500 parcels, making it the largest landholder in the City of St. Louis. As you may surmise from this statement, it has not succeeded in its mission of returning land to private use. Even worse, it has become a central focus of corruption within St. Louis government.1 Problems with land banks aren't limited to St. Louis, however, On the other side of the state in 2021, the Kansas City Star released an investigative report on the myriad of failures with the Kansas City land bank.2 I hope that you consider the very poor track records of the existing land banks before expanding the ability to create land banks to most cities and counties in Missouri. Proponents argue that land banking can help a city assemble large swaths of land. This can involve keeping land vacant for years in the hope that one day the city will be remade with massive development projects. As we have seen in St. Louis, however, these large-scale development projects often fail to materialize, and people who want to purchase property (to build a small business, for example, or rehab a home) are often turned away. The same problems have occurred in Kansas City. Show-Me Institute researchers spent a great deal of time several years ago researching the St. Louis land bank.3 Given that provisions of this bill are very similar to the state statutes that authorize the other land banks, I think it is fair to view the failures of the St. Louis and Kansas City land banks as the future for the rest of the state if this legislation is passed. Corruption in St. Louisln 2022, three members of the St. Louis Board of Aldermen were indicted and convicted on bribery charges.4 (As of this hearing date, all three are still in prison.) One of the bribery charges was related to payments for assistance in the acquisition of property owned by the LRA at less than the standard price.5 As the charges related to the LRA were described in the newspaper (emphasis added throughout testimony)6: [I]t says the businessman wanted to buy an LRA-owned property at 4201 R Geraldine Ave. in north city, which is within Alderman Jeffrey Boyd's 22nd Ward. Property records identify Mohammed Almuttan as current owner of the Geraldine site. Almuttan was neither charged nor identified by name in the indictment.In July 2020, the businessman was connected to Boyd by another alderman, John Collins-Muhammad, the indictment says. At the time, the LRA had listed the Geraldine site for sale with a value of \$50,000. But during a meeting with the businessman, Boyd indicated the property was appraised at a much higher value of \$459,000 and said he would support whatever bid the businessman offered.Before leaving the meeting, the businessman gave Boyd \$2,500 for agreeing to support his

effort to buy the property, the feds allege. The next month, Boyd sent a letter to L.C. supporting the businessman's \$9,000 bid, the indictment says. As the old saying goes, when the business of buying and selling is controlled by the legislature, the first thing to be bought and sold are the legislators. The idea that we would be expanding opportunities for corruption like this to other parts of Missouri is absurd. We should be reducing government ownership of private property, not dramatically expanding it throughout the state. Serious Problems at the Kansas City Land BankThe Kansas City Star published a story on the Kansas City land bank in December of 2021. The Star documented a history of questionable decisions by the land bank, including frequent decisions in recent years to reject offers to purchase property by qualified individuals and groups with no explanation given. According to the Star7:At its July meeting, the board rejected 31 of the 33 purchase offers without explanation beyond a rote recitation that they were deemed insufficient, the commissioners felt the buyer didn't have the resources to carry through with their plan, or both. "This is not an agency that is interested in selling properties; it's more interested in regulating who gets them and under what circumstances," development lawyer and former city councilman Mark Bryant told the Star after an offer from him and his partners at Onyx Development Corp. was rejected at a recent Land Bank meeting. The non-profit that Bryant, barbecue baron Ollie Gates, and former Research Medical Center public affairs director Will McCarther operate wanted to add to their holdings around the 4900 block of Montgall Avenue by buying eight Land Bank lots at a deep discount to potentially build an assisted living center. . . Lecturing the board, Bryant said it was wrongheaded to reject the offer when no one else has been interested in buying the lots since they became part of the Land Bank portfolio four years ago. He finds it absurd that the Land Bank won't sell the land to a willing buyer when no one else wants it. The rejection of offers to purchase property by the Kansas City land bank continues an unfortunate trend that Show-Me Institute researchers previously documented at the St. Louis land bank. The apparent desire for large-scale "miracles" impedes the more realistic-and commendable-aims of neighborhood residents and groups who want to improve their communities a few parcels at a time. Other examples in the Star report include a neighborhood group that wanted to buy a few properties to build a small park. They were rejected by the land bank, as were residents who simply wanted to acquire adjoining properties to expand their own yards. Expanding one's yard, as simple as that may be, has the multiple benefits of putting the land back on the tax rolls, removing it from city mowing expenses, and helping a family invest in their own neighborhood. But the Kansas City land bank is consistently rejecting those offers. This is not the type of approach we need to expand to the rest of Missouri.St. Joseph Land BankThe third land bank in Missouri is the St. Joseph land bank. It is newer and smaller than the other two. It acquired its first properties in 2021. It currently holds nine properties. It has sold three properties in the past three years.8 While it may have so far avoided the ethical issues of the St. Louis and Kansas City land banks, there is no reason to believe the Buchanan County land trust would not have had those same modest achievements. Frequent Rejections of Legitimate Offers to Purchase Vacant Property in St. LouisShow-Me Institute research found that for the eight years from 2003 through 2010, the St. Louis land bank rejected almost half of all formal offers to purchase its property. The most frequent reason for rejection was that the property was being "held for future development."In a paper published in 1975 by Team Four, Inc., for the City of St. Louis, the authors noted that the powers awarded to the St. Louis land bank could allow the city to "assemble a large inventory of property."9 While Team Four's plan was never officially adopted by the city, the intention to assemble and hold large amounts of property for future sale and redevelopment certainly influenced the St. Louis land bank. As to whether this strategy has been beneficial to the city, consider the fact that the St. Louis land bank still owns substantial amounts of property. Some may fear that vacant property in poorer areas of a city will not attract buyers. One of the main findings of the Show-Me Institute's study10 was that people wanted to buy property in both North and South St. Louis City—it was not true that there were no buyers for land bank property in areas beset by vacancy. However, it was true that offers were turned down throughout the city. A similar trend has been experienced in Kansas City with its land bank. In just the eight years examined, the St. Louis land bank received offers to purchase more than 5,300 different parcels—more than half of what it owned. It rejected offers to purchase more than 2,200 of those properties, and it rejected multiple offers to purchase at least 550 properties. Indeed, eight different offers to purchase 1252 Academy, just a little north of St. Louis City's bustling Central West End, were rejected. In 2001, the St. Louis land bank said "no" the first time because the property was being held for future development. In 2010, the St. Louis land bank said no for the eighth time, because the property was being held as part of a larger development site. It wasn't until 2011, after the Show-Me Institute and others had brought attention to the rejection of numerous previous offers,11 that the property was finally sold. Consider the cost of having a city maintain a vacant property for years instead of allowing someone to purchase it to start a business, own a home, or even just mow the grass. When you turn down an offer to purchase property today in the hopes of a better development tomorrow, you are turning down a certain offer (and property tax revenues), in the hopes that a future offer will materialize. In this economy, such a bet is ill-advised. It is true that private

```
actors often turn down offers to purchase property in the hopes of attracting a better offer in the future.
But when the government makes such decisions, it is not subject to the disciplines of a free market. As
St. Louis proves, economic efficiency—profit and loss—does not drive government decisions; political
favor does. Government should not be picking winners and losers. At best, the process results in
inefficiency; at worst, it leads to corruption. The legislation you are considering today would give most
cities and counties in Missouri the ability to create land banks and thereby the power to arbitrarily
choose who to sell property to—in other words, to make real estate development bets. Under this
legislation, land banks throughout Missouri could be formed to essentially become government-owned
real estate speculators. That is not a future that should inspire confidence or hope. The National
Geospatial-Intelligence AgencySupporters of land banks will likely argue that the St. Louis land bank
was an important part in the National Geospatial-Intelligence Agency (NGA) project in North St. Louis.
That is incorrect. While the NGA project will be beneficial, and the St. Louis land bank did transfer
many city-owned properties to it, this was a government project that did not need the St. Louis Land
Bank to do anything. Both the Federal12 and St. Louis city governments had the legal authority to use
eminent domain for this project. Indeed, the City of St. Louis used condemnations, eminent domain,
and lawsuits to acquire a few dozen acres of land and parcels for this project.13 While the LRA may
have simplified the process somewhat for the NGIA, the St. Louis land bank was not necessary for the
NGA project to move forward. The Political Nature of Land BanksUnfortunately, the operations of the
Kansas City and St. Louis land banks are inevitably political. Our area aldermen can sometimes
effectively kill a sale just by neglecting to provide a letter of support in favor of the sale—no explicit,
written "rejection" is required. As former St. Louis land bank commissioner Howard Hayes told a would
-be buyer, "We put a lot of weight on that judgment."14 In light of the recent bribery convictions St.
Louis reviewed this process, but the flaws in it are inherent to land banks. Ultimately, the City of St.
Louis passed an ordinance15 requiring additional conflict of interest statements on all development
proposals, but aldermanic approval or opposition is still carefully considered in LRA decisions. In
Kansas City, the extended family of an influential elected official was given a special deal for a group of
properties. The family did not redevelop the properties as they had promised. They simply "flipped"
many of them to another purchaser, using the special deal they received from the land bank to increase
their profit margin.16 I recognize that this bill prohibits family members of elected officials from
bidding on land bank property, but I doubt that such "conflict of interest" prohibitions will prevent
corrupt acts. The proper move is to limit or remove the opportunities for corruption in the first place.
not to naively assume a rule against it is going to end it. Furthermore, because only St. Louis County
(and not any of the 88 municipalities within the county) is authorized to have a land bank, several
hundred municipal elected officials in Missouri's largest county are exempt from those "conflict-of-
interest" laws anyway. While the study by the Show-Me Institute regarding the St. Louis land bank is
several years old, the problems it demonstrated obviously continue in St. Louis. They have also been
repeated in Kansas City, just as Institute writers predicted when they opposed the creation of the
Kansas City land bank in 2012. I could go on about the policy failures we have seen in St. Louis and
Kansas City. Indeed, I hope that both sides of our state can learn from each other's policy successes
and failures. Passing legislation to allow the creation of a land bank in almost every city and county
will allow local government to hold land for future development and increase opportunities for
corruption and favoritism around Missouri. In doing so, the local governments will be betting against
the very residents it is supposed to help. Why authorize cities and counties to create new agencies
similar to those that have failed in St. Louis and Kansas City? Why pin development hopes and dreams
on large-scale developers who have yet to materialize instead of trusting the small business owner, the
longtime community resident, or someone—in a case we have seen again and again—who sees a
property as his or her first chance to own a home? Land banks have failed in their mission in St. Louis
and Kansas City, and they have violated good government standards in both communities. Land banks
have shown no signs of success in their limited time in St. Joseph. There is no evidence that the rest of
Missouri will benefit from land banks. In fact, Missouri will be made worse off by their expansion.
                                                                 Barker, Jacob, "St. Louis Aldermanic
Thank you for the opportunity to testify today. NOTES1.
President, Two Allies Indicted on Federal Bribery Charges", St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 3, 2022. 2.
             Hendricks, Mike. "'They're Trapping Us in Blight': Kansas City Land Bank Has Failed, East
Side Residents Say." Kansas City Star, December 13, 2021.3.
                                                                 Spalding, Audrey and Stahl, Bruce.
"Standstill: Is Saint Louis Hindering Development by Waiting for Large-Scale Miracles?" Show-Me
Institute Policy Study No. 27, April 2011.4.
                                                    Barker, Jacob, "St. Louis Aldermanic President,
Two Allies Indicted on Federal Bribery Charges," St. Louis Post-Dispatch, June 3, 2022.5. Kirn,
Jacob, "City Halts New Land Bank Deals after Indictment Detailed Leader's Role," St. Louis Business
                                       Hendricks, Mike. "'They're Trapping Us in Blight': Kansas City
Journal, June 6, 20226. Ibid. 7.
Land Bank Has Failed, East Side Residents Say." Kansas City Star, December 13, 2021.8.
city website, accessed on Feb. 8, 2024; https://www.stjosephmo.gov/1011/Land-Bank-Properties-
```

Available.9. Team Four, Inc. "Citywide Implementation Strategies: The Draft Comprehensive Plan,"

1975, page 18. 10. Spalding, Audrey and Stahl, Bruce. "Standstill: Is Saint Louis Hindering Development by Waiting for Large-Scale Miracles?" Show-Me Institute Policy Study No. 27, April 2011.11. Spalding, Audry. "1253 Academy Is Approved for Sale!" Show-Me Institute, May 25, 2011; www.showmeinstitute.org/blog/municipal-policy/1252-academy-is-approved-for-sale.12. States Department of Justice, "History of the Federal Use of Eminent Domain," January 24, 2022; https://www.justice.gov/enrd/history-federal-use-eminent-domain.13. Barker, Jacob. "St. Louis Uses Eminent Domain—Again—on NGA Land." St. Louis Post-Dispatch, September 24, 2018. 14. Spalding, Audrey and Stahl, Bruce. "Standstill: Is Saint Louis Hindering Development by Waiting for Large-Scale Miracles?" Show-Me Institute Policy Study No. 27, April St. Louis City Ordinance 71620, approved in 2023.16. Hendricks, Mike. "'They're Trapping Us in Blight': Kansas City Land Bank Has Failed, East Side Residents Say." Kansas City Star, December 13, 2021.