
Meeting Notes

Date: Thursday, June 7, 2012
Time: 9:30 a.m.
Location: Mid-America Regional Council, 600 Broadway, Suite 200, Kansas City, Missouri
Purpose: Community Advisory Group (CAG) Meeting No. 4

Participants

CAG Members Present

City of Kansas City, Linda Clark
City of Kansas City and Kansas City Industrial
Council, John Patrick (alternate)
City of Raytown, Andy Noll
OOIDA, Kip Hough
Downtown Council of KC, Cliff Greenlief
MARC, Ron Achelpohl (alternate)

CAG Members Absent

3rd Council District (KCMO), Augusta Wilbon
3rd Council District (KCMO), Virginia Williams
City of Independence, Donna Coatsworth

Jackson County, Scott George
JC Sports Complex Authority, Jim Rowland
Greater Kansas City Chamber, Nora Lockton
Hispanic Chamber of Commerce, Carlos Gomez

MoDOT Staff

Matt Killion, Area Engineer
Allan Zafft, Transportation Planning Specialist
A.J. Byrd, Community Liaison/Civil Rights

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 a review of the initial improvement alternatives for the corridor and the evaluation of them.
- Approve the May 3, 2012 Meeting Notes:** Killion summarized the May 3 CAG meeting and asked for additional comments but received none. The CAG then approved the notes from the May 3 meeting.
- Initial Alternatives Review:** Allan Zafft (MoDOT Transportation Planning Specialist) provided an overview of the 12 initial alternatives and explained the comments received during the previous CAG meeting. He asked for additional comments as he outlined each alternative and the CAG responded as follows:



- **Alternative 1 – No-Build**
 - No comments.
- **Alternative 2 – Transportation System Management (TSM)**
 - Are variable speed limits being considered? Yes.
 - Do we know if I-70 is good for ramp metering – May not have the platoon numbers?
 - Ramp metering is better east of I-470, although it may be politically difficult.
- **Alternative 3 – Transportation Demand Management (TDM)**
 - Use Alternative 2 and 3 with whichever infrastructure is built – Inexpensive.
 - Aggressively promote subsidized bus passes like the University of Missouri-Kansas City (UMKC) program where student identification cards work as bus passes.
 - Have you considered High Occupancy Toll (HOT) lanes? No.
 - Some portions of I-70 could be HOT lanes and require a fee payment only at certain times of the day.
 - Would HOT lanes be considered High Occupancy Vehicle (HOV) options?
- **Alternative 4 – Other Modes (transit, bicycle, pedestrian) includes 4a (bus) and 4b (rail) options**
 - No comments.
- **Alternative 5 – Geometric Improvements**
 - What's the issue with truck traffic? They have trouble getting under the Stadium Drive railroad bridge.
 - The bridge was recently improved to 14 feet high, but it needs to be three feet higher.
 - Would love to have four lanes but the railroad isn't interested in making any bridge improvements.
- **Alternative 6 – Interchange Consolidation**
 - Combining 18th and 23rd Streets is good for vehicles but not trucks, e.g. from Belfonte and U.S. Postal Service – Trucks will go through the neighborhood because the bridge clearance is too low (trucks get stuck).
 - Focus on one bridge and improve it.
- **Alternative 7 – One Interchange per Zone**
 - Potential to help or hurt economic development – Focus synergy on one location within the zone rather than spreading it out.
 - Adding collection/distributor roads, especially on the east side of I-70, would help neighborhood economic development.
 - Include amenities with redesigned interchanges.
- **Alternative 8 – Collector/Distributor System**
 - Would cost almost as much as widening I-70.
 - Would have to limit access.
 - Would have significant impacts on the urban community.
- **Alternative 9 – Zonal Collector/Distributor System**
 - No comments.
- **Alternative 10 – Reuse Existing Lane – Reversible Lane**
 - Very expensive alternative.

- Will be difficult to get parallel grades – Won't happen.
- Neighborhoods don't use the highway – Commuters use it.
- **Alternative 11 – Improve Frontage Roads and Parallel Roads**
 - Incorporate design improvements that make the roads friendly to pedestrians.
 - Some frontage roads that exist today, e.g. Askew, are unfriendly.
 - Like the incident management aspect of the alternative.
- **Alternative 12 – New Interchange at Truman Road**
 - Truman Road is a good idea compared to Prospect and Brooklyn Avenues.
 - 23rd Street is another good location – Interchange is already there and motorists can travel to Independence.
- **Overall**
 - Do any of the alternatives improve the connection to U.S. 71? No, because it would cause too much congestion and the impacts would be steep. The U.S. 71 connection was considered in the first tier study but not part of the selected strategy.

4. **Initial Alternatives Evaluation:** Chris Nazar (CDM Smith Transportation Planner) provided an overview of the initial alternatives evaluation. Nazar said that each alternative was evaluated against the study's Purpose and Need, human and environmental resources, and engineering issues. He then outlined the results of the initial evaluation based on the handouts provided at the meeting (re: initial evaluation matrix). The CAG comments as follows:

- **Purpose and Need Criterion**
 - Ultimate goal is to use the criteria in the matrix to mix and match initial alternatives? Yes.
 - Crash analysis: Are you distinguishing between geometric improvements, fatality and injury, and disability? Yes.
 - Determine where fatalities are happening and fix those locations. A later phase of the Second Tier study will look deeper into accidents. Most are rear-end accidents.
 - Geometric issues are likely the curves and trucks.
 - Only the "build alternatives" address crashes – Some more than others.
 - Can synergies be teased out with TDM and TSM that would add to the attributes of the build alternatives, e.g. Alternative 4 + Alternative 2 + Alternative 10? Yes and the alternatives would then be tested with the traffic model.
 - What if you increased bus service on the arterials? MoDOT will apply the transit solution developed through the Jackson County Commuter Corridor Alternatives Analysis. No new transit solutions will be developed through the Second Tier study; only solutions that are currently under study will be applied.
 - Would like to have better transit service on U.S. 40.
- **Human and Environmental Resources**
 - Probably have 60 decibels of noise now – From the neighborhood, you can hear the trains more than the cars.
- **Engineering Issues**

- Manchester Bridge Project: Will change the results of the evaluation matrix once this project is added to the Statewide Transportation Improvement Program (STIP).
- Traffic impacts during construction – There significant differences between the alternatives. Likely, but the engineering data isn't available yet. This will be analyzed for the reasonable alternatives.
- Can you add more data to the evaluation as it becomes available? Yes – Purpose and Need is a living document. Build Alternative 5 will cause traffic reroutes that could impact the neighborhood vs. the highway – Discuss this further as the alternatives are combined.
- Include “constructability” with this study.
- Reversible lanes are hard to accomplish and have on-going costs. On-going costs aren't included in the project cost estimates. Only capital costs are shown at this time.
- Reversible lanes would make sense if the road profiles/alignments are similar for both eastbound and westbound.
- **The following were comments regarding which alternatives MoDOT should potentially carry forward for detailed study.**
 - Don't like the collector/distribution systems – Prefer incremental approach.
 - One interchange per zone isn't politically feasible – Could do some consolidation.
 - How many reasonable alternatives will be included in the study? Three plus the No-Build Alternative.
 - One interchange per mile would be a good contrasting alternative that adheres to the current standards and allows opportunity for consolidation.
 - Won't ever get the one-mile spacing.
 - No-Build Alternatives can't stand alone.
 - Alternative 5 is a favorite.
 - Like Alternatives 9.
 - Truman Road is intriguing – Consolidate Alternatives 6 and 12 or remove Alternative 12.

5. **Public Involvement Activities:** Killion provided an update of the public involvement activities connected to the study, describing Community Connections Team (CCT), mobile meeting, and MindMixer results. He said that a project kiosk had been placed at the Bluford Public Library for the duration of the study. The kiosk contained study materials, such as the current newsletter and wristbands. Killion asked the group to suggest locations for a second kiosk and the CAG responded as follows:

- Independence Square
- Independence City Hall
- Independence Events Center

Killion said that the next round of public involvement would focus on the initial alternatives, and there would be meetings with government officials, a listening post, CCT presentations and mobile meetings. The CAG responded that a CCT presentation should be given to the

Renaissance Neighborhood Association and to the Mid-America Regional Council's Total Transportation Policy Committee.

6. **Next Steps:** Killion said that the next steps in the study process included the development of reasonable alternatives, identification of a potential preferred alternative, draft and final versions of the Environmental Impact Statement, and a Record of Decision. He said the study would conclude in the spring of 2014.

Killion mentioned that the future CAG meetings are scheduled for August 2, October 4, and December 6 of 2012.

7. **Adjourn.**