

2040 Long Range Transportation Plan Update- Survey 2



1. Tell us a little about yourself (optional).

		Response Percent	Response Count
Name:		64.3%	9
Company:		50.0%	7
Address:		64.3%	9
Address 2:		7.1%	1
City/Town:		100.0%	14
State:		100.0%	14
ZIP:		92.9%	13
Email Address:		57.1%	8
Phone Number:		57.1%	8
		answered question	14
		skipped question	5

2. Section 1 of the LRTP has five chapters which describe CATSO's Transportation Systems and Planning Issues: Chapter 1: Introduction Chapter 2: Population & Employment to 2040 Chapter 3: Existing Transportation Facilities and Service Chapter 4: Land Use & Transportation Facilities Relationship Chapter 5: Transportation System Management Please describe any alterations, edits, omissions or additions you feel should be addressed in Section 1 of the Plan. Please be as specific as possible as to the Chapter and page number of your comment.

	Response Count
	13
answered question	13
skipped question	6

3. Section 2 of the LRTP has five chapters which describe CATSO's Transportation Planning Projects, Programs, Goals, Objectives, and Strategies. The next few questions ask for specific comments on each chapter. Chapter 6: Development of Priorities, Needs, Goals and Objectives -Do you have any comments on the proposed Goals and Objectives for transportation plans and planning in the Metro Area (Section 6.5)?-Do you have any other comments on this chapter?

	Response Count
	11
answered question	11
skipped question	8

4. Chapter 7: Future Project Plan -Do you have specific comments on the Major Roadway Plan (Appendix G)? -Do you have specific comments on the Sidewalk Project listing (see 2012 Sidewalk Master Plan in Appendix C)? -Do you have specific comments on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Plan (Appendix B)? -Do you have any additional comments on the Future Project Plan or this chapter?

	Response Count
	9
answered question	9
skipped question	10

5. Chapters 8 and 9 consider revenue sources and projections for transportation improvements to 2040 by jurisdiction (City of Columbia, MoDOT and Boone County) and maintenance, operation and capital costs for the transportation system and improvements including new projects. Chapter 8: Financing Transportation Improvements -Do you have any comments on Financing Transportation Improvements? Chapter 9: 2040 Transportation Plan Projects & Costs -Do you have any comments on the Transportation Plan Projects and Costs?

	Response Count
	9
answered question	9
skipped question	10

6. Chapter 10 considers Plan Implementation & Preliminary Recommendations, including performance measures for the Goals and Objectives. Chapter 10: Plan Implementation & Preliminary Recommendations -Do you have any specific comments on the Plan Implementation and Preliminary Recommendations? -Do you have any specific comments on the Performance Measures (Section 10.10)?

	Response Count
	5
answered question	5
skipped question	14

7. Do you have any additional specific or general comments on the 2040 draft LRTP?Would you like CATSO Staff to contact you regarding your thoughts, or to answer specific questions you may have? If so, please provide your contact information.

	Response Count
	13
answered question	13
skipped question	6

Q1. Tell us a little about yourself (optional).

1

City/Town: Columbia Jan 29, 2014 10:26 PM

State: MO Jan 29, 2014 10:26 PM

ZIP: 65202 Jan 29, 2014 10:26 PM

2

City/Town: Columbia Jan 28, 2014 10:25 PM

State: MO Jan 28, 2014 10:25 PM

ZIP: 65202 Jan 28, 2014 10:25 PM

3

City/Town: Columbia Jan 27, 2014 10:18 PM

State: MO Jan 27, 2014 10:18 PM

ZIP: 65202 Jan 27, 2014 10:18 PM

4

Company: North Central Neighborhood Jan 27, 2014 10:16 PM

City/Town: Columbia Jan 27, 2014 10:16 PM

State: MO Jan 27, 2014 10:16 PM

5

Name: Mary Lehlmann Jan 27, 2014 2:21 AM

Address: [REDACTED] Jan 27, 2014 2:21 AM

City/Town: Columbia Jan 27, 2014 2:21 AM

State: MO Jan 27, 2014 2:21 AM

ZIP: 65203 Jan 27, 2014 2:21 AM

Phone Number: [REDACTED] Jan 27, 2014 2:21 AM

6

Name: RUBY HENDERSON Jan 10, 2014 9:06 AM

Company: BOONE HOSPITAL CENTER Jan 10, 2014 9:06 AM

Address: 1600 EAST BROADWAY Jan 10, 2014 9:06 AM

City/Town: COLUMBIA Jan 10, 2014 9:06 AM

Editor's note:
Personal/home contact
information redacted for privacy

Q1. Tell us a little about yourself (optional).

State:	MO	Jan 10, 2014 9:06 AM
ZIP:	65203	Jan 10, 2014 9:06 AM
Email Address:	██████████@██████████	Jan 10, 2014 9:06 AM
7		
Name:	Zandra de Araujo	Jan 9, 2014 3:08 PM
Company:	University of Missouri	Jan 9, 2014 3:08 PM
Address:	██████████	Jan 9, 2014 3:08 PM
City/Town:	Columbia	Jan 9, 2014 3:08 PM
State:	MO	Jan 9, 2014 3:08 PM
ZIP:	65203	Jan 9, 2014 3:08 PM
Email Address:	██████████	██████████9, 2014 3:08 PM
Phone Number:	██████████	Jan 9, 2014 3:08 PM
8		
Name:	Ellen Thomas	Jan 9, 2014 12:22 PM
Company:	Tiger Pediatrics	Jan 9, 2014 12:22 PM
Address:	██████████	Jan 9, 2014 12:22 PM
Address 2:	██████████	Jan 9, 2014 12:22 PM
City/Town:	Columbia	Jan 9, 2014 12:22 PM
State:	MO	Jan 9, 2014 12:22 PM
ZIP:	65203	Jan 9, 2014 12:22 PM
Email Address:	██████████	Jan 9, 2014 12:22 PM
Phone Number:	██████████	Jan 9, 2014 12:22 PM
9		
Name:	Lawrence Simonson	Nov 26, 2013 2:15 PM
Company:	PedNet Coalition	Nov 26, 2013 2:15 PM
Address:	PO Box 7124	Nov 26, 2013 2:15 PM
City/Town:	Columbia	Nov 26, 2013 2:15 PM

Q1. Tell us a little about yourself (optional).

State:	MO	Nov 26, 2013 2:15 PM
ZIP:	65205	Nov 26, 2013 2:15 PM
Email Address:	lawrence@pednet.org	Nov 26, 2013 2:15 PM
Phone Number:	573-999-9894	Nov 26, 2013 2:15 PM
10		
City/Town:	Columbia	Nov 2, 2013 12:20 PM
State:	MO	Nov 2, 2013 12:20 PM
ZIP:	65201	Nov 2, 2013 12:20 PM
11		
Name:	Rachel Ruhlen	Oct 30, 2013 2:56 PM
Address:	██████████	Oct 30, 2013 2:56 PM
City/Town:	Columbia	Oct 30, 2013 2:56 PM
State:	MO	Oct 30, 2013 2:56 PM
ZIP:	65203	Oct 30, 2013 2:56 PM
Email Address:	████████████████████	Oct 30, 2013 2:56 PM
Phone Number:	██████████	Oct 30, 2013 2:56 PM
12		
Name:	Dan Harder	Oct 28, 2013 9:28 PM
Address:	████████████████████	Oct 28, 2013 9:28 PM
City/Town:	Columbia	Oct 28, 2013 9:28 PM
State:	MO	Oct 28, 2013 9:28 PM
ZIP:	65201	Oct 28, 2013 9:28 PM
Email Address:	████████████████████	Oct 28, 2013 9:28 PM
Phone Number:	██████████	Oct 28, 2013 9:28 PM
13		
Name:	Brent Hugh	Oct 23, 2013 8:07 PM
Company:	Missouri Bicycle & Pedestrian Federation	Oct 23, 2013 8:07 PM

Q1. Tell us a little about yourself (optional).

Address:	1709 Missouri Blvd, Ste. C #200	Oct 23, 2013 8:07 PM
City/Town:	Jefferson City	Oct 23, 2013 8:07 PM
State:	MO	Oct 23, 2013 8:07 PM
ZIP:	65109	Oct 23, 2013 8:07 PM
Email Address:	director@mobikefed.org	Oct 23, 2013 8:07 PM
Phone Number:	816-695-6736	Oct 23, 2013 8:07 PM
14		
Name:	Lawrence Lile, PE	Oct 22, 2013 2:07 PM
Company:	Lile Engineering, LLC	Oct 22, 2013 2:07 PM
Address:	██████████	Oct 22, 2013 2:07 PM
City/Town:	Ashland	Oct 22, 2013 2:07 PM
State:	MO	Oct 22, 2013 2:07 PM
ZIP:	65010	Oct 22, 2013 2:07 PM
Email Address:	████████████████████	Oct 22, 2013 2:07 PM
Phone Number:	██████████	Oct 22, 2013 2:07 PM

Q2. Section 1 of the LRTP has five chapters which describe CATSO's Transportation Systems and Planning Issues:

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Population & Employment to 2040

Chapter 3: Existing Transportation Facilities and Service

Chapter 4: Land Use & Transportation Facilities Relationship...

1	TOC: Should list Appendices Should add list of Acronyms Ch 3, pg 19, item 4): goal should also include decreased congestion. Ch 3, pg 28, 3.9: Southern Star has a gas pipeline parallel to the Williams fuel line in southern Columbia (they cross each other between Old Plank & Rt K.) Ch 4, pg 32, 4.4 list: Should also include wheelchair accessibility. Ch 5, pg 37, 5.4.B: Drifts a bit off subject (talks about cost of transit under Public Investment. Okay, but should tie the two together a little better near the end.) Definitely should talk about non-motorized transportation here and "build it and they will come". Ch 5, pg 37, 5.4.C, first paragraph: Same is true for bike/ped facilities and this should be mentioned, also.	Jan 27, 2014 10:18 PM
2	Citizens testified on a complete streets policy several years ago (2003 perhaps). That policy specified wider sidewalks, narrower streets, more robust surfaces, and the recognition that streets need to be safe and welcoming to cyclists, pedestrians. What does that look like now in city policy? Are we following it? What tangible steps do we currently take to reduce vehicle miles per citizen? Maybe having a visible measurement tool, the reverse of the national debt clock, would help promote a new kind of social norming would help.	Jan 27, 2014 10:16 PM
3	I have the general impression from looking through the Executive Summary (hence page numbers do not apply) that your emphasis is on the pathways of transportation, paths, lanes, tracks, sidewalks, whatever the means, and not much on the location of the functions, houses, offices, grocery stores, etc. that these pathways are supposed to connect. In the beginning you should have dense nodes of a large variety of functions, connected by the heavy-duty tracks, boulevards, and the lighter-use. paths, lanes, walks serving a particular node. Is it possible that you do not see this as part of your planning? I don't see people giving up using cars in a layout designed for automobile use, which is the prevalent suburban design in Columbia and most cities.	Jan 27, 2014 2:21 AM
4	Discussion of the COLT RR spur and its ability to be easily adapted to be a light rail commuter line. Currently population centers along the route are minimal but could be developed.	Jan 9, 2014 4:29 PM
5	The CoMo Connect plan seems to be a big improvement over the current bus routes.	Jan 9, 2014 3:08 PM
6	Chapter 1, page 6: I strongly support consideration of multimodal travel and environmental impact in transportation design. 3.2 The availability of public parking in walkable areas has to be balanced with the fact that parking generally reduces the walkability and interest--The use of the term "compact" parking is very important, and walkability is further improved by really concentrating on bike, pedestrian, and transit access. Furthermore, everyone's experience of Columbia would be markedly improved if the preferred way to reach campus was transit, over the single-occupancy automobile. This needs to be strongly encouraged, partially by removing surface university lots and not adding more university garages--instead improving transit. 3.3 I strongly support our excellent and expanding bike infrastructure. 3.4 Pedestrian infrastructure should be the	Jan 9, 2014 12:22 PM

Q2. Section 1 of the LRTP has five chapters which describe CATSO's Transportation Systems and Planning Issues:

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Population & Employment to 2040

Chapter 3: Existing Transportation Facilities and Service

Chapter 4: Land Use & Transportation Facilities Relationship...

first consideration in all road development. I am very concerned about 3-legged crossings, for example the one at E. Broadway and Trimble, which I find almost impossible to negotiate.

- | | | |
|---|---|----------------------|
| 7 | Page 111 of the new Comp Plan text says that Boone County had an employment of 107,134 in 2000. Page 9 of the 2040 Trans Plan shows county employment of 100,516 in 2000. This is a gain of 10,182 not 3,564 as shown in Fig. 4-1 of the Comp Plan. I don't see a projected total employment number for 2030 in the Comp Plan text for either Boone County or the metro area. Table 2 of the Trans Plan shows 2030 county employment of 143,327 and metro area employment of 128,994. While the CATSO numbers in Fig. 4-5 when added together total the correct metro area employment of 128,994, Fig. 4-5 is labeled Boone County Projected Employment Growth. CATSO projected metro area employment growth from 2010 – 2030 is 29,366. To cross check, I reverse calculated employment growth by multiplying the needed acres of land listed by employees/acre (e.g. 333 commercial acres x 20 empl/acre = 6,660, etc.) and arrived at a total of only 17,738 new employees. I understand the Comp Plan text to mean that the acreage listed represents the amount of land needed to accommodate metro area employment growth. If so, the numbers listed in the Comp Plan may be much lower than the amount actually needed to accommodate 29,366 new jobs. | Dec 30, 2013 4:36 PM |
| 8 | Level of service (LOS) appears to refer only to automobile speed and convenience. A complete LOS measurement should also consider pedestrians, cyclists, and transit users. | Dec 20, 2013 4:18 PM |
| 9 | Suggested changes to Chapter 4, page 29 to create this policy: p. 29 Provisions for transit, pedestrian, bicycle facilities **for users of all ages and abilities** must also be included in the roadway design. p. 29 The planning and provision of transportation facilities to address the specific needs of alternate transportation modes of public transportation, walking, and bicycling includes:
1. Provide continuous street connections to accommodate point-to-point travel;
2. Provide facilities for persons **of all ages and abilities** traveling on foot or bicycle along or on the roadway; and;
3. Eliminate or minimize barriers to pedestrian and bicycle movement. **These principles will be applied to all CATSO planning activities that involve public rights-of-way and to all activities conducted by CATSO to program federal, state, or other funds involving public rights-of-way. These principles apply to all phases of all projects involving public right-of-way, including planning, design, right-of-way acquisition, construction, construction engineering, operations, and maintenance.** **Exceptions to this general policy may be granted by the Transportation Advisory Committee, with the advice of the appropriate modal committees only in these situations:
- Where specific modes of transportation are prohibited by law (such as bicyclists and pedestrians on some sections of interstate highways); in such cases additional effort should be spent in creating multi-modal access on parallel corridors,
- Where the cost of providing facilities for multi-modal access is excessively disproportionate to need or use (defined in federal guidance as exceeding 20% of the total project, and where expected need or use does not | Nov 26, 2013 2:15 PM |

Q2. Section 1 of the LRTP has five chapters which describe CATSO's Transportation Systems and Planning Issues:

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Population & Employment to 2040

Chapter 3: Existing Transportation Facilities and Service

Chapter 4: Land Use & Transportation Facilities Relationship...

justify expenditure above 20%), and - Where population scarcity or other factors indicate an absence of need for both current and future conditions of the anticipated project life.** **CATSO encourages all agencies within the region to adopt similar policies in support of multi-modalism, such as the City of Columbia's Complete Streets Policy.** Another approach would be to add a statement in this section, "CATSO will promote the concept of multi-modal access and connectivity in all transportation projects within the region, encourage the adoption of multi-modal policies such as Columbia's Complete Streets policy, and will develop a regional Complete Streets policy." MARC took a similar approach--here is the resulting Complete Streets policy for the MARC region: <http://marc.org/transportation/pdf/CompleteStreetsPolicy.pdf>

10	In discussions with the Missouri Bicycle & Pedestrian Federation, I agree with their recommendations. Specifically: Suggested Chapter & page would be Chapter 4, page 29: a specific, strong, binding statement in support of Complete Streets in all CATSO's plans, projects, and programmed funds Page 29: Add the phrase **for users of all ages and abilities** to references to pedestrians and bicyclists. Provide facilities for persons **of all ages and abilities** traveling on foot or bicycle along or on the roadway Provisions for transit, pedestrian, bicycle facilities **for users of all ages and abilities** must also be included in the roadway design. Add 3 paragraphs: **These principles will be applied to all CATSO planning activities that involve public rights-of-way and to all activities conducted by CATSO to program federal, state, or other funds involving public rights-of-way. These principles apply to all phases of all projects involving public right-of-way, including planning, design, right-of-way acquisition, construction, construction engineering, operations, and maintenance.** **Exceptions to this general policy may be granted by the Transportation Advisory Committee, with the advice of the appropriate modal committees: - Where specific modes of transportation are prohibited by law (such as bicyclists and pedestrians on some sections of interstate highways), - Where the cost of providing facilities for multi-modal access is excessively disproportionate to need or use (defined in federal guidance as exceeding 20% of the total project, and where expected need or use does not justify expenditure above 20%), and - Where population scarcity or other factors indicate an absence of need for both current and future conditions of the anticipated project life.** **CATSO encourages all agencies within the region to adopt similar policies in support of multi-modalism, such as the City of Columbia's Complete Streets Policy.**	Oct 30, 2013 2:56 PM
11	None that I noticed	Oct 28, 2013 9:28 PM
12	The Missouri Bicycle & Pedestrian Federation is strongly encouraging all MPOs and RPCs to adopt comprehensive Complete Streets language as they update their long-range plans, particularly in anticipation of the planned new statewide transportation funding source that will be largely administered by MPOs and RPCs, and which will for the first time allow for and encourage a complete multi-modal approach to statewide transportation funding dollars. In reviewing the draft LRTP, it has an amazing amount of positive goals, objectives, projects, and supportive statements for biking, walking, transit, and accessibility. However, we	Oct 23, 2013 8:07 PM

Q2. Section 1 of the LRTP has five chapters which describe CATSO's Transportation Systems and Planning Issues:

Chapter 1: Introduction

Chapter 2: Population & Employment to 2040

Chapter 3: Existing Transportation Facilities and Service

Chapter 4: Land Use & Transportation Facilities Relationship...

do not see a specific, strong, binding statement in support of Complete Streets in all CATSO's plans, projects, and programmed funds anywhere in the document. At least four Missouri MPOs, with total population of over 4.7 million residents, have now officially adopted unambiguous Complete Streets language, most as part of their LRTP. With the Columbia area as a nationwide leader in biking, walking, and the Complete Streets movement, now seems like the right time for CATSO to become the 5th Missouri MPO to adopt such a policy. You know best where this may fit within the document and framework. However, a review of the document suggests that perhaps Chapter 4, page 29, is the most appropriate place to incorporate more detail and specifics. Suggested additions are enclosed in double asterisks (**):

1. Add a phrase: p. 29 Provisions for transit, pedestrian, bicycle facilities ****for users of all ages and abilities**** must also be included in the roadway design.
2. Add a phrase and three paragraphs: p. 29 The planning and provision of transportation facilities to address the specific needs of alternate transportation modes of public transportation, walking, and bicycling includes:
 1. Provide continuous street connections to accommodate point-to-point travel;
 2. Provide facilities for persons ****of all ages and abilities**** traveling on foot or bicycle along or on the roadway; and;
 3. Eliminate or minimize barriers to pedestrian and bicycle movement. ****These principles will be applied to all CATSO planning activities that involve public rights-of-way and to all activities conducted by CATSO to program federal, state, or other funds involving public rights-of-way. These principles apply to all phases of all projects involving public right-of-way, including planning, design, right-of-way acquisition, construction, construction engineering, operations, and maintenance.**** ****Exceptions to this general policy may be granted by the Transportation Advisory Committee, with the advice of the appropriate modal committees only in these situations:**
 - Where specific modes of transportation are prohibited by law (such as bicyclists and pedestrians on some sections of interstate highways); in such cases additional effort should be spent in creating multi-modal access on parallel corridors,
 - Where the cost of providing facilities for multi-modal access is excessively disproportionate to need or use (defined in federal guidance as exceeding 20% of the total project, and where expected need or use does not justify expenditure above 20%), and
 - Where population scarcity or other factors indicate an absence of need for both current and future conditions of the anticipated project life.****CATSO encourages all agencies within the region to adopt similar policies in support of multi-modalism, such as the City of Columbia's Complete Streets Policy.****

13 In Appendix D, Street Project Priority Listing, I would upgrade the priority of these projects: Sorrel's Overpass: I-70 Drive NW to State Highway E Van Horn Tavern Road/I-70 Drive SW - assuming this includes a bridge on Perche Creek Any expansion of the Circumferential Roadway system that relieves Route E or Clark Lane/PP would be among my highest priorities for roads. Route E is a dangerous road and another route into Route E would be important.

Oct 22, 2013 2:07 PM

Q3. Section 2 of the LRTP has five chapters which describe CATSO's Transportation Planning Projects, Programs, Goals, Objectives, and Strategies. The next few questions ask for specific comments on each chapter.

**Chapter 6: Development of Priorities, Needs, Goals and Objectives
-Do you have any c...**

1	Ch 6, pg 48, Goal 4, Objective 5: "Increase freight movement" sounds like an economic goal, i.e. as in "have more freight to move than we have now". I suggest rewording to "Accommodate increased freight movement and increase efficiency..." Ch 6, pg 48, Goal 7, Objective 3: Listing should include sidewalks.	Jan 27, 2014 10:18 PM
2	I used to ride the express buses in and out of downtown in the east and west coast cities I lived in. Could we create the equivalent of express buses by excluding cars and welcoming along those direct routes city buses, bicycles, pedestrians and persons in wheelchairs. Other cities have 'commuter lanes', we can create an equivalent that establishes a preference for low impact modes of travel.	Jan 27, 2014 10:16 PM
3	I think you need "inclusive (wide in space) arrangement before you need to plan for long in time. That way you can assess the results and shift as you go without trying to predict how development will shape up over time, which is bound to need adjustments anyway and should not take up your time. Think of a flashlight. The beam is clear close up and gets fuzzy further out. Get the dense nodes located in general out before before you go into details in any case.	Jan 27, 2014 2:21 AM
4	The COLT line with thoughtful development around commuter stops north of town could greatly reduce the number of trips people take by car.	Jan 9, 2014 4:29 PM
5	The reduced reliance of cars and focus on a non-motorized network should be key.	Jan 9, 2014 3:08 PM
6	I strongly support the Goals and Objectives as stated, with the possible caveat that goal 4-1 probably really should be "reduce AUTOMOBILE travel demand" The idea is that people can still get around as much as they want to, but aren't constrained to the automobile. However, improved density/walkability/urbanization may in fact reduce all travel demand somewhat. I particularly support the following: Reduce reliance on cars (Chapter 6, Goal 2, Objective 3, pg. 47) Expand and redesign the current transit system (Chapter 6, Goal 3, Objective 3, pg. 47) I also strongly support improved regional, intracity transit, whether rail or good bus service.	Jan 9, 2014 12:22 PM
7	Goals and objectives are excellent - especially "reduce reliance on the automobile," "expand and redesign the existing transit system," and "create a bikeway/sidewalk/trail network that complements the street system." Please add "Reduce Vehicle Miles Traveled Per Capita by some 5% per year."	Dec 20, 2013 4:18 PM
8	Add this statement: CATSO will promote the concept of multi-modal access and connectivity in all transportation projects within the region, encourage the adoption of multi-modal policies such as Columbia's Complete Streets policy, and will develop a regional Complete Streets policy.	Oct 30, 2013 2:56 PM
9	None that I can think of	Oct 28, 2013 9:28 PM
10	Perhaps the statement of Complete Streets policy belongs more properly in this section. Another approach would be to add a statement in this section, "CATSO	Oct 23, 2013 8:07 PM

Q3. Section 2 of the LRTP has five chapters which describe CATSO's Transportation Planning Projects, Programs, Goals, Objectives, and Strategies. The next few questions ask for specific comments on each chapter.

Chapter 6: Development of Priorities, Needs, Goals and Objectives

-Do you have any c...

will promote the concept of multi-modal access and connectivity in all transportation projects within the region, encourage the adoption of multi-modal policies such as Columbia's Complete Streets policy, and will develop a regional Complete Streets policy." MARC took a similar approach--here is the resulting Complete Streets policy for the MARC region:
<http://marc.org/transportation/pdf/CompleteStreetsPolicy.pdf>

- | | | |
|----|---|----------------------|
| 11 | A footbridge between Cosmo Park and West Boulevard, across I-70, which allowed access for bicycles, would open up Cosmo to a large residential area. Currently, it is unsafe for young bicyclists to access this park as they have to cross a high traffic area at either end of I-70 drive. This should not be done before anticipated widening of I-70 is complete. | Oct 22, 2013 2:07 PM |
|----|---|----------------------|

Q4. Chapter 7: Future Project Plan

-Do you have specific comments on the Major Roadway Plan (Appendix G)?

-Do you have specific comments on the Sidewalk Project listing (see 2012 Sidewalk Master Plan in Appendix C)?

-Do you have specific comments on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Plan (Appe...)

- 1 Ch 7, pg 51, 7.3, re. signalized intersections: While a roadway plan may not be the best location to address this, the opportunity to improve traffic flow through simple signal changes should be addressed somewhere. For example, we have Providence Rd (busy but rolling steady) and the Business Loop (every light is red every time). Out-of-sync signals cost fuel, increase pollution (exhaust, noise, tire fragments, fuel consumption) through frequent starting and stopping and increase travel time for all motorized traffic, including buses. This is the low hanging fruit from a cost standpoint and needs to be addressed, (mainly) with MoDOT. Ch 7, pg 52: No mention of a cloverleaf at I70/Hwy 63. Is this part of MoDOT's I70 plans? Should mention why/why not considered or if funding is in sight. Ch 7, pg 52, 7.4.A.1. I travel through this roundabout regularly. I hope that the engineering firm considers the following items: 1. Existing roundabout is oval, causing traffic to overestimate the radius in the tighter turns and hit the curb. Need to make it round. 2. Add bypass lanes for immediate right turns (e.g. off-ramp to Creasy), all roads. This would require widening Creasy near the roundabout. 3. Need 4 lanes under I70 with sidewalks and bike paths. 4. Visibility for left turns off the I70 E off-ramp is horrible. Need to fix. 5. I would like to see a second roundabout at the Bus Loop intersection south of I 70. City could buy the empty gas station and use for ROW. 6. I have no real problem with the W. Blvd turn. A little wider turn lane would be nice, okay otherwise. 7. Run a bike path/ sidewalk behind old gas station and restaurant from Bus 70 intersection to W. Blvd. App B is not the latest map (The one in the Exec. Summary looks like the latest). App H: Take out all private information. Q1. should contain just the question and a single "redacted for Privacy" statement. Delete all empty pages. App J: It seems from the Ch 7, pg 56 & 57, 7.4.D.4. to 6. descriptions that the planned Rd from Starke to Ballenger should be blue and East Waco should not and that the planned road from Ballenger to St. Charles should be blue. Also Rt UU should be named Rt TT from the pg. 54B.1 description. Though, I like the East Waco option better, as long as that is coupled with the already platted option to extend Providence to Hwy 63. The power station could be moved. Ch 7.6.B, pg 60, 3rd paragraph, re. increasing the number of walkers: While I understand ROW and other site constraints, more emphasis should be placed on maintaining a green buffer strip between the SW and the road (as discussed in 5 paragraph). If we want to encourage active transportation, we need to make SWs safe for families walking/cycling with kids. This is not the case without buffer strips. People learn habits young or not at all. Also, SWs along major roadways are used for transportation, not as recreational hangouts. These SWs should be straight (not meander) (e.g. in front of Douglas HS) and they should not be blocked by railing, poles, and landscaping rocks (e.g. in front of Taco restaurant at Bus Loop and Providence). Ch 7.6.B, pg 61, 2nd & 3rd paragraph, re. intersections: SW crossings need to be moved out of the intersections at the width of the buffer strip. The buffer strip is there for pedestrian safety at straight roadway sections, it's even more important at crossings. Maintaining the separation to the driving lanes at all intersections allows vehicle more time to see SW users and slow down/stop. In addition, people tend to travel in straight lines; the SW curves at intersections are as traffic impeding to walkers and cyclist as they would be to motorized transportation users. Ch 7.6.B, pg 61, 3rd paragraph, re. ped malls: I like these. Could start on a trial basis, e.g. every first Saturday of the month close the same couple of blocks downtown. Need to have merchant
- Jan 27, 2014 10:18 PM

Q4. Chapter 7: Future Project Plan

-Do you have specific comments on the Major Roadway Plan (Appendix G)?

-Do you have specific comments on the Sidewalk Project listing (see 2012 Sidewalk Master Plan in Appendix C)?

-Do you have specific comments on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Plan (Appe...

buy-in, be predictable and could combine with free transit days. This would promote both items at once. Ch 7.8.B, pg 63, Design: Should discuss why MoDOT wants to go to 8 lanes, if 6 are sufficient. And how does this tie in with the truck lane option from the EIS? Should state whether the currently ongoing bridge design for Bus 70/Creasy will be for 6 or 8 or 4+truck lanes. Does the current plan include a much needed cloverleaf at I70/63?

2	While I understand there are insufficient funds for road repair, sidewalk installation etc, we don't seem to take seriously the need to reduce passenger trips. Are their best practices other cities have followed?	Jan 27, 2014 10:16 PM
3	I don't think it is possible to make specific comments this early, especially as I have been saying that you shouldn't be very specific until you have the general location of the nodes which at least defines degrees of density and therefore types of paths as well as their location. I'm sorry, I know this isn't what you asked for, but it needs to be said.	Jan 27, 2014 2:21 AM
4	The Colt RR and right of way needs to have a parallel bike path. Furthermore, this effort needs to be teamed with the pending form-based codes to identify key areas that would be good for development between Columbia and Centralia.	Jan 9, 2014 4:29 PM
5	I am thankful for the attention to the business loop, particularly making Cosmo Park more connected in a pedestrian/bike friendly way. The sidewalks in Columbia are some of the worst I have encountered. It is difficult to get from point A to point B without crossing streets several times to remain on a sidewalk (just try walking from one end of West Blvd to the other!). Also, many sections are very narrow and in need of repair making it difficult for people in wheel chairs or using strollers to use the sidewalks. I hope more focus is placed on creating a more walkable city and improving pedestrian safety. - In general, the section on sidewalks and bicycles seems to be a lot less specific than that of the Major Roadways within the main document. This worries me as I think the emphasis is on the roadways.	Jan 9, 2014 3:08 PM
6	p 53 A.1.e I strongly support improved bike/ped access to cosmo park B. sidewalks: I agree with looking at lengths of pedestrian crossings and speed at which pedestrians can reasonably be expected to cross. All roads and intersections should be negotiable for even vulnerable users, like children, the elderly and disabled I can't see how I-70 could be increased to 8 lanes throughout Columbia without undermining all other goals. Good rail and bus connections to reduce demand would be far better use of money.	Jan 9, 2014 12:22 PM
7	I am skeptical about the validity of the travel demand forecasting model. At the current rate of infill sidewalk construction, it will take hundreds of years to complete Columbia's sidewalk network.	Dec 20, 2013 4:18 PM
8	At a public meeting, staff received a comment from a citizen asking that the Dublin Avenue extension be considered for removal from the LRTP. The 2030 Plan includes the extension as one of the new construction projects with cost estimate of \$2.5 million.	Dec 6, 2013 10:07 AM

Q4. Chapter 7: Future Project Plan

- Do you have specific comments on the Major Roadway Plan (Appendix G)?
- Do you have specific comments on the Sidewalk Project listing (see 2012 Sidewalk Master Plan in Appendix C)?
- Do you have specific comments on the Bicycle and Pedestrian Network Plan (Appe...

9

None that I can think of

Oct 28, 2013 9:28 PM

Q5. Chapters 8 and 9 consider revenue sources and projections for transportation improvements to 2040 by jurisdiction (City of Columbia, MoDOT and Boone County) and maintenance, operation and capital costs for the transportation system and improvements including new projects.

Chapter 8: Financing...

1	<p>Appendix A vs. App G and Q: It appears that MoDOT applies different road classifications to roads in the Metro Area than CATSO does. In some cases this may be justified due to planned changes to the classifications of certain roads. However, for most roads it appears that MoDOT and CATSO just use different terms to describe the same type of road. If this is the case, it would most likely simplify coordination in the long run for CATSO/CoMo to adopt MoDOT's naming convention.</p>	Jan 29, 2014 10:26 PM
2	<p>Ch 9.1, pg 71: Having a financially constraint plan is good. However, illustrative projects should still be included in the Plan, along with strategies to procure additional funding sources to enhance revenues to the level required to fund all beneficial projects. Ch 9, in general: Bike/ped facilities have a much lower capital and O&M cost than roads. For long-term viability, more money should be shifted to mode-shifting bike/ped facilities. Bike/ped/transit facilities connect people with jobs who have no alternative means of transportation and should take priority. This would not only have economic benefits, but would also help keep unfit drivers off the roads, including party goers, the elderly, and insecure drivers used to lower traffic volumes. Ch 9, general funding and cost allocation: New roads and LOS upgrades for Metro Area fringe developments should be largely developer funded. These areas are typically more affluent than center area developments (e.g. The Hawthorns vs. Oak Towers), yet the cost of upgrades spent per person benefitting is much higher than it would be for infill development. The Plan should recommend charging developers within the Metro Area a utility and infrastructure fee based on a predictable formula, e.g. straight-line distance from City Hall, to pay for infrastructure. This should be an additional fee - not a tax reallocation - and would thus promote a more compact city scape. The result would be reduced transportation costs and increased revenues to cover these costs. Appendix N: Should explain the bottom portion of the table (below "Total all Federal Revenues"). Ch 9 and Appendix N: The Plan should explain how the airport ties into the 2040 Plan. While outside the Metro Area geographically, it still serves the area and should be mentioned in the Plan. Especially, since it uses up a huge chunk of available revenue. The dollars spent per person served by the airport far outweigh the \$/person for bike/ped/transit facilities and even roadways. In addition, the people served by the airport will typically be financially better off than those served by bike/ped/transit facilities and the average road user. Thus, the people with the smallest need are receiving the largest per capita transportation support. The money would be better spent connecting low-income people with jobs, thus increasing revenues and decreasing costs to the public support system (e.g. food stamps, unemployment benefits, etc.). Appendix O: Explain acronyms in footnotes.</p>	Jan 28, 2014 10:25 PM
3	<p>Ch 10, pg 112, 10.9.10: Strike "Consider the". Complete Street policy should definitely be adopted. Since the City adopted complete street standards in 2004, not adopting it into the CATSO focus would be step backwards.</p>	Jan 27, 2014 10:18 PM
4	<p>I think we should create a public transit utility and charge a fee, much like sewer or water, so that we can fund transit at a level that will give us a bus service we can rely upon for commuting to work and to get our weekly errands. In the short term, give us the opportunity to buy a pass for \$10 on our monthly bill, and</p>	Jan 27, 2014 10:16 PM

Q5. Chapters 8 and 9 consider revenue sources and projections for transportation improvements to 2040 by jurisdiction (City of Columbia, MoDOT and Boone County) and maintenance, operation and capital costs for the transportation system and improvements including new projects.

Chapter 8: Financing...

	contribute an additional amount, much like solar on the W&L bill, to contribute to transit.	
5	Charge for parking in the downtown district. Look at how parking would change if the other existing commercial districts around town converted their surplus parking spaces to higher uses such as infill with shops/offices/residences.	Jan 9, 2014 4:29 PM
6	The funding is still very much focused on roads, which is very disappointing. The funding for bicycles and pedestrians does not seem to show a serious commitment to focusing on non-motorized networks. Additional funding should be assigned for things like bike shares, bike lanes and trails, sidewalks, etc. The sidewalk projects should be prioritized, why should we wait until 2020 and beyond to have proper sidewalks on popular routes near the city center?	Jan 9, 2014 3:08 PM
7	I am shocked at how far out (>10 years) many important sidewalk improvements are! Also, I understand that at current funding, it will take 500 years to complete our sidewalk infrastructure! When we are talking about over a billion dollars on automobile infrastructure, that just can't be acceptable! The same applies to transit, which shows no increased level of funding, despite all the excellent goals. The only way to reduce demand for auto infrastructure is to improve alternatives! The budget should ideally reflect a goal for mode share!	Jan 9, 2014 12:22 PM
8	The plan appears to project flat operating and capital budgets for Columbia Transit, even though the goals and objectives include "expand and redesign the existing transit system" and "reduce reliance on the automobile."	Dec 20, 2013 4:18 PM
9	None that I can think of	Oct 28, 2013 9:28 PM

Q6. Chapter 10 considers Plan Implementation & Preliminary Recommendations, including performance measures for the Goals and Objectives.

Chapter 10: Plan Implementation & Preliminary Recommendations

-Do you have any specific comments on the Plan Implementation and Preliminary Recommendations?

...

1	Ch 10.5.B, pgs 99 & 100: I would like the planned Routes 740 and TT to be designated as local scenic roadways. This could serve as a tool to preserve the greenspace and protect water quality in the affected areas. Ch10.6, pg 107, last sentence: Should update to state whether the 2013 MoDOT traffic counts were published and what area they covered. End of Plan, pg 115: The ending had me wonder whether I printed all pages. Would be nice to have a paragraph tying it all together to end the Plan.	Jan 29, 2014 10:26 PM
2	How are other cities making the cultural shift out of their cars? Where in the US or Europe have school districts and transit merged together to transport children to school. I live next to a school. The number of cars that queue up to drop and retrieve their children is high even though we spend a significant amount of money to fund the school bus system. Can we suggest changes to how this is funded if we are creating perverse incentives with this money? Why is it that most parents who can afford to drive and pick up their children from school. Something is broken here and I would like to understand more what contributes to this dynamic.	Jan 27, 2014 10:16 PM
3	Physical improvements to the new bus transfer locations are needed. These are areas of great economic opportunity. Small shops, mobile food carts, and mixed use surrounding these hubs are just waiting to be built.	Jan 9, 2014 4:29 PM
4	Please add Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) as a performance measure.	Dec 20, 2013 4:18 PM
5	None that I can think of	Oct 28, 2013 9:28 PM

Q7. Do you have any additional specific or general comments on the 2040 draft LRTP?

Would you like CATSO Staff to contact you regarding your thoughts, or to answer specific questions you may have? If so, please provide your contact information.

1	I like the increasing emphasis on non-motorized transportation. I hope the city continues on this track - and that future federal, state, city, and private funding will be increasingly allocated in a manner more beneficial to non-motorized and transit options.	Jan 27, 2014 10:18 PM
2	I see that this is the only question I really answered, and I would value your comments. My e-mail is mary.lehmann1@gmail.com	Jan 27, 2014 2:21 AM
3	THE NEW COLUMBIA TRANSIT CHANGES THAT ARE BEING MADE FOR AUG. 2014.MY CONCERNS ARE THAT THERE NEEDS TO BE MORE TRAINING FOR YOUR DRIVERS IN GENERAL SOME OF THOSE THINGS WOULD BE TO ARRIVE ON TIME TO WORK SO THAT YOUR PASSENGERS THAT ARE GOING TO WORK DO NOT HAVE TO BE LATE FOR WORK WHICH CAUSES SOME TARDIES FROM SOME EMPLOYERS. HAVE A BUS STOP AT BOONE HOSPITAL FOR EMPLOYEES AS WELL AS THE SICK TRYING TO GET TO THE HOSPITAL,HANDICAP ACCESSIBLE STOP LOCATION. DURING THE SNOW ROUTES HAVING THE SCHEDULE FOR THE DAY CALLED INTO KOMU LIKE OTHER ORGANIZATIONS THAT USE THIS TO AWARE THE PUBLIC REGARDING CLOSINGS. PLEASE TAKE ANY OF THE COMMENTS INTO CONSIDERATION FOR THOSE THAT USE YOUR SYSTEM DAILY.	Jan 10, 2014 9:06 AM
4	Columbia has a HUGE opportunity to attract people from across the country to relocate here. A functioning public transit system of buses and light rail will be key. Secondly, future development needs to have these assets in mind before they are built, and embrace place-making created by form-based code developments. Amenities within walking distance, smart transit, and our existing community assets can attract people from overpopulated coastal areas.	Jan 9, 2014 4:29 PM
5	I agree with PedNet leaders in that : -The seven goals and 28 objectives accurately reflect community sentiment regarding transportation planning -At the present rate of infill sidewalk funding, it will take 500 years to build the 750 miles of missing sidewalks -Bike/ped facilities should be emphasized while allocations for new highways and upgrades to existing streets should be reduced -A "Complete Streets" policy should be incorporated into long-range transportation planning	Jan 9, 2014 3:08 PM
6	A complete-streets policy (which the city of Columbia has) should be included in the CATSO plan for the entire region. I don't need to be contacted, but thank you for providing the opportunity for input.	Jan 9, 2014 12:22 PM
7	In view of the statement that "worldwide trends and events will lead to major gasoline price increases and periodic shortages during the plan period," please continue to emphasize transit expansion and improved bike/ped facilities, while reducing allocations for new highways and capacity upgrades.	Dec 20, 2013 4:18 PM
8	We strongly encourage CATSO to adopt a comprehensive Complete Streets policy part of the LRTP.	Nov 26, 2013 2:15 PM
9	Adopt a complete streets policy. Adopt the rest of the Missouri Bicycle and	Nov 2, 2013 12:20 PM

Q7. Do you have any additional specific or general comments on the 2040 draft LRTP?

Would you like CATSO Staff to contact you regarding your thoughts, or to answer specific questions you may have? If so, please provide your contact information.

Pedestrian Federation's recommendataions. Adopt the policies required by the League of American Bicyclists for gold-level bicycle-friendly communities.

10	Complete Streets Policy! Columbia has one and so should CATSO.	Oct 31, 2013 9:35 AM
11	CATSO is well positioned to enhance and strengthen the progress Columbia is making toward being a great place to walk and bicycle. As the only Silver Level Bicycle Friendly Community in Missouri, many people might think we're already there. And we are way ahead of most communities in Missouri. But they are catching up to us--and might surpass us. More importantly, there are some glaring deficiencies in bike/ped provisions (as I experience daily). It's great, but it's not perfect by any means. I was astonished to learn that MARC has a Complete Streets Policy but CATSO does not.	Oct 30, 2013 2:56 PM
12	I took 10 minutes and looked over the study and was very impressed. This is the first chance I have had to look over it and I have not seen previous drafts or studies, but I felt that it was backed up by a lot of numbers and data on current transportation problems and projections. I feel that with the current study, future solutions to transportation problems can be addressed well. I cannot think of anything further that needs to be done to the study.	Oct 28, 2013 9:28 PM
13	Find many Missouri Complete Streets policies, including links to the policies at Missouri's four MPOs that currently have such policies, here: http://mobikefed.org/CompleteStreets A good checklist to evaluate how the LRTP is currently adhering to Complete Streets principles is here: http://www.smartgrowthamerica.org/complete-streets/changing-policy/policy-elements Another excellent example from an MPO similar to CATSO would be SJATSO's 2002 Complete Streets Policy: SECTION 3 POLICY STATEMENT 1. Bicycle and pedestrian ways shall be established in new construction and reconstruction projects throughout the metropolitan area, unless one or more of three conditions are met: A. Bicyclists and pedestrians are prohibited by law from using the roadway. In this instance a greater effort may be necessary to accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians elsewhere within the right-ofway or within the same transportation corridor (interstates). B. The cost of establishing bikeways or walkways would be excessively disproportionate to the need or probable use. Excessively disproportionate is defined as exceeding twenty percent of the cost of the larger transportation project, exclusive of right-of-way costs. C. Where sparsity of population indicate an absence of need. For example, all construction of new public streets shall include sidewalk improvements on both sides, unless the street is a cul-de-sac with four or fewer dwellings or the street has severe topographic or natural resource constraints. 2. In rural areas, paved shoulders should be included in all new construction and reconstruction projects on roadways used by more than 1,000 vehicles per day. In conservation design subdivisions, "bike friendly" lanes may be provided in lieu of other accommodations such as trails or sidewalks. These treatments have safety and operational advantages for all road users in addition to providing a place for bicyclists and pedestrians to operate. Rumble strips are not recommended where shoulders are used by bicyclists unless there is a minimum clear path of four feet in which a bicycle may safely operate. The exact location of the rumble strip in relation to the automobile travel lane may be determined by	Oct 23, 2013 8:07 PM

Q7. Do you have any additional specific or general comments on the 2040 draft LRTP?

Would you like CATSO Staff to contact you regarding your thoughts, or to answer specific questions you may have? If so, please provide your contact information.

the agency concerned until such time that sufficient research has been completed to indicate safe placement of this safety feature. 3. Sidewalks, shared use paths, street crossings (including over-and undercrossings), pedestrian signals, signs, street furniture, transit stops and facilities, and all connecting pathways shall be designed, constructed, operated and maintained so that all pedestrians, including people with disabilities, can travel safely and independently. Americans with Disabilities Act Standards design shall be in compliance with guidance set forth by the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG), Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access, July 1999 and its successor updates/revisions. 4. The design and development of the transportation infrastructure shall improve conditions for bicycling and walking through the following additional steps:

- Planning projects for the long-term. Transportation facilities are long-term investments that remain in place for many years. The design and construction of new facilities should anticipate likely future demand for bicycling and walking facilities and not preclude the provision of future improvements. For example, a bridge that is likely to remain in place for 50 years might be built with sufficient width for safe bicycle and pedestrian use in anticipation that facilities will be available at either end of the bridge, even if that is not the existing condition.
- Addressing the need for bicyclists and pedestrians to cross corridors as well as travel along them. Even where bicyclists and pedestrians may not commonly use a particular travel corridor that is being improved or constructed, they will likely need to be able to cross that corridor safely and conveniently. Therefore, the design of intersections and interchanges shall accommodate bicyclists and pedestrians in a manner that is safe, accessible, and convenient.
- Designing facilities to the best currently available standards and guidelines. The design of facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians shall follow design guidelines and standards that are commonly used, such as the Missouri Department of Transportation's General Pedestrian and Bicycle Guide, the ITE Recommended Practice Design and Safety of Pedestrian Facilities, AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, and AASHTO's A Policy on Geometric Design of Highway and Streets. Where these standards are in conflict with the Americans with Disabilities Act Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG), Designing Sidewalks and Trails for Access, July 1999, the ADAAG shall have precedence. However, except in the case of ADA standards, the standards set forth in this document shall have precedence, followed in descending order by MoDot's General Pedestrian and Bicycle Guide and the remaining citations listed in this paragraph in the order listed. ----- Thank you!

The LRTP has many very positive elements for multi-modalism, healthy communities, and truly integrating the entire transportation system. A strong Complete Streets policy would tie a lot of those elements together in a very positive way.

Written Comments Received on draft 2040 CATSO Long Range Transportation Plan

Editor's note:
Personal/home contact
information redacted for privacy

Questions and Suggestions
Regarding the CATSO 2040 Long-Range Transportation Plan
Ian Thomas, 6th November, 2013

Chapter 1:

- Section 1.1: Is LRTP a 20-year plan or a plan for activities through 2040 (ie. a 27-year plan)?

Chapter 2:

- Section 2.1: Population increases refer to a 30-year planning horizon - shouldn't these time periods be consistent?

Chapter 3:

- Section 3.1: I cannot reconcile the various numbers in first paragraph with Table 1 - can you just include a simple table that shows miles of highways, arterials, collectors, and local streets controlled by each jurisdiction?
- Section 3.2: Are there really more than 7,000 bike rack spaces?
- Section 3.3: Table 5 shows ridership, service parameters, and costs ... for which year?
- Section 3.5: To explain concisely how many miles of sidewalks exist, can you just create a table that shows miles of highways, arterials, collectors, and local streets, and how many miles in each category have sidewalks on both sides, one side, or neither?

Chapter 5:

- Section 5.1: Where you say "Expanding the capacity of roadways is not the sole solution to congestion." (para. 3) can you reference research showing that widening roads often fails to reduce congestion or makes it worse (such as http://www.vtpi.org/cong_relief.pdf)?
- Section 5.1: In addition to the information about "Level of Service" (LOS) for cars, can you also discuss pedestrian, bicycle, and transit LOS (eg. see <http://www.ibike.org/engineering/los.htm>)?

Chapter 6:

- Section 6.2: Can you explain relationship between LRTP and MRP; and how projects move between these documents and the CIP, TIP, STIP, and annual City budget?
- Section 6.2: This section refers to "Columbia Transit Master Plan (2007)" - Drew Brooks says this plan is not relevant any more, and a new long-range transit plan will be developed in fall, 2014, after CoMO Connect gets started - can you mention that?
- Section 6.5: These goals are excellent - can you add "Develop metrics for Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT) and set goal to reduce VMT XX% by 2040"

Chapter 7:

- Section 7.2: In what ways has the "Travel Demand Model" been validated, and how well did it perform?
- Section 7.4: Why does first paragraph refer to "next 15 years" when this is a 27-year plan?
- Section 7.6: First para. on p. 52 says there are about "229 miles of streets in Columbia without sidewalks" - does this tally with data in Section 3.5?
- Section 7.6: What are "true cost parking measures," mentioned in second para. on p. 53?

- Section 7.7: "Columbia Transit Master Plan (2007)," which was mentioned in previous draft, has been removed - Drew Brooks says a new long-range transit plan will be developed in fall, 2014, after CoMO Connect gets started - can you mention that?

Chapter 8:

- Section 8.1: Does the "Columbia urbanized area" mean Columbia city limits or the entire MPO area?
- Section 8.4: Appendices M, N, and O are referenced but I cannot find drafts of these appendices
- Section 8.5: I suggest replacing "CATSO should support ... new sources of revenue dedicated to increased state investments in transportation" with something about CATSO supporting the most efficient use of scarce revenue for transportation.

Chapter 9:

- Section 9.4: In Table 13, the streets total of \$1.35 billion and the overall total of \$1.46 billion appear to be incorrect summations of values above.
- Section 9.6: Opening sentence says the focus of the plan is a "continued movement towards a more diverse transportation system that supports ... walking, bicycling, and buses" - there is discussion of a strategy for bike/ped but not for buses.
- Section 9.6: When a project is listed with an "illustrative" cost, such as the \$68m for the I-70/Scott Blvd. intersection, does this mean it's not part of the "constrained financial plan?" What is the reason for including these projects in this plan?
- Section 9.6: How do you anticipate this plan will change if Missouri voters approve a 10-year 1-cent-on-the-dollar sales tax next November, as many predict?
- Section 9.6: Capacity upgrades for major arterials lists "Broadway: Garth-West Blvd.; \$5.9m" - is a widening project to five lanes envisioned here, or a much more modest project to create left-turn pods, bury electric cables, and improve sidewalks?
- Section 9.6: The same section also lists "Rock Quarry Rd., Route 740-AC; \$10.0m" - bearing in mind that Rock Quarry Rd. is a designated "scenic roadway," what type of capacity upgrade is envisioned here?
- Section 9.6: The "Sidewalks and Trails" list shows \$23 million of projects - do you have the total mileage this represents?
- Section 9.7: Can you explain how the revenues and expenses in Table 15 (which I infer to be an overall summary) are derived from the numbers in Table 13 (Section 9.4), Table 14 (Section 9.5), and Tables A, B, and C (Section 9.6)?
- Section 9.7: Table 15 projects \$65 million in transit capital expenses and \$147 million in transit operating expenses. The corresponding average annual expenditures over the 27-year life of this plan (\$2.4 million and \$5.4 million, respectively) are almost identical to current expenditures. This is not consistent with the goals of this plan which include objectives to expand the current transit system and reduce reliance on automobile travel. Can you re-structure the projected expenses in the plan to reflect these goals and objectives?

Chapter 10:

- Section 10.2: In the previous draft of this document, there was a paragraph that stated, "It is likely that worldwide trends and events will lead to major gas price increases and periodic shortages during the plan period. Increased world demand, instability in the Middle East, and

the inability to increase oil production will combine to make for an unstable energy situation. In consideration of this, the plan gives increased emphasis to non-motorized modes of transportation." Why was this paragraph deleted from the current version of the plan?

From: **Borgmeyer, Les** [REDACTED]
Date: Fri, Dec 6, 2013 at 8:58 AM
Subject: Remove Dublin Avenue extensions from transportation plan
To: tteddy@gocolumbiamo.com

Hello Tim,

Thank you for providing your time and information on Wednesday regarding city plans. As we discussed, my neighbors and I strongly encourage the city to remove the extension of Dublin Avenue from the transportation plan. With Cunningham Drive being removed from the plan earlier, there is no reason to continue with an extension of Dublin Avenue which would only bring more traffic into an established neighborhood. The Scott Branch Trail has been completed and the area at the end of Dublin Avenue would suffer from construction that is not needed. It appears there are no more opportunities for growth or construction in the neighborhood. The current transportation access has been working fine for almost 20 years.

Help us keep our neighborhood intact and safe. We request that Dublin Avenue not be extended and such an extension be removed from the transportation plan.

Best regards,
Les and Ann Borgmeyer

[REDACTED]
Columbia, MO 65203
[REDACTED]

Comments on CATSO Long Range Transportation plan
From Trevor Harris, [REDACTED] Columbia, Missouri 65203

- Executive Summary: This concise look at the LRTP is useful and well-organized.
- Section 2.3: There are acreage needs stated to accommodate 47,000 new jobs and housing. Has there been any consideration to the land needed for food production for the existing and planned population? Building the growing food network into the LRTP might be incentivized through development bonuses that incorporate household food gardens into a site design.
- Section 3.2: Downtown Columbia's Short Street garage is now open, correct?
- Section 5.1: When I saw it a few weeks ago by bicycle, the Stadium/I-70 diverging diamond is complete except for pedestrian connections to City-owned Cosmo Park and I-70 Drive Northwest.
- Section 5.1: When existing, older sidewalks get torn up from construction, tree removal or are encroached upon by grass, this disinvested infrastructure remains in poor condition for a long time. This is a disincentive for walkers especially on street segments that are busy and lack any planting buffer. Could the LRTP cite ways the city can encourage sidewalk construction and/or maintenance? Possibilities include ONS-sponsored neighborhood gutter clean-out days and tax-billed sidewalk (re)construction for segments where interested neighbors want improvements before the City is prepared to make such investments.
- Section 5.1: Are there any local examples of a Parking Cash-Out? If so, a case study mentioned here or elsewhere in the LRTP would make for a good demonstration of how the program works for both employer and employee.
- **Section 5.2: Consider adding bicycle/pedestrian/transit LOS to the CATSO LRTP. [This model](#) ranks bicyclists' travel experiences differently from that of car drivers. It looks like a useful tool for gauging the bicyclist's experience on a given street segment or at an intersection.**
- Section 9.4/Table 13: Encourage MODOT and Boone County to invest a percent of their annual budgets for sidewalks on these agencies' facilities where density warrants new pedestrian infrastructure.
- Section 9.6: Consider adding as a Long Range Project a regional transit service. Annual investments from MODOT, Boone County and the City of Columbia could provide commuter service via a bus or van. Such a service would reduce VMT and wear and tear on area roadways. Also consider expanding the local rideshare program via the MPO. Look to existing commuter lots and providers such as OATS as partners.
- Section 9.6/Table B: Bike-Ped Projects: Add West Blvd. sidewalk (re)construction to sidewalk projects list. This is Major Collector street with episodically heavy vehicular traffic and significant local and commuter pedestrians. Sidewalks do not exist from Stewart south to Stadium. Sidewalks are badly deteriorated on both sides of West Blvd from Stewart south to Sunset Lane.

- Section 10.1: Really like the detail on how non-motorized travel encourages social interaction. Also, I appreciate how LRTP has pull-out text here from numerous existing and valuable plans and documents.
- Section 10.2.B2: I like this statement about how a bikable-walkable community provides economic benefits to individual households. Can the LRTP mention actual research-based figures of savings? [Here](#)'s one estimate.
- Section 10.10: I support all these great goals especially Goal 2 Objectives 1-4. Is there an existing car-share program as referenced on p.113? If, so a case study would help illuminate how it works for the users.
- I am glad CATSO recently added a Columbia School Board representative to the Technical Committee. The siting of schools drives transportation investments, which should be the reverse. Schools should be sited based on where transportation dollars are already spent. Such inter-agency collaboration seems to be supportive of the overall LRTP *Goal 6: Integrate land use planning with infrastructure development* (as seen on p. 114.)

General comments

- **Are there some tangible activities CATSO can list in the LRTP that aim to reduce VMT in the metro area? Consider examples from other organizations and MPOs.** [One example](#) from the US Green Building Council offers incentives to builders who invest near transit stops. Another example of tangible activities to reduce VMT are found in the [Boston MPO's plan](#). Its authors state specific programs and activities in which they will engage to reduce VMT.
- There are several local MODOT-owned and -maintained roads that would benefit from becoming more livable. (Think Providence Road between Stadium and Vandiver/Leslie Lane. Or Broadway from West Blvd West to the its terminus.) Better access along and across these street segments for bikes and peds will encourage more of the same and potentially reduce VMT. Can the City of Columbia develop a timeline to take over select local streets or segments from MODOT? MODOT shouldn't operate streets that bisect Columbia neighborhoods. The state agencies' dominant priority is moving vehicular traffic, which is dangerous for people in their neighborhoods.
- **There remain an almost infinite range of unmet transportation needs. This is especially glaring in the limited funds available for the hundreds of miles of needed sidewalks. Consider shifting a larger percentage of the local transportation sales tax to projects that make it safe to make the non-motorized choice.**

2040 CATSO LRTP Comments, January 31, 2014:
My Q1 info: City: Columbia, MO, Zip: 65202

=====

App H (2040 Survey) , Q2 and Q7 have numerous relevant comments regarding rail service and regional transit, yet both are mostly ignored in the Plan. The Plan should take a closer look at the comments and incorporate many of the suggestions, e.g. passenger service to surrounding communities, major cities and Amtrak, using the old Ameren property as a downtown train station, providing a real alternative to truck freight traffic, etc.

In General:

The City and County are moving heavily towards chip and seal in lieu of asphalt overlay. The construction cost of chip and seal is about 50 % of asphalt, but there are related costs of procurement, engineering, funding, scheduling, administration, bidding, etc. The service life of chip and seal is about half that of asphalt. So, in the long-run there is no financial gain. At the same time, the loose gravel is a serious safety hazard to cyclist and motorcycles alike. With the City not enforcing that the extra gravel should be swept off prior to reopening the road and not putting up warning signs, this is a personal injury lawsuit waiting to happen. One lawsuit will wipe out any savings. In addition, the quality of construction is lacking (at my street they sealed over walnuts and tall weeds growing in road cracks). Finally, the gravel washes off into streams where it clogs voids in the substrate which are required by organisms near the bottom of the food chain, thus impairing stream health. CoMo has to fulfill high dollar regulatory requirements regarding stream health and stormwater pollution. While chip and seal may be a good alternative for rural communities, using it in CoMo is counterproductive on every level and the Plan should call to discontinue this practice.

The Plan touches on subdivisions, the abandonment of the grit system and the proliferation of cul-desacs.

In combination with street width standards that allow the City's largest fire truck to make a turns in any road, the amount of impervious area per home and vehicle speeds are increasing. The Plan should place a larger emphasis on pushing for modern grid systems. Also, it seems that turning radius requirements could be met through mountable curbs with adjacent greenstrips or bike/ped facilities. More raised and planted medians would create safer road crossings and access, lower vehicle speeds and improve the cityscape immensely. Providence from Bus 70 to Stadium would be a prime candidate. Enough parking garages already. Put the money into mass transit.



Rachel Bacon <ribacon@gocolumbiamo.com>

CATSO LRTP 2040

Lisa Goldschmidt <lisa@pednet.org>

Tue, Feb 11, 2014 at 11:34 AM

To: ribacon@gocolumbiamo.com

Hello Rachel,

Unfortunately I will be unable to attend today's scheduled hearing on the LRTP 2040, but I would like to offer comments on behalf of CoMET (Columbians for Modern, Efficient Transit).

CoMET commends CATSO for the excellent "Goals and Objectives" listed in both the Executive Summary and full report. We feel this accurately reflects community sentiment by emphasizing the need for transportation planning and the allocation of funding to reduce reliance on cars, partly through the expansion and redesign the existing transit system.

However, we have noted that the Projected Cost Estimates for Transportation Improvements do not reflect the Goals and Objectives. The transit budget is projected to remain flat while nearly \$1 billion is allocated for streets during the plan period. Columbia's transit budget is between 1/5 and 1/3 of the transit budgets of similar cities such as Lawrence, Kansas and Ames, Iowa.

Considering the goal of transit redesign and expansion, we would like to see some of the funding currently allocated for streets redirected to our public transit system. With the anticipated advent of CoMo Connect, we believe demand for transit services in Columbia and the surrounding areas will continue to grow. The new bus system has been designed with growth in mind, and funds to support the expansion of our public transportation should be made available to support this goal.

While the CoMo Connect plan provides wider coverage, shorter wait times, and consistent service hours, public comments offered during the public input period also call for Sunday service, expanded hours, and shelters at all stops. We respectfully request that the LRTP 2040 plan support the allocation of funds to move our transit system forward.

Thank you,
Lisa

Lisa Goldschmidt, M.A., HHS
CoMET Campaign Coordinator
lisa@pednet.org
(573) 819-1635