

## **Background**

St. Louis County is recognized as a vital economic engine for the State of Missouri. It is important that the County remain strong, viable and competitive in order to attract and retain residents and businesses. In order to support that mission, the County must continue to invest in facilities, roads, bridges, intersections, sidewalks, parks, safety/security and communication systems. This investment will ensure that St. Louis County citizens have an enhanced quality of life and a safe, vibrant means of living, working, playing and commuting. The continued development of long-term, diversified business and employment opportunities will lead to increased wealth and well-being for the citizens, businesses, and institutions in St. Louis County and the St. Louis region.

St. Louis County must effectively articulate its goals, policies and practices, and develop a plan that reflects its needs and financial reality. The Capital Investment Initiative is a list of the highest priority needs with a proposed source of funding for each need. The purpose of this Capital Investment Initiative is to (1) forecast what infrastructure requires attention or improvement in the near term future (next 5 - 7 years; 2009 – 2015), and (2) determine alternative funding proposals that could meet these needs.

The first step in the process is to identify and prioritize the capital needs of the County. These have standardized characteristics such as high accident rates, congestion/delay, poor facility conditions, high utility consumption, poor trail/park access, health and wellness deficiencies, challenged geographical areas and code violations. As funds become available, the highest priority needs should be completed first.

Within the Capital Investment Initiative, projects were divided into 5 main capital categories: Buildings, Transportation, Parks, Economic Development and Safety/Security & Communications. The St. Louis County staff prioritized the projects in each category, determined each project's projected construction year and estimated cost. The estimated costs were adjusted to the construction year by application of an appropriate inflation factor.

The second step in the process is to determine how to pay for the needs. The St. Louis County staff identified various revenue sources available to fund the highest priority needs in each capital category. Each revenue source was evaluated for the funds it could generate, when these funds would be available and what types of projects these funds could be spent on. Revenue sources were also evaluated to determine if a public vote is required. A combination of fund sources is essential to meet the requirements of the Capital Investment Initiative.

## **Blue Ribbon Commission**

Following a presentation of the top capital needs of St. Louis County to the St. Louis County Council Committee of the Whole (COW) meeting on February 19, 2008, a Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) was formed in March 2008 by St. Louis County Executive Charlie A. Dooley. Executive Dooley wanted the County's Capital Investment Initiative to be reviewed and challenged by regional leaders so that a sound, economical plan was developed and implemented to meet the needs of the County and its residents. The BRC for the Capital Investment Initiative is made up of 15 members from the private sector, County Council and the community (Appendix A). County staff (also listed in Appendix A) provided information to the BRC but was not part of the BRC. The BRC reviewed and discussed all of the material presented to them by the County staff with the goal of determining the initiative's appropriateness, effective financial options, what required a vote of the people, and when that vote should be taken.

### **Blue Ribbon Commission (BRC) Meeting Schedule**

The BRC Members met according to the following schedule:

April 1, 2008	8:30am	41 Central; 8 <sup>th</sup> floor
May 6, 2008	8:30am	121 S. Meramec; 1 <sup>st</sup> floor
May 22, 2008	8:30am	121 S. Meramec; 10 <sup>th</sup> floor
June 3, 2008	8:30am	41 Central; 8 <sup>th</sup> floor
June 12, 2008	7:00pm	41 Central; County Council Chambers
June 17, 2008	8:30am	41 Central; 8 <sup>th</sup> floor
July 1, 2008	8:30am	41 Central; 8 <sup>th</sup> floor
July 15, 2008	8:30am	41 Central; 8 <sup>th</sup> floor
July 29, 2008	8:30am	121 S. Meramec, 10 <sup>th</sup> floor

These meetings were open to the public. Written correspondence as well as public comments received during this process are provided in Appendix I. Following is a summary of each meeting.

#### **BRC Meeting - April 1, 2008**

The kickoff meeting of the BRC was held on April 1, 2008. Appendix B contains the meeting agenda and a meeting summary.

BRC Chairman Skip Mange opened the meeting with all Commission Members introducing themselves. St. Louis County Chief Operating Officer Garry Earls thanked the members for their willingness to serve the County. He explained that County Executive Dooley formed the Commission to enlist its assistance in developing and implementing solutions to chronic, age-related deterioration of

many of the County's essential structures, roads, bridges, parks, safety/security & communications. "Our buildings, streets, parks and emergency facilities are getting old and dated," Earls said. "Many of them no longer meet the expectations of our customers, and some are simply incapable of fulfilling the job required of them. We need to make a reinvestment in our community. We have some long term challenges to face, and we need your advice and expertise."

Dr. Sheryl Hodges, St. Louis County Director of Highways & Traffic and Public Works, delivered the same power point presentation (Appendix B) to the Commission that was presented to the County Council COW on February 19, 2008. Jackie Wellington, Executive Vice-President of the Economic Council, Lindsey Swanick, Director of Parks and Recreation, and Darin Cline, Director of Intergovernmental Affairs, assisted in the presentation. Following are highlights of that presentation.

- Capital investment keeps St. Louis County and its infrastructure viable, bringing much-needed jobs to the area while enhancing public safety.
- Project types are diverse, with focus not just on renewal but additions and changes.
- Numerous studies have been completed that identify the critical infrastructure needs and provide the data to support what must be addressed now. A list of examples of these studies and reports is attached as Appendix C.
- The County has developed an extensive list of needs (an example page of the building needs list can be found in Appendix C). The Capital Investment Initiative is focused on near term (next 5 – 7 years) prioritized projects in each category. If additional funding were available, there are many more projects that could be implemented to address needs that did not make it to the "top" (prioritized near term) of the list.
- What constitutes a priority capital need was discussed.
- Needs were divided into 5 categories: Buildings, Transportation, Parks, Economic Development and Safety/Security & Communications
- The County has existing infrastructure valued at \$1.6 Billion, yet due to budget constraints only spends \$14 million of a needed \$52 million yearly to keep it in good condition. The explanation of the yearly expenditure requirements are discussed in Appendix L.
- Problems with the infrastructure include: old buildings, lack of space, high operating and maintenance costs, unmet service requirements, equipment that consistently breaks down, safety concerns, congestion, poor ride ability, poor facility conditions, limited facilities/programs, limited incentive for community rebuilding, limited quality jobs, underserved areas, and a lack of interoperable communication systems.
- Project priorities include: new family courts facility, new animal shelter, new crime lab, new health facility, road preservation, upgraded intersections, expanded roads, new sidewalks, updated park facilities,

commercial district improvements, training center expansion, and a region-wide interoperable communication system.

- Public Private Partnerships may be instrumental in meeting some facility needs.

The Commission requested that each member be provided with a copy of the December 20, 2007 Facility Programming Report (Executive Summary in Appendix C) prepared by Christner Inc. This report is an overview of the County's building infrastructure needs with recommendations on how to meet those needs.

The Commission agreed to take tours on April 8, 2008 and April 15, 2008 of some of the County's most problematic sites.

### **BRC Facilities Tour - April 8, 2008**

The Commission toured the Family Courts Building at 501 S. Brentwood Boulevard, the 121 S. Meramec building, the 111 S. Meramec building, and the St. Louis County Courts building at 7900 Carondelet Avenue. Materials related to these tours can be found in Appendix D.

#### Family Courts Building

- Facility serves as a detention and family (juvenile) courts building.
- Presence of asbestos throughout requires the use of expensive HEPA filters and adds to maintenance costs.
- Utility costs are high due to issues such as leaky windows and antiquated 1970s (original) heating and cooling equipment.
- Detention cells, family courtrooms, and waiting areas are small, and do not meet the needs of the families for privacy, confidentiality and counseling services to repair family relationships.
- Detention system is manual; doors must be opened one at a time, resulting in additional safety and staff concerns.
- Building is not ADA compliant.
- Building does not meet current seismic design criteria.
- Building is not big enough to meet program requirements, which are geared towards working with families by providing more social counseling services.

#### 121 S. Meramec Building

- Building serves as an office facility for many critical County staff functions.
- Underground parking area is not structurally sound.
- Building does not meet current seismic design standards.
- Building does not have a sprinkler system.
- Elevators are not reliable and need to be upgraded.

- Air conditioning and heating are a one-pipe system, resulting in inefficient energy use.
- Building is not ADA accessible.
- Lack of adequate space to meet customer expectations.
- High utility bills/consumption results from original 1960s equipment, single pane windows, etc.

#### 111 S. Meramec Building

- Building houses St. Louis County's nationally accredited Crime Laboratory, Health Laboratories and health care professional staff.
- Space is very limited for the Crime Lab and Health Labs. The Crime Lab solves very high profile crimes. Analyses in Health Laboratories support lead programs, the State of Missouri milk testing, etc...
- Pipes are old and rotted resulting in odors and molds.
- Presence of asbestos adds to maintenance costs.
- Building does not meet current seismic design criteria.
- Single pane windows mean energy loss/high utility bills. There is no redundancy in the original 1950s equipment.

#### St. Louis County Courts Building

- Court services are provided in this building.
- New computer technology is required to track and expedite court cases.
- Electrical system upgrades are needed to meet new technology needs.
- Upgrades in building security are needed. Especially since 9/11 and because of recent courtroom violent situations, increased security is required. There is one security screening area in the Courts building, leading to delays for people entering the facility.
- Upgrades in security for the Judges and clerical staff are needed.
- Office space is lacking as the number of courts has increased. Due to lack of space, the configuration of the Judges' chambers often requires the judges to pass individuals on whose cases the judge has just ruled. This lack of space also causes additional security concerns.
- Courtroom sizes need to be increased to meet current demands.

### **BRC Facilities Tour - April 15, 2008**

The Commission toured the North County Animal Shelter, the North County Recreation Complex, and the John C. Murphy Health Center.

#### North County Animal Shelter

- Space is too small for the number of animals.
- Due to lack of space, cages are in areas with cleaning material, dangerous animals are near other animals, minimal room for staff, etc...
- No air conditioning exposes animals and staff to heat related issues.

- No space for an animal adoption program minimizes animal adoption and results in increased euthanasia.
- Insufficient space and facilities for the veterinarian to service the needs of the animals.

#### North County Recreation Center

- Facility does not meet recreational needs of the people. Individuals want a variety of activities, whether it is a water park-type facility instead of a standard rectangular pool or an exercise room with classes instead of a single-use ice skating rink.
- Pool constantly needs costly repairs and is costly to operate.
- Complex does not adequately serve diverse needs of the community.
- Limited meeting space, so there are limited opportunities to use the facility as a “community center”.
- Poor configuration of space.
- Outdated equipment increases the cost of operations and maintenance.

#### John C. Murphy Health Center

- Space is too small to meet program needs to provide health care.
- Better separation is required between units that serve individuals with contagious diseases and those who are not contagious.
- Examination rooms are too small to accommodate family/support members and ensure privacy/confidentiality.
- Additional patient counseling rooms are needed.
- Medical supplies are stored in hallways due to lack of storage areas.
- More laboratory space is needed to run routine tests.
- Waiting areas are not adequate for the number of individuals served.
- Deferred maintenance issues, such as lack of roof replacement results in water leaks in the exam rooms.

### **BRC Meeting - May 6, 2008**

The BRC met May 6, 2008. Appendix E contains the meeting agenda and a meeting summary.

Sheryl L. Hodges gave a “Funding Scenario Overview” power point presentation (Appendix E) to the Commission with the following highlights:

- Top priority needs were listed by category.
- Total Capital investment requirements of \$528.7 Million (M)
  - Buildings = \$112.8 M
  - Transportation = \$213.4 M
  - Parks = \$43.9 M
  - Economic Development = \$41.5 M
  - Safety/Security & Communications = \$117.1 M

Pam Reitz, St. Louis County Director of Administration, then gave a presentation on “Capital Investment Initiative Financing Options” (Appendix E) with the following highlights:

- Financing Options:
  - General Obligation Bonds (GO Bonds)
  - Certificates of Participation (COPs)
  - Master Lease Financing (existing)
  - Transportation Trust Fund Sales Tax (existing)
- General Obligation Bonds (GO Bonds):
  - Requires an election; no change (no tax increase) to the current St. Louis County bond retirement fund rate; \$120 M to be generated over 5 years for County Government capital projects
- Certificates of Participation (COPs):
  - No election necessary to issue COPs; supported by various revenue streams that may or may not require an election; Proposed revenue streams include:
    - New Metro Transportation Sales Tax (Proposition M) (\$5 M to generate \$50 M), election required
    - Casino boarding fees (\$5 M to generate \$50 M), no election required
    - New Parks Sales Tax (\$7 M to generate \$70 M), election required
    - New Sales and Use Tax (\$15 M to generate \$150 M), election required
- Master Lease funds: a minor option that the County currently uses for small projects
- Transportation Trust Fund Sales Tax is currently being used for capital transportation projects; portion is transferred annually to Metro

The Commission discussed the fact that the various forms of revenue sources have restricted uses associated with them. The Parks Sales tax can only be used for parks. The Transportation Trust Fund Sales Tax can only be used for transportation related improvements. The Sales and Use Tax would be split with municipalities and can be used for public safety, park improvements, job creation, and enhancing local government services.

A “Funding Summary for Construction ’09 – ’13” by category and source was presented as the proposed funding scenario. The table can be found in the “Funding Scenario Overview” power point presentation.

### **BRC Meeting - May 22, 2008**

The BRC met May 22, 2008. Appendix F contains the meeting agenda and a meeting summary.

Garry Earls gave a presentation titled “Revitalization of our infrastructure” (Appendix F). This was a recap of the St. Louis County infrastructure needs, possible funding sources and new information regarding competing infrastructure financing and schedule of elections with the following highlights:

- Questions for the Blue Ribbon Commission:
  - Have we identified the critical needs of St. Louis County?
  - What funding mechanism should be used to meet the expenditure requirements of these needs?
- Competing Infrastructure:
  - MSD’s bond issue scheduled for August 2008 (\$275 M in added bond authority)
  - Metro Sales Tax (Proposition M) increase
    - ½ ¢ total (¼ ¢ for existing operations, ¼ ¢ for new system expansion)
  - Water Company capital renewal (\$100 M in 2008)
  - AmerenUE reinvestment
  - Highway 40/64 reconstruction
- Schedule of elections:
  - November 2008
    - Greatest voter turnout
    - Metro’s current budget is in need of new funds to meet current operating needs and for matching funds for expansion.
    - Need to get interoperable communications system constructed
- Capital Investment Category Needs (Total \$528.7 M)
  - Buildings (\$112.8 M)
  - Transportation (\$213.4 M)
  - Parks (\$43.9 M)
  - Economic Development (\$41.5 M)
  - Safety/Security & Communications (\$117.1 M)
- Funding Summary for Construction ’09 – ‘13

Tim Fischesser, Executive Director of the St. Louis County Municipal League, discussed the Sales and Use Tax that the Municipal League has worked on for several years (Appendix F). In general, the Sales and Use Tax applies to purchases (catalog and internet sales) greater than \$2,000 of materials and items outside of a jurisdiction but which are used within the jurisdiction. The State of Missouri along with eighteen municipalities within St. Louis County, the City of St. Louis, St. Charles County, and other counties all collect this tax. The Municipal League would like this issue placed on the ballot either in November 2008 or at a later time depending on the BRC’s proposal. The levy would be 1.85% with 1.0% shared between the County and municipalities, 0.5% for the County transportation tax (for roads and transit), 0.25% for Metro, and 0.10 % for parks.

Tim Fischesser and Garry Earls discussed with the Commission the need for a Countywide interoperable communications system that would be partially funded from the Sales and Use Tax. This new system is needed to ensure unimpeded communication between emergency responders throughout the County and region. Presently, Fischesser said, individual agencies are shackled to the radius of their respective communications towers. Once a particular fire truck or police car passes out of range of its tower, its ability to communicate effectively is terminated. When that occurs at a multi-jurisdictional emergency, people have to literally run back and forth with verbal messages.

The Commission scheduled public hearings on June 12<sup>th</sup> at 7:00 pm in the County Council Chambers, and June 17<sup>th</sup> at 8:30 am in the 8<sup>th</sup> floor conference room of the LK Roos Administration Building.

### **BRC Meeting - June 3, 2008**

The BRC met on June 3, 2008. Appendix G contains the meeting agenda and a meeting summary.

The Commission discussed the format and procedure for the public meeting. Exhibit boards illustrating capital needs and project priorities will be on display in the foyer area. Each station will be manned with key staff members. Sheryl L. Hodges will make a power point presentation before public comment is received.

The draft of the power point presentation was reviewed and comments made on what to change, add, or alter in preparation for June 12, 2008.

The Commission members discussed the format and content of the final Commission Report. The report will be a written summary of the actions taken by the Commission and the final recommendations. It will include all of the material, communications, power point presentations, handouts, and public comments submitted to the Commission. The final report will be sent to the County Executive and the County Council.

### **BRC Public Meeting - June 12, 2008**

The BRC held a public hearing on June 12, 2008 in the St. Louis County Council Chambers at 7:00 pm. A copy of the press release announcing the meeting is provided in Appendix H.

Chairman Mange opened the meeting and asked each Commissioner to introduce themselves to the public. Sheryl L. Hodges then gave a presentation

to the public titled “St. Louis County’s Capital Investment Initiative 2008: Revitalization of Our Infrastructure” (Appendix H) with the following highlights:

- Who is the BRC?
- Why make capital investments?
- BRC to answer if County staff has identified (1) the critical needs of the County and if the requirements meet the future service needs for our community and (2) what funding mechanism should be used to meet expenditure requirements
- Identified the Capital Investment Initiative project categories (Buildings, Transportation, Parks, Economic Development, Safety/Security & Communications) and expenditure requirements
- Identified deficiencies
- Discussed financing options
- Summarized funding sources and requirements by category
- Discussed benefits of making the investments

Time for public comment was provided. The Commission heard from Judge Carolyn Whittington, Maplewood Mayor Mark Langston, St. Louis County Municipal League Executive Director Tim Fischesser, and Richard Dockett from St. Louis Area Concerned Taxpayers. A summary of their comments is shown in Appendix I.

### **BRC Meeting - June 17, 2008**

The BRC met on June 17, 2008. Appendix J contains the meeting agenda and a meeting summary.

The meeting started with time for public comment. The Commission heard from Bill Hartmann, Ann Mack, Ginger Harris and Gary Higgs. A summary of their comments is provided in Appendix I.

Written correspondence received by the Commission over a period of several weeks is also contained in Appendix I.

The Commission held a discussion on the two specific questions.

1. Have we identified the critical needs of St. Louis County?
2. What funding mechanism should be used to meet the expenditure requirements of these needs?

The Commission agreed that the staff had identified the critical infrastructure needs of St. Louis County. These top priority needs must be addressed in the near term (2009 – 2015).

The Commission also had several recommendations regarding the infrastructure construction activity that will result from the funding as follows:

1. All new buildings should be designed to be “green” and sustainable. LEED standards should be followed to the highest level economically feasible.
2. Highway improvement and reconstruction projects should be planned to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian traffic. The County Highway Department should commit to working in cooperation with other transportation organizations to look at the full range of modes of transportation to make our communities more pedestrian friendly, livable and usable.
3. All projects must include appropriate goals for minority participation.
4. Before any development occurs on the parking lot on Central Avenue between the Administration Building and the Correctional Facility, the County should be assured that there is sufficient public parking to replace the lost parking.
5. It is important that the County continue to have a strong presence in Clayton. However, consideration should be given to expanding the current satellite offices, and possibly relocating other appropriate services outside of Clayton to less expensive real estate and closer to the public. The use of the Internet for the public to access County services should continue to be expanded.
6. The County should take advantage of public/private partnerships as much as possible in order to leverage the public dollars.

The Commission then discussed the timing of placing the four funding options on the ballot for voter approval. The four proposed revenue sources are as follows:

1. No tax increase General Obligation Bond Issue
2. ½ ¢ sales tax for Metro (Proposition M)
3. Countywide “Sales and Use Tax”
4. Park Sales Tax

The Commission held a formal vote on the following motion:

The Blue Ribbon Commission recommends that the no-tax increase General Obligation Bond Issue and the ½ ¢ sales tax for Metro (Proposition M) be placed on the November 2008 ballot; and that the Countywide “Sales and Use Tax” and the Parks Sales Tax be placed on the April 2009 ballot.

Each proposed tax was discussed in detail. It was agreed by the Commission that the best time to take these kinds of issues to the voters was in a general election when the voter turnout was the highest. There was unanimous agreement that the GO Bond issue and Proposition M for Metro should be placed on the November 2008 ballot to meet the critical infrastructure needs of St. Louis County and the Metro needs for operations and expansion.

There was also discussion about the Sales and Use Tax and how it would help fund the proposed interoperable communications system for emergency responders in St. Louis County. Concern was expressed about taking too many tax issues to the voters at one time. The Commission recommended that the voters be educated on the attributes of a Sales and Use Tax before the proposal is brought to a vote. The majority of the Commission agreed that this issue should wait until April 2009, though there was support for also placing it on the November ballot.

The motion passed on an 11-1 vote. The dissenting Commissioner felt that the Sales and Use Tax should be included on the November 2008 ballot.

The Commission then discussed the format of the final report. Chairman Skip Mange along with the County staff will draft the report and distribute a rough draft about June 25, 2008. The Commission will meet again on July 1, 2008 to discuss the draft final report.

### **BRC Meeting – July 1, 2008**

The BRC met on July 1, 2008. Appendix K contains the meeting agenda and a meeting summary.

Commission members and County staff met to discuss and revise the BRC's draft list of recommendations to County Executive Dooley. Ultimately, the commission pared the original eight recommendations to a total of six, which can be found listed throughout the report. Chairman Mange informed Commissioners that a revised draft of the final report would be emailed to them before the BRC's July 15 meeting.

### **BRC Meeting – July 15, 2008**

The BRC met on July 15, 2008. Appendix L contains the meeting agenda and a meeting summary.

The Commission discussed the need to include in the report documentation on the following items:

1. Financial justification for replacing the various buildings
2. Example listing of the various studies, reports, and needs lists on the condition of the St. Louis County infrastructure
3. Details on the need to spend \$52 million a year on infrastructure maintenance

It was decided that this material would be added to the appendices in the final report.

There was extensive discussion by the Commission on the question of revising the Commission recommendation on the timing of taking the various tax issues to the voters. Garry Earls provided input and requested that the Commission consider revising the recommendation to not include anything on the timing of taking the issues to the voters. Commission members Barbara Fraser and Colleen Wasinger spoke about the importance of addressing the emergency communication needs of the County. A request was made to include the Sales and Use Tax on the November ballot rather than the April 2009 ballot as recommended by the Commission. Other Commissioners supported not changing the recommendation. A Commission vote was held and the original recommendation was supported by a 10 to 3 vote.

It was decided that the Commission would meet again on July 29<sup>th</sup> to give approval to the final report. Chairman Mange asked that if any Commissioner wanted a "minority" report included as an Appendix to the final report, it should be provided to the Chairman and Sheryl Hodges as soon as possible.

### **BRC Meeting – July 29, 2008**

The BRC met on July 29, 2008. Appendix M contains the meeting agenda and a meeting summary.

The Commission met to discuss any remaining changes to its final report. Chairman Mange announced that he wanted to officially present the document to County Executive Dooley by the end of the week.

Chairman Mange also explained that two "Minority Reports" written by Barbara Fraser and Colleen Wasinger would be included as Appendix N in the final report.

The Commission discussed the challenges supporters of Proposition M will likely have to overcome to achieve approval of the measure this November. County Executive Dooley explained that passage of the proposition is very important to the region. Blue Ribbon Commission members agreed to continue to publicly support not only Proposition M but the other fund-generating measures specified in their final report.

The Commission recommended that St. Louis County staff hold public information meetings in each County Council District prior to the November election.

The Commission agreed to meet at 8:30 a.m. on August 20, 2008.

## Blue Ribbon Commission Final Recommendations

Between the months of April 2008 and July 2008, the Blue Ribbon Commission members have gathered to discuss the infrastructure needs of St. Louis County and ways to fund those needs as part of a Capital Investment Initiative. As a result of their joint effort and analysis, the Blue Ribbon Commission makes the following recommendations regarding funding St. Louis County's Capital Investment Initiative.

1. A General Obligation Bond Issue in an amount that results in no change (no tax increase) to the current St. Louis County bond retirement fund rate be placed on the November 2008 General Election ballot.
2. A ½ ¢ sales tax for Metro (Proposition M) be placed on the November 2008 General Election ballot.
3. A Countywide "Sales and Use Tax" be placed on the April 2009 ballot.
4. A Parks Sales Tax be placed on the April 2009 ballot.

In addition, the BRC makes the following recommendations regarding the infrastructure construction activity that will result from the funding.

1. All new buildings should be designed to be "green" and sustainable. LEED standards should be followed to the highest level economically feasible.
2. Highway improvement and reconstruction projects should be planned to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian traffic. The County Highway Department should commit to working in cooperation with other transportation organizations to look at the full range of modes of transportation to make our communities more pedestrian friendly, livable and usable.
3. All projects must include appropriate goals for minority participation.
4. Before any development occurs on the parking lot on Central Avenue between the Administration Building and the Correctional Facility, the County should be assured that there is sufficient public parking to replace the lost parking.
5. It is important that the County continue to have a strong presence in Clayton. However, consideration should be given to expanding the current satellite offices, and possibly relocating other appropriate services outside of Clayton to less expensive real estate and closer to the public. The use of the Internet for the public to access County services should continue to be expanded.
6. The County should take advantage of public/private partnerships as much as possible in order to leverage the public dollars.

Additional comments on the vote and recommendations from two BRC members are contained in Appendix N.