City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization (CATSO)

Thursday, May 25, 2017 2:30 PM	Coordinating Committee Meeting	City Hall 701 E. Broadway Council Chambers

I. CALL TO ORDER

MEMBERS PRESENT

Ben Reeser (for Mike Henderson)	MoDOT Central Office
David Nichols	City of Columbia Public Works
Michelle Teel	MoDOT Multi-Modal
Mike Schupp (for David Silvester)	MoDOT Central District
Thad Yonke (for Dan Atwill)	Boone County
Mike Matthes	City of Columbia City Manager's Office
Tim Teddy	City of Columbia Community Development

CATSO STAFF PRESENT

Mitch Skov
Leah Christian

Mr. Matthes called the meeting to order at 2:31 p.m.

II. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. MATTHES: All right. If there's no objection, I'll call the meeting to order and ask for approval of the agenda.
Is there anyone who would like to change the agenda?
(No response.)
MR. YONKE: Move to approve the agenda as written.
MR. MATTHES: All in favor, say aye.
(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)
MR. MATTHES: Opposed?
(No response.)
MR. MATTHES: Then, it is approved.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

CATSO Draft Minutes 2-23-17

Attachments: CATSO DRAFT Minutes 2-23-17

MR. MATTHES: Approval of the minutes. Do you want to have a motion on that or to change or pass?
MR. YONKE: Move to approve as written.
MR. NICHOLS: Second.
MR. MATTHES: All in favor, say aye.

MR. MATTHES: Opposed?
(No response.)
MR. MATTHES: There we are on the minutes.

Approved a Motion

IV. REQUEST FOR CATSO MAJOR ROADWAY PLAN AMENDMENTS FOR PROPOSED FUTURE COLLECTOR REALIGNMENTS ON NORTH SIDE OF ROUTE WW

Request for CATSO Major Roadway Plan Amendments for Proposed Future Collector realignments on north side of Route WW

Attachments: Staff Memo - Item 4 5-25-17

The Brooks Phase 2 TIS

MRP View

105527_CATSO Exhibit 1

CATSO Tech Draft Minutes 5-3-17

MR. MATTHES: Okay. Item 4 on the agenda is the Request for CATSO on Roadway Plan Amendments. I'll turn that over to Staff.
MR. SKOV: Yes, and I believe Mr. Crockett from the representative developer here would like to speak on this.
But what we have here are familiar with the roadway plan, and I will get to the map in the moment. We do have a couple of proposed future major collector streets which are shown on the north side of Route WW, just east to the preferred alternative extension or corridor which is identified for future staking Boulevard Extension.
The two collectors are as follows: First of all, there's a north-south major collector which is in between the presumed future Ballenger Lane Extension at Richland Road and it extends south of WW, and it's presumed to align with Elk Park Drive on the south side. That's shown here, No. 1. It's pretty much just a straight shot on WW northwards up to Richland Road, and, again, the presumed terminus in of Ballenger Extension should that happen.
The second major collector is one that aligns with El Chaparral Drive and its presumed intersection with Route WW. It extends northeast and then pretty much due east across what would be the northern boundary of the property we're talking about today. To the east, there is some access to Rolling Hills Road, and on the MRP, it's also showing terminating on Rangeline Road.
Again, there is the map. You can see the one I just talked about is the one that starts -- No. 2, starts at El Chaparral -- or it's presumed to -- curves to the northeast and then extends directly east. Again, across the northern part of the property where we're talking about today. And on to Rolling Hills, and, presumably, ultimately, over to Rangeline.
The development proposal has been brought into the city. It's a residential subdivision proposal called Brooks Phase 2. It's been submitted to the city for consideration, and it includes a couple of realignment proposals for the two mentioned collectors I just described, and it also included another proposed additional internal neighborhood collector street. The neighborhood collector street named Hoylake Drive is being proposed as part of the development to align with Elk Park at what would be a future signalized intersection at Route WW.

Go to the map, it's shown there as No. 2 extending through this residential building proposal and, ultimately, would connect to another collector street being developed at what they call Brooks Phase 1 there, the northeast corner, but this Hoylake Lake Drive under-street would essentially substitute for No. 2 as described previously. In other words, it would -- it would perform the function of the roadway that's on the major site plan, now starts at El Chaparral and then curves northeast and across the east across the Rolling Meadow property. The connectivity is the same, as it both provides connections to Rolling Hills Road.

The second north-south collector street alignment being proposed as an alternative, potentially what we show on the major plan, is more adjacent to the layout to the west. It's No. 1 there on the map. As you can see, it's not actually part of this subdivision development property, but it would provide the same function in terms of providing a natural Richland Hills -- Richland Road as well as the future terminus of Ballenger Lane, and it would line up with El Chaparral. So, effectively, the -- the roads are swapping interchange -- or intersections at WW with each other with what's shown on the MRP. There's also an internal neighborhood collector street there shown at the very western side here of the subdivision layout which provides some additional internal connectivity. That's not seen as being a major street, but it's still the ultimate collector standard.

There is additional information. We did attach the traffic study which was done by CBB for development -- for the Phase 2 development. At this point, I'd be happy to have Mr. Crockett come up and say whatever else he -- he might want to say about this, if anything, and then I'll report on what happened at the Tech Committee meeting.

MR. CROCKETT: Thanks. Chairman, Members of the Commission, my name is Tim Crockett with Crockett Engineering.

As Mr. Skov mentioned, this all came about due to a -- a proposed single-family residential development in this area. This project started here several months ago, probably six or eight months ago, started planning development, looked at CATSO plan, we talked to our traffic engineer. Our traffic engineers went to the City and got a scoping meeting set up. They brought up all that as well in trying to get some idea how far out this traffic study wanted to go.

What she did -- Shawn White was our Traffic Engineer with CBB -- what she looked at was how do we prevent traffic, what's the purpose of these collector streets at this location, and how can they be accommodated adequately for this development.

Originally, we believed that the initial reaction and, you know, thought was Hoylake Drive, which is shown as basically Item No. 2 on the screen, was to get traffic from Rolling Hills to WW. So, that's what we proposed.

We kind of left off No. 1. We had a meeting with Staff, I believe the County planners was there as well, and they really expressed to us a concern and the need for the extension going northward coming out of El Chaparral at that signalized location. And, so, we went back and looked at it, and this is the proposal we come up with. The difference is, as Mitch said, it's basically swapping intersections. And, kind of the reason for that is that we're wanting to do, we go back to what CATSO has for alignment, we're diverting a lot of nonglobal traffic through a residential neighborhood.

And, so, we feel that this alignment -- the traffic engineer feels this way -- that this alignment would be more agreeable to how the area out there is going to be developed. They both believe with the traffic that's needed, it's needed to go with both signalized intersections and both central neighborhood. We both went to the Coordinating Committee -- or, excuse me. I'm sorry.

MR. SKOV: Technical.

MR. CROCKETT: Technical Committee. I'm sorry. Mr. Skov got into that a little bit.

But, if the Coordinating Committee is so inclined to proceed with this, given the nature of the residential development and the timeframe that we're on, we would ask that, potentially, you would consider any special meeting for a public hearing for this minor -- for this modification so that we can move forward, if this Committee so inclines you to proceed with these changes.

Again, traffic study shows this -- in essence, we've also worked on is our -- between one and two that street to the south is called Roseta. And, at some point in the future, we have two signalized intersections at this location between the Roseta and some point to come right-in and right-out. If that's going to be a major intersection coming into the subdivision, it may not be adequate to serve this development.

Both County and City Planning have asked to work with the neighbor to the west to work on building that actual road as I had as No. 1, the north-south collector to a point where it could tie into the western side of our development. We've approached that neighbor. They're agreeable to that. Don't have much of an issue, I believe, in having us build that road and we could tie our subdivision into that, and then we have that second point of major access to come to a potential signalized intersection. So, I think, long-term, the two signalized intersections that will be there. They will both serve this development.

The third entrance potentially at Roseta could become a ride-in/ride-out only, be a minor access point. So, it's not something we're going to rely on heavily. And, so, I think we've kind of resolved that, and, certainly, that could be something that we could work out with the planners. We -- we would build the best portion of road that ties in there in conjunction of our development. We could come down the road and ask for something else to take care of that, we would probably build that portion of the road ties in there.

With that, I'd be happy to answer any questions, anything you have.

(No response.)

Mr. Skov: Thank you.

Just to update you on what happened at the Technical Committee meetings on May 3rd, we did look at these proposed realignments -- the realignments as proposed, anyway -- and their general census was that the realignment proposal wouldn't adversely affect the roadway network in the vicinity in terms of its operational abilities. Then, also, the proposed realignments with the collector streets would still provide the needed activity for the future development which Staff agrees that they do.

They did pass a motion to recommend the Coordinating Committee consider these proposed realignments to the current and future MRP collector streets noted and, also, to potentially schedule a public hearing for the consideration of only the MRP amendment to implement those proposed realignments, should the Committee be so inclined.

Thank you.

MR. MATTHES: So, you're looking for approval from this group today, with whether or not we move forward with the public hearing?

MR. SKOV: Correct.

MR. MATTHES: Is all the group comfortable with the idea enough to have a public hearing?

MR. YONKE: Yeah. That Technical Committee, we talked about the fact that they do provide the north-south connectivity to the other major roadways. It lacks some of the east-west connectivity that that roadway was originally put on there to provide, but that east-west connectivity was already somewhat crippled by the fact that the roadway at the north part of Old Hawthorne has been impeded by some developments that were there. So, it's value as a -- as a total east-west corridor has been somewhat diminished. So, as long as we can keep the north-south, I think that we're okay with it.

If you're looking for a motion, I'll make the motion.

MR. TEDDY: I'll put my two cents in. I agree it appears to be worthy consideration of the public hearing. I think, considering the long-range land use planning as well as the specific subdivision design, I think it performs -- gives you the functionality we desired of both of those. It's going to be low-intensity residential to the interior of the roadway plan. I -- I think that would be an appropriate network.
MR. YONKE: I make a motion that we approve this as a substitute for what's currently shown.
MR. NICHOLS: I'll second.
MR. MATTHES: All in favor, say aye.
(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)
MR. MATTHES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. MATTHES: Now, that moves it forward to public hearing.
MR. SKOV: You would actually -- sorry. You would really need to amend and put that in your motion, please.
MR. YONKE: I make a motion that we set up a motion --
MR. SKOV: And, if you would, Mr. Crockett has actually asked you for a special public hearing, and I don't know specifically what the timing is on that, although we would have to have at least 15 days to advertise it if it's going to be a public hearing meet. And it's any kind of a meeting, whether a special meeting or not. So --
MR. MATTHES: Can we just add it to the next CATSO meeting?
MR. SKOV: We could, yes. We could do that.
MR. NICHOLS: Which is sooner?
MR. SKOV: It's in August. August 24th.
MR. MATTHES: Not soon enough for your --
MR. CROCKETT: Given we started this several months ago and going through Technical and Coordinating, given another three months for the public hearing, we would ask that we'd -- you know, if you would consider a special public hearing, a special meeting for that public hearing. If you would be so inclined.
MR. MATTHES: Well, what's the flow of the group? I think we need to modify the motion anyway to include the public hearing, one way or another. Do you want to have Staff coordinate a special meeting before the next scheduled CATSO meeting? No one's excited about it?
MS. TEEL: Well, there is -- potentially schedule for consideration, so, is there an option to not consider a public hearing because it's not a significant-enough modification or is the public hearing needed or --
MR. SKOV: We consider this to be an amendment --
MS. TEEL: Okay.
MR. SKOV: -- to the MRP. So, we need a public hearing to actually implement it officially on the Major Roadway Plan. If it was not, it was an administrative provision, we could just proceed with that, but we're going to need to have a public hearing at some point to actually consider this.
MR. YONKE: I don't have an issue with modifying the motion to include the special meeting, but I'm Staff. So, I come to meetings anyway. It's everybody else's decision as to whether or not it inconveniences them to have a special meeting.
MR. MATTHES: Some of us drive a little farther than others, so we'll look to the others.
MR. REESER: Okay. We're fine.
MS. TEEL: Absolutely, I think we want to keep this moving forward as much as possible without delays.
MR. MATTHES: So, Thad, would you mind changing your motion?

MR. YONKE: I don't mind changing my motion, but, Mitch, do you need us to set a specific date or --
MR. SKOV: No. I was thinking like a Thursday, like all CATSO Committee meetings are. So, in order to get 15 days, we would need something mid or late June. So, hang on to the dates.
MR. YONKE: How about I modify my motion to allow you guys to find a date to set for a special meeting?
MR. SKOV: That's fine.
MR. YONKE: That way, we don't have to come up with it right now.
MR. SKOV: No, you don't need to come up with it now. We'll set one for, presumably, later in June.
MR. YONKE: Okay. Yeah. I'll amend my motion to allow for that as well.
MS. TEAL: Second.
MR. MATTHES: Satisfied by the Staff?
MR. SKOV: Did you get a second?
MR. MATTHES: Yes.
All in favor, say aye.
(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)
MR. MATTHES: Any opposed?
(No response.)
MR. SKOV: Thank you.
MR. MATTHES: Very well.

Approved a Motion

V. PROPOSED FUNCTIONAL CLASSIFICATION MAP REVISION REQUEST

Proposed Functional Classification Map Revision Request

Attachments: Staff Memo - Item 5 5-25-17
Columbia FC Sept. 2013
FC Clark Clark Lane

MR. MATTHES: We'll move to Item 5, Proposed Functional Classification Map Revision Request.
MR. SKOV: Yes.
Chair, this is a request that had been before the Coordinating Committee in February's informational item. Tech looked at it a couple times now. Simply, it's about the Federal Highway Functional Classification Map for the Columbia Organized Area, which you're probably all aware asserts some of the basis and the official record for the so-called Federal Aid Highway System in the Columbia area.
MoDOT has a responsibility for the development and updating the FC system in both urban and rural areas around the state. That's -- that's the same thing -- same thing is true here.
The -- this is the map as its currently shown. The black boundary among the edge there is the urbanized area boundary which includes all the city which is in beige and then some unincorporated areas in the county which are also considered urbanized by virtue of various criteria that are utilized to define urbanized. The majority -- the most scheduled of that is the population of Kansas City. But that's the current map as it shows, as it's developed.
We previously suggested a few changes for consideration, make a request -- make a

formal request for. One of them was the addition of Clark Lane between Ballenger and St. Charles Road. It's a minor arterial. We'd also suggest adding Richland Road in its entirety through St. Charles and Rangeline as a major collector, and then the section of Rangeline between Richland and Route Z/I-70 interchange.

At the February 2017 meeting, the -- we personally -- the Tech Committee did review that, and there were some concerns expressed about Richland Road, specifically, in the upgrade from its current local status which is technically not part of the functional class would prevent a use of a funding element called Soft Match Credit which is available for bridges that aren't in the Federal Aid System but not for those who are. So, adding this at this point would be problematic, because the County does have plans to replace a bridge on Richland Road at this point.

We did get a Staff update to the Coordinating Committee on the February 23rd meeting. There was no action requested at that time. We do think that the reclassification and the addition of Clark Lane to the class map for minor arterials is appropriate. And, just as an FYI, the City did complete a major reconstruction of this section of Clark, which was formally unimproved rural cross-section to a minor arterial standard back in 2013.

Our 2040 CATSO Roadway Plan MRP does classify it as a section in the MRP. And a Functional Classification Map designated Clark to the west of Ballenger as a minor arterial, as well as the section of east of St. Charles where it meets St. Charles as a minor arterial -- or, actually, it's a major collector at that point. But this section of Clark Lane does meet the Federal Highway standards for functional classification for minor arterial specifically -- for example, for traffic volume and some other criteria certainly in terms of the standards of how it's built.

This is the section we're talking about here, the gray section that's highlighted with the arrow. As you can see, there's a gap between that, between the section of Clark and Ballenger and St. Charles. It's appropriate for this to be added since it is a part of the same network. Tech discussed it again at their May meeting in light of previous discussion, and the Staff concurs -- they agreed that further pursuit of any FC Map revisions regarding Richland Road and the section of Rangeline Road between Richland and I-70 and Route Z intersection would be inappropriate at this time given the need for that bridge replacement and the presumption that Boone County would use the off-system credits for funding that bridge.

But they did agree the Functional Class Map provision to add Clark Lane as described as a minor arterial would be appropriate, and they did make a motion for Staff to formally make a request for the map revision as well as a recommendation for the Coordinating Committee to approve that action. And they passed that unanimously.

Any questions you have, I will -- will try to answer them.

MR. MATTHES: Questions, comments, or motions?

MR. NICHOLS: It doesn't make sense if we did update that road to that standard, and we spent the money to do that. And it is appropriate at this time.

MR. MATTHES: Is that a motion?

MR. NICHOLS: I make a motion.

MR. YONKE: Second.

MR. MATTHES: All in favor, say aye.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. MATTHES: Opposed?

(No response.)

MR. MATTHES: There we are.

Approved a Motion

VI. LETTER OF SUPPORT FOR MODOT COST SHARE - KEENE STREET/I-70 DR SW PROJECT

Letter of Support for MoDOT Cost Share– Keene Street/I-70 Dr SW Project

Attachments: CATSO Letter of Support for MoDOT Cost Share - Keene & I-70 Dr SE

MR. MATTHES: Okay. We're ready for Item 6, which is a letter of support for MoDOT Cost Share - Keene Street/I-70 Southwest Project.

MR. SKOV: Yes, Mr. Chairman.

The Public Works Department of the City of Columbia does have a project in the mill to do a cost share -- or doing a cost share of the roundabout project on that street. This is just a letter of support from CATSO. I have a copy of it. You are to sign, should you pass a motion to the effect of concurring with that, in doing so.

So, a -- a motion for approval of your -- sending a letter of support from CATSO is what we're asking for here.

MR. NICHOLS: Yeah. It was a request for the application process that we have, and if we get that support -- we already have the letter from the District Office of MoDOT supporting the project as well. So, this is one of the other checklists, if you will, that needs to be done.

MR. YONKE: I make a motion to give them the letter.

NICHOLS: Second.

MR. MATTHES: All in favor, say aye.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. MATTHES: Opposed, say no.

(No response.)

MR. MATTHES: There we are. All right. Moving on. Thank you all for that.

Approved a Motion

VII. DISCUSSION - DUBLIN COLLECTOR STREET EXTENSION

Discussion – Dublin Collector Street Extension

Attachments: Item 7, Staff Memo, Dublin Collector Street Extension

Dublin Ave (aerial)

Dublin MRP

MR. MATTHES: Discussion item about the Dublin Collector Street Extension.

MS. CHRISTIAN: The existing Major Roadway Plan component of the CATSO Long-range Plan does include a future Dublin neighborhood collector section. This would provide a link to Scott Boulevard and the link to Georgetown Drive on the western side of Scott. The construction of the extension will provide another access to Scott Boulevard from Fairview Road for Columbia area traffic.

You can see it there. It's the cache in between Fairview and Scott, and, currently, Rollins Road is probably the closest connector from Chapel Hill. It's about a mile difference where -- Dublin area would be about a quarter mile from -- from Chapel Hill.

So -- but we -- we have discussed this at a Committee meeting. CATSO Staff has to-date received four letters representing seven Dublin Avenue residents and one e-mail copied at 35 Dublin area residents that comprise a number of concerns with this proposed extension. Some of the concerns that have included in these letters are

potential property devaluation, increase of traffic hazards to area children and pets. There is a trail head at the end of that road. It's Scott's Branch Trail head that allows folks to bike into the Dublin Avenue Park which then connects to the Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary. This is another concern that neighbors have, that that trail head would have to be deconstructed to build a road there. And a number of the other resident concerns are included and detailed in the Staff report that was provided in the agenda.

So, at the May 3rd CATSO Technical Committee meeting, we did discuss some of the issues that Staff had brought up. The Dublin extension is listed in the City's Capital Improvement Program as a 10-plus year unfunded project that currently demonstrates a lack of urgency to pursuing implementation, and, as previously mentioned, it does cross that Scott's Branch Trail head. But, also, Staff has observed that continued growth in the area, there may be a need for additional linkages between Scott and Fairview. And, as I said previously, you know, that Dublin extension would provide that quarter-mile distance from Chapel Hill Road.

Some of the points that were brought up by Tech Committee members at our May 3rd meeting were basically that, you know, we need a connection in that area, because previous connections have not been made that were originally proposed. Cunningham Road was originally meant to provide a connection between Chapel Hill and Rollins Road, but the Bonnie View Nature Sanctuary was constructed, so that's no longer a connection. And I may go to a picture here in a minute.

Bray Avenue was also a proposed connection. You'll see here -- and, really, in a different map, Bray actually aligns perfectly with Georgetown -- but, when there was development at the terminus of Bray Avenue, it was decided to build a court to avert that extension. At the time, there was also resident pushback against having that connection made. And, so, currently, there's really no other connection in that area, because those two connections have not been made.

But, of course, Staff also, Technical Committee members also observed that, you know, Dublin does have a high number of driveways. It may not be the -- the optimal connector in the area. But, if there's residential development in the area, we will need an express connection. Columbia's Comprehensive Plan, Columbia Imagine, does identify the area for residential development. It is bordered by a 42-acre parcel just south of Rollins and north of Chapel Hill. It's currently zoned for agricultural use, but that's a very easy conversion to be rezoned into the single residences.

It's not a best photo, but you can see there, the green is a large plot of land undeveloped next to all of those roadways. There is a flood plain right here, but then -- I'm sorry, okay -- you've got the flood plain there, but, then, this is the area where there's potential for residential development.

So, because of all these points, the Technical Committee did discuss the idea that, if we're going to consider changing this proposed extension, it would be useful to talk about that within the context of our major roadway plan, you know, in the overall network plan. CATSO Staff is going to begin to consider potential amendments to our Major Roadway Plan. We are starting our -- the process of developing our 2045 Long-Range Transportation Plan.

That's slated for completion in early 2019, and our staff input phase starts next November. That's going to include, you know, really the feedback and other opportunity to hear from folks to make changes to our plan. So, there was a session of potentially postponing a decision until we start that process.

And, so, the Tech Committee did make a motion to forward a recommendation to CATSO Coordinating Committee to either, you know, decide to postpone a decision concerning Dublin extension until the 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan MRP Update begins or

the Coordinating Committee could schedule a public hearing to continue the discussion around this potential Dublin Avenue extension, and Staff does concur with the recommendation between those two choices.
I think that's it.
MR. MATTHES: You -- you concur we do either/or of those?
MS. CHRISTIAN: Yes. I agree. We agree.
MR. MATTHES: Well, I have one question. Is there any current investor/developer/builder with any plans to --
MS. CHRISTIAN: Huh-uh. Not that I know of. No -- no current plans.
MR. TEDDY: We're not aware of any what I would consider a driver for getting that moved into a project status, either design or study or anything.
MR. MATTHES: Other questions of Staff?
(No response.)
MR. MATTHES: Well, it is a good question, you know. That's just a comment -- that region, you've got Rollins to Chapel Hill and Fairview to Scott, there's really nothing to connect those four -- those four divisions. And that's a large area. You look west and you have the connective -- well, now, there's some in south. So, that's an interesting question, not having Bray there, and the other decision you made.
MR. NICHOLS: And there's a separation of a park in between those two.
MS. CHRISTIAN: Yes.
MR. NICHOLS: So, there is no potential for any other connection through.
MS. CHRISTIAN: Yeah. And, then, here is -- the trail head is right here. So, there is that -- the trail head here. It could -- I mean, the road could be built, but you would have to break through that trail head and some of the park to get there. So -- and, then, Bonnie View Sanctuary's up here is why you can extend too many out. I'm sorry?
MR. MATTHES: And where is it? Where would that connect Georgetown Drive? Is that --
MS. CHRISTIAN: Yes.
MR. MATTHES: That's a stop sign right now, isn't it, on Scott?
MR. NICHOLS: Correct. And when -- when we designed Scott, we had anticipated this connection with that design of Phase 1 Scott and following a major road plan. So, site distance and separations and everything else was set up for Scott for this future connection --
MR. MATTHES: To be a south line or something.
MR. NICHOLS: -- at whatever, talking about the traffic, but the right-of-ways and things like that were set aside.
MR. MATTHES: Tim?
MR. TEDDY: I was just going to say, just again, my opinion. I think it would be worthy to reexamine this. The planning that landed it on the Major Roadway Plan is sound principle, you know, connectivity principle and creating route flexibility and that kind of thing. But I do think the residents raise some good points about the -- the maturity of development in the area, the number of driveways along Dublin and Bray, its also curvature, horizontal curvature on Dublin and vertical curvature on Bray. So, that, with a lot of driveways on both, it's not an ideal situation for a higher-capacity road.
However, I -- I do feel that probably the best use of our resources would be to include the reexamination of Dublin with the Long-Range Plan. It's -- it's not moving as a project, and we don't foresee it moving as a project. It's on the City's 10-year-plus list which really just recognizes that it's a need.
MR. NICHOLS: Correct. Because it would be a City project, it would come in through City Development.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. So, the residents can have that assurance that they're concerned that the City would move into, you know -- move upon extending Dublin. And, of course, it's under the City's control entirely. They can decide to remove it from -- or remove any reference to it from the CIP. But I think -- I think we benefit from seeing it reviewed in the context of the roadway plan as a whole, because we have additional data that we could review as part of that, and direct Staff to make sure that the Dublin extension is given consideration in the updating of the plan.

MR. MATTHES: Okay. Other comments?

MR. YONKE: I'm reluctant to remove any connections that we've got since we've lost so many just out of hand. I think that it is important to look at it in the context of overall areas. I think we can support looking at it in the context of -- of the revision of the plan. I mean, part of the purpose of this is not just the interconnectivity of the road network, but the interconnectivity of the neighborhoods so you can allow for cross-interaction between the two neighborhoods without resorting to having to go to the absolute major roadways. And, you know, at the Technical Committee, every argument that was made against this is exactly an argument that can be used for it. Because it's not an attractive cut throughout. It's not going to see a lot of extra traffic. It allows for exactly what it's supposed to be, and that is additional connection between the two neighborhoods themselves.

So, if you don't have it, you're shoving absolutely everything on to Scott and Chapel Hill and Fairview. All that traffic's going to be there anyway. So, I think that's really important to look at it from the context of the overall. Since you've got some undeveloped land to the north, we can figure out some connectivity that might be able to be required if that area does develop a subdivision, because, eventually, it will. Then, in that context, we might be able to break this and have a newer place that meets some better criteria and doesn't have driveways, et cetera.

But, without looking at the whole context, you know, I don't think we can remove it until we have at least some thought as to what kind of thing we're replacing it with.

MR. NICHOLS: So, your motion is to do it as part of the analysis of the Long-Range?

MR. YONKE: If I'm going to make a motion, that would be to have it as part of the Long-Range.

MR. MATTHES: Is there a second?

MR. NICHOLS: No. I think that's a good idea. I'll second that.

MR. MATTHES: All in favor of taking this question up with the consideration of the next MRP that starts in October of '19?

MR. SKOV: Well, we're doing it now.

MS. TEEL: But public participation starts next fall, and we'll be sure to contact the folks we've already talked with about this.

MR. MATTHES: It would be a point in that process and analyze --

MS. TEEL: Yeah.

MR. MATTHES: All in favor of that approach, please say aye.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. MATTHES: All opposed say nay.

(No response.)

MR. MATTHES: Thank you very much.

Well, it's not a public hearing at this point. But I will share with you that, in our process, before any long-term decision gets made, there will be one or two -- and I think you heard some of the engineering points. There's no decision points other than to make sure to talk about it when we go through the bigger review. So, it's -- and, that way, it's going right. We didn't say, Don't even talk about it. So, let's bring it up again.

MR. SKOV: The next item after this is public comments, so there's potential for that.
MR. MATTHES: Yes. Other business first?

Approved a Motion

VIII. OTHER BUSINESS

MR. SKOV: We have another item. It's not Listed. It's something we thought about at the last minute.
There has been some notification that there are plans to close the I-70 eastbound on-ramp at Business Loop once the Conley Road connection is completed. And, I believe, actually, the westbound ramp will be closed as well. That's something we had not discussed formally at CATSO Tech or this Committee, and I believe Mr. Schupp --
MR. SCHUPP: Schupp.
MR. SKOV: Schupp -- pardon me -- is going to offer some comments on that.
MR. SCHUPP: Absolutely.
First of all, the Conley Road Extension Project, which has been hanging around for 10 years, is finally getting around to start in June. And, all along with that project, the intent was to sever the connection of the Business Loop eastbound on-ramp and merge to move in, which is absolutely horrible. Most of that traffic actually gets on to 70, then gets off at 63 Connector. So, with this project, one of the last things -- one of the last things to do will be to consider that connection so traffic will not be able to get on I-70 without going through the connector from the eastbound Business Loop.
So, is that clear?
MR. NICHOLS: Yeah. You have to get off at Rangeline to go eastbound. Correct?
MR. SCHUPP: Well, you can go through the --
MR. NICHOLS: From the Business Loop, the only way to get off of the I-70 would be at the Rangeline exit. Because, as you go further, either you would have to go through the connector --
MR. SCHUPP: Correct. Correct.
MR. NICHOLS: You would follow East Boulevard and then you would have to make a left back on to get in to the --
MR. SCHUPP: Correct. Right. So, that's what's going to take place in this project. Looking forward to that taking place.
Along with that, we've had a project in scoping to possibly remove the westbound Business Loop off-ramp bridge which is the worst we have on our interstate system today as far as its rating. So, that loop, as you're coming west coming through -- underneath 63, you merge to the left, get on to Business Loop to head west. So --
MR. MATTHES: That's right after you've got on-traffic coming from 63 to -- you can get on and then there's all that left to merge.
MR. SCHUPP: Right. Right. So, we're going to allow maintenance to keep that bridge functioning. We believe the improvements at Rangeline will handle that additional traffic. So, we're going to get in the process of, hopefully, seeking funding to move this from scoping to actually find money to design and construct it.
We don't have a specified timeframe. Obviously, we'll be asking for a possible extension until it's completed. You know -- but we'll, obviously, ask to do a public outreach to determine whether -- as soon as the Conley Road extension is complete -- to remove the bridge or go ahead to wait for it to come into a condition where it is time to close it and remove it. So, that hasn't been determined yet. You know, that would most likely be decided through the public outreach.
MR. MATTHES: What -- when is what will be decided. Right. Not whether it will

happen.
MR. SCHUPP: Correct. Correct.
MR. MATTHES: Well, I -- I, for one, am excited to see it happening. I -- one of the first things I had six years ago is about connecting Conley and getting those removed. Yeah. So, I can only imagine how all of you feel.
MR. SCHUPP: In the overall plan, there's supposed to be a slip lane from 70 allowing southbound 63 traffic in the overall plan for when the whole thing gets redone, this project being done in a way that allows for that, when that part of the project gets put in.
MR. MATTHES: If we rebuild it back to go out, will it allow east-to-south movement and north-to-south movement?
MR. SCHUPP: Yes.
MR. NICHOLS: Yeah.
MR. SCHUPP: We work with the TED to not take the space of this future.
MR. YONKE: Okay. That's what I was making sure that --
MR. SCHUPP: Yeah.
MR. YONKE: -- each of these pieces as they're done is complimenting the overall plan --
MR. SCHUPP: Correct.
MR. YONKE: -- and not putting this in and then have to jerk it right out.
MR. NICHOLS: That's why there was significant work to relocate and do the golf course, significantly shift this bridge to the south.
MR. YONKE: Right.
MR. NICHOLS: We did not take the space away for the future.
MR. YONKE: I just wanted to make sure that's not part of the plan.
MR. MATTHES: Thank you. All right.
So, we're -- any other business, I should say.
(No response.)
MR. MATTHES: Seeing none, now it's time for the general comments.

IX. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

MR. MATTHES: So, even though none of our items were public hearings, this is the time when we -- we invite everyone who has come to come share anything you would like to with us.
So, any -- any general comments by the public?
MR. BORGMEYER: Thank you very much for the time, and I appreciate having the opportunity to make a public comment regarding the Dublin Avenue Extension.
As many of the Committee know me, I've been in the same house for 23 years on Dublin Avenue, and that 10-year plan has been out there for well over 20 years now in terms of talking about extending Dublin Avenue down.
I would ask if it would be possible for me to see the map up there, because, before I go any further, I just want to make a little bit of a note to -- to everybody. Yeah. And if there is anything that is misrepresenting the -- the impact of what Dublin Avenue come out to Georgetown Drive is, it's that map right there. It shows almost a very easy connectivity and almost straight path there. I invite you to come down and walk that area with me and see the dramatic curve that has to be placed into that roadway to actually connect up to Georgetown. So, at that point in time, that map is not very indicative of what is actually happening in the -- in the area, and I would -- I would recommend that you take a look at whether or not that's indicative.
But it does show something very, very specific, and that is how much traffic we are saying can come into an area, a neighborhood that's bordered by parks on both sides,

and would funnel out to a Fairview Road that, essentially, is already handling as much traffic as it needs to handle to where what you're -- the opportunity is there for individuals coming from the west and Georgetown to cut straight across into Fairview and use that as an opportunity to go in all directions out there, whereas Fairview has no light at the end of Bray and you're coming to a T at that intersection.

The only thing on Fairview Road to draw individuals over there, other than looking at it as a bypass to pass traffic on Chapel Hill, or -- or whatever the case may be, or Broadway, or otherwise, is to add more traffic to the neighborhood that has been existing for over 20 years. I know. I've lived there.

So, there have been no complaints from neighbors identifying any problems with any type of connectivity with the rest of the city, and getting out of the neighborhood in any form or fashion. In fact, the neighborhood is pretty well unanimous, and let's say it's unanimous to my knowledge, because the people have all replied by e-mail saying, We do not want that extension to go through.

A couple other points. I won't take too much time. But the one point that's been brought up about connectivity with an area that is not even to Planning yet, and I understand that that will be on the -- the extension discussion for the Long-Range Plan. But West Lawn is there, and, obviously, they have no need necessarily to extend to -- to anything here. The only extension that I've ever worried about there is me walking the trail and taking a three-mile hike up through the Scott's Bridge Trail and through the Audubon Society and down through the park coming down on Rollins and then coming down the road.

If there's any connectivity that is actually needed, it could be in the way of trails, not more traffic and automobiles coming into areas, especially when you're looking at -- again, I -- I think Leah mentioned about the flood plain that is there. That is a creek bed area that is down there. The Giangiacomo's own the one land right nearest Chapel Hill and then right beyond that is Garland Russell who donated all the land to the park for the Aud-- Audubon Society and for the -- the rest of the park area there.

Beyond that, there's just a plat of land between West Lawn and that area there. There's no need for that connectivity beyond what we already have. So, that more vehicles could come in there. Perhaps, if Cunningham would have had an opportunity to go through at that point in time, individuals may have looked at that. But there is no traffic that is needed to come into that area from other neighborhoods at this point in time beyond the idea of trails.

The reason we've asked for, as much as anything, the ability to remove it from the 10-year plan eventually -- and we'll get an opportunity in the future to talk about it -- is that it would remove uncertainty for the neighborhood in terms of selling the houses, buying the houses, or anything else. Because our area is developed. There's no lots left for any more houses. And it is a done deal. That area on the other side of the creek bed and everything else over there is -- well, is immediately adjacent to Scott Boulevard.

Whether or not there would be more houses for that, it would be very difficult to put too many things there now because there's not that much space between the creek bed and -- and unbought property or undeveloped property at this time.

So, I would just summarize by saying, please consider, and I have an invitation for the group as a whole making this decision, to walk with myself and my wife, several neighbors, and we'll -- we'll go ahead and walk that path that is being proposed as an extension to go up to Georgetown, and we'll look at whether or not that connectivity is there or not there needed for the future. Because I think that you -- we can walk the entire length of Bray, we'll walk the entire length of Dublin Avenue, and we'll see how many driveways are there, and the dangers that we're putting the neighborhood in by continuing to have this extension on the 10-year -- 10-year plan.

So, that's an open invitation, and I hope that, before the next hearing, we're able to arrange that meeting and actually do that so that you can actually see it in real life rather than just seeing the pictures at this time. So, thank you very much, and I appreciate your time.

THE COURT REPORTER: What was your name?

MR. BORGMEYER. Les, L-e-s, Borgmeyer, B-o-r-g-m-e-y-e-r.

THE COURT REPORTER: Thank you.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you, Mr. Borgmeyer.

Councilmember Thomas?

MR. THOMAS: Good afternoon. Ian Thomas. I live at 2616 Hillshire Drive. I am the City Council Representative for the 4th Ward where this proposed project is located. I've been involved in a lot of discussions recently with residents of Dublin and the surrounding area about this project. I've heard absolutely no support from anybody for making this roadway connection, and I've heard lots of opposition for the reasons that Les just -- just mentioned.

It would devastate the area, and it's entirely unnecessary and would be a great expenditure of -- of taxpayer dollars that -- that isn't -- that isn't called for. I'm not aware of any traffic congestion on Chapel Hill or Smith or Broadway that rises anywhere close to the level of needing to create another connection here. So, I think we need to -- to sort of think in -- in modern terms and in data-driven terms about what our plans should be. We are actually in a time of reduced travel demand in the country as a whole and in Columbia. One of CATSO's goals or objectives in the 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan is to establish policies and programs to reduce travel demand, and we've also talked about in the next plan, the next go-around, setting a formal goal of measuring and reducing people miles traveled per capita as an -- as an important and valuable goal for our long-range transportation planning.

We need policies and plans that emphasize sustainability, and this would do the exact opposite of that, and the project makes no sense at all. I do appreciate, Mr. Teddy, your common-sense remarks about the weighing difference of pros and cons of the project. I think that the connectivity argument is one of many arguments, and I feel that, very often, Transportation Plan has put that above all else without any consideration of expenses and impact on neighborhoods, and the actual traffic demands that drives the need for connectivity.

And, finally, just to reiterate again what Les said. There is excellent interconnectivity in this area. Excellent bicycle/pedestrian interconnectivity. These neighbors can get to Scott Boulevard, clear up to Rollins Road through trails and -- and connections, and there's no restriction of movement whatever. We need to think about interconnectivity in a broader scope than just moving automobiles.

Thank you very much.

MR. MATTHES: Any other comments from the public?

(No response.)

MR. MATTHES: Thank you, all, for that. And that will be, obviously, on the record as we move forward. And the comments from Staff will be, also.

All right. Thank you very much. We will see you --

X. ADJOURNMENT

MR. NICHOLS: We need a motion to adjourn.

MS. TEEL: So moved.

MR. YONKE: Second

MR. MATTHES: All in favor?
(unanimous voice vote for approval.)
MR. MATTHES: Objection?
Meeting adjourned at 3:23 p.m.

Approved a Motion

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-7214. In order to assist staff in making the appropriate arrangements for your accommodation, please make your request as far in advance of the posted meeting date as possible.