
Issues Workshop Summary
January 8, 2010

The purpose of the Issues Workshop was to provide an overview of the study, to present the proposed concepts to stakeholders, business owners and representatives within the study area, and to allow them to ask questions and make suggestions about the proposed concepts. Thirty-three people attended the Issues Workshop on January 8, 2010.

The workshop included a presentation providing an overview of the study and the concepts, then breakout groups to allow for a closer examination of the concepts and an opportunity for in depth questions, followed by a summary of everyone's comments at the end.

The following comments were made during the breakout groups:

- Everyone liked the basic framework of the concepts – the orange mainline separated from the blue collector distributor roads and the green local service ramps.
- Everyone felt that Concept 4a provided the best solution to the congestion and safety concerns noted. People didn't like the out-of-travel routing within the "box" in Concept 4b3. It was also noted that direct access to the businesses in this area was very important to the economy and most did not want to see it removed.
- Most people asked for a couple of examples of how to get from Point A to Point B. Once this was done they felt the proposed interchange was easy to navigate. Some commented on complex interchanges in other parts of the country and how if you follow the green signs you should have no problem getting to where you want to go.
- Much of the discussion in the breakout groups focused on the cost and funding concerns and what short-term solutions could solve immediate problems. Since the improvements could cost up to \$1 billion, people were concerned about how long it would take to come up with the money necessary to build everything. They asked if there were any lower-cost improvements that could be done in the interim to extend the life of the existing interchange.
- The groups also discussed alternative transportation solutions, such as ITS, park and ride lots and transit, and how they might be incorporated into the design to help ease congestion. Everyone recognized that no one solution will solve all the problems and that it will take a multimodal approach.
- Everyone understood that it will be difficult to add an additional through lane on I-35 in the future with all the existing development up against the right-of-way. People were generally open to the concept of a managed lane (and inside express lane that is free to HOV vehicles and tolled for single driver vehicles).
- One breakout group noted the need to keep the regional perspective of the metro in mind when planning for the future.

The workshop concluded with a short survey, which is summarized below. 14 people returned the survey.

1. Was the information presented easy to understand?

14 responded that the information was easy to understand or presented in a way that was clear and straightforward.

2. Do you understand why this study is being done?

Everyone understood the need for the study.

3. What do you like best about the proposed options?

- That Lackman is kept in the plan –2 responses
- Saves driving time
- Easy to navigate
- Extended traffic forecasting used
- Consideration for alternative transit options
- Alternatives assessed reflect solution-based planning that's reassuring
- Improves flow and access plan—4a
- Appears to directly address all of the issues: 1) reduced weaving and 2) can keep access to Lackman and Renner.
- Like the 3 level road concept-yellow, blue, green-good solution
- The varieties of approaches studied the need to keep the Lackman interchange open.
- Excellent collector/distributor concept

4. What is your biggest concern about the improvement options presented?

Cost—5 responses

- Cost and increased travel time during construction—it could be worse than existing conditions.
- This is a good long-term solution, but we need to identify some affordable short-term band-aids.

Timing/schedule—5 responses

- Need it sooner, start sooner.
- Phasing

Construction and impacts—4 responses

- Construction congestion

- Public safety access during construction and elevated public risk during construction.
- As a property owner, how will it affect us.
- ROW impacts.

Functionality

- Sufficient evidence that the interchange will be used correctly by the driving public. For example, is it simple enough for an individual to enter the proper lane 100% of the time. The answer at the session was there is not a direct comparison available today.

Other needs

- I realize it is out of scope, but the I-435/87th Street doesn't seem to be getting any attention for congestion relief and what is going on at Lenexa City Center.

5. Were the breakout groups helpful to answer questions and understand how each of the concepts would work?

Everyone who responded indicated the breakout groups were helpful to answer questions and understand how the concepts functioned.

Please provide additional feedback.

It might have been more effective to have provided a more thorough overview of the concepts to the entire group or in the breakout groups to facilitate any additional questions.

6. Do you think we have presented solutions that can help address the issues and concerns identified with the interchange?

All who responded believe the presented solutions can help address the issues and concerns identified with the interchange.

Please provide additional information.

- Ultimate concept looks very good. Concerned with impact over the implementation period.
- We have immediate needs that need to be addressed at I-435 and Lackman.

7. What additional questions or concerns do you have that you did not express today?

- More regional solution.