

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE MINUTES

The Leawood Public Works Committee met on Tuesday, August 19, 2008, at 7:30 AM in the Main Conference Room at Leawood City Hall.

Committee Members in attendance:

Julie Cain (Ward 4 Councilmember)
Ken Conrad
Michael DeMent
Chair Mike Gill (Ward 3 Councilmember)
Jon Grams
Marsha Monica
Gregory Peppes (Ward 1 Councilmember)
Kip Strauss
Sherman Titens

Committee Members absent:

John Burge (prior commitment through October)

Guests in attendance:

Phil Gibbs, Leawood Business Owner and Leawood Resident

Staff members in attendance:

Scott Lambers, City Administrator
David Ley, P.E., City Engineer
Julie Stasi, Administrative Services Manager

The meeting was called to order by Chair Mike Gill 7:30 A.M.

- **The first item of business was to approve past meeting minutes.**
Julie Cain motioned to approve the minutes of the July 8th, 2008, Public Works Committee Meeting. The motion was seconded by Jon Grams. All members were in favor of the motion, motion passed unanimously.
- **Pending Business: Curb Repair-State Line Road**
Chair Gill began the continued discussion. At the last meeting, the committee asked staff to prepare analysis along State Line as the State Line really isn't that. There is a street called State Line and then there is the boundary of where the State ownership is. Part of the complication that we have is to identify where the boundary is and what sections we can deal with and what sections we cannot and what sections we need cooperation with others on.

David Ley described the map of the State Line Boundary as provided in the committee packet. The map is from Kansas City Missouri and it is updated every five to ten years. This is also the map the Police Department uses when they determine jurisdiction involving a traffic accident.

David Ley advised basic ownership as follows:

Somerset (79th) to 89th Street -	Both sides of the road are owned by Leawood.
89th to 103rd Street -	Leawood owns the west curb line.
103rd to Carondolet (I-435) –	Both curb lines of the road are owned by Leawood.
Carondolet south- to 135th	West curb line in Leawood, East curb line in KCMO.

The State Line south of I-435 is out in the pavement.

Chair Gill-There is no section of road where Kansas City Missouri controls the west side, correct? So if we wanted to fix the western curbs, we would not need the cooperation of Kansas City Missouri, correct?

David Ley-that is correct.

Chair Gill- If we were to take Somerset to 89th, and then from 103rd to I-435 where we own both sides, assuming without knowing that we would complete both sides and fix what we own . . .

David Ley-Yes, we would do both sides. Also note that North of 89th Street is all commercial on the east side of KCMO. Most of 92nd to 103rd, the east side is all residential.

Chair Gill-Are there any implications on commercial property owners adjacent to the curb?

David Ley-The other issue that comes up is that KCMO's policy is they charge the abutting property owners to replace the curb. So if we were to replace the curb or tried to get KCMO through an Interlocal Agreement; from what they have told us in the past, they would assess their properties. Leawood pays for our curb repair out of current tax dollars received.

Ken Conrad-In review of the map, the curbs are ours until we get to the area of 89th and that is where Missouri starts with some of the curbs. The islands however, are in Leawood. With respect to the islands in the pictures we have seen, there really is not much discussion as to who would be responsible to replace those. Those are physically in Leawood.

Jon Grams-In the report Joe Johnson prepared regarding miles of roadway, was he talking about both sides of the street or just one side?

David Ley-Joe estimated north of I-435 all the curb within Leawood; all the west and he included the east side (both sides north of 89th).

Joe Johnson's Staff report states: *"At the last meeting, we talked about a cost of approximately \$240,000 a mile to remove and replace curb. "There is approximately 32,000 feet of curb in Leawood north of 103rd which is approximately 6 miles. The cost to replace 6 miles of curb is approximately 1.44 million dollars. There is approximately 24,000 feet of curb in Leawood south of I-435. The majority of this curb is also failing. This cost is approximately 1.1 million."*

Kip Strauss- Has the City thought about developing a transportation improvement district, where the businesses come together to improve the area? Maybe curbs and other areas defined for improvement.

Chair Gill-Yes.

Scott Lambers-Giving the magnitude of the problem, a district certainly could be an option to explore. Although, with the Kansas City Missouri owners that would be difficult for Leawood to assess them. Basically that would go through a special property tax assessment and we do not have the authority to tax on the Missouri side. That can be problematic with one side ending up getting new curbs and one side not paying for it. It would need to be 100% voluntary on their part. If one property says no, then the whole idea would go away. That really would not be intended for this type of activity. It is more for a developer to come in that would have a major land holding at the beginning of the project, they would ask for the district and then they have it created before they start parceling off the property. Then everyone would be in the district once they purchase it.

The City of Olathe Kansas was able to do this because of the train crossing. The businesses recognized that they had a serious detriment to the businesses, so they were able to do that. Here with the curbs and gutters, I don't know that we would get the same response.

Chair Gill-Asked who all among the committee members had driven State Line.

Greg Peppes-Making a comment on what Scott Lambers said. Is not sure it's fair to reassess Leawood and Missouri not have to pay for it. If everybody was on the same playing field, he could understand. If we could assess everybody that would be an excellent way, but if it's going to be voluntary and even if Leawood 100% does it... The businesses along there are paying for the other side of the street that is going to be done clearly in Missouri and Leawood business owners are going to pay for it.

Scott Lambers-Basically they would pay for their curb and then the City at large would pick up the Missouri side.

Greg Peppes-Okay, I see. So if they have so many lineal feet of curb in front of them, they would not be paying for any more than what they had? Okay.

Ken Conrad-Clearly, we want this fixed. It looks terrible. I suspect that this committee could make a recommendation. I would recommend that all of that curb line be evaluated and all of the islands assessed that are in Leawood to be fixed. Both for safety, aesthetics and quality of our community. We ought to let Kansas City Missouri know that we're going to do that; that there are curbs on their side that (A) could be safety issues (deteriorating curbs keep the stormwater from flowing properly, people drive into the wrong driveway slots if there are no adequate curbs), and (B) that poor curbs on their side prevent us from doing our routine maintenance; which we are responsible to do in that section of the road. We're supposed to sweep it and remove the snow. Not to give an ultimatum, but we should let them know that they might want to give it some consideration because it is hurting safety and impeding our ability to do routine maintenance.

Michael DeMent-Wonders if we could pick up on that point and sometime have a larger discussion about these cooperative agreements. Not sure how many we have, but one thing that struck him when reading through the agreement for State Line Road Maintenance was that there are no performance benchmarks or obligations on our cooperating partner, in terms of specifically what are we expecting them to do and how often are we expecting them to do it. There is a generalized discussion, but part of the problem seems to be that we have gotten

to a point where we (Leawood) thinks it's reasonable to replace curbs and for reasons good or ill, Kansas City has not gotten to that point. We have no real way of enforcing the agreement. Not much is accomplished other than it's a piece of paper that sort of formalizes a general obligation.

Sherman Titens-We should talk to Kansas City.

Marsha Monica-Asked about the status of the recommendation at the last meeting for a Mayor to Mayor discussion.

Chair Gill-Reported back that he had talked with our Mayor about this and her comment was that it would be more efficient to work with the Council member whose district this falls in. Remembers his years living in Brookside when they needed curbs, they went through their council person who presided over that district. They work their projects differently.

Sherman Titens-If they turn us down, then we could look at these self help issues we have mentioned.

Chair Gill-If there was no cooperation and we were just to build on our side or in our areas where we own both sides and the islands, what would the outcome be?

David Ley-We own everything north of 89th, so the north section would be fine. And then, 89th to 103rd would just look like it does today.

Marsha Monica-Would it be cost effective if we were to do the islands and leave the curbs and gutters?

David Ley-If we did the islands, I'm assuming we'd still do the west curb? Is that what you're asking?

Marsha Monica-Is it just going to be the islands? Is that a waste of money, because when we come back later and do curbs would we have to tear the island work up again?

David Ley- If we do the islands, we would redo the curbs around the islands. It would not be wasting money, because we wouldn't have to replace them in the future. It would probably be more cost effective to do all the curbs at once, because we would get a better price.

Marsha Monica-the point is, if we didn't want to spend the money on the street curbs (on each side of the street), if you came back and redid that, you wouldn't be losing the money of doing the islands with the curb around the islands.

David Ley-Exactly, we would not be losing the money.

Chair Gill- Advised he had driven the entire length of State Line Road, and to his untrained eye, by far in a way, the further north we go, the worse the curbs become. South of I-435 to his untrained eye, the curbs did not look bad to him. Frankly, they didn't start to look bad until we got to the areas where most of it is ours on both sides. Is there a phasing aspect? Or a degree of failure?

David Ley-Yes. South of I-435, that was constructed in three phases: Carondolet to 117 (by Barstow School).

When you look at the curbs in that section, there is quite a bit of de-cracking going on and KCMO has put asphalt into the curbs in that location.

South of there, between Barstow and Verona Gardens, the curbs are hit and miss. Some areas are bad and some are still okay.

Chair Gill-We're looking at a big number here and there are sections that absolutely need or

should have had it two to three years ago. Is this really an all or nothing project?

Scott Lambers-Most cities have in their CIP a curb repair/replacement program. And it's typically done on a pay-as-you-go basis. For a city the size of Leawood you would expect between \$500,000 to \$1 million a year be set aside for that activity. Typically it is funded through property tax. So if you were to institute it, we would be looking at a mill levy increase. In this case, I would say that if you wanted to have the Council consider something, I think that it would be best to look at the 89th to 79th Street section and just say, we have both sides of this area and have everything be part of the CIP. The items would be a mill levy implication and then next year break down the rest of it. We have a lot of curbs outside of the State Line corridor that also need to be repaired as well. Once we get this a program and accept a one time tax increase and the money is there we could set aside for that program. We could also do it for sidewalks.

Greg Peppes-What do you think is a reasonable amount? If this is something that we should do like the maintenance of our streets, we should maybe assign a specific dollar amount and for the next five years put that much money every year into doing curbs. What would....

Scott Lambers-I would say that you would go with 1 mil. You are not really gaining a lot in terms of more per lane miles, you're keeping up with the cost of maintaining-of replacing the same amount of lane miles for five years. Then come back and evaluate it and decide whether the program is effective or not. Therefore, if the majority of the Council says they don't want to do this anymore and the five mill goes away, then the expense goes away. As long as we keep it separate and on track and it's tied directly to one mil, it's pretty straight forward. We would be tied to a specific dollar amount.

In this case, you would want to do a separate section by section until we get to the Missouri side and then we would need to talk to them to do something.

Marsha Monica-Is all for the 79 to 89th section, but also has the thought that the pictures we've seen are probably the worst and those are south of 89th. Is thinking the recommendation would need to be so many feet south of 89th. Make a section from 79th to south of 89th. Everyone seems to be in agreement that the north section needs to be addressed first. The islands just south of 89th are really bad.

Phil Gibbs-His building is at 9000 State Line. Comments that he appreciates the consideration and knows there are a lot of important things to do in Leawood and Public Works is involved in many things. Personally he is involved as he owns the office building and has for 18 years; buying it in 1990. We try to keep the building up, but he looks at the picture of the street. The neighborhood to the south of them that adjoins them, they have not mowed that strip along State Line now for four months. The trees are hanging out past the walkway and the neighborhood is going down in condition. Thinks if the street and the curbs were fixed, then the City could get everyone to try to take care of their property. The property to the north of him is owned by Copaken and they have funds. As a building owner, if he paid for the curb along the front of is property and it came to \$6,000, he'd probably pay for it or could afford it if someone else is going to do it. The City fixed the curb in front of

his home (in Longwood Forest Subdivision) just before they fixed the streets, and they didn't send him a bill. So his question is, why not do it for a business on a collector street? Plus when you own an office building, you take the value of the office building and you are taxed. With homes, they take 30% of that value and then they set the taxes. What is fair for everyone? It's not that I can't afford \$6,000 to fix the curb, but in looking out there every day at it. There is a water hole in the middle of State Line Avenue, and it's in Leawood. It needs to be fixed. Thought they were going to tear it out and put asphalt there in it's place, and has been talking to Public Works for six months about it and nothings done. Now there are weeds in the hole. The pictures shown ...shows the condition of the street and it's not good. It's ratty looking, the area, the property. If Public Works doesn't take care of their road, then no one else will take care of their property.

Mr. Gibbs advised he has been in the sight engineering business and worked contracts with the City and he wants his property to look nice. He wants the street to look nice. Mr. Gibbs advised he didn't come in and ask the City to spend 8 million dollars to fix all the streets, but if the problem is looking at a cooperative agreement, he does not want to wait 3 ½ years to get this to start looking better. Maybe there are some code items that people need to address to get their sections straightened out. One spot has a conduit or cable TV line hanging out in the wind...it looks like junk. Does not think Leawood should put up with it. He doesn't want to. He isn't hollering at the committee personally, he just wants to have it fixed up somehow.

Marsha Monica-Is there any reason that the islands (in the pictures) can't be pulled and asphalted over?

David Ley-Joe Johnson has had some conversations about doing that, but does not know if maybe there were some traffic issues where they were keeping motorists apart.

Kip Strauss-Mentioned the idea brought up the last meeting to do a concept study. There is probably a real benefit if all the property owners are together. If we tell them we are thinking about redoing the curb, what are some other ideas? If we go in and do this, someone might also bring to light a problem at one of the locations or issues. It might give an opportunity to fix a few things that property owners have been upset about. That might help them buy into the project and keep their property up.

Phil Gibbs-Think he hears what Scott Lambers said that you can set that up and if one guy does not want to do it, it may not work.

Marsha Monica-Most businesses might also say that they are paying taxes for that already.

Kip Strauss-Not talking about taxing them more, but looking for input.

Marsha Monica-Could see the businesses getting involved with aesthetic items such as benches, or trees. They may be more receptive, but to say it's x amount of dollars to put curbs in front of the business, that's more the nuts and bolts of what is expected.

Kip Strauss-More of defining a corridor and getting the businesses to work together to keep up their properties. The City may come in and make some improvements, tell us some other ideas you may have as a business. Maybe it is an access issue that they've always been problemed with or if there is something outside of the City's planning. Maybe they would help fund that specific improvement. That might give the property owners a better defined

area that they are taking care of and they wouldn't feel like the City came in and made a few improvements without listening to them about other issues.

Michael DeMent-In understanding Scott Lambers, it sounds like we have three things that we may be agreeing on.

- 1) Do the curbs, 79th to 89th, or just south of there to 90th 1/2 .
- 2) Have a commitment of 1 Mil per year for 5 years to do the rest of State Line.
- 3) As things unfold, informally consult with property owners to see if there are any loving fruit that we can pick off that will make them feel better served, more invested so that they might provide some sort of supported investment or direction to us.

John Grams-Seconds that understanding.

Chair Gill-Acknowledges Committee Member DeMent's Motion and Committee Member Grams second to that motion.

Marsha Monica-Only question is if we recommend that the mill be set aside for curbs and gutters or whatever, she would like to have it be more that the Council would look at each year. Does not think south of I-435 looks that bad. Does not know if we need to spend all that money.

Chair Gill-Thank you for saying that, agrees with Marsha and thinks we should de-couple the funding. We should make a recommendation, but leave to staff to come back either to the PW Committee or to Council what the options are. It may be that that is the option. I think we need to have a clear recommendation and priority that these curbs really need fixing.

Marsha Monica-Thinks the 79th to 90th is the top recommendation.

Michael DeMent-Amends his motion then accordingly.

Jon Grams-Second the amended motion.

Mike Gill-So the motion is a recommendation to the Council to redo the curbs and islands between 79th and 90th 1/2, or up to 91st. And as part of that consult with property owners for input and assume that as part of that staff will put together their needs assessment and a cost estimate.

Scott Lambers-Advised that when staff asks for the increase there will be council members that say here we go again, wanting to raise taxes. If you give the Council a sense that this is a new program that can't be handled through growth of revenue, thinks they need to have the sense that this committee recognizes this.

Chair Gill-Let me challenge that. I'm sitting here thinking we just passed the 1/8 cent sales tax or renewed it and it's for streets and curbs are streets. You have a much better handle on what our money is committed to and you may well be right, but I wouldn't. Based on what I saw driving State Line if I got into a priority on this or some contest with the budget and I had zero-sum new dollars to play with, someone would have to make a pretty compelling case that we have worse needs on our streets than this. This is convincing. They may be there and they may convince me.

Scott Lambers-the 1/8 cent goes to the Mill and Overlay Program. We do not have a curb program at all. We have a few hundred thousand dollars just to go in for strategic repairs

unless it's part of a street project and then we approve that cost in the street. That is what we have.

Marsha Monica-So the recommendation should be to have the Council look at establishing a curb program.

Scott Lambers-Typically a council will have in the CIP a Pay-As-You-Go Program that bites the bullet for the first tax to pay for the allocation and then it's there for year after year. You have to establish the monies for it and then each year you show what that mil represents and you identify each year the projects from 79th to 90th plus 1,000 feet and then for each of the five years. Ask for it to be identified in each of the five years we would show the segment of curb to be replaced in the CIP and the costs associated with each. Like our stormwater program, we would have a list of projects. We go down the list until we run out of money. This would be the same thing. We may not get some built if we don't have enough money, but we would stop at a reasonable intersection or something like that and then carry the money over if we didn't use it all before and then proceed on down the list.

Jon Grams-Is this a normal situation with counties or cities that they do have these types of funding mechanisms?

Scott Lambers-Yes. Basically you want flexibility. You do not want to bond it. You have to pay cash for it. The idea is that you have a set aside a money fund.

Marsha Monica-Maybe the recommendation should be that we would recommend to the Council that they look at initially a five year plan to set aside and at the end of the five years, to reassess.

Scott Lambers-With the essence of what Public Works has today and you through in an escalation factor, I think the one mil per year, for five years, would complete the State Line Program. And then decide after that.

Mike Gill-Is hearing two motions. Glad this discussion took place.

There is a motion on the table to look at 79th to 90th1/2 including islands and to consult with property owners and to make recommendations that Council approve and authorize those repairs. Any further discussion on that motion?

Julie Cain-One more thought on the island. If we're going to piggy back it and try to get the corporations and whomever else to buy in, we need to think that curbs are curbs but we can redo islands lots of different ways. If there is some oomph to our islands or pretty colored pavers that we do it might get the corporations excited. That would be their first part of this; with them possibly buying the benches or hanging baskets or something similar to the Chicago Gateway item mentioned last meeting. If we are looking for a corridor/State Line edge of Leawood beefed up, to make pretty islands, not just repair them.

Mike Gill-Might be a rush to get over to sit on that bench, but yes the same with the sidewalks too.

Marsha Monica-Understandably, but you know what she means; greenery, trees, etc.

Sherman Titens-That maybe a separate approach. To create a corridor program and involve the property owners in that input of the design and whatever it is. If we overlay the road, do it right. It is the gateway to Leawood, so if you think about that and what we have now out there it currently doesn't fit. That maybe a separate recommendation to the Council to

establish a gateway task force to come back and review.

Mike Gill-An example would be the medians on 135th Street. They are getting smaller, but they are still planted, and they still look nice. And the 135th Street islands have a lot nicer look than what we have on State Line at 89th. If we could do something like that.

Julie Cain-Yes, that is her point, if you look at the medians out here, they look a lot different than the medians on State Line.

David Ley-The landscaping can be done after the curbs are put in. Our standard is if the island is less than 8 feet in width that we do the colored pavers in antique red, so we have a black and red kind of mixed. That is our standard.

Julie Cain-If that is standard, then that might be sufficient.

Mike Gill-Taking the vote. All in favor to refer the recommendation to the council the motion on the curbs.

All members were in favor. No opposed. Motion passed unanimously.

Mike Gill-Marsha, do you want to make a second motion on the curb program?

Marsha Monica moved that the committee recommend to the Council that they establish a curb and island replacement program for the next five years in which they would allocate up to 1 mil annual appropriation for a period of five years.

Sherman Titens seconded the motion.

Scott Lambers-This could not start until the year 2010. That would be the earliest.

Michael DeMent-questioned the phrasing of “*up to*”.

Scott Lambers-Would prefer it say “one mil” because we will spend the money. It is going to be the cost increase is such that we’ll have a little bit more...the phrasing is going to determine how much money we spend each year. We just carry it over and so agrees, that saying 1 annually for the first five years.

Michael DeMent-seems to send a stronger message.

Scott Lambers-the Council also has a financial policy that it will not increase the property taxes more than 1 mil in a given year and right now our next property tax increase because of the CIP would be for the Residential Street Reconstruction Program which is 18 million dollars. We have one scheduled for 2011 and so it would either be 2010 or 2012.

Marsha Monica-Questioned if she keeps in the “*up to 1 mil*” wording then if the Council does other things. If we can only raise it 1 mil a year, then you’re done. If you say “*up to 1 mil*”, if there is another priority that the City Council sees, maybe they could say $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mil here and the other $\frac{1}{4}$ goes towards this. Trying to put in some flexibility.

Scott Lambers-Well, I think you are probably correct. So it’s not either that or nothing.

Mike Gill- I like “up to” and think it suggests flexibility. When this comes to the Council with the recommendation, he would like staff to be prepared to comment on the need for a curb and island replacement program, as opposed to just ad-hoc. That is the “Ah-hah”, we really do not have a program.

Scott Lambers-We also have islands in other places off of Stateline throughout the City as

well that this could support. Thinks it is important particularly and then they could use the money for beautification, landscaping, things like that and have that as part of the program. Jon Grams seconded the motion. All were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Phil Gibbs-Thanked the Committee for inviting him to attend. Another thing he wanted to mention was the condition of the neighborhood off of 92nd & State Line & High Drive area. In driving through the neighborhood, there appears to be about seven homes that are sitting empty. He knows the people are getting old and maybe moving on. Whoever the property owners are, they are not tending to their lots. Individuals used to look after these things. Maybe it was the homes associations making sure the neighborhood was kept up or keeping the trees trimmed back. Mowers used to come in and ask if they could assess the strip behind their property to mow, but no one lately has done this. It's a problem and wants it to look nice. Not sure if the homes association is active or not. Maybe they do not want the noise from State Line, so they leave it, but it is a problem and it looks bad.

Staff- advised they would bring this to Neighborhood Services for a follow up.

Chair Gill-Restated, we had a motion on the table on Marsha's motion for the curb program and it's suggested funding vehicle. All in favor? Any nays? Motion passes unanimously.

- **New Business: 133rd & Roe Traffic Signal Discussion**

Chair Gill-described the location with a reversed frontage road which has exceeded all expectations. People use it. There is an intersection at Roe and those of us who live there Marsha Monica-Yes, I pass by there every day (by the skin of my teeth).

Chair Gill-It is a scary intersection.

Marsha Monica-It is the only un-signaled area between State Line and Metcalf. There is a turn around at Lamar. Roe is so wide.

Chair Gill-There is an elevation change and you can't see cars coming around. The cars come fairly fast and it's a long width to pull out. It's not a question of if it's a question of when. Chair Gill lives in the area and drives it and feels strongly about this. Felt the same way at 127th and Roe and heard the same thing from the City's engineering department that we did not have enough need or not enough study. The greatest signal in the City from a safety standpoint is the one placed at 127th & Roe. Kids drive it. Not just kids, but there is a high school near that takes that traffic.

Chair Gill-What is the process? What role can this committee play or what do we need to do?

David Ley- A couple years ago we looked at the area and had received complaints about the sight distance. We looked at the south bound traffic and thought the sight distance was about 30mph. So we did post an "Intersection Ahead" sign and placed a reduced placard, but obviously people are not obeying it. The speed limit is 35mph. The sight distance might have been 25 to 30, can't remember, but the main line is 35mph. Ten months ago, Chuck Peters who has Building 133 that is under construction now, did a warrant at our request. He looked at the current traffic count that we provided to him and it was not warranted at that time. We got the traffic counts a month before we gave them to him so they were about a

year old. One of the warrants is accident data. There has been 5 accidents in 12 months.

Scott Lambers-Overland Park and others have an excise tax and they tax for traffic signals. Leawood does not do that, so we request studies for our information in case of future developments we would have accumulative data to say we believe it is warranted. The thing to do would be to have committee direct staff to do another warrant study that would involve both Public Works and the Police Dept and have them report back to the Committee.

Scott Lambers-I see people queued up trying to make it across Roe and it's a cat and mouse chicken game and I think I'd rather take the chance of signals causing a problem. By the time we get to it, it will be a year or two anyway and the warrants will only increase over time. So if you tell us, we would come back with a study if it's marginal, we'd say put it in the CIP, again, it would be 2010.

Marsha Monica-Suggested we take the signal going up at Fontana on 135 or whatever it is where there is nothing around for years and put it on Roe where you have people coming.

David Ley-That signal was paid for by the developer.

Michael DeMent-How long ago was the study?

David Ley-the warrant was done 10 months ago.

Michael DeMent-To committee members who live out there, your perception is that you live out there and the issue seems to be increasing?

Marsha Monica-Yes if you are heading west and you are trying to see over the top of the oncoming, it's tough.

Michael DeMent-If I understand Scott correctly, it sounds like one approach would be look at it again, it it's cuspy, but it in the CIP and by the time it rolls around you have a slam dunk case.

Scott Lambers-Well we would have certainly have Chuck Peters' building up and running. The worse case, we would before we do it, do a quick study to see what the impact of that is. A study doesn't always reflect reality. But currently that would be my suggestion and then we can make a decision that at that point in time. If it's close, then the council would probably be okay with it.

Kip Strauss-What we don't know, did the study that was done 10 months ago account for development that is committed that is coming in the next few years? If you go east on 133rd, they've already started grading for something out there. As the commercial strip starts to fill in with businesses, I think we are right in that grey area where maybe the data today actual counts don't show it but if you put in the committee projects I think it would push us over the warrant.

Michael DeMent-and in doing it that way protects current and future council members from the "We want a stop sign" "we want a stop light" even though it's not warranted and we'll wait, "you did it on Roe and now we're not good enough to do it". So I'd move to take another look at it and see where we're at and decide from there.

Marsha Monica-Understands the warrants, but thinks the other thing that needs to be a factor and for consideration is that site; which Mike brought up because it's difficult to go across four lanes not seeing across two of them.

Unidentified Committee member -Was it in the plans at some point to have a light there, do we know? Was it was just a matter of when?

David Ley-Yes.

Scott Lambers-At the time, we had the property on the south side of 133rd Street at Roe, an approved an approved plan. There also was a project to the east of that-a car dealership, that plan was ready to go. If either one of those had occurred, it would have triggered the light being installed. You're right Parkway Plaza is incrementally increasing but even then a lot of their traffic comes off of Roe and can use Nall. It does not have the impact as much, but these others clearly would. Also, the other thing that comes into play is that we will be extending Roe to 143rd Street next year. It will not go any further than that, but that will also increase traffic on 133rd.

Julie Cain-A light cost would be \$400,000?

David Ley-No a light at 133rd & Roe would probably be more around \$230 to \$300,000.

Ken Conrad-Makes a recommendation that Staff considers a warrant study the area of 133rd & Roe. Jon Grams seconded the motion. All members were in favor. Motion passed unanimously.

Chair Gill advised that in talking to David Ley, we can probably have a report back for our next meeting in 3 weeks.

David Ley-the studies are from Tuesdays through Thursdays.

Committee members mentioned that Sundays have a lot of traffic.

Marsha Monica asked about the site plans.

Scott Lambers advised that the development plans expired, but the zoning is still in place.

SCHEDULE REMINDER:

If assignment given, the group has chosen to meet regularly on the 3rd Tuesday of every month at 7:30 AM at Leawood City Hall.

Meeting adjourned at 8:20AM.

Minutes transcribed by: Julie Stasi, Administration Services Manager
Leawood Public Works Department

Olympus File DS300016