

# **COLUMBIA AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY ORGANIZATION (CATSO)**

## **DRAFT MINUTES**

**FEBRUARY 25, 2025**

### **Members Present**

Barbara Buffaloe, Mayor, City of Columbia  
Shane Creech, City of Columbia Public Works  
Tim Teddy, City of Columbia Community Development  
Machelle Watkins, MoDOT Central District  
Andrew Devereux (for Boone County Engineer Jeff McCann)  
Mike Henderson, MoDOT Central Office  
Thad Yonke,(for Boone County Commissioner Justin Aldred)

### **Members Absent**

De'Carlton Seewood, City of Columbia City Manager  
Jerica Holtzclaw, MoDOT Multi-Modal Division

### **Staff**

**Mitch Skov**

MS. BUFFALOE: Mitch, Tim asked if I would chair since the City Manager is not here, are you okay with it?

MR. SKOV: That would be fine. That's fine.

### **I. CALL TO ORDER**

MS. BUFFALOE: I'll go ahead and call the February 25, 2025 Coordinating Committee of the Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization. This is our rescheduled one because of weather and due to other things, so that should do.

### **II. INTRODUCTIONS**

MS. BUFFALOE: Let's do introductions. If you want to start at that end on that.

MS. WATKINS: Hi. I'm Machelle Watkins. I'm district engineer with MoDOT Central District.

MR. HENDERSON: Mike Henderson, MoDOT Central Office.

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

MS. BUFFALOE: Barbara Buffaloe, Mayor, City of Columbia.

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

MR. YONKE: Thad Yonke, I'm Senior Planner for the County, and I'm here for Justin Aldred.

MR. DEVEREUX: And I'm Andrew Devereux with Boone County Planning. I'm here for Jeff McCann

MS. BUFFALOE: All right. Thank you.

### **III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

MS. BUFFALOE: First on the agenda is approval of the agenda. Do I have a motion to approve?

MR. YONKE: Move to approve as written.

MS. BUFFALOE: And a second?

MR. HENDERSON: Second.

MS. BUFFALOE: All those in favor of approval of the agenda, say aye. Any opposed?  
(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

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

MS. BUFFALOE: All right. Approval of the minutes. We have the December 5th, 2024. I'll seek a motion to approve or if there's any changes, let us know.

MR. YONKE: Move to approve as written.

MR. TEDDY: I'll second.

MS. BUFFALOE: All those in favor of approving the December minutes, say aye.  
Any opposed? (Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MS. BUFFALOE: Great. Moving on, there were a few items -- there were a few items, and I know there's more of an audience, just a heads up for those in the audience. We have a few items that have votes attached to them that will be done this evening, and then there's one of a discussion, and obviously at the end general comments by the public, members of the committee, and staff. Just wanted to put a clarification on that one.

## **V. ADOPTION OF STATEWIDE SAFETY TARGETS**

MS. BUFFALOE. So up first we have adoption of the Statewide Safety Targets. Do we have a staff report?

MR. SKOV: Yes, Ms. Chair This is the same -- it's a typical thing we do on an annual basis as required by the Federal Agreement requirements. The MoDOT Central Office keeps us apprised of this. The table I will show in a couple of slides here, shows the MoDOT Annual Statewide Safety Targets which are provided to us and the other APOs in August of this year, or last year, pardon me. They were part of a Federal Highway Safety Improvement Program commitment. That's a federal aid program whose purpose is to achieve a reduction in traffic fatalities and major injuries on public highways. As usual, we have the option to provide formal approvals for the statewide targets or to establish our own from the CATSO Metropolitan Planning Area. We've always supported the statewide targets in the past, and we're doing so again and we find that acceptable. We recommend that we formally support by the committee. There is the table. You can see there's five actual categories, the number of fatalities, the fatality rate per 100 manned vehicle miles traveled, the number of serious injuries, the serious injury rate per 100 million on VMT, and the number of non-motorized fatalities and serious

injuries. Again, these are the statewide targets, and the staff is fine with the adopting them. The Tech Committee also was fine with adopting them, but they did pass at a motion after reviewing the targets at their February 11th meeting to recommend and coordinating committee that they formally adopt these targets that's requested and that's the suggested action we have for the coordinating committee. Pass the motion adopted in the statewide state targets as we typically do annually. Thank you.

MS. BUFFALOE: Are there any questions from the Committee for staff? Seeing none, I would accept a motion to adopt the statewide safety -- or I will make a motion to adopt the statewide safety target as was recommended by the Technical Committee. Do we have a second?

MR. YONKE: Second.

MS. BUFFALOE: All those in favor say aye. Opposed? (Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. Moving on.

## **VI. ADOPTION OF STATEWIDE PAVEMENT AND BRIDGE TARGETS**

MS. BUFFALOE: Do we have a staff report?

MR. SKOV: Yes, Ms. Chair. This is the second of the three targets we're looking at today. The table I will show shows that the state or the MoDOT Statewide Pavement and Bridge Targets they provided with us and APOs in October of 2024. As usual as the state -- for the state to charge us with the option of providing the formal approvals for these targets or the establish our own. We've always established or we have never established our own targets. We've always been supportive of the statewide targets. And as usual, we find them acceptable recommending they get approved by coordinating committee. There is the table. You can see

there is multiple conditions here. Our number of criteria, percentage of national highway system bridges in good condition, those in poor condition, percentage of interstate pavements in good and poor condition, and the percentage of non-interstate national highway system pavements in good condition and poor condition. And just for reference, for background, that is the Columbia area national highway system. It includes I-70, 63, and a handful of other roads, Stadium Boulevard being one of them, Providence Road between the Interstate and Route AC, Route AC itself, a portion of the Business Loop and then the Highway 763, Range Line, from the Business Loop up to 63. So, again, that's just what the highway -- National Highway System for the Columbia area looks like. The Tech Committee did pass a motion recommending the Coordinating Committee had formally adopt Pavement and Bridge Targets at their February 25th meeting, and that's what we suggest the Coordinating Committee does today is pass a motion giving approval to those Pavement and Bridge Targets. Thank you.

MS. BUFFALOE: Are there any questions for staff? Seeing none. I'll make a motion to giving approval to adoption of the statewide pavement and bridge targets. Is there a second?

MR. YONKE: Second.

MS. BUFFALOE: All those in favor, say aye. Any opposed?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

## **VII. ADOPTION OF STATEWIDE SYSTEM PERFORMANCE TARGETS**

MS. BUFFALOE: All right. Up next, adoption of Statewide system Performance Targets. May we have a staff report?

MR. SKOV: This is the third of the targets that we'll be in today. These are statewide system performance targets, they are provided to us and their APOs in October of 2024. As with the other cases, we have the option of providing formal approval. This is for the statewide

targets that we talked about, so we've established our own just so the CATSO metropolitan area. We've always provided formal approval and support of the statewide targets and never set our own. And as usual, we find those acceptable, staff does, and recommends they be given approval by the Coordinating Committee. That's the table, there is three categories, interstate travel time reliability measure, non-interstate travel time reliability measure, and freight reliability measure truck travel time reliability index. So those three things are what the system performance targets are comprised of. The Tech Committee, as with the other ones, they did review these at the February 11th meeting. They did pass a motion recommending the Coordinating Committee formally adopt, assist in performance targets at this meeting, and again that what we suggest the Coordinating Committee does is pass the motion giving approval to those performance charges. Thank you.

MS. BUFFALOE: Do we have any questions for the Committee since that? Seeing none. I make a motion giving approval to the adoption of the Statewide System Performance Targets. Do I have a second?

MR. YONKE: Second.

MS. BUFFALOE: Seconded by Thad. All in favor, say aye. Any opposed?  
(Unanimous voice vote for approval.) All right.

#### **VIII. FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP REVISIONS TO BUSINESS LOOP 70.**

MS. BUFFALOE: Moving next to the Functional Classification Map Revisions to Business Loop 70. Staff comments?

MR. SKOV: Yes, Ms. Chair. We have a functional classification map for the Columbia Metropolitan Area, as do other -- actually, it's not the metropolitan area, it's specific to the urbanized area, but this is capped by MoDOT, so, again, it's a federal related document.

There are two requests that have been made by the Central District Office. They're both in association with the I-70/63 interchange portion of the I-70 improvement project. You might -- I'm sure committees are all aware -- the committees are all aware that the westbound I-70, while a branch of the Business Loop was recently closed by MoDOT, and that caused some changes that these functional classification revisions will address. I'm just going to go right to the map so you can see what we're talking about here. The section in red there where's it's got the arrows that say Business Loop 70, that is currently designated as a local on the functional classification map. The request is to upgrade this from local to a principal arterial. That section formerly had no function because it was -- it was really local. There was no connectivity there. You'll recall that the Business Loop did terminate west of Hinkson Creek until ten years ago, or whenever that -- that road was completed such that it makes a connection with Conley Road onto the south and the east. So that portion is one of the changes being requested. The other one is a future round-about there. You can see it will be constructed by MoDOT as part of the I-70 project. The roundabout also will be a principal arterial, and not only will it include a connection to the Business Loop. It also connects to, in the future, I-70 eastbound off-ramp, and an I-70 eastbound on-ramp. So, again, those two things are part of this functional classification map revision request on the Central District Office. That's just a -- that's our map, our Functional Classification System map of Columbia Urbanized Area. There's another category that's somewhat similar to the major roadway plan, but it's not exactly the same. This is not something that CATSO has a direct impact on. We do give our blessing to it, but we do not accept the actual classifications directly. The Tech Committee did review this. They did pass a motion forwarding the two to FC map revisions to the Coordinating Committee with a recommendation of approval, and that's what we suggest that the Coordinating Committee does

is pass a motion giving approval to these two proposed Columbia FC Functional Classification Map revisions. Thank you.

MS. BUFFALOE: Question for staff? Can you bring up the map again, of the image map, like the drawn on one?

MR. SKOV: Yes.

MS. BUFFALOE: So these are -- sorry. I was a little falling behind on --

MR. SKOV: That's fine.

MS. BUFFALOE: So this is for what is currently under construction?

MR. SKOV: No. The -- the roundabout is not currently in construction, to my knowledge. I would defer to my MoDOT colleagues on that. But I am not aware of it being in construction, but, I mean, there's construction happening out there, but the round-about will be something that will be looked at in the future.

MS. WATKINS: It's part of the plan.

MS. BUFFALOE: So it will be part of, like, that 4D or whatever-- whatever one we are now, not the first phase, but the next Columbia phase, whenever that happens and through I-70; is that correct?

MS. WATKINS: No. This is part of the current construction phase.

MS. BUFFALOE: It is part of the current construction. Okay. I couldn't remember where we fell off.

MR. YONKE: We're scraping right where this is right now.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. Okay. And so this is then -- will this change -- and so this is going to update our classification for East Business Loop.

MR. SKOV: Yeah. The portion that you see there in red --

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay.

MR. SKOV: -- will be affected. It will be -- it's not classified currently. It's ending -- it's just a local. But it will be a principal arterial as will be the roundabout.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. Yeah. Just wanted to be clear. You can go ahead with a motion request.

MR. SKOV: Again, the Tech Committee did pass a motion suggesting this be approved by CATSO Coordinating Committee, and that's what we suggest the Coordinating Committee does is pass a motion giving approval to those two proposed functional classification map revisions.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. Any other questions besides my own? All right. I'll make a motion giving approval to the two proposed Columbia Functional Classification Map revisions. Do I have a second?

MR. YONKE: Second.

MS. BUFFALOE: All those in favor, say aye. Any opposed? (Unanimous voice vote for approval.) All right.

## **IX. CATSO UNFUNDED NEEDS LIST UPDATE**

MS. BUFFALOE: Now into the CATSO Unfunded Needs List Update.

MR. SKOV: Yes, Ms. Chair. This is the last of our action items related to MoDOT today. We have an unfunded needs list that we do on an annual basis, and we revise on an annual basis and provide to MoDOT. The Central District Office has made a request that we provide an updated needs list by March 1st. I'll also point out that the majority of the projects on the existing list from 2024 remained there. They haven't been funded or scheduled for any kind of implementation at this time. But I'll just -- I'll just note the few changes that are

happening. One of them is that there will be revisions to the description of the sidewalk project for West Broadway. That's Number 12 in the additional category. It's not one of the top ten, but it is a project that has had a portion of its section funded by TAP, a Transportation Alternative Program grant funding. The West Boulevard to Maplewood portion has received that grant funding, so it's no longer an unfunded need. The section from Manor Drive to Stadium remains unfunded and remains as an unfunded need. So that description change will be made to the list. There's a couple of other revisions also that we'll included in the 2025 list. Ones that I'm pointing out here are in the additional category of the Multi-modal session. One other is deletion of the COLT Railroad Aurora Dairy siding project reassigning project called Railroad. Staff has informed me that's not going to be eliminated, so it's no longer going to be an unfunded need. COLT Railroad staff also informed me of the need for a couple of new crossing projects, and add those to the unfunded needs lists, which is their request. They're both crossing projects. One is COLT Railroad crossing at Route B north of Waco Road. The second one is a COLT Railroad crossing at Peabody Road. So, again, COLT staff has asked if that would be included with the unfunded needs list. The Tech Committee did review a list for - a revised list of the February 11th, 2025 meeting. A committee member for the MoDOT Central District Office noted that the University has hired a consultant to study the Stadium Boulevard Quarter coming through the campus. And as a result, this committee member suggested that another project be added to the additional road and bridge category on the unfunded needs list described as follows: Just that the addition is Stadium Boulevard, which, of course, is Route 740, safety capacity improvements from U.S. 63 to Providence Road. The Committee was in agreement. The Tech Committee was in agreement with all the suggested revisions that I've gone over here. They passed a motion to forward their revised list to the

Coordinating Committee with a recommendation of approval. That's the list -- just, again, I don't need to go over all this. But, again, there is an addition in the road and bridge section for Stadium Boulevard safety and capacity improvements for 63 and Providence. And then under Multi-Modal, there's this change in description of the sidewalk project to reflect the back and portion will receive TAP funding, the deletion of the Aurora Dairy Rail turnout assembly, et cetera, and the two additions to the COLT Railroad for crossings at Route B and Peabody Road. We suggest the Coordinating Committee pass a motion giving approval to those proposed changes, and so we can submit a revised unfunded needs list to the MoDOT office as requested by March 1st. That's all.

MS. BUFFALOE: Any questions for staff? Okay. I have all the questions today, Mitch. I'm sorry. I was just wondering, have we recently taken anything off of the unfunded needs list because we got federal funding for it, but that money might not be paused?

MR. SKOV: Well, again, we'll -- the one description change I noted, technically, a portion of that project has been taken off the list because it got funded. The sidewalk project on West Broadway --

MS. BUFFALOE: Right. Right.

MR. SKOV: -- that -- that section is being taken off because it's funded.

MS. BUFFALOE: Right.

MR. SKOV: The Transportation Alternative Program granted.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay.

MR. SKOV: But I don't recall -- I don't remember if last year, we took one off or not.

MR. TEDDY: Maybe AC 63.

MS. BUFFALOE: I was wondering if you had anything like that, or like the Clark Lane,

you know, if you had taken off anything that we had gotten in funding for improvements.

MR. SKOV: I don't recall that.

MS. WATKINS: AC 163 was, at one time, as was the connector. MS.

BUFFALOE: Okay.

MS. WATKINS: And then I -- if I more related to it then if there's pause in federal funding, like if we're not going to get those, you know what I mean, even if we're not actually getting those funds anymore.

MR. YONKE: The potential difference between now and the past.

MS. BUFFALOE: Yeah. Yeah. So I think you just need to be aware of that.

MR. SKOV: I'm not really concerned about that.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay.

MR. SKOV: I'm concerned about transportation funds, so much as maybe some other people might be concerned about other categories.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay.

MR. YONKE: I mean, that's just from what I understand about the way transportation is funded. I think it's got dedicated funding sources. It's not as likely to be affected by that kind of action -- freeze action. I'm not saying it doesn't affect transportation, I'm just saying ultimately within the, you know, intermediate term, I'm as not as worried about that.

MS. BUFFALOE: But didn't we get -- receive word from Federal Highway that we were not going to receive our funding for the Business Loop? Or was that -- was that part of the planning grant that wouldn't have been on this month anyway.

MR. YONKE: That was the planning grant.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. What was Clark Lane?

MR. YONKE: Clark -- Clark Lane was a implementation construction project.

MS. BUFFALOE: And is that going forward or --

MR. SKOV: We don't have a grant agreement in place for that project as of yet, so there is nothing -- we have not been told anything that we're -- it's just gotten quiet.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay.

MR. SKOV: If that makes sense.

MS. BUFFALOE: I think I was wondering if that was an -- was on the unfunded needs list and if it was still on there.

MR. SKOV: I don't believe that's on the list. What specific needs. Is that a planning project?

MS. BUFFALOE: That was implementation.

MR. SKOV: For Business Loop?

MS. BUFFALOE: For Clark Lane.

MR. SKOV: Clark Lane. Well, we would have it on our list.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. Okay. I just wanted to make sure. Okay. All right. You can got to the motion, Mitch.

MR. SKOV: Okay.

MS. BUFFALOE: Any other questions for staff?

MS. WATKINS: Just for clarification, we revisit this every year.

MS. BUFFALOE: I -- I thought so, but I also didn't know if -- if what had taken anything off to make funding for something later on.

MS. WATKINS: I just wanted you to know how long it would be before we have a shot at that again. If something changes.

MS. BUFFALOE: Yeah. Yeah. All right. I'll make a motion giving approval to the proposed Unfunded Needs List for Columbia Metropolitan Planning Area. Do I have a second?

MR. YONKE: Second.

MS. BUFFALOE: All those in favor, say aye. Any opposed? (Unanimous voice vote for approval). All right. Moving on.

## **X. REQUEST FOR ASH STREET MAJOR ROADWAY PLAN REVISION DISCUSSION**

MS. BUFFALOE: Item 10, Request for Ash Street Major Roadway Plan Revision. Do we have a staff report?

MR. SKOV: I just would mention a couple of things here. We obviously received requests from the West Ash Neighborhood Association, as well as Local Motion, to give consideration to an Ash Street downgrade from its current major collector designation to a neighborhood collector. There are two letters from organizations that were included with the agenda packet. There also was a copy of the draft minutes from the February 11th CATSO Tech Committee meeting to provide some additional background on this item. Again, those are just the draft minutes, they're very brief, from the Tech Committee meeting where we had a discussion on this item. That's the roadway plan just for FYI. The Tech Committee did review and discuss the request at their February 11th meeting. They heard from representatives of the West Ash Street Neighborhood Association and Local Motion, provided as the case's request. The Committee did not take any action, but I'll go back to the map for the Committee's discussion. I don't think I have any further -- anything further to add, Ms. Chair.

MS. BUFFALOE: All right. So any from the Committee for Staff? I know I do. Nobody got a questions Mitch. I guess I have a quick question. So on this Major Roadway

Plan, I was looking -- today agenda has -- on the Major Roadway Plan, and on the Functional Classification Map not one that's there talking about the Business Loop changes. They show Stewart as two different designations. So on this map, it shows -- like, Stewart Road -- and I know it came up as Ash but that's been one that has been emailed as a comparison one. So on the -- on the functional -- sorry, what does FC stand for again?

MR. SKOV: Functional Classification.

MS. BUFFALOE: Functional Classification, on the attachment for Item 8, I think this is. If I read my Roman numerals correct -- it shows that Stewart is a major collector, but then on that map of our CATSO major roadway plan, it shows Stewart as a neighborhood collector. And I guess that my question is, do we have some different designations as City roadway plan versus a CATSO?

MR. SKOV: Well, for the CATSO Major Roadway Plan, we have a designation and the functional class map, which we don't set.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay.

MR. SKOV: We don't set the functional classification map.

MR. BUFFALOE: Okay.

MR. SKOV: That's a federal aid, and it's related to the federal aid system. It's something we give our blessings to, but do not actually make a determination on those. And the reason that, I think, Stewart is shown as a collector on the functional class map is that it would not be -- there is no lower classification than local. I believe it's shown as a minor. I can't -- I can't see the map very well, but --

MR. TEDDY: It's a major collector on the Functional Class.

MR. SKOV: On the functional map?

MR. TEDDY: I think that might be the Mayor's point.

MS. BUFFALOE: Yeah.

MR. SKOV: Okay. Well, obviously --

MR. TEDDY: We have it as a neighborhood collector on our Major Report.

MR. SKOV: And that's -- that's inappropriate designation for Stewart Road. I don't know why it's that on the Functional Class Map, but that's not something that we control. So the fact that it's a neighborhood collector on the Major Roadway Plan I think is inappropriate for how it functions.

MS. BUFFALOE: Yeah. Yeah.

MR. TEDDY: It's not as long a road. It dead ends at Fifth and the University campus and then just west of West Boulevard, whereas Ash is about a three-mile roadway as a continuous road west. That's -- that's not the size of the segment that's of concern to the neighborhood groups, but that's the total length of it uninterrupted and it crosses or connects six major roads.

MS. BUFFALOE: Right. Do we have any examples in town where that continuous roadway changes classification based on the physical built environment of where it is, because I think that's where we're hearing a lot feedback is that it's different, you know, between the central City areas, and because of the existing built environment. I think when I was looking on one of our plans, it showed from building structure to building structure in some areas, it was almost close to what we would want in right-of-way for a major collector, so I didn't know if we had any other examples or if we had the possibility to explore --

MR. SKOV: The Business Loop is an example that's crossing. I think multiple or most of its area, at least from Route B, I believe, to Creasy Springs Road, I believe it's an arterial, and

then it downgrades to the west of that, along the Cosmo Park area. So that -- that is an example just of a roadway that does change designation based on the functionality of it.

MS. BUFFALOE: Yeah.

MR. SKOV: Because the traffic doesn't drop off west of Creasy Springs Road.

MR. BUFFALOE: Yeah.

MR. SKOV: Considering Cosmo.

MS. BUFFALOE: Yeah. Because what I was looking at, you know, obviously I looked at them today, just to see the difference between, like, structures on Broadway, Worley and Ash, and then even Ash itself ability of Ash itself in different areas is just different as far as the structures, like when you get closer ARC and everything. So then I was looking at the -- the recommendations, I was trying to find our Major Roadway Plan when these conversations might have happen, and I found out that Council memo from 2017, and it talks about -- and I've mentioned this to you before, Mitch, about is there a policy for how you would approach, so do you want to speak to what are the recommendations for if we want to review the designation, what would be the process for that. And you mentioned public hearing and would it be a Council directive or coordinating committee directive.

MR. SKOV: It could be a Council request to CATSO coordinating, or it could be a CATSO coordinating directive to staff instead of public hearings.

MS. BUFFALOE: And what would that -- what would the request be? What would the motion be for that?

MR. SKOV: The motion would be to -- to staff, set a public hearing to give consideration to reclassifying Ash Street from a major collector to a neighborhood collector. And, again, that would be -- we need to do that in advance. We need at least 15 days of public

notice and comment area periods, and the Tech Committee would be reviewing again before a public hearing is held. The next series of meetings is in May.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. I don't know, like, do you -- I didn't write down any word you just said, so I'd like to make that motion that you just said. So say asking staff to set a public hearing for --

MR. SKOV: Reclassification.

MS. BUFFALOE: Reclassification. So I guess my question is more clarified before I make my full motion is, is it possible to do it within a limited space, or would it have to be the full of Ash.

MR. SKOV: Sorry?

MR. TEDDY: It could be for a portion of that. It doesn't have to be the entire length.

MS. BUFFALOE: Right. So it could be from Garth or Providence -- I actually -- Shane, if that were to be a potential, what would be the --

MR. CREECH: I guess it would depend on what the area of concern is exactly.

MS. BUFFALOE: I think it's the --

MR. CREECH: You narrowed it down quite a bit much.

MS. BUFFALOE: Yeah. I think, for me, my thought for thinking was it would be Clinkscapes to either Garth or Garth -- what's the next street?

MR. TEDDY: Providence.

MS. BUFFALOE: Well, I don't if Providence because Providence has a lot of commercial --

MR. CREECH: No. Between Garth and Providence, there is actually quite a bit of commercial.

MR. TEDDY: Or just probably the start of a real neighborhood.

MS. BUFFALOE: More residential?

MR. TEDDY: Yeah.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. Right. So I'd like to make a motion to ask staff to set a public hearing for the reclassification of Ash Street from Garth to Clinkscapes. Do I have a second? Did you follow my motion?

MR. SKOV: Yes, I did.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. Do I have a second?

MR. TEDDY: I'll second.

MS. BUFFALOE: Second. All right. Discussion?

MR. YONKE: I guess I -- the only discussion I've got on it is I'm wondering whether this is really the right thing for the desire, because if you look at Ash in that neighborhood area, and actually its downtown section, as well, it's part of the old grid and street network. And the old grid and street network is a much different animal than most of the other types of roadways that we find, especially new roadways that get built to the standards. And so you'll find things like Broadway, which is an arterial, Ash and Worley, all three relatively similar in its right-of-ways and things like that because they function as a system. Similarly, they function as that with Garth and then West Boulevard and Clinkscapes as the cross-reference roads. And what I'm wondering is, would it be better served to have the City investigate that system to see if some standards for how that whole system should really work together for traffic calming and all because they all have similar issues because my concern is that if you alter a system like that that's organic, you'll have unintended consequences of if you get it out equilibrium and you throw too much then to the other roadways that are all working as a network. And then it might

be looking at it too narrowly without taking into account how that system works. And maybe if you took it into account how that system works, you could come up with some standards that you could then adopt that would be workable for all of those sections, and then it wouldn't necessarily matter whether it was designated as a neighborhood or major collector or whatever because it would have its own set of standards that you guys would be using. It seems like that might address the concerns better than just reclassifying the section, and that's the only reason I have a concern with it.

MS. BUFFALOE: Well, I would agree that a full central city transportation system probably needs to have its own sort of review system because this area of Ash is way different than Ash when you get closer to Fairview, you know, just because of age of when it happened. I think the concerns I'm hearing from residents is that but we're also currently working with the system that we have, and we're -- we are a major project we're working on, and it is impacted by a classification -- the current classification of the streets.

MR. CREECH: I -- I would agree with that.

MS. BUFFALOE: Oh, okay.

MR. TEDDY: I don't think that anything we're proposing is necessarily tied to a classification group.

MS. BUFFALOE: Oh.

MR. CREECH: I mean, we'll be proposing more as to do with the limited amount of space we've got between the houses.

MS. BUFFALOE: Yeah.

MR. CREECH: We're trying to do the best we can do down in there. MR.  
BUFFALOE: Yeah.

MR. YONKE: I don't know that the classification of the roadway would change what we are proposing.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. The City street standards speak to that also. It makes note that while we have uniform standards for each type, neighborhood collector being one type, major collector being another, that when the street already exists and it's already when developed around it, flexibility is needed. So, and the case of Ash Street has been pointed out that it has lots and lots of driveways and your major collector standards says no driveways are allowed, but we wouldn't ever consider the designation of a plan to prohibit existing driveways and a closing. They're necessary, so that's a flexibility for right-of-way width. It doesn't mean either neighborhood collector standard for most of Ash. That's another example of the flexibility. So the City has license, if you will, that in the context sense of that design. I think that's important.

MS. BUFFALOE: So what would the process look like for the -- what Thad is referring to then. That sort of review.

MR. TEDDY: I think the first thing I would -- I would say in this is we just -- we just recently in August passed our 2025 Capital Improvement Sales Tax, and there's nothing proposed within that along Broadway or Worley, and the Ash Street project that we're working on now was in the 2015 Capital Improvement Sales Tax. So in the next ten years, all three of their function is essentially the same way. And I agree with Thad that they all have to function together. If you do something to one of them, that's going to impact the other two. And so the problem I have is we can study it and look at it, but if nothing is going to change on those in the next ten years, I'm -- I'm not exactly sure what -- what that end result would be. We'd probably have more information, but I don't know that we would have any way to improve on that. That's going to end it right now.

MS. BUFFALOE: Would the improvement (indiscernible 11:34;10) run the 2015 Capital Improvement Sales Tax for -- for Ash, will those improvements in -- Pat, you say it's related, so will we see then some sort of impact on them or brought -- and you know what I mean the balancing between Broadway and Worley?

MR. CREECH: I mean, I would say the project that we have proposed is trying to balance all of those, all of those desires, you know, to move traffic volume in relation to the other two roadways, but also to provide pedestrian bicycle facilities.

MS. BUFFALOE: Any other discussion on the motion?

MR. TEDDY: Well, I just wanted to comment on Thad's remark. We have talked about this. There are those other major collectors that Ash actually -- actually intersects with. I think at minimum, we at least want to make that part of the staff's analysis. It was -- what about those? What about Garth, West and Clinkscapes or most of Clinkscapes, which is -- these are also major collectors, and they have similar traffic volumes. Worley has a higher traffic volume, and it's in that major collector category and it has similar land use, although it's longer and it gets into the mall area, and that probably would be closer to I-70 probably explains higher traffic counts. But I think we would want to do something contextual for that report, because we might be back in this situation when we're doing another major city project or a city project on one of those major collectors.

MS. BUFFALOE: So I think, regardless of what happens with this vote for the second public hearing, I think having those conversations about how review the whole system as it stands together would be probably something that's going to need to happen. I apologize speaking of a ten-year plan, but we're talking about how -- you know, that maybe some of the thing might be not part of the Capital Improvement Sales Tax, they may be just part of our

planning and overlaid discussion that don't necessarily fit that infrastructure, and that's not that we would require. All right. So we have a motion and second on setting a public hearing for reviewing reclassification of Ash Street from Clinkscapes to Garth, a motion and second. Any other discussion on this? All right. I'll have -- do you want me to call roll, or how do you -- I don't know how you guys do votes at a council meeting.

MR. SKOV: However you want to do that. We have a recorder here, so —

MS. BUFFALOE: I think I would like to call role so you -- Mitch, would you mind calling the names?

MR. SKOV: Oh, sure.

MS. BUFFALOE: Thank you.

MR. SKOV: Mr. Devereux?

MR. DEVEREUX: Yes.

MR. SKOV: Mr. Yonke?

MR. YONKE: Yes.

MR. SKOV: Mr. Creech?

MR. CREECH: Yes.

MR. SKOV: Ms. Buffaloe?

MS. BUFFALOE: Yes.

MR. SKOV: Mr. Teddy?

MR. TEDDY: Yes.

MR. SKOV: Mr. Henderson?

MR. HENDERSON: Yes.

MR. SKOV: Ms. Watkins?

MS. WATKINS: Yes.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. So motion passes to have a set public hearing for having this reviewed for reclassification. I appreciate that. Thank you. All right.

**XI: CATSO DRAFT COORDINATED PUBLIC TRANSIT HUMAN SERVICES  
TRANSPORTATION PLAN UPDATE**

MS. BUFFALOE: Next we have the CATSO Draft Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan Update. That's quite a mouthful for the title.

MR. SKOV: It's the longest acronym I can think of.

MS. BUFFALOE: Go ahead. Go ahead. Do the staff report.

MR. SKOV: Yeah. This item is currently being prepared. It's in draft format. It's one of those documents that I don't think too many people see. I have to see it, but it is something we are required to turn in to the Federal Transit Administration, so it's on schedule to be presented to the committees in May. It's just FYI.

MS. BUFFALOE: All right. Any questions for staff? No. All right.

**XII. OTHER BUSINESS**

MS. BUFFALOE: Going on, is there any other business?

MR. SKOV: No, not to my knowledge.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay.

**XII. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF**

MS. BUFFALOE: Great. General comments by the public. Would anyone wish to speak? Any comments from members? We appreciate that. Appreciate the additional information, Mitch. Mitch, any comments from staff?

MR. SKOV: Not from me. Thank you.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. Great.

**XIV. NEXT MEETING DATE**

MS. BUFFALOE: When is our next meeting date?

MR. SKOV: It's May 22nd, which is -- this will be back on the usual Thursday schedule. I believe this was due to weather and what have you. It can get changed for weather reasons, but that will be the next one, May 22nd, Thursday.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. Well, it'll probably be so beautiful no one will want to come.

**XV. ADJOURNMENT**

MS. BUFFALOE: We'll go ahead and adjourn.

(The meeting adjourned at 3:09 PM)