

**ATHENS-CLARKE COUNTY
SPLOST 2020 CITIZENS ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES**

March 6, 2019

The Athens-Clarke County SPLOST 2020 Citizens Advisory Committee met on Wednesday, March 6, 2019, at 5:30 p.m. The meeting was held at 780 Barber Street, Athens, Georgia. The purpose of the meeting was for discussion and vote.

MEMBERS PRESENT: John Aitkens, Sara Beresford, Carl Blount, Laura W. Carter, Dr. Cshanyse Allen, Tracy Davenport, Katrina Evans, Denny Galis, Dr. LaKeisha Gantt, David Griffin, Thomas P. Lauth, Robert Miles, Adam Shirley, Lora Thompson, Rob Trevena, Dr. Shannon Wilder, Dr. Marilyn Wolf-Ragatz, Jennifer Zwirn, Frances Berry, Shane Blackwell

MEMBERS ABSENT: Amy Stone, Jim Weck

STAFF PRESENT: Keith Sanders, SPLOST Program Administrator, Derek Doster, SPLOST Project Administrator

1. WELCOME / COMMENTS / INFORMATION

Welcome by Chair, Dr. Shannon Wilder.

STRAW POLLING:

Discussion of Straw Polling Round 3 results.

RESULTS OF ROUND 3 VOTING:

The results of Round 3 voting had been emailed to the committee prior the meeting. Only two projects received 15 or more votes and were hence recommended. Twelve projects were removed from further consideration because they received four or less votes. During discussion of the rules for determining project status it was noted that there would be two voting members missing for future rounds of voting. Carl Blount made a motion to change the requirement for a project to be recommended from 15 to 14 or more votes. Adam Shirley seconded the motion and the motion was approved to make this change. The requirement for a project to get 5 or more votes to remain in consideration was not changed.

Carl Blount made a motion to raise the vote required to stay on the list for further discussion from three or less to four or less and to make retroactive for Round 2. During the discussion a friendly amendment was offered and accepted by Carl to not make the motion retroactive for Round 2 but to begin with Round 3. The motion passed.

ROUND ROBIN DISCUSSION:

Everyone was given an opportunity to speak for 2 minutes, in accordance with the approved process. Marilyn Wolf-Ragatz made a motion to continue with the 10 minutes of added discussion time. Adam seconded the motion and the motion was approved.

RESULTS OF ROUND 4 VOTING

Staff, before the individual project results were distributed to the committee, presented the overall results of Round 4 voting. Six projects received 14 or more votes. No projects that received four or less votes; hence, none was removed from consideration. During discussion the rules for determining project status were not changed.

ROUND ROBIN DISCUSSION:

Everyone was given an opportunity speak for 2 minutes, in accordance with the approved process. Sara Beresford made a motion to continue with the 10 minutes of added discussion time. Adam seconded the motion and the motion was unanimously approved.

RESULTS OF ROUND 5 VOTING

Staff, before the individual project results were distributed to the committee, presented the overall results of Round 5 voting. Seven projects received four or less votes; hence, seven were removed from consideration. Based on the approved voting system only one project met the 14 or more vote requirement to be recommended. During discussion of the rules for determining project status, it was presented that there were five projects that had 13 votes. Changing the limit to 13, would have resulted in there being only \$6,839,000 remaining to be decided. Leaving the upper limit of votes to be recommended at 14 votes resulted in there being \$170,218,000 remaining to be decided. Changing the upper limit required to be recommended from 14 to 13 would have allowed those five projects to be recommended.

Jennifer Zwirn made a motion to change the upper limit of required votes to be recommended from 14 to 13 or more votes. Motion was seconded by Carl Blount. There was considerable discussion on this motion to make this change. The main points discussed were: 1) concern that the two high value remaining projects (#5 and #55) may not be in the five projects with 13 or more votes and changing to 13 would prevent them from being included in subsequent voting rounds; 2) that making the change after the vote, even though before results were known would have changed how people voted; 3) that it may be leaving out other smaller projects that might not be in the five projects with 13 vote; 4) that if the larger projects were included in the five, then it was okay; and 5) that a project with 13 votes still represented slightly more than two-thirds majority.

The motion failed by a 10 to 8 vote. The results of the voting were distributed.

Carl Blount made a motion to change the requirement for a project to be recommended from 14 to 13 beginning with the next round of voting. Adam Shirley seconded the motion and the motion was approved by a 12 to 4 vote.

ROUND ROBIN DISCUSSION:

Everyone was given an opportunity speak for 2 minutes, in accordance with the approved process. There was no added 10 minute discussion time for this round.

RESULTS OF ROUND 6 VOTING

The overall results of Round 6 voting were presented by staff, before the individual project results were distributed to the committee. No projects received four or less votes; hence none were removed from consideration. Based on the approved voting system four projects met the 13 or more vote requirement to be recommended leaving \$155,539,000 still remaining to be recommended. During discussion of the rules for

determining project status it was discussed that since no projects were eliminated that the lower limit for being removed from further consideration be raised.

Carl Blount made the motion that including the current Round 6 voting that any project that received seven or less votes would be removed from further consideration. Adam Shirley seconded the motion. Limited discussion regarding the motion with the main point of discussion being that it should not be for Round 6 but for future rounds. The motion failed by a vote of 5 to 11.

Carl Blount made the motion that any project that received seven or fewer votes would be removed from further consideration for all future rounds of voting. Adam Shirley seconded the motion. The motion passed by a 12 to 3 vote.

Sara Beresford made a motion to change the upper limit of required votes to be recommended from 13 to 12 or more votes for all future rounds of voting. Limited discussion regarding the motion with the main point of discussion being that 12 would still represent two-thirds of the remaining 18 members. The motion passed by a 12 to 3 vote.

ROUND ROBIN DISCUSSION:

The results for all of the individual project votes were read aloud and printed result sheets had not been distributed because they had not been printed for this round. Everyone was given an opportunity speak for 2 minutes, in accordance with the approved process. During the round robin time, it was requested that staff provide printed result sheets for round six as some members had been using the printed sheet for gathering their thoughts for their 2 minutes of time. Result sheets were printed and distributed while the round robin continued. There was no added 10 minutes of open discussion.

RESULTS OF ROUND 7 VOTING

Staff, before the individual project results were distributed to the committee, presented the overall results of Round 7 voting. Four projects received seven or less votes; hence four projects were removed from consideration. Based on the approved voting system three projects met the 12 or more vote requirement to be recommended leaving \$72,896,000 still remaining to be recommended.

Katrina Evans motioned that the voting be suspended and the list of recommended projects be sent to the Mayor and Commission as the results of Round 7 that were shown. Adam Shirley seconded the motion. There was considerable discussion on this motion. The committee was informed that it was allowed for them to return a list of less than 150%. The main points discussed were: 1) the group should try going through the remaining projects one by one and discuss each project individually to try and reach consensus; 2) after seven rounds this was probably as much consensus as the group was going to reach; 3) the list represented a good mix of projects; and, 4) the committee should not send the list back without being complete to as close to 150% as possible. The motion passed 9 to 8.

INFORMATION / NEXT MEETING DATE

- The next regular meeting of the committee is to be determined. The committee will present the list of Potential Projects to M&C at the April 9, 2019 work session.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 12:15 a.m.

The above summation is an interpretation of the items discussed and decisions reached at the above referenced meeting, not a transcript of the meeting. Anyone desiring to add to, or otherwise correct the minutes, is requested to return written comments to the SPLOST Administrator by the date of the next meeting.

Keith D. Sanders

Keith D. Sanders, SPLOST Program Administrator

F:SPLOST2020/2.8/MeetingMinutes/2019 03 06