



MEETING DOCUMENTATION

HNTB
Engineers Architects Planners
715 Kirk Drive
Kansas City, MO 64105-1310
phone: (816) 472-1201
fax: (816) 472-4086

Date:	June 4, 2008	Time:	4:00 to 5:30 p.m.
Subject:	Columbia Community Advisory Group Meeting #3	Location:	ARC Conference Room

Meeting Participants

Bernie Andrews
Tom Bass
Elaine Blodgett
Susan Clark
Vicki Curby
Cameron Dunafon
Chester Edwards
John Glascock
Justin McNutt
David Mink
Ken Pearson
Sid Sullivan
Bob Walters
Elliot Njus
Julia Haslanger
Adrienne Pederson
Cate Kelly
Kathryn Lucchesi
Sara Semelka
Matt Grant
Dan Gemkow
Kenny Voss, Bob Brendel, Kathy Harvey, Matt Burcham
Buddy Desai, Kevin Nichols
Marie Keister
Betty Burry, Gretchen Ivy, Steve Wells

Representing (Agency or Firm)

Regional Economic Development, Inc.
Property Owner
League of Women Voters
Diversified Management
City of Columbia, Planning and Zoning
Taco Bell
Columbia City Schools
City of Columbia, Public Works
Vanderveen Crossing
Boone County, Public Works
Boone County, Presiding Commissioner
Boone County Smart Growth Coalition
Virtual Realty
Columbia Missourian
Columbia Missourian
KOMU TV
KBIA
Missouri University School of Journalism
Columbia Tribune
KRCG TV
KMIZ TV
MoDOT
CH2M HILL
Engage
HNTB Corporation

Agenda:

- Welcome and introduction conducted by Betty Burry, HNTB
- Self-introductions took place by Advisory Group members

- Meeting agenda reviewed by Betty Burry
 - Questions/Action Items from 4/1/08 Meeting
 - Where We Are in the Process
 - Review Improve I-70 Tier 2 Decisions
 - Initial Columbia Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement Alternatives
 - Follow-up Q&A
 - Next Steps

Questions/Action Items from 4/1 Columbia Advisory Group Meeting

Ms. Burry recapped several questions raised at the last meeting that would be addressed during presentations made at the meeting by Buddy Desai and Kevin Nichols with CH2M HILL.

Where We Are in the Process

MoDOT Project Manager Kenny Voss explained the Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) process and how it compares to earlier Improve I-70 environmental studies.

- The First Tier EIS (1999-2001) identified a general, statewide strategy to improve I-70, which was to widen I-70 to at least six lanes.
- The Second Tier EIS (2002-2006) evaluated how to widen I-70 in seven separate geographic areas of the state. The outcome was a series of decisions detailing widening strategies, interchange concepts and frontage roads.
- The Supplemental EIS (2008) will compare the general, statewide strategy to widen I-70 with the addition of truck-only lanes within the I-70 footprint established in the Second Tier EIS.

Mr. Voss explained that if the decision to widen I-70 to six general purpose lanes remains unchanged, MoDOT will continue to work to identify funding so that the Improve I-70 program can be built. If the Supplemental EIS concludes with a recommendation to include truck-only lanes, additional environmental evaluations will be completed, along with work to identify funding for construction.

Mr. Voss explained that the Improve I-70 Purpose and Need summarizes the goals that guide the evaluation of various alternatives, and include:

- Accommodate existing and future traffic

- Improve outdated design elements
- Accommodate all users of I-70
- Improve user safety

The Purpose and Need is an evolving document that is updated as projects move through various stages of development. During the Supplemental EIS, the Improve I-70 Purpose and Need is being updated to reflect the latest information on traffic congestion, freight movement and safety.

Questions and Comments:

Sid Sullivan commented that gas prices have tripled in the last three years, auto manufacturers are cutting production of sports utility vehicles (SUVs) and the effects of high energy costs on the public's travel behavior aren't totally known yet. The news indicates that trends are changing in how people are using their vehicles. Mr. Sullivan asked if the planners were looking at other transportation alternatives, and considering whether changes will also occur in truck traffic, which could affect long-term traffic projections.

Mr. Voss said that MoDOT has looked at recent traffic data on cars and trucks, and is not seeing a significant change that would decrease the need to improve I-70, which is already a 50-year old facility and not able to handle today's traffic needs, let alone potential future needs. He said that rail use is indeed growing, and that MoDOT just authorized spending \$80 million toward expanding rail capacity in Missouri. Mr. Voss said the state will continue to invest in alternative travel modes, but with the overall projected increase in congestion and freight movement, continued highway improvements will also be needed to keep up with demand.

Mr. Sullivan asked how MoDOT confirmed these trends.

Mr. Voss explained that MoDOT has employees who monitor all of the states roadways, including freeways, and perform traffic counts annually. He said employees would be sent to the Columbia area this summer to re-verify traffic counts at the US 63 interchange.

Review Improve I-70 Tier 2 Decisions

Buddy Desai, Columbia-area Task Lead with CH2M HILL, showed a video that summarized the Improve I-70 Second Tier EIS decisions in the urban section of Columbia. He explained the proposed improvements at locations through the heart of Columbia including the Stadium Interchange tight diamond, the one-way frontage roads through the "triplets" of Providence,

Rangeline and Business Loop East and finally the US 63 system interchange. He added that all this information is available on the Web site at ImproveI70.org.

Mr. Desai then addressed questions that were raised at the second Advisory Group meeting, including:

- **How will traffic impacts on local streets be handled?** Mr. Desai said that the interchange concepts developed in the Second Tier looked at impacts to local streets directly accessing I-70. The development of existing and new frontage roads was one mechanism for improving local traffic flow that otherwise might use the interstate for local trips. The Supplemental EIS will again look at this issue in the context of how truck-only lanes might affect the streets directly leading to and from I-70.
- **What pedestrian accommodations will be provided?** Mr. Desai read the conclusions directly from the Tier 2 EIS: *Recognize the commitment to pedestrian and bike connectivity. Missouri Department of Transportation is committed to making provisions for bike, pedestrian and wheelchair access across I-70, wherever possible and reasonable. Although a specific access plan has not yet been developed, the detailed concepts would need to be mindful of MoDOT's commitment.*
- **What opportunities exist for aesthetics and enhancements along the corridor?** Mr. Desai said that a Corridor Enhancement Plan was developed during the Second Tier studies. This plan outlined, in general terms, various options that might be pursued. Details would be determined during final design. MoDOT made a commitment to devote up to four percent of the overall project cost toward aesthetics and enhancements, and will keep this same commitment as Improve I-70 moves forward.
- **Was rail considered? What opportunities/challenges exist?** Mr. Desai said that a new passenger rail line in the I-70 corridor was considered during the First Tier EIS. MoDOT factored both existing and planned rail services into rail's ability to reduce traffic on I-70, but concluded that even with rail enhancements, vehicle traffic in the corridor would increase and improvements to the outdated I-70 facility would still be required. Additionally, a new rail line in the I-70 corridor would need to connect to existing rail lines through farms, communities and cities, creating significant environmental and community impacts, and at significant cost. More recently, MoDOT's Division of Multimodal Operations-Railroad Section has been working with Amtrak, Union Pacific and a rail passenger advisory committee to find ways to improve passenger train reliability and the flow of freight rail traffic on the existing Union Pacific corridor between Kansas City and St. Louis.

Questions and Comments

Chester Edwards asked who would pay for the improvements to local streets, and would MoDOT or local officials conduct the related studies?

Mr. Desai said MoDOT would take the lead on local street improvements required as a result of I-70 improvements, and local entities would take the lead on designing and funding any other local street improvements.

Sid Sullivan asked why the Clark Lane flyover and Connelly Rd. access road are considered part of the Improve I-70 effort, when it looks like they accommodate mostly local traffic.

Mr. Desai said there were similar “local” traffic improvements suggested during the course of the Second Tier EIS process, including improvements at Scott Boulevard, for example. But, unlike proposed suggestions at Scott Boulevard, the Clark Lane and Connelly Road improvements provide a direct benefit to I-70. By separating the local trips from the through trips that I-70 was originally built to address, MoDOT will be able to improve the overall efficiency and safety of I-70. These improvements will also help alleviate traffic at US 63, and help minimize impacts to services and businesses at US 63.

Mr. Desai said three main issues were addressed by the Second Tier EIS: whether or not an I-70 bypass should be built to the north of existing I-70, how wide I-70 would need to be to accommodate future traffic needs, and how to address specific traffic and safety concerns at the US 63 interchange. These same issues are being addressed during the Supplemental EIS.

The bypass was dismissed during the Second Tier because traffic projections showed that significant improvements would still be needed on I-70 even if a bypass were built, and there would be significant environmental impacts. A truck-only bypass is being dismissed in the Supplemental EIS for similar as well as additional reasons: a truck-only bypass would have significant environmental impacts; the truck-only bypass would not be usable by passenger vehicles, so significant improvements would still be needed on I-70; and trucks would still need local access to Columbia. The Second Tier EIS did identify a need for a major arterial or similar facility to improve access for local traffic movement in north Columbia. This information was shared with CATSO, the City of Columbia and Boone County officials.

Questions and Comments

There were no questions and comments regarding the bypass issue.

Initial Columbia Supplemental EIS Alternatives

Kevin Nichols, Columbia-area Engineering Lead with CH2M HILL, summarized four options for the placement of truck-only lanes across the entire state, which all fall within the footprint of the I-70 widening approved in the Second Tier EIS.

- Option 1 – Trucks restricted to the outside lanes only. Trucks would be prohibited from the inside lane of the 6-lane cross section. Trucks would be allowed in the remaining two

outside lanes in the eastbound and westbound directions. A grass median would separate the travel lanes of I-70.

- Option 2 – Truck-only lanes on the inside. Two general purpose lanes in the westbound direction would be on the outside and separated from the two westbound truck-only lanes by a grass median. Two general purpose lanes in the eastbound direction would be on the outside and separated from the two eastbound truck-only lanes by a grass median. The westbound and eastbound truck-only lanes would be separated from each other by a barrier.
- Option 3 – Truck-only lanes on the inside. Two truck-only lanes in the westbound direction would be on the inside and separated from the two westbound general purpose lanes by a grass median. Two truck-only lanes in the eastbound direction would be on the outside and separated from the two eastbound general purpose lanes by a grass median. The westbound and eastbound general purpose lanes would be separated from each other by a barrier.
- Option 4 – Truck-only lanes on the south side. Two general purpose lanes in the westbound direction and two in the eastbound direction would stay in their existing location. Two truck-only lanes in the westbound direction and two in the eastbound would be built to the south of the existing lanes. If the widening was to the north, then the truck only lanes would be built to the north of the existing lanes.

Questions and Comments

Chester Edwards asked if all of the options would fit in the I-70 footprint through Columbia selected in the Second Tier EIS.

Mr. Nichols said three of the options would fall within the existing footprint; option 4 would not.

John Glascock asked if there would be continuous frontage roads paralleling I-70 if option 4 were selected.

Mr. Nichols said this would not be the case, because the frontage roads were originally conceived to improve incident management, or emergency access to I-70 to clear accidents, to divert freeway traffic if necessary as well as accommodate more local trips. Truck-only lanes could provide this access instead, eliminating the need for the frontage roads and keeping I-70 within the environmentally cleared footprint.

Mr. Nichols noted this was one of the weaknesses to option 4, and one of several reasons why the consultant team was recommending option 2 instead.

Other reasons option 2 is being recommended include:

- The potential for fewer weaving conflicts at interchanges

- The national trend is to pursue truck-only lanes to the inside of existing freeways, and continuity/consistency is helpful to drivers
- Better visibility of ramps and businesses to general purpose traffic travels in the outside lanes
- Truck noise is further away from receptors and noise-sensitive areas

Mr. Nichols concluded by saying that, with the recommended option 2, general purpose lanes would take up the outside lanes of I-70, and truck-only lanes would be located in the inside lanes of I-70, across the state and in Columbia. These truck-only lanes would carry trucks traveling through Columbia. Trucks intending to stop in Columbia would not use the truck-only lanes.

Questions and Comments

There were no questions and comments regarding the recommendation to move ahead with option 2.

Mr. Nichols then discussed how, with option 2 – truck-only lanes on the inside of I-70 – there would be a grass median separating the general purpose and truck-only lanes in the rural sections of Columbia. In the urban section, the grass median would be eliminated and replaced with some form of separation. The team is looking at two methods to separate cars and trucks as they travel through Columbia: concrete barriers or buffer separation (usually painted stripes and/or rumble stripes).

Barrier separation between truck-only and general purpose lanes would require an additional six to 12 feet of right-of-way on each side of I-70, to allow more room for required shoulder width. This method would push the I-70 footprint beyond what was cleared environmentally in the Second Tier EIS. Mr. Nichols showed examples of this approach in Minnesota and New Jersey.

Using a buffer separation of either painted or rumble stripes provides more flexibility. Mr. Nichols showed samples of high occupancy (carpool) lanes separated with painted solid lines, with skip-striping in areas where vehicles are allowed to change lanes, in Los Angeles and Atlanta.

The team also considered and then dropped from further consideration suspending the truck-only lane operation in Columbia to allow all vehicles traveling through or within the area to mix. This would cause a number of safety concerns: potentially mixing traffic traveling at different speeds, breaking the continuity of I-70 truck-only lanes across the state and difficulty in moving vehicles to “assigned lanes”. All of these would be unexpected and potentially hazardous to drivers traveling across the state on I-70.

Questions and Comments

John Glascock asked how the configuration of truck-only lanes in Missouri would be coordinated with the four-state (Missouri, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio) Corridor of the Future initiative. How would truck traffic transition from truck-only lanes to all general purpose lanes? Would double-reversible lanes fit in Columbia like in St. Louis?

Mr. Voss clarified that the Supplemental EIS is being conducted separately from the four-state Corridor of the Future effort, and as a result Missouri is much further ahead in looking at these types of transition issues, which are indeed- critical. *(Clarify St. Louis answer.)* How these issues are addressed in Missouri will set the tone for the other three participating states.

Mr. Glasscock commented that trying to keep cars and trucks separate between US 63 and Stadium will be difficult.

Mr. Desai noted that in Columbia the percentage of truck traffic ranges from 15 percent to 30 percent of all trips. Statewide, 70 percent of all truck trips are long distance or through trips. Conversely, 60 percent of passenger vehicle trips in Columbia are local (start, end or wholly within Columbia).

Sid Sullivan commented that MoDOT traffic counts said there are 40,000 trips per day east of Route Z, traffic increases in middle of Columbia, and then traffic decreases to 37,000 to 40,000 trips per day.

Mr. Desai clarified that a local trip can include one from Kansas City to Columbia.

David Mink asked what advantages rumble stripes have over painted stripe buffer separations.

Mr. Nichols said rumble stripes have been shown to reduce accidents considerably in Missouri, because the noise and sensation of driving over a rumble stripe keeps drivers more alert to driving in their own lanes.

Mr. Mink commented that the rumble stripes MoDOT uses are uncomfortable to cross – if there is a lot of deliberate crossing of those, it could cause a different type of problem.

Steve Wells, HNTB Project Manager, said one option would be to use rumble stripes in areas where it is important that drivers stay in their own lanes. Painted stripes could be used in areas where drivers would be allowed to cross into general purpose lanes or access local interchange ramps.

Mr. Glasscock asked if the I-70 footprint in St. Louis is the same as the environmentally cleared footprint in Columbia. If St. Louis is narrower in some areas, would the use of concrete barriers be prohibited since they require more room for shoulders alongside the highway.

Mr. Nichols said the answer depends on how highway shoulders are handled, which would be finalized during the final design phase. At Stadium Boulevard in Columbia there would be additional impacts if barrier separation was used because the highway is already tightly confined there.

Ken Pearson asked if there is a safety advantage with the barrier.

Mr. Nichols said it depends. Barriers can prevent accidents from occurring because they keep traffic from mixing. However, if a vehicle hits a concrete barrier injuries can be quite severe.

Elaine Blodgett asked if barriers provide enough flexibility.

Mr. Nichols said that barriers limit flexibility for future changes in lane assignments should the needs change.

Mr. Nichols showed a table summarizing the pluses and minuses of the barrier vs. rumble/painted stripe buffer separation methods.

Rumble Stripe vs. Barrier Separation		
Consideration	Rumble Stripe	Barrier Separation
Separation of trucks and autos	-	+
Fit in existing footprint	+	-
Least expensive	+	-
Snow removal	+	-
Simple signage	-	+
Control of truck merge/diverge points	-	+
Incident management	+/-	+/-
Simple drainage	+/-	+/-
Flexibility for reallocation of lanes	+	-
Ease of emergency vehicle access	+	-
Control of truck weaving	-	+
Maintenance	+	-

Reviewing the table, Mr. Nichols said barrier separation would be better at separating trucks and autos, lends itself to simplified signage at the entrance and exit points, and would help clearly delineate truck merge and divergent points. Rumble/painted stripe buffer separation would be better at keeping I-70 truck-only lane improvements within the environmentally cleared I-70 footprint, less expensive, easier to maintain and remove snow, allow better access in an

emergency and provide more flexibility in allowing lane reallocation. Mr. Nichols said it was unclear which approach had the advantage when addressing drainage issues.

In light of these findings, the consultant team concluded that barrier separation would result in additional costs, impacts and potentially an increase in vehicle/barrier crashes. Thus the preliminary recommendation is to proceed more analysis of the rumble /painted stripe buffer separation method.

Questions and Comments

Justin McNutt asked if it would be illegal to cross the rumble strips. He commented that he hoped it would not be illegal.

Mr. Nichols said enforcement would be important because there may be a speed differential between truck-only and general purpose lanes and it was important to encourage drivers to stay in one lane to the extent possible for safety reasons. Mr. Desai added that the right solution might be painted skip striping. It would be important to limit areas where drivers can cross-over between truck-only and general purpose lanes to ensure truck-only lanes provide the sought-after higher level of efficient freight movement. Truck-only lanes would be intended to serve truck traffic traveling the entire way through Columbia.

Elaine Blodgett commented that, having driven I-70 in St. Louis, newly added rumble stripes have deterred drivers from crossing into the wrong lane. Ms. Blodgett asked where a driver would go if his vehicle broke down in a truck-only lane separated by a concrete barrier.

Mr. Nichols showed a picture indicating how shoulders would be accessible at all times with painted or rumble stripes, and a picture showing that with concrete barriers there would be a shoulder between the inside truck-only lane and the barrier. There would also be multiple areas where the barriers would have gaps that allow emergency access.

Mr. Desai said the team would research how other states with truck-only type lanes (High Occupancy Vehicle, etc.) are handling vehicle breakdowns.

Ms. Blodgett commented that the highway would be really wide if barriers were used.

Chester Edwards asked if speed limits would be same in all lanes.

Mr. Desai said this issue would not be determined during this phase of study. Mr. Desai's opinion was that different speed limits might be considered if there were barriers between the lanes. In some states, such as Illinois, there are different speed limits for trucks and cars, regardless whether there is a separation between the two.

Sid Sullivan commented that it was said earlier that there would be four lanes in each direction of I-70, with potential for a fifth lane. Does this take the fifth lane?

Mr. Desai said adding two truck-only lanes in each direction would take up the extra capacity to widen I-70 that the Second Tier had set aside for improvements at some later date. Mr. Desai said it was a trade off: pursuing truck-only lanes within the environmentally cleared I-70 footprint would remove some flexibility to expand later, but would increase capacity for both cars and trucks sooner.

John Glascock asked how truck-only lanes would be designed between West Boulevard and Stadium Boulevard.

Mr. Nichols said the truck driver who needed to access Columbia would stay in a general purpose lane, while trucks traveling through Columbia without stopping would stay in truck-only lanes.

Mr. Glascock said he needed Columbia-specific numbers for local traffic vs. through traffic, and an idea of how many trucks travel through Columbia, before he could determine whether there was a need to make this type of investment.

Facilitator Betty Burry asked the Advisory Group if, overall, they thought the rumble/painted stripe buffer separation approach was reasonable.

Elaine Blodgett and Vicki Curby nodded yes, they thought it was reasonable. Ms. Curby commented that she thought barriers were inappropriate, and that rumble stripes were more consistent with the rest of I-70.

John Glascock said no. He preferred that mixed traffic be allowed through the urban section of Columbia, from US 63 to Stadium Boulevard. He said truck-only lanes would be okay elsewhere.

MoDOT Project Manager Kenny Voss asked Mr. Glascock if he would be more comfortable if there was only one truck-only lane traveling through Columbia instead of two, as was currently being considered. Mr. Glascock said he still didn't think it was a good idea. He said rumble stripes would cause a lot of noise. When Mr. Voss asked if painted stripes would be a preferred separation method, since a decision on those specifics didn't need to be made now, Mr. Glascock said that was okay. He said he can hear vehicles hit the current rumble strips on I-70 even though he lives five miles away, on US 63. Ms. Curby commented that she lives closer to I-70 and doesn't hear them. Justin McNutt, who said his home is located above I-70, says the sound carries to his home.

Bernie Andrews, Susan Clark, Cameron Dunafon and Tom Bass nodded that they thought the recommended option 2 with rumble/painted stripe buffer separation was reasonable.

Chester Edwards said he thought one or two truck lanes were needed through Columbia – whichever made sense based on the analysis to follow.

Bob Walters said he was opposed to the physical barrier separation, and was in agreement with the recommended approach.

Sid Sullivan commented that if one looks at the low Level of Service (slower traffic flow) in the urban areas, where the area is more confined, rumble stripes will protect against accidents. Truckers have a tendency to drift when they're tired. Where Level of Service increases, and where traffic flows more smoothly, perhaps just painted stripes would be appropriate.

Justin McNutt said he doesn't support the barrier separation method. He suggested using painted stripes for now to test the concept, and then consider rumble stripe separation later.

John Glascock asked that MoDOT report how many noise complaints they have received since installing rumble strips on I-70.

Mr. Nichols said the next step in the study was to look at operational considerations for truck-only and general purpose lanes in the rural and urban sections of Columbia, and to see how truck-only lanes would affect independent and interdependent interactions in the area. He explained that these and similar questions have to be asked and answered during the analysis and later design phases to determine how it would all work together.

Chester Edwards asked if putting access roads on either side of I-70 could eliminate some of the existing ingress/egress (interchange) access points.

Mr. Desai said that type of analysis was completed during the Second Tier EIS, and as a result one set of interchange ramps will be removed if the Improve I-70 widening moves forward.

Mr. Nichols showed more detail at US 63 and discussed the issues that must be looked at when considering making truck only connections there.

The path forward is to look at the best allocation of lane assignments for truck-only, general purpose and auxiliary lanes. The team will also look at how and where trucks will interface between truck only lanes with general purpose lanes, and the complexities of truck/auto operations at the US 63/I-70 interchange.

Mr. Desai recapped the questions that were poised at the last Advisory Group meeting, and quickly reviewed how those answers were provided today, or how they will be provided in the future.

Sid Sullivan asked if the evaluation criteria will look at how truck-only lanes increase /decrease in safety.

Mr. Desai said safety will be looked at in much more detail and would be factored into the decision-making process.

Mr. Desai summarized the next steps, which include:

- Evaluate reasonable ideas
- Refine reasonable ideas
- Recommend best idea(s)
- Prepare draft environmental document
- Document ideas and their evaluation
- Finalize environmental document
- Receive federal report

Follow-up Q&A

Facilitator Betty Burry asked if there were any additional comments and questions

Questions and Comments

There were no further questions or comments.

Next Steps

Ms. Burry thanked the Advisory Group and public for attending the meeting. She announced the next Advisory Group meeting has not yet been scheduled but that a confirmation e-mail would be sent in approximately two weeks to confirm the date.

The meeting concluded at approximately 5:35 p.m.

Action Items	Responsibility	Deadline
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Confirm future meeting dates 	HNTB	Late June
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • % funding trucks provide for highway 	MoDOT	Next Meeting

<ul style="list-style-type: none">• What % of truck traffic gets off in Columbia today?	MoDOT	?
<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Info on how many complaints MoDOT receives about rumble stripes/related noise	MoDOT	Next Meeting