

MINUTES
COLUMBIA AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY ORGANIZATION
COORDINATING COMMITTEE
May 26th, 2016

MEMBERS PRESENT

Pat Zenner (for Tim Teddy)	City of Columbia – Community Development
Thad Yonke (for Dan Atwill)	Boone County Planning
Travis Koestner (for David Silvester)	MoDOT Central District
Barbara Buffaloe (for Mike Matthes)	City Manager’s Office
David Nichols	City of Columbia – Public Works
Kyle LePage (for Michelle Teel)	MoDOT – Multimodal

MEMBERS ABSENT

Mike Henderson	MoDOT Central Office
Derin Campbell	Boone County Public Works
Brian Treece	Mayor, City of Columbia

ALSO PRESENT

Mitch Skov	City of Columbia – Planning/CATSO staff
Leah Christian	City of Columbia – Planning/CATSO staff

I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. ZENNER: Good afternoon. I’m going to call the CATSO Coordinating Committee meeting on May 26, 2016, to order. I am Pat Zenner, I’m the Development Services Manager for the City and I am filling in for Tim Teddy, who is out today, ill. I’ve called our meeting to order.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MR. ZENNER: Any introductions, and I guess we will start down here along this end with Mr. Yonke.

MR. YONKE: Thad Yonke, I am here for Commissioner Atwill or Derin Campbell, the Chief Engineer for Boone County.

MR. KOESTNER: Travis Koestner, here for the Missouri Department of Transportation.

MR. NICHOLS: Dave Nichols, Columbia Public Works.

MS. BUFFALOE: Barbara Buffaloe, here for City Manager Mike Matthes.

MR. LEPAGE: Kyle LePage, MoDOT, Multimodal.

III. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. ZENNER: And moving on in the agenda, review and approval of the agenda contents. Are

there any changes or any additions to the agenda? Seeing none we will then move on to the review and the approval of the February 26th, 2016, meeting minutes. Do I have a motion?

IV. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF FEBRUARY 26TH MEETING MINUTES

MR. YONKE: There are a couple of corrections that I noticed. On page 4, it appears to indicate that it misspelled Ian Thomas' name. It says Ion Thomas if I remember correctly, I-O. And then on page 13 and 14, they are a number of things that are attributed to me that I believe Mr. Henderson actually said. With those corrections, I would move to approve the minutes. Do we have a second?

MR. KOESTNER: Second.

MR. ZENNER: All those in favor say aye?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

MR. ZENNER: All right. We have one public hearing item on today's agenda and this is a potential amendment to the CATSO Major Roadway Plan, the addition of Smith Drive as a collector street extension. Do we have a staff report?

MR. SKOV: Yes, Mr. Chairman. This is something that has been discussed on a number of occasions previously, but just to start out with I am going to have a map of the Major Roadway plan for this area up there, as you can see it on your screen. We do have a crossing or a future extension of Broadway shown crossing Perche Creek and connecting to Route UU, which would ultimately provide a connectional route to the Midway area and I-70. This proposal is for an addition of a Smith Drive extension. Smith Drive currently terminates here, at least on the Major Roadway Plan it does, here at Louisville Drive, it's a neighborhood collector street. The extensions proposed would extend west into the flood plain and connect to Broadway on the south and east sides of the creek. This is just a different map; it's kind of zoomed out from the previous version. It shows Perche Creek pretty clearly here and again this is the Broadway extension, which is currently on the Major Roadway Plan. Smith is currently here, the extension would be here. I'll just talk about it briefly. This first came to light as an issue because of the fact that there has been an annexation submitted to the City, an annexation request, and an accompanying -- being preliminary plat proposal for a single-family residential subdivision that was submitted to the City in October, 2015. It's a 91-acre tract, which just happens to be at the terminus of the existing Smith Drive. This is called the Breckenridge Park subdivision. There was some discussion initially by City staff of potentially aligning Smith Drive extension on that plat to allow for a future extension west across Perche Creek, also to Route UU, which hypothetically could potentially replace the future Broadway extension. Just as an update, at this time the annexation request has been withdrawn so the preliminary plat is in limbo. Of course, that request could be resubmitted at any time, and we anticipate that happening. Some brief background, the future, the major Broadway -- the major arterial extension of Broadway, which is now included on the Roadway Plan, has always been justified by the desire and the need for another crossing of Perche Creek, between the existing bridges on I-70 and Gillespie Bridge Road. I'll go back to the map just briefly there. I-70 crosses Perche Creek here and then the next

crossing south is Gillespie Bridge Road here and it is just over two and half miles between those crossings. For a variety of perspectives, it's been thought that it would be optimal to have a third crossing of Perche Creek for both traffic flow and for emergency vehicles access et cetera. Tech committee has discussed the possibility of a Smith Drive extension on -- at more than one meeting. Certainly, a Smith Drive extension across the creek to Route UU to make that crossing of Perche Creek would be shorter. It would certainly be less costly than a Broadway extension, but the Tech Committee's consensus was that the Broadway extension, major arterial street, should stay on the Roadway Plan. There was again major discussion on the Smith Drive extension options at the February 3rd Tech Committee meeting. The ultimate consensus was that the Smith Drive extension was acceptable as long as the Broadway extension major arterial would remain. It was presumed, of course, that only one of those future extensions would cross the creek and the Broadway extension remains then that is the one we will continue to show as being the Perche Creek crossing. The committee did pass a motion at that February meeting to recommend -- according -- committee consider approval of the addition of the Smith Drive extension and also will be added as a so called illustrative project in the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan. Currently we do have the Broadway extension in there in that same category. The initial drawing, the conceptual drawing, we had for a Smith Drive extension did show it as a substitute for Broadway, as a concept. But as a response to the consensus of the Tech Committee and their discussion and their recommendation, there was a revised conceptual alignment provided, which I will go to momentarily. This is a shot of that, an up close shot, Smith Drive is here, extending from, it currently terminates right here at Louisville and then it transitions into a private residential driveway, but the extension would basically come west and northwest to connect to the future Broadway extension in the flood plains south and east of Perche Creek. Again, the Broadway future alignment remains on the map as is. This is just another view of that same extension as it would look on the existing Major Roadway Plan map, which is again; the Major Roadway Plan is a component of the Long Range Transportation Plan. Just for the sake of objectivity, I have listed some cons, pros and cons of the Smith Drive extension as it is being proposed. As far as the disadvantages, I'll go through those first, there is some difficulty in justifying it from a financial perspective since there is no funding that has been identified to implement it and related to that we don't have an accurate project cost estimate for such an extension given that there hasn't been enough of an engineering study done to determine that. And again I have already mentioned it's addition to the 2040 Long Range Transportation Plan project list would also be as an illustrative project. As the name implies that's to illustrate that staff and/or the CATSO committee see that this project as being an important one but it does go against the strict fiscal constraint requirement of the Long Range Transportation Plan. That being that whatever revenue we project over the scope of the plan period has to be enough to cover the listing of projects that we include. Again, these are sort of an exception project, but it would not be part of a fiscal constraint project listing. Certainly, there are significant environmental impacts and topographic barriers, descending bluff, and crossing the Perche Creek flood plain, and ascending the bluff on the other side of the Perche Creek flood plain. Certainly the Broadway extension

is currently not shown in the City of Columbia CIP, the Capitals Improvement Program, nor is it shown in the work programs of Boone County or MoDOT. I don't even believe it is in the ten-plus-year project given the funding issues there. Another potential disadvantage is it is not being proposed to replace the Broadway extension, so it's utility as a roadway would be reduced by sending it into the flood plain but not actually crossing the creek as opposed to it being a replacement. Pros, such an extension would provide some increased public access and collector street connectivity within this part of Columbia, which is still developing. Again, the potential Breckenridge Park subdivision would be one of those residential subdivisions. Another advantage is if the Broadway extension were constructed, a potential Smith Drive extension as shown and proposed would give the residential neighborhoods in that vicinity another link to access the Perche Creek crossing of Broadway without actually having to get out onto Scott Boulevard to do so. I think probably maybe the biggest advantage or pro of this amendment proposal is that it would provide some flexibility to possibly use it as an alternative to the Perche Creek crossing to Broadway should future conditions merit this change if Broadway was seen as being practical and buildable. Smith could come back into play as a potential substitute for that. As far as suggested committee action, we don't -- Staff doesn't have a formal recommendation for this proposal. Again, I will just reiterate there might be some further consideration to revise alignment for Smith Drive, an extension of that, a collector street, should the future Broadway extension ever be found to be impractical and not actually included in the MRP. If Broadway was removed from the MRP, then a substitute would certainly be acceptable. And that is all I have, Mr. Zenner.

MR. ZENNER: Thank you very much. Are there any questions of the committee? If there are none, this is a scheduled public hearing and I noticed we do have people in the audience, so if you would like to approach the podium, state your name and your address for the record. We will take your comments.

MR. GEPHARDT: Good afternoon. My name is Jay Gephardt. I am a civil engineer with a civil group here in Columbia. I am here representing myself, the neighbors in Greystone Estates, the neighbors in Quail Creek west, and the neighbors in Stoneridge Estates. These are all neighborhoods that use Smith Drive as their primary access. One of the first things I want to talk about here is this map amendment revises Smith Drive from a neighborhood collector to a major collector and we are opposed to that. We are also opposed to Smith Drive being built in lieu of Broadway. You know the last part of the advantages that was just stated is that someday this may come back and because it is less expensive alignment there will be a desire or drive to replace Broadway with this and the neighbors are opposed to that. If Broadway is built first, connecting Smith to Broadway via Stone Valley Parkway provides that connection. Mitch indicated that you'd have to go out to Smith to go up to go west. There is a collector street shown on the map called Stone Valley Parkway that connects Smith to the north to Broadway and this connection, although would be seen as convenient, is not necessarily required because you do have a way for those neighborhoods to get to Broadway should it be ever extended. Smith Drive was currently being proposed through a cluster of sink holes and the current county standards for their storm water

standards require a buffer and it is a no disturbance buffer. So you -- theoretically would have to annex this property to avoid the county's requirements because the City has no requirements for sink holes. Beyond that, the neighborhoods don't believe it's a -- really a very good idea to build roads, major roadways, on sink holes and just wanted to bring that to your attention. We strongly feel that Smith should remain a neighborhood collector and it should remain a neighborhood collector through the Breckenridge, to provide access to Breckenridge, but it doesn't need to be extended to the west, with the main fear being that it would become a replacement for Broadway. The last thing is kind of a timing thing on the public hearing. I have probably 80 neighbors that would like to come and say these things to you but they can't because you guys have your meeting during the day and they all work. Public hearings like this you might want to consider having an evening meeting. You would get a lot better attendance and a lot better input from public, if that's what you desire. But I am not sure what the coordinating committee's action today -- if you approve this map amendment is it -- it is my understanding that then it has to go through the commission to council and the State Highway Commission to be adopted; is that correct? Or is it your action today actually makes the amendment change?

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Skov.

MR. SKOV: This group's actually -- action makes the amendment change for the Major Roadway Plan.

MR. GEPHARDT: Okay.

MR. SKOV: Again, it's considered a component of the Long Range Transportation Plan. We would also add it as -- to the project list in the Long Range Plan, but only in an illustrative sense.

MR. GEPHARDT: Okay.

MR. SKOV: It doesn't have to go beyond that. These types of minutes don't have to be officially approved by the Governor's office or the Highway Commission.

MR. GEPHARDT: Or County Commission or the City Council?

MR. SKOV: Well, the County is here represented on the CATSO, so no the County Commission separately does not have to approve it.

MR. GEPHARDT: And does City Council?

MR. SKOV: No.

MR. GEPHARDT: Well, given that, this is a pretty big deal that you are doing today and having the meeting at 2:30 p.m. on a Thursday afternoon is pretty hard for people to attend, so you may want to consider tabling it and calling a meeting in the evening, but that is up to you guys. That's really all I have. Do you guys have any questions for me?

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Skov.

MR. SKOV: I just have a comment. I wanted to note that I did leave a copy of a letter from the gentleman on the board of Stoneridge Neighborhood Homeowners Association. I did talk to him at length yesterday on the phone and then he e-mailed me with his objections just so you have that. It is unusual we get comments by e-mail, but -- so I provided that to you just so you could see who he is representing.

MR. KOESTNER: I might clarify a little bit before construction would actually happen, it would have to be approved on City, County budget plan for any construction.

MR. GEPHARDT: This is just the first step.

MR. KOESTNER: Yeah. It's the first step.

MR. GEPHARDT: This is just the first step to create the deed and you guys have a bigger job than to just look at what the neighborhood needs; you have to look at the needs for the whole city. I understand all that. I just think the -- if you believe Broadway is the arterial that goes clear across this town and should continue across this, then Smith Drive is, like Mitch had said in his disadvantages, is really kind of redundant because we have Stone Valley Parkway and it's an expensive street and that. But if the intent is for this to become a replacement for Broadway, then -- because it is less expensive -- then there -- it's a pretty big deal to get the map changed like this. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: Thank you Mr. Gephardt. Anyone else?

MR. ALDER: My name is Joe Alder. I live at 511 Parkade Boulevard. I'm a former board member of the Columbia Safety Council. It disbanded a number of years ago, but I am continuing to work on safety projects in Columbia at the request of the former state director. One of the projects I am working is to develop a civilian capacity community development for the eventual establishment of a City County Public Safety Commission in the city of Columbia and in the county of Boone. What that would do would comply with the spirit of much federal legislation that has been passed since 9/11 to enhance public safety, homeland security throughout the country and cities and communities. I don't have a specific comment on the discussion on the alternative routes today, but I just would ask you all to keep in mind that in the event of a major disaster or catastrophe, such as an earthquake, pipeline explosion, terrorist act, first responders and emergency personnel have a critical need for alternative routes to respond quickly to a site of emergency. That might be multiple sites in a major catastrophe. So just keeps that in mind in your long range planning, the big picture of the long range of public safety and also economic development. A number of years ago MoDOT proposed a spur I-70 to run from the Midway exit out to the airport. And just think of the economic potential had that been completed and then gone on east through New Bloomfield to connect with I-70 east of Fulton. That never happened because of lot of environmental and a lot of other concerns, but in the picture of long range planning don't forget that in the event of a major disaster alternative routes are critical.

MR. ZENNER: Any questions for this speaker? Thank you, Mr. Alder.

MR. THOMAS: Good afternoon. My name is Ian Thomas. I live at 2616 Hillshire Drive -member of the Columbia City Council, also member of Smart Growth America local leaders' council and the National League of Cities Transportation and Infrastructure committee. I am not representing those organizations, but I am going to express opinions that are consistent with those organizations' positions. I've got three requests. Firstly, do not adopt the extension of Smith Drive on to the Major Roadway Plan and the CATSO Long Range Transportation Plan. Secondly, remove the Broadway extension from those plans and thirdly, create a new policy whereby you don't allow so-called illustrative projects on the Long

Range Transportation Plan because they confound the process of planning by having unrealistic and unnecessary projects listed. So -- number of reasons that I take these positions. First of all, both of these roadway connections, and I think most of the so-called illustrative projects -- and I have no problem with projects that are currently illustrative staying on the plan if a proper analysis is done and a cost estimate is found and there is a realistic way to ever fund the projects. But, my reasons for this, Columbia's best community planning document that involved the petition -- the participation of hundreds and hundreds of citizens expressing how they wanted to see the Columbia area grow only has three recommendations in the area of transportation. The first is to accommodate non-motorized transportation, the second is to improve transit service, and the third is to promote a mobility management public transportation system. Nowhere in this document is the mention of enormous highway expansion projects that are going to promote sprawl, in fact, quite the opposite. These projects are also inconsistent with CATSO's own Long Range Transportation Plan vision and goals and objectives, which focus very much on -- similar to the Columbia Imagine document promoting alternative transportation, encouraging compact and infill type development, and reducing travel demands. This will do the opposite of all of those things. It will result in sprawl development. It will be impossibly expensive. As I understand it, a proposed extension of Scott Boulevard to go north to I-70 and create a new intersection does have a cost estimate on the plan at 68 million dollars while the distance of either of these extension is longer that and involves an extremely wide creek crossing. This is going to have to more than 100 million dollars. That is thousands of dollars for every family in Boone County. How can we possibly justify that? I respect the opinion of the previous speaker, it certainly is important to pay attention to potential emergency situations, but you have to do a realistic cost benefit analysis and if that is the only reason to do this, for a potential earthquake or major disaster, then I don't think the cost benefit analysis pans out. I do have a document that I want to share with everybody. This is research conducted by Smart Growth America and Tax Payers for Common Sense a couple of years ago. It looked at the way USDOT and State DOT's are spending highway dollars at the present time. It assessed the condition of highways across the country. It compared the situation in 2008 with the situation in 2011. Roads in good condition, 41 percent of roads were in good condition in 2008. That fell to 47 percent; a drop of 4 percent over that three years while roads in poor condition rose from 17 percent to 21 percent over that same time period. In 2008, states would have needed to spend more than 43 billion dollars every year for 20 years to bring the roads -- all the roads in poor condition, up to good condition. And by 2011 that figure of 43 billion dollars every year for 20 years had gone up to 45.2 billion dollars every year for 20 years. Over that same time period, states actually spent over 20 billion dollars in massive highway construction projects exactly like the two projects that are being proposed here. An enormous waste of money taken away from money needed to maintain roads in our current condition and provide healthy, sustainable, equitable transportation systems that actually serve people in an effective way. So I would appeal to you to start creating a realistic long range plan for transportation and mobility in this community and in this county, to be aware of environmental considerations, of equity considerations, and of the benefits of compact infill development

as laid out in both the Columbia Imagine Plan and the CATSO Long Range Transportation Plan. I would be happy to take any questions you may have. Thank you.

MR. ZENNER: Thank you, Mr. Thomas.

MS. PRICE: My name is Cheryl Price. 511 Parkade Boulevard. I am the chair of the Public Transit Advisory Commission. Though I don't represent the whole commission today, I do represent consistent concerns of ours and one of the big ones is a financial concern. We currently have hired consultants to help us redesign our system to make it more equitable for everyone in our city. In light of that, we will need new funding for that. I cannot see the purpose of spending the extra funding that would be necessary for this project, even though it might possibly improve safety. I certainly do believe in safety always being considered in any project you develop and also in our city and respect Mr. Alder for trying to get another safety commission developed in our city and county, but as the Public Transit Advisory Commission our focus right now needs to be on finding funding for our public transit system, CoMo Connect, as we know it now. There are many changes that we have heard from people that they want, all will require new funding. We are currently not able to retain bus drivers because they retrain them and they see new possibilities in other places with much higher salaries. We're not able to give them breaks for lunch. They are working consistent over time. We really need to focus funding on the public transit portion of the plans. So I would appreciate it if you would think of using the funding that would be for this project to put toward public transit. Thank you very much.

MR. ZENNER: Any questions?

MS. BUFFALOE: Thank you, Cheryl.

MR. ZENNER: Are there any other speakers? One more making his way.

MR. SIMONSON: Hello. I am Lauren Simonson. I am representing the PedMet Coalition and the 4,000 members that we represent here in the Columbia area and surrounding Boone County area. I just want to make a similar request kind of like Ian Thomas had made that the Broadway extension and the Scott extension kind of be removed from the master plan as we believe it goes against the Columbia Imagine Plan and even some of CATSO's own plans. We also don't believe in doing large illustrative projects. When my roof is not keeping the water out I don't plan for a pool and right now we know that all of our roads are crumbling and there are cheaper, more viable ways to do transportation besides building big, large highways. This is kind of a central design of urban sprawl that we know has negative effects on both the environment, health, economics, so we would like to see these removed from the Long Range Transportation Plan. Thank you very much.

MR. ZENNER: Are there any other speakers? Seeing none, I'll close the public hearing and I will ask for comments of any of the commissioners.

MS. BUFFALOE: May I ask you for clarification, Mitch? You guys have a policy not to put projects on that you don't currently have funding for. What's the process?

MR. SKOV: We don't have a strict policy against that. If there is a request made, or a direct request, recommendation from the Tech Committee, which is then approved by coordinating, then we will

add it to the Long Range Transportation Plan as an administrative revision. Our general policy or our preference is to not put so-called illustrative projects on the list, on the plan.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay.

MR. SKOV: Just because -- now there are a number of future projects on the Major Roadway Plan that show up on the map that are not in the project list in the Long Range Transportation Plan, but I am specifically talking about projects that are shown in the project list in the 2040 Long Range Plan that are illustrative, they are not with the main list of projects that are presumed to be able to be funded with the money we have projected for the scope of the plan period.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay.

MR. SKOV: Our preference is not to do that. The one example, we do have another example, for example the Scott Boulevard interchange is an illustrative project, but as mentioned by Mr. Thomas, there has been extensive engineering work done, we have a good estimate on that. But in general, I think we also have the Stadium Boulevard extension to the east as an illustrative project because again there has been an extensive engineering study done on that, alternatives have been selected.

MS. BUFFALOE: There have been no studies done on this?

MR. SKOV: No, there have been no -- any kind of major engineering study done for Broadway extension or certainly not for Smith Drive, of course, so we would rather -- I think the preference would be to not show those kind of projects even though again technically it is allowed by Federal highway.

MS. BUFFALOE: Thank you.

MR. SKOV: Uh-huh.

MR. NICHOLS: Clarification, this is a planning move, what we've used the CATSO roadway for as development occurs, right-of-ways are set aside once these are on the plan, dedication of right-of-ways, and so this is not a project that is on anybody's radar, but what it does is as development does occur, being on the plan requires that development to set aside the necessary right-of-way for future roadways. Many roads have been built because of that dedication that is set aside and so that's what the planning document is for. So, I just want to clarify, this is not a project that the city or the county is intending to build.

MR. YONKE: I'd like to add that, you know, the 740 extension was on the plan long before we did the study. We have a study now because we studied that corridor after it was already on the plan and so some of these major projects in areas that are so woefully underserved in terms of roadways have been critical to getting that right-of-way, as you said, as things do tend to develop so that we have the ability to provide a minimum amount of contact points in the road network system. And so, you know, there may be some potential in the future to do a study of this like we did a study of those others, but there is nothing that would preclude, as a matter of fact, it would be argued that this is our procedure because we do have a few of those others illustrative projects when they're major projects and that those projects have been done this way and that that is the way we have done our planning for it.

MR. KOESTNER: Does the developer have plans to do anything in the area or potentially

building roadways?

MR. YONKE: Would probably not be a roadway that the city or county would jump out and build the way it sounds.

MR. SKOV: I pulled this -- I don't have the permitted plat here, but yeah they, we do -- they do show the Smith extension to the limit to the boundary of the preliminary plat, which we would expect that to happen anyway as a neighborhood collector. No, there had not been any development; it, of course ends at the edge of the bluff -- at the edge of the property.

MR. ZENNER: An extension of the roadway would most likely -- while the right-of-way, I think as Mr. Nichols pointed out, would be collected at least through the Breckenridge project to allow for the alternative. Beyond its property boundary on the ridge, bottom of the ridge, basically it would become a public project if it were to be built. At least it would allow for the receiving of future public project to commence as development within the western portion of what would be considered our service territory to be evaluated. Now granted, that may or may not occur, through public funding but it could occur through private funding as we sewer this particular basin and the opportunity for development is being introduced that previously has not, due to the lack of public infrastructure -- sewer infrastructure. So, I mean, that from a -- from a planner's prospective, I mean obviously laying out our roadway network ahead of time, to allow us as projects come in, affords us an opportunity at least to be able to better consider what type of infrastructure needs to be allocated. It doesn't necessarily mean what is shown on this map in illustrative state or even as part of the identified funded projects that are particularly fiscally constrained make it built to that alignment. We may find through the design of the project that gets presented it may be built to the different location but generally affording the same type of conductivity that we need. I think Mitch, just for clarification purposes, the -- the separation requirement typically that we shoot for within the plan is half-mile separations for our major or do we break that down by category of road?

MR. SKOV: Half a mile is a good guide for, certainly for collector streets.

MR. ZENNER: We're basically exceeding them in this particular instance, even with these illustrative -- illustrative plus the one fiscally constrained project at this point or if I understand correctly, both are illustrative, correct?

MR. SKOV: Well, both Broadway and Smith are illustrative, I mean again, they are on the project list -- I'm not -- I was making a distinction earlier about the difference between future roadways on the -- on the roadway plan map -- and one -- the projects that are actually in the list -- in the Long Range Plan, which actually have an identified cost estimate with them. Whether it is the result of an engineering study or not, most cases we have an idea of -- a decent idea, of what it would cost, but that -- again -- most of the -- or many of the future links that are shown in the Major Roadway Plan are not in the project list. So while they are technically illustrative, they are not identified that way in the plan specifically as in the project list.

MR. ZENNER: It would be a correct statement to make that the roadways that are shown within the plan generally are funded by proposed development that is coming in necessitating that that right-of-

way be given, or improved in order to access that particular land area, correct?

MR. SKOV: Most cases it is going to be done that way, yes.

MR. ZENNER: Any other discussion amongst the commission?

MR. YONKE: I have got another comment and that is while you may be able to infer from Columbia Imagine that an argument could be made that this is not compliant with that, I don't know that that is the only argument you could make based upon that. And the other thing is this is not a just a City of Columbia project, it's CATSO – includes the County -- so our County master plan and the other would have to be reviewed and this is not inconsistent with that. It, as a matter of fact, having some of these connections, whether the City has a boundary there that stops or not the road connections still need to be on the plan.

MR. KOESTNER: And this project really does not touch the state system, you know unlike Scott Boulevard extension, you know the Broadway extension, Stadium Boulevard. It really doesn't have an effect on the state system so any voting, as MoDOT's part, I would abstain from voting on it, you know it's really more of a county/city type issues. It's not really a state connectivity road so – just so – you know that before you go to the voting stage.

MR. ZENNER: Mr. Nichols.

MR. NICHOLS: I thought Mr. Gephardt made a good point about public input. I am not sure, you know this is our format – but -- you know I'm sure there is a lot of – a lot more input out there that would probably be heard about this, so I am not sure moving forward -- or you know -- if that opportunity is something we can discuss further?

MR. ZENNER: And I think that's something we may want to discuss. Ms. Buffaloe, anything from the Managers Office?

MS. BUFFALOE: Well, so I had sent a message saying how to – you know -- your thoughts on it and I think there was the concern over the – if it is in the plan – but it's not – that's in line with your fiscal requirements or – not necessarily you said administrative policies, but the way that you guys had operated was the question on whether or not you put projects on there – illustrative -- and he also just told me to vote my conscious. Kyle?

MR. ZENNER: Multimodal?

MR. LEPAGE: Doesn't affect Multimodal or transit or anything like that, so I'll step out.

MR. ZENNER: You will abstain as well. So we are – let me ask the question -- Mr. Skov with two abstentions from voting, how does that impact what may end up happening here?

MR. SKOV: We you have four people that would be voting then. And of course there is no requirement for you to take action on this now. You can just choose not to take action and then of course then it wouldn't be added to the MRP or you can vote to not add it to the MRP, specifically or outright, but either way is certainly appropriate. Or you would potentially want to table this and have a meeting -- another public hearing at some future date.

MR. ZENNER: Let me ask a question: Given how your – how the funding within the CATSO

program is obtained through the federal process, are there any reasonable possibilities of being able to identify resources by which a more detailed analysis of this alignment could be evaluated to determine and answer some of the questions that I believe Mr. Thomas has asked for as it relates to being able to look at alternatives. Is there anything that you are aware of that may allow that to occur?

MR. SKOV: I don't know if there would be any federal funding available for that or not. I'm -- off the top of my head I can't think of a program right now that would ultimately -- I mean MoDOT would need to be involved probably. And of course this is not a -- the Broadway extension certainly is a, as Travis indicated, has an impact on the state system, but Smith as it's currently being proposed does not, but I'd have to do some more checking, I don't actually know. I don't think it's real likely to have federal funding available that would cover a study along the lines of a -- what it was done for Stadium or -- or I mean it's not the same kind of project. But again, I'd have to check further. I don't -- I don't think so, not on the federal level.

MS. BUFFALOE: In relation to what the public process that -- or public input that Dave brought up, do you know how this was advertised -- this public hearing -- to the neighbors?

MR. SKOV: It was advertised as a public hearing -- there was a display ad in the Tribune -- in the Columbia Public -- you know the Columbia Daily Tribune, as well as being on the website -- advertised on the City's website as a public hearing.

MS. BUFFALOE: I'm assuming since you then e-mailed -- that obviously, the neighborhood associations were informed of a discussion; is that right?

MR. SKOV: Well, it goes out on the listserv which goes to the neighborhood associations so all the -- anybody who is on the listserv will get a copy of the meeting notice for the CATSO meetings, both technical and coordinating.

MR. ZENNER: I think as a point of clarification as well, adding or not adding does not negate the fact of the road improvement or the extension of Smith coming in to the Breckenridge project having to be built. That is a requirement of the city subdivision regulations, so in essence should the commission -- should the commission -- committee decide that it is not appropriate to add the extension, its terminus basically will be at the western property line of the subject site. That doesn't negate the possibility of -- if funding is identified at some point with development the west side of the ridge, that that roadway may not be able to be constructed through other private means through an alignment study at that point that ties point A to point B. Granted, I will tell you that the actual improvement of the roadway segment beyond where the current pavement is that comes into the Breckenridge project would likely not occur and the proposal that has been submitted at this point does have some developmental triggers associated with it and that may need to be revised. That does not, however, again negate the ability to acquire the road right-of-way for the future extension. And should we at some point decide that we are not going to do that alignment, but choose to do Broadway, that right-of-way could be vacated at some future date. So based on the subdivision process, if we follow our subdivision standards with the City of Columbia, we acquire the right-of-way we don't necessarily need to have it improved other than what supports the development

that is proposed and we do not close any options for its future extension. We would then satisfy the county's concern to not have Broadway removed from the plan, which is really not the discussion here today. It is on the plan. It is not being proposed to be removed so would it remain as an illustrative project. Obviously, it is unfunded and it has been on the plan, as I understand it, for quite some time in that status. So until, I guess, demand would push the design or a cost benefit analysis of the extension of Broadway, we would not be doing anything with it unless the County has a proposal within its jurisdiction that necessitates some type of access. This is not an area – at least from a planning perspective because we do not have – we do not have an area plan similar to some of our other area plans that we have within the city. And this is an area that council of the City of Columbia, as well as the commission for the county may ask us to study given the fact we are getting infrastructure improvements there. And at that point there may be a better understanding of how to take care of PedNet's concerns, the concerns that Mr. Thomas has brought up in order to identify alternatives maybe to create the connections that do permit the ability for our citizens to move from east to west, possibly not on this alignment but still allowing us that connectivity. Planning can solve a lot of things along with money. We have no money, but we opportunity for planning so – a shameless plug for what I do for a living. But nonetheless I don't know if there are any other comments or concerns. I think the Mr. Nichols point, do you believe as a commission that -- or committee that we do need to do something different as it relates to notice and public hearing that may warrant a special meeting to be called in an evening that we actually have room at the inn. Seemingly we have meetings here all the time.

MR. NICHOLS: I think you made a pretty good point though that all we are talking about is adding Smith to this plan and --

MR. ZENNER: And adding or not adding does nothing to the proposed development that is there. It will be required to be added at a either neighborhood collector, as Mr. Gephardt indicated they would be supportive of, which is what is currently existing. I think we were looking from a City perspective as we did the development plan review and the possibilities of it being substituted as a lesser order street as a major collector as it came through the development. Traffic studies as well as the impacts that the individual development of Breckenridge creates may not necessitate a major collector. It could be supported as a neighborhood collector at that point. The major collector status probably evolves from the fact if it does get connected with Broadway at some time in the future.

MR. NICHOLS: Well, my thought is if Broadway stays on, I don't necessarily see the necessity of this being on a CATSO plan.

MR. YONKE: And part of the reason we supported this as a --- really a component of the Broadway extension because how this was brought forward at first was as an alternative and we absolutely do not support that. We will --- I mean we can make our position fairly clear, we're not going to ever support removing the Broadway connection unless we have an alternative because two and a half miles between bridges is just too excessive for any type of transportation for this side. I mean, if you look at it -- if you remember the east side of town before we did the east area plan, it was massively

underserved by major roadways and we added the major roadways in conjunction with the east area plan. If an area plan is done over here, it is likely going to end up going the same direction. When you do the whole overall area plan you will find that this is massively underserved and at least a few major roadways are going to have to be added.

MR. ZENNER: Do we have any other comments? I guess do I have a motion? Not that we need to take one as Mr. Skov has indicated. Directly or indirectly? I guess I would advise if you take a directive, we do take --- decide to take a directive motion to not add it, that may carry forward into the future as a policy of this committee to not potentially add this --- this is opt --- option should the demand arise or it be reoriented to a different direction even. I don't know if we want to go that far to limit ourselves.

MR. YONKE: I think we would want to let it die rather than go that direction.

MR. ZENNER: That is probably correct so – that I don't know how to back myself out of what we are in right now. Is there is no further action desired and is that the position of the committee on the Smith Drive extension being added to the Major Roadway Plan?

MR. YONKE: I move we take no action on this.

MR. ZENNER: Do I have a second?

MR. NICHOLS: I'll second that.

MR. ZENNER: Those that will vote, in favor aye?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. ZENNER: Those opposed? No. Okay. We are going to take no action then. So the Smith Drive extension has not been chosen to be added to the City's CATSO Major Roadway Plan and we will inform the applicant at Breckenridge of that outcome. Thank you all for coming today and allowing us to hear your input.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

Is there any other business the committee would like to talk about today? Okay.

VII. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

Are there any direct public comments as relates to any of the activities of the coordinating committee and our transportation issues? Seeing none.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

Do I have a motion for adjournment?

MS. BUFFALOE: I'll make that motion.

MR. KOESTNER: Motion to adjourn.

MS. BUFFALOE: Ah man Travis. Then, I second.

MR. ZENNER: We are adjourned. Thank you.

(Off the record.)

* * * * *