

**MINUTES**  
**COLUMBIA AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY ORGANIZATION**  
**COORDINATING COMMITTEE**  
**MAY 27, 2021**

**MEMBERS PRESENT**

John Glascock, City Manager, City of Columbia, Chair  
Thad Yonke, Boone County, Senior Planner (for Dan Atwill)  
Dave Nichols, Public Works Director, City of Columbia  
Tim Teddy, Community Development Director, City of Columbia  
Jeff McCann, Chief Engineer, Boone County  
Jenni Hosey, MoDOT Multimodal (for Michelle Kratzer)  
Mike Henderson, MoDOT Central Office  
Randy Aulbur, MoDOT Central District (for Machelles Watkins)

**ALSO PRESENT**

Brad Kelley, City of Columbia Planning/CATSO staff

**I. CALL TO ORDER**

MR. GLASCOCK: I'll call the meeting to order.

**II. INTRODUCTION:**

MR. GLASCOCK: We'll do introductions. I'm John Glascock, city manager of Columbia.

MR. MCCANN: Jeff McCann, Boone County.

MR. YONKE: Thad Yonke, Boone County Planning, I'm here for Commissioner Atwill.

MS. HOSEY: Jenni Hosey, MoDOT, multimodal operations. I'm here for Michelle Kratzer and I will not be voting on Item Number 7 due to a conflict of interest.

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

MR. AULBUR: Randy Aulbur, MoDOT Central District, assistant district engineer. I'm here in place of Machelles Watkins, our district engineer.

MR. TEDDY: Tim Teddy, city of Columbia Community Development.

MR. NICHOLS: Dave Nichols, city of Columbia, Public Works Department.

MR. GLASCOCK: Thank you.

**III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MR. GLASCOCK: Everybody's seen the agenda. I need a motion to approve

the agenda.

MR. MCCANN: Move to approve agenda.

MR. HENDERSON: Second.

MR. GLASCOCK: All those in favor signify by saying aye. Opposed same sign.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. GLASCOCK: Approval of the agenda.

#### **IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

MR. GLASCOCK: We have minutes from the February 25th, 2021, meeting. Any corrections or qualifications?

MR. YONKE: Yeah. There were two that I found. The first being on Page 2, it says Birch Creek, I think that is supposed to be Perche Creek. And then on Page 12 it has a capital. I believe it's J-A-F. It's supposed to be G-I-S. With those two corrections, if nobody else found anything, I would move for approval with corrections.

MR. TEDDY: I'll second.

MR. GLASCOCK: Motion's been made and seconded. All those in favor signify by saying aye. All those opposed same sign. Minutes have been approved.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

#### **V. PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO CATSO MAJOR ROADWAY PLAN (MRP) TO ADD NORTH-SOUTH COLLECTOR STREET BETWEEN WACO ROAD AND STARKE AVENUE**

MR. GLASCOCK: Item 5, public hearing for proposed amendment to CATSO major roadway plan to north-south collector street between Waco Road and Starke Avenue.

MR. KELLEY: Thank you, John. As previously discussed by the coordinating committee, the Tuscany Ridge residential subdivision development has triggered staff to review street connectivity along the western section of Waco Road. The north-south collector street was included on a 2006 prelim plat but has not been added to the major roadway plan since that time. A more extensive north-south collector would connect Waco Road with Starke Avenue which would provide essential connectivity to the adjacent area which includes Atkins Park, a future City Park development and the Boone County Fairgrounds. It is now being proposed to amend the CATSO major roadway plan to add this major collector street alignment between Waco Road and Starke Avenue. On the next slide I'll show you a general alignment for the collector street. At the previous coordinating committee, we discussed this and directed the technical committee and Staff to set a public hearing for the major roadway plan and that is what we're hearing today. This was advertised in the

Tribune on May 11th of this month. Here's a general overview of the area of the current major roadway plan. This orange line with dashes through it is the potential future expansion of Waco Road. Lines without dashes through them are existing dashes are potential future expansion. This is being proposed -- this yellow line with dashed green through it provide connectivity between Waco Road and Starke Avenue. And again, this was included on a preliminary plat in 2006. The technical committee earlier recommended to the coordinating committee to give consideration to this proposed major roadway plan amendment and hold a public hearing. The committee further reviewed this earlier this month but took no formal action as that was not necessary. Staff recommends holding a public hearing on the proposed amendment and recommends approval of amending the major roadway plan and passing a motion to give formal approval to MRP amendment to add the new major collector street between Waco and Stark Avenue.

MR. GLASCOCK: Is that it?

MR. KELLEY: Yes. I'll be happy to answer any questions you may have.

MR. GLASCOCK: Any questions of Staff? Okay. I will open the public hearing. Any comments from the public about this proposed public hearing -- proposed amendment. Sorry, this is the public meeting. Close the public hearing. No comment. Any further discussion on this amendment? Tim?

MR. TEDDY: Yes, we have talked about this a couple of times in the technical committee and with the prospect of additional phases to the subdivisions in this area, the potential development of the fairgrounds as a major attraction, the ultimate future extension to Waco Road, the very active Atkins ball fields when they are in season, I think we are agreed on tech committee that it would be beneficial to plan for something that's in between Brown Station Road and Oakland Gravel Road that would relieve excessive burden on Oakland Gravel, Starke Lane and Brown Station Road by allowing shorter distant trips in this area. And our understanding is that this would be a development-related roadway or at least a good portion of it would be development related and when we have a quarter on our major roadway planning, the opportunity to obtain upgraded right-of-way for such a road, so from a staff perspective I think we feel it's a beneficial addition.

MR. GLASCOCK: Is there a proposed development out there already or has something already been done?

MR. TEDDY: Tuscan Ridge is building out and they're looking at expansion. It would interconnect with the system of streets, Brown Station and Waco and then, of course, I kind of left out the school is there as well. So that is another traffic generator. So, it would allow some route flexibility through the area to get people to

and from school, to and from parks, neighborhood to neighborhood, etc.

MR. GLASCOCK: Did we reach out to the school and/or the developer to talk about it?

MR. TEDDY: We have talked with the developer about it.

MR. KELLEY: Yeah. I haven't had any discussion with the school. I know we're talking about the development agreement; the school had reached out to me and just kind asked what was going on. That wasn't necessarily referring to that major roadway plan addition. They we were just discussing general development.

MR. GLASCOCK: Okay. Anybody else? I'd entertain a motion.

MR. MCCANN: I'll move that we add this to the major roadway plan.

MR. NICHOLS: I'll second.

MR. GLASCOCK: Second by Mr. Nichols. All those in favor signify by saying aye. All as opposed same sign. Motion carries.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval)

## **VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED FY 2020-2023 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP) AMENDMENT**

MR. GLASCOCK: Number 6, public hearing on proposed FY 2020-2023 transportation improvement program amendment.

MR. KELLEY: MoDOT requested a proposed amendment to the FY 2020-2023 CATSO TIP for revisions to three projects currently in the TIP. Two of the projects are in the MoDOT roadway pavement and construction section of the TIP and the third is in the scoping sections -- scoping section. The first was a job order contracting for guard rail/guard cable. The existing project has a total budget of \$644,000. The revised project will have a funding increase in the amount of about one-half million to bring the total budget 2.142 million. Included is 428,000 in state funds and 1.7 million in state advance construction (AC) funding. The latter funds are being advanced by the state to facilitate project implementation. The state AC funds will be converted to or reimbursed by federal funds at a later date. All the funding is budgeted in fiscal year 2021. Here are the changes being shown to the TIP. The TIP number here in the top left marked in red and then on the bottom left as well, existing -- the top is the revision in April and the bottom is the new amendment to increased total funding. Next is one of the amendments to roadway pavement construction section. This is for TIP #2020-4: US 63 pavement improvements. Existing project 2020-4 has a total budget of \$16,360,000. The new amendment adds 428,000 to the budget for a total of 16,788,000. While the existing project includes the state AC funds to facilitate the project, the revised version contains \$13,430,400 in federal funding. All funding is budgeted in fiscal year 2022. Here is the chart

showing the changes. The existing TIP and then the changes to the TIP as well. The third is TIP # 2020-14: US 63/I-70 interchange improvement. The existing TIP project 2020-14 is scoping for US 63 connector/I-70 intersection improvements and it shows 10,000 in of fiscal years 2020 and 2021. The project will now be amended to budget additional funding with 1,300,000 in fiscal year 2022 and 3,000,000 in fiscal year 2023. Amendment will match up the CATSO TIP with the new MoDOT State Transportation Improvement Program. The total budget is now 4,300,000. All of the funded -- all of the funding budgeted is for engineering. The 20,000 for fiscal year 2020 and 2021 is now shown as prior program to match how it is shown in the draft MoDOT State TIP or STIP, which begins in FY 2022 and extends through fiscal year 2026. And here is the chart showing the existing TIP number and the proposed change to the TIP. At the May 5th, 2021, CATSO technical committee meeting the tech committee reviewed the potential TIP amendment and discussed the projects included. After review, the committee unanimously passed a motion to forward the amendment to the coordinating committee for their formal review with the recommendation for approval. Suggested to the coordinating committee that they review the proposed amendment for any necessary revisions or edits, hold a public hearing, and after holding the public hearing, pass a motion giving formal approval to the proposed amendment to the fiscal year 2020-2023 TIP. And that is all have you, and I will be happy to answer questions. And I imagine MoDOT could probably answer questions as well.

MR. GLASCOCK: Anyone have questions of Staff? I will open up the public hearing for the proposed TIP amendments. Any comments from the public? Seeing none, I will close the public hearing. How does the commission feel? Anything from MoDOT on this?

MR. HENDERSON: These are normal projects. I mean, resurfacing projects, the job order contracting project is one that was already in the TIP. We just start -- since the gas tax passed, I think they're ramping up some of the engineering work that they're wanting to do.

Mr. GLASCOCK: Very good.

MR. MCCANN: I move to approve all three of the -- I think it was three amendments.

MR. GLASCOCK: Yeah.

MR. MCCANN: Yeah, of the amendments.

MR. GLASCOCK: Second. All those in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. Motion carries.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

## **VII. POTENTIAL MAJOR ROADWAY PLAN REVISIONS IN OLIVET AND RICHLAND ROAD VICINITY**

MR. GLASCOCK: Number 7, potential major roadway plan revisions in the Olivet and Richland Road vicinity.

MR. SMITH: Clint Smith, City Planning. I'll just give a quick overview. The technical committee had received a request to consider a major roadway plan revision and they discussed it at their May 5th meeting. In short, just give you a quick overview. It involves a request that initiated from Crockett Engineering Consultants. Their request specifically was involving two major roadways, one being the eastern one, as you see on your screen, which would be Olivet, which is mostly constructed going from New Haven on the south up to I-70 and designated as a major collector on the plan. It also involved the next major roadway to the west, none of which is constructed currently, but is designated as a minor arterial. So, their request in short would be to flip the designations of those two major roadways. Olivet would become a minor arterial. The unnamed roadway on the west will become the major collector. In addition to that conversation, there was additional discussion on Tradewinds as well. That proposal would have been degrading or de-- I don't know -- reduction of the classification of that street from a minor arterial, which it is currently, to a major collector as well. I think we have some close-ups here. Another portion of the request coming from Crockett Engineering Consultants was to realign a portion of the western of these two collectors are two major roadways we saw on the first slide. So, this is the far north section, I-70 there on the north. This property in particular, the City's had a concept meeting regarding the development of this property's and also this potential alignment. So instead of continuing the unnamed roadway to the north on the west, it would curve around and connect to the future extension of Olivet. So that roadway would basically have traffic going from that roadway to the minor arterial. Staff did raise some questions on that given the unknown potential grading of Olivet because it is now identified as a potential location that would cross I-70 in the future with an overpass. So, by diverting that traffic there may be reductions in the access to I-70 Drive Southeast if it's not directly accessible from Olivet. Tradewinds, again -- that's on there. So, this is another view of that shot. The Tradewinds again, would be part of that conversation that the technical committee had, would be downgrading that, again, to a major collector status. And that would be basically the next major roadway to the east. I think the general consensus of Staff is that this will probably require additional, conversations and study. They did make a motion to report this discussion to the coordinating committee in seeking further direction on moving forward with further study on these two-- technically, I

guess, would be four proposals: two -- three reclassifications, and a potential realignment of the unnamed major roadway. With that said, I'd be happy to answer any questions but that's all we have right now.

MR. GLASCOCK: Clint, on that one you are showing right there, does that come in at I-70 Drive right at that bridge where that creek is?

MR. SMITH: Right here?

MR. GLASCOCK: Right there.

MR. SMITH: So yeah. The major roadway -- let me go back. I think it's on here. Yeah, so it would potentially come in very close to where I-70 Drive would intersect with the creek there. There's a few properties here. I think measuring that out, there's a few hundred feet from the edge of -- what you could consider as potentially future development areas to the creek. So, there is a small window there that you might be able to get a major roadway into.

MR. GLASCOCK: Okay.

MR. SMITH: And potentially part of that conversation about swapping all of that with the other one -- obviously, centered on the fact that Olivet would potentially become an overpass and that it would be more appropriate to have higher traffic volumes on it.

MR. GLASCOCK: And I agree with that. Any comments from the commission?

MR. MCCANN: The Olivet overpass originally was in line with where that unnamed arterial is, and it got moved over to Olivet and the designation for the arterial could switch to --

MR. GLASCOCK: Yeah. It came with the school, didn't it?

MR. MCCANN: Yes. That overpass, if you take it straight north, ends up intersecting with Battle Avenue and connects the north and south. It essentially would become the Forum Boulevard on the east side of town.

MR. GLASCOCK: Anybody else? What do you need from us Clint? You need direction on -- have the Technical look at it and bring it back to us?

MR. SMITH: I think that's what they were seeking was more specific direction on to look at this a little closer and then come back with a recommendation, I would assume at the next Coordinating for a potential public hearing at that point.

MR. GLASCOCK: I would make that motion.

MR. MCCANN: Second.

MR. GLASCOCK: Motion made and seconded. All those in favor signify by saying aye. All opposed same sign. Motion passed. Thank you, Clint.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

## VIII. POTENTIAL MAJOR ROADWAY PLAN REVISIONS IN SINCLAIR ROAD VICINITY-DISCUSSION

MR. GLASCOCK: Number 8, proposed -- or sorry, potential major roadway plan revision in Sinclair Road vicinity, discussion.

MR. SMITH: Thank you. So, this was another request brought to us from Crockett Engineering Consultants discussed at the May 5th technical committee meeting. So, it is a little more involved. It does have five components. Generally, the request was to remove these five components, although they are somewhat connected from the major roadway plan. I'll go through them real briefly each one. Here they're basically identified by A through E. I'll start on the west real quick. I will start here, and we can get into a little more detail look if you need, but this kind gives us a broad overview. So, there's an east/west collector here. Generally, would connect Scott on the west. And if constructed all the way through, would connect to Sinclair and then potentially line up with Stanley Pitts Lane, which also could then in the future could connect to Highlands Parkway. The additional part of that is a north branch of a major roadway that would connect to this piece. It could connect to Old Mills Creek Road going north and that would be the D segment. Going through these, again, quickly, A, the issue was raised -- and generally most of the issues raised here was a mixture of current development basically blocking the roadways, extreme grades and/or potentially floodplain in the area where these roadways would be constructed. A, A is a little bit of exception. It does show the roadway going through a currently platted development. That's Wyndham Ridge. And it goes right through a common lot, which is also where an existing blue line stream is located. So given the circumstances, that does seem to be an unlikely location for a future roadway, dedication and then also construction. That is a piece only though that would go between basically KK and Scott. B is partially improved basically with Southern Hills Drive. And then C is a small spur that would come off this east/west collector street. That would connect potentially into Arrowhead -- the Arrowhead Lake subdivision. And then D is a north/south one and some of the obstacles that they pointed out for the construction of that piece would be -- especially right at the northern intersection of this piece at Old Mills -- Old Mill Creek Road, was the extreme grades right at that intersection, and the fact that the roadway in that intersection's currently in the floodplain. The city has conducted a recent concept meeting for the piece that generally E, and D, and C are located on. It's the piece owned by the University of Missouri. There is potential development for that property. There is also another east/west collector to the north of that that could be constructed with that development, which would be Crabapple. But I think what also



was pointed out is there is very limited east/west connectivity in that Sinclair Road corridor all way from modern Nifong in the north clear down to K in south. So, the -- just kind of paraphrase, technical committee think they were not in a position to recommend any removal at this point. And it would be further study in the future. No formal motion was made at that meeting, but if the coordinating committee would like to investigate it further, they could provide that direction now.

MR. GLASCOCK: Has anything been brought forward about the Sinclair property?

MR. SMITH: Not beyond the concept meeting that was requested. There was a conceptual site plan for that development, and it was a residential development for the most part and it did show a Crabapple connection for the major roadway, but it included the request here to remove E, the E portion of this. So, they did not have that major roadway on their plan.

MR. GLASCOCK: Any questions of Staff? Is there anything you want to -- oh, go ahead?

MR. YONKE: I was going to say, I think it needs to have some more study on it. I mean, it's one thing to redesignate, swap designations, it's another thing to take out road that were placed for a reason.

MR. GLASCOCK: Okay. Anything else? Yeah, Tim.

MR. TEDDY: Not a question for Staff, but just a comment. Speaking for myself, I think what the existing roadway plan shows is the idea of joining Old Mill and Sinclair someplace in the middle so you don't have these two separate parallel roads that just get busier and busier and there's no way to cross between them. And Crabapple's what we've got now as a potential, but admittedly there is some constructability issues with those alignments, A, B, C, D, E. You know, so there is a degree of difficulty there. I like to focus on the idea of just trying to find alternate routes between those two places and not rely on Crabapple to be the funnel of it all.

MR. GLASCOCK: Anything else? Tim?

MR. CROCKETT: Tim Crockett, Crockett Engineering. We are the representative for the developer who's looking into developing the Sinclair farm. And we made the request to CATSO with regards to these -- these segments. With regards to section E and B, I think, you know, that can be done. I think that, obviously, A I think certainly needs to come off there. B has some challenges, very much so, but I think if the commission decides to leave B and E on there, I think that's -- that's, you know, certainly something that we need to look at. Mr. Teddy's correct. I mean, if we leave everything up to Crabapple, Crabapple is a collector street, but it has driveways on it, so with the construction and the access from the east -- from the

west to the east through the Sinclair property, they will need another point of access at some point. The issue is, is where. And there's been some discussion about the extension of Southampton, but again, that ties back into the north segment of where D is located, which is not only floodplain, but floodway. A large section of it. And it's going to be extremely difficult to develop in the floodway, especially if you're looking at additional major roadways. And so, what we would like to talk about or like to request of the commission, if you would, have them evaluate an east/west roadway through that location, but really focus, in my eyes, focus on that D segment. Because I think that D segment is really not very constructible at all. And both with extreme grades, to get down to that location. And then once you get down to that location again, we're in the floodway. And so that is going to be extremely difficult to develop around. So really, we want to focus here on the D segment more than anything. I think A stands for itself as not being constructible. Certainly, it's already been developed, so that's going to fall back on the city or whoever wants to develop that and build that road in the future. I think there's certainly an alternative route for that. And if B and E stay on the CATSO plan, then you know, we'll work around that. That is not a big issue. And of course, C, C is a little piece where the University is going to retain some ownership of the property out there and it has some varied nuclear waste on it. They're going to retain ownership of, very minute, not a big issue, but it needs to be left undisturbed. And so that is issue with C, but we're not going to touch that anyway. But if we would, we would like to request that this commission ask for further evaluation mainly for the D segment.

MR. GLASCOCK: Thank you. Any other public comment? I'll entertain a motion.

MR. YONKE: I would move that we have coordinating committee look at --

MR. GLASCOCK: Coordinating committee?

MR. YONKE: Sorry. The technical committee and then the coordinating committee look at all of these segments and try to review it. And actually, I was going to ask if Tim would get with the County and city staff, we could probably expedite some of that review if they help us do that rather than us purely say what is or isn't seemingly going to work.

MR. CROCKETT: Thad, we would be very happy to do that. Would like to proceed with that plan as soon as possible. The University has us under a very tight time frame. We understand that CATSO meets quarterly, and we understand there's certain parameters there. But we would be very happy to work with Public Works, work with Road Bridge, not Road and Bridge, but Research Management now, to come up with alternative locations.

MR. YONKE: Right. And that is what I hope we could do is we could some of the subsets of the CATSO tech together --

MR. CROCKETT: Sure.

MR. YONKE: -- ahead of time working with you to try to figure out what might work in the area.

MR. CROCKETT: Right.

MR. YONKE: Because as I said, when these roads were put on, it was understood they were going to be difficult and complicated roads to make work.

MR. CROCKETT: Once you look at it, we're -- you're going to quickly realize that there's -- while it's a long piece of property, we are very limited on where we can have access. Whether it's already developed, extreme terrain, floodway, take your pick, there is a lot -- I mean, there are not many windows to hit through there. So, I think we could help expedite that and provide information to that. Absolutely.

MR. YONKE: That would be the only way I could see that you would be able to get something quick. Because like you said, this body meets quarterly.

MR. CROCKETT: Okay. Be happy to do that.

MR. YONKE: I make a motion we send it to Coordinating to look into this a little bit further and engage the developer as well.

MR. MCCANN: Tech.

MR. GLASCOCK: Do I hear a second?

MR. TEDDY: Second.

MR. GLASCOCK: Motion has been made and seconded. All those in favor signal by saying aye. All opposed same sign. Motion carries.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

#### **IX. OTHER BUSINESS**

MR. GLASCOCK: Nine, other business. Anything else for this commission by the commissioners? No?

#### **X. GENERAL COMMENTS BY THE PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF**

Mr. Glascock: Any comments by public, members, and staff? Anybody from the public wish to be heard?

MR. THOMAS: Good afternoon Coordinating Committee. Ian Thomas, 2616 Hillshire Drive, and I am a member of the City Council. I want to express my appreciation for some of the discussion that you've had over the last year about a major amendment to the CATSO 2050 long-range transportation plan. A lot of concerns were raised by members of the public at the December 2019 meeting at which that plan was approved by the committee. And a major amendment is certainly badly needed in order to bring this plan into alignment with what the people of

Columbia and Boone County are looking for in the future transportation system. And John, I appreciate your proposal of creating a transit master plan as a part response to those concerns and there's -- that's definitely very much needed. However, to just do that transit master plan on the long-range transportation plan as it stands is a bit like putting a building on a rotten foundation. There are some really serious problems with the long-range transportation plan, the first of which being that it has some laudable goals and objectives that are utterly ignored in the plan. So, one of the goals is to reduce reliance on automobiles. There is zero evidence of any effort in the plan to achieve that. Invest in and preserve the existing transportation system, encourage infill in under invested areas of Boone County. None of those are reflected in any of the actions of the plan. The plan includes strategic actions to spend hundreds of millions of dollars building new highways and expanding existing roads into highways just as you have been discussing in some of the items this afternoon. The plan has performance measures. Now, a performance measure is supposed to be a way to test whether the goal is being achieved. So, for example, reduction in vehicle miles traveled in the CATSO area is a performance measure. But to my knowledge, there is no plan, no strategy to measure VMT and to see whether an VMT is reducing or not. So, it's a worthless performance measure if there is no attempt even to measure it. Increase in walking, biking, and transit trips, reducing negative environmental impacts due to the transportation system. None of those performance measures are measured. So, with those fundamental problems in the plan -- this is supposed to be a strategic plan that's driven by the public. It will all be constructed with public money. I think there needs to be a major amendment that focuses on a fully community-driven process to review the plan as it is, to look at the goals and objectives and see whether those align with what the public wants. And I think many of them will. The goals and objectives are good. Then, look at the performance measures and slim them down to a few that can actually be measured and then to set in place a program of measurements so that we see if the plan is achieving the goals. And then, to look at the strategies in the plan and make sure that the public feels those are strategies that are going to achieve the goals. Most importantly, overarching of all that is to make sure that the plan aligns with Columbia's Climate Action and Adaptation Plan, which projects that we need to reduce automobile travel by a considerable percentage within the next ten years, certainly within the next 30 years. And reduce our greenhouse gas emissions in the area. Thank you very much for the time to speak.

MR. GLASCOCK: Thank you. Anybody else for the public?

MR. SIMONSON: Lawrence Simonson, 411 McBaine. Back when the LRTP

was -- just before it was adopted, my organization PedNet Coalition gave an analysis of the LRTP. And our summary is essentially that we really like the goals and objectives that are laid out in the LRTP. We still stand by the fact that the plan itself and budget alignment does not match and don't think it will ever the goals and objectives. In fact, we think it stands in stark contrast of achieving those goals. That was about all I was going to say today. But today, I think I learned a really interesting lesson. I thought this was a very educational meeting when I got to watch Mr. Tim Crockett come up as he made his requests for amendments, and how it seemed like the technical committee took those very seriously and then brought them here before you. Over 30 people came to the LRTP meeting and suggested aligning the plan with the goals and objectives. At the very next technical committee meeting that I went to, I got to listen to Staff say we don't need to hear from the public. They don't know what they are doing. That is an exact quote. I won't say who said it, but it was very frustrating at the moment, but then to hear a professional come in representing a developer, making requests and those requests get turned around very quickly, it reinvigorated my frustration for the process. So, I'm going to leave it at that. Thank you all for your time. I know you all work very hard. Thank you.

MR. GLASCOCK: Thank you. Anyone else from the public? Members or Staff comment? Tim, I have a question based on what Mr. Thomas and Mr. Simonson said. Is there any way we can get a report on the alignment of what we see in the plan versus what they are talking about, measures?

MR. TEDDY: Sure. We can respond to it, next coordinating meeting.

MR. GLASCOCK: I would like a report on that.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah, we'll get a response.

MR. GLASCOCK: On the comments that were made here.

MR. TEDDY: Yes, sir.

MR. GLASCOCK: Anything else?

#### **XI. NEXT MEETING DATE**

MR. GLASCOCK: Next meeting? What time or what date is it?

MR. KELLEY: It's on Thursday, August 26th, 2021, at 2:30 PM in these very council chambers.

MR. GLASCOCK: Mr. Thomas, Mr. Simonson, I plan to have a report at the time. Thank you.

#### **XII. ADJOURNMENT**

MR. GLASCOCK: Motion to adjourn?

MR. MCCANN: Motion to adjourn.

MR. YONKE: Second.

MR. GLASCOCK: I guess we should vote.  
(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)  
(Meeting adjourned.)