

Appendix E
Public Involvement Meeting Summaries



MEETING DOCUMENTATION

DATE: September 19, 2006 **TIME:** 4-7 pm

SUBJECT: East Columbia EIS/Location Study **LOCATION:** Lighthouse Community Church
Pre-location Public Meeting 4275 Highway WW
MoDOT Job J5S0636 Columbia, MO

Project Team Members Attending

Kelly Cox
Holly Dentner
Mike Dusenberg
Kristin Gerber
Eric Schroeter
Gayle Unruh
Kenny Voss
John Glascock
David Nichols
David Mink
Carla Ballard
Greg Knauer
Ron Schikevitz
Christopher Kinzel
Molly Nick
Barry Rolle
Michael DeMent
Mary Jo Draper
Susan Tolleson
Ed Stroesser

Representing (Firm or Agency)

MoDOT District 5
MoDOT District 5
MoDOT District 5
MoDOT District 5
MoDOT District 5
MoDOT District 5
MoDOT District 5
City of Columbia
City of Columbia
Boone County
Burns & McDonnell
Burns & McDonnell
Burns & McDonnell
HDR
HDR
HDR
DOC Communications
DOC Communications
DOC Communications
Communique

Summary

Approximately 168 people attended the East Columbia EIS open-house public meeting from 4 to 7 p.m. Tuesday, Sept. 19, 2006, at the Lighthouse Community Church, 4275 Highway WW, Columbia, MO.

The meeting was held to give the public a chance to learn about – and provide feedback regarding – the East Columbia Environmental Impact Statement. It was publicized through:

- Guest appearance by MoDOT's Mike Dusenberg on radio station KSSZ-FM



MEETING DOCUMENTATION

- A half-page advertisement in the *Columbia Tribune* and *Columbia Missourian*;
- Media releases
- Postcard invitations mailed to approximately 1,850 study area property owners and stakeholders

Participation

- There were 168 individuals who signed guest registers. More than half of those who signed in were not already on the project stakeholder or property owner lists.
- There were 40 comment cards (13 with maps) and eight maps completed. The topic most often addressed was suggestions for an extension of Stadium Boulevard.
- Approximately 25 percent of the comments expressed appreciation for holding the meeting and soliciting public input at this point in the study.
- Overall, the comments were positive toward something happening within the study area. Some attendees said that, although they knew development would mean road construction was inevitable, it is something they will endure rather than welcome.

Comments/feedback about potential transportation solutions

1) Stadium extension to I-70 at St. Charles Road

- Three attendees said that Stadium Drive should be extended northeast to meet up with St. Charles Road, where it should then intersect with Interstate 70.
- One attendee expressed concern with the current safety conditions of St. Charles Road. She believes the curve near the St. Charles Road/Richland Road intersection is too sharp and might require a roundabout.
- Several attendees said an extension from Stadium Drive to St. Charles Road was not a big enough loop to take into account future development needs.

2) Stadium extension to I-70 at Lake of the Woods

- Four attendees suggested extending Stadium Drive northeast so that it connects to Interstate 70 at Lake of the Woods, near the City of Columbia and Boone County line.

3) Stadium extension to I-70 at Route Z

- Thirteen attendees said they would like to see Stadium Drive extended northeast to connect with Interstate 70 at Route Z. Several of these attendees said they would like the new road to go mostly eastward before it turned north into Interstate 70 and Route Z.
- Several comments preferred the Stadium Drive extension to connect with Highway WW at some point, then turn north and connect with Interstate 70 at Route Z.
- A few attendees expressed concern about Highway WW serving as the main connector road with Interstate 70 because of its hilliness and curves. However, five



MEETING DOCUMENTATION

comments suggested widening and straightening it because of its current traffic load and several suggested adding shoulders.

4) Stadium extension across middle of study area

- Five maps showed various suggestions for extending Stadium Drive across the middle to southern part of the study area. Variations on this theme included:
 - Extend Stadium Drive through El Chaparral subdivision to connect it with Highway WW near the South Fork of Grindstone Creek, then connect it with Route Z
 - Extend Stadium Drive in two directions: one road that goes northeast across the study area to connect with Interstate 70 at Route Z, and one road that goes through El Chaparral subdivision and connects with Highway WW near the South Fork of Grindstone Creek, then connects with Route Z
 - Extend Stadium Drive south of El Chaparral subdivision to connect with Highway WW near the South Fork of Grindstone Creek, then connect with Olivet Road (widened to a four-lane) and Route Z
- Two comments suggested that the Stadium Blvd. extension is no longer a viable option for the 2030 projections, but improvements on and widening of Highway WW would be preferred from U.S. Highway 63 to Rangeline Road. One of the comments requested that a new Highway WW bridge be built citing two recent fatalities at that location.
- An attendee also suggested that a major roadway be built going from the Broadway exit on the route that is currently Keene St. and St. Charles Road to Route Z and that Olivet Road become a major north-south connector.

5) New Haven Road to I-70 at Route Z

- Two attendees would like to see New Haven Road widened to Route Z as the main connector for the study area to Interstate 70. One of these also suggested a northern route to Interstate 70 such as widening Richland Road. Congestion at Stadium Drive was one of the reasons New Haven Road was suggested as a major thoroughfare to Interstate 70 and Route Z rather than an extension.

Additional comments, concerns or notes

6) Bicyclists and pedestrians

- Four attendees requested bicycle and pedestrian trails be included in design and construction.

7) City "loop" approach

- Four attendees suggested a highway "loop" approach as has been used in Springfield



MEETING DOCUMENTATION

(James River Freeway/US-60 and US-65), St. Louis (I-270) and Kansas City (I-435). One attendee said this would allow faster traffic flow from one end of Columbia to another and at major highway connections, but would keep the speed lower within city limits.

- One of the attendees points out that this has been somewhat adopted on the west side of Columbia, and should be considered for a New Haven Road/Route Z and Stadium Drive/St. Charles Road loop.

8) Congestion

- Three comments focused on general unhappiness with congestion. One comment specifically named congestion as a problem at the El Chaparral subdivision and Highway WW.

9) Environmental concerns

- A few attendees requested that creeks be kept intact as much as possible. Two attendees asked that as many 100-year-old trees as possible be kept during construction.
- Several said that preserving the rural character of the study area is important to them. They believe that would disappear if a high-speed roadway were constructed without consideration for green space or conservation of trees or creeks. One attendee suggested a parkway type of road rather than a highway type of road.
- One attendee said he lives one mile south of Interstate 70. He commented that the noise from the highway is incredibly loud at times. He requests that noise be considered in the design of any future roadways, and that measures are taken to reduce it.

10) Flooding concerns

- Two comments asked for design and construction to take into consideration floodplains and potential flooding that might be exacerbated by flattening the land for a roadway. They said development has already eliminated a lot of the natural barriers to flooding.

11) Quality of life

- Two attendees said they are concerned about the quality of life in this part of the community with the development, and now improvements and additions of roads. They are concerned about the speeds to be posted and the overall safety and congestion of that area in the future.

12) Rolling Hills Road

- Three comments were focused around concerns about the future of Rolling Hills Road and any improvements that will take place there. They are concerned about whether the traffic will increase as improvements are made.



MEETING DOCUMENTATION

- One attendee, Dr. Robert Myers, executive director of the Jefferson Institute, is developing a \$3 million, 67-acre public education facility south of New Haven Road next to the MU Horse Farm. He is concerned about any improvements that might be done to Rolling Hills Road and its connection to the new Gans Parkway, and their affect on traffic speeds and safety in the vicinity of this facility.

13) Miscellaneous comments/feedback

- Two comments asked why the study area doesn't include the proposed interchange at U.S. Highway 63 and Discovery Ridge (Gans Road).
- One suggestion was made to add a three-way stop at the intersection of Richland Road and St. Charles Road.
- Another comment asked why input from Callaway County wasn't considered in the study and public meeting.
- One attendee, Mr. James Fairchild of 9603 E. Vemer's Ford Road, Columbia, MO 65201, 573-876-1871, Fairchild@usgs.gov, included with his comments a copy of a signed letter of agreement between Billy Sapp and the Harg Neighborhood Association concerning Highway WW and the proposed development of 965 acres of land east of Columbia along Highway WW.

cc: Mike Dusenberg
Kristin Gerber
John Glascock
David Mink
Ron Schikevitz
Greg Knauer
Christopher Kinzel
Michael DeMent
File copy

Authored by: Susan Tolleson
DOC Communications



Public Information Meeting October 24, 2007 Overview and Summary

Overall Meeting Purpose/Expected Outcome

Inform participants of the recommended Reasonable Alternatives that most reasonably meet the project's Purpose and Need, which is to address traffic congestion and safety, connect the major highways between Eastern Boone County and Columbia and improve access to Eastern Columbia. Furthermore, the meeting was held to illustrate how the stakeholder's earlier feedback helped shape the recommendations and seek additional comments on the four recommended Reasonable Alternatives.

Date, Time and Location

Wednesday, October 24th, Elk's Lodge (4747 E. Elk Park Drive) - 4:00 p.m. to 7:00 p.m.

Meeting Attendance and Format

Two-hundred and eleven (211) people attended the open-house public information meeting. Participants entered the Elk's Lodge main entrance and were greeted with the first station of the public meeting. At this station participants signed-in and received a hand out, comment form and newsletter (if they had not received one in the mail). They then proceeded into the exhibit area, a separate room, which presented the exhibits in a clockwise chronological manner around the room. The first station in the room was Station #2, which discussed the initial nine conceptual alternatives. Station #3 followed, which described the Purpose and Need evaluation process and matrix. Then participants progressed onto Station #4, which identified the four recommended Reasonable Alternatives. Each of the four recommended alternatives were displayed on separate exhibit boards, each displaying a potential corridor superimposed on top of an aerial background of the study area. The participants ended the open-house at Station #5, a comment area complete with one table for oral comments and three tables for written comments. Following this station was a refreshment area available for participants with cookies and self serve water and coffee.



Public Information Meeting October 24, 2007 Overview and Summary

Pre-Meeting Publicity

- Newspaper ads in the Columbia Missourian (7,400 daily circulation) and the Columbia Daily Tribune (18,179 Monday - Saturday circulation) - printed October 17
- News releases were sent to area media by MoDOT (October 4), with follow-up calls made the day before and the day of the meeting, which resulted in stories printed in the Missourian and the Columbia Tribune (*dates*)
- Newsletter mailing to approximately 1,850 individuals, which identified the upcoming public meeting (October 2)
- E-mail sent to nearly 300 people inviting them to attend the public meeting (October 4)
- Radio interview with KFRU 1400 AM (October 23) and KOPN 89.5 FM (October 22)

Meeting Exhibits

A total of 25 exhibits were created for display purposes at the meeting. The following is a list of the stations and the boards presented at each.

Station #1: Welcome/Introduction

- (1) Welcome/Sign-In board
- (2) Project Overview
- (3) What is the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA)?
- (4) EIS Process and Schedule
- (5) Meeting Purpose

Station #2: Conceptual Alternatives

- (6) Station Sign
- (7) Summary of Conceptual Alternatives
- (8) How Alternatives are Developed and Evaluated

Station #3: Evaluation Criteria

- (9) Station Sign
- (10) Major Elements of the East Columbia - EIS Purpose & Need
- (11) Evaluation Criteria: Traffic and Safety
- (12) Evaluation Criteria: Major Highway Linkages



Public Information Meeting October 24, 2007 Overview and Summary

- (13) Evaluation Criteria: Access to East Columbia
- (14) Evaluation Results (Matrix)
- (15) Evaluation Results

Station #4: Recommended Reasonable Alternatives

- (16) Station Sign
- (17) Highlights of the Reasonable Alternatives
- (18) St. Charles Road and Reasonable Alternatives SC-1 and SC-2
- (19) Potential Roadway Types
- (20) Reasonable Alternative SC-1
- (21) Reasonable Alternative SC-2
- (22) Reasonable Alternative RR-1
- (23) Reasonable Alternative RR-2

Station #5: Public Comments

- (24) Station Sign
- (25) How to Stay Involved

Meeting Handouts

- Welcome/Frequently Asked Questions
- Recommended Reasonable Alternatives/Evaluation Matrix
- Comment Form
- Newsletter (if did not receive in the mail)

Study Team Participants

Mike Dusenberg, MoDOT
Kristin Gerber, MoDOT
Holly Dentner, MoDOT
Matt Burcham, MoDOT
Roger Schwartz, MoDOT
John Glascock, City of Columbia
David Nichols, City of Columbia
Dave Mink, Boone County
Thad Yonke, Boone County
Buddy Desai, CH2M HILL
Rob Miller, CH2M HILL



Public Information Meeting October 24, 2007 Overview and Summary

Kevin Nichols, CH2M HILL
Brian Sides, CH2M HILL
Molly Salmieri, CH2M HILL

Meeting Summary

As the 211 members of the public moved from display to display, they shared their comments and questions with the study team, who helped explain the concepts. The audience was encouraged to fill out comments to provide a written record of their input.

The following is a summary of comments submitted at the public meeting:

Question 1 - Please share your thoughts on the evaluation criteria developed for the project.

Question 1 received 21 positive comments, 4 negative comments; 14 respondents expressed no comment. Negative comments expressed concern with the length of time it took to develop the criteria and the failure to include the residents and cost in the criteria. Another 23 comments expressed general concerns and opinions about the project overall. These ranged from identifying the preferred alternative from the four recommended Reasonable Alternatives and the reminder for the project team to take into consideration the cost and environmental impacts in the study.

Question 2 - What, if any, additional criteria should be considered by the study team?

Thirty comments were made in response to Question 2 directly, 19 had no opinion, and an additional 14 comments again expressed general opinions on the project. Of the 30 comments, 4 stated they would not have considered any additional criteria, whereby 26 indicated criteria which should have been considered. The additional criteria suggested focused on traffic, disturbance and impact of homes and businesses, and cost.

Question 3 - Please comment on how well the recommended Reasonable Alternatives presented tonight meet the project's need.

Question 3 received 17 positive comments, 6 negative comments, 14 had no comment, and another 26 made general comments about the project. Positive comments stated all the alternatives met the project's needs. Negative comments



Public Information Meeting October 24, 2007 Overview and Summary

focused on the inadequacies of the alternatives meeting the needs of the homeowners as well as potential cost and displacement of homes. General responses to this question focused on preferred alternative suggestions and other area roadway improvements.

Question 4 - What other alternatives, if any, should be considered by the study team and why?

Forty written comments were submitted at the meeting regarding Question 4. Of those, 9 thought no other alternatives should be considered, 1 was unsure, and 24 suggested variations to the existing recommended Reasonable Alternatives or a completely new alternative. Suggested new alternatives included creating a large loop around the city from Stadium to Route Z, and altering Route 740 at 63 east to Rangeline and Z. Roadway improvements expressed were the expansion of New Haven, Rolling Hills and Ballenger Lane. An additional 6 comments referenced general opinions about the alternatives, focusing on cost considerations and the urgency to move forward with the project in an efficient manner.

Three additional written comments were received at the public meeting, not submitted on a comment form. One respondent shared the opinions of the Shepard Hills Improvement Association, suggesting that moving traffic from Route 740 to I-70 would be the most beneficial route. The other respondents identified a preferred route.

Comment Summary

Comments included 63 comment forms submitted at the meeting (30 percent of those attending), and 16 comment forms received by mail before the comment period 10-day deadline of November 7th. Additionally, three individual comments were submitted, in letter format, at the meeting and two more were mailed in before the deadline. Only one oral comment was submitted at the meeting, but the audio recording was not decipherable. During the 10-day comment period after the meeting, two emailed comments were received. This adds up to a total of 87 comments submitted at, or within two weeks of, the public meeting.

Of those who expressed a preference for any of the alternatives, more people (23, approximately 26 percent) preferred RR-2 over any other alternative. SC-2 was the second-most preferred (14 respondents) alternative. Several respondents (4)



Public Information Meeting October 24, 2007 Overview and Summary

indicated a desire to make NH-1 or NH-2 a recommended Reasonable Alternative. Of the 79 submitted comment forms, 28 respondents (35 percent) commented positively on the evaluation criteria for the project. Positive comments included: “good,” “adequate,” and “logical” and “encompassing.” Only 6 (less than 8 percent) respondents commented negatively on the evaluation criteria, citing a failure to include the public and cost of each alternative. Several respondents suggested additional criteria to be evaluated, including property impacts (10), cost of the project (8), as well as traffic and environmental concerns.

Of the comment forms submitted, approximately 25 percent expressed satisfaction that the recommended Reasonable Alternatives met the project’s needs. Other alternatives to be considered, as suggested by respondents, were to create a larger loop around the City of Columbia, improve existing roads and construct extensions of Richland Rd., Ballenger Lane or New Haven Rd. in various ways within the study area. The same comment was submitted at the meeting and received in the mail from the Shepard Hills Improvement Association, indicating the best alternative will move traffic away from US 63 and make use of all existing roads and interchanges. The other individually submitted comments expressed a preference for one of the Reasonable Alternatives and are included in earlier estimates.

Comments emailed during the 10-day comment period were sent by the City Councilwoman representing Ward 6 and the Boone County Fire Protection District. The Councilwoman indicated none of the Reasonable Alternatives are acceptable, and instead are destructive to the environment and will be costly. As a suggestion or an amendment to the four alternatives, the Councilwoman suggested widening New Haven Rd and Rangeline. The Fire Protection District specifically expressed concerns with emergency access and movement of vehicles during and after improvements in relation to Stations 12 and 1 located within the study area. Overall, comments were positive about the meeting, its content and interaction with the study team.

Post Meeting Follow-up

Several members of the local media requested copies of the material presented at the public meeting. All material related to the public meeting was made available on the project website the day after the meeting, Thursday, October 25,



Public Information Meeting October 24, 2007 Overview and Summary

2007. CH2M HILL staff retained the exhibits from the public meeting to use at future meetings and presentations.



Public Meeting 2 10/24/07 Comment Summary

Mailed Comment Forms

Question 1: Please share your thoughts on the evaluation criteria developed for the project.

Responses	Positive Comments
1	Good criteria
1	OK
1	Criteria was logical and encompassing.
1	Fair
2	Adequate criteria
1	Satisfactory evaluation
Responses	Negative Comments
1	Do not think you are including future growth of Richland Rd - which has already been mostly developed.
Responses	Other Comments
5	No Comment
1	The people (staff) at the public meeting were very helpful.
1	Only one combines: A) Best use of existing roads and interchanges B) Pushes as much traffic further east.
1	I believe the widening and realignment of WW/Broadway is very important due to the traffic that Old Hawthorne and other East Columbia projects will develop.
16	Total Responses

Question 2: What, if any, additional criteria should be considered by the study team?

Responses	Comments
2	None
3	All OK
1	Least number of interchanges on I-70, and reduce traffic volume to far east of I-70/USGS area
1	No additional, just focus on homes/property that will be impacted and our needs 10-20 years from now.
1	Total cost, and long-term needs of east Columbia!
Responses	Other Comments
2	No Comment
1	RR-2 was best of the four.
1	The Rolling Hills Road extension is important to provide efficient north/south traffic flow in connection to the other improvements.
1	Widening of the road to include additional shoulder and bike lane. Remove the junk yard.
1	Straighten WW from Keene to El Chaparral even though you need new right-of-way.
1	WW all the way to Rangeline Rd and then connect to I-70 from Rangeline Rd
1	Impact on Grindstone Creek should be minimal - environmentally sensitive area. Could be used for a future park.
16	Total Responses

Question 3: Please comment on how well the recommended Reasonable Alternatives presented tonight meet the project's needs.

Responses	Positive Comments
1	OK
1	Any of the four reasonable alternatives should work in meeting the needs. Prefer the two reasonable alternatives that connect the Lake of the Woods exit.
1	Rather well. Strongly believe RR-2 is the best fit! It meets Columbia's needs.
Responses	Negative Comments

Responses	Other Comments
1	No Comment
1	RR-2 is the best, most comprehensive choice.
1	Favor RR-2, extension of Ballenger Lane should not be an alternate, it should be project requirement. Bike/ped movement is very important component of transportation.
3	We feel that Alternative RR-1 or RR-2 fit the criteria and practical long range needs of the area and Columbia as a whole.
1	Alternative RR-1 or RR-2 are the best options.
1	SC-2 is the best. Improve day-to-day rush hour and out-of-town traffic. Route Z options would miss a lot of local rush hour traffic. SC options would accomplish more for half the cost.
1	SC-2 appears to be the best alternative if the Lemone extension can be moved to the east to minimize damage to the creek.
1	SC-1 & 2 do fine with getting stadium connected - this must be done. RR-1 & 2 are way too short sighted to use money on.
1	NH-2 was most needed and RR-2 was second choice. SC-1 and SC-2 does not meet the goals.
1	Still think using WW would be best choice.
1	Remove curves - dangerous road, especially at the bridge.
16	Total Responses

Question 4: What other alternatives, if any, should be considered by the study team and why?	
Responses	Comments
1	None
1	Extension of Rolling Hills Rd to Richland Rd should be completed ASAP.
1	A six-part plan revision of RR-2 - extend Stadium Blvd, move east of St. Charles Rd., eliminate St. Charles Rd/Richland Rd. intersection, stop Ballenger at St. Charles, bring St. Charles across itself and connect to Ballenger Lane.
1	WW
1	Use SC-1 or 2, then extend WW to Rangeline Rd to the east and improve Rangeline Rd to Route Z, exit at I-70.
Responses	Other Comments
9	No Comment
1	The public meetings are good!
1	With some small changes
16	Total Responses

Individual Mailed Comments

Responses	Other Comments
1	The Shepard Hills Improvement Association believes the most beneficial route should consider moving traffic from the terminus from State Route 740 to I-70 expeditiously and away from US 63, and make use of all existing roads and interchanges.
1	Criteria guidelines and standards are too broad, none of the Reasonable Alternatives will accomplish the needs for the area, none of the alternatives are long range when considering future growth patterns, extension of Stadium Blvd to the east would be beneficial, and NH-1 and NH-2 are far better alternatives than any of the recommended alternatives. Looking further to the future, a loop connecting Airport Rd via Rangeline Rd to I-70 could provide better access.
2	Total Responses

E-mailed Comments

Responses	Comments
1	None of the 4 alternatives are acceptable. All four appear to be the destructive of the natural environment and more expensive. Widening New Haven Rd and Rangeline appears less destructive of the environment and less expensive. Do not remember requirement about connecting Stadium Blvd with I-70, thought this was a study to come up with the best route to direct traffic eastward and at some point connect with I-70. The four reasonable alternatives seem to be pre-determined narrow 'choices'.
1	The Boone County Fire Protection District requests, during and after improvements, please insure the ability to move emergency equipment onto and through the Route WW corridor due to the location of Station 12. Please insure Station 1 continues to have emergency access to I-70 from the Lake of the Woods interchange. From an emergency service standpoint in the area, alternative SC-1 or SC-2 would be the most beneficial. Extension of Stadium Blvd to the Lake of the Woods interchange will facilitate and enhance the movement of emergency equipment from Station 12 and 1 by avoiding the loss of critical time moving through the I-70/US 63 connector.
2	Total Responses

Totals (Summary)	
16	<i>Mailed Comment Forms</i>
2	<i>Individual mailed comments</i>
2	<i>Emailed comments</i>
20	Total comments received after the October 24th public meeting



Drop-In Center January 8, 2008 Overview and Summary

Overall Purpose/Expected Outcome

The purpose of the Drop-In Center was to seek public input on more detailed roadway alignments that were developed since proposed transportation improvements for East Columbia were presented to the public in October at the Public Information Meeting (October 24, 2007).

Date, Time and Location

Tuesday, January 8th, Boone County Government Center (801 E. Walnut) – 4:00 to 6:00 p.m.

Meeting Attendance and Format

Ninety-eight people attended the open-house Drop-In Center. Participants entered the Boone County Government Center's main entrance and were greeted by EC-EIS Study team members at a sign-in table. Participants received a hand-out and comment form, then proceeded into the exhibit area, County Commission Chambers, which presented the exhibits in a clockwise chronological manner around the room. No specific stations were identified, as this was a Drop-In Center and intended to be an informal way for the public to simply review the proposals and comment. Each of the six recommended Reasonable Alternatives was displayed on separate exhibit boards, displaying a potential alignment superimposed on top of an aerial background of the study area. After reviewing the exhibits, a comment area was provided for the public to submit written comments. A refreshment area (cookies and lemonade) was also available for participants.

Pre-Meeting Publicity

- News releases were originally sent to area media by MoDOT (December 5). Due to inclement weather a cancellation news release was sent again by MoDOT on December 10th. A final news release was sent on December 27th identifying the rescheduled Drop-In Center date.
- Initial postcard mailing (mailed November 30) to approximately 1,970 individuals and property owners, which identified the Drop-In Center's original date. Another postcard mailing (mailed December 22) to the same mailing list, which notified the public of the rescheduled date for the Drop-In Center.



Drop-In Center January 8, 2008 Overview and Summary

- E-mail sent to nearly 340 people inviting them to attend the initial Drop-In Center (December 7), an e-mail sent December 10th to announce the cancellation due to weather, and a follow-up email sent on December 27th notifying interested stakeholders of the rescheduled date for the Drop-In Center.

Meeting Exhibits

A total of 11 exhibits were displayed. The following is a list of the exhibits.

- Welcome/Introduction
- Project overview
- What are the emerging alternatives?
 - Reasonable Alternative SC-2-A
 - Reasonable Alternative SC-2-B
 - Reasonable Alternative SC-2-C
 - Reasonable Alternative RR-2-A
 - Reasonable Alternative RR-2-B
 - Reasonable Alternative on Route WW (WWA, WWB, WWC)
- What is next in the East Columbia - EIS Study?
- How to stay involved

Meeting Handouts

- Welcome/Frequently Asked Questions
- Comment Form

Study Team Participants

Mike Dusenbergh, MoDOT
Kristin Gerber, MoDOT
Matt Burcham, MoDOT
John Glascock, City of Columbia
David Nichols, City of Columbia
Dave Mink, Boone County
Thad Yonke, Boone County
Buddy Desai, CH2M HILL
Rob Miller, CH2M HILL
Brian Sides, CH2M HILL



Drop-In Center January 8, 2008 Overview and Summary

Britt Marron, CH2M HILL

Meeting Summary

As the 98 members of the public moved from exhibit to exhibit, they shared their comments and questions with the study team, who helped explain the recommended Reasonable Alternatives. The audience was encouraged to provide a written record of their input on the comment forms.

The following is a summary of comments submitted at the public meeting:

Question 1 - Please share your thoughts on the more detailed recommended Reasonable Alternatives.

Question 1 received 15 positive comments, two negative comments, and four respondents expressed general concerns and opinions. Of the positive comments, seven expressed a preference for RR-2-B, six preferred RR-2-A, and SC-2-A and SC-2-C each received one preferred vote. Negative comments expressed concern with RR-2-B and the noise existing homes will possibly experience with the construction of this alternative. These general concerns and comments ranged from identifying variations to the Reasonable Alternatives to specific suggestion how to address problems on existing roadways.

Question 2 - Please identify, if any, additional environmental issues (such as wildlife habitat or archaeological resources) that may need further attention in the analysis of the emerging alternatives.

Fourteen comments were made in response to Question 2 directly, three identified potential issues, and an additional 11 comments again expressed general opinions on the project. The three potential issues identified were the drainage (issues? Potential problems?) near Grindstone Creek and Richland Road, the potential for Indian mounds in creek area near Olivet Road, and the possibility that a farm on Rustic Road may be now or in the future listed on the Federal Historic Register. The general responses to this question focused on roadway improvements, creek protection, and the possible negative impact the alternatives could have on the natural environment.

Question 3 - What additional comments/concerns do you have, if any, that the project team should consider on the East Columbia - EIS study.

Question 3 received one negative comment and 10 general comments; 10 respondents had no comment. The negative comment expressed concern with the cost of an additional road. The 10 general comments ranged from opposition to the Lake of the



Drop-In Center January 8, 2008 Overview and Summary

Woods alternatives to expressing a preference to return to the alternatives associated with New Haven Road and Rangeline Road.

One additional written comment was received at the public meeting, not submitted on a comment form. The focus of this comment was for the project team to consider the development of viable neighborhoods in East Columbia. The comment letter also proposed revisions to the recommended Reasonable Alternatives.

Comment Summary

Comments included 21 comment forms submitted at the meeting (21 percent of those attending), and two comment forms received by mail before the 7-day comment period deadline of January 15th. Additionally, one individual comment was submitted, in letter format, at the Drop-In Center. During the 7-day comment period after the meeting, six emailed comments were received. This made a total of 30 comments submitted at, or within one week of, the public meeting.

Of those who expressed a preference for any of the alternatives, more people (11, approximately 37 percent of those who commented) preferred RR-2-B over any other alternative. RR-2-A was the second-most preferred (six respondents) alternative. Alternative SC-2-A, SC-2-B and SC-2-C each received a vote for preference from a respondent. Of the 24 submitted comment forms, 17 respondents (nearly 71 percent) commented positively on the detailed recommended Reasonable Alternatives. Positive comments focused on the respondents preferred alternative. Only two (less than nine percent) respondents commented negatively on the Reasonable Alternatives, citing disapproval for RR-2-B because of the farmland it will take and the noise it will create. Several respondents suggested additional variations to the alternatives, including geometric adjustments and avoidance of creeks.

Of the comment forms submitted, three respondents identified additional environmental issues within the study area that may need further attention. Most respondents (almost 40 percent) submitted no comment to the second question on the comment form. Several respondents used this question to express further thoughts and opinions on each of the recommended Reasonable Alternatives, as well as items to be addressed within the study area related to East Columbia.

Those respondents who replied to the third question on the comment form generally expressed various factors to consider in the future design of any roadway in the East



Drop-In Center January 8, 2008 Overview and Summary

Columbia area. Again, most respondents (50 percent) submitted no comment to the third question.

Comments emailed during the seven-day comment period offered further suggestions for a preferred alternative. Specifically, two of the six emailed comments, stated a preference for RR-2-B. Other comments ranged from acknowledging the impacts of a new high school in proximity to the study area and its potential impacts to the importance of staying west of the Grindstone Creek.

Overall, comments were positive about the meeting, its content and interaction with the study team.

Post Meeting Follow-up

All materials related to the Drop-In Center were made available on the project website Friday, December 7, 2007, prior to the first scheduled Drop-In Center date, and will remain on the website until the conclusion of the project. CH2M HILL staff retained the exhibits from the public meeting to use at future meetings and presentations.



**Drop-In Center
January 8, 2008
Comment Summary**

Comment Forms Submitted at Public Meeting

Question 1: Please share your thoughts on the more detailed recommended Reasonable Alternatives.

Responses	Positive Comments
RR-2-B	
1	RR-2-B seems the least disruptive for home owners & most forward thinking for an additional artery for East Columbia.
1	RR-2-B least impact to existing developments and solves future problems the best.
1	RR-2-B is preferred, it solves the problems for a longer time.
1	RR-2-B looks great. Helps current traffic situation and looks ahead to future growth. Also, fewer displacements.
1	RR-2-B displace the fewest number of people, but don't like the idea of eliminating trees and farmland - reserve woods for natural areas.
1	Like RR-2-B and the WW-B alternative - less disruption for people.
1	RR-2-B most reasonable. Displaces the fewest homes but still links up with the Route Z interstate connection.
RR-2-A	
3	RR-2-A would be the best choice. If use an existing road the cost will be lower.
1	RR-2-A most viable alternative given the long-term timeline.
1	Prefer RR-2-A
1	RR-2-A is appropriate because it uses an existing road without much disruption. Serves traffic needs.
SC-2-A	
1	Prefer SC-2-A
SC-2-C	
1	Prefer SC-2-C
Responses	Negative Comments
RR-2-B	
1	RR-2-B is a poor idea - running a new road through farmland (a threatened commodity in rural Boone County) is contradicted!
1	RR-2-B comes too close to Old Hawthorne and would provide too much noise to residents and golfers.
Responses	Other Comments
0	No Comment
1	Follow current Route WW. Do not agree with extension of Ballenger over I-70. Should utilize Rolling Hills.
1	Make road cut to lower hill by American Legion
1	Prefer shortest way from 740 to LOW interchange - no bridges to build over the creek.
1	Have 740 Extension cross on east side of creek, take 740 Extension to LOW exit, and leave A-1 Auto Salvage alone.
21	Total Responses

Question 2: Please identify, if any, additional environmental issues (such as wildlife habitat or archaeological resources) that may need further attention in the analysis of the emerging alternatives.

Responses	Comments
7	No comment
1	Drainage near Grindstone Creek and Richland Road
1	Farm on Rustic Road that may be now or in the future on the Federal Historic Register.
1	Investigate Indian Mounds in low creek area near Olivet Road.
Responses	Other Comments
1	RR-2-B would create an additional crossing hazard for wildlife (and autos). Richland Road might be the best option.
1	Too many trees would come with plan RR-2-A and a lot of these currently surround residential properties.
1	Need more public input from City Council and County Commission. RR-2-C or RR-2-A seem the most reasonable.
1	Clean up junkyard with Broadway/WW
1	Minimize the loss of trees and natural areas.
1	Crosses North Creek twice - silly.
1	Cross the creek once and forest removal.
1	Protect creeks and non-motorized transportation. Should be part of comprehensive land use plan.
1	RR-2-A less effects on the creek and help save as many trees as possible.
1	Streams and trees
1	RR-2-B would negatively impact natural habitats.
21	Total Responses

Question 3: What additional comments/concerns do you have, if any, that the project team should consider on the East Columbia-EIS study?	
Responses	Positive Comments
0	
Responses	Negative Comments
1	An entirely new/additional road would cost additional money to maintain - snow removal. Cannot guess whether Z or LOW is the better place for exit.
Responses	Other Comments
10	No Comment
1	Totally opposed to Lake of the Woods alternatives.
1	Prefer open house to be held at the Elk's Lodge.
1	If RR-2-B is not done, then do SC-2-C, not SC-2-A or SC-2-B. Have no problems with access to 63 or 70.
1	Like alternatives that cross east of the creek, like Alternative that goes behind properties along Richland Road, good job!
1	Should go back and consider using Gans Road or New Haven and Rangeline to serve future needs - better for environment.
1	Build the road as soon as possible.
1	St. Charles version will cram an awful lot of major roads around the LOW south subdivision.
1	Environmental considerations should have been weighted more heavily were alternatives were narrowed down to 4.
1	Consider the future.
1	Make a road that goes where people can use it.
21	Total Responses

Individually Submitted Comments	
Responses	Comments
1	Please consider the development of viable neighborhoods. Distinctive characteristics that make a neighborhood walkable are: size, boundaries, open spaces institution sites, internal street system and diversified housing stock. That said, with the plan to improve Highway WW west of Rolling Hills should be abandoned. Also, provide supplementary access from developing residential areas. An alternative should be considered to the proposed extension of Stadium to Richland Road to preserve neighborhoods.
1	Total Responses

Orally Submitted Comments	
Responses	Comments
0	Total Responses

Totals (Summary)	
21	<i>Written comment forms submitted</i>
1	<i>Individual comments submitted</i>
0	<i>Oral comment submitted</i>
22	Total comments received at the January 8th Drop-In Center



MEETING DOCUMENTATION

DATE:	November 15, 2006	TIME:	4-7 pm
SUBJECT:	East Columbia EIS/Location Study Range of Alternatives Public Meeting MoDOT Job J5S0636	LOCATION:	New Elks Lodge 4747 East Elks Dr. Columbia, MO

Project Team Members Attending

Mike Dusenberg
Kristin Gerber
Roger Schwartz
Kelly Cox
Gayle Unruh
John Glascock
David Nichols
David Mink
Greg Knauer
Ron Schikevitz
Christopher Kinzel
Molly Nick
Cara Dewey
Susan Tolleson

Representing (Firm or Agency)

MoDOT District 5
MoDOT District 5
MoDOT District 5
MoDOT
MoDOT
City of Columbia
City of Columbia
Boone County
Burns & McDonnell
Burns & McDonnell
HDR
HDR
HNTB
HNTB

Summary

Approximately 155 people attended the East Columbia EIS open-house public meeting from 4 to 7 p.m. Wednesday, Nov. 15, 2006, at the New Elks Lodge, 4747 East Elks Dr., Columbia, MO.

The meeting was held to give the public the opportunity to learn about – and provide feedback regarding – nine potential transportation alternatives for the East Columbia Environmental Impact Statement. It was publicized through:

- Guest appearances by MoDOT's Mike Dusenberg on radio stations KSSZ 93.9FM, KBIA 91.3FM, and KFRU 1400AM
- A half-page advertisement in the *Columbia Tribune* and *Columbia Missourian*
- Media releases
- Postcard invitations mailed to approximately 1,850 study area property owners and stakeholders

Participation

- There were 155 individuals who signed guest registers. Almost half of those who signed in were already on the project stakeholder or property owner lists.
- Thirty-nine comment cards and two emails were received. The public was given 1 week following the meeting in which to send in their comment cards for inclusion in the meeting record.



MEETING DOCUMENTATION

- The topics most often addressed in the comment cards were 1) support for widening Route WW, 2) identifying a solution that would alleviate congestion at Highway 63 and Interstate 70, and 3) a desire that the recommended solution would anticipate and address growth so that future needs are adequately met for the long-term, not just the short-term.
- Alternative F1 was supported by the most attendees; Alternatives C and E2 also were favored. Attendees expressed support for F1 because it appears to address congestion issues at the Highway 63/Interstate 70 interchange, and because it addresses the needs of those who live north of Interstate 70.
- Overall, comments were positive about the meeting, its content, and interaction with MoDOT and the project team.

Comments about specific alternatives

1) Alternative A: Realign and widen Route WW

- Most attendees agreed with widening WW regardless of what else happens.
- Half of respondents said that, although improvements to Route WW are needed, they would not be enough to relieve congestion and solve traffic issues, particularly as they relate to the Highway 63/I-70 interchange and to the intersection of Route WW and Rangeline Road.
- The Boone County Fire District is concerned that construction during the widening of Route WW would affect operations at Station 12 (at Highway WW and El Chaparral Avenue).

2) Alternative B: Realign and widen Route WW; Extend Stadium Boulevard to Route WW

- Twelve comment cards opposed this alternative, while eight expressed support for it. Most commented that this dumps more traffic onto Route WW and does not help alleviate traffic concerns at the Highway 63/I-70 interchange.
- Several attendees said this is a good short-term solution, but is not an adequate long-term one.
- One person pointed out this could be an inexpensive solution since property acquisition costs would be low with relatively little development along that segment.
- One attendee suggested moving the extension connection further to the west to avoid two stream crossings.

3) Alternative C: Realign and widen Route WW; Extend Stadium Boulevard to Lake of the Woods Interchange

- Sixteen comment cards supported this alternative, although most people commented that the St. Charles corridor is too narrow and would need to be widened.
- Several attendees said that although this is a good solution, it does not relieve traffic on Clark Lane, which contributes to back-up on Interstate 70. Many people who liked this alternative also liked F1 with the added Ballenger extension, stating that Alternative F1 would assist with Clark Lane traffic.
- Those who did not favor this alternative said that Alternative C adds to congestion and is too short-sighted.

4) Alternative D: Realign and widen Route WW; Extend Stadium Boulevard to Route Z Interchange



MEETING DOCUMENTATION

- Attendees were evenly split on support and lack of support for this alternative.
 - Those who did not support this alternative said it does not provide enough congestion relief, particularly for the Highway 63/I-70 interchange, and that it does not address growth along Rangeline and New Haven Roads.
 - Several people were concerned about improvements to Richland Road and their impacts on homeowners along that corridor.
- 5) Alternative E1: Realign and widen Route WW; Extend New Haven Road to Rangline Road and Route Z Interchange
- Fourteen comment cards did not favor this alternative; eleven did. Most of those who did not support it said it did not help Highway 63/I-70 interchange congestion.
 - Two attendees were concerned about the alternative's impact on residential property. One attendee was concerned it would promote sprawl.
 - One attendee expressed concern about how farming equipment would move east and west within the study area if New Haven Road were widened to a 4-lane, 55 mph road.
- 6) Alternative E2: Realign and widen Route WW; Extend Stadium Boulevard to Route WW; Extend New Haven Road to Rangeline Road and Route Z Interchange
- Nearly half of the comment cards favored this alternative, stating that it seems to anticipate and address future traffic issues and helps move traffic around populated areas, rather than through it.
 - Several commented that the alternative seems to promote sprawl.
- 7) Alternative F1: Realign and widen Route WW; Extend Stadium Boulevard to Lake of the Woods Interchange; Extend Ballenger Lane across I-70
- This alternative was favored most by those who commented because it appears to address congestion issues at the Highway 63/I-70 interchange, and because it addresses the needs of those who live north of Interstate 70.
 - Several people commented that it seems to be the best solution because it alleviates congestion with the least impact, and because it includes Ballenger.
- 8) Alternative F2: Realign and widen Route WW; Extend Stadium Boulevard to Route Z Interchange
- Ten comment cards expressed support for this alternative while 13 did not. Attendees not in favor of the alternative expressed concern about changes to Richland Road and how they would impact homeowners.
 - Attendees also stated that if the Ballenger extension is included, St. Charles Road would need to be widened.
 - Several attendees questioned whether the Ballenger extension was needed if improvements are made to St. Charles Road.
- 9) Alternative G: Realign and widen Route WW; Extend Stadium to a new interchange at I-70
- There was much opposition to this alternative, with several people stating that residents and businesses located near the Lake of the Woods/Interstate 70 interchange would object strongly to removing the interchange at that location.
 - Five people said adding a new interchange closer to Route Z and removing the existing did not
-



MEETING DOCUMENTATION

make sense and questioned whether that would be the best use of funds. Many attendees commented on the cost of such a proposal.

- The Boone County Fire District said this alternative would greatly increase response time for Station 1. They added that during construction, ramp closures would restrict department access to I-70 for accident response.

Additional comments, concerns or notes

6) Bicyclists, pedestrians and mass transit

- Two attendees said the solutions do not yet include consideration for pedestrians, bicyclists and mass transit.

7) Environmental concerns

- Four attendees expressed concerns about various environmental issues:
 - Timing on the archeological survey and how those findings will affect the recommended solution
 - Locating floodplains and how those would interact with the recommended solution
 - Addressing noise reduction with the change to 4-lane, increased-speed corridors
 - Indicating environmental impacts on future graphics of the recommended solution

8) Public meeting comments

- Seven people mentioned specific positive comments about the meeting, its contents or their interaction with MoDOT and the project team.
- One person suggested that future meetings be held at a location on the City bus route.
- One person said they felt that business owners and developers monopolized MoDOT/consultants at the meeting. She said once she was able to talk with the team, her questions were answered and it was a positive interaction.

9) Property issues

- Three comments focused on general concern that property owner rights be protected. There were general comments throughout that the recommended alternative be one that has the least impact on homeowners. One attendee said all of the alternatives had too much impact on homeowners.
- One attendee was concerned about new houses being built on St. Charles Road and how those would be impacted by an extension of Stadium Drive.
- One attendee expressed concern that an alternative not go through A-1 Auto Salvage as property acquisition costs drive up the cost of the project.

10) Traffic comments

- Three comment cards said that whichever alternative is chosen, Stadium Drive must have access to Interstate 70, and the further east, the better.
- One person questioned traffic forecasts in the study area and whether those were high enough.
- One attendee said studies continually show that wider roads increase traffic and that it would



MEETING DOCUMENTATION

be a mistake to widen the roads in the study area. However, another attendee said that it appears in order to meet future traffic demands, most all of the roads in the study area would need to become 4-lane.

11) Miscellaneous comments/feedback

- The Boone County Fire District requested to be involved in the process; Ron Schikevitz is adding them to the small group stakeholder update meetings. They want to be more involved in the process so they have a better understanding of how road additions and closings might affect response time and the Insurance Services Organization fire rating for structures in the area.

DRAFT - 11/30/2015

East Columbia-Old Hawthorne Meeting

ATTENDEES: Thad Yonke/Boone County Approximately 30 citizens affected
 Kevin Nichols/CH2M HILL by Alternative RR-2B

FROM: CH2M HILL

DATE: January 30, 2008

LOCATION: Old Hawthorne Club House

TIME: 2:30PM – 4:00PM

On January 30, 2008, Thad Yonke and Kevin Nichols met with a group of citizens affected mostly by Alternative RR-2B. The meeting was arranged by Don Stamper/Old Hawthorne. The alternative layouts for RR-2A, RR-2B, SC-2A, SC-2B, SC-2C, WW-A, WW-B and WW-C were displayed on the table for the group to view. The typical sections for an Expressway, Major Arterial and Minor Arterial were also displayed.

Kevin Nichols, Consultant Engineering Lead for the East Columbia EIS, gave a general explanation of the alternatives and noted that he and Thad were there to listen and answer their questions. It was emphasized that people should submit their comments on the website.

General comments related to the various alternatives are listed below.

SC Alternatives

- The shortest alignment (SC versus RR) is the cheapest, therefore the best.
- The St. Charles area will be too built up by the time the road is constructed.
- The SC alternatives are too close to I-70 and US 63 to be of much relief. The road needs to be further south and east.

RR Alternatives

- There are 60-100 high cost lots on the north edge of Old Hawthorne. Many of the roads are in and some of the houses are underway.
- The expressway alignment should be more than a mile south of I-70. Currently they are too close to I-70 for both noise and leaving enough room between high capacity facilities for communities to develop.
- Values of the lots may be as higher than \$100,000/acre.
- If the location of RR-2B had been know, Old Hawthorne would have been laid in a different fashion.
- The expressway is not a good idea along Richland Road or along the north lot line of Old Hawthorne.
- If RR-2B were moved 500-1,000 feet north of the north lot line of Old Hawthorne, there would not be as much concern about proximity impacts to the development.

WW Alternatives

- The school at El Chaparral and WW will not be there. It was noted that the EIS team has been unable to get a commitment from the school board about the future of this school. Public comments have been received that want the road moved away from the school. Billy Sapp will attempt to get something from the school board that states the school will not be there in the future.

Other Alternatives

- An alignment that goes south of Old Chaparral, connecting back up with WW and extending further east and up to Route Z should be studied.
- Another idea is to extend 740 up to the intersection with WW. The route would then follow existing WW to the east, passing along the south lot line of Old Hawthorne. Just past Olivet, it would turn north and intersect I-70 at Route Z. Ballenger would come from the north and intersect WW at the same point as 740.

Land Acquisition/Compensation

- There were concerns about equitable compensation for how prices will be affected by their proximity to a busy expressway.
- A number of comments revolved around land values dropping because of the presence of the expressway. Access and being land locked were also discussed. MoDOT generally has right-of-way specialists at the public meetings to answer such questions.

Other

- Essentially there are two projects, Ballenger, which fixes the interchange at 70/63, and the 740 extension up to I-70.
- The SC and RR alternatives only serve the people south and west of I-70 and US 63, not the people living in the area that the roads run through.
- All approved plats need to be shown on the alternative maps and should be considered on an equal basis with lots with existing houses. Kevin requested that the information be sent to him directly since not all of the plats are shown, nor does the aerial photo reflect the latest construction.
- There were several questions about when there would be a decision on the preferred alternative. The draft is anticipated for May, but it was suggested that they go to the website to verify the time line. There would be time for the public to review and comment on the DEIS and the FEIS before a Record of Decision was reached late in 2008.
- Old Hawthorne prepared a traffic study for their development that they will get to Kevin Nichols.
- There was concern expressed over intersection safety associated with a high speed expressway.