MINUTES

COLUMBIA AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY ORGANIZATION

COORDINATING COMMITTEE

May 1, 2014

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tim Teddy	City of Columbia - Planning Department
John Glascock	City of Columbia - Public Works
Bob McDavid	City of Columbia – Mayor
Barbara Buffaloe	City of Columbia – City Manager - Proxy
Derin Campbell	Boone County – Resource Management
Mike Henderson	MoDOT
Eric Curtit	MoDOT
David Silvester	MoDOT - District Engineer

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mike Matthes	City of Columbia - City Manager
Dan Atwill	Boone County Commissioner

ALSO PRESENT

Mitch Skov	City of Columbia - Planning

I.   **ROLL CALL OF MEMBERSHIP**

MR. TEDDY: All right. Well, good afternoon, everyone. Welcome to the Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization Coordinating Committee Meeting, Special Meeting. We have a special meeting on MoDOT transportation project prioritization process, which you're going to hear more about momentarily. My name's Tim Teddy; I'm with the City of Columbia. My title's community development director, and I'm the chairman of this committee. Mr. Matthes, our city manager, is the normal chair, so I'm running the meeting on his behalf this afternoon. Thanks to my colleagues for being able to attend this important special meeting. We're going to hear some information from staff, but first a few preliminaries, and we will allow public participation. Item four on our agenda is a public hearing. Let's start with the roll call of membership. We'll start with Mr. Campbell to my right, your name and organization, if you would.

MR. CAMPBELL: Derin Campbell, chief engineer, Public Works.

MS. BUFFALOE: Barbara Buffaloe, sustainability manager and proxy for City Manager of City of Columbia.

MAYOR McDAVID: Bob McDavid, Columbia mayor.

MR. TEDDY: Again, I'm Tim Teddy.

MR. GLASCOCK: John Glascock, Public Works, City of Columbia.

MR. CURTIT: Eric Curtit, Missouri Department of Transportation, administrator of railroads, proxy for Michelle Teel.

MR. HENDERSON: Mike Henderson, MoDOT central office, transportation and planning.

MR. TEDDY: Mitch Skov who is staff is also with us. And I believe we have another MoDOT official who will approach the dais and introduce himself momentarily.

MR. SILVESTER: Dave Silvester, central district, MoDOT.

MR. TEDDY: Welcome, and again, thanks to everyone for being here.

II.   REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. TEDDY: The second item of business is review and approval of this agenda. Are there any adjustments that any committee members would like to make or suggest to the agenda? If not, I'd entertain a motion to approve it as submitted.

MR. CAMPBELL: I move to approve it as submitted.

MAYOR McDAVID: Second.

MR. TEDDY: Moved, Mr. Campbell; seconded, Mayor McDavid. All those in favor of the agenda as written, say aye. Any opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

III.   REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. TEDDY: Okay. We have our agenda. Third preliminary is the minutes from our last meeting which was a regular meeting, February 27, 2014. Have we had a chance to review the minutes and are there any corrections? I had none. Any? Seeing none, I'll entertain a motion to approve.

MAYOR McDAVID: Moved.

MR. TEDDY: Mayor McDavid, motion to approve.

MR. GLASCOCK: Second.

MR. TEDDY: Second, Mr. Glascock. All those in favor of the minutes from February 27th, say aye. Any opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

IV.   PUBLIC HEARING: CATSO Priority List of Transportation Projects

MR. TEDDY: Okay. We have minutes. Okay. This is our featured item this afternoon. It is a CATSO list of priority transportation projects and this is a process that was requested by MoDOT and has everything to do with the possibility of additional transportation funding and how we would make use of that. So, Mr. Skov, do you want to guide us through?

MR. SKOV: Yes, Mr. Teddy. I'll just start with a little bit of brief background for those who might not be as familiar with this issue. Specifically MoDOT has been given the task of preparing a prioritized list of transportation projects. Conceivably or in part this was to potentially be ready should additional revenue be made available by the passage of a ballot issue that might be on the ballot in the fall November 2014. There is apparently a good likelihood that that will be the case, but even if that were to not happen, certainly I think MoDOT has indicated there's some value in having a prioritized list for this particular agency for the CATSO area. So each of the districts in MoDOT, state organizations, will prepare a list. And within the districts, each planning agency was preparing their own prioritized list. And

that's what we've been doing since the end of February basically. We worked with consultant Burns McDonnell and Mr. Andrew Reed here sitting in the front row as well as Steve Wells with Hg Consult, Incorporated who helped us come up with some framework for scoring the projects or one way of scoring the projects I should say, to re-evaluate the projects. It's not an end-all or a final decision by any means. But that, along with the online surveys, is one way to take some public input. We did have a meeting on April 3rd and we had, I believe, 18 people attend that. The process, obviously we're trying to be impartial in terms of prioritization today. The objective for this meeting is to approve a list. And again, the committee is free to substitute projects that they think to be should be on the priority list as opposed to the ones that are on the draft list. The process, you can see here the flowchart. We're now at the May 1st committee meeting. We do have to have a draft or a list approved by the committee today to submit to MoDOT in the next couple of days. I wanted to go over the draft list of projects. I wasn't going to get so much into the public input as much, but I will say that as far as the public meeting went and the surveys, there's a couple different things. We had a value survey and we also had an opportunity for people to submit their own projects. And the online survey along with the public meeting we got, I believe, 41 suggestions for projects. Just to go over in the memo here what the categories were generally, we got 14 responses for expand transit service; 5 for additional or new sidewalks; 4 for new bicycle trails, lanes, pedways, et cetera; 13 for improvements to existing roads; and 3 were suggestions for new roads. And in your materials you did have a list, a specific list of the actual projects that were suggested in that survey as well as in the public meeting on April 3rd. I'd like to actually get right into the list, and I do have copies of the matrix we utilized to rate these, should the committee wish to see it. The framework matrix is based upon, I believe, MoDOT Moves, at least in part on MoDOT Moves, partly on the basis of the last couple of years to get public input on what the citizens of Missouri valued as the highest priorities in transportation. But there are four pillars: Maintenance and preservation of the system; safety; economic development; and connections and choices. So in each of those categories we ranked a list of projects that were provided to us. We were provided projects by Boone County, by City of Columbia Public Works, by Columbia Transit, and also by Parks and Rec because we have some trails projects on there that have actually transportation element and they do connect other streets, they connect parks to schools, so we got input from all of them. And we condensed it down based upon the scoring matrix to a list of 15 road and bridge projects and 15 multi-modal projects, which is what MoDOT is allowing each planning agency to submit. I want to emphasize the committee is free to put whatever kind of priority rating they prefer on individual projects. The one thing I would suggest is that the CATSO does submit a full list of 15 in each category. Since we're allowed to do that, we might as well submit 15 multi-modal, 15 road and bridge. But if the committee wishes to select a few of those to be a top priority, that's certainly your right to do so. I'm just going to get into the list briefly. I did not include the cost numbers in the initial slides just to avoid the distraction of that. I do have the cost information if we want to discuss it, but cost information will become more important at the district workshop meeting which the initial one will take place later this month on May 28th in Jefferson City. At that point we will have to have more specific cost information when the project discussion takes place. The draft list that you see on the screen is in your -- in your packet. I believe I had scores from the matrix on the list in the packet, but I don't have them here,

although they are in order basically as to how they scored in the framework matrix. So I'll just go over them, read them briefly. For road and bridge projects, again, these are in order of how they scored in the framework matrix. It doesn't mean it needs to stay that way depending on the committee's preference. First project is Interstate 70 and 63 interchange reconstruction. Next is Clark Lane reconstruction, Woodland Springs Court to Ballenger. Next one is a portion of the Scott Boulevard extension; it's not the whole thing like the interchange is, but the new alignment for Broadway North to I-70 Drive Southwest. Two more interchange reconstruction projects, 63 and Route WW, Broadway, and U.S. 63 and Route AC. Next project is Stadium Boulevard extension, Missouri 740 from the existing terminus from U.S. 63 up to I-70. The next project is not correctly worded. It's Route PP which of course is Ballenger from approximately Clark Lane up to Mexico Gravel Road. That will be a reconstruction. Ballenger Lane extension from St. Charles Road approximately down to the Route 740 extension alignment. Next, Waco Road from U.S. 63 to Route B; Bearfield Road, the construction from Grindstone to Gans Creek; Maguire Boulevard extension to New Haven; Gans Road, Providence to Bearfield; I-70 Drive Southwest from the Sorrels overpass west across Perche Creek to West Van Horn Tavern Road; Battle Avenue, which would be an entirely new project, all the way from Mexico Gravel to Olivet Road with an overpass on I-70. And just for the sake of discussion, I did include the next five projects in terms how they scored in the framework. Those projects were Clark Lane extension to Route Z; Creekwood Parkway, Golden Bear Drive to Vandiver; Providence Road, Missouri 163 from South Hampton to Route K; I-70 reconstruction from the west urban limit to east urban limits of Columbia; and Bluff Creek Bridge over Grindstone Creek to East Pointe, the street. For multi-modal in terms of how they ranked, again, expansion of service hours for Columbia Transit, Sunday service, which would be eight revenue service hours per Sunday. That ranked very highly as did the service hours expansion of two additional hours per day for Columbia Transit. Next we have the North Fork of Grindstone Trail, Maguire to Battle High School; Hinkson Creek Trail from Stephens Park to COLT Railroad; COLT Railroad from Columbia College to Boone County Fairgrounds; West Broadway sidewalk, West Boulevard to Maplewood; Hominy Trail Connector, Old 63 to Green Valley; Bear Creek Trail from Blue Ridge Road to Fairgrounds; sidewalk on Vandiver from east of Providence to west of Westfall; and Perche Creek Trail from MKT to I-70. The last grouping of five multi-modal graphics: Cow Branch Trail from Providence Road to Auburn Hills Park; Nifong Park to Philips Lake trail connector; sidewalk on Garth Avenue, Worley to south of Sexton; Mill Creek Trail, MKT to Scott Boulevard and Thornbrook; and Perche Creek Trail from I-70 to Cosmo. Next five projects mostly are obviously trial and sidewalk. The two first are trails, Rice Road to Hinkson Creek Trail Connector and Bear Creek Trail from Cosmo to Blackfoot; Oakland Gravel Road from Smiley to Blue Ridge and from Vandiver north to existing sidewalk; and then a Columbia Transit vehicle replacement, 13 heavy duty buses. It's currently past due in terms of the usual replacement. The other projects that were submitted for consideration which did not score as well based on the matrix: Discovery Parkway was one of those, a new section of that from Gans to New Haven Road; Rustic Road North from Broadway to St. Charles Road; two Columbia Transit vehicle replacements, one for heavy duty buses over a period of five years from the years 2019 to '24 and paratransit payments from years 2016 to '19. And I also included FYI, two COLT railroad projects that are in the works at some point or something that the railroad

certainly is planning to do, but I don't believe there's funding for it at this point or it hasn't been identified at least. Some upgrades to signals on existing lines and new crossing signals location and also the replacement of the I-70 and Business Loop 70 bridges on the railroad. I had no way to evaluate them based on the framework matrix so I -- there's no actual score attached to them. Of course they're freight only, but I did want the committee to be aware that these projects are out there so if you want to give consideration to them. At this point I think I would just leave it to the committee to enter into discussion as to how you want to orchestrate things, if -- if at all. The one thing I will say about the multi-modal projects is I have been advised by Parks and Rec Department that there's three of the trail projects that they rank more highly than anything else. In fact they said that those three projects are more important than all the other ones and those are Hinkson Creek Trail from Stephens Park to COLT Railroad, the Bear Creek Trail from Blue Ridge Road to the Fairgrounds, and Perche Creek Trail from the MKT Trail to north of I-70. So just as a point of reference, those are the three projects that they want to be prioritized the most highly.

MR. TEDDY: Anything else then for now? I'd suggest if you have any questions you have of Mr. Skov first, then we can go to the public hearing. And then we'll close the public hearing and have our discussion of what we want the priorities to be. Are there any questions?

MS. BUFFALOE: I have a -- I have a couple for Mitch. Of the projects, you know, this is based on the potential bond initiative statewide MoDOT funding, the ones that are new, so not a replacement or reconstruction of existing, is the bond, do we know, also planning on covering the additional maintenance costs of new infrastructure?

MR. SKOV: I don't know how -- that would be up to MoDOT in part to determine that. I'm sure there will be -- part of the funding will come off the top for maintenance. I think it's better Mr. Silvester address that question.

MR. SILVESTER: I'll try. The temporary sales tax that's working its way through legislature is to help build -- help build and maintain. So with every project we have, there is future maintenance in it. So if we resurface the road, future maintenance work goes along with that. Any existing infrastructure we have is already figured into the maintenance work, as far as for the state system, is figured into some of the budget money we already have for maintenance. So anything new that's adding to our system or would add to any local system doesn't include future maintenance costs. This is only for construction costs now. Some of this, if you look at some of the modal things where you're looking at increasing hours for a -- for the transit, you know, if this temporary sales tax passes and then goes away in ten years, you're -- somebody's going to have to figure out how to handle that additional. So those are the things to take into consideration because right now with this money, if it's passed by the voters in November, assuming it gets out of the legislature, there is -- there is a sunset to this.

MS. BUFFALOE: Thank you.

MAYOR McDAVID: Let me ask a question about the ranking. And specifically you ranked at the top Highway 63/70 interchange and you ranked second Clark Lane expansion with sidewalks. And as you know there is a group of our constituents that view Clark Lane as, you know, the preeminent need. And so I -- what message are we sending when we rank that number two? I mean, I would presume if

the sales tax passes, there will be a group that would larger than two that will be funded although I don't know that. So I think the optics of this for some of our citizens would be that we're ranking Clark Lane secondary to Highway 63. Now, whether that is the correct ranking or not, that -- that will create substantial controversy in the city of Columbia.

MR. SKOV: Understood. And one reason that Clark Lane ranks so high is that we do have knowledge of public support for that project. 63 and 70 ranked high for simply other reasons based upon the traffic issues there and the congestion, et cetera. But again the committee is free -- I listed them in order of how they ranked. That does not mean I'm presuming that's how the committee may want to rank them. It may not be necessary to do that. One thing to consider with U.S. 63 and 70 is the cost of that, if that budget were funded could potentially preclude anything else being funded. Because I think the estimate that we have attached to this right now is 125 million as a potential for that specific project. Again, that's a preliminary estimate, but.

MAYOR McDAVID: Well, I'm going to be advocating the Clark Lane be moved to the top. It's a $6 million project as I understand it and --

MR. SKOV: That will be fine. And again, if the committee wishes to designate that project and whatever other ones as top priority, you're certainly free to do that. I do think it's worthwhile to submit a whole, full 15 project list, but again this is -- this -- the framework was intended just as one way of evaluating the projects. It's not an end-all or the only way to evaluate them.

MR. TEDDY: It gives us a starting point. You're using objective criteria, so you're not -- you're not using your own judgment.

MR. SKOV: Yeah. There are projects that ranked higher on this list from the framework matrix than I would have ranked them otherwise.

MR. TEDDY: Other questions for Mr. Skov? If not, I have one. A number of these projects aren't on or don't connect to the MoDOT system. Is it assumed that the temporary sales tax would generate a pot of money in the overall revenue that could be allocated to local agencies to do local agency transportation projects, not --

MR. SKOV: That is -- that's the presumption. And again, I mentioned maintenance earlier just for the existing system. Obviously I think some of the funding would probably be used for maintenance of the existing system I would presume, but as far as otherwise, I'm -- I don't know.

MR. SILVESTER: We've said that these funds could be used for any transportation -- any transportation-related project, state or local systems. And also part of this that's part of this legislation is 5 percent off the top, which goes to cities, 5 percent goes to counties. So though that 5 percent is not included in this list, because this list is -- when we come to MoDOT and we prioritize the 18 counties that are in the central district and then all the counties in the state and then the regional issues, the regional priorities that we have, we have billions and billions of dollars of needs, yet this tax will only generate X amount. So we have to figure out priority-wise across the state what can we get done, what are the biggest issues, things we need to tackle. The mayor brings up a very good point as far as the priority. And Mitch also brings up if the 63 connector -- that's a very expensive project, very expensive job. Both have their needs, both have their priorities and so it's a matter of figuring out what those -- what those

are. So you do see that there are some system projects here that are local. As those -- if those shake out to be priorities, then that's -- we'll figure out how to take care of those.

MR. TEDDY: I appreciate your response. That clarifies it. And I want it noted for the record that, yeah, we can do local capital improvements.

MR. GLASCOCK: Also if we go back to the mayor's point on Clark Lane, if the City wanted to participate in that project with MoDOT, that would move it up on your list as well, wouldn't it?

MR. SILVESTER: Yeah, absolutely.

MR. GLASCOCK: Instead of you going it alone, if the City said, you know, We will take it over after you build it, that would put it higher on the list?

MR. SILVESTER: It does, yes. Anytime a local entity or a developer comes to us with a cost participation, it elevates the priority for us with that project.

MR. TEDDY: Okay. Any other questions or statements? I'll open up the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

MR. TEDDY: Anyone who desires to address the CATSO Coordinating Committee, please come forward to the lectern. You may ask questions, make comments, suggestions, whatever's on your mind regarding this topic of the priority project list we will be submitting to MoDOT. Could you state your name and your address.

MS. PRICE: My name is Cheryl Price, 511 Parkade Boulevard. I'm a member of the city's public transit advisory commission and disabilities, the City's disability commission. I commend you in the work you have all done here. It's -- I'm sure it was very difficult to put some of these lists together and to get people to respond to your surveys. I really appreciate, Mr. Mayor, your comments on Clark Lane. As you know, the disability community and a number of other people have really been focusing on that for a long time. And do I understand from your question, Mr. Glascock, that if the City participated in that project with MoDOT, that it would get a higher priority ranking? Do I understand that correctly or not?

MR. SILVESTER: I don't know that it would get a higher priority ranking as we're going through this process. Because what we're doing is we are identifying the prioritization of the projects statewide. And if we probably weren't going through this process and we were working on this project independently of where we are, it would be a priority. Like I was saying, if anyone comes to us with half the money or more, it makes it an automatic priority for us to try and figure out how do we fund it, how do we build it. This exercise, what we're really doing now is to identify top down for our 18 counties in the central part of the state what are the big priorities first. Now, once we figure that out, then we can dig down into some of the details and some of the projects like this one and say, okay, the County's willing -- or the City's willing to come to the table on X job. Let's figure out how we do that. That will make it a better priority. That should help -- because then that will free up money to do another job someplace else.   But the big thing we've got to do first is identify top down what are the big priorities for the central region of the state.

MS. PRICE: Well, I certainly concur with the mayor that we should move Clark Lane to the top of the list, representing the constituency that I do. And also that -- seeing that public transit has so many responses and the rankings that they have, I would really encourage you to put some money toward public transit. I think that in the past we have been negligent in funding public transit over building roads and maintaining

roads, which is important too. But a lot of people, especially disabilities and the elderly, if they don't have public transportation, they're stuck. I mean, talk about losing your independence. Let me tell you, I had a severe, severe brain injury, but what was horrible to me was losing my ability to drive, and that is really a big thing for a lot of people. So seeing the number of responses for public transportation and Columbia Transit, I would really encourage you to put as much money as you can toward that. Put that as high as you can on the priority list. And once again, I thank you all for the work you've already done.

MR. TEDDY: Before we let you go, do any members have any questions for Ms. Price?

MS. PRICE: They've heard enough from me.

MR. SILVESTER: I'd like to thank you for your comments and know that the multi-modal aspect of this is a very important part of the prioritization process and the project selecting. There will be a significant number dollar-wise, a lot of them are smaller compared to road and bridge projects, but that means we'll maybe get to do a lot more projects as far as the multi-modal. So I'm excited because this is the first time that we as a state agency have been able to include multi-modal in the state funding because --

MS. PRICE: That is exciting.

MR. SILVESTER: -- that's what this tax will allow. So thank you very much.

MS. PRICE: Well, thank you. Appreciate everything you all have done.

MR. TEDDY: Anyone else like to approach the committee? Anyone else? More time? Does anyone want to speak for the record at this hearing? Seeing none, I'll move that we close the public hearing. I'll close the public hearing.

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

MR. TEDDY: Discussion among members.

MR. GLASCOCK: Could you go back to the list?

MR. SKOV: Yes.

MR. GLASCOCK: One of the things that, if we move projects forward as I listen to Dave, we've got to be able to compete regionally, which means traffic, congestion in the state, and then we've got to compete against the state level. And so if you put local streets on here, they're not going to compete regionally, like Clark Lane. They just don't. The I-70 piece will compete regionally and it'll compete on a state level and so that's the kind of projects they're looking for to move forward with. If you put Bearfield Road on here, it's not going to compete regionally, so it's going to fall off the list. So our voices aren't going to be heard. So if you want to make impact, you've got to have projects that can compete against, what are your 18 counties? Washington, Rolla, Jeff City, places that -- I'm just trying to name the ones that I know are in the area.

MR. SILVESTER: Well, our region goes from Potosi to Fayette and Kingdom City to Lebanon.

MR. GLASCOCK: So all those cities in there and those interstates, I-44, I-70, 63, all those, that's what you're competing against for this money. And to put local streets in there, you're not going to compete very well; is that correct?

MR. SILVESTER: I don't know that you're -- you probably will have a difficult time rising to the top. Clark Lane, John and I have been working on this for a while, and this money -- this is a project I

would like to do independent of this sales tax. It's something that I want to get done anyway. It is a priority of MoDOT; I know it's a priority with the City. So what -- we can add projects back into the stip and do cost share work which if the transportation passes, that will open back up, I'm confident. I don't have our commission to say that, but I'm confident it will. This project becomes more of a reality, probably less of a priority on here, because it's something that we want to get done.

MR. GLASCOCK: At the local level.

MR. SILVESTER: But I think it's worth having that discussion in here because if we put it on the list, we have the discussion, we end up taking it off because we're going to deal with it with the other money, it elevates something else up through the process. That's why it's important to identify all those top down, figure out how much money comes out of this, draw the line and figure out what's below the line that should be up and what's above the line that might need to be down and tweak those. And then we've got to take the best list forward that does the most for Missourians.

MR. TEDDY: Until the yellow ribbon's cut, we need to have some redundancy to make our point.

MR. GLASCOCK: Yes.

MR. TEDDY: Okay. Any other suggestions? I believe we're going to have a motion to amend the list.

MS. BUFFALOE: Can I ask a question of Mitch? Mitch, when you submit these to MoDOT, we should or should not change up the ranking or does it matter?

MR. SKOV: No. I don't think that really matters. It's up to the committee's discretion as to whether we rank projects in each of the categories of each of the groupings of 15 as top priority or not. The one thing I know just based on guidance I've received from the Parks people, I would rank those three trail projects. I would submit we rank those three trail projects as top priority as opposed to any other trail projects given the linkage they provide. One, Perche Creek, for example, provides linkage from the I-70 corridor and the MKT Trail. So there's some connectivity from those three projects. There's the Bear Creek project and Hinkson Creek Trail project.

MR. TEDDY: So we think of those as providing a form of basic transportation in addition to recreation.

MR. SKOV: Right. MKT Trail provides a connection underneath I-70, so that's a crossing point there.

MAYOR McDAVID: Do we need to re-rank that then?

MR. SKOV: Not necessarily, but --

MR. TEDDY: They're high. They're just below --

MR. SKOV: I would suggest --

MR. TEDDY: -- expanded service.

MR. SKOV: I would suggest, yes, we re-rank the multi-modal trail -- three trail projects that Parks wants as a top priority just in -- just in the grouping of three. They're all close to the top in terms of their scores, but they didn't score as well as a couple of others. The one that really scored well was the trail that goes to Battle High School for obvious reasons I think, but that is not one of the priorities right now.

MR. TEDDY: Is there any point in preparing matrix scores between two categories or are those apples and oranges? For example, the top rank in roads and bridge is 68. We have 72 on both of the expanded --

MR. SKOV: Yeah, they're not really --

MR. TEDDY: They're not comparable?

MR. SKOV: They're not comparable.

MR. TEDDY: They're separate lists?

MR. SKOV: Correct. And there's some different criteria for the bike and ped transit system than there were for the roadway projects.

MAYOR McDAVID: Well, are you looking for an amendment to the list?

MR. SKOV: Yes, please.

MAYOR McDAVID: I think for the purposes of our committee, I'm going to move to move Clark Lane project to the top of the list.

MR. GLASCOCK: Second.

MR. TEDDY: Moved, Mayor McDavid; seconded, Mr. Glascock, that we move the Clark Lane project on line ten of the matrix, item five under this agenda item, that we move that ahead of Interstate 70, U.S. 63 interchange, so it's the top priority road and bridge project on the list. Any discussion of the motion?

MAYOR McDAVID: I make that motion fully understanding that, number one, if the tax revenue does not come forward from the vote in November, some of this becomes a moot point because the revenue will not be there, so it's incumbent on those who have an interest in these projects in the community to step forward. And second I say this understanding that we are competing for a slice of the pie and we don't want to compromise our slice of the pie. When we get our slice of the pie, we will reslice it. But again, we understand that everybody wants the big slice of the pie throughout this whole region. But notwithstanding that, I still think from a community standpoint the message will be favorably received if we approve this motion.

MR. TEDDY: Any other discussion on the motion? Was there anything else anyone would want considered on this list? Why don't we go ahead and amend the list; that's the motion on the floor. All those in favor of the motion, say aye. Any opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. TEDDY: Okay. We amended the list. Do we want to take a separate motion to approve the list then?

MS. BUFFALOE: What about amending the trails -- what about the amendment to the trails?

MR. TEDDY: I think it was a comment that we maintain their high position. Am I right?

MR. SKOV: Maintain their high position, but I would suggest if we're going to specifically rank them differently, we move those three to the top. They're all equally important according to my discussions with the parks people and they all have literally transportation function or certainly have the potential for that.

MR. TEDDY: Those are third, fourth, and fifth on the list of -- with expanded transit hours being the top two.

MS. BUFFALOE: And it's replacing, because you have some at the top of the trail ones that are not the ones that were recommended by Parks and Rec?

MR. SKOV: Not by Parks and Rec.

MS. BUFFALOE: Correct.

MR. SKOV: We'd already done the rankings and we sent it to them and they made the point and comment afterwards that the three that I mentioned were more important than all the other nine trail projects they gave us a list of put together.

MR. GLASCOCK: Can you explain how Perche Creek is a transportation project?

MR. SKOV: Well, there are people that commute via trail, maybe not very many, but there are a few. I've done it myself using the MKT.

MR. GLASCOCK: Now, I want you to tell me how you commute from Perche Creek to MKT and get into town.

MR. SKOV: There will be a direct connection along Perche Creek corridor on a trail. I don't know where the connection will take place at I-70, I can't specifically tell you that, but certainly if somebody's traveling statewide on the Katy Trail, they can take the MKT into Perche, Perche out to the corridor. Because they're switching from the trail to going on the road. Obviously they can't use the interstate itself, but.

MR. TEDDY: And I misspoke a moment ago. Perche is ranked down the list, so.

MR. GLASCOCK: But that's one of their top priorities from what I heard him say.

MR. TEDDY: So the three are North Fork --

MR. SKOV: I'll go to those. The three that they rank most highly are Hinkson Creek Trail from Stephens Park north, north under I-70 to the COLT Railroad; Bear Creek Trail from Blue Ridge to the Boone County Fairgrounds; and Perche Creek Trail from the MKT trail to I-70.

MR. TEDDY: Okay. Well, I messed up even more then because the only one of those three that's in that position I indicated is North Fork and Grindstone. It's the third ranked right now. And then we've got Bear is six, seven, eight ranked. And then it looks like Perche's tenth.

MR. SKOV: If we simply just move the three projects right below service expansion or however the committee wants to do it, that's one way to do it.

MR. TEDDY: With equal scoring or --

MR. SKOV: Yes.

MR. TEDDY: -- we can't really say that --

MR. SKOV: Scoring's not really going to be the priority right now. Just rank them as being all high priority along the trails.

MAYOR McDAVID: I so move.

MR. GLASCOCK: Second.

MR. TEDDY: Moved by Mayor McDavid, seconded by Mr. Glascock that we move up in priority to the third, fourth, and fifth position the North Fork of Grindstone Trail and --

MS. BUFFALOE: That's not the one; it's the Hinkson Creek Trail.

MR. TEDDY: Hinkson Creek Trail.

MS. BUFFALOE: Bear Creek Trail.

MR. TEDDY: Bear Creek Trail and the Perche Creek Trail. Any discussion on the motions? All those in favor, say aye. Any opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. TEDDY: Okay. Sorry for the confusion.

MR. SKOV: I do have another point to make, Mr. Teddy, just before I forget. I don't know if I mentioned it, but May 28 is the first central district workshop with various planning agencies from the central district attending to the, I believe, the initial ranking. I'm not sure how that workshop will be orchestrated, organized at this point, but it'll be the initial time that everybody gets together to present their specific lists. Each planning agency gets four voting members to weigh in. The coordinating committee certainly has the option of delegating that -- that job to certain individuals. I would suggest -- the one requirement, my understanding is that there should be -- there needs to be someone from multi-modal interests among the four. Otherwise, I think it -- the committee's free to appoint whoever they would like. I would suggest that we have a representative of Boone County, someone from the City, as well as a multi-modal person. And beyond that we're free to choose who or whatever, but again, the only requirement I believe is the multi-modal person. And that could be the transit -- the multi-modal manager, another transit person, somebody who's more of a bike/ped advocate. It's up to the committee, or that can be something you delegate to the staff to -- to decide or to ask people to attend. But again, it's up to you whether you want to specifically appoint individuals to that group, but we need to have four people who will attend the May 28th -- and I assume that Rachel Bacon and myself would attend just as an FYI, you know, just for our reference, but not necessarily be the voting members.

MR. TEDDY: Is that something we have to decide this minute?

MR. SKOV: No. No. We can do this via email.

MR. TEDDY: Do it by email, why don't we do that and get Mr. Matthes --

MR. SKOV: I wanted to mention that.

MR. TEDDY: -- involved. Okay. Appreciate it. Anything else we need to attend to on this? Are there any other amendments to the list? Want to go ahead and just do a motion approving the list as amended for clarity.

MR. GLASCOCK: So moved.

MAYOR McDAVID: Second.

MR. TEDDY: Moved by Mr. Glascock this time, seconded by Mayor McDavid that we approve the lists as amended by two motions that have been made. Any discussion of this motion? Seeing none, all those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

Very good. We have our list.

V.   OTHER BUSINESS:

MR. TEDDY: Our next item is other business. This is a special meeting, so we really only had the one item. But are there any announcements any members would like to make as long as you're all here? Anyone from the public has a general comment they'd like to make?

VI.   ADJOURN

MR. TEDDY: Seeing none, we'll move for adjournment.

MR. GLASCOCK: So moved.

MAYOR McDAVID: Second.

MR. TEDDY: Moved and seconded. All those in favor of adjournment, say aye. Thank you.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

(Off the record.)

(The meeting concluded at 3:17 p.m.)