



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.

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



Public Information Meeting October 24, 2007 Overview and Summary

- 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 (October 19) and the Columbia Tribune (October 23)
- Newsletter mailing to approximately 1,950 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
- (13) Evaluation Criteria: Access to East Columbia
- (14) Evaluation Results (Matrix)
- (15) Evaluation Results

Station #4: Recommended Reasonable Alternatives

- (16) Station Sign



Public Information Meeting

October 24, 2007

Overview and Summary

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



Public Information Meeting

October 24, 2007

Overview and Summary

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 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?



Public Information Meeting October 24, 2007 Overview and Summary

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 after the meeting. Only one oral comment was submitted at the meeting, but the audio recording was undecipherable. During the 10-day comment period after the meeting, two emailed comments were received. This made 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) alternative. Several respondents (4) 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.



Public Information Meeting October 24, 2007 Overview and Summary

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