

PedNet Coalition Position Statement on CATSO 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan

PedNet Coalition asks that CATSO:

1. Take steps to significantly improve its public engagement.
2. Not accept the proposed draft 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan.

Why

- CATSO is a largely unknown decision-making body with very little public engagement, and has not developed this plan around public input.
- The LRTP project list is inconsistent with and would work against the goals of other existing plans that call for increased investment in walking, biking, and transit.
 - Climate Action & Adaptation Plan
 - Vision Zero
 - Strategic Plan
 - Community Health Improvement Plan
 - Columbia Imagined
 - Loop Corridor Plan
- The LRTP project list is inconsistent with and would work against the LRTP's own goals and performance metrics.

2050 LRTP Projects Summary

Total projects cost: \$1.19 billion

- 78% Roadways & Maintenance
 - Primarily highways and large, high-speed roads
 - \$62.5 million (20% of total Roadways & Maintenance costs) is for building new, high-speed roads
- 19% Transit
- 3% Bicycle/Pedestrian

The 2050 LRTP makes heavy philosophical lip service to walking, biking, and transit, but the plan's recommended projects would instead work against these forms of transportation by primarily investing in vehicle travel on high-speed roads.

PedNet strongly advocates that CATSO create a new and fundamentally different LRTP that includes:

1. Extensive public input
2. Mode share goals consistent with those adopted in the Climate Action & Adaptation Plan
3. Project list that prioritizes walking, biking, and transit that will:
 - Achieve the mode share goals
 - Align with the goals of other existing plans
 - Align with the goals of the LRTP itself
4. Design and layout that is easy to read and understandable for the general public

Why (More Detail)

1. Public engagement

- CATSO is a largely unknown decision-making body with very little public engagement.
 - Announcements of CATSO meetings and projects are primarily limited to public notifications (City web and hard copy postings) and a newspaper ad.
- CATSO meetings have little to no public input.
 - Meetings are held at City Hall in the middle of the workday, making them inaccessible to the general population. (PedNet staff are frequently the only people in the audience.)
- The public input process described in the LRTP is from 2013.
 - CATSO did conduct a survey in fall 2018, but the survey results are not described in the 2050 LRTP, nor is there any mention of how the public input informed the development of the LRTP.
- CATSO's existing public engagement process does not include strategies that will gather input representative of the entire community.
 - Staff who conducted the 2018 survey acknowledged that the data are likely to be skewed and are not representative of the general population.
 - CATSO conducts no focus groups or neighborhood-level public input meetings.
 - The only CATSO committee member who represents the public in Columbia is the Mayor, and he does not attend CATSO meetings (likely because they are held during the workday).

2. The LRTP project list is inconsistent with and would work against the goals of other existing plans.

Each of these plans was heavily influenced by public input.

1. [Climate Action & Adaptation Plan](#) (Sustainability)
 - Goal T-1. Reduce travel by car.
 - Goals adopted for percent of trips by 2050:
 - 40% transit
 - 25% walking
 - 20% biking
 - 10% single occupancy vehicle
 - 5% carpool
 - Strategy T-1.5: Shift land use patterns to shorten trips and reduce the need to drive.
2. [Vision Zero](#) (Safety)
 - Goal: Eliminate all traffic deaths and serious injuries by 2030.
 - Principle: Prioritize the safety of the most vulnerable road user (i.e., people walking, biking, underserved populations)

3. [Strategic Plan](#) (Social Equity)
 - Infrastructure Outcome 1. Improve transit ridership
 - Infrastructure Outcome 2. Implement a Complete Streets policy within Focus Neighborhoods
 - Infrastructure Outcome 4. Increase public engagement on infrastructure needs and projects in the neighborhoods
4. [Community Health Improvement Plan](#) (Health)
 - Basic Needs Strategy 1. Increase access to transportation
 - Safe, Healthy, Affordable Housing Goal 1 Objective. Add or improve decision-making processes to include health and equity criteria
5. [Columbia Imagined](#) (Growth)
 - Land Use
 - Goal 3. Encourage density in the city's core
 - Goal 5 Objective. Incentivize mixed and desired uses in key locations
 - Environmental Management
 - Goal 1 Objective: Reduce reliance on private automobiles
 - Goal 4. Connect trails and enhance the non-motorized system.
 - Mobility
 - Goal 1. Columbia is a fully accessible and efficient community for all modes and abilities
 - Goal 2 Objective. Reduce reliance on automobiles as residents' primary transportation mode
 - Goal 3. Columbia will have a comprehensive, interconnected trail and walking/bike path system that allows people to move around the city efficiently by walking, bicycling, or wheelchair
 - Goal 4. Ensure that public transit fits the needs of all people who do or could use it
 - Goal 5. Promote public transportation system expansion with regional considerations
 - Livable and Sustainable Communities
 - Goal 1 Objective. Promote easy access to health care, social services, mental health, and elder care
 - Goal 2. Development standards that encourage compact, contiguous neighborhoods within reach of workplaces
 - Goal 3. The City will become a model community for implementing universal design standards
 - Goal 5 Objective. Plan future developments that are livable and walkable for residents throughout the City
6. [Loop Corridor Plan](#) (Business)
 - Extend the pedestrian environment
 - Improve the bicycle network

3. The LRTP project list is inconsistent with and would work against the LRTP's own goals and performance metrics.

The LRTP project list primarily invests in roadways (especially large, high-speed roads and new roads).

The LRTP goals and performance measures (P. 133-137) emphasize shifting trips from driving to walking, biking, and transit.

- The current LRTP project list will not allow CATSO to achieve these goals.
- The included performance metrics do not establish a baseline or set a measurable target amount.
 - Number of multi-modal trips
 - Number of people walking/biking/riding the bus
 - Reduction in vehicle miles traveled
 - Reduction in automobile ownership
 - Increases in funding for transit and non-motorized travel
 - Increases in number and length of sidewalks, bike infrastructure, and trails
 - Development of a plan and funding for ADA compliance
 - Increase in transit routes, service, ridership
 - Reduction in peak travel motor vehicle volumes
 - Reduction in single-occupant commuter automobile trips
 - Increase in number of multimodal projects
 - Encourage compact and infill development
 - Reduction in the negative environmental impacts of the transportation system
 - Increase the number of walking and biking trips for commuting, shopping, entertainment
 - Expansion of public transit and bike system outside City limits
 - Eliminate traffic deaths and serious injuries by 2030

The LRTP goals and performance measures call for an open, inclusive, and participatory planning process.

- The current LRTP public input process will not allow CATSO to achieve these goals.
 - Support an open, inclusive and participatory transportation planning process
 - Improvement in public satisfaction in transportation projects and improvements
 - Higher levels of citizen input/participation in transportation planning
 - Use of new technologies and other participatory tools and options for planning
 - Identify and address the needs of minority and low-income populations in making transportation decisions
 - Increased numbers of minority and low-income populations participating in the transportation process
 - Improvement in how projects and policies consider/address the needs of minority and low-income people

The 2050 Long-Range Transportation Plan is fundamentally flawed. (Even More Detail)

The plan is inconsistent with public input and other adopted plans. The “public input process” described is from 2013.

The LRTP has not been significantly updated since the 2040 LRTP (adopted in February 2014) to reflect public input or the other public plans adopted in the CATSO region in the last 6 years.

The references are outdated and incorrect.

Many of the statistics and references to other sources are outdated and incorrect because the plan has not been thoroughly updated.

The project list is based on assumptions of extensive suburban sprawl.

The plan uses a low-density housing calculation and assumes that 68% of new housing needs will occur outside current city limits.

There are no data included to support the need for roadway expansion.

There is only a placeholder for the “travel demand model” used; it is not described. The project list is based on assumptions of a need for new roads and roadway expansion which are not justified or supported with data.

The math is wrong.

The MoDOT project list total cost is incorrect and overstated by \$21 million, and the City path/trails total cost is incorrect and overstated by \$450,000. The project list costs are inconsistent between the individual tables and the summary table.

"The 2050 Plan assumes the construction of **new collector and arterial streets** that comprise the MRP network anticipated to be needed as new development proceeds and more **outlying areas** of the MPA are annexed into the City of Columbia. As the population grows, the trend towards **single family homes on large lots** will further the physical spread of the community over a wider geographic area and produce **additional VMT**, the need for more street mileage, and **additional gasoline** consumption." (Page 104)

Notes and Concerns by Page

FAST Act requirements (P. 7-8):

- Performance-based approach, first strategy listed is **safety** ("achieve a significant reduction in traffic fatalities and serious injuries") → project list does not emphasize safety improvements

Travel demand model (P. 9):

- Presumably this does not include **mode share shifts** as called for in CAAP → How can this model be updated to align with the mode share goals?

Land Use Forecast (P. 13):

- Uses projection of 2.6 housing units/acre across all housing types → This is low-density development. How can this model be updated to align with dense, mixed-use development as called for in the CAAP and Columbia Imagined?
- "42,873 housing units will require a total of 16,489 acres... To accommodate population growth through 2050, it is anticipated that an additional 11,165 acres of land presently outside the City limit will be developed over time" → This is suburban sprawl. Assumes **68% of additional housing needs will occur outside current city limits.**

Bicycle Facilities (P.25-28)

- Reference to north-south bike boulevard is outdated
- Reference to bike route map is outdated and link does not work

Safety performance measures (P. 46):

- Only includes MoDOT state-level goals
- Does not include goals for CATSO area
- Does not mention City of Columbia Vision Zero goals

Goals and Objectives (P. 49):

- Lists "public input" as influencing factor as well as other community plans that address transportation

Applicable Land Use and Transportation Plans (P. 50-51):

- Does not include Vision Zero or CAAP
- CoMET reference to long-range transit plan is outdated

Public Input (P. 52):

- This language is not an accurate representation of the actual public input process.
- **Refers to public input process from 2013, not 2018-2019.**
- What Commissions were approached in 2019? What was their input?

VMT (P. 57):

- Says CATSO will start tracking VMT and set goals for reduction after 2015. → This reference is outdated. Did this actually happen? What are the VMT reduction goals? Are they aligned with CAAP goals?

Forecasting Travel Demand (P. 59):

- Includes only a placeholder, **no explanation of methodology used**

Future Roadway Projects (P. 61-69):

- "MoDOT's plans for the expansion of I-70 have highlighted the need for an expanded arterial system to move local traffic" → Why? (Studies referenced are very outdated.)
- Includes no justification for the need for expanded roadways. There are no data included to demonstrate that additional roadways are called for.
- Refers only to widening/expanding roadways, connections to interstates and highways, no traffic calming or narrowing to reduce speeding or improve accessibility for all modes of transportation
- No mention of safety improvements at all
- Walking, biking, transit are not mentioned at all in roadway projects, but instead are addressed entirely separately, as if they do not interact with roadway projects
- Business Loop
 - Refers to outdated 2002 Revitalization Study
 - Does not mention The Loop's 2018 Corridor Plan
 - <http://theloopcomo.com/loop-corridor-plan/>
 - 10-year vision (2018-2028)
 - Includes goals to reduce speeding, consolidate driveways, expand and improve sidewalks and crosswalks for pedestrian access, expand and improve bike lanes, create public gathering spaces

Bicycle & Pedestrian Network Plan (P. 69):

- Refers to "publicly expressed goals and objectives gathered through the public input phase of this plan" → What were these goals and objectives? What was the actual public input process?
- Refers to public demand for walking and biking facilities
- No mention of protected bike lanes
- No Level of Service for walking and biking facilities, or goals to improve LOS
- Network Plan Map color codes entire streets based on "proposed new additions to bicycle and pedestrian network," but does not explain what those necessary additions are (i.e., protected bike lanes? crosswalks? lighting?)
- No detail on "future projects" comparable to roadway projects
- Report overall frequently refers to "accommodating" people walking and biking, not prioritizing these forms of transportation over single occupancy vehicles

Transit Projects (P. 74):

- Includes ridership projections but does not include justification → What mode share is this based on? Is this consistent with CAAP mode share goals?
- Includes projections only to 2040, not 2050
- No detail on "future projects" comparable to roadway projects

NEPA Requirements (P. 75):

- Discussion of "need" for I-70 widening is based on study from 1999
- MoDOT funding proposals for I-70 widening have all been resoundingly defeated by voters
- **No explanation or justification of travel demand model used**

City of Columbia funding (P. 79):

- Does not mention Park Sales Tax used to fund trails and other walking and biking facilities

City of Columbia Special Districts (P. 80):

- Refers to District CID but not Loop CID

Financially Constrained Improvements (P. 83):

- "The CATSO 2050 Transportation Plan places its priorities on investing in long term solutions to existing transportation needs and providing adequate capacity to accommodate future growth" → This doesn't seem to be accurate since it dramatically over-prioritizes roadway projects at the expense of walking, biking, and transit that the public has called for

CATSO Transportation Project Needs (Unconstrained) (P. 87):

- How were the projects determined to be the highest need? How was this list vetted with the public?
- Streets = 89% (\$1.0 billion of \$1.1 billion total)
- Transit = 7% (\$77 million)
 - Assumes no MoDOT or County funding contribution
- Bicycle/Pedestrian = 4% (\$42 million)
 - Assumes no MoDOT or County funding contribution
- Funding proportions are out of line with CAAP mode share goals and will not allow Columbia to achieve this mode shift
- Funding proportions are out of line with Vision Zero goals and existing safety needs (i.e., 18% of fatal/serious injuries receive 4% of the funding)
- Funding proportions are out of line with the public's stated goals (even within CATSO's own "public input" received), and other existing plans
- Street funding amounts **do not include anticipated annual maintenance costs**

- Why is this list unconstrained in light of the previous discussion that being fiscally unconstrained means you will include projects that are unrealistic and unjustified (P. 83)?
- How does this table relate to the 2050 LRTP projects table (P. 95)?

LRTP Projects (P. 88-89):

- "The focus of the CATSO 2050 Transportation Plan is the **continued movement toward a more diverse transportation system that supports the use of walking, bicycling, and buses** as an alternative to the automobile." → This doesn't seem to be accurate.
- "The highest priority is placed on **maintenance and capital preservation** for the existing system. New construction and potential system expansions are funded only if revenue is available." → This doesn't seem to be accurate.
- **The math is wrong.** The project costs sum to \$148,507,509, not \$170,122,509. This is a difference of \$21 million.

MoDOT Projects (P. 89):

- Includes new \$80 million construction project which seems to conflict with discussion that the highest priority is maintenance (but "illustrative" and not included in cost list)

Boone County (P. 90):

- Includes \$4 million new construction project which seems to conflict with discussion that the highest priority is maintenance

City of Columbia Long-Range Projects (P. 91-95):

- Includes two new \$101 million construction projects which seems to conflict with discussion that the highest priority is maintenance (but "illustrative" and not included in cost list)
- Includes four new \$58 million construction projects which seems to conflict with discussion that the highest priority is maintenance (included in cost list)
- "Level of Service Upgrades" (\$76 million) do not explain what that entails → Is this primarily road widening/expansion?
- Does "Level of Service" consider level of service for people walking, biking, riding transit?
- Why do sidewalks not have target years like road projects?
- Chapel Hill Connector trail is duplicated
- Why do trail projects (and probably sidewalks, too) only go out 10 years instead of 30 years like road projects?
- "City of Columbia Plan Status" (P. 95) refers to 25-year planning period instead of 30 years
- **The math is wrong.** The project costs for Shared Use Paths/Greenbelt Trails sum to \$26,405,870, not \$26,855,870. This is a difference of \$450,000.

CATSO 2050 Transportation Plan Projects (P. 95):

- Roadways + Maintenance: 78% (\$931 million of \$1.2 billion total)
- Transit: 19% (\$225 million)
 - Assumes no contribution from County
- Bicycle/Pedestrian: 3% (\$42 million)
 - Assumes no contribution from MoDOT or County
- Includes asterisk that "Roadway projects include pedestrian and bicycle accommodations as part of construction" → **This cannot always be true since MoDOT and Boone County do not have Complete Streets policies**
- Funding proportions are completely out of line with CAAP mode share goals, VZ, public input, and other plans
- **No listed projects** for the \$616 million in "Maintenance" costs.
- **No listed projects** for the \$225 million in Transit costs.
- **Costs are incorrect.**

MoDOT	Table 15	Project List Table A or C	Actual Sum
Roadways	\$170,113,521	\$170,122,509	\$148,507,509
City			
Roadways	\$140,635,144	\$140,635,146	\$140,635,146
Shared Use Paths/Greenbelt Trails	Included in \$42,002,007 Bike/Ped total	\$26,855,870	\$26,405,870

Social Impacts, Quality of Life, and Livability (P. 98):

- Plan repeatedly emphasizes the need for multi-modal transportation, dense development, mixed use, etc.
- But also says "the probability remains that the single occupancy vehicle will remain the overwhelming mode of choice for residents" → Yes, if we keep building what we've been building. Yes.
- Very light consideration of impact on underserved populations, **no discussion of equity anywhere in the plan**

Bicycle & Pedestrian Elements (P. 101-102):

- "The presence of more and better facilities for bicyclists and pedestrians will in theory provide financial benefits for individual households" → Why "in theory"? Why not in fact?
- No mention of economic impact of walking and biking by reducing need for roadway expansion and maintenance by creating mode shift

Transit Element (P. 102-103):

- No discussion of anyone using transit besides people who don't own a car and low-income people

- No mention of economic impact of transit by reducing need for roadway expansion and maintenance by creating mode shift

Energy (P. 104):

- "The 2050 Plan assumes the construction of **new collector and arterial streets** that comprise the MRP network anticipated to be needed as new development proceeds and more **outlying areas** of the MPA are annexed into the City of Columbia. As the population grows, the trend towards **single family homes on large lots** will further the physical spread of the community over a wider geographic area and produce **additional VMT**, the need for more street mileage, and **additional gasoline** consumption."
- Refers to trying to increase trips by walking, biking, and transit, but sets no mode share goals.

Environmental (P. 105):

- No mention of CAAP anywhere in plan.
- No mention of climate change at all; only air pollution, noise, water runoff, and vehicle waste

Bicycle & Pedestrian Network Plan (P. 106):

- "**The 2050 network adds a minimal number of trails** and trail connectors (links between trails and public streets) to the previous network"

Land Use (P. 107):

- No mention of CAAP or Columbia Imagined land use goals

Environmental Justice (P. 109):

- LRTP objective is to include needs of low-income and people of color
- "CATSO will need to... evaluate and improve the CATSO public involvement process to reduce participation barriers and **engage minority and low-income populations** in transportation decisions" → The public engagement plan may be technically compliant, but is not successful in engaging underserved populations

Target Populations (P. 111):

- **7.5% of Columbia households have no vehicle at all**
- **9.6% of Columbians have a disability**

Greatest Transit Needs map (P. 112-113):

- Data used to identify locations of likely transit users is very old (2007-2011); ACS has more recent updated data

Public Involvement (P. 113):

- CATSO policy:
 - <https://www.como.gov/community-development/wp-content/uploads/sites/14/2019/08/CATSO-PPP-August-2019.pdf>
 - "It will make a special effort to notify, inform, involve, and serve groups and **individuals who are traditionally under-served** by transportation investments. Low-income persons, minorities, elderly and disabled persons will be given equality of opportunity to participate in transportation planning. CATSO will give due consideration to access to, and benefit from, transportation improvements and services by low-income, minority, elderly and disabled persons in the plan-making process."
 - "**The public shall be involved in every stage of transportation planning**, from initiation of plans and planning documents, the formulation of goals and strategies, the development of alternatives, to the adoption of a plan or planning document."
 - "All meetings of the Technical Committee and the Coordinating Committee shall be conducted in **convenient and accessible locations and times**, with reasonable accommodation of persons with disabilities" → CATSO meetings are held at City Hall in the middle of the workday. This is not convenient or accessible for the general population, and especially not underserved populations.
- LRTP public engagement requirements:
 - "Solicitation of goals and objectives from stakeholders and interested parties"
 - "Preparation of the draft plan for public review and comment"
 - "CATSO will make every effort to include **public involvement at each stage of this process**, including but not limited to: posting of draft plan products for public review and comment; notices of public meetings; distribution of comment cards; active solicitation of comments from stakeholder groups and public hearings"
- Requirements for development of LRTP:
 - "maximize the safety and mobility of people"
 - "provide for multimodal capacity increases based on regional priorities and needs"

Specialized Transportation (P. 113):

- Reference to Columbia transportation sales tax contribution to transit is outdated (2014)

Trip Reduction Strategies (P. 125):

- Bicycle/pedestrian facilities listed as influencing VMT and mode share by less than 0.1%
→ This does not seem accurate or based on current data.

Safety (P. 127):

- References to Blueprint (2012) and Highway Safety Plan (2013) are outdated

- No mention of Vision Zero anywhere in the plan except in performance measures chart at the end

L RTP Performance Measures (P. 133):

- Goals/objectives do not establish a current baseline or a measurable target goal number
- "Accommodate" walking, biking, transit, not prioritize them as called for the CAAP and other plans
- Objective 4 is about underserved participation → There are no strategies around this
- "Increased number of multi-modal trips" → No quantitative goal for what this should be
- Reduction in VMT → No quantitative goal
- Vision Zero reference only describes enforcement and education, not engineering

Prioritization Criteria (P. 137):

- **None address equity**
- Highest priority/weighting should be given to safety (which also will address equity)

Other things:

- Many typos and formatting errors
- Uses "accidents" instead of "crashes"
- Poorly assembled and difficult to read; not accessible to the public; speaks to the larger issue of lack of engagement with the public

Conclusions:

The overall theme of this plan is heavy philosophical lip service to walking, biking, and transit, but the plan's recommended actions would instead work against these forms of transportation by massively investing in high-speed, high-traffic roads.