

MINUTES
COLUMBIA AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY ORGANIZATION
COORDINATING COMMITTEE
February 23, 2023

MEMBERS PRESENT

Jeff McCann, Boone County Public Works
Thad Yonke (for Justin Aldred, County Commission)
Shane Creech, City of Columbia Public Works
Nick Foster (for Columbia Mayor Barbara Buffaloe)
De'Carlton Seewood, City of Columbia City Manager
Tim Teddy, City of Columbia Community Development

STAFF

Clint Smith
Mitch Skov
Brad Kelley

I. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order at 2:30 p.m.

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MR. MCCANN: Jeff McCann, Boone County Engineering.

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

MR. CREECH: Shane Creech. I'm the Director of Public Works for the City of Columbia.

MR. FOSTER: Nick Foster, City Ward Council member, Ward 4, and here for Mayor Buffaloe.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: De'Carlton Seewood, Chair of the committee.

MR. TEDDY: Tim Teddy, Community Development Director for the City.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Now, Clint with staff?

MR. SMITH: Clint Smith, Community Development. I am CATSO staff.

MR. SKOV: Mitch Skov, CATSO Staff. We have Brad Kelley out here, also CATSO staff.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: All right.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Approval of the Agenda. Do we have any changes to the Agenda or modifications?

MR. YONKE: Move to approve the agenda as written.

MR. TEDDY: Second.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote for approval of the Agenda.)

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Approval of Minutes.

MR. YONKE: I've got a correction to the Minutes. My last name is spelled Y-O-N-K-E, not Y-A-N-K-E, so I have that correction, but --

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Any other corrections for the Minutes? If not, can I get a motion for approval?

MR. YONKE: Move to approve with corrections. This is Thad.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: All in favor. Oh, I've got to -- let me get a second.

MR. TEDDY: Second. Tim Teddy.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

V. PUBLIC HEARING

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Do you want to give a staff --

MR. SKOV: We'll indicate to you, Mr. Chair, we do have Tammy here today directly, so we do not need -- you do not need to indicate your name before you speak.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Oh, okay.

MR. SKOV: Just a -- it's an FYI. Thank you.

MR. SMITH: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is a public hearing to consider some major roadway plan amendments to the City's major roadway plan. It's titled Philips Farm Road corridor. There's actually a few of these, but they kind of -- kind of a good summary of the area that we'll be talking about tonight -- excuse me -- this afternoon. And, generally, they're going to be the Philips Farm Road Corridor and then also the Gans Road and the State Farm Parkway area, and we're going to conclude with a little discussion on the Buttonwood Drive and Veterans United Drive. So all of these are kind of generally in that vicinity of south of Nifong, east of Providence, Gans Road north and then Highway 63 really on the eastern side of this corridor. So this is, again, kind of what I just described as the boundaries of this. It's kind of the general vicinity here that we'll be looking at. The brown road there on the far bottom of your screen, that's Gans, and the purple on the far north is -- is Nifong. The blue on the east is 63, and the red on the west or on the left side there is Providence, so all of these kind of fall within this -- this area, this corridor, this kind

of general vicinity of town. And we're going to talk about these kind in groups to kind of break them up and make them a little -- a little more easier to digest. And just to recap real quick, the Coordinating Committee did see this back in December when they decided to set the public hearing. Tech did meet on February 1st to offer recommendations, which are included as part of this packet, as well, so I'll just be summarizing those recommendations. So the first one, the first kind of grouping we're going to look at is the Philips Farm Road realignment. We'll dive into this just a little bit more detail. We're going to look at kind of the east side of Philips Farm Road and the west side. In general, it's really just kind of a minor alignment tweak. The east and the west side, those locations are kind of set right now, so it's really just a slight revision to the alignment based on some analysis the staff has done. The second part of this is going to be a little more there in the lower left, kind of look at Corporate Lake Drive and State Farm Parkway extensions, and then we'll clue it up by the Buttonwood and a couple, as of now, unnamed -- unknown -- excuse me -- unnamed neighborhood collectors that's going to connect to the extension of Buttonwood and also Veterans United Drive and State Farm Parkway. So before we get started, I'll say I may misstate some street names. There's been some changes and there's a lot of street names in here, so if I -- I make any mistakes, somebody can kind of yell that out as we go. I don't want to misstate any roads. This information is in the packet. It kind of gives a brief summary on the background and the analysis that was done, and there are recommendations that staff had proposed before these changes. I won't go into these in great detail here. I'll kind of go through each of those groupings that we -- as we had discussed earlier, but this is a good reference if you're following along in your packet. The first one we'll look at is Philips Farm Road. Again, the -- the east side of this is the current Philips Farm Road, a kind of stub was constructed along with the Discovery Office Park North many years ago, kind of late 2000s. So part of this is going to be looking at kind of moving what's shown on the major roadway plan up to where that road actually exists now. The west side again is set with the roundabout located at State Farm Parkway and Veterans United. So as part of the analysis of this kind of realignment, staff actually looked at two potential alignments for this, and this came -- kind of was born out of some potential development that has been occurring in the City, as well, kind of started that conversation. So staff engineers looked at a couple of alignments, and here on your screen you'll see really we're looking a north

and a south, the north being the red route, the south being the green route, also known as alignment one. Alignment two is the northern one, the red alignment. Part of this also is discussion about the potential kind of offset, so the -- the idea that maybe this corridor here wouldn't be continuous all the way from the east to the west. So we're going to break this up actually into two parts, the east and the west. So we'll dive into the east side here real quick. And what you'll notice on here is kind of on the -- on the bottom part of the screen is that grayed out dash black line. That's an existing prelim -- preliminary plat. It was approved by Council. And that really, again, precipitated a conversation about this alignment. Staff wanted to give an idea of maybe where this roadway would be best suited. That was part of the -- the study that was done. So the green line, as you can see, would go through the existing prelim, so really the red alignment on the east side of Bearfield is probably the preferred alignment right now. But I would caveat that with saying it's probably not precluded at this point from also going on the green alignment east of Bearfield, but, generally, I think the circumstances probably favor the northern red alignment and that is, again, what the Tech Committee has recommended at this point. So a couple of things I'll just point out. The red alignment goes a little further north. It does start at Philips Farm Road there on the east as shown on the screen, and it does go through some existing facilities there you see as it approaches Bearfield. And that's -- that is noted. It's -- it is an issue where the potential redevelopment of that site would most likely need to occur for this alignment to be constructed at some point, and that's not really different than any other proposal. A lot of those, though, tend to happen on green field sites where there isn't these obstacles. But really given the -- the development to the south here with Bristol Lake Subdivision, there's not really a clean corridor, and that's kind of true for this entire corridor, as we'll see. So there's -- there's some general alignments we're being asked to kind of look at here and set. In this case, staff did look at -- and the Tech Committee looked at that alignment. And at this point, they're -- they're favoring the northern red alignment and not to jump ahead too far, but then also to have an offset here. So I wanted to point out there on the -- on the left side of the screen, you see the blue kind of barbell icon, and that is indicating that in that location there may be a split in the alignment. Generally a corridor, you know, it stays in one alignment all the way through. In this case, though, given some of the challenges with existing development and some terrain issues, we're going to split here and go south on

the west side of Bearfield. So this is just kind of an overview of the aerial, just kind of give you an idea of the terrain we're looking at out there. You can see facilities again along the red alignment, but then we're going to jump to the west alignment. So the eastern alignment would be the red alignment as shown on the previous slide. Going west, though, there's a couple of different things to take into consideration. So the green alignment as shown here on the south is very similar to what alignment is shown right now on the major roadway plan. But as we stated, given a lot of the development pressures here, I think the consideration was to go from a more generalized alignment, which a lot of the CATSO major roadway plan is, to something that's a little more tailored to the terrain, given that with the development pressures we're seeing, it may be worthwhile to have a better alignment so that development going into the future is going to have a better idea where these roadways are going to be. So a couple of the challenges, though. If you'll notice on the red, it's -- it's stated on there, the red alignment does take into account that some existing residential single-family homes would need to be removed. That was not necessarily something that precluded the idea of looking at that alignment. Really the alignment was looking at just any potential locations for this, but, honestly, I think Tech did feel that that was a pretty -- pretty significant obstacle to get over in order to recommend that alignment. The green alignment to the south isn't without its own challenges. There is some grade issues especially at Rock Quarry Road. There would be some significant cut necessary to bring the grade of the street down to Rock Quarry grade -- Rock Quarry grade. Not something that is necessarily impossible, but it would take, you know, a significant infrastructure program there to probably make that happen. But all in all, with the obstacles on the north side with the existing homes, the green alignment, one being similar to what there is -- as the alignment is today, is the Tech Committee's recommended preferred alternative for west of Bearfield for the Philips Farm Road alignment. And as you see that really some of the important part of this, too, is the approach to the roundabout that you see on the far left of the screen for State Farm and Veterans, before that came in from a southerly route, and this is going to now come in from the east leg of the roundabout, which opens up the possibility for a southern extension, which is our next stage, so we'll jump to that. Again, just an aerial there to kind of give you an idea of the -- the actual terrain out there for that western alignment. So the -- the second stage here is the first one was just really a realignment. This one is actually going to be

adding two segments to the major roadway plan, and those segments are shown here as State Farm Parkway south of Veterans United Drive, and Corporate Lake Drive east of Providence Road. And both of these, really, when you look at the area and sometimes -- excuse me -- and some of the distances here, really make a lot of sense, but they're also included as possible extensions per a study that was conducted with the City and the County for the Gans Road extension. So the most of the brown segments for Gans Road on the south part of this shows really a kind of a jog to the north with the roundabout. So the extension of State Farm Parkway from the roundabout to the north down to here would provide that additional northerly connection, and the same with Corporate Lake Drive would provide kind of that outlet, that additional outlet off Providence to get over to Gans Road providing some additional connectivity within the street network. And we point out, too, in general, when you're looking at collectors and -- and streets that are going to be collecting a fair amount of traffic, general guidance here is to look for about every quarter mile or so, and that's generally your lower grade, and then you'll have higher grade streets, so arterials a little farther apart. The distancing here really works right within that realm of distance and spacing for -- for additional collectors to facilitate that -- the traffic flow. So both of these, additions in both of these were recommended by the Tech Committee for addition, the State Farm Parkway as a major collector, and the Corporate Lake Drive as a neighborhood collector. And this is kind of again just an aerial to give you an idea of about where those roadway segments would be. So Corporate Lake Drive and State Farm Parkway extensions are the pink, the red is the Gans Road alignment, which was already added to the -- to the MRP -- excuse me -- just shown on here for -- for clarification. The third component of our recommended amendments here, a little bit further north, kind of in the southeast corner of Nifong and Providence, so this is kind of a combination. So it would be the addition of two neighborhood collectors, and really the classification of two existing streets as major roadways. So the streets exist right now. They'll be classified, though, as a potential major collector. And those two streets that would be classified, that is basically Buttonwood Drive south of Nifong, and then the Providence -- Providence Road outer road on the east side. Those streets are already existing, so we would -- the recommendation would then be to reclassify -- not reclassify -- initially classify these streets as major collectors. It would be similar to Buttonwood's classification on the north side of Nifong. And, again, looking at the distance

between our collectors, this would kind of hit somewhere in that quarter mile distance, and also recognize that a through street here would provide a lot of connectivity from Providence and then connecting with the neighborhood collectors we'll be adding all the way down to Veterans United and State Farm Parkway. So providing kind of an additional outlet, especially for the fair amount of commercial development you see occurring already around the Buttonwood corridor there. So the recommendation then is to classify Buttonwood Drive and the outer road as major collectors, actually extend the outer road a little bit further south, also as a new major collector, but then, because that dead ends, we would need to add some new collectors initially as perhaps intersections where we would have a new east-west and north-south neighborhood collector that's going to connect that outer road over to State Farm Parkway, and then also south to Veterans United Drive. So providing really that through connectivity through this kind of growing commercial area. Yes, I saw a question.

MR. FOSTER: Just to orient myself here, the East Southampton as it's shown here, that's Veterans United Drive, correct?

MR. SMITH: That is correct, yeah. So the maps we have were produced a little bit longer ago than the name change occurred, so we have a little bit of -- of offset there. And I think if I go here -- so, yeah. This actually is better. I have labeled it there on the south, Veterans United Drive, State Farm Parkway, and you can kind of see a little bit the context of the area. But you see the -- the fairly dense commercial quarter there where Buttonwood Drive is located. Having that collector designation, I think, recognizes kind of how it's operating now or would operate in the future with an extension to the south. I point out we've had staff and the City has had some -- I think some conversations and some development kind of initiated through this area, some conversations about this connectivity have occurred, so we're looking at, I think, trying to provide that connectivity through the site especially in that neighborhood collector realm. Adding this to the major roadway, I think, just solidifies, I think, that recognition that this area needs to have some connectivity really and trying in the major roadway plan going forward. So that's kind of the third kind of component of -- of the amendments. And so there's stated here, one correction I will make -- actually, let me jump back to here. I think in the report, it was misidentified. The Buttonwood Drive classification, I think it's -- it's labeled as a neighborhood collector designation. As you can see on

the graphic, it's shown as a major collector, and that should be the recommendation. So I would ask if -- if the Coordinating Committee so chooses, to amend that recommendation that staff has provided and that is number seven. It would be the last two words in number seven. It says neighborhood collector, that would change to major collectors, and I can update that when we get to that point, as well. So that's just a summary of those amendments. Again, it's really -- the first stage is the Gans Road, Philips Farm -- excuse me -- the Philips Farm Road component, the east side, the offset, the west side alignment. Then the second point is the -- the new collectors that's going to connect to the Gans Road new roundabout. There will be an extension of State Farm Parkway and Corporate Lake Drive. And the third one is the Buttonwood area, so classifying two new roads as major collectors and adding two neighborhood collectors to complete that connection to the surrounding collector network. Come -- the action here would be to -- the Tech Committee passed a motion on February 1 to forward these alignments as presented by staff today for public hearing and potential adoption of the amendments. So you could see the recommendations here and we did summarize those. The suggested action today is going to be conduct a public hearing, and then after any commentary offered by the public is to propose a vote on the proposed text amendments -- excuse me -- roadway amendments. So I would be happy to answer any questions on those, though.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: This is open for the Committee. Any questions for staff? If not, we'll open up to the public.

PUBLIC HEARING OPENED

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Anyone want to speak on the approval of the amendment for the roadway?

MS. DOCKEN: My name is Dee Docken; I live at 804 Again Street. My main comment is that this process is not public enough. There's not enough public awareness, enough public input and discussion. And especially when we start moving down into this sensitive southern area of Columbia, you have to look at the whole context when you're making decisions like this, and I think most people aren't even aware that this is going on. I know these projects would come through City Council or the County eventually for public comment, but when it's all -- when it gets into the plan, that's a big step, and people -- and then can

say, well, this has been on the major roadway plan for years, so we're just carrying through with this. And I think this area needs a more comprehensive planning before more amendments are changed here. Where do we want development? What do we want Gans Road to look like? In the current plan, I think it says that it should be a scenic road. What parts of this planning is going to ensure that? How many entrances are going to come in and how many signal lights, roundabouts? What's going to keep it a scenic roadway that's mainly for getting people from one side of the town to the other, but not a commercial strip? So I think that, for one thing, these meetings should be held when more people can come to them, not in the middle of a workday, and we would have had more people here to participate if that was true, but also the whole process needs to be more public and more considered. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Thank you. Any other public comments?

MR. SHANKER: Hello. I'm Rick Shanker; I live at 1829 Cliff Drive. And I'd like to just echo what Dee has said. This is a sensitive area. It has a lot, as you know, the last couple of years has had a lot of press as far as development along Gans. And I totally agree with the fact that this needs more public exposure. And I'm not suggesting that you guys and gals are trying to do anything underhanded or not, but more public information should be -- should be rendered. Secondly, why was -- why are these two roads, the reds and the greens, being sought after to begin with? I guess I don't understand that, or how did it develop?

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Do you want to answer?

MR. SMITH: Yeah. I can jump in.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Clint will answer.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. So the red and greens, so they're a little more detailed alignment for the major roadway that already exists on the plan. So the Philips Farm extension is already shown currently. So given, I think, a lot of the development pressures we've been seeing there, the Bristol Lake Parkway Subdivision, really called at this point for a little bit closer evaluation of where actually you can construct that roadway.

MR. SHANKER: And when was this roadway proposed; the red and/or the green?

MR. SMITH: Well, the red and the green are just staff's evaluations of potential alignments, so it

was proposed recently in the last six months as part of this evaluation for realignment.

MR. SHANKER: By?

MR. SMITH: By staff. Staff evaluated the alignment spaces --

MR. SHANKER: I thought CATSO -- you'll have to forgive me. I'm real ignorant about --

MR. SMITH: Yeah. No. No. No. That's -- that's perfectly acceptable. The -- the evaluation, the particularly -- particular engineering evaluation that was done by City staff, and it was shared with the City's Tech Committee and also with the Coordinating Committee.

MR. SHANKER: For the purposes of -- I guess what I'm wondering is, many years ago --

THE COURT REPORTER: I'm not picking him up.

MR. SHANKER: Okay. Many years ago -- hello. Thank you very much. Many years ago, we were faced with a problem with Nifong, and we were told that the new parkway that's there now would be taking care of all the problems with east-west travel. Regrettably, it's -- to some people at least -- it's turned into a real commercial avenue. And I guess what we're wondering is, or some of us are wondering is, is this an addition to east-west travel, this -- this proposal, those red and green routes?

MR. SMITH: No. It wouldn't be an addition. It's, again, just kind of clarifying more precisely what the alignment of this roadway would be. It's an existing road on the plan now. Is that the question you have?

MR. SHANKER: I -- I think so,

MR. SMITH: Okay.

MR. SHANKER: But I think what I'm really asking is I thought that the east-west corridor problems were going to be resolved by the -- the path across Grindstone with Grindstone Parkway. Now you're indicating that we need this either red or green route, or you are, and also maybe development of Gans, and that's what a lot of people are concerned with. And like Dee indicated, this is just a small portion of the public that we're going to be hearing from in the future.

MR. SMITH: I think the answer to your question is that major roadways really per, I think, standard practice, and the Grindstone was probably designed to -- to take a lot of that commercial corridor. But as growth occurs and the property does development -- or does develop, you're still going to

want to have a collector network, and that's generally the best practice there is every quarter mile or so, you're going to have a roadway that's a little bit higher grade than a standard residential street, and that's going to collect the traffic even if it's residential and directed out to the arterial road network. So even though Grindstone exists, we're still going to have a network of these collectors that go through really everywhere in town. And it's not necessary to drive commercial development --

MR. SHANKER: The case is north of town, also? Is that the case north of town, also?

MR. SMITH: Yeah. It's really the case throughout the city.

MR. SHANKER: Thank you. Thanks. I hope you guys will consider more public hearings. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Thank you. Any other public comments?

MR. ROBERSON: Hi. I'm Kevin Roberson; I live at 7355 South Bennett Drive in Columbia. I'm the president of the Friends of Rock Bridge, and I got notification this morning about this meeting, and I don't follow as much as I should of the City, but I didn't have time to prepare, kind of about what they're saying, the public is really interested in this area. But I know that I believe the -- some of the visioning plans of the City have this not zoned isn't the proper word, but it's characterized as a sensitive area where -- certainly where the Gans Creek Road goes through, and the -- we want to make sure that it stays a sensitive area and is protected and doesn't end up being commercialized in the way that would -- we think would be harmful to the State Park and the whole area, we're concerned about. And no one has mentioned this today, but that Clear Creek is a supremely clean, nice creek going through there that supports a lot of the wildlife in the park. And we're seeing bridges going across, several new bridges, and all that with the development causes concerns. So I'd like to make sure that we have time to think about this and read about this, and I see you all reading plans. How do you get ahold of one? I don't know how to get ahold of them. I can figure it out now that I know there is, but we would be interested. And I ask for more public input if possible, and I thank you all for your work here. And I -- one more question. Rick was asking how long these have been on here, and I heard you say, well, they're in the plan, they're there. But then you said that you've developed them in six months -- in the last six months. So what drives the development? Just somebody comes up and knocks on the door and says, hey, we need a road through

here, or do you just get up and look around and say I think we need a read here? How does that work?

MR. SMITH: So, yeah. Just to kind of restate again, the -- the particular one I think you're talking about, the Philips Farm Road?

MR. ROBERSON: Yes. Right.

MR. SMITH: So that is shown on the major roadway plan right now, currently. So the red and green alignments were really looked at to get a little bit better idea of exactly where that roadway could be built in the future if development were to occur in that area. So we're not actually adding that road, it's already there. We're just kind of fine-tuning the best alignment for it. So there are a couple we're adding, and that's a little to the north, and that was based kind of on -- really on the development trends in that area. A lot of commercial growth.

MR. ROBERSON: Uh-huh. Right. So my question being if it's on the plan currently, it just says we're going to start here at -- near the Philips Lake and we're going to end up over at Providence, and we don't know how we're getting there, but that's how it's on the plan or was it actually drawn somewhere on the plan?

MR. SMITH: No. There's -- all the roadways on there are shown as roadways on there, right? They're physically shown on the plan. A lot of those, I think we would consider a little more general alignments because we don't have -- I think there's not been so much development there where you need to kind of fine-tune it, so we do like to leave it open for flexibility based on development patterns, based on environmental factors. This one, we're -- we're kind of running out of a little space there. So really it was prudent here to start kind of looking at it a little closer and deciding where -- where really can this be built. There really isn't a lot of flexibility in this location anymore.

MR. ROBERSON: All right. So it's part of the alignment. It's because of the developed that that has occurred?

MR. SMITH: Correct.

MR. TEDDY: If I may, I'll follow up on Planner Smith's comments. As he indicated, we do have a version of Philips Farm represented on our long-range plan, and it goes -- it basically continues Southampton through Veterans United Drive, and then all the way across the Discovery development to

Ponderosa, so that it's from Sinclair Road to Ponderosa. I doubt it would function as a route that people would often take with that length of trip. Usually when it's a collector, they take shorter-range trips, but it's an intermediate road in between Nifong and Grindstone Parkway above it and Gans Road, Discovery at the south. And just to give a -- kind of a simple illustration of how we've been using the plan. If you're familiar with Park Forest South, a subdivision on Rock Quarry, I think that's about 20 years old. And at that time, we did have Philips Farm Road on the major roadway plan. That developer actually provided a small amount of right-of-way at the very south end of that development. I don't know that we'll actually use that right-of-way. It's not improved with the City, but we did have them set that aside and that's the process that we generally follow with these collector roads. And then another example that has nothing to do with these amendments, on the west side of town, would be Louisville Drive, if you're familiar with that - - it's parallel to Scott Boulevard, and it kind of functions the same way. I relieve Scott Boulevard of carrying all that neighborhood to neighborhood traffic, as well as folks trying to get from McBaine into town and trips in between. Louisville was mostly built by developers, and then the City has done a project that filled it in, and filled in the missing segments, so today we have from Smith Road all the way down to Chapel Hill, you've got a collector road.

MR. ROBERSON: Right.

MR. TEDDY: So that's an historical example of how this kind of long-range planning works. We don't know when the Philips Farm project might materialize other than one on the east end that's going to be related to a subdivision development. So this is -- we're not proposing a project today, we're -- and so a lot of design is still to come, but we want to have the planning tool.

MR. ROBERSON: Right. So most important to me is the -- what's kind of the tail of the dog here. We're talking about going from Gans up to the roundabout there at Veterans United Parkway and State Farm Parkway because that's -- if that's put in, and then the traffic is just going to zoom. As it is now, I guess you all are familiar, 163 in the last ten years has become a commuter road for the west side of town going to Jeff City. Well, I'm sure that will drop straight to Gans then with all the negativity of that, but you've got to come up with a plan, and I know that's what you all are working on. But, hopefully, we can get public input and a broader announcement, or I maybe need to do a better job of keeping up with the

City website. I thank you all for your time and for letting me speak my peace.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Thank you. Any other public comments?

MR. DAVIS: My name is Tony Davis; I live at 4655 South Rock Quarry Road. And I'm primarily here first so I'm echoing, I think, if there's a better way to get out the information. I've lived on Rock Quarry for 42 years, and I didn't -- I know about the Philips Farm Road, and I -- actually, I think that was in place in -- when I moved out there in 1980; is that correct? Hasn't that been on the CATSO plan for --

MR. SKOV: I don't recall, but it's been a number of years.

MR. DAVIS: So long you can't recall?

MR. SKOV: Yes.

MR. DAVIS: Exactly. Well, I remember seeing it, so I'm aware that here are plans that are laid out there. One of the primary questions that I have, and I think you answered it, was that you can have a plan where a road that lays out from A to B across, say, the breadth of the City, in the event that there's development started in any of those areas and the development precedes the road, is that correct -- that the development -- in other words, where -- in other words, like, I have almost about three-quarters of a mile of frontage road that will be when Gans is improved, that starts back by Bearfield, continues on, and then goes to the north side of the road on the extension of Gans going through. And the Philips Farm Road in the original ones, one of them he shows comes down by Clear Creek and you go along the creek. But if I don't develop that property or the property in front of me is not developed, then a road does not take place; is that correct?

MR. SMITH: Yeah. That is the typical way, I think, that infrastructure -- street infrastructure in particular is constructed in the City is usually a property owner, developer comes up with a plan for that site. The major roadway plan informs the decision that a major roadway should be included as part of that subdivision. But there are instances sometimes that the City would take the initiative to construct that roadway at some point in time. So that's not necessarily the case, I don't think, right now for this, but that is -- that's not something that's unheard of. It can happen.

MR. DAVIS: Right. And if someone purchases -- I -- I -- Tim, you just said that there was an easement given on the south side of the property of that development -- the park development. Is that a

continuous easement along the property line, or is that a meandering easement?

MR. TEDDY: Continuous. It's a straight line east-west, and I don't even know if it's a whole right-of-way. It might be what we call a half street.

MR. YONKE: A half width.

MR. TEDDY: And Mr. Yonke is indicating it was a half-street. He was around when they did the review and -- or the City did the review. So it's -- it's kind of land banking a little bit of right-of-way. No street was put in because it wouldn't really have any function and people might park and store stuff in it if you did.

MR. DAVIS: For example, that 140 acres that's just south of that that's bordered by Rock Quarry, Fairfield, and Gans, was all part of the original farm where I live, and that's been restricted into 17 livable areas, but has to have 70 percent approval to change any of the restrictions on it. So the likelihood of a street coming through there in the near future or at all would be unlikely. So I guess what I'm thinking about is -- unless, well, a property owner in conjunction with a developer says they want to develop something, there's going to be a road needed, these plans aren't going to happen.

MR. SMITH: Yeah. And just, I think, an echo of what was said before. These -- these aren't necessarily construction plans. It's not the City is going to take an initiative here to build all these at any point in time. It really is to kind of have that future looking alignment so that if development did occur, if those property owners decided to redevelop the site, that they have kind of foresight and foreknowledge into the City's expectations for what streets need to be constructed in that location.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. I guess, again, clearly if you own property and you're not developing it, then another road is not going to be put through it.

MR. SMITH: In most cases, that is correct.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Not likely. Not Likely. Yeah.

MR. DAVIS: Okay. Well, that's mainly what I'm after, so -- so I think that if there's a way, this has got a lot of different people coming from a lot of different angles, to have them set together, and this has gone on so long. But if you -- if we can get out information especially in that particular area, you know, where -- of course, you may not want to -- you may want to dodge the arrows and all that stuff, but to get

out information as soon as you can so we kind of know what is going on in that area, in particular. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Thank you.

MR. ODLE: Been a while. Hi. I'm Nathan Odle; my wife, Lisa, and I recently moved in at 4653 South Bearfield. Obviously have some things going on in the area, but I'm here as a homeowner today, and I'm representing the interests of a couple of neighbors also: Nick McKay, Matt and Paula Fleming, and Fred and Kathy Fumsoll. And so, basically, what I've described as that portion of land on the green alignment between Bearfield and Rock Quarry, if that makes sense? As a civil engineer, definitely appreciate the planning that you guys are putting together for this road route. I know the development on the east side of Bearfield there that's getting ready to occur needs this, and glad that you guys are doing that. Basically here today, though, to request that maybe we leave things more vague on the west side of Bearfield for now. The reason for that is, you know, number one, both those alignments are really hairy. There's major topographical challenges on the green route, and, obviously, we've got some residential stuff on the red route. And the time scale during which this development could occur is probably a long ways down the road. You know, certainly, the vast majority of the developable land lies in Laurie's place to the west, and chances are it's going to be awhile before that gets developed. There is certainly not a lot of interest there. Really the only other major piece that's developable besides, you know, those -- that massive piece of Laurie's would be my, I guess, 17 acres to the north. And I've got 200 acres to develop over there. I don't -- you know, this is -- this is my place. And so, basically, you know, given that there's probably different ways that development could transpire, and the fact that it's so far down the road, you know, the -- the green and the red alignments hit Laurie's in different places, and certainly the shape of that development could actually drive the preferred alignment down the road. And so, you know, basically, requesting that, yeah, again, we -- if you guys -- if the Committee would limit their amendment to just the part east of Bearfield Road today, I think it would allow everybody actually more wiggle room in the future for those future alignments. Thank you.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Thank you. Is there anyone else from the public who would like to speak?

AUDIENCE: Can I ask one more question?

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: You've got to come up.

MR. SHANKER: Rick Shanker again, 1829 Cliff Drive. When Fred Overton came before a governmental body, there was an agreement made, I think, that there was going to be a north -- to his newest development, a north-south way to get out of his subdivision, because, otherwise, it would all leak out onto Gans. Is that correct, or is that part of this, or is this in conjunction with this?

MR. SMITH: Well, I don't think that's particularly relevant to the amendments, but are you talking about Bristol Lake Subdivision?

MR. SHANKER: Right.

MR. SMITH: There will be a connection potentially in the future. The extension of Bristol Lake Parkway through his subdivision would be constructed in the east to connect to Philips Farm Parkway, so it would be doing that short segment through the City's area there to the east to him.

MR. SHANKER: Okay. But it has nothing to do with this red and green -- it doesn't intersect them?

MR. SMITH: It does. It would intersect with the -- the red alignment on the east side.

MR. SHANKER: All right. Thank you very much.

MR. SMITH: You're welcome.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Are there any other public comments?

PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED

VI. COMMENTS FROM COMMITTEE

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Any additional comments from the Committee?

MR. YONKE: Well, I think it's important to remind people that there has been a lot of public input into these pieces before they got placed upon the plan to begin with. Like the Gans Road study that we did in 2008 had extensive public input. Tony Davis even helped with that study, and that's how we defined the corridor for the Gans Road before it got finalized on there. And that, you know, these roads have been on for decades, that we're not looking at putting brand-new roads on that no one has looked at, but these are refinements of roads that have been on this plan for decades. And, for example, the extension, while

it didn't get put on there, the extension from State Farm Parkway down to Gans is actually shown on that 2008 study, and it was anticipated at that time. It wasn't added to the plan at that point, but it is part of a formal and adopted study that was adopted, so -- with extensive public input. So, you know, having the public input for roadways that would be placed upon here that have never been shown, I can understand being concerned for that, but the roads that we have literally had on for decades, it's just a matter of figuring out the particulars. And so, if people have issues with a particular alignment that's being refined, I think that's -- that's important and that's what this is for, but for the concept of whether there's a road there or not, that -- that issue was decided decades ago, so I think that's important to keep in mind.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Well, thank you for your comments. Any other additional comments from the Committee? Okay. Can I get a motion?

MR. YONKE: Well, it's not our road, so I'm interested in knowing what the -- what the City's thinking is on -- at least we had one thing presented where they said just focus on the part you need today, and leave the rest because what I think everybody needs to recognize is, is let's sway that the City said, you know what, fine, we can live with that. Let's deal with what we need to today, but we'll leave the rest is that that literally though does leave the rest. The current alignment which is that red or pink line would stay right where it is from Bearfield all the rest of the way over. And so it would be amorphous. There would not be a choice made necessarily in that. And, you know, it's not going to go away, it just simply means that it's not refined. But I don't know what the City's attitude on that and it's their road. I mean that they're the ones that are going to have it. So it's not really ours to make a motion. Normally, we do make lots of motions, but, in this case, you guys really need to weigh in on what you want, I think, before it's finalized.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: No. That's a good -- that's a great point. Clint or Tim, do you want to add anything?

MR. CREECH: The only thing I was going to say is I think it's important, even though we don't know -- we don't know when someone is going to come in to develop, it's important that we have the ability to plan, and that's what this is for;. And so, from me -- from my perspective, refining it is the -- is the right way to go, to set ourselves up whenever that may be, even though we don't know when that is.

MR. TEDDY: I'd say I agree. And, again, we're not -- we're not doing design here, so we are identifying some of the design factors. It is -- there is some sensitivity to landscape both the natural features and some of the constructed features of the landscape that we have to consider as you go down the road with design, but that's still a long way off. But in the meantime, we don't want to be caught off guard by subdivision proposals and some ambiguity as to whether that particular tract of land is going to be responsible for some part of this, or otherwise relate to some part of this. You know, we really want to try to nail that down a little bit more for planning purposes.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Great. Would somebody from the City like to make a motion?

MR. CREECH: I will move to approve.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: That would be -- can we get a second?

MR. FOSTER: Second.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Are there any additional comments from the Committee? Clint?

MR. SMITH: I would just note, too, that the revision to Recommendation Number 7, to go from neighborhood to major collector. Make that part of the motion, as well.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Can you make that part of your motion, Shane?

MR. CREECH: I will try. I will move to approve with the revision to call out Number 7 as a major collector.

MR. FOSTER: Second.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

VII. ADOPTION OF THE STATEWIDE SAFETY TARGETS FOR CATSO.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: I think that's you, Mitch.

MR. SKOV: Thank you. I'll talk about this, Mr. Seewood. This is something we do on an annual basis. We're required by federal regs to adopt -- by federal regs -- pardon me -- to adopt statewide safety targets or we can develop our own safety targets. These were provided to us by MoDOT back in August of 2022. They're something that's part of Federal Highway Administration Highway Safety Improvement Program. That's one of the federal aid programs whose purpose is obviously to achieve a reduction of traffic fatalities and major injuries on public streets and roads. So CATSO, as usual, we have the option of

either providing our own formal -- our own targets, and CATSO can either apply a formal approval in support of the statewide targets provided, or we can establish our own specific targets. We have never seen the point of doing specific targets for the CATSO metro area tailored for us. Obviously, the option or the intent to is reduce fatalities and serious injuries, and the targets are geared toward doing that. We do find the statewide targets acceptable and recommend that they be formally supported by the committee members. Previously, when we've adopted -- we've actually adopted those two or three times in the past. In every case, we did adopt what MoDOT had proposed. We did not develop our own. I did not get into a detailed discussion with the MoDOT engineers about how they came up with this, but it's basically based to some degree on their -- what they call the five-year rolling average, and their so-called baseline for these various performance measures, such as number of fatalities, fatality rate per one hundred million vehicle miles traveled, number of serious injuries, et cetera, number of non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries. All those categories, there is a target set for reduction of those, you know, both fatalities and serious injuries. So, again, as usual, or as typically, we recommend and we prefer to adopt what statewide projects were provided to us by MoDOT. And I'll answer any questions if you have some.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Any questions from the Committee?

MR. FOSTER: I have -- I have a couple. VMT is what?

MR. SKOV: Vehicle miles traveled.

MR. FOSTER: Okay. And these are statewide targets, they're non-specific to our -- to the CATSO area?

MR. SKOV: Correct. Right. I mean, again, every MPO has the option of either adopting what the state provides them, or to come up with our own. I mean, sometimes it looks kind of counterintuitive, but, generally, of course, the target is always going to be less than what the roving baseline average has been. The one example here that's slightly different, the number of non-motorized fatalities. The methodologies they use actually ended up with a larger number of fatalities and serious injuries than what the five-year rolling average had been. So in those cases, they actually used the baseline. They used the rolling average baseline. And that would be the only example on this table, and that's at the bottom right there. The five-year rolling average for non-motorized fatalities and serious injuries was 499, and they stuck with

that because the methodology they had was giving them a larger number.

MR. FOSTER: Thank you.

MR. SKOV: But I mean, there are -- if you look at the notes down below, you can see. They're based on a zero by 2030 fatality reduction, zero by 2040, serious injury reduction, et cetera. Presuming a one percent VMT increase annually, I believe.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Are there any additional questions from the Committee? Are there any comments from the public on the safety targets? If not, can I get a motion from --

MR. YONKE: I move to adopt the safety targets.

MR. TEDDY: I'll second.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

VIII. COMPLETION OF CATSO LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: This is you also, Mitch.

MR. SKOV: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is just a -- for your information. We're obviously going to have to revise the schedule. We looked. We've got February 2023 to get our RP out for the consultant, which we'll have do the plan this time, which you may be aware. This is the first time we've used a consultant for the Long-Range Transportation Plan update. We are going to proceed with it this time. It is due technically in May of 2024, which is five years from what our original deadline was. We actually didn't adopt the actual -- the previous one until December of 2019. We had gotten an extension of six months. But that is the date we're shooting for. We'll hopefully put out a request for proposal here in the first part of March.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Tim?

MR. TEDDY: Yea. I just wanted to make a clarification. We did receive some confirmation from MoDOT that we would actually be allowed till September. That is when the plan is considered to -- to be completed, so September of '24.

MR. KELLEY: I believe that's correct.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. Come to the microphone, Brad.

MR. KELLEY: Brad Kelley. I believe MoDOT confirmed for us that it would be December 2024.

MR. TEDDY: Oh. I thought you were --

MR. KELLEY: This -- no. I'm sorry. I was trying to say it would be five years from when it was adopted.

MR. TEDDY: Got it. Yeah.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: So that's December of 2024?

MR. TEDDY: So even more wiggle.

MR. SKOV: Great. Okay.

MR. YONKE: So are you still proposing the May date for planning purposes so that you've got time to --

MR. KELLEY: Yeah. I think we need to. We may shoot for September or something like that to give us enough time if we need to revise anything that -- if we have to go back and add some stuff, that we have plenty of time to do that, yes.

MR. YONKE: So we can revise the schedule later if we have to.

MR. KELLEY: Of course. Yes, definitely. And we're still working on the scope of work for RFP and such, and we will coordinate that with you. We just -- yesterday just finished working on the comprehensive plan RFP for the most part, so we're kind of switching gears to this side.

MR. YONKE: Not a problem.

MR. SKOV: This does not require any action, Mr. Chair. Again, it's just an FYI.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: I understand. Any additional questions on the schedule? Or if not, are there any other business for the Committee? Mitch, anything?

MR. SKOV: No, sir. I've got -- I think Brad has got something.

MR. KELLEY: I've got a few things. MoDOT had its statewide planning partner conference today, so I came back from that, so I've got some information there. We talked about unfunded needs list. That's something we go through each year. It's kind of this new process, as I mentioned several times, so it's been being refined and refined. They stated today that they have pretty well formalized the process and they'll be sending something out soon. It's going to start in March, which is just a couple of weeks away, so they will be sending something to us, and I'll share that with you guys so we can start getting that

worked on, because it'll be due in, basically, late summer is what they -- what they indicated. They were also talking about the governor's proposal for I-70 and such, and I believe MoDOT indicated that they will be submitting a federal discretion -- a federal grant like RAISE Grant, Build Grant, et cetera, to go along with that that could be nearing about \$2 billion, which is by far one of the largest RAISE Grants ever submitted to my -- my knowledge. So doubtful that we would get that full amount, but that would go some way into tagging along onto the governor's proposal if that does go through. Some other things. I think since our last meeting, the City of Columbia and CATSO was awarded a Safe Streets and Roads for All Grant. It's basically a safety grant. We did not get -- we requested \$17 million in funds. We got a million and a half. We didn't get any construction money, which is largely the component we were looking for, but nobody else in Missouri did. We actually received the largest grant, even more than Kansas City and St. Louis combined, so it's pretty significant. It could take up to a year, I think, to get that contract sorted out before we can be eligible to start work on that, but that was a pretty cool grant that we got stuff for, so we'll be having some work going for that in the future. And that's all I have.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Thank you, Brad. Anything from the Committee? Are there any comments from the public? If not, Mitch, the next meeting date?

MR. SKOV: It will be May 25th of this year. It says 1:30 p.m. on the slide. Actually, it should say 2:30 p.m.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Two-thirty?

MR. SKOV: Yes.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: All right. Can I get a motion to adjourn?

MR. YONKE: Move to adjourn.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: Can I get a second?

MR. FOSTER: Second.

CHAIRMAN SEEWOOD: All in favor? (Unanimous voice vote for adjournment.)

(Meeting adjourned at 3:28 p.m.)