



# City of Columbia, Missouri

## Meeting Minutes

### Columbia Area Transportation Study Organization (CATSO)

---

Thursday, May 24, 2018

2:30 PM

Coordinating Committee Meeting

City Hall  
701 E. Broadway  
Council Chambers

---

#### I. CALL TO ORDER

##### MEMBERS PRESENT

Dan Atwill, Boone County, Presiding Commissioner  
Mike Matthes, City of Columbia, City Manager  
Tim Teddy, City of Columbia, Community Development  
David Nichols, City of Columbia, Public Works  
Mike Henderson, MoDOT, Central Office  
Steve Engelbrecht (for David Silvester), MoDOT Central District  
Jeff McCann, Boone County, Chief Engineer

##### MEMBERS ABSENT

Brian Treece, City of Columbia Mayor  
Michelle Teel, Director, MoDOT Multi-Modal Operations  
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, City of Columbia - Planning/CATSO staff

**MR. MATTHES:** I'd like to welcome everyone to the City of Columbia CATSO meeting. I think we've lapped our last five years of meetings, so that's -- that's good. So, this is a pretty typical public meeting, and there'll be opportunities for public comment, and we'll consider a number of items of business with staff reports and questions and votes. So, I would like to call us to order and we'll start with introductions.

#### II. INTRODUCTIONS

**MR. MATTHES:** If we could just introduce ourselves as we come around.

**MR. MCCANN:** Jeff McCann, Boone County Chief Engineer.

**MR. ATWILL:** Dan Atwill, Presiding Commissioner of Boone County.

**MR. MATTHES:** Mike Matthes. I'm the City Manager of the City of Columbia.

**MR. TEDDY:** Tim Teddy, Community Development Director, City of Columbia and  
CATSO Tech Committee.

**MR. NICHOLS:** Dave Nichols, City of Columbia, Public Works Director.

**MR. HENDERSON:** Mike Henderson, MoDOT, Central Office, Transportation Planning.

**MR. ENGELBRECHT:** Steve Engelbrecht, MoDOT, Central District Planning, here for  
Dave Sylvester.

**MS. CHRISTIAN:** Leah Christian, City of Columbia, and CATSO Transportation  
Planning.

**MR. SKOV:** Mitch Skov, same.

**MR. MATTHES:** All right. Thank you very much.

### III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

MR. MATTHES: Now it's the item where we approve the agenda. Are there any changes  
to it on behalf of the Committee? No. May I have a motion to approve the agenda?

MR. NICHOLS: So moved.

MR. TEDDY: Second.

MR. MATTHES: Okay. It's been seconded. All those in favor, please say yes. Aye  
counts. All of those opposed say no.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. MATTHES: Okay. We have an agenda.

### IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

February Meeting Minutes

**Attachments:** [Meeting Minutes 22-Feb-2018](#)

MR. MATTHES: All right. Our next item is the approval of minutes. Any -- any changes  
to the minutes? Can I have a motion to approve?

MR. NICHOLS: So moved.

MR. MATTHES: Is there a second?

MR. TEDDY: I'll second.

MR. MATTHES: All in favor, please say yes. All opposed, no.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. MATTHES: Approval of the minutes.

## V. PUBLIC HEARINGS

### 2018 Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan Update

**Attachments:** [2018 Coordinated Public Transit Human Services Transportation Plan](#)

MR. MATTHES: Okay. Now we'll move into the public hearing section of the meeting.

This is the item for the 2018 Coordinated Public Transit Human Service Transportation Plan Update. Is there a staff report?

MS. CHRISTIAN: Yes, there is. Thank you. Our last transportation plan was updated in February of 2013, and we are required to update this every five years per MAP 21 and Fast Act Transportation Bills, in order for the Metro area to remain eligible for federal transit funding, Sections 5310, 5316, or 5317. 5310 funds programs that provide transportation to elderly and disabled populations, and 5316 provides funding for low-income individuals for transportation to and from work, and 5316 provides funding for organizations that go above and beyond American with Disabilities Act standards. The plan does require an assessment of available services and current transportation providers. There is also an assessment of transportation needs for individuals with disabilities, older adults, people with low incomes. There's also a requirement to identify any unmet transportation and transit needs within the CATSO area. There is also a requirement to develop strategies and activities to address those unmet needs, and we also are required to prioritize those strategies.

The assessment process of this plan, we did do an in-person interview with both GoComo and OATS staff. We also provided them online surveys that they completed. We also contacted and worked with 16 social service agencies within the CATSO Metro area. We coordinated phone interviews and online surveys with them. We utilized 2010 census data and 2012 through 2016 American Community Survey data. We were also able to provide feedback from riders and stakeholders through past project analysis, so that

includes our -- the City's 2014 Columbia Public Transit Survey and the 2016-2017 GoComo bus service evaluation project, but -- and it did feedback from a number of transit stakeholders including municipal leadership, downtown businesses, GoComo drivers, and transit users, the University, and a number of other stakeholders.

We did identify a number of needs based on all of these survey results. There is definitely a need for expanded service hours, nights and weekends, in the City and the county. There is a need for increased service in the county. There is also a need for greater service frequency and more routes in the City. And, of course, we did identify funding for ongoing and capital needs, a number of local human service providers are looking to upgrade or expand their fleet of, generally, vans to provide transportation. We also recognize a need for improved coordination and partnerships within our region, and for the use of technology for information sharing among service providers.

And we did prioritize some strategies and tactics to try to meet some of these needs. For the short term, we could develop a one-stop information web page to match these needs with providers, and also promote education and information sharing between agencies and providers. In addition to a website, there could be a joint e-mail list-serve and also, of course, interagency meetings to establish relationships and identify coordination opportunities.

For the medium term, we would want to continue to improve that coordination based on what we identify, you know, and come up with strategies for targeted funding opportunities and service delivery partnerships. There is also a medium term recommendation to streamline GoComo's service delivery through some of the recommendations that were made in the bus service evaluation project. That includes targeting routes to populations of need and providing flex service options, bi-directional loops, and coordinated bus schedules for -- to make the transfer process easier.

And for the long term, you know, we saw a need to expand and streamline the Boone

County services, mainly the OATS provider. OATS has started a coordinated fixed-route system in the Camden County area. They did partner with a number of area employers to do this. We did meet with OATS in person and they do see a potential to do this also in the Boone County region, so that's a recommendation. And also, of course, if OATS could find a way to expand opportunities for service to nights and weekends, that could help members of the Boone County population. And also for the long term, of course, and I know that everyone here knows this, but we do see an opportunity to expand GoComo's service frequency schedules and coverage. Of course, there isn't current funding to do that, so some of the tactics to get there would be to advance, you know, further funding sources. There's various ideas in the plan to look at expanding MU partnerships, partnerships with local employers and service agencies. There was also a lot of feedback in the participant surveys on potentially trying out a fare-free system to increase ridership. And, of course, we can continue to support transit use through our own land use and parking policies.

So that basically covers the main points of the plan, and now we, you know, we have a public hearing and then, of course, the Committee can make suggestions for amendments or to adopt.

MR. MATTHES: Are there any questions on behalf of the Committee for staff? All right. At this point, I'll take public comment.

**PUBLIC HEARING OPENED**

MR. MATTHES: It's a public hearing. Are there any members of the public who would like to speak about this item? Seeing none, I'll close the public hearing.

**PUBLIC HEARING CLOSED**

MR. MATTHES: I expect you're here for a different item, right? All right. Are there any comments by the Committee? May I have a motion?

MR. TEDDY: I move that we recommend adoption of the plan.

MR. MATTHES: Is there a second?

MR. MCCANN: I'll second.

MR. MATTHES: All in favor, please say yes. Opposed, no.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

## VI. GRACE LANE TRAFFIC STUDY

### Grace Lane Traffic Study

**Attachments:** [Item 6 5-24-18 Grace Lane, Staff Memo](#)  
[047-17 Grace Lane Alignment Study.Final](#)

MR. MATTHES: All right. We're moving into the Grace Lane Traffic Study. Is there a staff comment?

MR. SKOV: I'm just going to say a couple of brief things here and then Mr. Light from CBB is going to give a presentation about the results of the study. We all know that Grace Lane is an existing street. It's currently classified as a minor arterial in the CATSO Major Roadway Plan. It extends north-south from St. Charles Road down to Richland. I wanted to emphasize that the study was done at the behest of both Columbia Public Works Department and the Boone County Resource Management Department. They did commission the study and the report was received in April, and there was a sharing of the cost for that. And the point of this exercise today of this item is strictly to -  
- for the Committee to receive information. There is no action item or decision to be made by you, but the point of it is to -- for you to know -- the Committee to receive more information about the results of the study in more detail. Thank you.

MS. CHRISTIAN: We're just going to put in a presentation from the consultant here, so --

MR. LIGHT: All right. Thank you. Good afternoon. So, my name is Shawn Light; I'm with CBB Transportation Engineers and Planners, and I'm going to talk about the Grace Lane Alignment Study. While this is getting loaded up, the general agenda or what the presentation is going to entail, first, is talking about the planning process in general, about why we do planning studies, just to put the presentation in a little bit more context.

Talk a little bit about Grace Lane specifically, about why this study was done now, some of just the general program development process in terms of kind of next steps and where we're at in the overall process, and then some of the technical elements of the study.

So why do we do planning studies in the first place? The reason that we -- and would undergo a study like this is there's several reasons. One is to help guide future development as it occurs. This area of the City and the county is undergoing residential, some commercial development, and it really helps to have a plan in place to help guide how that development occurs. A good example is, we do a lot of work in St. Charles County along the I-70 corridor and along the I-70 -- along that corridor, we have a similar situation as what you have at the -- at the St. Charles Road interchange where there's an interchange and then there's outer roads that are closely spaced, so you can think of Cave Springs Road, you can think of Zumbuhl Road, you can look at Highway K. And in all of those cases, St. Charles County did a lot of development in the vicinity of that interchange without doing good planning of the local road system. And now that it's fully developed, we're trying to fix the traffic problems that have occurred. And we're trying to avoid that situation here by doing a planning of Grace Lane and the interchange and just trying to figure out how all this stuff fits together and can work together in the long run. That results in responsible stewardship of infrastructure and public funds, rather than have to get in and have a really expensive fix that you have to take care of later, you can plan things out in a logical way. And it also lets the public know kind of what's coming down the road, so it lets the public be aware of what changes will occur as we go through the overall process.

So why are we really concerned about Grace Lane now? There's several things that have been occurring along this corridor which makes it make good sense to do the study that the City and the county did, so kudos to you for -- for doing this at the right time. One of

them, as you can see, is development is occurring to the south. You've had improvements along Rolling Hills Road. That -- improvements are occurring, the development is occurring. Soon, and under design, we've got Discovery Parkway, so Discovery Parkway will complete a connection all the way from 63 up to 70. So as that connection gets made, it will become an attractive bypass when the connector gets full of traffic. So between -- and there's ongoing development, so as development is continuing to occur, as Discovery Parkway gets connected up, as improvements are made elsewhere along the corridor, this corridor is becoming more and more attractive. And then if you add into that other plans like the 740 plan, again, you've really got to plan out this whole corridor.

And I brought up the interchange earlier. This wasn't an interchange study, but whatever solutions are developed for Grace Lane need to fit in the context of an interchange, as well, so it all has to work together. If you plan those without thinking how they fit together, you can end up with -- with a mess in the future. So this shows some of the improvements that have been done to Rolling Hills Road, improved cross section, sidewalks, curb and gutter, and this is all being planned. It's being built as a two-lane road, but it's been planned out for a four- to five-lane road in the future as it -- as it expands.

This shows the connection of Discovery Parkway, again, a connection all the way from 63 heading up to 70. This becomes important because, as you know, a lot of folks in the Columbia area work in Jeff City and vice versa, so this is a convenient way for people to get through this area. And the ongoing development -- and this is just an aerial photograph, but you can see on the photograph different areas that are graded out. So development in this area has been occurring, it continues to develop, and as this development occurs, we're going to see pretty substantial changes in traffic volumes along Grace Lane.



Today, Grace Lane carries about 5,000 to 6,000 cars a day, which is, you know, pretty reasonable for a road of that type. We expect when Discovery Parkway connects up and some of these near short-term developments get built, there might be a bump of volumes up 10 to 15 percent, again, not a ton of traffic for that road. But when this is fully built out in this area, we could see traffic volumes of 20,000 to 30,000 cars a day, which is four to six times the volumes that are currently on -- on that road. So the road that's there certainly can't handle that level of traffic volume and improvements will need to be made in the future and, again, it makes sense to plan for those improvements now.

And this shows the 740 connection. In the 740 EIS, one thing to note is it does show a local improvement to Grace Lane by the City or the county. So, listed in the EIS is a -- part of that is the recognition that the City and county will have to make improvements to Grace Lane as far as fitting in with that overall improvement.

So where we're at in the development process, you can generally break a development process down with -- with this. You start by developing some plans to really understand what the dynamics are

in -- in how things ultimately fit together. Once you have a plan, the next thing you need to do is you need to find money, right? So at this point, there is no funding for this project, but we're in the planning stages to try to determine what kind of improvements are necessary to give you an idea of what types of funds might be necessary. Once the funds are secured, you start to go through a design process, and then there's project implementation.

So there had been some questions about public engagement process and when that's appropriate. This first piece is just the initial technical study to try to get a feeling for what the technical elements are with the plan, and that's what our study represents.

Tonight I would say is kind of the first opportunity for public comment, which we'll see. When we start looking at development of getting funds for the project, there's a potential - there's a ballot measure in 2025 that will come out. This could potentially be a project down there. There's no -- I don't know if there's any discussion about what needs to go on there at this point in time, but if the City and the county determine that this is an important improvement, then that would be the time to start looking at trying to -- trying to get money from that potential ballot measure, and again another opportunity for public comment into the process.

Only after those funds are secured is when you would get into a design process. At this point, we're looking at 2025 -- or 2026, maybe 2027, and there's a whole public engagement process that's part of that design process. So there are -- I only bring those up as that there are checkpoints along the way to get public input into these, in the studies and into the process, and this was really the start. So where we're at is really the initial phase, the very start of this whole process.

So within our technical study -- or technical study, what we're going to talk about a little bit is a study area to give you a feel for what all was looked at, some of the factors that we considered, some idea of the concepts. We -- we did a lot of brainstorming and came up with a lot of different concepts, how we screened those out, and then how we landed on the preferred alternative for this study. So for the study area, we really looked all the way from 63 up to 70. We broke that down, and if you look at the study report, there are several appendices. The primary study area is the section of Grace Lane really from, you know, say, Richland Road up to -- to Bull Run Road. But we extended this out again to make sure we looked at the overall context of how this corridor will function.

So there's an appendix for the 70 interchange, so my friends at MoDOT might be interested in taking a look at that and some of the improvements that we propose for those outer-road connections. Again what we're trying to do is if you look at Grace Lane,

you've got St. Charles, you've got the interchange ramps, you've got the outer road, you've got Bull Run, you've got Grace Lane all connected in a very short space with multiple -- potentially, in the future, multiple traffic signals, right? Again, and that's what causes the mess at a lot of these other interchanges in -- in areas like St. Louis. So the idea is to try to consolidate some of those intersections, and try to get the geometry so that you can get some pretty coherent and reasonable signal space in through there when this thing is all built out. And then the section to the south, there's another appendix that looks at how those connections down at New Haven Road and WW need to be made at some point down the road.

There are some things that we looked at. We obviously looked at the -- the CATSO Major Thoroughfare Plan, we looked at the Route 740 study. We did a lot with geometrics, just to understand the geometry of the roadway, how things fit, what the topography is, those types of things. We looked at future developments and what that development plan could look like. We used that for looking at future traffic volumes and obviously consider traffic safety as a major component. So one of the things that we started with, the Major Thoroughfare Plan, this is -- this was -- project is on the CATSO's Major Thoroughfare Plan, and from my understanding, it's been on there for quite a number of years. And as far as improvements to Grace Lane at some point in the future, and you see that with the improvements that are happening out on Rolling Hills Road, so some of this stuff is being implemented as we go in pieces as it becomes necessary. But this connection on the north end is going to be necessary and has been acknowledged that it will be necessary for some time.

When we look at the no-build future conditions, and this drives some of the traffic, we looked at two situations, a 2020 and a 2040. For 2020, we assume that Discovery Parkway is open and some traffic diverts there, and we start looking at some of the development that's already approved or being constructed and assume that will be done.

And, basically, the existing facility you have works relatively well initially. By the time we get to what we call a 2040 condition or a build-out condition, and, you know, that 2040 could be 2040 or that -- that year could -- could slide depending on how fast this area develops, right? And there's no -- I don't think anybody in here would be able to tell you at what point we're going to have significant development in this part of the City or this part of the county. It depends on the stock market and a whole other host of factors that are out there. But when we get to that full build-out, the system just would not be able to function at all with that kind of development with the current roadway system. You wouldn't be able to pull out from the side streets. Certainly, the folks that have driveways along Grace Lane wouldn't be able to get out of their driveways, big queues all directions, so a need to make some improvements and to bring this really from a -- a farm road, right -- which it kind is now to that kind of a cross -- rural cross-section into an urban cross-section.

So we looked at several concepts from as starting point. We -- we looked at roundabouts in several locations. We looked at, you know, can we run straight up Grace Lane, and that was in some of the concepts. We looked at using that open area to the west in different configurations, and we looked at really about ten different concepts from the starting point, several different configurations up at the I-70 interchange, using jug handles and all kinds of other treatments, realignment of the outer road, just to see what was possible, what was feasible, and to get a feeling for what some of those impacts might be.

We had a pretty big evaluation to -- to try to consider what all those impacts look like, and we ended up back on four. There was a lot of redundancy in those ten concepts. Some of them just didn't work, so ended up at four major concepts, and we can walk through those.

Now, it's important -- and before I move on from this -- to recognize in the report, we lay

out the technical evaluations of all four. So one of the things, we'll -- we'll end up with a preferred alternative, but it's important to note that we're talking about construction at the soonest ten years down the road. It could be further than that. Things can happen in ten years, right? So when we look at this alternative, it's important to have all the technical data so that you can look at this in ten years and say, does this still hold true to what we thought was going to happen or have things changed. A good example are the prices. What's the price of land? What's the price of asphalt? What's the price of concrete? What's the price of oil? And then all those things can fluctuate a lot in 10 to 15 years. So, you know, I would strongly advise that when you're down the road, you'll take another look at it and see if the assumptions we made still make sense, or if there have been any changes to the assumptions that we're -- that we're making right now.

We consider this in two phases, and that's how the existing Rolling Hills is being developed now, Phase 1 and Phase 2. Phase 1, two-lane cross-section, but basically what you're doing is you're preserving the right-of-way for the rest of the road so it's easily widened in the future. Good example

of -- of the need to do this. If you look at, you know, we just finished Page Avenue Phase 3 in St. Charles again, and that land was first preserved back in the late 60's, right? So it took 50 years to get that road built, but if it hadn't been for the preservation of that corridor, that road would have never got built. So we build two lanes, but we preserve a width for five lanes or four-lane with some turn lanes, and be able to put sidewalks and everything else on there.

So Option B, this is -- ends up being the lowest cost alternative. It basically uses -- and it's the simplest. It uses the existing alignment, so it's the one that's most compatible with what's in the Thoroughfare Plan today, and it makes a direct connection to I-70, which is really where the majority of the traffic is going to go. It's the lowest cost. And what's nice about this one is that it provides an ability for incremental implementation. In

other words, there's some home buyouts, and I know we'll be talking about that a little later, but over the next 10 to 15 years, if a homeowner decided, hey, you know what, it's time for me to move on or sell for whatever reason, the City could -- or the county could very incrementally make improvements as far as widening the road, purchasing properties, making that realignment up to Bull Run, and they could do things in a very incremental way rather than having to wait until you have the full pot of money to make an improvement. And from a traffic standpoint, this -- this works real well.

Option F, this one is kind of a -- the Hail Mary a little bit, so we're going way around. The idea with this is to avoid any impacts that we can. This one ends up being a little bit more expensive and it adds some adverse travel to people that are making that movement and you're going to swing way to the left and then come back. This one would make sense if there was a partnership between the people who own that property and they would like to develop that property, and as part of the development of that property, it partnered with the City and the county to -- to build the road. So this is one that could make sense if an opportunity came up, but it's a big piece to bite off. You would need to build this one, like, all at once. You need to come up with all \$12 to \$13 million dollars to get this one done. It's pretty tough

to -- to put this in without -- in a real phase approach. Other than the Phase 1 and the Phase 2 I talked about earlier, it's hard to do this one incrementally. From a traffic standpoint, this does work.

Option J looks a lot like Option -- the first option that we went through, except we have a little wiggle in the road. And what that allows us to do is to avoid as many of the property impacts. But rather than using existing Grace Lane, because you use that for a local road, you have to build another road which ends up being a little bit redundant. It's a little bit higher cost than the first option and -- and again, a little harder to do. You -- it would

be harder to do in an incremental way. Oops, I missed -- skipped over one here. Oh. And then Option E, I apologize. I must have hit the button twice earlier.

Option E, we were toying with some ideas of again going through the property to the west and tying in with St. Charles Road in kind of an offset. The challenge here is that folks from the south want to get up to 70, so we're requiring then at this -- everybody is going to turn at this intersection at St. Charles Road and relocated Grace Lane, so there's a lot of turning movements, all left turns and right turns. It still works, but it's really not ideal in that it creates this jog in the system which people get confused, and we all know locations like that. And if you're going to spend this kind of money in building the road, you might as well do it in a way that's a little bit more -- that makes a little more sense.

So going through these, we compared all these alternatives in terms of, you know, how flexible are they for implementation, what the cost is, what the travel time route, adverse travel is, how well they work from a traffic standpoint. And when you put all this together, Option B, from a technical standpoint anyway, comes out as the one that -- that makes the most sense as far as low cost and -- and very flexible as far as implementation. It would be a lot easier for the City to bite this off and build this over time rather than, again, have to wait for a big pot of money. In addition, you know, so the soonest we're talking about building is ten years from now, 2028.

If this road got pushed down to 20 years or even later, the traffic volumes on Grace Lane in the affected where those properties are is -- the nature of it is going to change. Traffic volumes are going to grow. When -- I talk to folks all the time that live on very heavily traveled roads and it's not ideal. It's -- they -- people get frustrated because it's not safe, right -- because they're backing out onto a road where people are going fast and there's a lot of traffic and they have a hard time getting out. Again, so if folks at some point decide, you know what, I've had enough, time to go someplace else, it makes it a lot easier for the City than to go and address those personal concerns kind of one at a time,

where with something like Option B, you know, hey, we'll take care of this when we get the pot of money to build everything, but it's not as easy to solve individual concerns as -- as time goes on.

So next steps in the process, again, there's no funding currently for this. As far as I understand, the -- the next real opportunity to look at funding is 2025. What we're here to do is to have CATSO adopt the study, again not necessarily the preferred alternative because by the time you get down the road, that would require -- you're going to want to reevaluate that anyways. The City Council and the Boone County Commission would accept the study again as a planning tool and -- yeah, and then it could be talked with the earliest construction probably like 2028. So I think that's all the presentation I have. I don't know if you have any questions.

MR. MATTHES: Questions of the Committee? Now, to clarify, this is not a public hearing or a vote tonight.

MR. SKOV: That is correct. Although as Mr. Light just suggested, you could take an action to accept the report should you choose to do so. It's not a necessity.

MR. MATTHES: And the public hearing --

MR. SKOV: It's not a public hearing, that's correct.

MR. MATTHES: Portions --

MR. SKOV: Right.

MR. MATTHES: The public hearing portions are envisioned at later stages in the process?

MR. SKOV: Correct. And they would not be here necessarily. It wouldn't be a public hearing at this body.

MR. TEDDY: Things I've learned through social media, acceptance, not necessarily endorsements. In this case it's --

MR. SKOV: Correct.



MR. TEDDY: -- not actually endorsement of any particular alignment, right?

MR. SKOV: Uh-uh.

MR. TEDDY: It's just accepting that a study was done and the study, in fact, does make recommendations, but --

MR. MATTHES: The study is finished and the report is out.

MR. TEDDY: We're not necessarily getting behind the preferred alternative as a group.

MR. ATWILL: What's the consequence of not accepting it?

MR. TEDDY: We're not saying no, either. We're saying a study is done and we're -- we'd be agreeing to accept the study as information that we can use as a resource. Going forward, I think it's the local agencies that deliver the projects that will have to grapple over the alignment issues.

MR. ATWILL: But what do you do once you accept it? I mean, I've seen these before, but, I mean, it's -- there's no funding, so you're not going to take action. I mean, you're not going to accept a specific recommendation whether it's any of the lettered numbers they have given us, right?

MR. MATTHES: That's right.

MR. TEDDY: That's correct.

MR. MATTHES: We're not here to decide anything today.

MR. SKOV: No.

MR. MATTHES: Other than if we want to accept the study or just move on to the next item, right?

MR. ATWILL: I don't understand the meaning of accepting it.

MR. SKOV: It's an acknowledgment that the report was done, as Mr. Teddy said, I believe. It's not an adoption of the study. Obviously, that's not the -- that's not the -- it's not a necessity or it's not a --

MR. ATWILL: So, it would be an acceptance of the fact that they have met their

contractual arrangement to produce a report?

MR. SKOV: That would be one way to -- to look at it, yes.

MR. ATWILL: What's the other way?

MR. SKOV: Well, again, I would say it's an acceptance that the study has been, there's been an engineering alignments options reviewed, and the body is acknowledging that. Again, it's not this body's action or responsibility to take a responsible -- or to take a position on any of the alternatives at this point.

MR. MATTHES: All right. Is there a level of comfort on the part of the Committee to move for receipt of the study? Hearing none, thank you for the presentation.

All right. Okay. Let's -- I hope that was useful.

## VII. PONTENTIAL PONDEROSA MRP REVISION

### Potential Ponderosa MRP Revision

**Attachments:** [Item 7 5-24-18 Ponderosa MRP, Staff Memo](#)  
[CATSO MRP, Nocona, Endeavor Locations](#)  
[Discovery Park N](#)  
[Pages from 18-76 Discovery Park S PD - PD Plan 2018-02-19](#)

MR. MATTHES: The next item is Potential Ponderosa MRP Revision.

MR. SKOV: Yes, Mr. Chair. This is an item which was discussed by the CATSO Technical Committee at their meeting on May 2nd. Specifically, it is concerned with the development of the Discovery Park development, which is on each side of -- on the north and south sides of Discovery Parkway and Gans Road. The -- it's an opportunity to implement an actual major collector street alignment in place of the existing Ponderosa intersection and configuration with Discovery Parkway and Gans Road. There is a new north-south collector street called Nocona Parkway, which has been constructed to Discovery Park North development. Just to give you some context, you -- I think we all know where the area is here. Nocona Parkway is the section of street on the north side of Discovery Parkway, and there's a future collector street called Endeavor, which is

proposed for Discovery Park South. Again, this is just a closeup of the Office Park North development. The alignment here of Nocona is shown. Again, it accesses Ponderosa Street at a roundabout here, and continues to the south and west to another roundabout, at which point it will then -- it intersects with Discovery Parkway. And on the south side of the street, there is proposed development in the mill, Discovery Park South, a planned development here, which includes a street called Endeavor Parkway or Endeavor Street, rather, and that is also being built to a collector standard as was Nocona Parkway.

The proposal here and the opportunity is for an improved intersection at Discovery Parkway. In other words, to replace the interchange further to the northeast here where Ponderosa currently intersects Discovery Parkway, there are stop signs there. This would provide for the opportunity for a signalized interchange and a better spacing from the ramps on U.S. 63-Discovery Parkway interchange. And, again, it's going to be -- it's going to be an improved standard from what was -- is the case for Ponderosa as far as the -- that goes.

The Tech Committee did discuss this at their May 2nd meeting. Again, the -- one thing -- probably the biggest benefit of this is, again, an improved collector street standard for Nocona Parkway and Endeavor, and an improved intersection which is further southwest from the existing intersection and better spacing from the ramps to Discovery and U.S. 63 interchange. So there is a possibility of a future CATSO MRP amendment to implement the addition of this in place of the existing Ponderosa intersection with Discovery Parkway and Gans Road. It would also involve the vacation of some existing Ponderosa streets access to allow for that -- that change. Not all Ponderosa will be vacated, but a portion of it would be left to provide access, but the collector street on the Major Roadway Plan would actually be replaced or the section between the -- between where Ponderosa and Nocona intersect and Endeavor and Ponderosa intersect would be no longer part of the Major Roadway Plan.

And the Tech Committee did believe this was a good idea and the opportunity was there and potentially it would be a good idea. They did pass a motion to recommend that you discuss a potential Major Roadway Plan amendment to add that alignment as a major collector to replace that existing Discovery Parkway-Ponderosa intersection and the portions of Ponderosa that are affected, and to potentially set a public hearing for this in the future.

That's it. Thank you.

MR. MATTHES: If I may, would you back up just a little bit and walk me through the -- yes. That one.

MR. SKOV: This one?

MR. MATTHES: That one.

MR. SKOV: This is the Discovery Park South PD Plan.

MR. MATTHES: So south of the current --

MR. SKOV: South of Discovery Parkway-Gans Road.

MR. MATTHES: And what are -- what's the improvement over the current plan in this?

MR. SKOV: Well, the improvement is that the intersection here is going to be -- the intersection shown here on the plan is actually further from the ramps, and it will be an improved intersection because it allows for a signalized intersection as opposed to just the current one which is sort of stopgap measure done at the time of the Discovery Parkway-63 interchange -- the construction. The existing Ponderosa, of course, had to be moved back further southwest to accommodate the ramps. This takes the intersection further back from the ramps and potentially -- and it's going to be a better intersection. Again, the opportunity is there for signalization as opposed to the current -- the spacing for -- in the current one is not good relative to the ramps.

MR. MATTHES: Highway. Yeah.

MR. SKOV: Yes.

MR. MATTHES: Okay. Other questions of staff? If there is a comfort level, a consensus, is there a motion to direct staff to set a public hearing for a Major Roadway Plan revision? Well, I'll move. I think I get to do that, right? I think we should.

MR. TEDDY: Yes. I'll second.

MR. MATTHES: Second. All in favor, please say yes. Opposed, no.

(Unanimous voice vote for approval.)

MR. MATTHES: Okay. Very good.

## VIII. DRAFT STREET PROJECT COSTS, 2050 LRTP

### Draft Street Project Costs, 2050 LRTP

**Attachments:** [Item 8 5-24-18 DRAFT Street Project Costs](#)

MR. MATTHES: The next item is the Draft Street Project Cost, 2050 Long Range Transportation Plan. I haven't had to say 2050 Long Range Plan yet, so that's -- there we go.

MR. SKOV: Yeah. The -- the length -- the size of the spreadsheets are large enough and broad enough that we attached a link to the report in the agenda packet materials. What it is, is actually a listing of draft street project costs for future Major Roadway Plan improvements for each of the jurisdictions that comprise CATSO; of course, those being Boone County, MoDOT, and the City of Columbia.

There are a number of projects that are currently listed under the Boone County administration. On that spreadsheet, given that the locations are currently in the unincorporated sections of the county, although in some cases, that would change, of course, with future annexation activity. The projects that are included are those primarily for which we have cost estimates that we feel are accurate or at least legitimate in terms there's been some engineering study applied to them, at least on a minimal level. Those -- for example, we do include those that are listed in the City's Capital Improvement Program, and the MoDOT State Transportation Improvement Program, as well as we do

have a number of -- a minimal number of illustrative projects for which some detailed studies have been completed. A prime example of that would be a proposed Scott Boulevard extension-I-70 interchange, which, of course, there was an Access Justification Report done for that and an environmental assessment. There's no funding available for that, that's why we included it as illustrative. The point of this -- this item is to actually solicit comment and input.

I do just have some numbers up here, just FYI, I'll go over real quick, and again this is a very -- this is a preliminary number at this point. But for MoDOT, total estimated capital project costs are in the \$160 million range, maintenance costs, \$53.4 million, total cost of \$170 million, and the estimated revenue is very high, at least relative to the costs, which is \$284 million plus. Now, the reason for that primarily is the fact that most of MoDOT's projects beyond the current four-year scope of the TIP are pavement improvement projects, and there haven't been a large of number of projects identified beyond that four-year scope for -- for implementation. That's what accounts for that large estimated surplus at this point.

Boone County, we show -- we just -- again, this is a -- this is a draft. Total estimated capital project costs, \$37-plus mil, \$92.9 million of maintenance costs, with a total cost of \$130 million, and total estimated revenue is \$131.5, so the surplus is \$1.2. Again, this is not a budget, but this is a demonstration for Federal Highway and the requirements of the transportation planning process that the plan be fiscally constrained. And it does show that the revenue for the proposed projects or potential projects is indeed there. City of Columbia has the largest number of projects, we're presuming. The capital project costs are \$423.5 million. The estimated maintenance costs are quite a bit higher, over \$525 million, total cost of \$948 million, and an estimated revenue of \$973-plus. And the surplus there is nearly \$25 million, but again there's a lot of projects for which we haven't -

- we haven't identified those or have estimates that could be included at this point. Again, as I just mentioned, it is based on the requirement that the list be fiscally constrained.

It's based on projected revenue available over the fiscal year 2018 to 2050 period, minus those maintenance costs and presumed capital project costs.

I don't need to go over those surpluses again, but again I'll mention that MoDOT does have a very large surplus shown, in part because we're unaware of a number of specific additional projects beyond the current four-year TIP scope that -- for which funding has been dedicated. I can think of two, and the other ones are in the category of major projects or major maintenance for minor and major routes on the MoDOT system. So we certainly have opportunity for identifying other, you know, additional projects in each of the jurisdictions should those numbers or projects be available and should CATSO's members of Tech and Coordinating want those to be identified. But again this is a listing, in part, as a demonstration of our fiscal constraint.

And I really would like some comments back from members of the Committee, should you have them, but again there's no action required of you today on this item. Thank you.

MR. MATTHES: This is a -- a 32-year window.

MR. SKOV: Correct.

MR. MATTHES: And we don't have a lot of firm projects out in year 32 at this point, right? But we do have a pretty good grasp of the four years, all three of us, and then we -  
- I know we have a list longer than we can fund now, but -- so that's -- that's basically the gist here, right? You're --

MR. SKOV: Correct.

MR. MATTHES: It's a pretty long planning window, so that makes a lot of sense.

MR. NICHOLS: I notice we have about nine -- some action going on at various stages with at least nine in here, so it's -- it is an active list, so that's something that we were

working toward.

MR. SKOV: It's influx.

MR. MATTHES: If it doesn't change every year, then we're doing something wrong, right?

Any other comments or questions of staff?

MR. TEDDY: I have a question. The maintenance figure, there's an aggregate maintenance figure for the City, for example. Is that the entire City street and road system?

MR. SKOV: Correct. It's an estimated based upon what we have in the budgets now with a 3 percent inflation factor weighed in.

MR. MATTHES: I think that inflation factor is really spot on. That --

MR. SKOV: I think it's relatively -- I think it's the best estimate we can go for at this point.

MR. MATTHES: The years that we've managed to see slightly smaller are definitely made up for by the years that are above, so I think you've got a pretty good estimate with that. Okay. Anything else about that item?

Very good. Not needing a vote, we'll move on to Other Business.

## **IX. OTHER BUSINESS**

MR. MATTHES: Is there other business? Very good. We'll move on to general comments by public members and staff.

## **X. GENERAL COMMENTS BY PUBLIC, MEMBERS AND STAFF**

MR. MATTHES: Is there any comment from the public?

MR. CLARK: My name is John Clark; I live at 403 North Ninth Street. And as you all know, I believe in planning and projecting. I mean, I built a neighborhood association based on the entire notion, Linda Roots and I did, and said, what you attempt to plan for increases the chance you'll get something you're happy with. And when you don't do



that, and you don't fight off the people that say, well, we can't know everything in detail, you just condemn yourself to ad hoc other kind of things. So, my question here and, of course, not to this body, but to the City Council, I encourage them to make the Grace Lane Study an East-Southeast Area Transportation Study. And so, I printed off the first 26 pages, but in listening to the consultant's presentation, apparently they actually did have a larger study area. And in the appendix, which I have not read, there are other kind of things that talked about the intersections that are not in this particular thing, but they felt obliged to think about them. And actually there may have been other kind of things, so my questions is: And I'll ask it to you, might ask the consultant separately -- between the study itself -- not thinking about any recommendations -- and the appendices, which they professionally in part felt that they really had to include, does this come anywhere near being actually kind of what I was looking for, which is a large area East-Southeast, or at least the first step transportation study -- not a plan, but a study. Are there enough things in the materials they presented that if they were kind of taken together and you asked them, which you could just reforecast this and say, now think of it as this whole thing together, that it would -- it would amount to a study that might cover south -- in the east and the southeast.

As I said, I haven't looked at the map and seen how much, because I really liked his presentation, the very beginning, the purpose of such planning. I remember the purpose that they had to follow when they did actually plan the Boone County Northeast Area Transportation Plan was, one -- of course, there was not too much remediation to be done there about things that were old mistakes, but the idea was to lay the foundation so that there would be the least mistakes, the least kind of conflict, the least kind of things that actually got done by not having thought about them in advance. So I guess my question is: Are you clear kind of what I'm asking about, because I could be just talking to myself and in a never never land.

MR. MATTHES: Honestly, I'm not quite sure. Could you try again in maybe two sentences?

MR. CLARK: Okay. Actually, what I had suggested, and I must admit I've suggested this for the west and the southwest. Of course, there we don't have any area plans, but so -- but this is a -- basically a transportation study. Between the things in the appendix, which they carefully said, well, we didn't put that in part of the core of our report because our focus was meant to be on Grace Lane, but they did say some things about impacts and future problems on things that were outside of that Grace Lane right there. If you looked at those and said, well, now, let's just consider it was a larger study, would it add up to being the kind of study that you would -- you would kind of want?

I must admit, one, it could be just a reformatting. The other thing is, since they carefully listed this at ten years out before you're going to build -- because I thought the things I read were really quite useful, and I've never had a problem with CBB except when, basically, they got higher developers in the City Council listen to their report for project by project. Might you consider -- say, suppose they said, yeah, it is close to that, but if we were going to do that larger -- thinking that larger study, we want to fill in these three or four things, does that -- Mr. Matthes, does that answer your question a little bit?

MR. MATTHES: I think so, yes.

MR. TEDDY: Yeah. Are you asking is this a building block, if we wanted to analyze another aspect of that southeast area transportationwise, could we use the data from this study? For example, if we were looking --

MR. CLARK: Well, I'm certain you could use the data. The question is between the study and its appendix, had -- you actually have the data or -- and actually -- or there are more things would have to be looked at to basically cover what might be considered an east-southeast area, both -- this is both in the City and the county.

MR. NICHOLS: Yeah. I think a lot of the counts are very targeted to this corridor, but it

wouldn't take much then to expand that in and take more counts, use the growth analysis, and the development models to expand the study to whatever parameter you think it fits, but it's -- this basic format could be expanded to -- to incorporate a larger area.

MR. CLARK: Well, then I'll actually make a request of this group and, of course, the county and the City are part of it, and say, knowing that you've gotten an introduction to the issues -- that's what this study really did -- and it provided a bunch of baseline data and so forth, and you're kind of thinking there's not going to be construction for ten years. And so you're not -- and, of course, Mr. Atwill is careful about, so what does accepting really mean, and after that was this -- this ten-year thing, I would encourage you to recommend to the City Council, ask for a proposal from CBB about what it would take to kind of expand this study to be that kind of large area transportation study. We have the time. It is my belief that both the City Council, the Boone County Commission, actually, the school district, the regional planning group, and certainly the City Council, would find that useful and we have kind of the time. Looking at this and what was done already gives me great confidence that it would be done well, probably for not a great deal additional expense, and would be really useful to achieve the goals that -- and I can't remember your last name --

MR. LIGHT: Light.

MR. CLARK: Light. -- that Mr. Light has outline before about, well, we're trying to mitigate and deal with some problems that came from the past by not having done this 40 years ago, but also we want to make sure that we can say 20 and 30 years out, by doing this kind of look, we avoided a whole bunch of problems for ourselves as governmental bodies and for actually our citizens by having done this review.

MR. ATWILL: You mentioned the Northeast Study, which is helpful. No question. And I would like to see a study in the south and southwest.

MR. CLARK: Well, so would I.

MR. ATWILL: The only thing that stands between us and all kinds of master plans and transportation studies is money. There is no government problem that can't be solved with the right amount of money.

MR. CLARK: Oh, I agree. Of course, my response to that is and, of course, the Northeast

Area -- the Boone County Northeast Area Transportation Plan mainly funded, I believe, by the county, but with a lot of planning input and so forth with the City. I believe it's already yielded just enormous benefits, frankly, in terms of lower costs for developers who are going to be working in that area and so forth. So I think you have a really good case, though money is tight, to basically say for the City thinking, we've got, you know, our Council savings things and so forth, and even with the county, especially sharing the costs of some of these things, to say the benefits, you might even ask the development community to chip in a part of the cost, not designing it, not commissioning it, but you have examples where many of their representatives have said when we've done this kind of large area study, it actually has saved us tons of money because it means we don't think in certain directions, we don't -- we don't waste our time on some things.

Now I must admit, and I made this presentation to the Council, for the west and southwest, and southwest is built, but our west thing is the need for an area plan which is not the transportation plan, and the Boone County people said they were able to effectively do a Northeast Area Transportation Plan because they had already gone through that process, a joint one between the City and the county, about a whole area plan, and that took and looked at all kinds of factors and had those kind of then as a baseline for that. I -- and so I realized I would encourage to jointly --

MR. MATTHES: In the interest of time, can you wrap up, please?

MR. CLARK: Yes.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you.

MR. CLARK: In answer to Commissioner Atwill's question, I think it saves so much money that it's well worth trying to get the different governmental bodies in the room together and say, I think we -- we could afford to do this and I think we can justify it to our publics. In fact, I think they'll be grateful.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you. Any other questions?

MR. CLARK: Thank you very much. Appreciate the work.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you, John. Are there any other comments or questions from the public? Seeing none.

MR. MATTHES: Are there comments by the members of the Committee?

Staff comments? Oh. Did I miss someone?

MS. CHRISTIAN: Did you want to make a comment? I thought I saw her starting to stand up when you did.

MR. MATTHES: Oh, I'm sorry. I didn't see you behind John. That's all right.

MS. KING: I wasn't -- was it just the one item on the agenda?

MR. MATTHES: We had many items, but go ahead. You can talk about anything you want.

MS. KING: I was interested in -- no. I was interested in the one about the Grace Lane.

MR. MATTHES: Grace Lane. So, we had a presentation on that, but we don't -- we didn't take any action, and it wasn't a --

MS. KING: Okay. Were there any handouts?

MR. MATTHES: We can get you a copy of the presentation.

MS. KING: Okay.

MR. MATTHES: Yeah. Just stay after the meeting and we'll get that to you.

MS. KING: Okay. All right. Thank you.

MR. MATTHES: Yeah. You bet you. Okay. Let me make sure. Yes. One more. This

is the right time to stand up.

MR. SIMONSON: It seems like you guys have heard a lot of comments, so I was just going to give up, but -- I just wanted to make a quick comment and I'll use the study that was done as an example. One of the things I would like CATSO to consider is as you do these kind of studies, to also look at other modes of transportation and how those are affected. This study was specifically to look at how it moves automobiles from the south to the north and north to the south, but didn't take into necessarily a lot of consideration of how people biking or walking across that road would be affected. I can assume that by building one of the suggestions, whether it be B, F, whatever, would definitely improve the ability for automobile traffic to move north-south, south-north; however, it may have a negative consequence for those that live in that neighborhood that Grace Lane passes through, such as their ability to cross over to the neighborhood park that is there on the east side or the ability to cross over Grace Lane to get to the neighborhood church that is on the west side. So, I just ask that that be taken into consideration.

MR. MATTHES: Absolutely. And just for me to confirm, so the -- I know the plan envisions bike lanes and pedways, sidewalks, but you're talking about crossing.

MR. SIMONSON: Yeah. Well, the study says, how will this improve people's ability to travel by car north-south. It doesn't discuss anything about people's ability to travel that road by any other mode of transportation. So it may have a positive effect for all I know, but that wasn't considered. And us being a biking, walking, active transportation city and county, it's just something to consider.

MR. MATTHES: Correct. And it did show our complete streets cross-section.

MR. SIMONSON: It does. It does.

MR. SKOV: Mr. Simonson, would you please identify yourself formally? Thank you.

MR. SIMONSON: I'm not as known as John Clark, I guess. Loren Simonson, 2076 Hillshire.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you. And, ma'am, I'm sorry. I'm -- we get so few public comments, I -- I missed these parts. Could you --

MS. KING: I think my husband would have been here earlier. I -- my name is Mary Jane King, and I live on 5602 St. Charles Road.

MR. MATTHES: Thank you. Thank you very much.

## **XI. NEXT MEETING DATE**

MR. MATTHES: Okay. Is there a next meeting date we could announce?

MR. SKOV: It's Thursday, August 23rd of this year at 2:30 p.m. in the usual location, here in the Council Chamber.

MR. MATTHES: Okay. Very good.

## **XIII. ADJOURNMENT**

MR. MATTHES: All right. We are out of business to conduct, so I'll declare us adjourned. Thank you very much.

(The meeting adjourned at 3:35 p.m.)

Members of the public may attend any open meeting. For requests for accommodations related to disability, please call 573-874-CITY (573-874-2489) or email [CITY@CoMo.gov](mailto:CITY@CoMo.gov). 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.