

Parkville Route 9 Corridor Study
Steering Committee Meeting
July 16, 2015, 2:00 pm - 4:00 pm
MEETING MINUTES

Consultant Attendees (4):

Sabin Yanez/CFS Team 816-333-4477/syanez@cfse.com
(Project Manager-Principal In Charge)
Rick Walker/CFS Team 816-333-4477/rwalker@cfse.com
(Deputy Project Manager and Project Design Manager)
Andrew Robertson/CFS Team 816-333-4477/arobertson@cfse.com
(Traffic Engineer)
Thomas Morefield/CFS Team 816-333-4477/tmorefield@bnim.com
(Public Engagement and Planning, BNIM)
Kim Pemberton/Trekk 816-874-4658/kpemberton@trekllc.com
(Survey, Design)

Steering Committee Members Present:

Shelie Daniel/MoDOT 816-645-6090/shelie.daniel@modot.mo.gov
Nan Johnston, Mayor/Parkville 816-741-7676/njohnston@parkvillemo.gov
Daniel Erickson/Platte County P&D 816-858-3368/derickson@co.platte.mo.us
Mike Duffy/Riverside 816-372-9017/mduffy@riversidemo.com
Laurie McCormack/Park University 816-584-6210/laurie.mccormack@park.edu
Marsha VanDever/Parkville 816-678-3311/info@parkvillechamber.com
Ed Bradley 816-584-3130/ed.bradley@banklibertykc.com
Alicia Stephens/Platte County EDC 816-270-2109/astephens@plattecountyedc.com
Stephen Lachky/MARC 816-701-8247/slachky@marc.org
Lauren Palmer, City Admin/Parkville 816-741-7676/lpalmer@parkvillemo.gov

Others Present:

Mike Kellam/Parkville EDC 816-268-5006/mike.kellam@parkvilleedc.com
Erik Bergrud/Park University 816-584-6412/erik.bergrud@park.edu
Joan Roeseler/MoDOT 816-607-2258/joan.roeseler@modot.mo.gov
Luke Miller/MoDOT 816-607-2147/luke.miller@modot.mo.gov
Tim Blakeslee/Parkville 816-741-7676/tblakeslee@parkvillemo.gov
Beverlee Roper/Platte County 816-858-3330/beverlee.roper@co.platte.mo.us

I. Summary of Stakeholder Meetings held in June and July

- Goal: Establish several “one-on-one” meetings with specific property owners along the corridor in an effort to gather input for the development of the corridor alternatives.
- Progress: These results were shared with the Steering Committee for their review and comments. The attendees shared some of their specific knowledge of those properties.
 - Property owners along 62nd Street were concerned about entering mainline traffic and were concerned about drainage of the adjacent stream. Adding a signal at R9 & 62nd St is not warranted but the intersections to the north (R9 & 63rd St) and south (R9 & Clark Ave) are warranted. Installing a frontage road

connecting 62nd St to a possible signal at Clark Ave was discussed. Local property owners were concerned about increased traffic and drainage issues.

- Property owners at R9 & Main St were concerned about entering mainline traffic due to the angle of the intersection. Alternatives were briefly discussed but no clear design was proposed. Major design constraints were listed as topography, maintaining access, and sight distance.
- Property owners utilizing 12th St were concerned about adequate sight distance around the existing retaining wall. Road designs that account for sight distance will be produced after a road cross section has been chosen.
- Concerns were raised at the meeting of maintaining consistent bike lanes or paths to connect to downtown and to the river park. Directing all bike traffic along the trail between R9 and Park University was not desired.
- The US Post Office was contacted about moving from its current location. Representatives replied that there is a lengthy process which involves governmental authority in order to move. They requested a draft proposal in writing which they could evaluate. Concerns were raised at the meeting regarding keeping this building a post office. Statements were made that the building looks old and marks the entrance to Parkville in a negative way aesthetically. Platte County voiced that, in the future, there would most likely be only two US Post Offices in Platte County and that a Parkville location would likely be one of them. A discussion was held regarding possible alternatives which would move the office to a retail location close by with updated amenities.
- Concerns were raised regarding pedestrian safety crossing Route 9. Walkability and safety for pedestrians should dictate the corridor design and paths should be easily accessible and should promote connectivity between land use areas.
- The remaining one-on-one meetings will take place after the public meeting.

II. Analysis of existing roadway condition and constraints

Goal: Identify corridor existing conditions and unique challenges to account for in design.

Progress: Thomas Morefield presented a handout showing existing conditions at 6 key locations supplemented by cross section renderings and photos. The 6 locations were as follows:

1. East St (R9) & Clark Ave
2. Walnut Grove Cemetery
3. Old Parkville Cemetery
4. East St (R9) & 7th St
5. East St (R9) & 4th St
6. East St (R9) & 3rd St

Right-of-Way (ROW) restrictions were colorized to show where a 56 ft wide Route 9 cross section could fit and where it could not fit. On the reverse side of the handout was 9 key issues which presented unique challenges to the design. The 9 issues were as follows:

1. Drainage Issues - at 62nd St
2. Traffic Signal Location - at 63rd St, 62nd St, or Clark Ave.
3. Uncontrolled Access - Over 700 ft south of Clark Ave.

4. Walnut Grove Cemetery - Proximity to the road
5. Main Street Intersection - Angle of entering traffic
6. 12th Street Intersection - Sight distance
7. Narrow Right-of-Way - Less than 56 ft in many locations
8. 1st Street Intersection - Congestion
9. Access to English Landing and Existing Trail - Unclear for users, Railroad crossing

These issues were discussed in conjunction with the Summary of Stakeholder Meetings.

III. Potential street templates that identify functional components and ROW requirements

Goal: Establish several alternatives for design of Route 9 including Complete Street elements, multi-modal transportation elements, and desired streetscape/enhancement elements.

Progress: Thomas Morefield presented several slides to show how the cross sections could be designed. Preference was stated for including green space between the back of the curb and the sidewalks. If taking bike lanes on both sides of the street into account, this may not be a viable option. Concerns regarding the safety of bike lanes were raised in regards to the speed difference between motorists. Adding street improvements will most easily be done on the eastern side of Route 9. Retaining walls will be used at Walnut Grove cemetery and should not involve disturbing known graves.

IV. Identification of key design challenges

- Areas with unique and challenging constraints that will require special attention

These issues were discussed in conjunction with the Summary of Stakeholder Meetings and Analysis of existing roadway condition and constraints.

V. Results from Initial Traffic modeling along the corridor

Goal: Establish several alternatives for improving traffic throughout Route 9.

Progress: Andrew Robertson presented several slides regarding 3 main areas for installation of a signal (downtown, to the north between Lewis St and Clark Ave, and Mattox Rd). Results for the intersections downtown were as follows:

- Keep current design with stop signs - Congestion will grow in the future, alternatives offer clear improvements to travel time, not viable
- Add signal at East St & 1st St - Total travel time for all movements decreased 1.2 minutes in the AM (5.2 minutes in the AM 2035), 0.5 minutes in the PM (2.3 minutes in the PM 2035), less impact on Main St, Pedestrians cross easily at signal, Stop signs switched direction at Main St & 1st St, Required eastbound lane on R9, 2 southbound left turn lanes required at intersection
- Add signal at R9 & 2nd St - Total travel time for all movements decreased 1.3 minutes in the AM (5.6 minutes in the AM 2035), 0.3 minutes in the PM (2.1 minutes in the PM 2035), more impact on Main St, more impact on 2nd St, Pedestrians cross easily at signal, Parking will be removed along 2nd St, Stop signs switched direction at Main St & 2nd St, Required eastbound lane on R9, Westbound traffic from Route 9 can no longer use 1st St
- Single lane roundabout at R9 & 1st St - Increased travel time for evening rush hour, not viable

~Adding a signal at East St & 1st St was the recommended alternative.

Results for the intersections to the north were as follows:

- Lewis St - Proximity to major intersection of R9 & R45 is an issue, future traffic warrants a signal
- 63rd St - Future traffic warrants a signal
- 62nd St - A signal is not warranted but serves 69 houses with residents who have difficulty entering mainline traffic
- Clark Ave - Future traffic warrants a signal, possible connection street between 62nd and Clark could mitigate difficulty of 62nd traffic entering mainline traffic

~Adding a signal at R9 & Clark Ave was the recommended alternative.

Results for Mattox Rd were as follows:

- Mattox Rd - Future traffic warrants a signal

~Adding a signal at R9 & Mattox Rd was the recommended alternative.

Crash records did not warrant a signal at any intersection location.

Pedestrian crossing were discussed and emphasis was put on pedestrians crossing at a signal.

Concerns over pedestrian bridges were raised due to cost and conflict with the planned gateway features.

VI. Review initial Land Use/Re-development concepts

Goal: Identify redevelopment vision/land use goals.

Progress: Thomas Morefield presented several slides regarding land uses determined by a previous corridor assessment. Attendees noted that the public meeting should not include new land uses not previously approved by the City.

VII. Review Project Schedule

Goal: Review project schedule if time available.

Progress: Reviewed schedule leading up to Public Meeting on August 5.

Goal: Identify a Plan of Finance for future improvements.

Progress: Next Steering Committee Meeting.

VIII. Upcoming Activities

Goal: Setup public meeting.

Progress: Public meeting scheduled for August 5th, 2015 at Parkville Presbyterian Church 819 Main St, Parkville, MO 64152.

IX. Adjourn