



City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization (CATSO)

Thursday, February 27, 2020
2:30 PM

Coordinating Committee Meeting

City Council Chamber
City Hall
701 E. Broadway
Columbia, MO

I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. GLASCOCK: Call this meeting to order of the Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

John Glascock, City Manager, City of Columbia (Chair)
Thad Yonke, Boone County Commission
Jeff McCann, Chief Engineer, Boone County
Tim Teddy, Community Development Director, City of Columbia
David Nichols, Public Works Director, City of Columbia
Mike Henderson, Transportation Planning Specialist, MoDOT

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Brian Treece, Mayor, City of Columbia
Michelle Kratzer, MoDOT Multimodal
Machelle Watkins, MoDOT Central District

ALSO PRESENT:

Mitch Skov, Senior Planner, City of Columbia

II. INTRODUCTIONS

MR. GLASCOCK: Let's go around the dais and do introductions.
I'm John Glascock.

MR. YONKE: Thad Yonke for Dan Atwill.

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

MR. TEDDY: Tim Teddy, City of Columbia Community Development Director.

MR. NICHOLS: Dave Nichols, Public Works Director, City of Columbia.

MR. HENDERSON: Mike Henderson, MoDOT Central Office.

MR. SKOV: Mitch Skov, CATSO staff.

MR. GLASCOCK: Thank you.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. GLASCOCK: I need a motion to approve the agenda.

MR. TEDDY: Motion to approve the agenda.

MR. McCANN: Second.

MR. GLASCOCK: Motion's been seconded. All those agree by saying aye?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. GLASCOCK: All opposed? Thank you.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. GLASCOCK: Approval of the minutes. Any corrections?

MR. TEDDY: Mr. Chairperson, I have just a few quick corrections.

On the very first page where I'm speaking, I introduce myself and I say I serve on this committee as well as what we'll call the CATSO Technical Committee. So I think there's a couple words missing there.

And then on the reverse when I'm introducing Mr. Skov, I said, He'll give an overview of the plan, and then it reads "and I like the contents." I believe I said, "He'll give an overview of the plan and highlight the contents." I did like the plan contents.

And then it's not paginated, but later in the meeting Mr. Yonke and I were having a dialogue about the Gans Road project, and near the bottom of the page, it reads: It's an unapproved segment on the south side of town. I think that's unimproved segment.

Those are my corrections.

MR. GLASCOCK: Okay. Any other corrections to the minutes?

MR. YONKE: Move for approval with the corrections.

MR. NICHOLS: Second.

MR. GLASCOCK: Seconded. So all those in favor of approving the minutes as amended for the December 5 meeting minutes, say aye.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. GLASCOCK: All opposed? Thank you.

Draft December 5, 2019 Meeting Minutes

Attachments: [December 5, 2019 Minutes.pdf](#)

V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

A. Public Hearing: Proposed Amendment to FY 2020-2023 Transportation Improvement Program

MR. GLASCOCK: Public hearings. Mitch?

MR. SKOV: Yes, Mr. Chair. MoDOT Central District has requested that an amendment be made to the existing adopted CATSO fiscal year 2020-2023 TIP in order to add new projects, specifically in the scoping section of MoDOT's projects. Project Nos. 2020-2025 is for some preliminary engineering work on potential improvements in the future at the U.S. Highway 63 and Route AC interchange. The total cost in the budget for this project is anticipated to be 275,000, 50,000 in fiscal year '20, 225,000 in fiscal year 2021. Of the total, 220,000 of that is federal funds and 55,000 in state funds. This is just an illustration on how it will look in the TIP listing itself. It's the usual format. It doesn't match up with MoDOT's STIP format. Again, there's money in the fiscal year 2020 and 2021 for this engineering work, and they anticipate that in the future, at least at implementation, it would be 13 million to 15 million range for whatever improvements might be chosen. There was a consultant study that was commissioned by MoDOT sometime back to examine the options for improvements, and the final report of that was actually received by the end of December of 2019. And as I already mentioned, it was 13 million and 15 million as a potential total cost for actual implementation.

The Tech Committee did talk about this at their February 5th

meeting. They had some general discussion on the possible options for that eventual project should it occur. They did pass a motion unanimously to forward this to the Coordinating Committee for their review and approval. There was a consensus that this TIP amendment is appropriate. So the suggested community action is that there is any discussion we want to have and review after holding a public hearing. Staff does suggest you give formal approval to this proposed amendment. Thank you.

MR. GLASCOCK: Was the -- was there a recommended improvement for the interchange or was it just a --

MR. SKOV: I do not believe there was actually a recommended improvement. There are four options listed, but I didn't see a referral alternative in the study. I looked over the executive summary. So I don't believe so at this time.

MR. GLASCOCK: Any other comment?

MR. NICHOLS: The 13 million, that's not -- there's a developer contribution for that interchange?

MR. SKOV: I think that's just a general --

MR. NICHOLS: Okay.

MR. SKOV: That's just a general overall cost.

MR. NICHOLS: Overall.

MR. SKOV: Estimate. Very, very preliminary.

MR. GLASCOCK: Any other questions? I'll open it up for a public hearing. Seeing none, I'll close the public hearing.

Any further comment or discussion?

MR. TEDDY: Move to approve the amendment.

MR. GLASCOCK: Moved to approve. Is there a second?

MR. YONKE: I'll second.

MR. GLASCOCK: All those in favor, signify by saying aye.
(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. GLASCOCK: Opposed, same sign. Thank you.

Proposed FY 2020-2023 TIP Amendment

Attachments: [CATSO Coord 2-27-20 TIP Amd.pdf](#)

[FY 2020-2023 CATSO TIP Project Listing with MoDOT scoping amendment Feb. 2020.pdf](#)
[Proposed FY 2020-2023 CATSO TIP Amendment Feb. 2020.pdf](#)

VI. DISCUSSION: ADMINISTRATIVE REVISION TO FY 2020-2023 TIP

MR. GLASCOCK: Moving on to No. VI, discussion of administrative revision to the FY 2020-2023 TIP.

MR. SKOV: Mr. Chair, this is also a TIP issue, but there's no need for any formal action by the committee. This is just for your information. There was an administrative revision included in your packet with other general materials. It's an administrative revision to the existing TIP. The changes that are being included aren't substantive. There's no changes to numbers as far as financial totals. They don't meet the standard for a TIP amendment, but we did have -- we've had an ongoing discussion with Federal Highway Missouri office, a number of amendments they'd like us to make to the document, specifically to the narrative section. Again, they don't impact the project listings or the financial summary sections. They don't affect total budgets, and actually there isn't any action required by the committee. But we did want you to be aware of this. We're actually still in discussions with

the Federal Highway office about what the final look of that will be, but it's basically just sort of a re-presentation of some of the information that's contained in the current document.

MR. GLASCOCK: So it's being requested by Federal Highway?

MR. SKOV: Correct.

MR. GLASCOCK: Okay. Any discussion? When do you think we'll get this back?

MR. SKOV: I think we'll have it done within the next couple of weeks.

MR. GLASCOCK: Okay. So it will be on our next agenda to have a hearing on it.

MR. SKOV: Well, I don't think we'll need to have a hearing. I think we just make this as an administrative change. It will not morph into a TIP amendment. I don't anticipate that happening.

MR. GLASCOCK: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SKOV: But we will send out the revisions, of course, the whole new document with all the revisions once it's finalized.

MR. GLASCOCK: Okay. Thank you.

FY 2020-2023 TIP Administrative Revision

Attachments: [CATSO TIP FY 2020-2023 Admin Rev for CATSO Coordinating 2-27-2020.pdf](#)
[Item 6 Coord 2-27-20 TIP Admin Rev.pdf](#)

VII. DISCUSSION: PROPOSED MAJOR AMENDMENT TO CATSO 2050 LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP)

MR. GLASCOCK: Moving on to No. VII, discussion of proposed major amendment to CATSO 2050 long-range transportation plan. Mitch.

MR. SKOV: Yes, Mr. Chair. There has been a request by city representatives, City of Columbia representatives, that consideration be given to actually doing an amendment to the long-range transportation plan in order to provide more detail for potential expansions and changes to the existing public transit system, that being of course GoCOMO, and the entire CATSO metropolitan planning area. At this point, of course, that does not go beyond the City boundaries. The suggestion was that a two-year process occur to prepare the amendment in order to provide some further transit policy direction for the entirety of the metropolitan planning area geography.

I just want to go over a couple brief things about the plan itself. It is a multimodal plan. It's developed and adopted through the metropolitan planning process. It does reflect collaborative decision-making efforts among all the stakeholders, which of course in this case is Boone County, MoDOT, and the City of Columbia. The existing plan was adopted this past December, December 5, 2019, by the CATSO Coordinating Committee.

This is the existing map of the current routes for GoCOMO. Again, they are within the existing city limits as you would expect. Some background, brief background, about the revenue situation for the planned projected transportation revenue. It's just actually under 1.3 billion is the projections we have for total revenues over the planned scope period up to 2050. Of that total revenues, we assume that 233 million of that will actually be expended for transit purposes specifically by GoCOMO. I did not include the OATS expenditures in here given they're relatively minor, but that is what we're presuming is to be expended over that plan period. As you can see, it's

a sizable chunk of the total revenue. It is 233 million. That is 23+ percent of the total. These are just total expenditures by jurisdiction, 243 million for MoDOT, 177 million for Boone County, and 647 million for the City of Columbia. Expenditures are just over 1 billion, so there's a \$200 million+ reserve. I didn't include anything else at this point. I just wanted some background revenues. There are more slides at the end that highlight what's being spent on streets and greenbelt trails, et cetera. But again I just wanted to give a basic overview of what the revenue situation is here.

And I will let you ask questions from there.

MR. GLASCOCK: Okay. So I'm the one that's asked for this. I talked to Mitch and Tim about it a little bit. When we looked at the long-range plan, we have a 20-year look at streets and what we think they want to be in the future. We have a ped 20-year projection of where they want to be, but our transit map only shows what we currently have. So we never really looked at what we want transit to be and successful. And I'll use the airport as a model right now. We were floundering 12 years ago. We had a plan to fly to hub airports. We started doing that. So it's been very successful doing that. So I want to do the same for transit. I want a model that we can all agree that this is where we need to go, and then we go there. So we don't constantly try to make it better all the time. We got a plan to get us there in 20 years. So, you know, that's what I've asked for so we can put it in a long-range plan so everybody can see where we're trying to head. So I'm happy to discuss any of that.

MR. YONKE: I think it makes sense.

MR. TEDDY: I think we could make a motion to direct CATSO staff to prepare a scope of work for a major amendment to the plan to be carried out over approximately two years. I think that was the expectation we talked about.

MR. GLASCOCK: Okay. Mike, anything?

MR. HENDERSON: No, that sounds like a good plan to me.

MR. GLASCOCK: Does anybody care if I open it up for comments? Would anybody from the public like to speak on this?

MR. SIMONSON: Hello, Lawrence Simonson, representing PedNet Coalition. First, I just want to say thank you for bringing this amendment forward, Mr. Glascock. We heartily support this amendment. We think it's a great visionary move to point us in the right direction so we're not just shooting off in all sorts of directions. We're not aimless. Now, we have a target to aim for, so I really appreciate your bringing that forward.

I would also like to say thank you to both Tim and Mitch for the process leading up to the adoption of the total LRTP. I felt like as staff they heard the public's comments about wanting more involvement, and they did a really good first step in moving towards a more robust public input process. So I think they did a phenomenal job. So thank you for doing that and hearing the public's want to do that.

I would continue to encourage as we move forward to consider also adopting measurable benchmarks for many of the other goals within the LRTP and then setting up some schedule to regularly measure those benchmarks to make sure that we are reaching our goals. They're not just aimless goals or high hope goals, that we have some sort of objective measurement to ensure that we are accomplishing that goal. The goals are great. I just want to make sure we can get to them.

I also continue to encourage the usability of the long-range transportation plan document. Right now, it really reads as a very

professional document that as a layperson trying to pick it up, I think they would either use it to put themselves to sleep or set it down really quickly, and I mean no offense because it's a good document other than, you know, it's not really representative for the general population.

So again I fully support this, and I think it's a very good idea. I encourage the adoption of goals of measuring and usability of the long-range transportation plan. Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: Good afternoon. Ian Thomas, 2616 Hillshire Drive, also a member of the City Council. I also very much support Mr. Glascock's proposal that we take some time to develop a major amendment to the current version of the long-range transportation plan. The transit system has been floundering really forever, I think. There's never been a clear direction. A lot of people are not aware of the system, but increasingly people who are reliant on the system are coming forward and explaining, you know, how the system really doesn't work well for them. And then we have other stakeholders in the community who are coming forward and are very interested in improving the system for other reasons such as reducing our carbon emissions, improving our safety in the community as well as providing transportation service for people that don't own a car.

And I like the reference to the airport. I think the airport was similarly floundering about ten years ago, and that was a very good process. So I think CATSO, the CATSO Coordinating Committee, is the right venue to develop a long-range vision and plan for the transit system.

I'm not sure if this was part of your specific proposal, John, but I hope that staff recommends to create some kind of a stakeholder committee that brings in all of the different groups that have an interest in the future of the transit system and the transportation system in general to develop this plan which will then be incorporated into a long-range transportation plan. To create the context for doing that, I think they should step back a little bit and look at the current long-range transportation plan. First of all, look at the goals and objectives and compare whether those goals and objectives are connected in any way to the actual plan. I will argue that they are not. Most of the goals and objectives look very good on paper, but one of them is the public transportation system will be viable throughout the metropolitan planning area. I see absolutely nothing in the 140-odd pages of the plan that shows any kind of attempt to implement that goal. So it seems to be just an empty goal.

Another goal that's listed in that section is to reduce reliance on automobiles for Columbia residents and better serve those that don't have access to an automobile. Again, I don't see a single word in the plan as a whole that shows there's any attempt to achieve that goal. So -- and you can go down. There are a lot of goals, 20 or 30 or more goals out there, and many of them fall into that category with no apparent connection with the plan itself.

So then as Lawrence mentioned, performance measures. If we have goals, if they're real goals that we want to accomplish, we need a plan that we think is going to accomplish them and we need an evaluation plan for the plan which will give us benchmarks or performance measures to see whether we're actually achieving that plan. And we have performance measures in that same section, but again in most cases they are performance measures that we have no plan, no ability, in many cases to measure. So they might be performance measures, but we have no idea how we're going to actually measure them and see if we are achieving the plan. There's a lot of

performance measures based around the number of trips taken by Columbia and Boone County residents in different modes of transportation, about reducing auto ownership trends. But without any approach, any strategy, for actually measuring the performance measures, they are pretty well worthless.

So I would like the taskforce to look into this major amendment to recommend some really measurable performance measures, that we actually have an approach, a strategy for measuring those periodically, whether it's every year or six months or three years, so that we can see if we are achieving it with the plan. And if not, adjust the plan.

And then a third thing again, and this relates very much to the transit plan, I think we should review other long-term plans that MoDOT, Boone County and the City of Columbia have and see whether this plan is aligned or not and if we need to adapt the long-range transportation plan or potentially those other plans to bring them into alignment. Just to give you one example, this is the City of Columbia's Climate Action and Adaptation Plan, which was adopted by City Council last year. One important part of that is transportation, the emissions-related transportation, and this plan measures the current baseline for transportation mode: Single-occupancy vehicles, 78 percent of trips; transit, 1 percent of trips; others, carpooling, walking and biking, and set goals for 2035 to reduce the single-occupancy vehicle trips from 78 percent to 40 percent, almost reduced that by half. Increase transit trips from 1 percent to 17 percent, increase that by 1700 percent. And by 2050, reduce single-occupancy vehicle trips to 10 percent and transit trips to 40 percent. Now, those are some very, very ambitious goals, but they were the goals that were recommended by the taskforce that developed this plan and were fully endorsed by the entire City Council. It doesn't make sense to have a plan like this that is completely at odds with the long-range transportation plan for this metropolitan planning area.

So I would want the taskforce to look at this plan in alignment with the long-range transportation plan and other plans that the county or the state transportation agency may have to make sure that we have some alignment. It doesn't build confidence in government, to the citizens, when we have plans that are going off in completely different directions. There has to be some reality here. And if the taskforce needs an example of an MPO that does that really well, then the Missoula, Montana, MPO does build in mode-shared goals into its long-range transportation plan similar to the format of the mode-shared goals that are in Columbia's climate action plan and they do have their climate action plan aligned with the long-range transportation plan. So it can be done. I'm sure there are plenty of other examples, but Missoula is a city very similar to ours in many ways.

Thank you for proposing that, John. Thank you for putting it together so it will work, Mitch. And I look forward to watching this process unfold.

Anybody have any questions or comments?

MR. TEDDY: I'll just make one comment, if I may, Councilman Thomas. I think there's a place probably for the analysis of road networks as they relate to transit where we could use the objective to grow transit as something used to evaluate, not only location and capacity of those proposed roadways, but their network capabilities, for example, building a road at higher capacity that serves Point A and Point B well but if it doesn't connect to a network that could be used by a bus system wouldn't be as worthwhile as one that does have a meaningful connection. I think we have to be mindful of the road network that buses are going over and the distances they have to cover, because that's going to translate into the quality of the service, quality

of service in a business sense, building progress. So I just want to make that point.

MR. THOMAS: Uh-huh. I --

MR. TEDDY: I don't want to set it up as two things in opposition of you can have either one or the other. There has to be --

MR. THOMAS: We need to integrate the transit plan with the roads plan. Absolutely. Right.

MR. GLASCOCK: Thank you.

MR. THOMAS: Thank you very much.

MR. GLASCOCK: Any other public comment? Thank you.

Mitch, this falls under the MPO process, correct, for public input and everything?

MR. SKOV: I believe so.

MR. GLASCOCK: So what I would say is spelled out in there, does it spell out a stakeholder committee? What does it spell out in there? I know it doesn't prohibit it, but does it actually call out for you to use those kinds of things?

MR. SKOV: I don't actually know. I'd have to read about it in -

MR. GLASCOCK: Well -

MR. SKOV: -- I'm not sure it falls under that.

MR. GLASCOCK: Because we've got to be sure it follows all that, that we're not at odds with the FHWA.

MR. TEDDY: I think it can be part of the proposal that staff comes back with just how to address the suggestion that there be a citizen taskforce or other advisory group.

MR. SKOV: You're aware in Tech when we've done this in the past for completing long-range plans we would have representatives from every jurisdiction, and a committee -- special committee, a subcommittee of the Tech Committee if you will.

MR. GLASCOCK: CATSO will be looking at also the urbanizing area down here outside the city limits; correct?

MR. SKOV: Correct.

MR. GLASCOCK: So you'd have to have representatives from that area.

MR. TEDDY: We do maintain as a part of our public participation plan a list of stakeholders and these are organizations, some of which do have interest that align well with transit planning or nonmotorized transportation planning.

MR. GLASCOCK: Can I make a motion to start studying this?

MR. TEDDY: Uh-huh.

MR. GLASCOCK: So I'll make a motion to do this proposed amendment, look at the public comments we took here today and try to incorporate those elements into our plan going forward, and I so move that.

MR. TEDDY: I'll second.

MR. GLASCOCK: All those in favor?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. GLASCOCK: All those opposed? Thank you.

Potential LRTP Amendment

Attachments: [CATSO 2050 LRTP Approved 12-5-19.pdf](#)

[CATSO Tech 2-27-20 Potential Major Amendment to CATSO LRTP.pdf](#)

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

MR. GLASCOCK: Any other business? All right. Any announcements? Mitch, anything?

MR. SKOV: No, Mr. Chairman.

IX. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

MR. GLASCOCK: General comments by the public? Okay.

X. NEXT MEETING DATE

MR. GLASCOCK: The next meeting date is when, Mitch?

MR. SKOV: May 28 of this year, same usual time here in the Council Chambers.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

MR. GLASCOCK: Do I hear a motion to adjourn?

MR. YONKE: Move to adjourn.

MR. HENDERSON: Second.

MR. GLASCOCK: All those in favor, please say aye.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. GLASCOCK: Opposed? Thank you.

(Off the record.)

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