



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization (CATSO)

Thursday, August 23, 2018
2:30 PM

Coordinating Committee Meeting

City Hall
701 E. Broadway
Council Chambers

I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. MATTHES: I'd like to call us to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MR. MATTHES: Let's start with just going around the table and introducing ourselves. How about we start here.

MR. MCCANN: Jeff McCann, Chief Engineer, Boone County.

MR. SILVESTER: David Silvester, Central District Engineer for MoDOT.

MR. MATTHES: Mike Matthes, I'm the City Manager in Columbia, and I have the pleasure of being the Chair of the CATSO Coordinating Committee, unless I can talk anyone else into it.

MR. TEDDY: I'm Tim Teddy. I'm the Community Development Director for City of Columbia and also serve on the Technical Committee.

MR. NICHOLS: Dave Nichols, I'm the Public Works Director for the City of Columbia.

MR. HENDERSON: Mike Henderson, I'm with MoDOT, Central Office Transportation and Planning.

MS. CHRISTIAN: Planner with CATSO and City of Columbia Community Development.

MR. SKOV: Mitch Skov, with the same, CATSO staff.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you. I thank you for coming and helping us take impeccable minutes. It's really, really helpful. And together we are CATSO, Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization. It's our pleasure to plan a lot of projects and sometimes apply some funding to that. So, we'll run through a few public hearings today and couple of other items. And we'll always have general comments at the end for you gentlemen.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. MATTHES: Let's have the approval of the agenda. Are there any changes to be reported? Do I have a motion to approve?

MR. SILVESTER: So moved.

MR. MCCANN: Second.

MR. MATTHES: All those in favor, please say yes.

(Unanimous voice vote of approval.)

MR. MATTHES: Opposed, say no.

(No speakers.)

MR. MATTHES: We have an agenda. _%_

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. MATTHES: Let's approve the minutes if we can, if everyone's had a chance to read them. Are there any changes to the minutes from May 24th? Can I hear a motion to approve?

MR. NICHOLS: So moved.

MR. MATTHES: Second?

MR. SILVESTER: Second.

MR. MATTHES: All in favor, say yes.

(Unanimous voice vote of approval.)

MR. MATTHES: Opposed, say no.

(No speakers.)

MR. MATTHES: That's the approval of minutes.

Draft May 24, 2018 Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [Draft, May 24 Meeting Minutes](#)

V. PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED FY 2019 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP)

MR. MATTHES: Okay. Our first public hearing is the about the proposed FY 2019

Unified Planning Work Program, the UPWP. Staff comments?

MS. CHRISTIAN: So, as the Metropolitan Planning Organization, CATSO is the recipient

of Federal Consolidated Planning Grant funds. And the CATSO UPWP is one of the documents that is produced every year in our transportation planning process. Federal law requires UPWP to be to be updated annually, and to identify all work task and consultant studies to be funded with the CPG funds and related local match.

This fiscal year 2019 WP narrative describes all the CATSO transportation planning related work activities for the upcoming fiscal year, October 1st through September 30th of next year. Our work budget includes a total of \$451,414 in funding. That does include our local match. The Consolidated Planning Grant, federal share of that is \$361,131, and, you know, again, these Consolidated Planning Grant funds are a combination of federal highway and federal transit planning funds, and then, 20 percent of local match is provided.

Our funding request this year is smaller than last year's budget. Last year we did pay for our GIS division to complete a Natural Resources Inventory. That was \$100,000 in funding. Given that we're not doing that this year, we do - we do see in our total funding approximately \$100,000 less, and that CPG

funding is about \$80,000 less this year. Our non-salary purchases include the purchase of an Urban Canvas Modeler renewal subscription. And that basically is the web-based platform from Urban Sim that provides us with housing and employment allocation for land-use forecasts. We will also be renewing the subscription license for the ReMix software that public transit uses to create shareable public maps that they can show folks, you know, proposed route changes. And we will also be purchasing for the GIS division Nearmap Aerial Services, which will provide an annual update aerial imagery within Columbia, and we can use that to aid in our sidewalks, structures, and our impervious surface data. And, of course, there will be travel and training expenses in this year's budget.

Our funding does pay for 4.9 employees in total, that's two full-time staff within CATSO. We also support 2.9 positions in Community Development, GIS and Transit. And this year, of course, we will continue our - our regular work activities, you know, completing our Transportation Improvement Program, and our Major Roadway Plan amendments, annual work products like the UPWP, and, of course, you know, maintaining our geographic data systems and our continuous program evaluation.

Some of the specific completed goals for this year include the completion of our 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan. We will be finalizing those goals and objectives and working on our public participation process this fall. We are also continuing our collaboration and support for local and regional partnerships based on - or focused on the City's Vision Zero Action Plan and the Columbia Climate Action Plan. We will also, you know, continue our assistance in prioritizing funding for non-motorized infrastructure through the completion of the five-year Columbia Sidewalk Master Plan this year. And we will be implementing our sort of trying out our first city wide bike pedestrian audit. We have chosen a manual bike count program. Something similar to what Lawrence, Kansas does. This year we did do a thorough review of all the -- the technology available for those types of counts, and it still seems like volunteers on the ground produces the most reliable numbers. So, we're going to stick with that this year.

The GIS division will be completing the update of the Natural Resources Inventory this year. And, you know, Go COMO continues to work on those recommendations that came out in 2017 Bus Service Evaluation Project. So, these are some of the bigger items we'll be focusing on in our grant this year. And this is just a breakdown of our specific budget numbers. I guess I'm realizing now it's kind of hard to see that from here. But, you know, we do - we spread our funding through land-use planning, long-range transportation, short-range transportation, transit planning, grant management, and information systems. And that's just the breakdown of where you can see the different funding dollars going towards, and it does include those expenditures I've already reviewed.

Now, this is a review of our current consolidated planning grant balance. This shows that we do have a funds balance of more than \$700,000.

It is CATSO policy to maintain a balance. It's good to have that reserve for big projects like the National Resources Inventory or similar to - you know, in 2017 we paid for the consultant for transit. So big purchase items it's really helpful to kind of have that kind of balance.

The UPWP was reviewed at our Technical Committee meeting on August 1st, and they did pass a motion to forward this version to the Coordinating Committee for a public hearing. We also have received extensive review and feedback from federal highways and we have responded to all of their recommendations also and they have provided tentative approval of this version of our - of our UPWP for this year. And so, this draft can be adopted as written or there can be revisions proposed by the Coordinating Committee. We will be using this as the basis for Consolidated Planning Contract. Once this passes today we will providing that contract to City Council. We will be putting that into the Council report tomorrow to go onto the September - the first September meeting for City Council. So, after a public hearing and review we do recommend approval. And, of course, if you have any questions.

MR. MATTHES: Any questions?

MR. TEDDY: We're going to update the sidewalk master plan?

MS. CHRISTIAN: We're planning on doing that this year.

MR. TEDDY: This year?

MS. CHRISTIAN: Yes.

MR. TEDDY: Okay. What process - do you have a process in mind?

MS. CHRISTIAN: We do. We started the process in the last couple months with our

bicycle and pedestrian commission, and what we've done is we - we have a priority ratings matrix that we've updated that does include things like, you know, what kind of roadway are the sidewalks on, you know, is it major arterial or collector. We're also looking at pedestrian attractors within the area. And so, we have a - GIS has created us a comprehensive map that shows, you know, where the incomplete sidewalks are and where the pedestrian attractors are. We're also looking at getting more priority for sidewalks that are in lower income areas, just based on a needs basis. We're also considering other plans, you know, things like the Business Loop Corridor Plan. You know, giving extra points to sidewalks that are already in other city or organizational plans. And then we will be hosting two public meetings, probably in the Spring. And I'll definitely let everyone know about that ahead of time.

MR. TEDDY: Okay. Thank you.

MR. MATTHES: Other questions? All right. Let me open the public hearing portion of this item. Is there anyone from the public that would like to speak about or plan?

I don't see anyone moving, so I'll call the public hearing to a close. And can I ask if there is someone willing to move our adoption?

MR. MCCANN: I'll make that motion.

MR. MATTHES: Is there a second?

MR. TEDDY: I'll second.

MR. MATTHES: All in favor, please say yes.

(Unanimous voice vote of approval.)

MR. MATTHES: Opposed, say no.

(No speakers.)

MR. MATTHES: There we are.

CATSO FY 2019 DRAFT UPWP

Attachments: [CATSO FY2019 UPWP- DRAFT](#)
[Item 5, Staff Memo, Draft FY 2019 UPWP](#)

VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED FY 2019-2022 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

MR. MATTHES: Okay. Our next public hearing, our second one, is about the proposed

FY 2019 through 2022 Transportation Improvement Program or TIP.

MR. SKOV: Yes, Mr. Chair, this is not even what we do concurrently, typically with the

Unified Planning Work Program. It's, again, a Transportation Improvement Program for fiscal year '19 through '22. The format is similar to that of MoDOT. TIP version known as a STIP. It's basically a narrative listing of the transportation related capital projects for the four-year period coming up, fiscal year period. And it specifically lists projects that have federal funds program for them, including, for roadways, for the Go COMO transit, and some private provider transits that use federal funds, the Get About Columbia program, which, of course, is the federal non-motorized transportation pilot program. The various other projects for MoDOT in Boone County, City of Columbia, and private transit providers. And it does include bicycle/pedestrian projects as well, sidewalk, trail, et cetera. It does also list anticipated maintenance costs for regional agencies, Boone County, City of Columbia, and MoDOT. Specifically, for what we call the federal aid system of roadways. We have just under 361 lane miles in the Columbia metro area. The estimated maintenance cost for those on an annual basis are \$10.4 million approximately.

TIP must be fiscally constrained. The documented revenue available for projects has to be sufficient to cover the listed projects and this document is that. Specifically, if a local jurisdiction transportation related wants to use federal funding for transportation projects, they have to be listed in the approved TIP. This paper documents lists a total of approximately \$117.5 million in capital project costs, and included in that is just over \$35 million in federal funding. The majority of the federal funds in this paper document are from MoDOT roadway construction projects and for Go COMO transit capital projects, specifically bus and other facility acquisitions. There's also, of course, Go COMO or I should say the Get About funding that's winding down so

that is lower than it has been the past few years in the TIP.

This is just a financial summary. Again, this would have been on the document that went out with your packet. It just lists things as far as by section. There are a number of sections. Again, MoDOT has a couple of sections, one for scoping. The preliminary engineering section in effect, the roadways themselves, and then the various other jurisdictions and types of transportation. Again, \$117.5 being in capital funding and for the federal aid maintenance it's just under \$10.5 million is what we estimate. So, the total program there with the maintenance is just under \$128 million over the four years. And we do have plenty of revenue to cover that. Most of the remaining revenue, I'm sure, will be used for maintenance on local streets.

Again, the draft TIP can be adopted as presented with any kind of revisions or amendments you might suggest, as was the case with the UPWP this has been extensively reviewed by MoDOT as well as by FTA, and specifically by the Federal Highway Administration and we've responded to all their comments and made a number of revisions based on those comments, so - because - as the case with UPWP we have tentative approval to proceed with this and we will be able to get it formally approved by Federal Highway. And, again, once this is actually approved by the Coordinating Committee, we'll actually provide that to MoDOT Federal Transit and Federal Highway immediately before the end of the month.

The Tech Committee did review it at the August 1st meeting in general discussion. I think - I'm not sure - I don't think we had a meeting. We did have lengthy phone conversations with Federal Highway and Federal Transit, but we, again, had extensive conversations on the phone and back and forth email with the revisions based - and made a number of revisions based on those comments. The Tech Committee did make a motion for the draft TP - TIP with an appropriate revision, which we have made some since the tech meeting to add a couple of projects that came in late. We do think that the document's in final format now and any sort of suggested action I would suggest to have you review it and hold a public hearing. If you have suggested revisions, please make those. But after a public hearing we ask that you actually give formal approval to proposed FY 2019 - '22 TIP. Thank you.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you. Any questions at this time? This is also a public hearing.

I'd like to invite anyone from the public that would like to speak about the TIP program, please approach the microphone.

No one.

All right. We'll call this public hearing to a close. Is there a motion?

MR. NICHOLS: So moved.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you. Is there second?

MR. TEDDY: I'll second it.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you. All in favor, please say yes.

(Unanimous voice vote of approval.)

MR. MATTHES: Opposed, say no.

(No speakers.)

MR. MATTHES: There we are.

Proposed FY 2019-2022 TIP

Attachments: [CATSO Staff Summary - FY 2019-2022 TIP](#)
[CATSO TIP FY 2019- 2022 DRAFT Revised 8-17-18](#)

VII. PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED MAJOR ROADWAY PLAN AMENDMENT - PONDEROSA REALIGNMENT

Proposed MRP Amendment

Attachments: [Item 7 8-23-18 Ponderosa MRP Amd](#)
[CATSO MRP, Nocona, Endeavor Locations](#)
[Discovery Park N](#)
[Pages from 18-76 Discovery Park S PD - PD Plan 2018-02-19](#)

MR. MATTHES: Our third public hearing is a Proposed Major Roadway Plan Amendment for Ponderosa Realignment.

MR. SKOV: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is something that was originally brought to you at your May 24th meeting. The Tech Committee had reviewed the possibility of doing a realignment of the Ponderosa Street Collector alignment in the vicinity of the Discovery Park development. And at the May 24th meeting you communicated and directed staff to set a public hearing for this meeting. Well, just to refresh your memories, this development of Discovery Park in the vicinity of Discovery Parkway and 63 interchange has provided an opportunity to possibly implement a major collector street realignment in place of the existing Ponderosa Street configuration where it intersects with Discovery Parkway. There has been a new collector street called Nocona Parkway which serves the Discovery Park North development. And along with another street called Endeavor Avenue, which is also constructed at least initially through Discovery Park North. It actually connects to Nocona at a roundabout there, and then continues across Discovery Parkway where it currently stubs.

The realignment would actually replace a section of Ponderosa between where - at the point where Norcona intersects at that roundabout to where Endeavor will eventually transition back into Ponderosa. And the actual focus of this and big improvement here is to provide for an additional intersection at Discovery Parkway and Endeavor, which will be fully signalized and provide some additional space in back from the ramps at Discovery Parkway and 63 interchange.

I've got a number of maps in here. You can see that here is Ponderosa where the arrow is. I know it's hard to see, but Nocona Parkway does exist. It has been

constructed and the section of Endeavor here on the north side Discovery Parkway has been constructed and stubs to the south.

The next map shows just what it looks like from the aerial. Currently, you can see, again, Ponderosa is here, the access road for 63. Norcona Parkway is here and at this roundabout, the southern portion of the development it actually transitions into Endeavor and connects to Endeavor Avenue and Endeavor, again stubs, here. Now, the idea or the initial PD Plan we've gotten submitted for the Discovery South development shows Endeavor extending on through the site to some point in this vicinity. Which this map shows, again, that's a general description of where Endeavor will transition back into Ponderosa. That alignment is still under discussion, status still having discussions as to where that might or where that might connect back to Ponderosa - existing Ponderosa. Excuse me.

This is a just a close-up of the Office Park North development, Discovery Park. Again, probably more detail than you need. This is Nocona Parkway and Endeavor where it connects to Discovery Parkway. This is the southern portion, Discovery Park PD. Again, the road stubs to about this point where the arrow is and then it continues on or will potentially continue on. That's the plan to transition back into Ponderosa at some point here. You know, that specific line is not a deterrent. The point, again, of this Ponderosa is this section of major roadway plan alignment is to specifically replace the Ponderosa Street intersection and Discovery Parkway, and provide for the full four-way signalized intersection that will ultimately be there. And it's an improved street certainly in terms of condition to the existing Ponderosa. And the spacing from the ramps is nearly a full quarter mile back from Discovery/63 Interchange. So, it pretty much doubles the existing distance where Ponderosa comes in currently.

Passing the amendment as proposed will implement the addition of that Nocona Parkway/Endeavor major street alignment and replace the section of Ponderosa in between the point where Ponderosa and Nocona Parkway connect at the roundabout north of Discovery Parkway. And this, again, this section is approximately nine-tenths of a mile, I believe, that Ponderosa would be replaced at least on the major roadway plan. And I'm not suggesting anything about closing down part of Ponderosa. I'm just focusing on the fact that the major roadway alignment, the collector street alignment, will be acknowledged as being this alignment, not Ponderosa between those two points. And, again, the big focus here is the intersection. That's what is the major improvement. The location and the facility itself, which currently is just a stop sign intersection which is very close to the ramps.

The Coordinating Committee, again, as I pointed out at the beginning, you reviewed this item at your May 24th meeting and directed Staff to set a public hearing. Again, adding this Nocona Parkway and Endeavor alignment as a substitute

collector alignment for Discovery Parkway/Ponderosa intersections and the sections of Ponderosa which I've described. That's all I've got other than after you hold a public hearing and if you propose an amendment, if you have a consensus, I would suggest you pass a motion giving approval to this implement. Thank you.

MR. MATTHES: Any questions of the Committee to the Staff?

MR. TEDDY: Just a comment. I think it's worth repeating what Mr. Skov said about our

action doesn't replace one roadway with another completely. We're talking about replacing a classification and the decision on whether Ponderosa's a road and continues to exist will be up to the local jurisdiction. But --

MR. SKOV: Yes, Ponderosa - the sections that I'm describing are between Nocona

Parkway and Endeavor Parkway transition back into Ponderosa. That will just become

classified as a local street as far as the major roadway plan is concerned.

MR. MATTHES: Any other questions? Well, with that I'd like to open it up to a public

hearing. I see we might have interest in this one. Please come forward.

MR. HOLLIS: Good afternoon. Robert Hollis with the Van Matre Law Firm, 1103 East

Broadway, here on behalf of the Gans Creek Homeowners Association.

COURT REPORTER: Can you speak up?

MR. HOLLIS: I'm sorry. You can't hear me. How about now? This is great there's no timer. How long do I have?

MR. MATTHES: How much time do you want?

MR. HOLLIS: A couple - mainly questions. So, there is a request that is moving

through the city right now for the area south of Discovery and I guess to the west of Ponderosa. Mitch, is there any way you can go back a couple to a map?

MR. SKOV: Which map would you like?

MR. HOLLIS: Actually, go to that - there you go. Right there. That would be great.

So, the request applies to that area that's on the screen now being made by the property

owner and so the people that I represent are just to the south of this. They're not shown there, but it's a neighborhood that is immediately adjacent to this proposed development. And I just - I guess one point of clarification I think is really relevant here is that this plan is proposed that's being shown. It's not approved. Right? Mr. Teddy, Correct me if I'm wrong, the plan that's being shown is simply proposed? There no existing PD plan.

MR. SKOV: That's correct. In this case, it's been submitted.

MR. HOLLIS: Yeah, it's not even been to the Planning and Zoning Commission. So that

plan does not exist. Just to be clear because I wasn't sure, it wasn't clear from the presentation that the plan exists, but it doesn't. So, I'm not sure what sort of bearing that has on a decision that you make with regard to reclassifying a road that doesn't exist. But, again, I don't know much about what your processes are. But in our - from our perspective, maybe it should exist, but we received very little - well, actual zero feedback from the applicant with regard to this even though we've reached out to them so we're just learning as we go. And it was on the zoning agenda for the Planning and Zoning Commission tonight, but I made a request for information and found out that it was tabled, so we'll assume it will be coming back at some point in September. But, again, we've not heard from the applicant, but I wanted to make sure it was clear, this plan does not exist. And to my knowledge it's the only place that this proposed road is shown, is on this plan. So, I guess the question: What is the - what is the purpose of reclassifying or I guess changing the major roadway plan to reclassify a road that doesn't exist. Is that a question that could be answered?

MR. SKOV: Yes. We had a number of alignments on major roadway plans that actually don't exist. A number of them have been there many years. But this - what it acknowledges by showing it on the roadway plan is that that's a superior alignment from our perspective. Specifically, because of the intersection location and the fact that it will be fully signalized. So the fact that it is a future - and then the map will designate that. That it's a future potential alignment. Or that that is what we presume will be the future collector street alignment for this vicinity. Again, we - Ponderosa would still be shown on the map, it wouldn't be a major street. It would show as a local street on the map or in the background most likely for the portion that I've referenced. But, again, we've had numerous examples where we have - what we consider to be preferred alignments that are - that are future. We just label them as future.

MR. HOLLIS: Right. Right. Thank you. I think I understand.

MR. TEDDY: And if I may, just to add. The plan, then, is going to be - in conjunction with regulations to give guidance on where roadway alignment should be and joint specification of the build, because these different roadway classifications are tied to the standard specifications that exist in the ordinances.

Mr. SKOV: Right-of-way identification, driveway spacing.

MR. HOLLIS: Thank you.

MR. NICHOLS: You said you represented an owner's association. Can you give that name again and describe the area that's -

MR. HOLLIS: Right. It's Gans Creek.

MR. NICHOLS: What group of properties is that?

MR. HOLLIS: Immediately to the south and maybe if you go a couple of slides back from that I think you can see. You can't - yeah, you can. South Brock Rodgers Road. It's all the property owners along that road.

MR. NICHOLS: Rodgers?

MR. HOLLIS: Right.

MR. NICHOLS: Thank you.

MR. HOLLIS: Well, so - and maybe we're late to the game here or maybe it doesn't matter, but I know from - you can obviously tell from the questions I'm asking I don't know what's going on and I haven't really heard nor should I have heard much about what's going on with the process. I did look to become a little bit educated for the minutes of the meeting that you've got in front of you and they weren't available, so that's sort of another reason for the ignorance, but from the property owners' standpoint, looking at it very simplistically, which is the only way I can see really is that they see a road that doesn't exist that's not on a plan that is moving closer to their residences. Right? And so, to the extent that they can be educated and add input they're very, very interested and to the extent that I can help with that, I would like to.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you.

MR. HOLLIS: No other questions than that.

MR. MATTHES: Are there other public comments at this time?

MR. LATA: My name's Tom Lata. I live at 6901 West Charlene. I'm representing the (inaudible) of the Sierra Club, and we're pretty concerned about - of course, there's no specifics, but we would like to see the road and spur back as far as possible from the creek. Gans Creek's basically a losing stream that basically disappears under Rock Bridge State Park, reappears several - several times. And just adjacent to this particular property

there is a major sink hole where most of the creek seems to disappear. It goes straight down and then reappears later in spots. And much of that water nobody knows where it goes. It could very easily end up in Devil's Icebox and other cave formations, so it's a very delicate ecosystem there. So that's about all I have to say. I don't think anything's complete out there, but from our perspective try to make it as far back as you can from the creek. Thank you.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you. Other comments? I thought we were resting, but.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: My name is Max (inaudible). I'm the president of Gans Creek Homeowner's Association. And, of course, we are as an association all concerned about development close to this quiet neighborhood and concerned about having quick access to Highway 63. The fact that (inaudible) Roadway does involve a ramp up, which may be superior, but there are an awful lot of gasoline tanker trucks that move through this area. So from my point, that should be some consideration and also just in the neighborhood there is some concern on part of the homeowners of moving through potentially a development area with our major collector street. So, we are very interested in how this comes together and the decisions of the roadway as well as the future positions of this. Thank you.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you. Are there any other public comments?

MR. SANDER: Good afternoon. Chris Sander with McClure. Our office is at 1901 Pennsylvania Avenue.

COURT REPORTER: Could you please speak up? I'm sorry.

MR. SANDER: Chris Sander with McClure and our office is at 1901 Pennsylvania. I'm here on behalf of the owners of the property, the applicants for the roadway change. And largely this is the next step in the process that was begun many years ago with the design of the overpass and the construction of, you know, moving and creating Discovery Parkway. The intersection location where Endeavor stubs in where we're looking to realign the major

roadway was built with the overpass part of the joint lead cooperative between MoDOT and the city and the county. It's built out with plenty of room for lanes, signalizations, the light bases and stuff are there, the turns lanes, in anticipation of trying to get ahead of the development so that the roads were in place and made available. So, the designation of this road should have been taken care of at that point and we're just falling behind and we're kind of - we're behind in asking that it be done now with the development of other property is closer at hand but the traffic engineering and such has really identified that this is the proper location for a major intersection and we just need to pull back away from the offramps and I believe the sign as it's been laid out with the overpass is once the traffic picks up to a high enough level that Ponderosa where it intersects now will be converted into right-in/right-out access only. So, traffic moving north on Ponderosa from the south would not be able to turn left to go east - I'm sorry - west. Which then, you know, causes traffic to divert somewhere else creating quite a mess.

One other thing - I think a perfect example of roadways shown that are not planned in your conversation would be Phillips Farm Road that's up here on the screen right now. It comes from the roundabout across the park. And if looking at the roadway plan, if you zoom out a little bit further, it goes all the way across to State Farm Parkway. That roundabout is sort of floating out there by itself. It's a very similar situation where we're just realigning to the infrastructure to make it a safe passage of intersection. I'll try to answer any question you have for me.

MR. MATTHES: I've got a couple.

MR. SANDER: Okay.

MR. MATTHES: I'm not an engineer so, can we see the map of the - it's called the - I'm looking at it on my - of the actual - yes. Thank you. So that stub up there that's already on Ponderosa coming in, is there an engineering reason to not just connect with that?

MR. SANDER: That stub?

MR. MATTHES: It's like a cut off driveway. You've just got the satellite view.

MS. SANDER: Yeah. Okay. I understand.

MR. NICHOLS: It was part of the initial development.

MR. SANDER: Well, so the presence of the truck traffic coming from the tank, you know, there's quite a few tankers that come through there as somebody mentioned. Where that driveway is stubbed in there, it's more of a - it's a 90-degree driveway approach to the road and so to have enough room for a smooth transitioning back into the signal and to come perpendicular to the parkway that's not an ideal location for it, for the connection to be made.

MR. MATTHES: It's too hard to turn big trucks on a 90 degree. Okay. So that's why we would pull south of that already existing east (inaudible). Any other questions?

MR. SANDER: All right. Thank you.

MR. MATTHES: Other public comments? All right seeing none, I'll call the public hearing portion -

MR. NICHOLS: I have a question. Even if CATSO didn't recognize this as the alignment the developer could still be able to collect around this location?

MR. SKOV: Yes.

MR. NICHOLS: It's just a designation from a CATSO perspective, not from a developer perspective?

MR. SKOV: Correct.

MR. MATTHES: Ultimately, it's a recognition that at some point in the future we would expect more traffic on this side than on Ponderosa.

MR. SKOV: Yes, that would be preferable given the location of the intersection.

MR. MATTHES: And because it's not developed yet we can make it a standard that will be able to handle traffic better than the current one?

MR. SKOV: Right. It's going to be built to a collector standard. That's what they show on the initial submission of the PD plan for Discovery Park South.

MR. MATTHES: What's your - you two can read the team leads better than anyone.

When do you think - when will this happen? What's the likelihood that -

MR. SKOV: Well, we don't know for sure. Mr. Smith is here, but - he's

handling the case for the city. I don't know if he wants to speak to this or not. I believe it tentatively scheduled for September 6th P and Z meeting at this point.

MR. SMITH: Yes. We publish for the public hearing on September 6th at this point and more than likely at that - that schedule would be at council for a final decision on their October 2nd meeting that's pending those types of schedules. It there's delays, it could be pushed back but that's kind of our tentative schedule for those types of meetings.

MR. MATTHES: Can you identify yourself.

MR. SMITH: Yes. Clint Smith, planning department.

MR. MATTHES: Thanks. And what I really meant was, partly is handling the traffic flow.

When do we expect an increase in traffic?

MS. SKOV: Well, the traffic study that was done for intersection had a 2030, I believe, the ultimate phase out of the for the development. But that's pretty difficult to - that would just be the guess on my part.

MR. MATTHES: Well, I was trying to give the neighbors some information on the time period. You know, the time period where we would be looking at restricting right-in/right-out on Ponderosa is a pretty good number of years.

MR. SKOV: It's, again, I would just be making an educated guess and it's really difficult to say. Who knows if - I'm not even going to give any suggestion about what happens or will happen to Ponderosa. But certainly, if the intersection were ultimately open as was discussed you'd want to restrict Ponderosa as a right-in/right-out from a safety perspective. I mean, this is to control the left turns is a very important safety aspect, and that's something that the intersection, the new intersection, would do once it's fully finalized.

MR. MATTHES: And, again, that's really not part of this process.

MR. SKOV: No.

MR. MATTHES: We would just refer to a classification change is all; is that right?

MR. SMITH: As far as a right-in/right-out restriction. There's been some conversation in the context of when the light is activated that that would be part of the conversation at that point. So maybe, it may not be that far down the road. But I think that is part of the conversation that once I get that signal at Endeavor and Discovery is activated which could take place kind of in the context of this plan.

MR. MATTHES: Is it all right with the committee if we reopen the public hearing? Does that work for everyone?

MR. RODGERS: I'm sorry. I thought it was still open.

MR. MATTHES: We had closed it, but go ahead. It's fine.

MR. RODGES: Alan Rodgers from Bluff Pointe Drive. Are you saying that in this

proposal that if a person is turning south on Highway 63 and you get off at the exit that you would not be able to turn left onto Ponderosa Drive?

MR. MATTHES: It's going to be right-in/right-out once this is connected, is the

question. You'll have to go into the full intersection.

MR. SKOV: That was my understanding. I don't know.

MR. RODGERS: So, would that be an advantage to all the people that live south, not

only on Gans Creek, but on south towards the tank farm there's a lot of houses, duplexes, church. All those people will have to continue all the way over to the proposed intersection, loop around and then then cross the bridge to get home or will you have to go down to some other exit down to who knows where?

MR. MATTHES: I think if you travel just a little further west.

MR. RODGERS: I'm sorry.

MR. MATTHES: I think it just shows that you have to travel just a little further west

before you can go south and that left turn would be added at a signalized intersection versus a non-signalized currently.

MR. NICHOLS: The benefit is that it's safer, but it is more distance to travel.

MR. RODGERS: So, have there been a lot of accidents there at that point?

MR. MATTHES: I think the concern is that there will be. The development hasn't

occurred yet, which once it does, I don't know what would trigger the signal there at Endeavor. I don't know if the volume of traffic will indicate where that signal will be warranted or not.

MR. SKOV: I can't recall at what point in the phasing of development that would happen.

MR. MATTHES: Maybe if (inaudible) came in. I didn't know. CPT did a study, didn't they?

MR. SKOV:(Inaudible).

MR. MATTHES: So, there is at a some point a trigger that signalizes there at Endeavor?

MR. SKOV: I don't remember at what point. I don't remember seeing that.

MR. RODGERS: Will the road realignment facilitate development? Is that the point?

MR. MATTHES: I think it's more of a response to development.

MR. RODGERS: A response to development. Well, what's part of the

development
plan?

MR. MATTHES: Well, I know there's quite a bit north of there.

MR. NICHOLS: Pretty good size tracts, but I don't know if anything's
been brought in. MR. MATTHES: And this is a specific plan that's
coming to P and Z in September.

There's got to be a fix somewhere there.

MR. NICHOLS: A fix there with Ponderosa, I don't know if we've seen
that there yet at

this point.

MR. RODGERS: Sounds like it's going to be something more favorable
to the

development than to the residents that live south on that intersection. Thank
you.

MR. MATTHES: Any questions? Thanks.

MS. CHRISTIAN: I just want to make a Staff clarification. Any decision
that gets made

today won't - won't decide whether or not these developments take place. This
is just a decision - just so everyone in the audience and the board understands,
this is a just a decision that if the roadway goes in that you acknowledge it on
our map and we've classified correctly. But in the end, any decision made
today isn't going to impact whether or not these developments get built or
whether or not even the road gets built necessarily.

MR. MATTHES: Thanks for that. It sums up everything we were saying
in much more

succinct way. All right. Any other questions by any other committees? Is there
a motion then to adopt this proposal?

MR. NICHOLS: Yeah, I'll make a motion.

MR. MATTHES: Is there second?

MR. SILVESTER: I'll second it.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you. All in favor, please say yes.

(Unanimous voice vote of approval.)

MR. MATTHES: Opposed, say no.

(No speakers.)

MR. MATTHES: Thank you all.

VIII. BUSINESS LOOP 70 CORRIDOR PLAN PRESENTATION

MR. MATTHES: All right. That brings us to what is not a public hearing,
but we're here

to take up a presentation from the Business Loop 70 Corridor Plan. Welcome.

MR. ROARK-GRUENDER: Thank you. My name's James

Roark-Gruender. I am the vice

chair of the Business Loop CID and I have the pleasure of being the chair of the
planning committee for the Corridor Plan. On behalf of the Corridor, I want to
thank you for allow us to present this to you.

If you're not familiar with the Business Loop CID it does run from the West Boulevard roundabout all the way down to College Avenue. Any business or property that touches the Business Loop is part of it. It's about 90 business and 160 properties.

MS. CHRISTIAN: I have to do it for you.

MR. ROARK-GRUENDER: Thanks. The public process, how do we reach the public. So many people contributed new ideas as possible. We had six public meetings and ten planning committee meetings. We did online surveys, email notifications. Me and Carrie, our executive director, actually walked the Loop twice and invited everybody who not only worked with for the businesses but the business owners to our meetings. We're very proud of our very first meeting. We had 95 people show up at our meeting. Which is, as you guys well know, you all hold meetings all the time, that's a pretty good public interest for our first meeting.

Things they wanted to see: Beautification, infrastructure, transportation. By transportation we mean by all modes of transportation, walking, biking, and car. It's not just cars. Business attraction, job creation, public safety, they want new development, especially restaurants and places to do things at night. And then marketing and all that other fun stuff is after that.

After a nationwide search - we actually had people all the way from Portland, Oregon come in and give us a presentation. We chose our (inaudible), which most of the people in this room are familiar with, and that is also one of the reasons we chose them is we wanted somebody familiar with MoDOT, familiar with city. Our tourist at the college meeting, which I think turned out to be really nice and actually fits with the character of the street. We also partnered with Energy Services and Surveys, the CPT who's doing the transportation study, and we also partnered with MoDOT to extend their traffic studies that they were doing which is part of the new common road extension or as I like to call it the business road extension, which is also the Business Loop all the way out to the light.

So, the public process is we wanted to get people's opinion so we held town hall meetings. We actually came from the - we had the meetings with our - the committee meetings and then we took that information to the public. We listened to them, took it back and revised it and then went back to the public again with what we found. As I said, this is a planning committee meeting. The planning committee, we actually had many requests from other people. We had people like Trent Brooks from the Missouri Department of Transportation, Cris Burnam with Parkade Plaza who has developments all over not only the United States, but the world. So we got feedback from him. We had business owners. We had Paul Land with Plaza Commercial Realty. We had council members. We had really good representation of everybody including Staff from the city. I do want to make sure everybody in the room realizes that even though these people from MoDOT and the City were on a planning committee, they were not there speaking on behalf of the City or the people that represent the City. Just kind of giving us some guideline and

saying, Yeah, you know, MoDOT would be okay with this. As far as I know the City would do - or you know, you're completely off base, you can't build that. Because in the end, what we wanted was a doable plan that we could actually present to the public and make happen. We didn't want to present, you know, something that was not going to be able to happen.

Feel free to interrupt and ask questions.

So key projects. How can we take advantage of projects that are already being done and capitalize not only on our partner's money but our money as well? Believe it or not, and you guys probably will because you're in transportation, we can actually make two lanes of traffic on the Business Loop, a dedicated bike lane, a center-turn lane, a buffer, a buffer to be determined, something to make sure that the cars can identify when they're going into a bike lane, all within the existing surface without bulldozing the road, without doing anything all within the existing surface.

The reason that's possible is back when Highway 40 was built the roads were very much wider than what they needed to be. So we narrow the roads. And also, when you narrow the roads, you slow the traffic down, which makes it safer for pedestrians, which makes it safer for bikers. So, you're not only - and if you do some other improvements to the road you can actually get through the Business Loop quicker at a slower much safer rate.

So MoDOT's going to be doing restriping. They do it about every seven years. I believe it's three to four years' time line, and when they do that we can partner with them on this and basically, it's paint. You already, you know, mow it down and get the nice clean surface and then it's just partnering with them on that. So, this is a very doable project within the next four years.

Rangeline intersection with a new common road extension opening up, MoDOT has identified this as a trouble spot, if you want to say. It is already congested. My business happens to be at this intersection and it is more and more congested every day. I noticed this morning that the common road is (inaudible) coming onto the Business Loop. So, it will be interesting to see what that traffic brings to it. My understanding is that this intersection is already at capacity. It's also not a very attractive intersection. And people don't realize that four of the five or six - five of the six exits coming into Columbia pass through the Business Loop. So, the Business Loop is what the majority of the people coming into our city see. And I don't think anybody in this room believes that what they see on the Business Loop right now is what represents the City of Columbia, and we want to change that. We want to beautify and make it something that the City can be proud of and when you come in it actually represents the city that we love.

So, with a little bit of work - we have in our plan - we have a diagram that marks out the roundabout. We have dedicated turn lanes. What we want to do is work with MoDOT and the other partners, work with the business owners and make it a useable, walkable, bikeable street that will also work for the businesses on the street. We do have a lot of medians on the Business Loop. We've been told by our friends at MoDOT those must stay because of

safety issues. So, you've got people who want to make U-turns. Right now, U-turns are illegal on the Business Loop. So, you have people who ritually drive down the wrong side of the road to bypass the medians. You have people who drive through parking lots to bypass the medians. This is very unsafe. It's unsafe for driving and it's also unsafe for people walking. And I will tell you there's a lot of people who walk around the Business Loop.

This is where the City could help us. The City undergrounding -- there's actually undergrounding from West Boulevard to Providence, and if you look that direction you can clearly see the difference in the appearance of it. Also, when you underground, it gives you an opportunity to do sidewalks. We wouldn't want to come in and do sidewalks and then the City come in and underground and tear out what we've already done. Like I said, we want to partner with people that's doing things already and utilize all of our money to the best of our ability, because none of us have a whole lot.

Threshold projects. What is that we do now to create public spaces and get an interest back into the business? One of the things that we have fully re-budget for is a popup festival lot. Next to Dave Grigg's Flooring America, Boone Electric owns a lot. We plan on putting a festival popup there. What I mean is we put turf down. We'll put a stage up. We'll have a place for food trucks. People will be able to come out and enjoy themselves. Have a lunch, have, you know, (inaudible) Beverage has already contacted us and want to throw events there. It's a place for the people to get out and enjoy themselves. It's also good for other businesses. You say you cannot have - nobody would want to have - open a restaurant on the Business Loop. I would say just call (inaudible). Everybody eats there. Sometimes there's actually a two-hour wait. People want this, we just need to show them more examples of that spot.

The City's bike boulevard is almost completed or completed. It's getting close. It's coming out right at Madison. What we want to do is enhance that and put in a little bike repair shop. Have a little compressor, a place where people can work on their bikes similar to what they did down on Katy Trail once again capitalizing and improving and partnering with stuff that people have already done.

Traffic art boxes. We don't have a lot of traffic art - a lot of traffic boxes on the Business Loop, but we have zero art on the Business Loop. So, we can work with our existing associations and create traffic box art. We can also turn that into (inaudible) transformer boxes that we can take to the city program and do that with those as well.

Long-term projects. So, what can we do - what do we need to decide to look at now for the future. Regional stormwater. We want to rethink the way stormwater's done. Right now, stormwater's done on a parcel by parcel basis. The Business Loop has 163, I believe, parcels. Some of them very strong, which means some of them are exempted from stormwater. But that stormwater still has to go somewhere. So, if you treated it as a regional - as a corridor-wide plan, you can capitalize on investment and where these detention basins are, we just wanted to mock up to make sure that it was

actually a feasible plan. We're not proposing putting this on private property. Once again, we want to make sure that what we were putting out there was actually doable.

Do you have a question?

MR. NICHOLS: No, I'm collecting my thoughts. No question.

MR. ROARK-GRUENDER: That is probably our most ambitious and that is the one that we would really have to work with the City on as well.

Smart development - we're actually kind of laughing that we don't have a whole lot of empty buildings, but we do have a lot of large parking lots and vacant lots that are mostly being utilized by car lots - not car lots, but just empty lots for parking. We also have the building behind there, the Ellis Fischel, which is going to be 30 acres that will soon be up for sale that the University wants to do something with that. But we need to do smart development. We need to utilize - well, we're actually very lucky to just get a grant to work with Smart American to do some technical things. With the new UTC we can actually do small scale manufacturing with the retail in the front of it. The Business Loop is already doing that. There's already manufacturers. We just found out there's a business right off the Business Loop manufacturing electronic components. So, let's utilize that and capitalize that.

If we do all this stuff, this is what the Business Loop could look like. This is actually a mockup in front of Hickman of a little garden that we could do there to use as a teaching example as well. But that's a walkable, drivable street. That is something the City of Columbia could be proud of instead of the way it is now.

Immediate priorities are that we would like the city council to approve our corridor plan and one of the ways that can happen is to present it here with you guys and getting you on board. We'd like to ask for the City to do the undergrounding and accelerate the undergrounding of the powerlines from Providence to College. We would like to coordinate with MoDOT when they do the restriping and we also need to be in the future conversations with MoDOT for the planning for the Rangeline intersection. But like I said earlier, we have been - Trent and all them have been on our committee so they have - none of this is new to them. They've also gotten what the business owners concerns are with the different types of options at that intersection. So, we've actually gotten a lot of the layout from MoDOT on that. We've had a lot of feedback from the public as well.

So, all of our information is actually on our website. And I'm also very proud to say all of our financial are on our website, our P&L is on our website. We are a very transparent organization. We want to be very upfront and honest. The money in our bank account is not ours. It is the people who spend the money on the Business Loop, it's the property owners and the Business Loop, so we take that very seriously. So, I would like to answer your questions and if I can't answer them, Dave or Carrie could probably do a great job of it.

MR. MATTHES: Any questions?

MR. NICHOLS: Yeah. I have one. Some of the initial planning where

they have roundabouts at the side streets, is that still in your long-range plan? Like, at Garth and different locations are supposed to have roundabouts?

MR. ROARK-GRUENDER: Yes. Those are options in the plan. What we found was, if you build a roundabout somewhere people might like the roundabout, but when they see it, they don't understand necessarily the conceptual part of it. So, like, this is on my property five feet. Where is this line and where is that line? So, what we found is that we were getting so bogged down into somebody believing that it was going to be in that exact location instead of looking at it as a concept plan. So those are still in there, but we've also looked at getting a right-hand turn lane and a dedicated turn lanes. And believe it or not from our experience the roundabout actually is less intrusive of property owners than right-hand turn lane and left-hand turn - dedicated turn lanes. But those are still all -

MR. NICHOLS: They're on there. I was going to say that with medians, you know, you can do a lot of access management and then change direction and go the other way, so I just wasn't sure if it was still in the long-range plan.

MR. ROARK-GRUENDER: It's one of the options that we believe should be looked at.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: They're indicated, Mr. Nichols, as traffic improvements need to be done here.

MR. NICHOLS: And what will dictate that? A future traffic study? Is that something

MR. ROARK-GRUENDER: When it comes down to it, it's a MoDOT road and MoDOT will determine what happens to a median and we'll have that conversation.

MR. NICHOLS: Well, we support it standing as a MoDOT road, yes.

MS. GARTNER: MoDOT's just completing their traffic study and it needs to be still updated with more data on that.

PUBLIC SPEAKER: Sorry guys. I have to go to my next meeting.

MR. ROARK-GRUENDER: I would say that there was a lot more people who preferred the roundabout than did not prefer the roundabout. But it got - with property owners they - they got a little contentious because they didn't see, you know, with the roundabout you can move it and adjust it. And it just got a little complicated.

MR. TEDDY: This is getting down into details a little bit, but when you talk about the short-term fix of narrowing the travel lanes to 10 feet or so to accommodate new bike lanes, did you get into much of a design discussion about how to handle those bikeways as they cross intersections, because that's where you're going to have right turns overlapping.

MR. ROARK-GRUENDER: We got into that and we also looked at curb cuts. I forget how many, it was 190 -

MS. GARTNER: Yeah. It's not just the interference of the intersections which is common for bike lanes. It's interference with the fact that we've got probably ten times the amount of driveways on that road than a normal road would have. That's why -

MR. ROARK-GRUENDER: Dave Grigg's place has three of them. One of the goes right into his building.

MS. GARTNER: Right into his building. That's why we didn't do a protected bike lane. It just was absolutely not feasible with all the curb cuts. So, we have the conceptual plan for this bike lane. When it comes down to it every project on this will have to undergo whether it's intersection improvements, perhaps roundabouts, perhaps not. How we do the bike lanes. Each project will undergo a specific engineering discussions. So, these aren't the detailed engineering designs at this point, just conceptual.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah, but it sounds like everyone's aware of that.

MR. ROARK-GRUENDER: Yes, yes, absolutely.

MR. GARTNER: Yes.

MR. ROARK-GRUENDER: And one of the things we found looking back is the curb cuts which was actually more of a challenge because we have found that a lot of people don't get off those curb cuts even if they're not using them because they may use them in the future and they feel it is an asset to the zone. That's actually been more of a challenge in my opinion than the intersections.

MR. NICHOLS: Will there need to be some engineering to bury the lines and put those sidewalks in as you're proposing just so they're not going to be in the way or torn out later with future development or future widening or planning or whatever?

MR. ROARK-GRUENDER: We were going to just (inaudible) reference off of the City when they do their - just like what happened originally at West Boulevard and Providence. When the City underground that's when the -

MR. NICHOLS: So, there wouldn't be any future development in that that would then force that underground to be relocated at a future date or anything like that?

MR. GARTNER: So, if this is approved by city council it will - and you know this. I'm telling you something you know. This becomes part of the parcel of what you take into account. So we've worked with Water and Light on that. I know that the property owners worked with Water and Light to coordinate developments and I think happened with True Media, for instance, when they were doing their development they kind of encouraged Water and Light to do undergrounding in conjunction with the development. So we would work with any new developments. I don't know how many new developments are being planned at the moment. Once it gets closer to undergrounding we'll have a better sense.

MR. NICHOLS: Okay. So you'll have that with - so that once it's underground it's going to stay there no matter what future -

MS. GARTNER: Yeah, that's our intent. You know, get that line away. Get it under. Get the sidewalk in and we'll go from there.

MR. ROARK-GRUENDER: And one of the challenges of where the sidewalk is now, is some places have wide - wide right-away, some places have absolutely no right-away. So, we will have to work with property owners

to work with them to build the sidewalks. Any other questions?

MR. MATTHES: I will just say that you've all done an excellent job. This is a great plan and we look forward with partnering.

MR. ROARK-GRUENDER: It's a very exciting time. There's a lot of energy and a lot of, you know, people that are looking into business, looking in different directions and I think, you know, with our Smart Growth grant that we just got, it just shows that, you know, I'm very proud to be part of excellent working group.

Loop Corridor Plan

Attachments: [Loop-Corridor-Plan](#)

IX. BRIDGE, PAVEMENT, AND SYSTEM PERFORMANCE MEASURES

MR. MATTHES: So this is not an action on our part. So let's - I see our time is running so let's move to the Bridge, Pavement, and System Performance Measures items, which I think it is an action.

MS. CHRISTIAN: My apologies the meeting is running over. I'll try to move this quickly. The federal Map-21 legislation established, and the Fast Act continues a performance-based approach to transportation projects. Seven national performance goals were established for the Federal-Aid Highway Program, and in some of these fifteen performance measures were developed for states, Metropolitan Planning Organizations, like ourselves, transit assets and transit agencies, which are all required to set goals and monitor progress.

Right now, CATSO must decide to adopt Bridge and Pavement, known as the PM2 Performance Measures and System Performance PM3 Measures. We can decide to support the four-year targets that have been established by MoDOT or we can decide to establish our own quantifiable targets by November 16th.

These are the Bridge and Pavement targets. You'll see there on the left side of the MoDOT 2022 Targets, and then you'll also see what our current conditions are. These are taken from 2016 numbers. In general, we are actually doing better than most of the targets so it wouldn't be - and really in the end, whatever targets we support, they're not going to have a huge impact on CATSO specifically. I mean, MoDOT funding decisions, you know, will get made based on these targets. But as a MPO, you know, what we support isn't going to really - it won't have a negative impact on us if we don't meet those targets. So, this is just sort of for your information to see what those targets are and to see how we measure up currently.

You see here that we're looking at bridges that are in poor condition and good condition. And, of course, our interstate pavement conditions and some non-interstate pavement.

I will move forward when you're ready.

And this is our system performance measures. We don't currently have

this for the CATSO area, but we do have what the state targets are. Here, MoDOT has used a couple of different ways of expressing these targets for interstate and non-interstate travel time reliability. We are looking at some of the ratio of the longer travel times. Some at 80th percentile and above to those normal travel times at 50th percentile. And the targets basically are an expression of what we want that and need travel time to be in relation to that longer travel time. So when you have an 87.1 percent target, what you're saying is, you know, you want that normal travel time to only - to be at 87 percent or greater of the time of the longer travel time is. Basically, you don't want to see a 13 percent differential between those two different times.

For freight reliability, same concept, but for whatever reason they chose a ratio versus a percentage. So here they're basically saying you don't want that highest travel time to be greater than 1.3 times the median travel time. Basically, just keeping those really long travel times low enough that they're still - that folks are able to - to utilize them.

I spent a lot of time talking about this with Tim to really try to get you guys a nice concise definition because I did find it slightly confusing, but hopefully that makes sense.

So, basically, we need to decide if we want to support these. Our Staff Committee reviewed and they do vote to support MoDOT's targets and so now you can decide if you think that CATSO should support there or, of course, if you want to direct Staff to establish our own targets, we can work on that.

MR. MATTHES: I believe that frankly MoDOT does a good job on this. So if we have a motion.

MR. NICHOLS: I'll second that.

MR. MATTHES: Hearing no outcry, is there a motion to adopt the MoDOT targets?

MR. NICHOLS: I move that we do.

MR. MATTHES: Second?

MR. TEDDY: Second.

MR. MATTHES: All in favor, please say yes.

(Unanimous voice vote of approval.)

MR. MATTHES: Opposed, say no.

(No speakers.)

MR. MATTHES: Thank you all.

Bridge, Pavement, and System Performance Measures

Attachments: [Staff Memo, Item 9, CATSO Bridge, Pavement and System Performance Measures](#)

X. DRAFT 2050 LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP) EMPLOYMENT PROJECTIONS

MR. MATTHES: Okay. Next item is the Draft 2050 Long-range Transportation Plan

(LRTP) Employment Projections.

MR. SKOV: This is just an information item, Mr. Chairman. It's not an action item

per se. I just wanted you to be aware of the fact that we've got these in the mill for the Long-Range Transportation Plan update, which will be 2050. It will be our ultimate year or end of the scope period.

Specifically, there's some different projection rates, annual growth rates shown there for employment. For the City the CATSO Metro Plan - Metropolitan Plan area itself and for Boone County as a whole. The consensus, the Tech Committee that reviewed this August 1st was that the 1.3 percent annual growth rate was appropriate and desirable. There was some suggest to go lower than that, but they wanted to keep it at 1.3 percent minimum. And as far as the base of the employment here the source is sort of a combination, an adjusted total based upon a community survey data from the US Census Bureau and from the Post City Directories Database. Again, we think that 1.3 percent is certainly reasonable. It could be that things were lower than that, but we - at this point we're going to presume that 1.3 percent is the annual growth rate.

And then this is just a breakdown by sector, which is, again, maybe more than you want to know but just as an FYI. Again, we don't need your - any action here. It was just something I wanted you to be aware of and the Tech Committee, again, has 1.3 percent as the appropriate growth rate for employment.

MR. MATTHES: And that's based on what we've actually seen?

MR. SKOV: Correct.

MS. CHRISTIAN: And it is slightly higher than the national predictions. But I think it should be - my argument is that it needs to be a little bit higher than the 1.1 the US Bureau of Labor is predicting for nationwide growth rate.

MR. MATTHES: Okay. Very good. Thank you very much. Any questions?

CATSO LRTP Employment Projections

Attachments: [CATSO-County-MPA Emp Projections 2050](#)
[Item 10 CATSO 8-23-18](#)

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

MR. MATTHES: Okay. Next item is other business. Is there any other business?

MR. SKOV: Yes, we do have the annual CATSO Self-Certification Statement. We'd like you to consider. We have a copy of it here. It's something that is included in the appendixes of the TID, but we typically adopt it separately. This isn't anything that's an action item, but that is we're here as the rule submit a signed version of a Self-Certification Statement. It basically certifies the CATSO Transportation Planning Process is done in accordance with

federal rules as described and we're requesting that you give it a formal approval. And upon approval it would be signed by you, Mr. Matthes and by Mr. Silvester, as representatives of CATSO and Central District being a District Engineer.

MR. MATTHES: Do you happen to have that with you?

Can I have a motion to approve that?

MR. NICHOLS: I'll move to approve it.

MR. MATTHES: Second?

MR. SILVESTER: Second.

MR. MATTHES: All in favor, please say yes.

(Unanimous voice vote of approval.)

MR. MATTHES: Opposed, say no.

(No speakers.)

MR. MATTHES: Excellent.

MR. SKOV: Thank you.

XII. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

MR. MATTHES: We do have some reserve time for general comments by the public members and staff so we'll start with the public, any general public comments from anyone?

Nobody's jumping up, so thank you for that. Any comments by the members of the committee? Staff, any summary statements? Okay. Do we have a next meeting?

XIII. NEXT MEETING DATE

MS. CHRISTIAN: Thursday December 6th at 2:30 p.m. in council chambers.

XIV. ADJOURNMENT

MR. MATTHES: All right. Thank you so much. I declare us adjourned.

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-CITY (573-874-2489) or email CITY@CoMo.gov. In order to assist staff in making the appropriate arrangements for your accommodation, please make your request as far in advance of the posted meeting date as possible.