

MINUTES
COLUMBIA AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY ORGANIZATION
COORDINATING COMMITTEE
December 5, 2019

MEMBERS PRESENT

Tim Teddy	City of Columbia, Community Development
David Nichols	City of Columbia, Public Works
Michelle Kratzer	MoDOT Multimodal
Jeff McCann	Boone County, chief engineer
Kim Tipton	MoDOT, transportation planning coordinator
Mike Henderson	MoDOT Central Office
Thad Yonke	Boone County (for Dan Atwill)
Decarlon Seewood	City of Columbia, deputy city manager

ALSO PRESENT

Mitch Skov City of Columbia Planning/CATSO staff

I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. TEDDY: I'm going to go ahead and call the meeting to order. Good afternoon. My name is Tim Teddy. I work for the City of Columbia and I'm going to be chairing the CATSO Coordinating Committee meeting today. Mr. Glascock, our regular chair, was not able to attend. And I'll start by apologizing for the last-minute room change. A very important announcement -- that is, there is a very important announcement scheduled in the City Council chambers at three o'clock. A city/county press conference is going to take place. And while I mention it, if there's anybody here that really wants to hear what is being said, of course, feel free to excuse yourself from this meeting and go next door. We'll still be talking when you come back. We have an agenda that includes two public hearings today; one on our Long-range Transportation Plan, and following that, a public hearing on the shorter range Transportation Improvement Program.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MR. TEDDY: First order of business is introductions. And let's start with you, Mitch, as CATSO staff, and then we'll go right around the table. Name, title, and organization that you work for.

MR. SKOV: I'm Mitch Skov. I am the senior planner and I am a CATSO staff person.

MR. TEDDY: Tim Teddy, community development director for the City and I serve on this committee as well as we'll call the CATSO Technical Committee.

MS. TIPTON: Kim Tipton, transportation planning coordinator with MoDOT.

MR. HENDERSON: Mike Henderson, transportation planning specialist with central office transportation planning at MoDOT.

MR. NICHOLS: David Nichols, the public works director for the City of Columbia.

MS. KRATZER: Michelle Kratzer, multimodal operations director with MoDOT.

MR. MCCANN: Jeff McCann, chief engineer, Boone County.

MR. YONKE: Thad Yonke, senior planner at Boone County, here for Dan Atwill.

MR. SEEWOOD: Decarlon Seewood, deputy city manager for City of Columbia.

MR. TEDDY: And thanks to our court reporter for taking the minutes of these proceedings. I also want to thank our event services staff. They had to do a quick

scramble. Press conference was announced yesterday and we displaced a utilities department all-day training from this room and then I think that cascaded into another room displacement, so event services have been very busy in the last 24 to 48 hours. We appreciate what they've done to set this room up. I hope our audience will bear with us.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. TEDDY: First order of business, approval of the agenda. Everybody satisfied with the order of items on our agenda?

MS. KRATZER: Move for approval.

MR. YONKE: Second.

MR. TEDDY: It's been moved by Ms. Kratzer and seconded by Mr. Yonke that we approve the agenda. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed same sign.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. TEDDY: Okay. Approval of the minutes from August 22nd. We had a chance of review those minutes and are there any corrections?

MR. YONKE: I move to approve the minutes.

MR. TEDDY: Is there a second?

MR. HENDERSON: Second.

MR. TEDDY: Moved, Yonke; seconded Henderson that we approve the meeting minutes from August 22nd. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed same sign.

(Unanimous vote for approval.)

MR. TEDDY: Okay. We got our minutes.

V. PUBLIC HEARING - PROPOSED CATSO 2050 LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

MR. TEDDY: Let's go right to public hearings. Item 5 on our agenda is a public hearing on the CATSO 2050 Long-range Transportation Plan. And before I turn Mr. Skov loose on that, let me just say something about the order of the hearing. First, we will hear him do a staff report. He'll give an overview of the plan. And I like the contents. Then we will have questions from the committee, if any, of our staff person. And then, I'll open up the public hearing. So anybody from the interested public, I'm going to ask you to come up to the microphone so our court reporter can hear your comments. I'd also ask that you sign your name, if you haven't already, so we can get the correct spelling of your name. We will keep and preserve a record of the entire meeting including the public hearing. Following the close of the public hearing, we will have a committee discussion on the plan, and as appropriate, entertain any motions and votes. That's the order of today's hearing. Just a little bit about CATSO. Mr. Skov has an informational slide on the screen. It stands for Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization. It is a type of organization known as an MPO or Metropolitan Planning Organization. These are organizations that are set up by Federal Transportation Authorization Law, which is currently called FAST Act, all capital letters FAST Act. And so that is where we get our authorization. And the rules for MPOs really say what CATSO is, is the committee and that the committee shall consist of local elected officials, officials of public agencies that administer -- administer major modes of transportation in metropolitan areas including representatives of public transportation and appropriate state officials. So I think those of us around this table, in one way or another, resemble that classification. And the 20-year plan is something that we deliver every five years. That's a mandate. Planning is a continuing process, though. So the plan is capable of being amended from time to time as needed. This is not a situation where we simply set it and forget it for the next five years. It needs

to be adapted to changing circumstances. So we can do specific amendments of that plan once it is adopted. All right. Are we all right with going ahead with the presentation? Mitch, do you want to give us the overview?

MR. SKOV: Again, I'll just give a little, brief overview on the follow up to what Mr. Teddy has said. The Long-range Transportation Plan is intended to be multimodal and it's reflected in, of course, the collaborative decision that are made among the various municipalities and the various jurisdictions that make up the Metropolitan Planning Area. In this case, of course, it is Boone County, MoDOT, and the City of Columbia. It's -- briefly, it will identify the existing system, any future demand on the system, and what strategies we think might be best to meet those demands. As Tim indicated, it is a federal requirement in the federal statutes to have this plan. And it is primarily when it comes down to the base, it is something we have to have in order to be able to get federal aid. Not only transportation planning funds themselves, but actual federal capital and operational funds for various types of other transportation, either street projects or transit. It has to be financially constrained. In other words, the projects we conclude in the document there must be revenue shown to actually provide for those projects. It is -- to go briefly over what public involvement we've had, we did have a public input survey, which we did in the fall of 2018. We got 860 responses, which was actually way better than we've ever gotten before. It was 10 times the responses that we got for the 2040 plan, which is the existing Long-range Plan. We had an open house, a public meeting on September 18th. There were 30 people who signed the attendance sheet. There are a number of other people there as well. We received 27 written comments via email and from comment sheets at the meeting. We've also had a number of discussions at various Technical and Coordinating Committee meetings at the CATSO regularly scheduled meetings going back to the very end of 2017. Most recently, we had a discussion on the LRTP draft at the August meeting, and of course, we have the public hearing today. A little bit more about the online survey. Obviously, it's created to try for us to get as much input as we can. It was sent up for a various stakeholder list. It was promoted through a Facebook message on the City of Columbia's page. The sample size, of course, is not as much as we'd like, but it is .57 percent of the total MPA population, which is 149,000 approximately with the 200-- the 2016 estimate is at that number. Again, we would like to get more, but again, that was way better than we've ever done in the previous Long-range Plans in terms of responses received. Just a brief survey of things to show what the -- some of the major highlights were. As far as the respondents, they indicated 75-plus percent of their work trips, 82-plus percent of their nonwork trips were made in motor vehicles and they drove alone. 47 percent rated the pedestrian network as being good, and 35 percent rated it fair, 8 percent poor. Similar kind of numbers for the bicycle network. You can see slightly lower number rating at fair, similar number as poor. The overall perception was 42 percent people rated it well, as good; 40 percent fair, and 14-plus percent poor. A smaller percentage of people rated it excellent. As far as public transit, specifically Go COMO, 14 percent of the respondents indicated they did use the system. That's just a graph showing what I we just told you. The green is the people who drive alone. According to the bicycle pedestrian network, most people rate it as being good or fair. Smaller numbers rated it excellent or poor. Overall perception, again, most people ranked the system as either being good or fair. The next number of people, around 14 percent, ranked it as being poor and a much smaller number ranked it as being excellent. Our projections as far as population of employment for 2050, we used the 1.5 percent annual growth rate presumption for the population, and a 1.3 percent projection for employment. Revenue; I want to get to the finances, which are a major part of the

document. As far as revenue, MoDOT is 386.7 million is the -- pardon me -- 386 million .7, 181 million point -- for Boone County and 712 million for the City of Columbia. This is the specific resources -- financial resources for transportation purposes. And the federal money that we anticipate is rolled into those numbers depending on, you know, which jurisdiction is -- will be receiving it. Total revenues are just over 1 billion, 1.28 billion. Again, this is over a 30-year period. Just looking at some of the capital projects we are anticipating, new construction level of service upgrades for the City of Columbia, the current list is 14 projects. Estimated costs are around -- just over 100 million. Major maintenance reconstruction, there are three projects we are presuming will occur just under 6 million in terms of total project cost. And MoDOT's costs are all going to be on their existing system. Effectively, it's capital preservation of what they call major maintenance, which means that they may replace pavement sections, they may do overlays, they may replace a bridge. But there are more major projects, but they are maintenance existing system. It is not construction of any new roads. The total street project costs are just over 278 million. That's the roadway plan and any of the projects that are on the list are going to be on the roadway plan there under one of the major classifications. As far as nonmotorized types of projects, standalone projects for sidewalk, and greenbelt trails for example, the plan does show 30 sidewalk projects which is an estimated cost of just over 15 million. There's 29 greenbelt trail and shared-use path projects. Again, the estimated cost for that is just over 43 million and the total cost for those type of projects are estimated at 58.3 million. That is the CATSO Long-range Transportation Plan and Bicycle Pedestrian Network. The majority of the bicycle -- certainly all of the greenbelt trail projects would be on this system, and the majority of the sidewalk projects would happen on that as well. Although, it's possible, we do have some of the sidewalks listed are local streets that technically not part of the major network here, but they are obviously part of the entire system. Total maintenance cost, which is a big part of the projected expenditures, 70.5 million for MoDOT. Boone County is 177-plus million, and the City of Columbia right about 250 million. For MoDOT, of course, this is their routine maintenance costs, which they anticipate on a yearly basis. Again, this is their cost specifically for the CATSO area. Total maintenance for all jurisdictions is 497 million -- 497.7 million. It's just under 500 million, which is a very large chunk of the total expenditures presumed. Total public transit costs; MoDOT, we are anticipating would contribute 682,000 over that 30-year period. And that is just for operations and maintenance. The City of Columbia's transit systems, Go COMO, we're presuming for operations and maintenance 216-plus million. And estimate for capital project cost over this period, 16.5 million. The total transit expenditures that would in the estimate is 233.2 million over that planned period. Total estimated expenditures; for MoDOT that's 243.6 million; for Boone County 177.1 million; and for City of Columbia 647.5 million. You can see there is a reserve for every one of those jurisdictions. It's necessary to have a reserve and it's necessary to demonstrate that through fiscal constraint purposes for federal law. I'll note that Boone County is anticipating they will spend all their revenue for maintenance. They do not have any new projects listed. But total expenditures are just over a billion dollars. So the reserve is 212 million. That's, like, 16.5 percent reserve of the projected revenue. Illustrative projects; we have three of those shown in the plan currently. They are not part of the fiscally constrained list because we don't anticipate there's any funding available now or anytime in the near future. The two big ones there are the Missouri 740, which is Stadium Boulevard extension from its current terminus up to I-70 at the St. Charles Road interchange. The cost estimate there is 80.5 billion. That would include some reconstruction on Route WW from 63 eastward to the end of the urbanized area.

The other illustrative projects there -- listed there, that's a very large project, is Scott Boulevard extension and I-70 interchange. The cost estimate for that is 81 million. Both of those projects, of course, have had extensive engineering studies done for them to actually examine the corridor in detail and actually pick a preferred alternative. The Broadway extension is included there as well. There has not been any kind of engineering study done on that. So that estimate is not nearly as detailed and not as -- based on any kind of a study. I will point out again that as compared to previous Long-range Transportation Plans, this has got much more focus on upgrades to the existing system and capital preservation and maintenance than the previous long-range plans. The previous plans contain way more new projects and project listing that are assumed way more new projects than this one does. In part, that reflects some changed priorities. It also reflects some new financial reality of the number of sources for transportation funding are stable now or they are actually declining. In the City's case, of course, sales tax is a primary example of that. Again, it also contains -- the plan also contains the trend from the existing 2040 plan in that we're showing a greater number of nonmotorized facility projects and funding. Previous Tech Committee action; most recently the Tech Committee did meet on November 6th. They reviewed the proposed document and they did pass a motion for the new Long-range Transportation Plan, with any kind of minor corrections, to the Coordinating Committee for a public hearing with the recommendation of approval. Certainly there can be revisions made today. I have been informed that we may have a revision for the document, but we have made some minor revisions and format changes after the Tech meeting. None of those were really major. Again, they did send it on for a public hearing with the recommendation of approval. Our existing 2040 Long-range Plan is actually now expired. It expired at the end of February in 20-- this calendar year. If formal approval is given, it will not only allow it us to be actually up-to-date, it also would allow us to approve a new updated fiscal year 2023 TIP, the Transportation Improvement Program, which is the next item on the agenda. So we are requesting that the committee actually consider this and pass a motion formally approving it as presented or with any suggested revisions you may have to any component of the document. Thank you.

MR. TEDDY: Any questions for Mr. Skov from the committee or comments you want to make at this stage? Anyone? We'll turn to our audience then and I will open the public hearing. How many, just by a show of hands, how many intend to speak to us today? If I could just ask, comments, about five minutes to wrap up. Please come forward. We have a microphone. We just ask speakers to speak in the microphone. Come forward anyone who is ready. I'll open the public hearing.

MR. SCHMIDT: Good afternoon commission members and thank you. My name is Frank Schmidt. I reside in the city of Columbia at 505 Silver Thorne Drive. I have lived in Columbia for 41 and a half years now. Even as old as I am, that's the majority of my life. I applaud the work you've done. I applaud the effort you have put in, but I find some severe deficiencies that could be addressed in the document. I've gone through the document and through the magic of word search, I have discovered that Vision Zero is mentioned exactly three times in 140 pages. Now, obviously, you know, concrete standards and that sort of technical standards wouldn't show up there, but I think that -- I was a member of the commission that -- or the task force that recommended Vision Zero. It was adopted by the City of Columbia. And unfortunately, since that time relatively little has been done to implement it in terms of really the important and probably most efficient and most telling activity, which is change in engineering standards. And pure and simple, Vision Zero does not mean

vision some or vision a few or even vision as few as possible. It is, in fact, zero. Unfortunately, we've had several pedestrian deaths, which have occurred in the last few months, that have been exactly at places where there have been other pedestrian deaths. And so if you look at the map of Vision Zero Commission, the dots all show up in the same place. I would like to recommend three possible ways to deal with this. The first of which is, I'm old enough to remember the Grateful Dead when they were all alive. One of my favorite songs had the refrain of speed kills. In the Netherlands the speed limit is 18 miles an hour because at that speed a pedestrian has a greater than 95 percent chance of surviving an impact with a car. It drops to half at 30 miles an hour and precipitously after that. I think that is the first step of what I would call -- what the Dutch call forgiving infrastructure, slow everything down. Related to this is construction standards, which would be directed along those lines. And so my other things -- I guess I've got four things to recommend. Okay. One is simply to reduce the number of arterial, multilane, speed-enhancing, speed -- you know, go-faster-because-you-can-streets, which we have. I regularly cycle along Scott Boulevard. It is -- I can do it because I have been doing it for a long time. But it is certainly not hospitable to either pedestrians or to cyclists. In slowing down things, I think that an engineering standard that could be adopted in any new construction and in infill is to, as a matter of principle and first priority, is to limit the sightlines. If you drive out Scott Boulevard south of Rollins Road it's wide, it's big, it goes forever. You can see whatever all the way down to where it constricts. Cars go that fast, as they do on Stadium, as they do on Providence Road north of town, you name it. So I think that that engineering standard, if incorporated, would clearly be appropriate, not merely in residential areas but also elsewhere. And then third, again, looking at the map of pedestrian deaths, they often occurred when people are crossing very long stretches of un signaled streets. So that -- as streets are neighborhood collectors and what arterials we are stuck with are there, there should be regularly spaced pedestrian activated crossing signals, either the hawk or the rectangular rapid flash, one way or the other. I wish it were possible to persuade people that walking an extra half-mile to the signal and crossing there and coming back was good for their health. It is, not merely from the fact that they're less likely to get hit, but also the fact that they get more exercise. But people don't do that. Unfortunately, we are a slothful species and that is what happens. I would like to encourage as the program moves forward to incorporate these things, again, with the motto of safety first, because what does it profit a city if it gains all of the speed and loses its citizens. Thank you.

MR. TEDDY: Before you receive Dr. Schmidt, any questions of the speaker or comments? Okay. Thank you, sir. We appreciate it.

MR. SCHMIDT: One more thing. For purposes of identification, I'm also a member of the City Bicycle and Pedestrian Commission. However, these are my thoughts and not theirs. I wouldn't presume to represent them, although if they're smart, they will agree with me.

MR. TEDDY: Thank you. Who will be next?

MR. THOMAS: I will go next. Ian Thomas, 2616 Hillshire Drive. I'm a member of the City Council. The comments that I'm about to make are most definitely not representative of the whole council, but I think they are good comments anyway. First of all, I want to say how much I appreciate the work of the CATSO staff to really make progress in the public engagement effort this time around over what has traditionally been done. Getting 800 survey responses was a tremendous effort. The public hearing that you held in here on a weekday evening definitely increased people's engagement and understanding of the process, making some plan amendments based

on the input that you received at that meeting. And I think all of this has gone to length of the fact that we really have a significant attendance, which is not typical for these kind of meetings. So I think this is really great progress. However, I do not support the plan update that you are looking at today. I don't believe that it is going to lead a safe transportation system in the future. I don't believe it's going to lead an equitable transportation system in the future, and I don't believe it is sustainable. I don't believe it's going to result in the carbon emissions decrease that we have to do here in Columbia, and Boone County, and the state of Missouri, and the United States of America, and in the entire world. We are one of the most progressive communities in this part of the country, so we should be leading on these things and not continuing to do the same kind of planning that we have done for so many decades now that the knowledge and the situation has changed. Whilst the public engagement effort was excellent compared with previous efforts, I don't believe it is adequate yet. I think there needs to be -- for such a weighty plan, the program's so much future money and makes it so difficult for the downstream as the projects, kind of, come on to five-year, two-year, capital improvement plans to make any changes. I think the public has to be better educator, better informed, and better engaged in being able to give their opinion about the way the future transportation system is being planned. The plan has some excellent goals, objectives, and performance measures, which I think are similar to the ones that were developed five years ago. And I thought that was a really good process of developing those goals, objectives, and performance measures. However, there is no system, no plan to actually measure those goals, objectives, and performance measures and see whether we are accomplishing them. So it is a paper exercise, really, to just put goals, objectives, and performance measures in and then not really refer to them in the actual plan and not even have a way of measuring whether we are achieving them or not. So some of those performance measures that I believe we can measure in a better plan than this would be the vehicle miles traveled per capita. And we have some goals to reduce that in the Metropolitan Planning Area. The mode split among different modes of transportation, carbon emissions, traffic fatalities, traffic serious injuries. We have goals and objectives and performance measures for some of those, but we don't have any way, any plan to actually measure them and achieve them. And they are not specific goals either. They are general goals. So that's the second thing that I think should be in the plan. And then thirdly, we do have a forward-looking road expansion plan. We have a forward-looking trail expansion plan. We actually have a -- the city of Columbia level at least, we have sidewalk master plan. But there is no public transit master plan, either at the city level or at the CATSO level. So transit is going to evolve somehow in the future. We ought to be able to have a public engagement process and decide as a community, as a metropolitan area, how we want to see public transit evolve in the future, document that into a plan and then development and implement strategies to bring that about.

That must be all done with the best information that we have available, current conditions and future conditions and fit with those -- within that framework. So just some of the ideas that I would love to see discussed in the transit master planning process would be looking at fare-free transit, which has been in place in a number of cities like our for many years; Missoula, Montana, North Carolina are two that I'm very familiar with. Kansas City, Missouri is looking seriously at fare-free transit now. There are some tremendous benefits for a community level for creating fare-free transit. Also, I think we should look at shared governance model so that the transit program is taking out from just from the City of Columbia. The University of Missouri might very well have a big stake in the transit system of the future. Many, many, many college

towns have a shared governance and a shared funding model for transit through which all of the students and often all of the faculty and staff as well at the University automatically travel free on the transit system. And subsidies, the business community as part of that. And businesses will buy into the system and provide free transit for all of their employees. This is tremendously effective of building a strong transit system and getting people to use it and reducing the vehicles on the road, increasing safety, reducing congestion, reducing emissions, all of these tremendous benefits. Then the third system, which is tied with having some shared governance with the University, is that U-Pass system. And that that system that I referenced whereby students all travel free. So I ask you not to adopt this plan. But if you do decide to adopt it, then I ask you to start work immediately on an amendment as Tim just mentioned. Amendments -- major amendments can be made to the plan in between the five-year time points. I would recommend a two-year process to address some of these items and some others that I'm sure other people will come up with and it will -- it should involve some sort of a task force that's -- goes out and really engages the community, educates people on what this is about so that people can then give informed input rather than not really understand what the process is. And then gather that input and make recommendations to you, as a committee, on an amendment I would suggest in about two years time.

MR. TEDDY: If you will stand up for a moment. Do members have any questions of counsel member -- or Counsellor Thomas? Thank you, sir.

MR. THOMAS: Thanks very much.

MR. TEDDY: I appreciate your input. Who will be next? Who wants to make a comment for the record?

MR. SIMONSON: Hello CATSO. Good evening. My name is Lawrence Simonson. First off, I want to commend the staff and really think it has been pretty wonderful working with staff and seeing their hard work put into accepting all of the public comments that have been given through this process. I have worked with city staff and other committees before and there has been resistance to change and I really think that this has been a very progressive process. Thank you very much. Not only being willing to listen to the public concerns, but then have really worked hard to incorporate the public concerns into the current version of the Long-range Transportation Plan. So thank you very much. I commend you. I would like to encourage, however, as we move forward to continue to improve the public engagement and accessibility of CATSO. While quite a bit was improved in this last round, I do still think that there are many steps that need to be taken to make this more accessible. I think it says quite a bit in the fact that in the time that I have been coming to the CATSO meetings over the years, this is probably the second largest meeting I have ever been to where usually it is one or two people in the room. I think when something is as important as the job that you all take on with the Long-range Transportation and all of the other work that CATSO does, it's very important that the public is walking side-by-side, step in step with you along the way as you create these plans. I encourage you to continue to make those improvements and thank you for the improvements you've already made. I also want to stress that an adoption of measurable benchmarks related to the Long-range Transportation goals should be done and that those goals should be -- excuse me, those benchmarks should be measured at a regular interval to ensure that the plan is moving us towards our stated goals. I think that is something that is lacking and should be strongly considered and developed as we move forward. I also would also like to encourage that we continue to work on improving the readability and overall design of the Long-range Transportation Plan to make it more accessible to the public.

The document is fairly difficult to read, pretty professional -- a lot of professional language, hard to navigate. I think some improvements have been made in this most current draft, but as we continue to improve our public engagement process for CATSO, I think that is one big leap forward that can be made, a document that is very easy and accessible to the public. Thank you very much.

MR. TEDDY: If you will stand for a moment and give the committee members an opportunity -- any questions of our speaker? Seeing none, thank you, sir. All right. Would anyone else like to address the committee on the Long-range Plan? Anyone else? Okay. So I will close the public hearing seeing that no one has indicated they want to speak. We did receive quite a number of written comments, so not only our speakers today, but I will thank everyone that took time to look at the plan and offer comments. I think they were very constructive and I appreciate hearing the speakers today, that while comments are critical, I very much appreciate the spirit in which the criticism was offered. All right. I will turn to our Coordinating Committee members for any discussion.

MR. YONKE: So Mitch, in the stuff that you sent out there were some proposed changes from the draft that had been put through. Specifically, we're looking at eliminating some projects?

MR. SKOV: Well, there were three projects that were moved from the specific project list for the City of Columbia to, basically, for the most part, more of a reserve. There was a suggestion made, of course, that there were too many street projects shown. So the -- there were three projects specifically taken out and the impact was -- I believe it was 47 million less is shown in that list. As you well understand, whether the project is in the list is it not, specifically, has no direct bearing on whether the project can be constructed or not as long as it is part of the major roadway plan, which all these projects are. But you're right; I took out three projects. I believe there's one of them --

MR. YONKE: County would like to have the Gans Road project reinserted.

MR. SKOV: Okay. And where it was shown before, we -- it was shown out in fiscal year 2028.

MR. YONKE: Yeah. We were looking at 2030 and 2040 time.

MR. SKOV: You want to put it in 2035?

MR. YONKE: That will work.

MR. SKOV: Well, that will -- of course that will up the estimated cost based on the inflation factor, but there's plenty of reserve.

MR. YONKE: Right.

MR. SKOV: I would make a presumption it would be a city project?

MR. YONKE: It will be a combined project probably and it will likely be significantly funded by development. So it's one of those things where it needs to have -- it needs to be there because there may be some other money opportunities at times. It needs to be in the plans so that if those other money opportunities come in, it can be funded.

MR. SKOV: The -- one of the other projects I took out was the Providence Road extension between Smiley and Brown School Road. Specifically, that was taken out because it is a fairly expensive project, but it will be pretty much funded by the development community. If that property is developed, they would be the ones building the road.

MR. YONKE: Yeah. This -- this one, though, may have partnership potential. So we want the Gans Road put back in.

MR. SKOV: And you -- I mean, the difference -- the question here is do you want any of that shown as a county project? The amount of reserve in the county section is

very minimal.

MR. YONKE: Right. Not at this time, but we can look at that --

MR. SKOV: That doesn't --

MR. YONKE: It's not that kind of plan. I mean, it's not that level of granularity.

MR. SKOV: No.

MR. YONKE: We want it back in there so that if things come about that allow us to get that plan -- I mean, we already spent a significant amount of money on alignment studies and in conjunction with all of the other players and so it is an important corridor and so if it gets the potential to come in, and if additional money from outside become available, we want to not have the hurdle of oops, it's not in the plan.

MR. SKOV: Well, it would be the other example, besides the two big illustrative projects that have had a major engineering study done. So --

MR. YONKE: Right.

MR. SKOV: There is certainly plenty of reserve shown to assume it is going to be on the project list. How about if we -- I'll just presume it will be at 2035.

MR. YONKE: That will be fine.

MR. SKOV: Is that fine?

MR. YONKE: Because if it ends up accelerating or not, it can be amended to move forward or backward. So -- but it needs to be in the plan.

MR. TEDDY: I think I'll continue comments of the committee at the appropriate time. I think we should make a motion to amend anything that we are going to change that differs from the content of the draft plan. I agree that there was a fairly good public process for the Gans Road corridor. I recall participating in the Rock Bridge Elementary open house. I think the design firm won an award for that process.

MR. YONKE: Yes, they did. And, you know, it's --

MR. TEDDY: It was fairly innovative.

MR. YONKE: Right. It's got --

MR. TEDDY: The first one --

MR. YONKE: -- built-in storm water controls. It's got the full, complete streets. It's got five roundabouts. I mean, it's made to slow traffic even though it is taking traffic off of another -- yeah. It's one where everything came together.

MR. TEDDY: Other comments from members of the committee?

MR. HENDERSON: I just want one clarification. So when you say remove the three projects from the plan, that means from the fiscally constrained --

MR. SKOV: From -- from the fiscally constrained project list, not from the major road --

MR. HENDERSON: They go to the illustrative list then?

MR. SKOV: No. It didn't go to the illustrative list. They just were not shown on any list. It would certainly be appropriate to have the Gans Road as an illustrative, but it's not necessary. The other two I -- were moved just for the sake of adding to the reserve. They wouldn't have to be removed.

MR. HENDERSON: Well, you explained the one project was expected to be completed by the developer.

MR. SKOV: (Nodded.)

MR. HENDERSON: The other project, what was the reason?

MR. SKOV: Well, the third project was a -- I believe it was St. Charles Road and the presumption was I just didn't think that was as likely to happen is why I put that one. And it wasn't as big of a priority as something like, for example, and additional bridge over Perche Creek, which I left that project in even though it's more expensive. Again, to explain to the audience, it doesn't -- it doesn't constrict the project from being done

or not being done by it being in the list or not being in list. If it is part of the Major Roadway Plan, it is still a potential project.

MR. TEDDY: I will just add to that. Take the example of Providence Road alignment from Smiley to Brown School Road, fairly large tracts in that area. Depending on what happens to those tracts, there may be some opportunity there to get dedications of right-of-way through the subdivision process. And a lot of the projects we see in the plans are delivered with some private development dollars. They are not all public expenditures.

MR. SKOV: We would not have to remove any of these projects, necessarily.

MR. HENDERSON: So again, for clarification, is the suggested amendment going to be to keep the Gans Road project in there or is the suggested amendment to take three projects out?

MR. SKOV: No. The projects were taken out in the process of revising the draft after the comments received. Especially at the -- especially at the September meeting. What Mr. Yonke is suggesting is we put Gans Road back into the project list, the specific project list of anticipated projects under the fiscal constraint.

MR. TEDDY: What I am suggesting is that they are, in fact, staying on the Major Roadway Plan. So we still have a plan as a contingency should there be emerging need on St. Charles Road or Providence alignment. Any other questions about that or comments? Anything else? Any other aspect of the plan? Any takeaways from our public input?

MR. NICHOLS: The request to review it on a more frequent basis, is that something this body does or can implement?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. I think it has to be initiated by this committee. We'd probably want to have further dialogue about any future amendments, but that is something that we could initiate. What I take away from the several comments today is we need to look at capacity building. And the rules governing MPOs do say we ought to reach out to other planning efforts in our areas. So that would go to things like the climate action and adaptation plan and Vision Zero. You know, we do, in fact, coordinate a lot of planning efforts in the document. And that's something that maybe isn't brought out enough in the planning document. The Gans Road corridor that we were just talking about, having a public process would be a small example. But there are other types of planning documents; the comprehensive plans of Boone County and of the City. We try to incorporate a plan for that, for example. So a lot of the content in the Long-range Plan is somewhat derivative of other -- other efforts and other transportation improvements that have been publicly vetted. So a lot of the projects on the project list, for example, aren't originating with this plan. Some have been on the plan for a number of years. And many come from documents such the city's capital improvement plan or the state or county plans. All right. If there's no further questions or comments, I'll entertain any motions.

MR. YONKE: I move to approve the plan with the Gans Road reinstated in it.

MS. TIPTON: Second.

MR. TEDDY: Okay. It has been moved by Yonke, seconded by Ms. Tipton that we approve the plan subject to the Gans Road improvement being reinstated to the project list.

MR. YONKE: Yeah.

MR. TEDDY: This is the segment that is unapproved -- I'm sorry -- yeah. It's an unapproved segment on the south side of town that's had a study. Any discussion of the motion? It remains on the plan either way. This would be restoring it to the project list as well as approving the plan. Okay. If there's no further comments, all of those

in favor of the motion to approve the plan, subject to the amendment, signify by saying aye. Any opposed same sign.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. TEDDY: Okay. We have a plan document. Thank you everyone for your comments.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING - PROPOSED FY 2020-2023 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PLAN

MR. TEDDY: We have another public hearing we are going to move into. We're going to move right into our second public hearing, which is proposed fiscal year 2023 Transportation Improvement Program.

MR. SKOV: Thanks, Mr. Chairman. This is the typical annual update we do for the Transportation Improvement Program for the CATSO Metropolitan Planning Area. Just briefly, the TIP regularly features a narrative listing of the transportation related capital projects. In this case, it's for the four-year period starting in fiscal year 2020 through 2023 for this area. It's very similar to that of the MoDOT version of a TIP, which is called the STIP, the S-T-I-P. Primarily, the purpose of the TIP is to list the federal funds that are programmed for the various types of transportation projects, which of course will include roadway as well as transit. The last project for the Getabout Columbia, the federal nonmotorized program project is included there. There's some bicycle/pedestrian projects and sidewalk projects for the City of Columbia as well as Boone County maintenance and projects et cetera. And some private transit providers, too, as well; primarily, OATS. It also doesn't list the anticipated maintenance costs needs of the local agencies that comprise CATSO. Again, that's Boone County, MoDOT, and the City of Columbia. Specifically in this document, we only show the maintenance costs for the lane miles for what they call the federal aid system, which is that which is technically the higher classification, streets, federal transportation planning types of finances. The maintenance costs for those -- those roadways estimated over the four-year period is 14.1 million. Like the LRTP, it has to be financially constrained. In other words, all the revenue that is shown has to be sufficient to cover the projects that are listed in the document. And again, in order for local jurisdictions to use federal funds for any kind of transportation-related project, it has to be listed as the approved TIP. This particular version of the TIP doesn't include just over -- or just under 137 million in capital project costs; 34-plus million of that is federal funds. The majority of those federal funds in this case are for MoDOT roadway projects, again, for upgrades to the current system as well as for Go Como transit projects. The lion's share of that is for operations and maintenance, for Go Como operation, for Go COMO system. This is not the easiest thing to see, but it's just a breakdown by section. You can see MoDOT roadways we're showing 83.3 million; 360,000 for the scoping, which is a preliminary engineering section of MoDOT. Boone County does not have any new capital projects. Again, they're spending all of their money on maintenance, existing system. Columbia streets has 16.8 million. Columbia sidewalks, 904 million. Pardon me, 904,000. And the Getabout project is shown there, 1.8 million. And then the second largest amount of money besides the MoDOT section -- the MoDOT roadway section is for transit. Again, the lion's share of that is going to be for operations and maintenance, but there's also some capital projects shown there as well. The total capital projects funding we're presuming is 136.9 million, plus 14.1 million in maintenance just for that federal system. Total amount of program money is 151 million. And the amount of revenue is 224 million. We are anticipating the lion's share of the remaining funds will go to other related transportation systems. I believe some -- the lion's share, I think, will go to maintenance for the other streets that are not part

of the federal aid system. Certainly, the draft TIP as presented can be adopted as presented, or it can be adopted under revisions or amendments that are suggested and approved by the committee. This will be formally provided to the Federal Highway Administration, FTA and MoDOT, immediately upon approval by the Coordinating Committee. As far as that previous Technical Committee action, the Tech Committee did review at their November 6th meeting. They had some general discussion on the draft. They did pass a motion to forward the proposed TIP to the coordinating committee for review and approval and with the recommendation of approval. As with the previous item, any -- after any review the committee wants to or any suggestions the members may have for revisions and after holding a public hearing, Staff would suggest that the committee give formal approval to the proposed fiscal year 2020-2023 TIP. Thank you.

MR. TEDDY: Thank you, Mr. Skov. Questions of the committee for Mr. Skov? Any comment on the draft document? Seeing none, is there anyone in our audience that would like to speak to the Transportation Improvement Program? This is where the partners and CATSO do actually express commitment to specific transportation expenditures. This is a document that also can be amended and often is amended sometimes to change the expenditure amounts or project scopes or assignment of the years of the different phases of the improvements. I mention those two require public hearings, generally speaking. Okay? Once again, any public comment on the TIP or Transportation Improvement Program? Seeing none, I will close the public hearing on that. Is there a motion?

MR. YONKE: I move to approve as presented.

MR. HENDERSON: I'll second.

MR. TEDDY: Moved, Yonke; second Henderson to approve the Transportation Improvement Program as presented. Any discussion on the motion? Seeing none, I'll call for a vote. All those in favor say aye. Any opposed same sign.

(Unanimous voice vote approved.)

VII. PROPOSED REVISIONS TO COLUMBIA AREA FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP

MR. TEDDY: All right. We have a TIP and a Long-range Plan. Now, we're going to go -- this is the third topic, not formatted as a public hearing. Revisions of the functional classification map.

MR. SKOV: There are quite a few slides for this item. I'm go to try to go through it as briefly as I possibly can. For those of you are unfamiliar with this, this is a map which is somewhat similar to our major roadway plan, but it's -- as opposed to the major roadway plan, which includes some future roadways, the functional classification map, which is technically a document which is for federal aid use, for federal project financing for roadways, is something, which really presents a snapshot at the current moment of what functionality of that particular street is. I will bring the map up in a moment, but the MoDOT central office has asked us to make some revisions to the existing map. Technically, this map is maintained by the central office of MoDOT. So there is somewhat of a formality of this procedure. But they do want us to review it and give our approval to that -- to their proposed changes. The current functional class map we have was approved in August of 2018. The proposed changes that will be listed on the following slides. There are four future designations, which are typically not on a functional class map, but we did have a handful. Those have been determined now. They don't meet the standards required to have them on the functional class map, so they suggested those deletion, which Staff has no objection to. In theory, any future roadway that's shown on the functional class map is presumed to be implemented within

five years. There's no funding to implement within five years, so we are going to remove them from the map, or I should say MoDOT is going to remove them, but we're certainly fine with that. What the functional class map, again, does is it just -- it identifies the federal aid system. The functional classifications of federal aid system for the roadway system. This is a Federal Highway Administration documented as poor. What you see there is not, of course, the Metropolitan Planning Area boundary. That's actually the census defined urbanized area boundary. The roadways that are there are various classifications, of course. The higher order ones all have a brighter color. The gray ones are local, the lighter lines. And the actual boundary there, the black line boundary, includes the city limits as well as what the Census Bureau calls other areas that are urbanized. So there is some gray area there within that boundary. It's actually unincorporated Boone County, but it is still part of the urbanized area based on the census definitions. Now, the report went into some more detail about how that's defined, which I am not going to get into. But this is the -- again, the functional classification system is basically a tool for federal aid, ultimately. Now, again I am going to try to keep this brief. The roadways that were -- have been shown in the current map that we're going to remove, there -- for some reason we have future Creekwood Parkway major collector between Clark and Vandiver. The Gans Road principal arterial, which we've discussed. Removing it from the functional class map is different than removing it from the roadway plan, of course. This is again -- it's just a reflection of what the roadway does at the current moment. Future Providence Road minor arterial from Smiley Lane to Brown School Road, also a project we discussed earlier. And a future Northwest Loop minor arterial between Brown School Road and Obermiller Road. That will be a completely new roadway as would the other ones listed here. But these are going to be removed from the functional class map given there's no immediate funding available or presumed to be available within five years. There's some other ones, similar streets that are going to be changed in terms of classification. They will remain on the map, but I'll try to go through these quickly. Brown School Road from 763, which is Rangeline Street to Creasy Springs is being changed for a local and a minor to a major connector. As a result of that future Northwest Loop being removed, there is no longer an arterial connection there. So having a collector street classification is more appropriate. That includes Brown School from 763, again, Rangeline over to Creasy Springs. In line with that, Creasy Springs Road between Brown School and Obermiller is being upgraded from a local to a major connector. Obermiller Road from O'Neal to Creasy Springs is being downgraded to major collector from a minor arterial. Again, there's no Northwest Loop connection on the map, so this will match up Obermiller and other collectors in the vicinity. Blackfoot Road, which is -- basically a local now, but it's shown on the roadway plan as -- in some places as a minor arterial there. It was a little new section of it shown functional class map. It's being upgraded to major collector to match Obermiller and the other -- so the entire existing section of Blackfoot is going to be major collector. Route E, Stadium Boulevard extending from Blackfoot down to I-70 will be downgraded from an arterial to a major collector. Smiley Lane from Providence to Rangeline is actually being upgraded from major collector to minor arterial. Presumably to -- because of the fact that Providence Road is a minor arterial, the upgrade is being done for that reason. Smiley Lane from the removed proposed Northwest Loop is being downgraded from major collector to a local. The fact is this section of Smiley Lane actually going west from where Providence connects to it, actually dead ends into a private driveway, I believe. So it's appropriate to make it be local. And then there's two sections of Bluff Creek Boulevard. There are no pending plans for any kind of Grindstone Creek bridge

at this point to link those two sections, north and south. As a result of that, there's no thru movement on around and downgrade to a local for both the north section and the south sections is appropriate. Route 163, Providence Road, between Nifong, Route AC and Route K currently it's shown as a freeway expressway and principal arterial. It's going to be downgraded to minor arterial. That will match up to what Route K is designated. From Route K to the proposed Gans Road, which I should say the removed proposed Gans Road is being downgraded a collector so it can match the classification of MO-163 heading south down toward Rock Bridge Park. Gans Road from the start, from its initial beginning, over to Rock Quarry is being downgraded to local. Again, because the future link is no longer shown in the functional class map. This section of Gans Road again terminates at a private property. Local is appropriate. And then Gans Road between Rock Quarry and Bearfield is being downgraded to minor collector from arterial. Again, because of a lack of an arterial connection there with the future link removed. And between Bearfield and 63 ramps is being downgraded to major collector. Again, that's a better designation for what the road currently serves than principal arterial. As far as any previous review, the Tech Committee did look at this at their November 6th meeting. There was a question about why -- what the point of upgrading Smiley Lane might be from Providence -- between Providence and Route 763. It's currently a major collector and that's what matches up to the actual designation for Smiley Lane on the east side of Rangeline. Presumably, it's being upgraded to match up to the fact that Providence is a minor arterial on the functional class map and it currently terminates at Smiley Lane. Designated that section of Smiley an minor arterial continues that arterial function over to 763. Either way, Staff certainly has no objection to either one of those classification for that portion of Smiley Lane. And that is a large number of changes, but again, it doesn't have any bearing on any future roadway changes. It just really designates things as they are at the moment. That's all I got.

MR. TEDDY: Committee members? Any questions of Mr. Skov? We did review this, those of us that serve on the Technical Committee. We went over it. I think we're ready for a motion.

MR. YONKE: I just want to point out that we also want to make sure that everybody does understand that we are looking at this is a snapshot map and that it's not a backdoor justification to try to turn around and change things on the long-range map. That's not appropriate. In recognizing that, we'll move to approve it as it has been presented.

MR. TEDDY: Is that a motion, then?

MR. YONKE: Yes.

MS. TIPTON: Second.

MR. TEDDY: Moved, Mr. Yonke; second, Ms. Tipton that we recommend these revisions to the Columbia Area Functional Classification Map. Any discussion on the motion? All those in favor say aye. Any opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

VIII. PROPOSED 2019 SAFETY TARGETS FOR CATSO AREA

MR. TEDDY: Let's move on to our next item. We're on VIII of our agenda. These are the proposed 2019 safety targets for the CATSO area.

MR. SKOV: Mr. Chair, this is an -- become an annual exercise for CATSO regarding Federal Transportation Regulations. The requirement, that being for the FAST Act, require that all MPOs adopt either our own safety targets for the upcoming year, or to adopt the statewide safety targets. In the past, and specifically a year ago, we adopted what MoDOT had set. They would provide their safety targets, which are on

the next slide here, to us in the later part of August. Technically, we have until February 27th to approve them or come up with our own. February 27th happens to be the date of the next CATSO Coordinating meeting. I guess it is not an absolute that we prove these here, but I have not done any analysis on the numbers or looked into the data with any detail. I was informed recently that this is something that has to be done, for us to keep compliant, by February 27th. The latest numbers are there on the screen. This is the adopted safety targets related. You can see fatalities, fatality rate per hundred million vehicle miles traveled, number of serious injuries, serious injury rate per 100 million vehicle miles traveled, and the number of nonmotorized fatalities and serious injuries. There's a column for a five-year rolling average there between 2014 and 2018, and a statewide target for calendar year and five year rolling average for the point target for year 2020. You can see the -- what they're based upon. The targets are based upon a 13 percent fatality reduction, 8 percent serious injury reduction, and a very minimal amount of EMT increase. Also, 5 percent nonmotorized reduction. I don't really have anything further to say about this. It's actually up to the committee to do as you like. But the Tech Committee has not looked at this because of the timing Staff learned about this. Again, we do have time until the next meeting that we could technically adopt it on the day they're do, which would give the Tech Committee a chance to review if there's any value in that.

MR. TEDDY: I would say we certainly aspire to reduce serious injury and death and crashes to zero. These would be trends that would be indicative of progress.

MR. SKOV: Yes.

MR. TEDDY: Is that a way to look at it?

MR. YONKE: These are the numbers that the state is using?

MR. HENDERSON: And what was the position that CATSO took when the original targets were due?

MR. SKOV: We adopted the statewide targets.

MR. HENDERSON: Statewide targets. So that's all we're asking to do in the end is continue that?

MR. SKOV: To renew the new statewide targets that are provided.

MR. YONKE: I don't see any reason to wait. I mean, we can amend -- we can take these and it doesn't change the fact that we're still trying to make things safer and do better than that. I mean, this is just a matter of we must have the goals set and there's no reason this can't be the goal if it is the statewide goal. I would move that we adopt the state ones now. I don't see any benefit from waiting.

MR. HENDERSON: I'll second.

MR. TEDDY: Moved, Yonke; the second Henderson to adopt the state's safety targets. Any discussion on that motion? Seeing no further discussion, all those in favor of the motion say aye. Any opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote.)

MR. TEDDY: You have your targets.

MR. SKOV: Okay.

IX. CATSO PLANNING PROCESS CERTIFICATION

MR. TEDDY: Next item is the CATSO planning process certification.

MR. SKOV: Required by the Metropolitan Planning Organization or under federal law, we renew our planning process certification every year as part of the TIP approval. It's actually included in the TIP appendices, but it is preferable and we would advise that we should actually review this in consider it as a separate agenda item. Basically, just certifies that CATSO is fulfilling the obligations under the Federal Transportation Planning process rules and we're doing that in accordance with those

rules as described, specifically on the certification. Once the committee gives their approval, the statement will be signed by the committee chair or maybe the vice chair in his absence, and by the MoDOT engineer. That doesn't have to be done today, but it is something that we'll include as part of our final approved TIP when we submit it to MoDOT. We'll forward that immediately once we have a signed document and include it with the TIP document. Again, I think it is just a matter of -- for -- to make it more obvious to do it as a separate item as opposed to adopting it as part of the TIP approval. So the suggestion would be that give the formal approval by the committee and permission for the appropriate parties to sign.

MR. TEDDY: Was there questions or comments? I'll entertain a motion to approve the self-certification.

MR. HENDERSON: I move that we approve the planning process for CATSO.

MR. YONKE: Second.

MR. TEDDY: Moved, Henderson; second Yonke to approve the self-certification statement. Any questions about that motion? All those in favor say aye.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. TEDDY: We're now going to downshift a little bit.

X. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC MEMBERS AND STAFF.

Mr. TEDDY: Item 10 is general comments from the public and members of staff. If there is anything that relates to transportation and planning that is not featured on our agenda today, please feel free to come forward.

MS. MEYER: I don't have any comments. I just want to thank you for all that you have already done. And as a citizen of Columbia I drive a lot. I also love riding my bike and walking and I am becoming more educated to the process and thank you again for the invitation to participate as a citizen. I'll learn a lot more and then hopefully have an opportunity to have educated comments and such in the future.

MR. TEDDY: Can we get your name, ma'am?

MS. MEYER: Yes, Lisa Meyer.

MR. TEDDY: Thank you, Lisa. Thank you very much. Anyone else from the public? Any members have something to share with the group?

XI. ADJOURNMENT

MR. TEDDY: Staff, you've said a lot. I'll call for a motion to adjourn.

MR. YONKE: Moved to adjourn.

MS. TIPTON: Second.

MR. TEDDY: All those in favor of adjourning say aye.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

(Off the record.)