

MINUTES
COLUMBIA AREA TRANSPORTATION STUDY ORGANIZATION
COORDINATING COMMITTEE
AUGUST 25, 2022

MEMBERS PRESENT

De'Carlton Seewood, City Manager, City of Columbia, Chair
Barbara Buffaloe, Mayor, City of Columbia
Thad Yonke, Boone County, Senior Planner (for Justin Aldred)
Shane Creech, Public Works Director, City of Columbia
Tim Teddy, Community Development Director, City of Columbia
Bill Florea, Boone County Planning (for Jeff McCann)
Machelle Watkins, MoDOT Central District Engineer
Mike Henderson, Transportation Planning Specialist, MoDOT

ALSO PRESENT

Brad Kelley, City of Columbia Planning/CATSO staff
Mitch Skov, Senior Planner, City of Columbia

I. CALL TO ORDER

MR. SEEWOOD: All right. It's 2:30. Let's call this meeting to order.

II. INTRODUCTION:

MR. SEEWOOD: Let's do introductions. I'm De'Carlton Seewood, city manager for the City of Columbia, and chair of the CATSO hearing.

MR. CREECH: I'm Shane Creech. I'm the interim director of public works for the City of Columbia.

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

MR. FLORA: Bill Florea, Boone County Planning, sitting in for Jeff McCann.

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

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

MR. HENDERSON: Mike Henderson, MODOT Central Office Transportation Planning.

MS. WATKINS: Machelle Watkins, District Engineer for MODOT Central District.

MR. KELLEY: Brad Kelley, Planner with the City of Columbia.

MS. SKOV: Mitch Skov. Same, CATSO staff.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. SEEWOOD: Can we approve – supposed to get the approval of agenda. Are there any changes to the agenda?

MR. YONKE: Move to approve as written.

MR. HENDERSON: Second.

MR. SEEWOOD: All in favor.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

MR. SEEWOOD: All right. How about the approval of minutes, any changes?

MR. SKOV: I don't believe so. It's a straight transcript, so we didn't have any changes.

MR. YONKE: Move to approve as written.

MR. HENDERSON: Second.

MR. SEEWOOD: All in favor.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

V. PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED FY 2023-2026 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (TIP)

MR. SEEWOOD: All right. Let's call to order for the public hearing, proposed FY 2023-2026 transportation improvement program for the TIP. Mitch?

MR. SKOV: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is our typical update to the transportation improvement program, which, of course, is the – a four-year, a fiscal year document, which specifically features a listing of all the transportation capital projects for that period scope for the CATSO metropolitan planning area. It's a very similar format to what's found in the MoDOT version, the DOT State version of the TIP, which is called STIP. It primarily focuses on those projects that have federal funding. And that's -- included in that is both MODOT roadways, projects for Go COMO transit, as well as the private transit provider, such as OATS for Boone County, for City of Columbia, et cetera. It also lists the -- we anticipate what would be the maintenance cost for what's called the federal aid system, which is the major roadways that are eligible for federal aid specifically. That's a subset, of course, of all the maintenance costs that actually need to be taken care of in the area. But all we're required to list is the ones that are specifically for that portion of the street network. We're anticipating for that, this year the maintenance cost will be just over 15 million. One feature the TIP is it needs to be fiscally constrained. We're not able to show projects that are proposed and have no funding identified for them. The documented project revenue has to be enough to sufficiently cover all the projects that are listed. Now I want to emphasize CATSO does not pick the projects that are here. They're actually selected by the

individual jurisdictions, by MoDOT, by Boone County, and by the City of Columbia. We do work with the staff to check on which projects need to be in the TIP. But we get a number of projects that are actually just submitted to us directly. We have to have the projects in the TIP in order for federal funding to be used to actually be obligated for use in a project. The current TIP includes just over 288 million in capital project costs over the period, 211.5 of that plus, is federal funding. The majority of those federal funds are from MoDOT roadway constructions, and for Go COMO transit projects. This is a summary of the project. There's a considerably larger amount of federal money here this year than there was last year. And the difference is primarily with one project that being the US 63/70 connector interchange area projects. That was in scoping the preliminary engineering section of the MoDOT projects last year. I believe it had 4.3 million shown for it then. Now it's got over 195 thousand -- pardon me, 195 million shown and has moved into construction section. I believe 155 million plus is federal funding for that. But again, the total projects we're anticipating being done over the four-year period is just over 288 million, with 211.5 million of that federal funding. Category, many of the projects or the majority of them, are in MoDOT construction. There's a number of them in MoDOT scoping. Boone County has a project for a bridge replacement. I'm showing city streets. Five are new projects. One of them is just similar to the Boone County project, it's a bridge replacement project for which a grant application has been submitted. There's six sidewalk projects, which we show as well as a couple of rail highway. One of those is a crossing and one of those is actually improvement to the Colt Railroad. I want to just mention that I do actually like to include projects that don't necessarily have federal funding in them if the funding's been identified, even if it's all local. Just for transparency's sake, I like to show those certainly in the streets and sidewalks category for the city. And there's also some transit projects. We have 13 in there. Most of them are Go COMO city transit system projects. The total project cost we're anticipating are 23.15 million. And 15 of that would be federal funding. There's a big chunk of that would be operations and maintenance. And part of it is for capital acquisition. The TIP may be adopted as presented within revisions or amendments that we get. We have been in contact with MODOT on a number of occasions about this and have made a number of revisions since the original draft was produced. And went to text. So once it goes for public hearing here, it will be formally provided to federal highway and federal transit administration and MoDOT. Immediately appointed if they get approval by the committee and then it will go through the usual channels for approval there. The tech committee didn't view this at the August 3rd meeting this year. Some general discussion, but they did pass a motion to forward

the proposed TIP to the coordinating committee for their review and approval. They did not make any changes. Suggested coordinating community action would be after your review and after holding a public hearing, staff would suggest that the committee pass a motion to get approval for the proposed fiscal year 2023, 2026 TIP. Thank you.

MR. SEEWOOD: All right. Thank you. Are there any comments or questions from the committee? Seeing none. Because this is a public hearing, we'll open up to the public. Are there any questions or comments from the public?

MR. MCNABB: Tom McNabb, 104 Clinkscapes. I would like to urge everyone in the room to do anything they can to improve the congestion at I-70 and 63, which perhaps would include the extension of Stadium Boulevard around to Lake of the Woods, or to Broadway, at least. And that's been kind of in the plans, is my understanding for some time. And this hopefully is a good time to move forward with that. Thank you all.

MR. SEEWOOD: Thank you. Anyone else from the public? Hearing none, we'll close the public hearing. Can I get a motion?

MR. YONKE: Move to approve TIP.

MR. SEEWOOD: Can I get a second?

MR. TEDDY: I'll second.

MR. SEEWOOD: All in favor of approving the TIP say aye.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval)

MR. SEEWOOD: Any opposed? Hearing none.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED FY 2023 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP)

MR. SEEWOOD: I'll open public hearing for the proposed FY2023 Unified Planning Work Program, the UPWP. Mitch, is this yours?

MR. SKOV: Brad's

MR. KELLEY: This is mine.

MR. SEEWOOD: Okay. Brad?

VIII. CATSO UNFUNDED NEEDS LIST 2022

MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. CATSO is a metropolitan planning organization and receives consolidated planning grant funds from the federal government. As an NPO CATSO is federally mandated to create a Unified Planning Work Program annually, which generally identifies the work activities that staff would be working on for that fiscal year. Also includes software and consultant studies as well. The fiscal year begins October 1st of this year and will extend through September 30th of the next. This work budget includes about 1.2 million funding. The

federal share of which is about 950,000. It's significantly larger than previous years. And I'll get into the details of that shortly. The funding requested is reimbursed at 80 percent. So, the local match is 20 percent be provided for the grant. The UPWP for the year may be adopted as written or with revisions as approved by the coordinating committee. And the UPWP serves as the basis for the consolidating planning grant agreement between MoDOT and the City of Columbia. Said contract agreement was sent to city council and rescheduled for first read on September 6, 2022. This is sort of a breakdown of the budget for each work activity. We can come back to this later. The main thing I want to point out is from the new infrastructure build there's a requirement for a set aside for safety and mobility related items, so we created a new work activity specifically for that function and were committed by Federal Highway doing so. This is the CPG funding summary that sort of details our application and our balance of previous years. It should only been staff policy to maintain a reserve of planning funds in the situation that we would have several plans that we would need to do and would need to seek consultant services for, which is the case this year. Some of the larger items that we have on our work program are an update to the long-range transportation plan with an estimate of about \$200,000 for the services and planning elements that would be required. This year's plan will include extensive public engagement and input from traditional representative groups. A long-range transit study, climate change, and adaptation planning, in a format that is easy for the public to read and understand. And we, again, received accommodation for federal highway for this inclusion into the work program for this year. Two of the items are the Comprehensive Transit Route Study that Go COMO will be working on. It's about \$200,000 as well. They're also submitting that as part of a federal discretionary grant. So, if it gets funded through that they'll be funding through that means. However, if they are awarded that grant, we'll fund it through the UPWP. And the final item is a prorated cost share for public engagement for the City's comprehensive plan. And they'll likely be some overlap and cost sharing between the public engagement for that plan and the transportation plan. The technical committee reviewed this draft of the -- or the previous draft of the UPWP at its August 3rd meeting. And after review, the committee unanimously passed a motion to recommend it to this committee subject to some technical corrections. And we've had one minor revision to account for the GIS employee salary and other clerical revisions that we've responded to and have put into the draft that is before you today. So just action is for this body to review the proposed fiscal year '23 UPWP and suggest any revisions. And after holding a public hearing, pass a motion giving formal approval to the proposed FY 2023 UPWP. Happy to answer any questions.

MR. SEEWOOD: Is there any question from any of the committee members? Seeing none, we'll open up to the public. Any comments or questions from the public? Seeing none, we'll close this public hearing. Can I get a motion?

MR. YONKE: Move to approve UPWP.

MR. SEEWOOD: Can I get a second?

MR. HENDERSON: I will second.

MR. SEEWOOD: All in favor.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

VII. SAFE STREETS FOR ALL (SS4A) IMPLEMENT GRANT APPLICATION

MR. SEEWOOD: Next on the agenda is Safe Streets for all Implementation Grant Application.

MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is a new discretionary grant created from the recently passed by parks infrastructure law that authorize and appropriated a billion dollars for the Safe Streets and Roads for All grant program. It comes in two parts. There is an action plan, application process that's generally for planning activities. And there's implementation grant side that is -- so for implementing projects. The grant, in general, is safety related with focus on local agencies in preventing roadway deaths and serious injuries, States are not eligible. It's open to cities and local agencies in general. It's looking at a focus on all modes of transportation whether that's pedestrians, cyclists, public transportation users, motorists, et cetera. This competitive grant is in line with the City of Columbia's vision Zero work, MoDOT, CATSO safety targets and resulting work over the last several years. Funding from this grant would allow the city to move several projects and initiatives forward. The City of Columbia is pursuing this grant as the lead applicant. And staff is requesting that CATSO apply as a co-sponsor to the City's application. The City heard this item, I believe, last month and authorized the city manager to apply for approximately 17 and a half million from the Safe Streets and Roads for All implementation grant to support Vision Zero work. Of that 17 and a half million, 80 percent would be federal share with a 20 percent local match. I've detailed some of the projects that were included in the City's request, but this is not a complete collection of all of those. Some of them are Clark Lane reconstruction, safety improvements, the transit study I mentioned earlier, various sidewalk projects, comprehensive re-examination of city's insurance policy. And some data analysis related things that kind of serve as the basis for any update to the action plan. This is the first year of a five-year grant program. So, I imagine we'll be submitting applications in the future, whether that's a reapplication or for requesting additional projects in the future based on further analysis. At the time all the items are -- have

the principal lead as the city, but there's an opportunity in the future should Boone County want to participate in any projects or expand the Vision Zero study area into the county. At the technical committee on August 3rd, the committee discussed this. One question came up in regards to, what would CATSO's reporting requirements be if they did sign on as a co-sponsor. I talked with the Safe Streets and Roads for All program team. They indicated that the lead applicant would be the primary contact for any reporting requirements. And that would be the City of Columbia. So, there would be nothing expected of CATSO at this time. So after that discussion we had at tech, committee unanimously passed a motion to recommend to the coordinating committee that the coordinating chairperson be authorized to submit an application for the implementation grant as a co-sponsor to the City's application. With that, I would recommend reviewing and discussing the grant information we've discussed here and then pass a motion giving formal approval to the chairperson authorizing them to apply for the Safe Streets and Roads for All grant program as a CATSO co-sponsor to further implement vision zero work. Happy to answer any questions.

MR. SEEWOOD: Are there questions or comments from the committee? Seeing none, I will open up to the public. Are there any questions or comments from the public on this item? Seeing none, can I get a motion?

MR. YONKE: Yeah. Move for approval.

MS. BUFFALOE: I would second.

MR. SEEWOOD: All in favor?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. SEEWOOD: Any opposed?

VIII. CATSO UNFUNDED NEEDS LIST 2022

MR. SEEWOOD: Next item on our agenda is a CATSO unfunded needs list for 2022.

MR. KELLEY: Thank you, Mr. Chair. The MoDOT unfunded needs list is a wish list of transportation needs featuring multi-level projects and road and bridge projects as well. It's sort of a new process with MoDOT. I believe the last two or three years they're working with their planning partners to identify these needs that they bring to the statewide list and bring to the general assembly. The current MoDOT list identifies about five and a half billion dollars in multimodal and road and bridge needs. And earlier this month MoDOT solicited an updated list from each of the -- each of the planning partners for the top unfunded road and bridge and multimodal needs. Staff has met with few commissions. To begin with, the bicycle and pedestrian commission, which recommended several sidewalk projects from the sidewalk master plan and a trail project, if there was room to include it. The

disabilities commission recommended general support for sidewalk and accessibility or ADA projects. And the public transit advisory commission recommended support for Go COMO's capital projects and operational needs, in addition to sidewalk projects that would facilitate safe connections to the transit system. Staff reached out to the sustainability staff to schedule the agenda for the climate commission, but there's a schedule conflict with one of the workshops. We had two workshops earlier this week on Tuesday. Had two members of the public attend those at the first meeting. A member of the climate commission attended one and then a number of the public transit commission attend another in addition to staff. We also sent out an online survey last Monday that closed today at noon. We've had nearly eight responses with 218 total recommendations. We asked just some sort questions about travel preferences, top three needs or priorities. Asked some demographics about where you live in and around the city and durability or mobility status. Getting into those in terms of travel preferences, peoples primary modes of travel on the survey was by personal vehicle with a tie in second place for biking, walking, or wheeling. And the primary – the line's fairly closely with recent since this data, but outside the personal vehicle, there may be slightly over-represented. The preferred mode shows a reduction in personal vehicles with higher emphasis on biking, walking, and public transit. We also asked if respondent's owned or had access to a car, truck or motorcycle. And nine respondents said yes, they do have access to those. In regards to specific priorities, peoples first priority was for maintenance followed by safety and public transit, then traffic congestion. And in looking at all of the needs aggregated overall there's a priority focus on maintenance, safety in second, and then public transit, traffic congestion and sidewalks. I'm going to come back to this chart if you'd like to see it further breakdown later. And then just looking at some demographics to collect some info on who are responding to these. It was pretty evenly distributed amongst the wards, aside from wards three and four, which had a larger share in the past couple days. And as far as ability and mobility status goes, one in five respondents had a mobility impairment or had a familiar or professional connection with those that do. Getting into the lists themselves, CATSO already has five projects on the road and bridge list. And we're only allowed to submit five, so the technical need recommended submitting the same items with moving the Route B item one project higher. And if there were room for more, they also recommended a traffic study on Route K to address safety improvements. Over the multimodal items, we hadn't been able to reach the -- reach out to transit at that time. But technical committee took in the considerations from bicycle and pedestrian commission and forwarded those along with the rail projects and allowed room for us to modify it based

on the transit input. So the items that are in bold on this multimodal list are items that are already on the statewide list, that includes four sidewalk projects, two and three rail. And since receiving the public input I have modified this a little bit to include two transit projects totaling about 13 million each, that's capital. And operation's needs. And to do so, I had to move a rail project off the list. That was more so tied to economic development. So, what is on the list I'm presenting to you today in order are, four sidewalk projects, transit operations for about six to seven million, transit capital projects for about six to seven million, two more sidewalk projects, and then two rail items related to maintenance of the existing rail line and a bridge that needs repair. And we have additional projects here if MODOT does solicit more than ten, we have those prepared. Again, we discussed this at the technical committee forwarding these lists to CATSO coordinating with room to modify the multimodal list kind of based on the input we get from transit. After the discussion, the committee unanimously passed a motion to recommend these lists to coordinating committee with possible revisions. So we would recommend reviewing the proposed unfunded lists, opening the floor for public comment, suggesting any revisions deemed appropriate. It's on a regulatory public hearing item, but I still suggest opening to public comment. And then after this body's review, passing a motion giving formal approval for staff to forward these lists to MoDOT Central District. Happy to answer any questions.

MR. SEEWOOD: Are there any questions, concerns or comment from the committee?

MS. BUFFALOE: Brad, I have a question. When this goes through the technical committee, how do these get ranked; is it a scoring matrix that the technical committee is reviewing and then that's how they get listed?

MR. KELLEY: Good question. No, we don't have that at this time. We had started a little bit of work on that earlier this year, but with staff resources both the city and the county, we haven't had time to formalize and approve a scoring matrix for that.

MS. BUFFALOE: But historically, we normally have a scoring matrix of sorts – or no.

MR. KELLEY: No. It's mostly discussion. So, starting with the sidewalk ones, I met, I think twice with the bike and pedestrian commission to sort of rank them. The sidewalk projects are already -- they do have a scoring matrix associated with a sidewalk master plan. So, they sort of use that, plus their knowledge being more intimate with the city sidewalk projects to kind of use those and create a ranking for their submissions.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. Thank you.

MR. SEEWOOD: Any additional comments or questions?

MR. TEDDY: Just quickly, the Colt Railroad Project that was removed from the multimodal list that was spurlined in the milk plant?

MR. KELLEY: Yes.

MR. SEEWOOD: Any other additional comments from the committee? If not, we'll open to the public. Are there any comments or questions from the public?

MS. AMPARAN: Hi, Carolyn Amparan. I live in Columbia on Shale Oaks Avenue. And I just wanted to provide input to prioritize an unfunded project in the multimodal list. It is for the sidewalk improvements for Lake of the Woods to Battle High School. It is already on the list. But I also wanted to, you know, ask in general for that area to be considered for anything needed for students to walk or bicycle safely to Battle High School. And the reason that I'm bringing this to your attention is even though I cannot speak for the Youth Advisory Council, I did attend one of their meetings and this was a subject of conversation with all the Battle High School students that were there, that they don't feel that it's safe for them to walk or bicycle. And that's obviously a group that does not have access to cars. So, I wanted to recommend that for the list. That's a high priority.

MR. SEEWOOD: Thank you. Anything else from the public? If not, can I get a motion?

MR. YONKE: Move to approve as recommended by staff.

MS. BUFFALOE: I second.

MR. SEEWOOD: All in favor?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. SEEWOOD: Any oppose?

**IX. CATSO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE RESPONSE TO CITY OF COLUMBIA
CLIMATE AND ENVIRONMENT COMMISSION ANALYSIS OF CATSO 2050
LONG-RANGE TRANSPORTATION PLAN (LRTP)**

MR. SEEWOOD: All right. Next item on the agenda is a CATSO technical committee response to the City of Columbia climate and environment commission analysis of the CATSO plan.

MR. SKOV: I didn't really have any comments other than to say the letter was attached with your agenda. And there is no -- I would accept the letter and there's no formal action necessary on the part of the committee, but that is up to you.

MR. TEDDY: We had the letter on our technical committee agenda as draft on the 3rd. And we did have some folks in the audience that wanted to make comments, so we took a number of comments on the letter.

MR. SEEWOOD: Any additional comments from the committee?

MS. BUFFALOE: Yes. Hi. So, I guess I'm looking back to what we received from -- and this was obviously written from the Office of Mayor-Council when I was not -- so speaking in that. And the recommendations in it were, you know, talking about public input into our process. And how do we look at alignment for some of the goals that the City has within the long-range transportation plan. The letter we received back I wouldn't say necessarily is responding to that letter from council, but maybe more of the additional things from the climate and environment commission. So I just wanted to state it's not my favorite tone of a letter from the technical committee. I think it kind of gets into probably backstory that might be outside of what was happening as groups. But I do want to just comment that the original intent about this idea of the next time we do an update, which Tim you brought up when I was reading our last meeting minutes. We talked about we're about to start the process for our next long-range transportation plan update. So, I guess I wanted to ask, you know, you mentioned earlier, Brad, I think it was -- not that I'm saying your name wrong, but I think it was you who was mentioning it -- about our next steps for having a consultant help with the public input, looking at the climate impacts for how transportation does.

And so I think that those pieces would've been better in this letter than the response that we received because they're more in line with what we received from the city council. So, I just wanted to make note to that. The other thing is, I'm interested, you know -- the Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization, it's Columbia plus our areas, and I appreciate the discussion. We have MoDOT, the City and Boone County. And I think I'm wondering in our next iteration, is there options for us to review some of these projects with a lens of city -- these are city projects so there's things that are important to the city are these mode shares goals. Like, the city -- we're thinking about this, how can we include that in projects. And then I also think about the piece around the city, we know we're gonna grow. And so, as we incorporate additional things that maybe used to be in the county, how can we have some of that data influence those projects, or at least be knowledgeable of it as we grow so that we're thinking proactively and towards the future as we grow. Because once it is us, I do want to make sure that people have the ability to walk, ride their bike, get around safely. So I don't know if now is the time, or if you want me to save it, Mitch, but the questions I have about the long-range transportation update next steps. Do you want me to save that for the -- I think this letter is related to it, so I don't know when to ask those.

MR. SKOV: We're just preparing those first steps now. I know Brad -- we've done a little bit of investigation as far as the scope of the plan. And we're planning to

use a consultant this time, at least for the first time since I've been involved to actually do the plan. At this point it's beginning to collect some demographic information and financial projections from each of the jurisdictions. So those would be the initial steps. But again, the big difference now between this iteration of the LRTP and previous ones is that we're gonna be using a consultant. So that will be a completely different process. We've always done this inhouse prior to that. So that's what's going on now. I don't know, maybe Brad can speak to if we've done anything further as far as looking into the consultant.

MR. KELLEY: Yeah. I would just add the first steps for us with having consultants is we have to include it in the UPWP that we approved earlier. So, the City Council would likely approve the CPT contract, we'd get that done. That fiscal year begins in October. So, I think that's the point that we can start working with financial services staff and procurement of consultant services. So, we'd probably start that in maybe October, and I think it'd take three to six months to select a consultant. Tim or De'Carlon may have more information on city budget items.

MR. TEDDY: It's pending.

MR. KELLEY: That's the other part of this.

MR. SEEWOOD: Brad, can you go back to the slide that talks about that? Because I think that's important to understand the scope of what we're looking for when we go out for that consultant.

MS. BUFFALOE: I guess -- and this is kind of really to the question I asked earlier about how we score items, like the matrix that were on the unfunded needs list. Will the scope of going out for the next long-range transportation plan include like -- it could it include suggestions for how we look at scoring things in the future. And it's -- and I'm pre-answering a question that someone might have. And it's not just saying no to things, it's just so we have all the information before we move forward. Do you think that's a potential?

MR. SKOV: It's a potential. We haven't scored things in the past specifically, typically at least. At least not really in a real focused manner. I mean, we have certain projects we include as what we presume will be done within the scope of the long-range plan period. That doesn't mean that they will actually be done. To some degree we know, and to some degree we're making an educated guess. When we select like road projects and then the specific trail projects that -- or sidewalk and pedestrian improvement projects that we're going to include. I don't know what else they add besides that.

MR. KELLEY: Go ahead, Tim.

MR. TEDDY: I would just say it's important to have some criteria so that when

projects appear in the long-range plan there's some idea of what services they're performing. So, a scoring matrix could add some additional narrative on what it does as opposed to just what it is.

MS. BUFFALOE: Right.

MR. TEDDY: So is there safety benefit; is there congestion mitigation benefit; economic development. Is there connectivity with trails on a transit route. You know, all those kinds of things can be put into a justification so people know why it's in a plan and why it's considered important.

MS. BUFFALOE: I think that would be beneficial to moving forward, yeah.

MR. YONKE: I do think though that one thing that you led into with a question is that, and it may be because of your newness to it, is that it's less important to have that when you consider that all of the projects are recommended by the entity whose jurisdiction it's in. So CATSO doesn't micro-manage the city projects. The city recommends to CATSO the projects they want. And CATSO approves those projects in the mix with the rest of them. MoDOT brings the projects they want. The county brings the projects we want. So, we don't send and put on a different matrix to say well, the City of Columbia recommended these four projects here, we're not going to approve those projects in here. That's not how it works. We assume the city uses whatever criteria it wants for the projects that it brings to us. So CATSO is more the organizing tool, not the ranking tool from that point of view. If it fits in the goals and can be argued that it meets those goals, that's really all that it needs to do for the CATSO purpose.

MS. BUFFALOE: Right. And I guess I was just thinking of the opportunities that we have for educating and doing outreach about how we do our transportation planning. And any data that we can put out there that are -- like, I'm thinking you-all are just getting ready to start your next comprehensive plan, I think. You know, anything that's in line with their comprehensive plan that you have another opportunity to educate its alignment is beneficial to Boone County, to our Columbia area. The other piece is that because they have to be on here in order for us to get so much of our federal funding, I think it also makes it easier for us to help show the interest and need, you know, as you're looking at -- and Mike and Mabelle, I can't speak for MoDOT, but just to know that these are things that are of interest to the central region, helps then when you're having communications back at the home office. And just thinking about those funding. So for me, I think more awareness is there. And I understand my newness to the position, but having served, sat up here before, the difference is how do we improve the process as we move forward just to make sure that it is serving the needs of our community. So, yeah.

MR. SEEWOOD: Any additional comments from the committee? If not, we'll take some comments from the public.

MS. KLEEKAMP: Good afternoon. Traci Wilson Kleekamp. There's some value in addressing that letter head-on and tearing it apart. But I see that we diffused that because if we could do that, we could address equity as it relates to measurement and why that's important. We'll just take, for example, we'll include extensive public engagement, I want to know what extensive is. And who are the underrepresented groups. And what are the metrics that we're using to understand the things that are listed there. It may not be something we've done in the past. That doesn't mean we fittin' to do it in the present. And it also means that if we are growing as the Mayor suggested, we should grow knowing how we're growing and what that impact is. And so whether you're new or old here, we all should be in the space of life-long learning because these are big projects that cost a lot of money. And we need to start doing them right with data. I don't know whose educated guess we're using, but it's not mine. And just to be cheeky, I'll say my educated guess is better because I like to use data, just for fun.

MR. SEEWOOD: Thank you. Anything else from the public?

MS. TRIPLETTE: Hi, CATSO coordinating committee members, my name is Annette Triplett, I'm a member of the climate and environment commission that conducted the LRTP analysis that you and the technical committee received at your meetings in May. The task requested of the CEC by City Council was to assess the LRTP in light of the climate action and adaptation plan. And then the recommendations that CATSO then received that called for improvements to the LRTP were requests made by City Council. So, the requests made of CATSO were not from the CEC, they were from City Council because City Council agreed with the CEC's analysis. And City Council is the decision-making body of the City of Columbia, which is one of the three member entities that compose CATSO. City Council's request to CATSO were in two categories. First, short-term improvements for implementation of the current 2050 LRTP. And second, long-term improvements for the next version of the LRTP. In the first category of short-term improvements, City Council asked for a major amendment to the 2050 LRTP that included five things. Number one, public input on transportation needs. Two, mode share goals consistent with those in the cap. Three, transportation score card for rating projects. Four, project lists that prioritize walking, biking and transit. And five, an implementation accountability strategy. In the second category of long-term improvements for the next version of the LRTP, City Council asked for another five things. Number one, extensive public engagement. You actually have the list on the screen here. Extensive public

engagement in the process of developing the LRTP. Two, input from traditionally underrepresented groups. Three, long-range transit master plan. Four, climate change adaptation planning. And five, a format that is easy for the public to read and understand. I'm actually very encouraged to see that this list is included in the UPWP plans that Brad just presented. This is the first I've seen that it's included in the scope for the consultant. So that's very encouraging. However, the draft response letter that's on your agenda today, that was assembled by the technical committee dismisses this entire set of requests made by City Council. City Council requested ten different LRTP improvements and the letter does not recommend how to take action on any item that City Council requested. The draft response letter is three and a half pages long and spends two of those pages arguing with the mode share goals included in the cap. Again, the issue of mode share goals was one of ten recommendations made by City Council. And while the letter claims that the mode share goals were set arbitrarily, the great irony here is that when the cap was being developed, and the climate task force was trying to figure out at what level the mode share goals needed to be set, the calculations that ultimately determined the level of the goals were done by the previous CATSO staff planner. Regardless, CATSO has the prerogative to set its own mode share goals. And frankly, I believe the CEC would welcome this. If CATSO dismissed -- or if CATSO discussed the current mode share percentages and decided to set its own goals for walking, biking and transit, that were lower than the cap, but higher than where we are now, that would be a huge improvement. But the problem is that right now there is no measurable target in the LRTP for what we want trips to look like in the CATSO area. The LRTP is a transportation planning document. And let's not forget that transportation planning is not an end to itself. We don't make plans just for the purpose of making plans. The purpose of transportation planning is to meet the needs of the people. The City of Columbia is one of the governing bodies of CATSO and City of Columbia represents 81 percent of the people who live in the CATSO planning area. So, the City of Columbia's plans and priorities are relevant to CATSO planning. Not just because City has voting authority on CATSO, but because the City's plans and priorities are also those of 81 percent of the people whom CATSO is supposed to be serving. The draft response letter was voted unanimously forward to you by the technical committee, including by the City of Columbia representatives on the technical committee. The last thing I'll draw attention to is that the closing statement in the letter from City Council to CATSO is this, City of Columbia representatives on the CATSO coordinating committee will review projects consistent with city goals and plans, including the cap. Of the eight seats on the coordinating committee that are

currently filled, four of them are filled by City of Columbia representatives. To me as an outsider, this direction from City Council seems pretty clear. So, on behalf of the climate environment commission, I ask that you reject the draft response letter from the technical committee and make plans to take action on the recommendations from City Council, both for the current LRTP and as you are developing your plans now that will extend over the next two years to develop the next version of the LRTP. Thank you.

MR. SEEWOOD: Thank you.

MS. PEREZ: Good afternoon. I'm Dani Perez. Before I start, I want to just address that when we talk about equitability, these types of meetings are at an unequitable time. There's a lot of people that want to be here but can't. I also notice there's, like, no name tags. So, for people who are neuron divergent and can't remember things very well, to know people's names and faces would be very appreciated. Just a tid bit to make our meetings more equitable and accessible. Anyway, I find a lot of interesting things about the letter. I know we're concentrating so much on this letter. But I think this letter draws a lot of color on the character that is CATSO. I'm an aspiring biologist and my big thing is data and we get harped on about making sure that we have credible resources to back our claims up. CATSO makes a lot of claims. Spits out a lot of data. But there's no documents that I can follow to educate myself. So there's that issue, which makes me feel a bit incompetent with what they're talking about. They claim about how things are undoable, unrealistic and the most interesting choice of word, unreasonable. It doesn't really specify what is unreasonable, but it does like to make comparisons to Columbia with some of the largest cities in the world, which is not a fair comparison. Even when you're looking at things in a scientific standpoint, you don't want to make comparisons to things that are too out of the rang because it makes things unrealistic and it makes thing appear unreasonable. I would like to know what is so unreasonable about the requests that the City Council has made. They don't seem that unreasonable. But based on this letter, it just sounds like we're asking everything and the moon. And the thing that just disturbs me is the idea that climate change is this other thing. And it's almost like as if we have this left brain/right brain mentality. We have the left brain, which is CAPA, and the right brain, which is the LRPT. And for some reason these things can parallel each other, but they're not a part of each other. And as a scientist, I'm telling you that climate change is not a separate thing. It is interwoven with every aspect of our life, whether it's our healthcare, our food, our infrastructure, how we build buildings, how we do transportation. Because I'm here to tell you that in 2050 that's when you're going to

start seeing a lot of the stuff happen. We're gonna be considered the heat belt. You've noticed we're getting more precipitation. That has a great effect on all forms of transportation. So, when I hear language in the document saying we don't want climate change, or basically the same, we don't want to put -- climate change is not at the forefront. That's concerning. It should not be a -- it should be interwoven. It shouldn't be an afterthought or amendatory consideration. Climate change isn't consideration. It is a reality. And every aspect needs to put that into their planning. All right. Sorry, that is all I have to say. Thank you guys so much. And please consider this.

MR. SEEWOOD: Thank you.

MR. HEIM: Good afternoon. My name is Mark Heim and I'm here today representing the members of Mid-Missouri Peace Works, the overwhelming majority of whom live in Columbia or Boone County, outside of Columbia. And I want to say that I'm gonna focus in on one point, but I share agreement with the other speakers on the points raised so far. The thing that amazed me when this was brought to my attention is that it is now 2022, we have a planning document for 2050 that does not take into account climate change. We are living in a climate emergency in case you didn't notice. And I think most of you have noticed it because it's happening every day from the fires to the floods, the extreme weather events that are more and more frequent. I don't want to burden you with too much on that, but I do want to say that this is not something that came by surprise. You know, it snuck up on us, no. In 1988, Dr. James Hanson spoke to the U.S. Congress and sounded the alarm on climate change. In 1992, the world community gathered in Rio for the earth summit and set out goals to address the climate crisis. It's unthinkable to me that in 2022 we have a document that's planning for 2050 that's 28 years from now. And it's planning for 2050 without taking climate into account. This is the height of ridiculous, except it's real. And, you know, it to me speaks volumes that people could think they could plan 28 years in the future and not think about climate change, do not take that into account and now say well we'll do that in 2055 to 2060 version of this document. I won't be around in all likelihood in either 2055 to 60, or 2050, but I will leave a world to my child, who's now an adult and my grandsons who are youngsters but soon to be adults. I want to leave a world that works for them. And I think the City of Columbia, Boone County, and the State of Missouri should put our heads together and come up with a plan that does put into effect climate change. Does take that into account. And looks at how we can switch from vehicular transit to walking, biking, and public transit. These kind of changes can and will be made if we put our minds to it. But right now, to deny it, to not include it, just doesn't make any sense to me. Thank you

for your time and consideration.

MR. SEEWOOD: Thank you. Anyone else from the public?

MS. AMPARAN: Good afternoon. Hello. Carolyn Amparan now speaking for the Mid-MO Sierra Club Group, which has, as Mark indicated, for Peace Works, most of our members in Columbia and Boone County although we do represent Mid-Missouri. Sierra Club did provide input to the 2015 Long-range Transportation Plan to ask for a greater focus on climate change. So, I just want to, you know, bring up that this isn't like something that we haven't provided input for in the past. But I am glad to see that it is gonna be a factor in the next plan. It's important to, I won't -- I try not to repeat what other people have said, but it's important to remember that the historical climate is no longer a reliable prediction of future risk. And any road or other infrastructure we're building today is likely to be around for 50 years and so we can't wait. Any new construction that we're doing, we must begin to factor in planning and design and operation related to climate change in it according to the National Research Council from the National Academy of Science and Engineering. We will see significant changes in planning, design, construction, operation and maintenance of transportation systems. So waiting another two or three years to factor this in, Sierra Club feels is wrong. We're already experiencing significant impacts from climate change. We've seen a significant increase in a number of hot days here in Missouri this summer with days over 95 degrees. Missouri has already experienced three major rainfall events. And these were all predicted by the scientific community that we'd be experiencing these type of heavy rainfall events. 2013, Waynesville, St. Roberts experienced 13 inches over two days. 2021, Columbia, Boone County, experienced 13 inches over several days in late June with five and a half of that following in one day. And just in July, the St. Louis region got 10 inches of rain overnight. So, between the heat and these heavy rainfall events, we can't wait. Any project that's underway now needs to take into consideration climate change. Additionally, in order to meet the greenhouse gas emission reduction goals for the City of Columbia, we need to be factoring in more modal shift away from personal vehicles. Over 90 percent of the trips in this area were by car in 2021. So, we haven't made any progress, and this is really important for emissions reductions as well as a matter of equity. So, from the Sierra Club perspective we'd like to ask that the coordinating committee reject the technical committee response and that you also begin to do the preparation work now that is going to make that 2055 Long-range Transportation Plan better. From a public awareness perspective, implementing some type of score card that factors in equity, safety, climate change support would all be very beneficial. Looking at the list of unfunded projects or the list of the projects you

approved at the beginning of the meeting, you just can't make any sense of it as a member of the public without some kind of scoring factor. And so I think that that's something that should be implemented now, not wait until we get the 2055 plan in place. It's also a matter of equity because like, for example, I spoke earlier about the students at Battle High School. Well, they can't be here today to testify. They're probably not even gonna be in tune because they're not voters to the fact that, you know, these kinds of decisions are being made. But it's something that they care about. So, you know, if we had a score card like that, it would greatly help. Sierra Club also requests that for any short-term decisions like those being made today, that the project for public transit, walking, and biking be prioritized. It's also important now to implement those performance metrics. There's a lot of performance metrics that are discussed in the Long-range Transportation Plan; none of them are measured. And it was in the climate and environment commission recommendation to look at vehicle miles traveled, public transit ridership in other one. And those were all things that if we start collecting the data now, it will make the new plan better. If we wait until we put the new plan in place, it's gonna be like four or five years before anyone starts collecting any metrics. So we need to implement metrics now. So with that, I want to thank you for your time and hope you'll make the right decision.

MR. SEEWOOD: Thank you.

MS. CARTER: Susan Renee Carter and I live in Ward 2 in Columbia, Missouri. And so I don't want to repeat what a lot of people have said but there are two things that I'd like to bring up. And one is that looking at your survey that was done, there's two obvious things going on. One is, is that we have a great need for more public education about the kind of transit that we should be using in our town to meet our climate action plan. Their preferences were using a car. And so, we can't continue doing that and meet those standards. So, the surveys that we do need to reach out to people. We need to be going to people, not inviting them to places, but going door to door and asking them questions, providing them with education and asking them what kind of alternative types of transportation they would use if their roads and sidewalks and bike lanes and walking paths were different. Because I think you would get different answers for your survey. If people knew that there might be different alternatives available. We're just basing our answers to your questions off of what we have now. And there's a lot of places in my neighborhood coming this direction from the north that I wouldn't ride a bicycle across in order to get here and feel safe. So, we need to make our streets, you know, livable, walkable, and safe for people. The second thing is, is that, you know, as other people stated about the letter, and about some of the conversations is that, you know, we tend to want to do things the

way that we've always done them. And when people suggest new things, we want to reject them and make them feel as if they don't know what the process should be like. But I agree with Mayor Buffaloe in that we need to be taking data. We need metrics. We need to be knowing what it is that we're doing and why we're doing it. And what the outcomes of what we've done have -- you know, whether they've improved, or whether we need to make adjustments. Until we start doing those things and making decisions about how we spend money and how we do projects, our city is not going to be walkable, livable, and safe for people. And so I want to support that we reject the letter. And that we look at it and take it apart and determine, you know, what it is that we really need to do moving forward. Thank you.

MR. SEEWOOD: Thank you.

MR. SIMONSON: Hello CATSO coordinating committee members. My name is Lawrence Simonson and I am the CEO of Local Motion. Local Motion represents 8,000 members in Boone County, including individuals, families, businesses, clubs and organizations. Local Motion supports the recommendations made by City Council for improvements to the current and upcoming versions of the Long-range Transportation Plan. Specifically, I'd like to address City Council's recommendations around public engagement. The Columbia City Council recommends a planning process for the LRTP that includes extensive public engagement and input from traditionally underrepresented groups. The draft letter on your agenda today responds to that recommendation. The response says input from the public and community is welcome during discussion for long-range goals. The LRTP process seeks input from the general public in discussion of transportation projects. The process and any suggestions will be looked at and considered for the next iteration. This sounds really constructive, that CATSO is open to public input and that public input will influence CATSO's plans. But the draft letter also makes the following statements. Modifications to the LRTP is a process of refining and building upon the foundation we have. Departure from the process is not conducive to the needed continuity of the plan. These statements make it clear that the previous indicators of openness to the public input are not being made in good faith. That reality of CATSO being far removed from public input and community needs is consistent with my personal experience in attending CATSO meetings over the years. You've heard me address this before and I'll address it again until it's addressed publicly by the coordinated or technical committee. I recently attended a technical committee meeting where a committee member stated that the group did not need public input because community members don't know what they're talking about and they, the committee members, are the experts. The situation in front of you today is that

CATSO has received public input both from the Columbia City Council, members of the public, representative organizations and individuals who believe that CATSO's plan do not meet their needs or those of the broader community. And yet, so far, all the public input from City Council, the community members representing Boone County residents, has all been dismissed in that letter. CATSO's own public participation plan sets out the following three goals. Continuous two-way communication between CATSO and residents, involvement of residents in all stages of planning and decision-making, development of broad-based community support for CATSO decisions. Right now, CATSO is not achieving these goals. CATSO does not have continuous communication with residents. Meetings are in the middle of the workday. It is rare for anyone besides myself to attend these meetings. CATSO's public participation plan says CATSO will hold meetings in locations which are assessable and reasonably available to all residents including low income and minority individuals and those with disabilities.

And CATSO will make a special effort to notify, inform, involve and serve groups and individuals who are traditionally underserved by transportation investments. Low-income persons, minorities, elderly, and disabled persons will be given equal -- equality, excuse me, of opportunity to participate in the transportation planning. Residents are not involved in all stages of the planning and decision-making. Even when residents are able to get to a CATSO meeting, their input is often not listened to. The very last technical committee meeting on August 3rd was a prime example of this. Seven committee members -- excuse me, seven community members attended, contributed comments, and asked questions. They were all women and included several women of color. Part way through their comments, half of the technical committee members walked out of the room. The remaining committee members who were all white men dismissed the community members input including their feedback that the LRTP is not equitable and accused them of using equity as a buzz word. As a result of this lack of communication and involvement of residents, CATSO does not have broad-based community support for the transportation systems being made, particularly in the LRTP. On behalf of Local Motion and our 8,000 members, I ask the coordinating committee to reject the draft letter from the technical committee on the basis that it is unbecoming of CATSO's professional standards. Further, I ask you to listen to what public input you are receiving, including from City Council and make plans to act on council's recommendations from proving the LRTP. Thank you very much.

MR. SEEWOOD: Thank you. Any additional comments from the public?

MS. DOKKEN: Hi, my name is Dee Dokken. I'm just speaking on behalf of

someone who couldn't be here today because it's held during the day, had to work. So that is an issue I agree with. And also, he has brought up the point that why is there no public membership, no membership of the public on the CATSO coordinating committee. It's true of other NPO organizations. If the bylaws were changed, we could have public participation is my understanding. Or public membership on it. Thank you.

MR. SEEWOOD: Any other comments from the public? Any comments from the committee?

MS. BUFFALOE: What are the next steps? You said this is a letter we're receiving.

MR. SKOV: I don't think the committee -- the committee can just take the letter, it was received. You can take formal action or not. I don't see the need for any formal action either way. When I say accept, I'm just saying you acknowledge the receipt of the letter. That doesn't mean you approve of the letter or reject the letter. But again, that is your decision as to what you do.

MS. BUFFALOE: And can we make recommendations in response to it? Would I do that now or during comment?

MR. SKOV: Well, I would defer to the committee on that. I don't know that I have a strong opinion about that.

MS. BUFFALOE: Sort of like follow-up questions to come to our next meeting.

MR. SEEWOOD: I think that would be better served at the general comments.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. I can save my response.

MR. SEEWOOD: Anything else on this particular item?

MR. TEDDY: I'll just say the letter has not been well received. So I'll just acknowledge that.

MR. SEEWOOD: Duly noted.

X. PHILIPS FARM ROAD NEIGHBORHOOD COLLECTOR REALIGNMENT - REFERRAL TO CATSO TECHNICAL COMMITTEE

MR. SEEWOOD: Philips Farm Road Neighborhood Collection Realignment.

MR. SKOV: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is just a request for a referral by the coordinating committee to the CATSO technical committee. We recently received a preliminary plat request. We, being the City of Columbia staff. It would require a section of what's known as Philips Farm Road, the future Philips Farm Road, which is a neighborhood collector street to be shown as part of that particular development. The CATSO major roadway plan currently shows that specific road extending on alignment south from where the existing stub of the road is. There's only one little, short, five-hundred-foot stub of the road actually constructed. It's just off Ponderosa.

Just to the west of Ponderosa. There's now a number of buildings that are shown in the alignment as its shown on the major roadway plan. Things have changed over the years from what the presumptions had been as far as that original alignment. But the starting point, of course, the Philips Farm Road extension needs to be that – the term of that stub. And that's a thousand feet northwest of where the future alignments currently depicted. At the May 4th tech committee meeting, a discussion was held on two potential alternative alignments for the future extension of this road. There was no formal action taken at that time. The two potential alignments have been drawn up by city staff I think in discussion with potential, the property owners in that area. The alignments are shown there. There is -- you can see there's a red alignment and a green alignment. That's just FYI. There's no need for any action on the part of the coordinating committee other than we'd like to -- since we now have this preliminary plat in play, we would like the coordinating committee to refer the topic to the tech committee for review. And a potential recommendation to the coordinating committee for a major roadway plan amendment, which would be needed to revise that Philips Farm Road alignment in coordination with the future development along that alignment with any future plat approval. Again, there was no -- there was extensive discussion at the May 4th tech meeting, but no formal action was taken. And there hasn't been any further movement until now. It's possible that the tech committee would determine the proposed realignments, either of those two would be in substantial conformance with the major roadway plan. And in that case, there wouldn't be any recommendation coming back to the coordinating committee. But for now, again, what we would like, what step we're suggesting is that the coordinating committee pass a motion to refer this for tech committee for a further study and a decision as to what alignment will actually be utilized in revising the alignment as it's currently shown on the major roadway plan. Thank you.

MR. SEEWOOD: Any questions or comments from the committee? Any comments from the public on this project? Hearing none, can I get a recommendation or motion?

MS. BUFFALOE: The motion is referenced to the CATSO technical committee for approval, I make so moved.

MR. CREECH: Second.

MR. SEEWOOD: All in favor.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. SEEWOOD: Any opposed? None. All right. Motion is passed.

MR. SKOV: Mr. Chair, I just want to say Other Business should be the next item on the agenda. I just noticed that. It's actually -- we don't have any other

business. But just so you're aware.

MR. SEEWOOD: Other Business before General Comments, I got you.

MR. SKOV: So we can move on to Item 11 now.

XI. OTHER BUSINESS

MR. SEEWOOD: All right. General Comments, first from the public. Any comments from anybody in the public would like to make to the CATSO coordinating committee?

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: So I had a brain fog. I forgot to mention in the letter, you mentioned something about traditionally CATSO does things a certain way and chooses basically -- not chooses but oversees what is considered reasonable and not. And I think that not just with this committee, but a lot of the committees of Columbia are having an issue with what's considered tradition, what is considered doing how things have been done and continuing to do these things. Rather than as a scientific community would say, evolve. The whole -- what he mentioned about having a meeting and a few people of color, mainly women, talked. And a good chunk of people stepped out. That did happen, I was there. And that's not the first time I've seen stuff like that happen with Columbia in general. So, it's something to really keep in mind, what is tradition. We need to start thinking about what's considered tradition and what is considered things that has been done that need to change in order for us to again, as I use the word evolve to be better. And I'm not saying be ashamed that you are all, mainly all of you are white. I'm saying hey, this is an issue, we can be better. You guys can be better. Let's be better. And so I just wanted to challenge that word tradition and how it's used with the word reasonable and unreasonable. Thank you.

MS. JEFFERSON: Barbara Jefferson, Ward I. I think about moving forward and I do think the priority you should start looking at the climate change, which is really real. And I think you should look at how it affects our infrastructure and everything else. Public input, you know, that needs to be done better. This is bad timing. But also, just sharing about that survey online. I'm thinking about who really knew about that survey online. Whole growth. The action overall we should look at how we're gonna benefit all. When I heard about these new bus routes that just recently came in, like, you know, they're mostly going on the north side of town, I've always thought about how do -- why don't we have more bus routes on the south side of town. Is it equal? And I think about why is it that on the north side of town we have to deal -- because I do live on the north side of town. We had the deal with following our cell phones to hopefully be connected by a bus route. But is that the same thing on the south side of town also, and which one works the best. Data is

important. Thank you all.

MR. SEEWOOD: Thank you. Any additional comments from the public? If not, comments from the committee?

MS. BUFFALOE: I have a staff question.

MR. SEEWOOD: Yes, ma'am.

MS. BUFFALOE: May I mention, Brad, sorry. Just a quick clarification, what's the process for projects – just you mentioned that each of the three entities put together their project list and send it to CATSO. Do we have -- do each of the entities have their own requirements? Is it a certain dollar threshold of which you would come to the Long-range Transportation Plan? Like what is the process of it coming from those groups?

MR. YONKE: It needs to be a project that you might need federal funds on.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay.

MR. YONKE: So, for example, not all pedestrian projects in the CATSO metro area are gonna show up in the Long-range Transportation Plan because a goodly portion of the trails and other pieces that are done in city parks department aren't under CATSO. They're part of the sales tax and the way that the city does those on their own. So, they wouldn't necessarily show up because they're not part of anything that's expecting to get federal money. That's a piece of it that's separate from the other. And whatever matrix or decision matrix the individual entities use to make their decisions, is whatever criteria they have set up to do it within their own. So for the most part, a lot of this is the wrong venue. CATSO just coordinates the individual pieces of the other entities. So, if you want to see more bike and pedestrian or transit projects, the City of Columbia will need to present more bike and pedestrian and transit projects.

MS. BUFFALOE: And then I guess my additional question on that, is there any harm to adding these to our list even if they're not using federal funds?

MR. TEDDY: There's not. Use example of trail projects, a number of trail projects have used federal funds, transportation enhancement program for example for at least two phases of the Hinkson Creek Trail. So yeah, it's good to have them in the plan because you would wind up amending the plan to qualify it for federal funding if a federal funding opportunity came up.

MS. BUFFALOE: Right. I remember voting in amendments to TIP or whatever one of the plans were a few years ago. So, there's no harm to adding them even if they're not amending?

MR. YONKE: No. But they may not take all of them is what I'm saying. It's not a comprehensive thing you can look at. I mean, you can put them in there if you

wanted to, but that's why it hasn't traditionally been in there.

MS. BUFFALOE: So can the CATSO coordinating committee, and I'm not making a motion, I'm just asking this question to start; could we make a recommendation to encourage our entities to add additional projects that help show the additional mobility that we're putting in. Because I think -- you talk about the venue. Fortunately, this is one of the venues of which to have the public engagement piece. And sometimes people aren't able to come to a Monday night meeting of City Council to have this. Or they're not in the room with Public Works talking about some real projects. So, this is a public venue of which to have some of these conversations. So I think any opportunity we have to raise that awareness is only beneficial to us. And with my -- this is my question for staff, is if staff had -- this is a technical committee with -- there's always committees. The technical committee, but from staff, if staff has recommendations for some of the suggestions that were in here, I appreciate the inclusion of the public engagement piece and the review for climate change impacts and all of that in our next round. But I didn't know if CATSO staff had recommendations for some of the ways they could incorporate some of these pieces from the letter. And if so, if we could request that you come back with a report to us on that, like what we could do in the meantime. And whether or not that's asking for the entities to provide additional data, whether that's us saying what's the percentage of dollars we spend on things that we -- or ways that we're including climate change projections in our current projects. Is that -- like before I were to make a request of the coordinating committee to make that, is that a real thing you all could do?

MR. TEDDY: In other words, look at the glass half full, what are we capable of delivering that's in that request on the city side, can we suggest.

MS. BUFFALOE: Right. Because, I mean, the point about the city making up the majority of the projects that people, this members -- I think it is a relevant request. Yeah. So, I guess my request is, and I can do it in a motion form if you all want to vote on it. Is that we ask for CATSO staff to come back in the review from the March letter from the Columbia City Council to see what could we incorporate in the short term before we do our next update to maybe ask of the other entities for data or --

MR. TEDDY: Some adjustments and priorities.

MS. BUFFALOE: Yeah.

MR. TEDDY: You know, those kinds of things.

MS. BUFFALOE: Yeah. I'm not asking to change --

MR. SKOV: As a preliminary to actually doing the updated plan.

MS. BUFFALOE: And the idea is it's hopefully kind of starting us on that path

so that when we do have the consultant and they're doing -- we've already kind of started being like here's the things we do know we collect data on. Because I imagine you all collect tons of data and I know we probably do. It's maybe not out there. Putting it out there and just start the process. That way we're not starting in two years from ground zero. So can that be the motion?

MR. SKOV: Yes. I would like that in a motion.

MS. BUFFALOE: No. So, I mean, I'm making that motion. But do you understand what I said?

MR. SKOV: I would like you to restate the motion, please.

MS. BUFFALOE: Mr. Teddy, do you want to restate what I said?

MR. TEDDY: No. I think you should restate it.

MS. BUFFALOE: Okay. So I'm making a motion that we ask CATSO staff to come back to the coordinating committee with how we can incorporate some of these recommendations in the meantime. What data can we start to collect, what additional public engagement can we do. What options do we have until we do the full range update. That is my motion. Do I have a second?

MS. WATKINS: Second.

MR. SEEWOOD: All right. We have a motion and a second. All in favor. (Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. SEEWOOD: Any oppose? Any additional comments from the committee? Comments from staff? All right.

MR. KELLEY: I just may have one item. We heard a couple times today that staff walked out during the technical committee. It was relayed to me that at the climate commission there's a statement that staff walked out in protest. I don't believe that was the case that happened at the technical committee. I think others here were in attendance as well. I think maybe we should clarify that, just for the public record.

MR. TEDDY: Members had other places to go, in other words.

MR. KELLEY: Yeah.

MR. TEDDY: It was a fairly long meeting.

MR. HENDERSON: I'll throw in there, I was probably the second person that left that meeting. At no time did I intend to disrespect anybody. I waited until the last person that I heard spoke and then I left, which was a half hour after the meeting time supposed to end. So, to say that people left in protest, there was no intent to be protesting. And as a matter of fact, I sat and listened to all of the speakers to be respectful.

MR. SEEWOOD: Any additional comments?

XII. NEXT MEETING DATE

MR. SEEWOOD: Next meeting is scheduled for December 1, 2022, at 2:30 in council chambers.

XIII. ADJOURNMENT

MR. SEEWOOD: With that, can I get a motion for adjournment?

MR. YONKE: Move to adjourn.

MR. SEEWOOD: Can I get a second?

MR. TEDDY: Second.

MR. SEEWOOD: All in favor?

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

(Meeting adjourned.)