

***Appendix G***

---

**City of Springfield Comments**

1. Page ES-1 – Need to review wording on the bullet that starts with **Transportation planning study**- did not include US 65, MO13 north to Bolivar, but did include consideration of the realignment of MO13 north of I-44 to align with West Bypass. **Did not find**
2. Page ES-2 - **West Bypass/State Highway FF** functionally this segment should be a freeway – but could be constructed initially with at grade intersections. **Discussed as expressway throughout – to be considered as possible freeway as explained in the study.**
3. Page ES-2 – **Campbell Avenue/US160** correct typo change US65 to US60 **Done**
4. ES-2 move heading **US 160 widening north of I-44** to ES-3 **Done**
5. ES-3 **Evaluating the Alternatives** **Comment noted, is already discussed in report.**
  - **State/federal funding eligibility** –
    - The degree in which the project serves **statewide travel interests** and/or would be attractive to MoDOT to participate in project funding

From Page 2 - **Kansas Expressway Extension Study** – states: The Greene County Commission has approached the State and Federal Legislature many times in the past for funding assistance to make the future corridor a reality, but with no success. The future roadway has an estimated cost of more than \$20M, and with only local funding for the project the roadway has never made the County priority list for construction.

What is the likelihood that regional or statewide funding will be available for **new** arterial alignments in metro areas (i.e. East/West Arterial, Kansas Expressway, and/or National Avenue)?

6. **Table ES-3 Recommendations** (review study findings) **No change requested.**

#### **NEW CONSTRUCTION**

- West Bypass/FF –
- Kansas Expressway Extension –
- US160 (north of I-44) –
- National Avenue Extension –

#### **SYSTEM MANAGEMENT**

- Campbell Avenue/US160 –

#### **FURTHER STUDY**

- Highway 13 Connector –

7. ES-4 - Is the refined alternate cost (\$226M) based on 2-lane construction? **4-lane**
8. ES-4 – **Next Steps and Timeline** – What was the basis for the study recommendation to complete an environmental impact study (EIS) for the West Bypass/FF Extension/Kansas Expressway Extension? **Not a recommendation, just a statement on what a next step would be.**
9. ES-5 - Show proposed alignment of the East/West Arterial and identify major east/west roadways. **Noted**
10. ES-6 – Need to look at alignment for MO13 Connector **Noted – this alignment is very preliminary.**
11. Page 1 – **INTRODUCTION** – Appropriately notes that the metro area has only one (1) North/South Freeway, this is a deficiency that should be fully considered in the study recommendations.
12. **Springfield-Branson Corridor Transportation Study Summary Report May 2000** should be included as an attachment to study. **The study is referenced. The reader will need to obtain this study separately.**

#### **Page 1 - Study Objectives**

- Improve coordination of land use and transportation decisions in the Corridor
- Develop consensus and support for the Study's recommendations

#### **Page 4 - Transportation Problems**

- Traffic congestion, characterized by significant delays during peak travel periods, on the north/south highways in the Corridor, **particularly Routes 65 & 160**
- Inadequate ground transportation for air travelers arriving at Springfield-Branson Airport with destinations in Branson
- Inadequate transportation for employees of the Branson-Lakes Area, and increasing commuter-oriented traffic congestion on major arterial roadways serving Springfield

**Page 6** - Most transportation agencies select a level of service as a target for traffic operations at the end of the 20-year planning horizon. Level of Service C is usually adopted as the desired target for roadways like the ones in the Corridor. In recent years and particularly in urban areas, Level of Service D has been deemed acceptable, as travel demands have progressively increased.

#### **Page 7 - Transportation Needs in the Corridor**

#### **Page 8 - General Transportation Needs – Figure 4**

3. The Corridor's transportation system has developed along the north/south axis and east/west connections are inadequate. These east/west connections are important to effectively distribute traffic throughout the Corridor

**Page 8 – (Springfield/Branson Regional Airport to Branson/Lakes Area)**

- A new access roadway to the airport with connection to the regional freeway system will be required

**Page 8 – (East/West Travel Corridors)**

- A need has been identified in southern Greene County for an east/west arterial roadway to augment the James River Freeway (US60) and to provide better connectivity with the north/south arterial roadways in the Corridor

**Page 9 – Figure 5 Priority Transportation Solutions**

Immediate Priorities (1 to 5 years)

- Address the capacity and safety deficiencies along US65 between I-44 & US60, including the major interchanges at I-44 & US60. This may involve interchange improvements, or improvements along the entire segment of US65, for example widening to six lanes.
- Address the capacity deficiency on US160 (South Campbell) between the JRF and Nixa. This may involve the widening of existing US160, a new roadway to the west, or a new transportation corridor.
- Address the deficiency in east-west connections in southern Greene County

**Page 10 – Figure 6 – Priority Solutions Highway Improvements**

**Page 11 – Priority Transportation Solutions**

13. Page 3 – **Study Purpose** – states - After completion of this study, the next steps would include an environmental clearance document and preliminary and final designs of the highest priority alternatives/corridors. The primary goal of the study was to identify the highest priority corridor, which would be evaluated with the other **regional** priorities for funding. **Comment addressed.**
14. Page 3 – **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCESS** – The City of Springfield communicated its concerns about impacts to Kansas Expressway, Campbell Avenue and National Avenue as a result of extending these routes southward, without consideration for interchange improvements along the JRF and capacity improvements along these routes north of the JRF, and for the need to construct the East/West Arterial to distribute traffic. These legitimate concerns were not addressed in the study. **Comment addressed.**
15. MoDOT policy has required local jurisdiction(s) to assume maintenance responsibilities for like mileage for new roadway. This policy should be

- explained in more detail. **The discussion of MoDOT and local system is included in Chapter 5 as appropriate at this point in the process.**
16. Page 6 – correct typo’s change Sunshine Avenue to Street **Comment addressed.**
  17. Page 7 – Identify major east/west routes (i.e. I-44, Sunshine Street, JRF and proposed E/W Arterial) - **noted**
  18. Page 8 - % traffic growth (review with consultant)
  19. Page 10 – Identify major east/west routes - **noted**
  20. **General Comment:** Page 11 - Kansas Expressway extension impacts four (4) times as many residential properties and two (2) times as many schools as the West Bypass/FF extension.
  21. Page 11 – correct typo’s change Sunshine Avenue to Street **Comment addressed.**
  22. Page 12 – Out of sequence should be after page 10 **Information is described on p 11, so graphic must be on p. 12**
  23. Page 13 – Identify major east/west routes - **noted**
  24. Page 14 – It should be noted that current traffic volumes north of the JRF on Campbell Avenue are as high or higher than south of the freeway and do not account for the higher east/west traffic volumes. If the congestion north of the JRF is not addressed, what travel time benefits will the public receive? **Travel time benefits are described in Chapter 4.**
  25. Page 16 – Identify major east/west routes - **noted**
  26. Page 17 – **EXISTING TRAFFIC VOLUMES** – correct maximum volume to approximately **40,000** (per Table 3.7). **Comment addressed.**
  27. Page 19 – Note the Springfield-Branson National Airport is a Top 100 Air Cargo Airport. Need to expand the regional and statewide significances of the airport. **Comment addressed.**
  28. Page 20 – Identify east/west routes and need to show US160 to Willard - **noted**
  29. Page 23 – **SUMMARY OF EXISTING CONDITIONS** – is consistent with Springfield’s concerns about impacts to Kansas Expressway, National Avenue, and Campbell Avenue north of the JRF
  30. Page 26 & 27 – % Growth (discuss with consultant)

31. Page 26 – Is Cox Road a three (3) lane collector? – **used capacity as indicated in the travel model**
32. Page 28 – identify east/west routes; also question designation of National Avenue north of JRF as congested vs. very congested. – **comment addressed.**
33. Page 29 – It should be noted that TSM & ITS strategies typically have the highest B/C ratios. – **report uses the words “cost effective” instead.**
34. Page 30 – “The widening of US65 from four to six lanes is assumed in the study.” Was this considered in the traffic model? **Model refinement is needed to better represent vehicle capacity, we refined the network to a small degree as provided to us. The study acknowledges the need to enhance or refine the traffic model.**
35. Page 30 – **4.3 Analysis of Strategies** last paragraph states: Given the high level of traffic demands forecasted, with only build strategies the arterial system will not function efficiently unless there is a balance of land use strategies and roadway capacity. Given the importance of land use should an exhibit of existing and projected land uses along the corridors be provided? **OA met with the various local governments and planners to approximate this information. It was decided by OA and the local planners that given the uncertainty of specific locations, that it would be approximated and that such a graphic would not be included.**
36. Page 30 - There is an unnecessary bullet at top of right side of page. Also, in that paragraph, there is reference to construction of an **expressway** south of JRF to Highway 14, which appears to inconsistent. **Fixed bullet, expressway discussion clarified.**
37. Page 30 - **Analysis of Strategies**, US160 south of the JRF is “moderately congested today”. The count shown on page 14 in Table 3.5 shows 44,438 vpd on Campbell Avenue between El Camino Alto and Lakewood in 2005. This is the highest volume on any of the studied corridors. To refer to 44,438 vpd on a four (4) lane roadway as moderately congested is inaccurate and misleading. – **Dropped the word “moderately”.**
38. Study did not include ITS/TSM solutions as recommended in SAFETEA-LU. **ITS/TSM is discussed in Chapter 4 and included in Chapter 5.**
39. Page 31 – West Bypass/FF functional classification freeway vs. expressway
40. Page 31 – MO13/Kansas Expressway – is described as a four (4) lane expressway (Study recommends downgrading from expressway to arterial). **In the initial alternatives, it was tested as an expressway. It was recommended to be downgraded following that analysis.**

41. Page 31 – Campbell/US160 – expand paragraph to include ITS/TMS alternatives.  
–Comment addressed by adding more explanation to the introduction paragraph under section 4.4.
42. Page 31 – National Avenue – change Briar Street to Gaslight –Comment addressed
43. Page 31 - Top of left side, there is a conclusion that “additional roadway capacity will be needed in order to maintain an acceptable level of travel mobility” even with the full implementation of the operational and land use strategies. It should not be presumed that TDM solutions will be sufficient for existing Rte 160 if parallel roadways are extended? –Comment addressed
44. Page 31 - Under West Bypass/State Highway FF, there is reference to construction a new four-lane expressway section from JRF to Highway 14. (Should this be freeway?) – leave as freeway/expressway, to be determined as part of Environmental/location study
45. Page 31 - Top right side, under MO13/Kansas Expressway, it states that Kansas Expressway would be extended farther south as a “new four-lane expressway.” (Study recommends downgrading from expressway to arterial) – see comment 40
46. Page 31 - Under Highway 13 North of I-44, the paragraph would read better as follows: a new freeway connection for Highway 13 with a shift *westward to align* with the West Bypass. Also, in the last sentence: . . . north of I-44 would *intersect* with the new Highway 13 connection. –Comment addressed
47. Page 32- identify east/west routes (larger fonts would improve readability)
48. Page 33 – Review MO13 Connector alignment –see comment 10.
49. Page 34 – **Evaluation Criteria** – Concur that the potential for state/federal funding is dependent on whether or not the project serves statewide travel interest.
50. Page 34 – Exhibit is needed to show Commercial Frontages along each route. – see comment 35
51. Page 35 – **Magnitude of Costs** – Is the cost for Kansas Expressway based on expressway or major arterial? 4-lane arterial
52. Page 36 – states “The results do support concerns expressed by the members of the public and the Steering Committee that the extension of Kansas Expressway would increase traffic volumes significantly on Kansas Expressway north of the JRF. Study does not address this significant concern in terms of potential impacts to property owners, viable alternatives, or estimated public costs. –Comment addressed

53. Page 38 - Under project Refinement, West Bypass/Highway FF extension is referred to as a four-lane “expressway”. Is the reference to Evans Road correct? A new Figure 4.4 is needed to show the potential access points as referred to in the text. –**Change made.**
54. Page 38 - Top right side, change “prevent” to “attract”. – **was not sure attract was more clear.**
55. Page 38 – **PROJECT REFINEMENT** - Given the potential for state/federal funding question rankings especially for new arterials. –**comment noted.**
56. Page 38 – **PROJECT REFINEMENT** - It is typical for residential properties to back up to freeways & expressways in metro areas as they do not require direct access. **comment noted**
57. Page 40 – Identify east/west routes including proposed E/W Arterial. **Need to make change**
58. Page 44 – **WEST BYPASS/FF/KANSAS EXPRESSWAY EXTENSION** – What is the logic for the statement that the need for corridor preservation is greater along the Kansas Expressway corridor than the West Bypass/FF corridor? – **changed to more immediate.**
59. Page 44 - Again, West Bypass Extension/Kansas Expressway Extension is shown as a joint priority. Given funding limitation should the OTO expect MoDOT to fund more than one (1) north/south corridor? These are two separate projects. – **Since future funding is uncertain, it would be premature at this point in the project development process to segment the projects, although it is a possibility given the funding situation.**
60. Page 44 – states: However it is the recommendation of this study that planning for the extension of Kansas Expressway south of the East/West Arterial can continue, even if the conditions stated in the amendment are delayed. Should there be a commitment on the urban service area? – **modified to differentiate planning from construction.**
61. Page 44 – Greene County and the City of Republic should be added to OTO jurisdictions that receive sub-allocations of STP funds. – **change made**
62. Page 45 – Need additional clarification on Phased construction on Kansas Expressway. Also, need to modify Adopted Major Thoroughfare Plan if Kansas Expressway is being downgraded from expressway to arterial. **Need to modify MTP is noted in the report. No additional information is available at this point in the project development process to provide additional clarification on project phasing.**



63. Page 45 – Interchange improvements @ JRF should be moved up in priority. While the Study recognizes the impacts to existing Kansas Expressway (north of JRF) it does not make recommendation as to funding priority. **The report reflects the priorities as agreed to by the Technical Subcommittee and the Technical Committee.**
64. Page 45 - Top left side, the references to right of way needed on West Bypass Extension for an expressway. Should we be considering ROW for a freeway? **See comment 44.**
65. Page 46 - identify east/west routes. Should recognize that final alignments will be contingent on EIS findings, engineering, and public input process. **Need to modify graphic. Final alignment comment is addressed in report.**
66. Page 47 – Study findings that six (6) laning Campbell Avenue is not a priority is in conflict with Springfield-Branson Corridor Transportation Study. **yes**
67. Page 47 - Top left side, the first paragraph, statement that Campbell Avenue is not a priority to add new lanes is contradictory to the statement at the top of Page 31. However, TDM's should be fully considered implemented where viable prior to widening, at least until some parallel improvements are made to see if traffic volume stabilizes. **Additional text added to clarify.**
68. Page 47 - Top right side, should refer to the capacity project priority for US160 as a locally driven need. **-Comment not understood.**
69. Page 48 – Conclusions do not fully consider several factors including funding limitations specifically as related to the Kansas Expressway Extension. – **Comment noted, no change made.**
70. What are the estimate costs for an EIS for West Bypass Corridor and the Kansas Expressway Corridor? – **That information is independent of this study.**
71. Would like explanation of Year 2030 Volume Forecast (Appendix vs. Study) – **perhaps this can be done as a separate activity in order to fully understand the information needed.**
72. Recommend that the current estimated costs for the OTO high & medium priority projects be included in the study (Appendix). – **The intent of the project is to take the study information and costs to the OTO project prioritization process, rather than take the OTO project prioritization process into this study.**
73. May want to consider changing “Springfield area” to “Springfield Metro Area (Metro Area) throughout study document – **comment noted.**