City of Columbia, Missouri

Meeting Minutes

Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization (CATSO)

Monday, November 13, 2017 10:00 AM	Coordinating Committee Meeting	City Hall 701 E. Broadway Council Chambers

I. CALL TO ORDER/INTRODUCTIONS

MEMBERS PRESENT

Mike Matthes, City of Columbia City Manager
Tim Teddy, City of Columbia Community Development
Thad Yonke (for Dan Atwill), Boone County
Mike Henderson, MoDOT Central Office
Steve Engelbrecht (for David Silvester), MoDOT Central District
Jenni Jones (for Michelle Teel), MoDOT Multimodal
Jeff McCann, Boone County Chief Engineer

MEMBERS ABSENT

Brian Treece, City of Columbia Mayor
David Nichols, City of Columbia Public Works
Brad McMahon, Ex-Officio, Federal Highway Administration
Jeremiah Shuler, Ex-Officio, Federal Transit Administration

ALSO PRESENT

Mitch Skov, City of Columbia - Planning/CATSO staff
Leah Christian, CATSO staff

II. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. MATTHES: Let's review and approve the agenda. Is there any changes to the agenda that anyone would like to see?
MR. YONKE: Move to approve as written.
MR. MCCANN: Second.
MR. MATTHES: All in favor?
(Unanimous voice vote of approval.)
MR. MATTHES: Opposed?
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: We have an agenda.

III. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Draft 8-24-17 CATSO Coordinating Meeting Minutes

Attachments: Draft CATSO Meeting Minutes 8-24-17

MR. MATTHES: All right. Let's move on to an approval of minutes.
MR. TEDDY: Mr. Chairman, I have a correction.
MR. MATTHES: Yes, sir.
MR. TEDDY: On Page 6, there are references to CBG. That should be C, D as in dog, B as in boy, G. And then there's also references to T-I-F. That should be T-I-P in all cases for Transportation Improvement Plan.
MR. MATTHES: Great catch. Okay. With those amendments?
MR. YONKE: Move to approve as corrected.
MS. JONES: Second.
MR. MATTHES: All in favor?
(Unanimous voice vote of approval.)
MR. MATTHES: Opposed?
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: Okay. We'll have the minutes.

IV. PUBLIC HEARING - PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FY 2018-2021 TRANSPORTATION IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM

Item 4 FY 2018-2021 TIP Amendment Memo

Attachments: Item 4 11-13-17 PH TIP Amd

Proposed MoDOT project amendment - FY 2018-2021 TIP

Attachments: MoDOT Amendment to CATSO FY 2018-2021 TIP 11-13-17

MR. MATTHES: All right. We'll move into the public hearing phase of the meeting. We have the proposed amendment to the FY '18-'21 TIP. So, we'll start with staff comments.
MR. SKOV: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is actually a MoDOT-proposed amendment for a couple of new projects in the MoDOT construction and payment section. Specifically, again there are two projects. One of them is for Keene Street and I-70 Drive Southeast roundabout, and it's specifically -- to avoid any confusion, this is specifically for the payment to the City of Columbia from the MoDOT Cost Share Program for that ultimate project implementation.
Again, it's going to be a roundabout constructed at the Keene Street and I-70 Drive Southeast intersections to replace the existing T intersections there. The project includes a total of $326,000 with 316 of it identified as being from the Cost Share Program specifically.

Just additional discussion on it is, as I mentioned, there may be some confusion. This doesn't show the entire anticipated cost of the project. It's specifically the MoDOT's portion for their payment from the Cost Share Program. It does not specifically represent or depict the entire City cost or the

entire project cost.

The City will be matching this, and our understanding is the contract between the City and MoDOT for that ultimate project hasn't been finalized yet. Again, it's appropriate to include this as an amendment so that ultimately the federal money included in this can be obligated so it's available for reimbursement at the time the City needs that.
The second project is much more straightforward. It's Interstate 70, various ramp locations, safety improvements there, specifically for some wrong-way countermeasures on I-70. Total budget of that is 505,000.

This is just the entry as they will look in the TIPs. As you can see, most of the money is concentrated in the fiscal year 2020 for construction. Again, it's shown as a payment project, but that's when it's anticipated, I suppose, that construction will actually take place. There's also 10,000 included there for engineering.

This is the second project I mentioned for the I-70 ramps, the safety improvements. The money there is showing fiscal year '19. The Tech Committee did review this amendment at our November 1 meeting. They had a general discussion on it. They approved it, and they did pass a motion to forward this proposed amendment to the Coordinating Committee for review and approval. The committee's suggested action after holding public hearing is that you give formal approval to this proposed amendment. Thank you.

MR. MATTHES: Are there questions from the committee to staff?
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: I have a comment. I'll just say thank you to MoDOT. This is a great project. We've been waiting quite a while. It's a great idea, so thank you.
It is a public hearing. Is there anyone from the public who would like to speak?
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: Seeing none, we'll draw that to a close. Is there a motion or a comment from anyone?
MR. YONKE: Move to add the two items.
MS. JONES: Second.
MR. MATTHES: All in favor?
(Unanimous voice vote of approval.)
MR. MATTHES: Opposed?
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: We have an amendment. Thank you.

V. PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED AMENDMENT TO FY 2018 UNIFIED PLANNING WORK PROGRAM (UPWP)

Approved FY 2018 UPWP Budget

Attachments: Approved UPWP2018 Budget

Item 5 Proposed UPWP Amendment Memo

Attachments: Item 5 11-13-17 PH for UPWP Amd

Description of proposed FY 2018 UPWP amendment

Attachments: Description of proposed CATSO FY 2018 UPWP amendment - staff report

MR. MATTHES: Item 5 is the proposed -- or is another public hearing, a proposed amendment to the Unified Planning Work Program. Staff?
MR. SKOV: Yes, Mr. Chair. Staff is actually proposing to amend our current approved fiscal year 2018 Unified Planning Work Program to add a project described below, the description there on your screen. We'll actually include it in the narrative on the long-range transportation planning section, but as I will detail later, we'll be taking -- anticipate taking some money out of both long-range and short-range to cover this project.

Specifically, what we're asking for here is staff would like to utilize what's called Urban Canvas modeler software, which is a web-based platform from a company called Urban Sim, in order to do the spatial allocation for the housing and employment for the land use forecast for our travel demand model, so-called transportation analysis zones. This will speed up the process of actually allocating those forecasts by zone. In the past, we had to do it manually, which is very time-consuming.
But, ultimately, this requires the purchase of a one-year subscription for us to access the user interface for this work. These are prebuilt models from this company called Urban Sim. They're at the census block level, and we do anticipate as an accessory to the software subscription needed that we will need to contract with Urban Sim's staff to provide some scripting data services in order to automate the exchange of the modeling output used by those two different software applications. Our model is TransCAD, the modeling software we use, and Urban Sim, of course, has their own set of models.

The software subscription, if you do it one year, you can get it for 9,600. We are anticipating maybe additional funds in the range of 5 to 10 thousand might be needed for the related contract data work and scripting by the Urban Sim's staff people, again in order to enable their software to work with the TransCAD software. So at maximum, we'd estimate the total funds would be up to $20,000, but I would anticipate it will be less than that.
We do think that this project can be implemented within the current approved fiscal year 2018 work program budget which we already have allocated for

long-range transportation planning and for short-range, so no contract provision is going to be necessary to go through City Council, and we will not need to change the budget.

At the November 1, 2017 meeting, the regular scheduled meeting of the tech committee, they did express that we more explicitly show where we would presume we'll get the funds for this purchase, so we did provide the breakdown shown on your screen, which is based upon fiscal year 2017 program area surpluses. We do think there may be a little bit less in the excess in LRTP funds because of additional staff hours charged to that program area in fiscal year '18, but otherwise, we think this will be pretty comparable for fiscal year '18 in terms of the surpluses we anticipate.

You saw that and you see it here that we had an 18,600 plus surplus in 120, which is short-range transportation planning work category, and nearly 28,000 in the 130 category, which is long-range transportation planning, so we're anticipating we can potentially have a surplus of 18,000 in each of those areas and utilize $10,000 at max for the Urban Sim subscription, which will still allow us $8,000 again in excess or in surplus.
This is just our current budget document as approved by the CATSO Coordinating Committee in August of this year. You can see that 120 short-range transportation planning has $73,000 plus total, including nearly 59,000 in CPG federal funds, and long-range has nearly 126,000 total with just under 101,000 in federal CPG funds. So, again, we're anticipating that will be enough to cover the Urban Sim subscription.

The tech committee did review this proposed UPWP amendment at their November 1 meeting, and there was some general discussion as usual and a suggestion to provide more detail on anticipated funding work categories for the purchase, as I mentioned and as we just showed you. The committee did pass a motion to forward the proposed amendment with the modification based on that additional information as to where the money will be taken from to the Coordinating Committee for your review and approval, so our suggested action is that once you hold a public hearing, to give formal approval to this proposed amendment. Thank you.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you. Are there any questions or comments for staff?
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: Well, let's open it up to the public. Any public comment on this item?
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: Seeing none --
MR. YONKE: Move to approve.
MR. HENDERSON: Second.
MR. MATTHES: All in favor?

(Unanimous voice vote of approval.)
MR. MATTHES: Opposed?
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: There we are.

VI. PUBLIC HEARING: PROPOSED REVISION TO CATSO BY-LAWS

CATSO PPP 2014

Attachments: CATSO-Public-Participation-Plan-2014

Item 6 By-Law Revisions Memo

Attachments: Item 6, 11-13-17, By-Law Revisions

Current Approved CATSO By-Laws 2013

Attachments: CATSO-By-Laws-12-5-2013

Proposed Revisions to CATSO By-Laws

Attachments: Proposed Revisions to CATSO By-Laws, 10-25-17

MR. MATTHES: Moving to Item 6, a public hearing on the proposed revision to CATSO By-Laws.

MS. CHRISTIAN: The City of Columbia recently reviewed all by-laws for City-affiliated commissions to ensure that all boards and commissions are in compliance with the Open Meetings and Records Law, otherwise known as the Missouri Sunshine Law, and we did work with our one of our city attorneys on this, and based on those discussions and review, we have the following recommendations for some changes to kind of get us more in line with those Sunshine requirements.
The first thing that we are suggesting to change is our Article 6 meetings, Item B, and that is just discussing basically how we advertise our meetings, and because we have a different procedure for our Coordinating Committee meetings and have public hearings versus our Technical Committee meetings that do not have public hearings and tend to be more staff and technically oriented, we just wanted to clarify that difference. We do always advertise our Coordinating Committee meetings with public hearings 15 days in advance, but our Technical Committee meetings, we always at least provide 24 hours in advance per Sunshine Law, but generally three days to a week in advance, and so this particular revision just clarifies the difference between those two types of public notices for each different type of meeting. I'll just give you a little time to review this, and then I'll move on to the next one. Was that enough time?

(No speakers.)
Our next biggest issue was our Article 9 section on quorum and voting. Our current by-laws do allow electronic or telephone voting for smaller, minor administration revisions, but that is actually in violation of Sunshine Law because the public is not able to observe that vote take place.
So we have recommended that we remove that section, and in order to still allow for quick decisions to be made in relation to minor revisions, we've added a section that clarifies the difference between minor and major revisions and we've given more authority to CATSO staff and to our coordinating chair, and I'll show you that. So this basically just separates out, and it shows you all things that are required to go to a public vote, but then we have an additional section we added that describes our administrative processes. We also have a direct link to our public participation plan, which basically provides pretty detailed definitions for what a minor versus what a major revision is. And an additional item that sometimes requires quick decision-making is when we need a letter of support from the CATSO Coordinating Committee, so we have provided authority for staff to draft those letters of support as long as we can get approval from our coordinating chair, the City Manager in this case. And all of this has been reviewed by the city attorney. I also want to note that these changes will also require slight revisions to our public participation plan just in these areas, so -

MR. MATTHES: So the key point on the administrative process is that for minor things you do what must happen, but then you report to this group after it happens.
MS. CHRISTIAN: Yes. So staff may make those changes, but we will always let this group know if we made a minor revision, yes, and that it was also open to the public, of course, too. All right. You guys good?
MR. MATTHES: Yep.
MS. CHRISTIAN: All right. The Technical Committee did review these at our November 1 meeting and did make a motion to forward to the Coordinating Committee for review and approval. Our staff suggestion is after discussion, and we do also need to hold a public hearing for these proposed revision, that the committee give formal approval to these changes.
MR. MATTHES: Any comments or questions from the committee?
MR. TEDDY: I'll just comment that I think these are important changes, that we are making them, and I appreciate the staff's effort to coordinate the by-laws revision with our public participation plan.
MR. MATTHES: Very good. Is there a motion? Oh, I'm sorry. This is a public hearing. Are there members of the public who would like to speak?
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: Seeing none, is there a motion?
MR. YONKE: Move to approve the by-laws amendments.
MR. TEDDY: Second.
MR. MATTHES: All in favor?

(Unanimous voice vote of approval.)
MR. MATTHES: Opposed?
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: There we are.

VII. GO COMO FAST ACT TRANSIT ASSET MANAGEMENT TARGETS

Item 7 Transit Targets Memo

Attachments: Item 7, 11-13-17, Transit Targets

MR. MATTHES: Okay. Item 7 is the Go COMO Fast Act transit asset management targets.
MS. CHRISTIAN: Yes, so the federal Map 21 legislation established and now the Fast Act has continued a performance-based approach to transportation projects. Seven national performance goals were established for the federal aid highway program, and then from these seven goals, 15 performance measures were developed for states, metropolitan planning organizations like CATSO, and transit agencies, which are required to set goals and monitor progress. Transit asset management is the first performance measure for which targets must be set, and additional targets will be developed by CATSO as required. And Go COMO was required to develop an asset management plan for the public transportation needs, including vehicles, facilities, equipment, and other infrastructure by January 1 of this year, and now CATSO has been made aware of these Go COMO targets. They do mirror the transit asset management targets set by MoDOT. And CATSO must adopt and affirm the Go COMO targets within 180 days, and so we're going to discuss those today and I'm actually going to invite our Go COMO transit manager up to talk about those.
MR. BROOKS: Hello. So the targets are really around how we manage our equipment and our facilities.
MR. MATTHES: Would you mind stating your name?
MR. BROOKS: Oh, sorry. My name's Drew Brooks. I'm the Transit and Parking Manager for the City of Columbia.
MR. MATTHES: Thank you.
MR. BROOKS: So the targets that we're looking at are around equipment, rolling stock, and our facilities. We don't have any fixed guideway, which is like rail and that sort of thing, so we don't have to have an applicable target for that. We are mirroring the state targets that were set; however, we opted to set our own targets because we can adjust those each year and we didn't want to be kind of tied exactly to whatever the state was doing if our needs should change. So we can revise the targets each year and wanted to have the flexibility to do that at the local level if we need to. I'll answer any questions you might have.
MS. CHRISTIAN: And these targets were reviewed at our November 1 Technical Committee meeting and there was general discussion and approval and a move to forward these on to the Coordinating Committee, and so our suggestion is

that the committee formally adopt these Go COMO transit asset management targets, and then we will integrate those into the CATSO long-range planning targets.
MR. MATTHES: Well, I see this is not a public hearing, so any comments from the committee? Questions?
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: Is there a motion?
MR. YONKE: Move to adopt.
MS. JONES: Second.
MR. MATTHES: All in favor?
(Unanimous voice vote of approval.)
MR. MATTHES: Opposed?
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: There we are. Thank you, Drew.

VIII. DRAFT POPULATION PROJECTIONS FOR LRTP UPDATE

Draft CATSO Population Projections 2045 LRTP

Attachments: Draft CATSO-County-City Pop Projections 2045

Item 8 CATSO Pop Projections Memo

Attachments: Item 8 Pop.Proj 11-13-17

MR. MATTHES: Okay. Agenda Item number 8 is draft population projections for the LRTP update.
MR. SKOV: Yes, Mr. Chair. In the past, of course, we've used the Census Bureau numbers as our base for our population projections for the long-range transportation plan. Given where we are in terms of time right now, we don't have a census number or specific census number like we did last time when we used the 2010 number. We do have the American Community Survey numbers, which are a feature or component of the census meta program, but it's not the same thing as the full-blown census, so we did use the 2016 ACS estimates as our base number for suggesting we use for projections in our update, our LRTP update, which we'll be doing here or actually we've been doing. But, as I said, the ACS is something conducted by the Census Bureau, but it's not a full-blown census. The percentages we are going to include here are in the range of what we utilized in the past to come up with a population number. I want to point out that the census number that we -- the number we're using here for the metro area for 2016 or what we're estimating is our number. The ACS did not have a specific number for the CATSO metropolitan planning area geography. They had a number for the city and for the county itself. The number they had for the metro area was the same number as they had for the county. We just did our own estimate based on the ratio of the city population in 2010 to the metro area population and then just applied the same ratio to come up with the

2016 number, which we estimate as 149,635, which is just over 11% up, a little bit under 2% annually.

We are presuming with some current economic trends and the decline in enrollment at the University of Missouri, the growth rate will be lower in the future than it's been over the past 15 to 20 years. The city's population itself went from 108,500 at the 2010, the actual census time, to the ACS estimate of 120,606 for this year, so it's very similar to what we're showing for the -- what we estimated for the increase for the metro area. Boone's population, the Boone County population, is slightly lower in terms of the increase, but again, it increased from 162,642 in the 2010 census to what they estimate as 176,594 in 2016. We do think that a 1.5% annual growth rate will be reasonable to use for a 2045 population projection and outwards. We can consider some other projections in that range -- 2%, 1%, whatever the committee may want -- but we would prefer to have a lower estimate than one higher than 1.5% annually. These are just the numbers we're throwing out as drafts. Again, you see the base population there for 2016 based on the ACS numbers, 120,606, and then our estimate based on the city to metro area ratio in 2010 or the estimate we came up with is 149,635. And Boone County's number, again we -- the red number, the 1.5% annually is what we prefer or we think is reasonable, but again, that's up to the committee as to what they prefer us to use in order to come up with an actual maximum total population number for the metro area for this LRTP update.

The Tech Committee did review the projections at their November 1 meeting. They had discussion on it, and there was a consensus, a general consensus, that a 1.5 % annual population growth rate is a reasonable projection to utilize, and they did pass a motion to forward the population targets or projections to the Coordinating Committee for their review and approval. Again, we're certainly up for any kind of discussion you might want to have about this, but 1.5% seemed as being reasonable. So, our suggested action is that after you review and discuss it, whatever discussion you may have, you give us some approval or guidance on our recommended population projection for use in the 2045 long-range transportation plan update. Thank you.

MR. MATTHES: Well, I'll just comment. I do think it's wise to be conservative with that number. Given what I see happening in the economy, we're due for a recession. All the indicators I watch say it's coming, and exactly what impact that has remains to be seen, but let's say that we get it wrong and it actually is 2% for the next 20 years. So what impact does that really have on CATSO's bottom line?
MR. SKOV: It doesn't.
MR. MATTHES: Okay. I just wanted to make sure that was the --
MR. SKOV: We have to pick something to use for the document and ultimately to include with the model that we take or base our allocations on for the travel

demand model.
MR. MATTHES: I also think it's smart mathematically if we had a couple thousand single family homes every year, which is about what we do, that's going to be a smaller percentage as the city grows. Just based on the facts, that seems a pretty good guesstimate. Any other comments? Questions?
MR. TEDDY: Well, I'll just add a rejoinder on your dialog that I think 1.5%, if we have that truly every year, that would be an impressive decennial rate of growth, and then we do amend our plan every five years, so that's an opportunity to revisit projections. If we're guessing low, we'll make that adjustment, and if we're guessing high, we'll make that adjustment.
MS. JONES: I was just going to echo the very same thing that Tim said. You know, this isn't stagnant. It's always updateable. You know, especially when we have the 2020 census information come out, being able to update it then, or if we get more information, updating it as you guys see fit.
MR. MATTHES: Well, given that conversation, is there a motion?
MR. YONKE: Move to adopt the target of 1.5.
MS. JONES: Second.
MR. MATTHES: All in favor?
(Unanimous voice vote of approval.)
MR. MATTHES: Opposed?
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: We have a new reduced target percentage of population growth.

IX. OTHER BUSINESS

MR. MATTHES: We have made it to Item 9, which is other business. Let me ask the committee if there's other business they wish to discuss today.
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: Seeing none, we'll move into general comments by the public, members, and staff.

X. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF

MR. MATTHES: Are there any comments from the public?
(No speakers.)
MR. MATTHES: Bless you both for coming. I hope you found it riveting and interesting. Is there any comments from the members or the staff?
MS. CHRISTIAN: We do have at our next Coordinating Committee meeting, our federal funders, federal highways and federal transit, would like to hold a ONE DOT listening session. That would be an opportunity for the Coordinating Committee to bring questions, comments, thoughts to the leadership in those organizations.
The plan is to have our Coordinating Committee meeting that day, February 22, at our general 2:30 time here in Council chambers and then at 3:30 to move into Conference Room 1A for that session. I will be sending reminders and

calendar invites out to folks.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you for the reminder.

XI. ADJOURNMENT

MR. MATTHES: All right. If there's nothing else, I'll declare us adjourned. The meeting was adjourned at 10:33 am.

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.