

ST. JOSEPH AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY
COORDINATING COMMITTEE
4th Floor Conference Room – 12:00 Noon
August 22, 2013

Voting members present:

Jerry Russell, Chairperson	Citizen at large
Bryon Myers, Sr.	City of St. Joseph
Donna Jean Boyer	City of St. Joseph
J. Bruce Woody	City of St. Joseph
Dan Hausman	Buchanan County

Staff members present:

Ty Nagle	City of St. Joseph
----------	--------------------

Others present:

Jody Carlson	City of St. Joseph
Elaine Buckner	City of St. Joseph
Andy Clements	City of St. Joseph
Dustin Smith	City of St. Joseph
Abe Forney	City of St. Joseph
Mike Rinehart	MoDOT
Shannon Kusilek	MoDOT
Angie Hoecker	MoDOT
Paul Cockram	ATU Local #847
Bill Schellhorn	Village of Country Club
Allison Smith	KDOT

OPENING REPORTS

Chairperson Russell opened the meeting.

Roll Call. A quorum was present.

Approval of Minutes. **Member Myers moved to approve the minutes of the June 27th meeting. Member Hausman seconded the motion, motion passed unanimously.**

Opportunity for public comment. No one appeared for comment.

OLD BUSINESS – No old business was brought before the committee.

NEW BUSINESS – 2035 LRTP Amendments – Amending Long Range Transportation Plan (LRTP) to include interchange at 36 Highway. Mr. Nagle explained that a request was received to add an interchange on 36 Highway to the LRTP. In reviewing the project it didn't conform with the LRTP because of conflicts with potential future projects: an eastern outer loop around St. Joseph, non-compliance with the Bridge-Deck Policy and the hindrance of 36 Highway becoming an interstate. The interchange involves a private developer constructing a connector road from the interchange south to Pickett Road and MoDOT constructing the interchange in 2014. Mr. Nagle read a letter in support of the project from Dr. Robert Vartabedian, President of MWSU, which was received during the public comment period.

Mr. Nagle referred to portions of the LRTP to which this project has been added: Fig 7-1 listing the functional classification as “collector” and the planned use map listing bridges. Time constraints prevented the sub-consultant, URS, from examining how the proposed east loop would shift to accommodate the interchange. Since the LRTP is in the process of updating, the outer loop location has been kept as is and the interchange listed as a road.

Secretary’s note: the remainder of the minutes have been transcribed verbatim, or as near verbatim as possible, to best reflect the speaker’s intent.

Chairman Russell: You will have three interchanges instead of two if you go to the east loop. How far would that be from the proposed interchange?

Mr. Nagle: That is also a mile.

Chairman Russell: That would put three interchanges in two miles. What if we doubled up and had one interchange serve both?

Mr. Nagle: That would be ideal.

Chairman Russell: In the LRTP, plans that people have all across the state of Missouri, on 36 Highway we are putting an interchange to the south to serve Pickett Road. Everything is land locked with no access to the north business park area. Basically, it will represent what we have on Route 752, where the highway stops and goes nowhere. To many people, that is not a productive use of dollars, the money we have to fight to get, much less adding to it with another problem. We are looking at an interchange in one direction to serve one institution. For years people have wanted one on Faraon but we were denied again and again because of its closeness to exits on 36 Highway and Frederick. We are trying to do the same thing on 36 Highway. As far as I am concerned, in all the years I have been on this committee and looking at the LRTP, up jumps the devil in the middle of it. It has come on rapidly and strongly. I can only justify it one way and that is making one interchange to serve both entities. Let’s get some use out of it rather than just to Pickett Road which now is substandard. Improvements that were supposed to be going on now are not being done as was promised in the business plan. We are dropping everything for one interchange. I do not think it is a wise spending of MoDOT money, even though it is supposed to be paid back. There are many, many other needs in this area.

Member Boyer: I have two concerns: 1) How would it affect 36 Highway becoming an interstate in the future; and 2) the City of St. Joseph being able to improve Pickett Road. What would be St. Joseph’s responsibility when it is not something we included in the CIP or looked at long-term?

Member Myers: I am not convinced. I have a vision of 36 Highway becoming an interstate. Farmers and small towns would have limited access. I don’t see the state causing some of those small towns to disappear. I don’t know how we could make access for them. My guess is that it won’t be an interstate very soon.

Chairman Russell: That is right because of St. Louis. My neighbor bought right of way for 36 Highway back in the 50’s. If it is not important, why did two counties out east buy bonds to finish the 4-lane?

Member Myers: I think 4-lanes are very important.

Chairman Russell: I see Kansas City signs in Illinois. It is advertised as the shortest route from Chicago - 72 to 36 to 35. Someone is not forgetting us, the city manager of Springfield, Illinois. It is there, or it is not there if you want to be blind. When this side of the state wakes up and bands together with the Interstate 72 Committee east of Chillicothe, this organization should be part of that. I have talked to people out of state and know their feelings. Out east they built a school. MoDOT tried to stop them from building on the roadway because they

were looking to the future. They will have a school in walking distance of the shoulders of 36 Highway. If you represent a community where they don't see a dream, you are not pushing. I have pushed for 20 years for 36 to 72. You are turning away from commerce coming through our community.

Member Myers: When you limit access to people in those small towns you eliminate growth. How will they get here?

Chairman Russell: They will have access. Should we have stopped I-29 because it didn't run through Dearborn?

Member Myers: But we know the results. We eliminate some towns.

Chairman Russell: This is long range planning. If you don't have a LRTP you have no plan at all. So, all of seven years' work is up in smoke. The whole idea is to make the corridors there and make them accessible. Regarding the eastern part of the state, it is pretty well limited access now.

Member Myers: How does this affect Riverside, Pickett, Faraon and I-229? Does it help us or hinder us?

Member Woody: There are pros and cons on both sides. I am not sure how it affects 36 Highway, given that it is a full diamond interchange. This is actually a good thing. Multiple at grade interchanges impede interstate status. My negative concern is the future liability it creates on a section of Pickett Road.

Regarding the animal health corridor, it has some very positive possibilities to help that important business sector in our community. It brings the emphasis out of Kansas City to St. Joseph where it belongs.

We must recognize also that access issues for this development is more than just what comes off the highway. Back door implications will change some traffic patterns. On the positive side it will release some stress that Altec is feeling, but redirects pressure on Pickett, Riverside and Riverside Terrace. If we had an agreement/threshold for participation with the county or developer to upgrade that road, it would greatly help relieve the anxiety I have about this project. At one time the loop tied to Rt. AC, then further back to W. That is not to say it can't come back in and be this interchange. Where would the tie-ins come on the north side of the bridge? Phase 3 would be down Corporate Drive back out to Mitchell, but one buyer bought four lots (Bayer) and there may be an interest to have a road through the campus. I don't know to what degree that has been explored. Should the north end of the bridge tie into Mitchell or Mitchell Woods Business Park, that would be a positive. Does it have the ability to tie into the outer loop which would require right of way through Bayer's campus? Some part is flood plain. There are unknowns that trouble me. \$4.8 million doesn't come around very often. I don't want to solve one problem and cause another by putting it off on the city of St. Joseph to address it. I am fearful that the Pickett Road problem will become a problem just as quickly as the Ag Exposition Center becomes successful. I would like to see discussion to address that concurrently with the successful development of the Expo Center. The north end problem is a longer term problem, but still needs to be addressed.

Member Boyer: I remember when the Eastside Business Park started, we had complaints about people along Pickett seeing an increase in large truck traffic. These were citizens of St. Joseph whose taxes would go to paving the street. Upgrades to Pickett Road are not something we have talked about as part of our LRTP.

Member Myers: We need a forecast of how much money would solve the problem or tie into what would be a great opportunity for us.

Member Woody: I don't know about the potential cost to upgrade.

Member Boyer: Or how much sooner would the city be expected to do some upgrades.

Member Woody: We have an old agreement on perimeter roads to share repairs.

Member Hausman: We maintain Riverside Terrace but not the bridge.

Member Woody: We need to update that.

Member Hausman: How much on east of Riverside to Pickett? Hopefully the Industrial Park will spread and grow so we are not all of it. How will it be addressed, I don't know. It will have to be worked out later. We presented the plan to Bayer. We need 5 acres of their property to do retention. They asked where the road is going north. We said a stub will end the pavement to the north. They see the value in allowing their employees and transportation to get off on that interchange. I am not saying they will put in a connection right away.

Member Boyer: That is part of the discussion - about the road going through their campus?

Member Hausman: They were talking about a private road for their campus.

Member Myers: That is not an advantage to people who don't work there.

Member Hausman: It is a packaging and distribution center.

Member Woody: Bayer is interested in only a private road?

Member Hausman: They are open to both private or public road. You still have the expense of putting in the road if they gave you the property. They are excited about the project and the value to their business. This area of town is going to grow and there will be requirements. We have had city-county cooperation like the BI project. There is some traffic from the KCP&L substation.

Member Woody: The only reason KCP&L was allowed to have the driveway was because of infrequent (20) trips a day, as opposed to a business driveway with truck traffic.

Member Boyer: There should be some discussion of partnership. Can you offer us anything more solid?

Member Hausman: The county has always come to the table on economic development.

Ms. Boyer: I am concerned about making the citizens of St. Joseph responsible for something they are not aware of at this point. Will there be any more public meetings?

Mr. Nagle: Not after today. The funds can go through as soon as they want. The only thing that would keep it from going through is that the money would not get reimbursed. With money being reimbursed through MoDOT, I do not think there would be another requirement for a public meeting.

Member Boyer: People are only aware of what they read in the newspaper.

Member Hausman: Only one person is impacted.

Member Boyer: We have people say "I didn't know what was going on and I live on that street".

Member Hausman: People had 30 days to express their opinion.

Chairman Russell: The city council meets at night, unlike the county court.

Member Hausman: We come to the people.

Chairman Russell: What is your interest in this? You are leading the project. I think you have a hell of a conflict of interest.

Member Hausman: I am a member of the MPO, a county commissioner, and on the board of the Ag Expo Center. I have worked diligently. The money will not stay here unless this project is done.

Chairman Russell: What happened to the original plans? You had 40 acres the county already owned at Riverside and 169 Highway. Now all of a sudden it is here and we will build a new interchange. One entity is getting \$4.8 million.

Member Hausman: We will operate at a \$200,000/year loss. The project will not work without an interchange off 36 Highway because we have hotels and restaurants on site. Let's keep our eye on the \$4.8 million and make it a public entity to serve everyone in the county. The money was granted to the Ag Expo Center.

Chairman Russell: Why not put the interchange to the west?

Member Hausman: It was granted at the front door.

Chairman Russell: Are you telling me that the state of Missouri earmarked it at the front door only, or is it granted onto the property?

Member Woody: Even if there was flexibility in the location, it presents a problem getting it back to the property. It is no longer a \$4.8 million project.

Member Hausman: MoDOT cited this as the least expansive place to put it.

Chairman Russell: It is really stretching the ruler because it is less than a mile to the west, so we have to fall back to the drawing board if we want to change the east loop again. That is what I am trying to avoid. As far as I am concerned this was a done deal according to the media. Two months ago I was at Osborn and they said we are building an interchange.

Member Woody: I have not seen a cost estimate for the project and don't know how tight the budget is or if there is reasonable growth built in. I would like to see us consider assisting with improvements on Pickett Road. It would still be a partnership. It is our (City's) road so it is not 100% yours (County's), but as a developer the Ag Center will create a spike in traffic.

Member Hausman: The grant only reads to build a diamond interchange off 36 Highway. Money left over can't be used elsewhere. If we go over, we have to pay the extra. We can't use it on the connector road. Any unspent money goes back to the state.

Member Woody: The money can only be spent inside MoDOT's right of way.

Member Myers: I would like to know what things are hanging out there and the results that could generate additional expense for the city to make it work. I am not hearing that there is a plan we can take and develop to make everything go smooth.

Member Woody: I know you are anxious to get this going.

Member Hausman: We have a contract ready to sign in September. Design will take 6-8 months and construction 6 months. The project should be completed at the end of 2014. Everything is in place and ready to go.

Member Boyer: What improvements are you making in the city limits?

Member Hausman: We are only taking a road from the interchange to Pickett.

Member Woody: Do you propose it as a 2-3 lane road with curb and gutter?

Member Hausman: Snyder Engineering will do the on-site infrastructure and traffic study. It will be a private road on private property.

Member Woody: A private road?

Member Boyer: How does Pickett enter into this?

Member Woody: The general public going out to your facility would have to cross a city road from Riverside to Riverside Terrace, a county road, and then a private road to get to an interchange? I was riding the fence until I heard that.

Member Hausman: The County only does chip and seal and these roads would be asphalt or concrete. All infrastructure is private.

Member Woody: Why is the County opposed to having a county right of way as a county road?

Member Hausman: They don't want the maintenance.

Member Woody: Illinois Avenue, the Stockyards road comes into mind. If the county does not have enough commitment to make it a public right of way, why would the city support it and commit to Pickett Road?

Member Myers: Pickett is a much higher cost to maintain.

Member Boyer: I understand why you want the interchange, but you understand that we are representatives of the people of St. Joseph.

Member Woody: Yes, the MPO is made up of members who represent their respective areas.

Member Boyer: I am trying to look at it from the public's point of view. We are building an interchange that is going to be mainly accessible to the Expo Center. You say we need it. I am representing the public who hasn't had an opportunity to ask these questions.

Member Woody: I know the county doesn't have asphalt roads. But if the county themselves does not have enough commitment to do the maintenance on it even though it might require contracting it, why should the city build and maintain Pickett Road as a result of that without any commitment from the Ag Center.

Member Hausman: Most of the traffic on the site will come off 36 Highway.

Member Woody: The public and businesses will find the interchange.

Member Hausman: It will not be Ag Expo traffic. It will be your people.

Member Woody: We have not gone through a planning process to decide how we will respond to it.

Chairman Russell: It will be like the Stockyards road. What other infrastructure is out there? Sewer?

Member Woody: They have a standing request for sewer service. We have tendered an initial offer of pre-annexation with an intent to be respectful of the need to stay out of the county because the funding source must have it out in the county. Upon completion of full development, we ask that they come into the city limits and provide sewer service. What I have heard is that part of your business plan causes an ongoing need to stay out in the county. I have not presented to Council whether they are willing to provide a sewer subscription agreement to an outside entity. I would recommend it continue to be the same rate, 2.3 multiplier.

Member Myers: Once you generate traffic, if it wants to go west we would have to improve Pickett all the way to the Belt.

Member Woody: Traffic may drop off onto a gravel road as those will be private roads.

Chairman Russell: I say "Get ready for Pickett Road"!

Member Woody: When we do Pickett it has vertical profile problems and lots of dirt to move, it is not just resurfacing.

Member Boyer: It will be a boulevard between Riverside Road and the Belt?

Mr. Clements: Yes, it goes to 28th and Commercial.

Member Hausman: Pickett all the way to the Parkway?

Mr. Clements: Yes.

Member Hausman: Were there any other letters?

Mr. Nagle: There was one from Duane Foster, but it referenced the TIP.

Member Myers: On this board we deal with the metro area but the area with the greatest impact, positive or negative, is St. Joseph.

Member Hausman: We project this project will bring \$57 million into the area.

Member Myers: I just want to address the city issues.

Member Boyer: I support the project. It is exciting. But I anticipate calls from people complaining.

Chairman Russell: When it boils down and the hype is over, we spent \$4.8 million for an interchange to a private road. There is no way I could back that.

Member Myers: Realistically, I don't see they can have an internal roadway to be private.

Member Woody: At least it should be County road right of way. That connection troubles me.

Member Boyer: Funding for the interchange was not a public project.

Member Hausman: I was approaching them as a member of the board. That may be a fine point, but I think they can justify getting their money that way. It may not play out that way to the public.

Member Myers: It is public and private. There is a connection.

Member Hausman: MoKan wrote the grant. The project was presented by MoDOT (Mike Rinehart and Don Wichern) and himself. We are not renegades, we partnered with MoDOT. This 3-member panel spoke in Jeff City and satisfied their questions on economic development.

Member Woody: Do you think the County would give serious consideration about it being public right of way? We could have an MOU regarding how to address the county section from the bridge to Riverside Road.

Member Hausman: There are utility easements on this private road.

Member Woody: The roadway is primary concern.

Member Hausman: We have not approached the county about accepting the road once it is built. As a commissioner, it is not a roadway we would maintain. We are not capable of handling repairs on it.

Member Myers: What about a second sidewalk on the bridge? We need to have this conversation with the people who make the decision.

Member Nagle: There was discussion about this at the last MPO meeting.

Mr. Carlson: We spoke about whether it could be interstate in the future and the change from state to federal funding.

Mr. Clements: The Technical Committee was not aware it was a private road.

Member Woody: I came in here riding the fence and expecting to vote in favor. In the big picture, there are things I am anxious about, such as sewer. It affects some of the community's potential lines and takes some things out of the community. I was not aware that this was proposed to be a private road from the bridge to the county's right of way. I worry that if the county is not committed enough to the project to even do the maintenance on the road, why should the community of St. Joseph take care of the design, construction and future maintenance on our part of Pickett?

Member Hausman: The County will maintain from Riverside Terrace.

Member Woody: There is the peril of it being shut down or not maintained if the project is not successful. If the county will not commit to even doing maintenance on it, it discourages many from the city to take on obligations.

Member Myers: I want to see the project happen, but without the loose ends tied down, I'd prefer we don't vote on it.

Chairman Russell: I call to table it. The private road issue should go back to the Technical Committee if not discussed. Also, I am interested in possibly going north completely through Mitchell Woods.

Member Hausman: We would love that.

Chairman Russell: We need to have an open conversation if those people (Bayer) will discuss it. This committee cannot say they are favorable to it because I have not heard them speak. We looked at the possibility of moving the east loop and using that overpass. The problem is finding a path northbound. That is where the discussion will have to come with Bayer. There is the possibility of making this a situation where invested dollars can get more than one venue. Say what you want, an interchange to a private drive will not fly in the public's eye. This is the biggest group of people I have ever seen in an MPO meeting. The public does not come. We have communities we have trouble getting to come.

Member Woody: Public participation is a challenge for any unit of government.

Member Myers: We need for the people involved to get together to bring a win-win circumstance.

Member Hausman: We have a lot of stakeholders. Delaying the vote on this interchange will not help this project at all. The commitments have been made. We have stakeholders putting money into it. It will not move forward without this interchange. We have the option to approve or not approve.

Member Boyer: I want something in writing that the County, stakeholders and city is committed to.

Member Hausman: We had 60 days to do it.

Member Myers: Some in the room are just finding out today it is a private road. That is a red flag.

Mr. Grey, Chairman of the Ag Expo Center: Your comments are very valid. The thing that we may be losing sight of is the magnitude of the project. We don't have to sell you on the project. We have to keep in mind the number of jobs the project brings to St. Joseph, Buchanan County and Northwest Missouri. Interchange money is dependent on this project creating jobs. We have a calendar. What I want to see happen today is to take a vote to approve contingent on three or four of the main concerns being worked out. It would enable the project engineering to start. That would give us the momentum to stay on the calendar. Every month that goes by without starting, we move closer to the end of the agreement. The whole project is totally coordinated by volunteers who love agriculture and agri-business and the good of the greater community that this board represents. The project would fail without the interchange.

Speaker not identified: No, I think the project is so driven and publicly supported in the 5-state area. The best we can do for those people that count on us as volunteers is to stay on the calendar for the end result. We can all win here today. You could get your very valid concerns addressed. If not addressed to your satisfaction, the wheels stop turning. It would force us to address those issues and enable us to keep the wheels of the calendar turning. Thank you.

Member Hausman: There is a 5-year window on job creation.

Member Woody: Those are good comments. I would like to add to that. My concern about the section of road from the bridge to Pickett is that it needs to be public right of way. The County can contract with the Ag Expo Center to do the maintenance on it.

Member Hausman: They will establish easements.

Member Woody: They need to be "in perpetuity". We still need to address Pickett Road. I would love fixing something to Mitchell, but those bridges, although close, do not necessarily nix our future LRTP. Does it hurt it? Perhaps some. Does it stop or prevent it? Personally, I don't think so. If it is a bridge to nowhere on the north end, it is a loss.

Chairman Russell: We have one of those now, Route 752.

Member Woody: We need as much multiple use as we can get. I am not against this project. I am looking long range. I have done a lot of this. I am just throwing scenarios out. If it did fail, who will pay? Future projects will come up and we will still be paying off some project out here that goes against us. Until that is paid, we can't do anything else.

Speaker not identified: How could \$4.8 million fall back in our lap?

Chairman Russell: As you receive money you will repay it.

Member Hausman: We put the money up front. Once the project is completed and we create jobs, they reimburse the amount in 5 years up to \$4.8 million.

Chairman Russell: Don Wichern told me that federal funds would be used to build it and the Ag Center would reimburse them. If you are putting the money up front, then it is a whole different story.

Mr. Sprong: We can give you a signed copy of what it says. We have to put \$4.8 million up front. It goes to MoDOT and stays there. We get 1/60th of the money back from the creation of non-retail jobs paying more than \$35,000. Regarding the private road, we just need to get someone to assume responsibility. I don't see it as being an issue. We can't do any significant fund raising unless this is approved. The financing is very challenging. Is there a way to approve it without the road done?

Mr. Clements: You can't make a contingent approval. There is no way for an MPO to say we "kinda approve" it. You can yes, no, or table, there is no partial approval.

Member Myers: We could call a meeting next week to get something in black and white, and get on with it.

Mr. Sprong: It is not clear to me.

Member Woody: I want the County to accept the road right of way from the bridge down to Pickett. It doesn't matter who maintains it, but it should be public right of way. I think that would be easy. Our notification process to hold an MPO meeting is 30 days notice.

Mr. Nagle: Yes, with a TIP amendment. It has gone out for public comment. It was noticed today and no one showed up and those same comments could be transferred to next week. I have to notice 30 days prior.

Ms. Hoecker: What is the PPL outline? Some plans advertise every so many days for a special meeting.

Mr. Nagle: Only four things they are voting on. The TIP and LRTP amendment has gone through the public comment period as required.

Member Myers: I suggest continuing the meeting and not adjourn.

Member Woody: 1) We need an MOU between the city, county and Ag Expo for the road that heads up to the bridge (connector road). 2) We need a commitment between the city, county and Ag Expo regarding how to access Pickett to the connector road. It gives a paper trail acknowledging we have an issue. Yes, it is our road, but at least there is a buy-in from all of the city council about the fact that we are accepting this potential liability. 3) There needs to be an actual conversation with Bayer regarding their interest level to do a public connection to Corporate Drive or Mitchell Road or a future loop to connect to their property.

Member Boyer: Is there a way that answers are provided positively, not just a discussion?

Speaker not identified: In the world I come from, a man's word is everything. If we get your approval today and we say we will have a productive conversation to work out your concerns, then I can tell you on behalf of the Board we will take them very seriously and you can trust us. Call me naïve.

Member Myers: When it comes to legality, they don't honor our commitments.

Member Hausman: We can only commit that we can bring parties together. The best way to do it is through grants. If we can come up with a plan that the road to the north will create jobs, we can get a 100% grant or a cost-share 50/50 grant. There are ways to raise revenue. We can work as a community.

Member Boyer: If we approve this today, we approve it as a private road and the interchange where it is. We are only approving the plan presented. That is my problem.

Mr. Sprong: You are approving changing the master plan and building the interchange.

Member Boyer: We are implicitly approving what has been presented without answers to our concerns.

Member Woody: I can get over not addressing the problem on the north end although it still troubles me. I can't get beyond a private road to the bridge. Maybe a one week postponement or two weeks to come up with something from the county and Ag Expo to say it will be a public road.

Member Hausman: The county won't accept anything that is not done.

Member Woody: You can put contingencies on it. My concern is that it needs to be public right of way.

Member Hausman: It will be paved and have curbs. Saying we will give a county easement on each side is no problem. The maintenance and upkeep of the road will be an issue between the county and Ag Expo.

Member Boyer: How can you make it official at this meeting?

Member Hausman: When we design the roads we put a public easement on the side of the road.

Member Woody: Donate public right of way that covers all improvements for the connector road.

Mr. Sprong: We will do that if that makes it a public street legally.

Member Myers: I hear Marty say it will be public.

Member Hausman: We can say the street is public but who maintains it is the question. We have no problem with it being a public street.

Member Boyer: The board chair made a statement in a public meeting. Is that binding?

Member Woody: That means they will donate it to the county and the county has to accept it but not until it is built. That can be the terms of the county accepting it. Public right of way and public easement are basically the same. A worst case scenario is loss of access to the bridge, whether due to the private owner closing the road or failing to maintain it to the degree that it is usable.

Member Hausman: The grant says we must have an access to Pickett Road?

Mr. Sprong: It is not in the agreement now.

Member Boyer: One of my concerns has been addressed and the other put off. I have heard assurances that it would not interfere with Highway 36 becoming interstate in the future. Pickett Road is a problem regardless of why and when it is addressed. I could support doing it today. As long as you are comfortable with people saying in an open meeting that they would be agreeable to giving public right of way.

Member Woody: Yes, if the statement culminates with the county accepting it.

Chairman Russell: All in favor of amending the LRTP to include the interchange at 36 Highway? Members Boyer, Myers and Woody voted in favor. Chairman Russell voted in opposition and Member Hausman abstained from voting. The measure passed.

2014-2017 TIP Amendments – Mr. Kuselik described four new MoDOT projects: BR-47, HE-33, HE-34 and BR-48. 1) federalizes engineering/design costs for critical bridge inspections around the MPO; 2) Hosea School pedestrian yellow flashing crossing lights which is funded 100% by Safe Routes to Schools; 3) closing guard rail openings in three bridge locations in the MPO area to meet new federal standards; and 4) 36 Highway interchange money. The Ag Expo Center is putting in construction costs and design and inspection on their own separately. Member Boyer asked if they will be reimbursed the entire amount? Member Hausman responded yes, if we create jobs. **Member Hausman moved to accept the TIP amendments. Member Myers seconded the motion, motion passed unanimously.**

2014 Draft UPWP – Work elements to be completed in 2014, and alignment with 5 Strategic Plan. Mr. Nagle said the Plan outlines what work the MPO will do in 2014. Comments will be compiled for the next meeting when it will be voted on for approval. He asked for additional comments or items to be added.

ADJOURN - The meeting adjourned at 2:00 p.m. The next regular meeting is scheduled for October 24th at 12:00 noon, tentatively at the Buchanan County Court House. Lunch will be served during the meeting.

Others present outside of members and staff:

Marty Grey	Ag Expo
Fred Hannah	Ag Expo
Gerald R. Sprong	Ag Expo
Donald L. Milles	Ag Expo
Sharon Cornelius	Ag Expo
Melody A. Smith	Ag Expo