

---

## Meeting Notes

**Date:** Thursday, May 3, 2012  
**Time:** 10:00 a.m.  
**Location:** Mid-America Regional Council, 600 Broadway, Suite 200, Kansas City, Missouri  
**Purpose:** Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting No. 3

### Participants

---

#### **CAG Members Present**

3<sup>rd</sup> Council District (KCMO), Augusta Wilbon  
City of Independence, Donna Coatsworth  
City of Kansas City, Steve Ornduff  
City of Raytown, Andy Noll  
JC Sports Complex Authority, Jim Rowland  
Jackson County, Scott George  
OOLA, Kip Hough  
Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Carlos Gomez  
Downtown Council of KC, Cliff Greenlief

#### **CAG Members Absent**

3<sup>rd</sup> Council District (KCMO), Virginia Williams  
City of Kansas City, Linda Clark

Greater Kansas City Chamber, Nora Lockton  
Kansas City Industrial Council, Ron Schikevitz  
MARC, Mell Henderson

#### **MoDOT Staff**

Matt Killion, Area Engineer  
Allan Zafft, Transportation Planning Specialist  
Jennifer Benefield, Customer Relations Manager  
A.J. Byrd, Community Liaison

#### **Consultant Team**

Chris Nazar, CDM Smith  
Triveece Harvey, Vireo

### Agenda Items

---

- Welcome and Introductions:** Matt Killion (MoDOT Area Engineer) opened the meeting and provided an overview of the agenda for the day's I-70 Second Tier Environmental Impact Statement Community Advisory Group (CAG) meeting. He explained that the meeting would focus on initial improvement alternatives for the corridor. He said that MoDOT provided CAG members with binders to keep project materials such as the contact list, meeting notes, agendas, presentations, and initial alternatives.
- Approve the March 23, 2012 Meeting Notes:** Killion summarized the March 23 CAG meeting, noting that much of the discussion centered on the I-70 problems and issues in three highway segments. The CAG then approved the notes from the March 23 meeting.
- Community Advisory Group Name:** Killion asked if the group wanted to discuss potential names for the CAG, noting that some CAGs have had unique names. He said that he had



received one name suggestion to date: Citizens for I-70. The CAG decided not to rename the group.

4. **Improve Key Bottlenecks Strategy:** Allan Zafft (MoDOT Transportation Planning Specialist) provided an overview of the Improve Key Bottlenecks Strategy. He said that the strategy was developed during the I-70 First Tier Environmental Impact Statement (FTEIS) and it focused on improving the key locations along I-70 where slow-downs occurred, traffic congestion was highest, and safety was a concern. He said that the strategy did not include adding new lanes throughout the corridor. He also said that adding lanes would require MoDOT to re-open the I-70 FTEIS and would delay the existing Second Tier study. He said that the Second Tier study would not involved adding lanes. He then described the roadway, interchange, transit, and other aspects of the strategy. He said that the MoDOT was investigating interchange consolidations and that the consolidations would be a significant message for the general public. CAG comments included:

- Are the current I-435 improvements the first phase of a larger project? Yes.
- What is the proposed shoulder width for the bus on shoulder option? Minimum 10 and preferably 12 feet.
- Are commuter bridges the same as pedestrian bridges? Yes.

5. **Initial Alternatives:** Chris Nazar (CDM Smith Transportation Planner) described the initial alternatives for the corridor. He said that they were built upon improvements noted in the Improve Key Bottlenecks Strategy and included some variations, such as bus on shoulder, interchange consolidations, and full build-out of the I-435 Interchange. Killion added that the group should comment on the alternatives and consider the following questions:

- What would make any of the alternatives better?
- What should be changed about any of the alternatives?
- What do you like most about any of the alternatives shared today?
- What alternatives are missing?

Nazar provided an overview of each of the 12 alternatives and the CAG commented as follows:

- **Alternative 1 – No-Build:**
  - Manchester Bridge could be a design-build project.
    - Have requirements for the project already been determined? No.
    - What if people want more connections under the bridge? The new bridge will be four lanes. The Second Tier study will not preclude it.
- **Alternative 2A and 2B – Transportation System Management:**
  - Why where the ramp meters in the downtown loop closed?
  - Supportive of ramp metering as an interim step to ramp closure.
  - What evidence do we have to support recommending High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) lanes?
  - HOV lanes are not an incentive for carpooling – Kansas City has a culture of single-occupancy vehicle operation.
  - HOV lanes in Texas operate as separate lanes (additional through lanes).
  - Alternative 2 doesn't solve anything – It mitigates existing issues and problems.
  - In the end, everything will come down to available funding and timing.

- Not fans of variable speed limits – People don't necessarily think as a group. They think individually.
- **Alternative 3 – Transportation Demand Management:**
  - No comments.
- **Alternative 4A – Other Modes (Transit, Bicycle, Pedestrian):**
  - What is current transit ridership and has it increased with gas prices?
  - How many buses would we need to mitigate I-70's issues? 50-60 buses in peak periods to have any affect at all.
  - Even though there is a cost for buses, they are still important – Good for the environment.
  - The Kansas City Area Transportation Authority (KCATA) is already hurting for money – What funding is available for transit?
  - Provide people with transportation alternatives until we get light rail.
  - Park-and-Rides cost less but partnering with KCATA is critical.
  - Isn't transit out of MoDOT's control? MoDOT provides some funding to transit and is coordinating recommendations for I-70 with the Jackson County Commuter Corridor Alternatives Analysis.
- **Alternative 4B – Other Modes (Transit, Bicycle, Pedestrian):**
  - Better choice.
  - Easier to find support for a large one-time expense vs. a continued expense.
  - Good that it's not solely reliant on bus transit.
  - It will still be a long time before a major impact can be felt.
- **Alternative 5 – Geometric Improvements:**
  - Stadium Drive and Raytown Road – Address the truck traffic issues.
  - Eliminates left exit options – Nobody likes these.
  - Provides better I-435 access.
  - How about auxiliary lanes between 18<sup>th</sup> Street and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street?
  - Benefits of this alternative include getting on/off the ramps more easily and improving ramp lengths.
- **Alternative 6 – Interchange Consolidation:**
  - Does consolidation mean “complete closure”? Yes, e.g. close Brooklyn Avenue and leave Prospect Avenue open.
  - Oppose consolidating U.S. 40 and Manchester Trafficway because the industrial community depends on it.
    - Other interchanges are close together. Why is the U.S. 40 and Manchester Trafficway area still on the radar?
    - Need to talk with constituents about closures/consolidations, such as U.S. 40 and Manchester Trafficway as well as 18<sup>th</sup> Street and 23<sup>rd</sup> Street, etc.
    - City of Kansas City is investing in the 22<sup>nd</sup>/23<sup>rd</sup> Street Connector project.
    - Manchester Trafficway is so close to I-435, so it always comes up – New bridge should address issues.
    - For political reasons Manchester Trafficway will never close – Provides access to the stadium and more. It shouldn't come up anymore.
  - 18<sup>th</sup> Street and Vine Street – Concerned with access to Vine Street.

- Truck restrictions cause the postal service to use one interchange.
- **Alternative 7 – One Interchange Per Zone:**
  - Is one-mile interchange spacing common in industrial communities like ours?
  - I-70 has too many obstacles to overcome to support one interchange per zone.
  - Concept may be right, but it isn't politically feasible due to neighborhood impacts.
  - Selectively close entries/exits.
- **Alternative 8 – Collector – Distributor System:**
  - Addresses the issues of getting on/off of I-70.
  - Would this alternative cost the same as widening I-70?
  - Limits access.
- **Alternative 9 – Zonal Collector-Distributor System:**
  - Needs to be well signed so people won't miss exits.
  - Provides more access.
  - Does this alternative require more right-of-way? Yes, for the collector-distributor road located adjacent to the mainline.
  - Is this alternative similar to U.S. 169 and I-435? Yes.
  - Do you have ramp Level of Service (LOS) figures? Yes.
  - Can the Second Tier study improve the LOS with this improvement alternative? Yes.
- **Alternative 10 – Reversible Lanes Using Existing Lanes:**
  - Lots of bridge improvements are needed – Expensive solution.
  - Improving everything else – Might as well just build extra lanes.
  - Makes the biggest impact on congestion issues.
  - Have seen this approach in other cities, e.g. Omaha, Dodge City, and St. Louis.
  - Need to deal with the short ramps.
- **Alternative 11 – Improve Frontage Roads/Arterials and Parallel Roads:**
  - Doesn't solve the traffic volume issues between the Little Blue River and outlying areas.
  - Could support this alternative if it helps with incident management issues.
  - Might not be good for commuters.
  - Combine this alternative with the interchange consolidation alternative.
  - Might restrict pedestrian access.
  - Concerned about further neighborhood isolation.
- **Alternative 12 – Interchange Consolidation and Rebuild Truman Road:**
  - Combine with Benton Boulevard improvements.
  - Residents may prefer the Truman Road exit.
  - Prefer entries/exits at major roadways.
  - Concerned with closing the existing Manchester Trafficway exit.
- **Alternative 13 – CAG Suggestion:**
  - Provide continuity among all of the elements because I-70 is a gateway to the city – Aesthetics are important.
  - Ensure all improvements have a similar look.
  - Your opinion of the city is based upon what you see while driving.

6. **Initial Alternatives Evaluation:** Zafft said that the initial alternatives would be evaluated based on the Purpose and Need, human and environmental resources, and engineering issues. He said that the evaluation criteria would be similar to that used to evaluate other transportation improvement projects. He then asked the CAG to suggest additional criterion and they commented that political acceptability and public involvement should be included among the factors.
7. **Public Involvement Activities:** Killion explained that upcoming public involvement activities included the April 17 Listening Post (public meeting). Community Connections Team presentations for Blue Valley, Washington Wheatley, and Westside Neighborhoods and mobile meetings at the Bluford Branch of the Kansas City Public Library and Happy Foods Grocery would happen thereafter. He said that kiosks would be positioned at the Bluford Library and at the Gregg/Klice Community Center. Each kiosk would contain project information, such as the newsletter and wristbands, and advertise the MindMixer town hall meeting. Killion added that over 60 people were registered for the town hall to date.
8. **Next Steps:** Killion mentioned that the next CAG meeting would be June 7, 2012 at 9:30 a.m. which will be about the initial alternatives evaluation. The remaining meetings for 2012 are scheduled for August 2, October 4, and December 6 of 2012. The next Listening Post is planned for July 2012 and it relates to the initial alternatives.
9. **Adjourn.**