



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 counter-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 five recommended Reasonable Alternatives and the three options for Route WW 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 11), 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 Alternatives on Route WW (WWA, WWB, WWC)
- What's Next in the East Columbia - EIS Study?
- How to Stay Involved

Meeting Handouts

- Welcome/Frequently Asked Questions
- Comment Form

Study Team Participants

Mike Dusenberg, 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 Drop-In Center:

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 potential drainage 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 Drop-In Center, 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 10 comment forms received by mail or fax before the comment period seven-day deadline of January 15th. Additionally, one individual comment was submitted, in letter format, at the Drop-In Center. During the seven-day comment period after the meeting, eight emailed comments were received. This made a total of 40 comments submitted at, or within one week of, the Drop-In Center.

Of those who expressed a preference for any of the alternatives, more people (17, approximately 43 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 31 submitted comment forms, 24 respondents (nearly 77 percent) commented positively on the detailed recommended Reasonable Alternatives. Positive comments focused on the respondents preferred alternative. Only two (less than seven 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, four respondents identified additional environmental issues within the study area that may need further attention. Most respondents (almost 45 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 issues for East Columbia not related to the focus of this study.

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 (approximately 45 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 eight emailed comments, stated a preference for RR-2-B, whereas another respondent stated RR-2-B was the worst possible choice. 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 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 Drop-In Center 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 to 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	Written comment forms submitted
1	Individual comments submitted
0	Oral comment submitted
22	Total comments received at the January 8th Drop-In Center



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

Mailed Comment Forms

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

Responses Positive Comments	
RR-2-B	
3	RR-2-B is the best for Columbia's future.
1	RR-2-B is the correct choice - best value and for the future.
1	The RR-2-B choice is the best bang for the buck!
1	RR-2-B is the best choice for Columbia's current and long-term needs.
1	Alignment RR-2-B is the least displacement and least cost plan.
1	RR-2-B is the best plan. RR-2-A would be second choice. Both provide better long-term traffic management than the SC options.
Responses Negative Comments	
0	
Responses Other Comments	
0	No Comment
1	Best long-term solution is to extend Stadium to I-70. Prefer alignment that leaves Richland Rd intact. Ballenger Road Extension necessary.
9	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	
1	Storm water from pavement leading to erosion of nearby streams. Plan for bike/hike trails as part of pednet master trail network.
Responses Other Comments	
7	No Comment
1	Coming up St. Charles will add noise pollution and runoff into Hominy Creek.
9	Total Responses

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

Responses Positive Comments	
1	This has given us an opportunity to be forward thinkers and long-range planners.
Responses Negative Comments	
0	
Responses Other Comments	
4	No Comment
1	Plan for perpetuity, and if so, suggest WW-B of El Chaparral area.
1	Think seriously about the long range - use of human resources and construction dollars.
1	We will never have a better plan. RR-2-B is the way to go.
1	Make the best use of this money and take Stadium Blvd to Route Z - it's the sensible thing.
9	Total Responses

Faxed Comment Forms (to MoDOT)

Responses Other Comments	
1	Any St. Charles plan would be much more efficient, cost less, benefit traffic in all directions, and less impact on environment. RR2B will negatively impact water quality of Gans Creek. EIS study team should consider future needs of Columbia. A second plan should be developed to extend Grindstone Parkway east on New Haven Rd. to Rangeline to Rt. Z.
1	Total Responses

Individual Mailed Comments

Responses Other Comments	
0	Total Responses

E-mailed Comments

Responses Comments	
1	Ensure location of new high school is taken into consideration for new roadways. Continue to urge elected officials to look at the long-term vision. Establish a sound roadway system for the growth that will take place. Purchase right-of-way now before development makes it much more expensive. Attached letter: RR-2-A provides a major artery for the area, RR-2-B is the worse possible choice, WWC presents best choice regarding Route WW, and SC-2-C best solution to reduce traffic on I-70 and US63.
1	Should stay west of the creek as much as possible because 1) less bridges required 2) if goes east of creek will bring more congestion to El Chaparral area 3) west of creek will allow for easier transition onto and off WW 4) west of creek might allow some of the salvage yard to be moved away from the creek.
1	New highway for Richland Road will impact noise effects on my house. If going to put a major highway in front of my house, I would rather you put it through my house so I can move. Way of life will be impacted with new roadway. Prefer RR-2-B.
1	Heading East on WW from 63 straighten the road to go along the North edge of the Legion field, then curve back to old WW East of Cedar Ridge Elementary. This would be straighter, shorter, and safer. The current Route WW was the result of one man's political influence years ago.
1	Still think need to keep traffic on WW until it intersects with Rangeline Road and then go to I-70. Why not put the road around the that will be developed in the next 10 years. Building a road based on a plan that is out of date. How much tax money is wastes purchasing right-of-way now that developers have done work and it is considered commercial.
1	Best route or plan is Route Z plans. A better plan would be to use WW to exit further east.
1	Alternative priority: WW to Rangeline, RR-2-B, and then RR-2-A. Utilize existing roadways to decrease displacements. RR-2-B is the least disruptive to existing homes. Fully support Rolling Hills Road extension. Chopping up landscape doesn't make a more viable place to live.
1	Best option is RR-2-B, it disrupts the least amount of homes and allows for future commercial growth.
8	Total Responses

Totals (Summary)

9	Mailed Comment Forms
0	Individual mailed comments
1	Faxed Comments
8	Emailed comments
18	Total comments received at the January 8th Drop-In Center