

**MINUTES of the
Leawood Public Works Committee
July 29, 2020**

7:30 AM – Leawood City Hall Main Conference Room – 4800 Town Center Drive – Leawood, KS 66211

= MEMBERS appearing via ZOOM media due to COVID-19:

<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Andrew Osman, Chair, Councilmember Ward 1	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Julie Cain, Vice-Chair, Councilmember Ward 4		
<input type="checkbox"/> Lori Ames	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Ken Conrad	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abbas Haideri	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Todd Harris
<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Marsha Monica	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Jim Rawlings, CMW2	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chuck Sipple, CMW3	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Chris White

STAFF in Main Conference Room:

David Ley, P.E., Director of Public Works

Brian Scovill, P.E., City Engineer

Ross Kurz, Director of Information Services

Julie Stasi, Administrative Services Manager, Sr., Public Works Department

Shelly Rexrode, Administrative Assistant, Public Works Department

GUESTS appearing via ZOOM media due to COVID-19:

Howard Lubliner, P.E., Burns & McDonnell

Brant Vermeer, Burns & McDonnell

Mike McKenna, P.E., Affinis Corporation

Addison Miller, Affinis Corporation

Vice Chair Cain called the meeting to order at 7:40 AM.

Chair Osman had internet connection issues so was going to relocate to another connection. This was our first ZOOM Meeting, staff setups took a little more time to get the meeting started.

Staff member Stasi read a statement: To reduce the likelihood of the spread of COVID-19 the meeting of the Leawood Public Works Committee is being conducted remotely using the Zoom Media Format and some of the members of the board may appear remotely. Public comments will not be accepted during this meeting. City Hall is closed to public access during this meeting, however, the meeting will be live streamed on YouTube and the public can access the livestream by going to the link posted on the City's website at www.leawood.org All votes taken by Roll Call.

FIRST ITEM OF BUSINESS (OLD BUSINESS): Review/approve the previous meeting Minutes.

ACTION: Marsha Monica- Motioned to approve the Minutes as corrected of the Public Works Meeting held December 4, 2019. Chris White-Seconded the motion to approve the Minutes. Roll Call Vote taken: All members present by Zoom in favor were: Monica, Conrad, Rawlings, Cain, Haideri, Sipple, Harris, and White. Motion passed. Minutes Approved.

SECOND ITEM OF BUSINESS (OLD BUSINESS): Review Mission Road 133rd to 143rd Traffic Configuration. David Ley gave an introduction of the project. Burns & McDonnell were hired earlier this year to design the roadway of Mission Road Improvements from 133rd to 143rd. As part of their scope they were required to include a traffic study and provide a recommendation on the configuration of Mission Road between 137th and 143rd Street. Over the past seven months Burns & McDonnell, their traffic consultant Affinis Corporation, the City of Leawood and Leawood's traffic consultant Olsson and Associates have worked together on the traffic study and recommendations. Leawood Staff and Olsson agree with their findings in the traffic study and with their recommendation on the configuration of

Mission Road. With that he will turn the meeting over to the Consultants for presentation. Dave Ley mentioned that he failed to introduce the consultant at roll call: Howard Lubliner with Burns & McDonnell who will present the findings and asked Howard to introduce everyone that is on their side of the zoom connection.

Howard Lubliner advised he is the Project Manager for the 133rd to 143rd Mission Road Project and he also has the privilege of managing Burns & McDonnell transportation practice out of the Kansas City office. With him today is Mike McKenna our Traffic Aspeed for Affinis. In addition for doing all the survey work that has taken place along the corridor they are doing a traffic analysis which includes the capacity analysis along Mission Road itself and will meet all the various signals and different traffic issues along the corridor so they are in the midst of that. We have two colleagues with us as well Brant Vermeer from Burns & McDonnell and Addison Miller from Affinis who are the ones doing most of the work behind the scenes. We wanted them to be here today for the exposure and experience. And then if you have some incredibly nuance questions to ask, that Mike and I possibly would not know the answer to we have those folks too that can step in and help answer as well.

Mr. Lubliner presented an overview of the project and then the traffic study. David did a good job but he also has a couple of nuance elements he wanted to share. Then we will get into the traffic study which is the meat of the meeting today and Mike will talk about some of the methodology behind that. And we will talk about typical sections between 137th and 143rd Street.

A majority of the traffic analysis that came out is pretty straight forward and we have a pretty good understanding of what we want to do but this section has kind of a little bit more nuance to it and he wants to make sure the Committee is comfortable with the recommendation we are wanting to move forward with and then we will talk about why we came up with the recommendations we did. And then we will have time for questions and answers.

Presentation . . .

As we went through analyzing and starting the project we basically divided it into three (3) distinct segments. The first segment is from 133rd to 135th Street. Overall this section is pretty much near its typical section. It has four lanes; two lanes north bound and 2 lanes south bound each for four lanes total. It has a dividing concrete median that separates traffic by the Price Chopper Grocery. Overall we will be going back with a typical section with an exception that we will add some on-street bike lanes and then also be widening with the multi-use path for that section.

The next section is from 135th to 137th. This is an area that sees an active development interest especially with the proximity between 135 and 137th with those being very close we do expect to widen this section. Currently it is two lanes; one through lane in each direction. That will go to four lanes; two lanes in each direction and a lot of that is to accommodate some of the different queuing at intersections and then the anticipation of it being developed.

The third segment and again the majority of our project is the discussion point for today. This is a largely residential section that incorporates access to a number of different neighborhoods and then of course we have access down here at the various south. Again the majority of what we will discuss and I think a pretty unique situation for Leawood and where we are at. I will turn it over to Mike McKenna to talk about traffic study and what went into our analysis.

Mike McKenna-Traffic Study and predicting whether there may be similarities and wait for assumptions for future results. Determining the appropriate lane configurations one of the big findings for this is from 137th Street down to 143rd Street. Does it make sense to have the 2 Lane with the turn lanes or roughly a 3 lane section? OR does it make sense to go with a 4 lane undivided section? That was one of the big things to look at. How the pedestrians are crossing Mission Road down by Prairie Star Middle School and then of course the three major intersections of 133rd, 135th and 137th and then the turn lane configurations at those locations. We also looked at the turn lanes at 143rd as well.

Using computer models, the Mid America Regional Council (MARC) has a large traffic model that covers the whole City and it has big assumptions in nature. So we use that model to come up with background traffic for the overall growth of the City as it grows over the years. We looked twenty years out to the future for a number. Based on those numbers, it is about a 1 1/2 % overall growth in the background. The one thing the model never does well is look specifically at development in an area and how that is going to affect intersections nearby. What we did do is we took certain areas of development, and labeled them T1 through T8 and the assumption was that all of those areas would fill in in the next twenty years. That is a conservative assumption. That means everything is full.

We then took those numbers and added them to the existing and the background numbers to develop future numbers and every step of the way we looked at it in a more conservative manner. So we believe the number that we have presented is conservative on the high end. So we are not underestimating the traffic on the roadways.

Typical Section Alternatives-

A recap of why we are here. Mike McKenna shows a photograph of the existing typical section; a narrow 2-lane section with open ditches and not built to accommodate the future traffic demand. A minor Arterial road and is posted at 35 mph.

Howard Lubliner-

The typical sections we are considering are two major options.

The first option is what we call a 2-Lane divided typical section. This allows one through lane in each direction. Again you will have on-street bike lanes and you will have multi-use shared paths but this does have a divided raised median that allows for turning lanes at the appropriate cross streets. Some may call it a 3-Lane section but technically it is a 2-Lane divided section.

The other option that was considered in this study is a 4-Lane typical section. This would be similar to what is being constructed and was constructed on 143rd Street to the south. So 2 lanes north bound and 2 lanes south bound with on street bike lanes and multi-use shared paths.

The one thing that I would like to show about this section for the discussion is as you can see right now we have 58 feet curb to curb in the 4-Lane section. The edges of our curbs are 58 feet apart in this alternative (the 4-Lane alternative).

And in the 2-Lane alternative they are also 58 feet apart. The reason for that is that allows us in going with this raised section it is that we can set all of the utilities and all of the storm sewer along this outside curb line and it makes the 2 Lane alternative upgradable. So if we go with the 2-Lane raised section now and if in twenty years from now it turns out the development is denser than we've imagined we could much more easily upgrade this section into a 4-Lane section just because those curb lines line up exactly in the same place. An important feature that we needed to point out here.

Our recommendation is the 2-Lane divided section. And we have two major volumes of that, the traffic volume and the safety considerations and I'll let Mike speak of that.

Mike McKenna-The 16,000 traffic volume is per day or average daily traffic. That number was developed when we looked at all the model numbers and projected them out to the future. This is a very conservative number. The numbers come from a number of different studies. When you look at the 2-3-Lane divided section a lot of times the studies that have been done for those are called road diets. It is because there has been a lot of 4-Lane undivided sections around the country that have been built prior to a lot of use of a 3-Lane section that were then called “road diets” and then they went back and added a 3 – Lane section so they could get a trail or a bike lane in there. So there is a lot of data on those. That data culminates into a chart where you can see there is a range of ADT (average daily traffic) that are used for each type of roadway.

Again this is the 20 year projected future traffic volume that we anticipate with all the areas developing with overall traffic roads throughout the area. All of that results in 16,000 which is at the higher end of our 2-Lane divided section, but still well within the range of that time.

Howard Lubliner-Describing the safety information. In general and as a safety professional myself, this demonstrates what we call different conflict points. These are locations in which different vehicles may interact with each other. In general the three lane section as opposed to a four lane section is just cleaner in terms of being able to pull the turning vehicles out of the two lanes and it is some of the number of different points at which in intersection in crossing vehicles or turning vehicles might potentially interact with each other. The theory goes that the fewer conflict points you have the fewer opportunities you have for crashes therefore we are fashioned to that.

One of the things I would point out about this corridor which is incredibly unique and why we are recommending a bit of a unique section verses what is in the rest of the City is that despite the fact that it is a residential section and there is almost no entrances/house direct entrances to Mission Road between 137th and 143rd Street. There are a couple of houses at the very south end of that corridor, there is one house at the north end. But every other connection point to Mission Road is a dedicated street. So that is a lot of what allows us to be able to use that raised median. I think about just to the south even though it has a higher overall traffic volume as well like 143rd Street, there is a lot of individual homes along the road and if you had to create a median for each and every home at that point you essentially would just have a full three lane section paved anyways. So that is why the two lane divided does give the opportunity to physically separate the north and south bound traffic to all but eliminate the opportunities for those head on crashes and then also gives us capacity and we do not have to keep opening and closing the medians because there are system access points throughout. Again to that there is also this visual issue sometimes with the four lane undivided where a car can get hidden. So if you have a car in the far lane and a car in the near lane sometimes you cannot see that and our two lane divided or similarly the three lane section does reduce that issue.

One thing we wanted to point out, we do think that route continuity is very important so as somebody is traveling down Mission Road we want to have some consistency in what they experience. And overall Mission Road is a two lane road. Going from 133rd Street it’s got by and large two lanes just one lane north bound and south bound, currently south of 135th Street is 2 lanes. And then even beyond that south of 143rd Street is 2 lanes. So going with the 2 lane section here between 143rd Street and 137th is absolutely consistent with the rest of the corridor and would meet the drivers’ expectations.

Questions and Answers.

Julie Cain-Has questions as this is in my back yard and has questions but will defer to committee members first for their questions.

David Ley-Introduced Andrew Osman who has joined the Zoom Meeting. We will call on members as we see their question hands via ZOOM icon. (a little instruction, to “Participants” at the bottom of the screen there should be a list of everyone, and then there is an option to “raise your hand” at the bottom of that list).

Ken Conrad-Quick question. In the end is the Committee going to be asked to make a recommendation

on Burns & McDonnell's recommendation?

David Ley-That is correct.

Ken Conrad-Is prepared for a good discussion but is a little concerned about feeling comfortable enough in 20 minutes to make a good well thought out decision but let's proceed.

Todd Harris-Excellent presentation from Howard and the team. Has two questions. On the traffic volume, the info graphic that had the three tiers. On the study, is there any effect locally-I mean in the very local community area that you've seen through your different traffic study metrics that if you go to a 3 lane it causes drivers to make different choices about the routes they would use? The only reason I ask is I'm up in the north part of Leawood area and I drive through the Prairie Village area where they calmed Mission Road by going from 4 lanes to 3 on a section north of 75th Street and I've got to think that caused people to pick different routes to get to where they need to go. I understand this is a conservative high number but also does that make an effect of people making different choices about the route they use? (First question).

Mike McKenna- Stepping back for a second, Julie Cain mentioned living by this corridor and Mike lives near the corridor too, so he does drive it. Todd, the project you mentioned and brought up, I was actually part of that design so he is aware of the area mentioned. Based on the traffic study that was done by another consultant their findings were that the traffic volume could easily be handled on that street and he understands Todd's point as far as would someone pick another route because they didn't feel like the amount of traffic could be handled on that route. There is a possibility that some people do that, traffic kind of moves like water through a pipe system where they will typically take the path of least resistance. But whatever is in your mind as the path of least resistance they take. There will be some adjustments but in general if someone went away from that thinking it was going to be bad and then came to the realization later on that traffic was still moving and it wasn't stopping and things were working well, they probably will go back to it and use it just fine. Overall it's worked really well.

Todd Harris-What I see is that the idea of cut through streets up in the north area, 85th Terrace, some residential neighborhoods become cut-through streets. So he didn't know if there would be a concern about that sort of thing with the 2 lane divided or 3 lane design. Something to think about. He would not want to see this have that effect on a neighborhood down there like it does up in the northern part of the City.

Todd Harris-The other question is on the graphics of collision points, he noticed none of those included bike or pedestrian. Which to me bike and pedestrians have become more and more of a norm. So on those info graphics he can only imagine that potential collision points and the blind spots bicycle verses **{Internet connection with Todd Harris was lost- reconnection was choppy}**.

Howard Lubliner -: In addition to what Mike mentioned about the through capacity of the road, beyond all the signalized intersections and in a corridor like this we are making sure we have adequate capacity at those signalized intersections. We are currently coordinating with Operation Green Light and others to optimize the traffic through the corridor. And we should be able to maintain a good north/south travel along the corridor. Todd's point is valid, as we add bicycles both bicycles crossing Mission Road and operating along Mission Road the fewer lanes of traffic that we have the few opportunities we have for them to interact with cars will reduce accidents.

Todd Harris-Traveling around to National Parks, has noticed an e-bike thing coming out that are pretty fast...**{Internet connection lost}**. Additional comment the E-bike trend he has noticed as he travels around has become an emerging trend, the E-bikes are very quick and fast and they also seem to add another component to traffic safety in areas like this.

Abbas Haideri-Thank you David and Thank you Design team for presenting this. To the development on Mission Road between 119th to 127th which has gone from a 3 lane with a turn lane in the middle. And

that was a different feeling section than what is being proposed here. I wondered is that because we didn't have the right of way width over there, is that the reason? I see the turn lanes in the middle. I assume that will facilitate the few homes that have access directly off the street. The second part of my question is on the four lane section that is potentially proposed for the 133rd to 143rd, has it taken into account the fact that 143rd is now becoming a 4 lane road and potentially drawing a lot of traffic? And will that kind of turn this section off of Mission Road into a conduit for people cutting across 143rd to 135th and visa-versa in a very quick mode. Will this continue to be at 35 mph or will it get upgraded to something beyond? Personally I like the divided two lane section in that it retains the character. But that would be my main question. Also once we get down to the Mission Trail Elementary portion, how do we address the traffic that is paused for school pick up and stuff like that?

David Ley- To answer the first question, on Mission Road from 119th to 127th Street there are a number of driveways; quite a few actually that front Mission Road in that section. That is why we widened the roadway slightly in order to construct that center turn lane. That is the reason why that section is constructed the way it is. The section between 127th and 133rd Street is coming up in 2022 and we will leave it pretty much the same width that it currently is. Because we do not have any of the driveways we just have the intersection. As far as the remaining questions I will let Howard and his team answer that. The speed limit would stay at 35 on Mission Road.

Howard Lubliner-To answer your third question about routing at the school towards 143rd Street. The typical sections that we are proposing here the special two lane divided will transition once we get to the school. We have currently been in discussion with the school about their internal routing of traffic. We do understand that especially at pick up and drop off times that things can get busy there. We are still finalizing but are talking about potentially carrying the two northbound lanes currently it drops at the south entrance to the school. We are talking about actually now taking it all the way up to the north entrance into the school to provide some additional storage past the school. That specific section differs a little bit from what we are proposing here. But we are actively in discussions with the school to make sure we have that capacity.

Mike McKenna-Regarding the cross over traffic. Just to clarify was the question about Prairie Star Middle or Mission Trail Elementary?

Abbas Haideri-Both I guess.

Mike McKenna-As Howard mentioned, taking up to the north drive as currently they come off the south drive during pick up and drop off. And then bring a little car in to the north side so they route them through the parking lot in an S curve back up to the north. You talked about the traffic coming across 143rd and if it is going to become a cut through. Most likely not. One of your biggest drivers on 143rd could change in the future, might not, it just depends. An example when we look at the 143rd intersection the northbound right turn lane is a pretty heavy movement. We have a lot of vehicles doing that and that is going to continue. The reason why is a lot of those are vehicles from the south that are having to come up and go across 153rd over to 150 and cut off that way. So if that bridge is repaired and constructed on 151st Street, there is a potential that people will use 151st Street and head over to route D and then go north to 150 and then head out that way. There is always going to be those opportunities for traffic to adjust or shift based on different changes like that. But currently what you are seeing right now I do not see a lot of people necessarily diving off of 135th and heading down to 143rd on Mission. That kind of goes back to Todd's comment about will people looking for cut-thru and things like that. Some people will use Mission and some will use both. Some use Nall, everyone uses different street but the one thing about these neighborhoods down in this area is there is not a lot of straight lined roads to go from point A to point B. So you're not going to get a lot of cut-thru traffic as if they did have a lot of straight thru residential streets.

Abbas Haideri-Looking at an overall map please. Wants to look at it again. We said from 130th to 135th is 4 lane already. From 135th to 137th is potentially going to be 4 lane because of the future development. And we said from 143rd to the middle school which is about 141st maybe is also going to be 4 lane. So

truthfully we're really just looking at an area of about 4 blocks divided road?

David Ley-That is probably about $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile.

Brian Scovill-Real close to $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile- I got .75.

Unidentified speaker-He is correct, what we're talking about is 137th to 141st, that is really the issue here of what is going to be divided. From the north of Prairie Star to 137th is the area under discussion.

David Ley-That is correct. Abbas if you are done, we will move on to Chris White.

Chris White-Couple of issues. First of all bike lanes are going to have a big impact on that area because there are a lot of bicycles. I also live in the neighborhood, there is a lot of bike traffic there so those bike lanes are going to resolve a lot of road rage and such in that area because it is a big issue in the traffic. That said then I noticed it looked like the traffic study only covered basically 135 to 137th over to Roe, to all the way down to 143rd and not all the way over to Nall. Is that correct? Because on the idea of cut thru and the bridge that is currently closed on 159th that is getting rebuilt. Everything moves around and I'm curious about how much more traffic will go down Mission once it is a functional road? Because right now there is a lot of bike traffic and it is a narrow two lane road. So people are not going to go there once we put some bike lanes in there, even if it is a divided section it is a much more functional road and I suspect there is going to be a lot of traffic that is going down Nall and Roe right now that will shift over. Did you look, was your traffic flow only strict to that area or did it expand into a broader area?

Mike McKenna-Our traffic study focused on Mission Road and it really is easy to start expanding out but when you think about it, the overall base for the traffic volumes comes from the MARC Model and the MARC Model is regional. So the MARC Model does take into account the what-ifs. If bridges are out. You are going to see some change and some traffic will move over to Mission Road from that standpoint. That is taken into account in the model as well. The one thing that you've got to remember too though is the fact that there's bike lanes and we don't have bikes on the road where you are waiting behind trying to sneak around them and pass. Or you have a turn lane when you didn't have a turn lane before so now you are not waiting for someone to get out of your way so you can keep going. It is a much more-smoother travel pattern which again leads to that safety aspect of it. A lot of your 4 lanes be such as 133rd to 137th are meant to be relief routes for 135th. So you will see a lot what I'll call transaction movements up and down north/south between 133rd and 137th that will not carry as much on the north/south arterials other than that. So they will use those to move around and then they will go north/south on where they are trying to reach their destination or in most cases their house.

Chris White-I'll agree with that on 133rd I'm not sure if 137th is really quite honestly the relief route for 135th and south really seems to function as 143rd just because 137th really is not through and there are some other issues there. I hear what you are saying, I think that is my concern. I think as Mission becomes more functional, get the bikes out of the way of the main -I think there is going to be a lot more traffic flowing there. With 143rd being a 4 lane major through fare, it gets a lot of traffic. People running from Metcalf over to 150 Highway. I will be curious to see how much of that traffic is there. Another thing noticed is that 16,000 was on the upper end of the dividing section and is also on the lower end of the four lane. So it was kind of in the range of both of those designs. I hear what Abbas says about the divided kind of keeps the feel of the character of a smaller neighborhood but I think Todd's point about up north where they tried to calm the traffic to reduce speeds and maybe reduce accidents resulted in a lot of-you just push traffic in other areas. So I'm leaning towards the idea of going ahead and maybe making a 4 Lane all the way from 135th down to 143rd. Again there are a lot of issues that I'm glad to hear what you were saying about Prairie Star, the drop off and pick up definitely falls into the roadway. The car line runs out into the street and that is normal. So you got to have four lanes down there. I'm not sure there is a lot of benefit in cutting down the routes between 141st and 137th.

Abbas Haideri-To address what Chris was saying; Yes, I think I do like the 3 lane characterization in the middle but at the same time the reason I asked for that was to see what the extent was and if it is just $\frac{3}{4}$ of

a mile it might even make sense to go 4 lane now all the way. But I'll leave that open to debate. Thank you.

David Ley-One comment as far as traffic moving over Mission Road from Nall. Nall Avenue is a 45 mph roadway. More than likely I think people would be staying on that section of roadway before they would want to switch over to Mission if they are trying to get somewhere in a hurry.

Chuck Sipple-Looking at the overview map-please correct the name "Rose Avenue" to read "Roe Avenue". Added he lives out here and uses the section at least several times a day and I'd like go with Chris and Abbas in that I think we're looking at something that we should continue with the 4 lanes from 137th down to Prairie Star School otherwise it looks like we have under designed it. All the neighbors out here are very much in favor of a 4 lane undivided just like at Prairie Star School or up near the Price Chopper at 133rd and 137th. We do not want to under design this thing. One of the big problems out here is I would call it very high bicycle traffic. When you get down to the sections of the 3 lane from 133rd down to 119th Street, even with the bike lanes in there it is congested with bicycle traffic. We anticipate that is going to continue to increase in the years ahead, so we do not want to under design our road. When you get down to 133rd to 127th, that is a 3 lane and I know there is a turn lane in the center. But if you get behind a truck or a very slow moving traffic you are stuck. You can't move around and continue to where you want to go, which in my estimation is a pretty good reason to go with the 4 lane. Asking the Engineers here or from Burns & McDonnell, what is the difference in cost since we are dealing with the same right-of-way between a 3 lane and a 4 lane undivided? Is it a cost thing that we want us to go low rather than high?

David Ley-There is probably not much savings in cost at this time to go from a 2 lane proposal or to go to a 4 lane. Would you agree with that Howard?

Howard Lubliner-Yes it would be nominal in terms of what we are doing in the current structure. I will point out one thing that is relative to our recommendation is we do certainly understand that the 2 lane divided section is towards the upper end of its capacity as that one chart showed. So that is our 20 year projection. So that 16,000 vehicles a day is what we project in 20 years with some conservative estimates about how much density develops at the north end of our study corridor. If traffic does not grow quite as fast or if that area does not develop as densely, then we would not necessarily see the 16,000 per day. We do recognize that issues that you all have raised in that maybe it is not adequate to handle future capacity and that is where we are a big proponent of the fact that it is upgradable. Because they have the same outside curb line is that in 15 years or 10 years if it turns out that the traffic growth here much more substantial than we had we could upgrade to a 4 lane roadway with ease. One reason why we do recognize what you guys are saying is potentially the capacity is there and this could accommodate that in the future with minimal additional cost.

David Ley-Add all to that Chuck you were mentioning about the bike lanes. This is going to be a wider bike lane than what we have north of 133rd Street. This is going to be a 5' wide bike lane with a striped buffer to create a clearance between the vehicles and the cyclists. So the feel for the cyclists is it is going to be much wider. The 22 feet in width also allows emergency vehicles to pass cars if they are on a call, someone can still have room to pull over and they can still get past them. Howard kind of mentioned it, but they were looking at 20 years in the future. Typically roads we have quite a bit of construction almost or reconstruction after 30 years anyway. So really what we are looking at trying to build here is more of the right size of street and not overdesigning the street today for something today that may or may not be needed 20 years from now. So that is why we were kind of leaning more towards the 2 lane roadway.

Julie Cain-Thank you for the presentation first of all. I respect and I'm well aware of what is going on with this street but boy I am not a proponent of the 2 lanes in each direction at this point in time. It is my understanding from years ago, 20 years ago when I first started on the Public Works Committee but Mission Road was never intended to be a main North bound thoroughfare where as Nall clearly was and Roe dead ends on 143rd. Mission Road dead ends on 119th and it has the two schools and it has the

church on the end and we are all well aware of what is there. But it was never designed or never intended to be a major route north/south. I think these projections like you said conservatively –projections that may or may not happen and the fact that the two schools are on there and I think it would be personally I think it would be way over designed and it would just be... the thing that keeps coming to my mind and maybe this is silly but just that it would take away from the integrity of what that was when all this was designed to be. It was never supposed to be a major north/south and you don't have as somebody was pointing out you don't have a bunch of driveways up and down from 137th down to 143rd and so to have the 2 lanes there to me each way would be way overkill and almost like a scar to me personally to do that to that road. Projecting something out that may actually never happen. Even if it does happen in 20 years to your point, it's still the same width and it could be retrofitted and it would be time to retrofit anyway. Obviously the Park is there-Ironwoods Park. We do have those two multi use lanes which I would think would take some of that bike dropping off the littler people. The main bike riders are already on that road. So if they have a 5 foot lane they are on that road anyway, and they are going to stay on that road. Some of that is going to be able to divert safety wise to those multiuse lanes on either side plus the fact that they are going to be on either side I didn't realize we had the room or the easement to put them on both sides all the way from 135th Street. They are terribly needed in my mind. We have been asking for those for a long time. I really-really urge the group not to over improve or over develop this stretch for something that may or may not happen even in 20 years. We have no idea what's coming along 135th nor when it's coming clearly. It has been sitting there for ages.

Marsha Monica-the thing that is important to her is the schools and in making sure that we have safety at both Mission Trail and Prairie Star Middle. My question down at Prairie Star Middle School do you have any plans to have a school crossing like what is in front of Mission Trail where there it is signalized for traffic to stop for school crossing?

David Ley-The plan is there is currently a crossing on the north side of the north entrance on Mission Road into the school. We would maintain that crossing somewhat in that location and we would use rectangular rapid flashing beacons which is what we have on 143rd Street at Windsor. It is not a signalized intersection. They would be push button and the yellow light strobe and then there will be a crossing guard at that location. In my opinion if the student wants to go to a signalized intersection to cross they can go down to 143rd Street & Mission where we have it.

Marsha Monica-Okay. I have to kind of agree with Julie Cain that Mission Road has always been kind of a country road and I think people like that feel. I know when I see 133rd with the concrete it's just a busy street and it doesn't have any charm to it.

Chuck Sipple-Since I live here and I commute on Mission Road south of 137th, I still feel strongly that and my neighbors are all very adamant about wanting to have no congestion. If we can design this for no congestion. The trucks, the landscaping people and bicycle riders. If we can alleviate the congestion that we have now that is what we want. So I am leaning towards the 4 lane. I could live with a 3 lane but I'm going to vote for the 4 lane. Thank you.

David Ley-I will add one of the biggest complaints we had on 143rd Street is due to the width of the roadways is the speed of the traffic. It is very difficult and very challenging for people to drive the speed limits. So by going to a super wide roadway there is a potential for increased the speed. The speed limit would not be raised but the 85th % could possibly go up and I'd leave it to Mike McKenna to see if he would agree with that or what his feelings would be on that.

Mike McKenna-Yes David you are absolutely right. When you drive on 143rd Street right now and I'll tell you when we look at the traffic studies from the two different projects. The volumes on 143rd are projected to be higher than what is on Mission Road. Currently right now on 153rd there is not a lot of traffic on there. From the stand point of it is easy to get around and so what happens is to David's point, you get that feeling that I've got this wide road and no one around me and I go a lot faster then I think I'm going and you end up having to put a police officer out there all the time continuously writing tickets. Then people get a ticket and wonder why isn't the road posted at a higher speed. It's kind of a circle so that is on a road that has a higher projected traffic volume. But if it is on Mission Road you will have that

same scenario for a lot longer period of time.

Chuck Sipple-The thing about Mission Road is the bicycle traffic. It is a very attractive road because you can go out to 250th Street and Mission Road and we get the bike traffic. 143rd does not get the bike traffic. The neighbors out here want to alleviate that congestion. Even in spite of the fact that there is going to be a bike lane, not all of the bike riders honor the one in the road when they get going. They get two and three across and you're stuck. We just want to alleviate that congestion.

Marsha Monica-We have a lot of bike traffic on Mission Road between 119th and 135th but it is also not 24/7. Weekends are worse but there is not as much traffic on the roadway on the weekend. Later in the evening a little more traffic but again I do not see bike traffic being a 24/7 problem.

Jim Rawlings-It's 3 lane proposal, the center lane from 137th to 143rd is that all supposed to be paved or will it not be necessary to have a turn lane and will it be green space?

David Ley-That would be green space. The turning lane would have pavers because it will only be two to three feet wide. Once you get beyond those turn lanes the island would be grassed and you could plant trees if you wanted those in there.

Jim Rawlings-To the bicycle question: With the study done taking into consideration what is the traffic as far as cars vs bike traffic. I agree with Marsha and I think she's got a good point that that is not a 24 hour issue. What is the most important consideration that we should consider and the vote is car traffic vs bike traffic which is important also. I'm struggling with that. I travel Mission Road. My son lives out near 157th across from Ironhorse and I travel out that way a lot. I'm leaning towards the 3 Lane if you are talking about $\frac{3}{4}$ of a mile it would be an absolute great improvement to carry that traffic so that is where I am right now. Could we address the traffic as far as cars and bikes? Thank you.

Mike McKenna-There is no doubt that there are a lot of bikes that use Mission and along that connection. There's also a lot of bikes currently that use Roe and it is simply because there is no shoulder on Mission and with Roe being improved, they will go anywhere from 1, 2 to 10 bikes wide riding down that road. There is this phenomenon where if a bike has to share a lane with a car, the more they have in that pack, the safer they feel on riding bikes. So in the case of having the bikes on the road where there is an extra lane, they are going to take up most of that extra lane. In essence you will have a car lane and then a bike lane that would be the same. If you have a separate bike lane that has markings and everything saying this is your safe space, then they are a lot more inclined to pack into that area and stay within the markings of the bike lane and function that way. I actually think there will be an increase in some bikes from Roe over to Mission once there is a bike lane. And a bike lane is really going to relieve the bike traffic from the vehicle traffic.

Ken Conrad-Very good discussion but I go back to my beginning and have a lot of questions. And there is a little bit of a difference between making an emotional decision and technical decision. A couple of points. You talk about the two lane solution and we just talked about how it was going to be treated in the center lane and it sounds like there will be a median with grass. That could be a significant maintenance issue. Hopefully the City will consider that and also more to tear out if you ever expand it. And yet a fully paved third lane in the middle is probably got a lot of issues in it. So I am not 100% sold on the 2 Lane or 3 Lane whatever you want to call it as a very functional solution, especially in an area where there are so many dynamics on what to pick. Bikes are a huge issue in this discussion. I think that the herd mentality with bikes certainly makes it difficult as to how do you control that and how do you design for it? I'm not a bike rider so I don't fully understand it but I think it has a big impact in what we design. It is interesting that most of the local people on this call initially seemed to be in favor of a 4 lane solution and I think that's difficulty, we haven't discussed at all what the input is from our Fire, Police and medical response people. I do not know if that is important. In the four lane solution that you show, those lanes are 11 foot wide. I'm not a traffic engineer or a street designer is that a little narrow?

David Ley-As far as the maintenance of the island, we have been in contact with the Parks Department and they have no concerns about adding this to their annual mowing contract for mowing of the island. So the City has miles and miles of islands. They were not concerned about that issue. As far as the...

Ken Conrad-Are they going to be irrigated?

David Ley-That is a decision made later. The question today is a 3 lane or 4 lane. Staff is supporting of a 3 Lane and we have discussed this with the Parks Department. We have not asked Police. We have discussed it with Fire Department because that is their main access along Mission and they said due to the length, the width of our lane, which is 22 feet, that provides plenty of room for them to be able to get past another vehicle.

Ken Conrad- If there is a center median and the Fire Department (I can't see all that at one time). So from the center median that is a thirteen (13) foot length plus a five (5) foot bike lane, I think. Is that what it is dimensioned as?

David Ley-It would be an eleven (11) foot lane, a two (2) foot buffer and a five (5) foot bike lane.

Ken Conrad-Looking for the 2-Lane. The 2-Lane you will have a 13 foot lane and a 5 foot bike lane. Then I guess you are going to have some of that 2 foot that is drivable. So if an emergency vehicle was going in one of the directions and you got traffic in that, can they get by?

David Ley-Yes they can. I have talked to them about it. The 22 foot is plenty wide enough for them to get by-a fire truck with a car pulled over in it.

Ken Conrad-But you don't have 22 foot, there's a curb. What does it clear?

David Ley-Right. The 22 feet back to back. The clear width would be 21 feet.

Ken Conrad-Okay, if it's been discussed, that was one of my questions, to be able to get emergency vehicles through. Okay. I still have a lot of questions. My recommendation would be if I need to make a decision, I think a Work Session would be appropriate.

Julie Cain-I think a good point that Ken just made: an emotional decision vs a functional decision. I just want to make sure I am understood that I am not making an emotional decision. I think the functionality of the 2-Lane and in following staff's recommendation and following Burns & McDonnell and Affinis' professional recommendations. I always again, (25 years of doing this) I always hesitate to override our staff and the professionals they hire; override their decisions on such a thing. Because I am certainly not a traffic engineer. Never pretended to be. I have a lot of anecdotal information driving up and down. I know Chuck. With all due respect Chuck I know what your neighbors might be saying but your neighbors, nobody can speak for the whole stretch in through there. I'd like to urge everybody to respect exactly what we were charged to do which is hire professionals to come and give us their best recommendation and as well as our professional staff. And not potentially override what their best recommendation and their professional seeing these kind of exact profession are recommending. Just because we can and if we are basing it on productions and anecdotes things that we don't know when and how they are going to come through. Thank you.

Chris White-Following what Julie said, I think she is right in a sense that the opinions in the neighborhood are fairly brought. I think there are some people who really want this to be opened up as wide as possible and there are other people who would love to see it stay as a two lane road exactly the way it is right now forever more because they don't want more traffic. There are a lot of different opinions. I also agree to some extent to what she is saying about I really appreciate the presentation. It is good and I know you have evaluated this and I wouldn't lay down my body against the divided section I think that it certainly is a huge improvement over what we have right now and I'm sure would be very functional for the foreseeable future. The feedback I get from the people from our neighborhood is kind of what Chuck has got and I've got a lot of people who are looking at traffic and I'll admit an emotional bias. I lived in Phoenix Arizona back in the late 80's where they wanted to keep a small town feel of Phoenix. So they refused to build any new interstate, any new highways and they had basically one north/south and one east/west interstate and that was it. And it was a trap because they wanted to hold onto that small town feel. Even though there was like 8 million people. That is what I'm worried about in this situation. I think there are a lot of people in the neighborhood who would like to keep it 2 Lane and I know there is a tendency to do that but I think the traffic flows-like you said 143rd. There's a lot of

people who are picking that speed up and people don't like that but that is definitely a preferred traffic path for a lot of people as well. I kind of think that Mission is going to go that way too and I think you can only fight nature for a while. My point is I would be willing to accept the divided roadway, I still think ultimately just the way I've seen and that traffic area and the number of people who would use it if it was available. I don't think we'd be over designed if we went with the 4 Lane.

Abbas Haideri-I want to briefly point out I personally do like the divided 3 Lane or 2 Lane, whatever you call it. The reason I asked about the 4 Lane again is if you look at the span of Mission Road from 119th Street all the way to 159th Street, there's no stretch that is divided on that road. So all we would be doing is making a ¾ mile wide section in that whole span of multiple miles and even that ¾ mile is split up with turn lanes or deceleration lanes and so I'm kind of questioning the logic of is this the best solution? We are not getting a significant amount of green space or a divided highway. Now if I look at it as a traffic calming device, absolutely. I am for it if that is what we are trying to achieve but is that truly the character of Mission Road in the entire span? That is where my question comes from is whether this makes sense or is there a separate alternative? Personally I do like a 2 Lane but I question the logic.

David Ley-Staff was looking at it, because of the number of complaints that we are getting on 143rd Street, they are continual and there is a lot more traffic on 143rd but there is no way to keep the speed at 35 mph because of the width of the street. We are getting not only complaints because of the speed but with the schools right there at 143rd & Mission we are getting a lot of complaints from the parents due to the speed of the traffic and the safety. They feel that it is unsafe having the crossing across a 4 Lane roadway for kids to get to school. So that gets us into the situation where if we do construct a 4 Lane roadway then-you know we're not going to put traffic signs up when we have them just down the street. So we would have a flashing rapid fire beacons at that cross walk but they are just not as visible when you have a 4 lane roadway.

Abbas Haideri-We talked about that the last time. In my personal experience people don't stop at the strobes they just continue to go. We were on Mission I was waiting at the pedestrian crosswalk just before Ironwoods and no one stopped for me. People see you stopped at the Pedestrian Crosswalk, there are signs that say there is a Pedestrian Crosswalk and our family, with bicycles, we all stop and not a single car cared to slow down or stop. So I don't know, going back to what Marsha was saying do we have a traffic signal or some kind of active signal to allow kids to cross maybe we need to be looking at stuff like that too as part of the design.

Chuck Sipple-I want to add on to what Abbas was comment was, this is going to be the only stretch of Mission Road at least down to 143rd which has a grassy median in the middle and I think we ought to be consistent if you guys go with a 3 Lane rather than a 4-make it all with turn lanes in the middle. I don't think we need a grassy median. That to me seems unusual. I would go for whatever we've got north of 133rd. A consistent look all the way down to 143rd. Thank you.

David Ley-Will add one comment. We will have islands on Mission Road between 133rd and 137th. So it is not going to be unusual and it would actually tie in with that section that already would have islands so we wouldn't be building just a ¾ mile roadway with islands where there is no other islands located.

Chris White-I thought 133rd to 137th was going to be 4 lanes.

David Ley-It is a 4 Lane divided roadway. It will be similar to Roe Avenue between 133rd to 137th.

Ken Conrad-Looking at Google Maps if I start at 137th Street and I go south. 138th street has got access to Mission Road. 140th which is a pretty big intersection to the east it looks like it has a divided exit from a subdivision.

David Ley-That is correct, that is Siena.

Ken Conrad-Then there is 141st and then you get to Prairie Star School. So we are talking about a median that will be continuous except for 3 breaks. Is that right?

David Ley-That is correct.

Ken Conrad-So if, why don't we just build a 2 Lane road? And at 3 locations we have to widen it out a little bit. Why build a median that is ¾ of a mile long that needs maintenance?
Am I understanding how many breaks in the median there would be if we did the 2 Lane?

David Ley-The plan was to build it with the median so that if we needed to widen it to four lanes in the future then we didn't have to go to the outside to impact all the residential properties again to reconstruct sidewalks, reconstruct stormsewers and move utilities out of the way. The curbs would be set to where if it needed to be a 4 Lane road in the future we would not have to go back and relocate all the utilities also. So that is the reason why we were going with the island feature. As far as the median breaks I'll let Howard answer that question. As far as the number, he can bring up the map to view.

Howard Lubliner-There are three side roads that intersect and the one at the north end. One of the reasons why we recommended the 2 Lane divided as opposed to the 3 lane flush pavement all the way across is again so we could maintain that outside edge of curb which is consistent with the potential future 4 Lane. So if we did a paved 3 Lane which is typically narrower than the 2 Lane divided, then that would require us in the future if we went to the 4 Lane we would have to go back and reconstruct those outside curb lines. Potentially have them do storm sewer modifications. That was one of the main drivers of why we put a 2 Lane divided in with the 3 Lane fully paved section.

David Ley-We should turn it over to Julie our Vice Chair as it is getting late. We can see if they want to continue this item or if we want to go to a vote.

Julie Cain-The question before us is are we ready to accept this recommendation or not and or those are our options. Yes accept it, don't accept it or continue the discussion.

Chris White-Motioned that Committee accept the Burns & McDonnell and staff recommendation of a 2-Lane, Divided roadway in the segment running from 137th to 142nd by the entrance to the school.

Marsha Monica Seconded the Motion.

Members present by Zoom were polled on their vote.

In favor of the Motion: Rawlings, Monica, White and Cain, Haideri

Opposed to the Motion: Sipple and Harris

Abstained: Conrad

Abbas Haideri-Asks Vice-Chair Cain to change his vote to Abstained. Abbas thinks we need a little more discussion or would like to see the design team at least show us the plan of how much or what we are talking about in this case.

Julie Cain- Abbas' YES vote is going to an Abstain, so now we have 4 YES, 2 NO and 2 ABSTAIN and we are waiting for Andrew Osman as I understand it.

Julie Stasi-Correct.

David Ley-He has no microphone. Andrew Osman has texted me that he votes YES.

Julie Cain-I just got that text too. So we have 5 YES, 2 NO and 2 Abstain to the Motion on the table

Julie Stasi-That is correct, that is what I have.

YES: Rawlings, Monica, White, Cain, and Osman

NO: Sipple, Harris

ABSTAIN: Conrad, Haideri

Motion in favor carried for the approval of the recommendation of staff and the professionals hired to approve a 2-Lane, divided roadway in the segment running from 137th to 142nd Street.
Motion Passed.

Julie Cain-Do we want to have any dialog about the scheduled timing of this? As I understand with COVID-19 that this has been pushed back. David do you want to update the Committee Members on this?

David Ley-Howard has been able to continue with the design as far as for the construction plans. We are still anticipating a March or April 2022 bid letting. Construction would be early to Mid-2022 for the roadway construction and then finish in 2023.

Staff advised the committee recommendation would be presented to Council at the August 17th Meeting. Staff advised the Public Works Committee would not have a meeting on their regular first Wednesday of the Month, and will remove August 5th date from the calendar. Staff will be in contact regarding the next meeting date.

Abbas Haideri-Motioned to adjourn the meeting.

Todd Harris-Seconded the Motion.

Vice-Chair Cain adjourned the meeting at 9:20 A.M.

Minutes transcribed by: Julie Stasi, Leawood Public Works Department