

TAG/SAG BRIEFINGS

Meeting Summary

JULY 18-19, 2018



Table of Contents

- 1) St. Charles County Meeting Minutes**
- 2) St. Louis County Meeting Minutes**
- 3) Handouts**

This document contains the work products of the July 2018 meetings for members of the Technical Advisory Groups and Senior Advisory Group for the I-70 Planning and Environmental Linkages Study conducted by the Missouri Department of Transportation. Project is managed by Jacobs, with public engagement support by StratCommRx.

1. St. Charles County Meeting Minutes

Subject:	I-70 PEL Study Joint Technical Advisory Group (TAG)/ Senior Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting	Client:	MoDOT
Meeting Date/ Time:	July 18, 2018 1 pm	Project:	I-70 PEL Study
Meeting Location:	O'Fallon City Hall	Project Number	MoDOT: J6I3038 Jacobs: C1X32800

Meeting Participants

Advisory Group Members

Steve Bender, City of O'Fallon
Terry Epps, City of Pine Lawn
Mike Hurlbert, St. Charles County
Pat Kelly, Municipal League of Metro St. Louis
Derek Koestel, City of Lake St. Louis
Douglas Lee, City of Wentzville
L.G. Loos, City of Maryland Heights
Susan Spiegel, City of Wentzville
Brad Temme, City of St. Charles

I-70 PEL Team Members

MoDOT
Tom Blair
Matt Burcham
Wesley Stephen
Shaun Tooley
Andy Tuerck
Eddie Watkins

EWG
Marcie Meystrik
Paul Hubbman

Consultant Team
Tracey Lober (Jacobs)
Kelly Ferrara (StratCommRx)
Heather Lasher Todd (StratCommRx)
Olivia Lackey (StratCommRx)
Kennedy Moore (StratCommRx)
MaryAnn Taylor Crate (Added Dimension)

Summary of Meeting

1. Welcome and Introductions
 - A. Collaboration of MoDOT, EW Gateway, METRO – regional effort through the TCIG.
 - B. High-level corridor study, PEL, not legally binding, attempt to set vision. What will this corridor look like in 2045 and preceding years? Want to make sure addressing all the needs of citizens, and this study has been successful in doing that.

- C. Still accepting comments and tweaks. Will not be seeking/do not need approval of Federal Highway Administration. PEL attempts to bridge NEPA and strategy planning to expedite study process.
- D. At the end of this we are required to submit a PEL questionnaire to show we followed PEL process and has been done to NEPA satisfaction to jump-start future NEPA processes.
- E. These are not project-specific concepts, but this study has done the vetting to say these are feasible things that can be implemented on this corridor. Local entities can review this and use to pursue your NEPA processes.
- F. Shelf-life of five years, so look to move forward with your NEPA process in that window.

2. Tracey

- A. TAG meeting in June – summary of what was discussed
 - i. PEL process – needs, goals, strategies, prioritization matrixes.
 - ii. Vision statement for project, takes us into 2045
 - iii. Goals – corridor-wide and at segment level (5 segments to ease reviewing and strategizing concepts)
 - iv. Six key steps in PEL process to come up with full report

3. Public Involvement Update

- a. Three technical advisory groups and SAG for full corridor
- b. Efforts include:
 - i. Public meeting
 - ii. MetroQuest tool, pushed digitally, libraries, copy for newsletters, media coverage; more than 2600 people completed survey to share feedback – about 40,000 individual pieces of data, able to extrapolate who were “super-users” of corridor (more than 7x/week)
 - iii. Kept people informed through ongoing TAG/SAG/TCIG meetings, ongoing media relations, continuously updating website
 - iv. Key influencer interviews – major employers, elected representatives, community leaders, regional/neighborhood organizations, educational institutions

4. PEL Study

- A. Five segments: Allow for flexibility in future NEPA analyses
- B. Prioritization of strategies – For each strategy listed, team looked at how would logically be applied in each segment; matrixes for each segment and grouped in two categories -
- C. Cost not considered, but are provided
- D. Each strategy rated good, fair, or poor based on benefit gained
- E. High-priority do best job, overall, for addressing needs within that segment of corridor
- F. Transit upgrades, addressing weave sections, and TSM were recommended in all segments

5. Corridor-wide strategies: Should be done across the corridor, rather than in individual segments. Transportation Demand Management, intelligent transportation systems, new and emerging technologies (automated vehicles, connected vehicles)
6. Segment 1
7. Segment 2
8. Segment 3
9. Segment 4
10. Segment 5
 - A. Is the plan to straighten S curves? Yes – no details as to how implemented at specific intersections, more the high-level need to address. The specific details would be worked out in the NEPA process.
11. Process in final report for MoDOT to use in evaluating future projects, such as “Does proposed action address one or more goals/strategies identified in segment”?
12. Reversible lanes: MoDOT has asked us to do a technical memorandum on what can be done with them; will show history of them, existing conditions, stakeholder outreach, etc.
13. Final report posted on project website; will send an email to everyone involved in study so you can download it
14. Questions:
 - A. Timeframe? Wrapping-up now, internal review, sending to MoDOT within a week or two.
 - B. Copy of slides? Handouts, on website, possibly taking video of presentation to share, can also send file. Also, all maps will be on website.
 - C. After approved, what happens? The concepts will make their way into the long-range plan, currently being updated by EW Gateway and there will be projects from the segments. Individual project sponsors can then say they would like to undertake a NEPA process for each project and initiate that NEPA work. This will guide you. These strategies are intentionally not in conflict with the others – complement the plan for the full corridor. MoDOT will run projects through these weighted questions.
 - D. If project doesn't score well, then what? You may want to rethink your NEPA concept. This encourages further, more detailed NEPA analyses. This sets the foundation for you to do that.
 - E. Concept of DDI to replace roundabout that will reach congestion in 10 years. NEPA is new to me (Susan). Should we work on NEPA? Yes, pursue under NEPA. This sets vision – to allow proper planning of corridor over the next decades.
 - F. Document has shelf life of 5 years – will you revisit at that time? Yes, strategies will have reasonable range of costs, but question is will region have capacity to fund those ranges in reasonable amount of time? Have to decide what priorities are – many competing needs.
15. Tracey Lober to send public meeting slides to Susan Spiegel
16. Adjourn

###

2. St. Louis County Meeting Minutes

Subject:	I-70 PEL Study Technical Advisory Group (TAG)/ Senior Advisory Group (SAG) Meeting	Client:	MoDOT
Meeting Date/ Time:	July 19, 2018 1 pm	Project:	I-70 PEL Study
Meeting Location:	UMSL JC Penny Building	Project Number	MoDOT: J6I3038 Jacobs: C1X32800

Meeting Participants

TAG Members

Jerry Beckman, St. Louis Lambert International Airport
Tom Curran, St. Louis County
Gary Elmstead, St. Charles County
John McCarthy, University Square
Don Roe, City of St. Louis
Adam Spector, St. Louis County
Jan Titus, St. Louis Lambert International Airport
Betty Van Uum, University of Missouri – St. Louis
Deanna Venker, City of St. Louis
Doug Zaiz, City of Woodson Terrace

I-70 PEL Team Members

MoDOT
Wesley Stephen
Shaun Tooley

EWG
Marcie Meystrik
Jerry Blair

Consultant Team

MaryAnn Taylor Crate (Added Dimension)
Kelly Ferrara (StratCommRx)
Tracey Lober (Jacobs)
Olivia Lackey (StratCommRx)
Kennedy Moore (StratCommRx)

Summary of Meeting

Content from the prior presentation was the same. Comments and questions along with discussion points are noted below.

Questions and Answers

- A. Were those projections taken into consideration as far as population? So we are projecting the entire region and not the area?
 - a. We use the regional model to project growth
- B. In reference to the parallel roads how wide in the corridor was the study looking at?
 - a. The study of the corridor is only half a mile wide. There were some places in St. Charles County that we went over a mile.

- C. I don't see anything about economic development in this study?
 - a. One of the goals was provide or improve interstate connections serving current/future development/redevelopment areas. This goal is also in the prioritization matrix board.

###