

Parkville Route 9 Corridor Study
Steering Committee Meeting
October 9, 2015, 10:00 am – 12:00 pm
Parkville City Hall – Board Room
MEETING MINUTES

Consultant Attendees (4):

Sabin Yanez/CFS Team 816-333-4477/syanez@cfse.com
(Project Manager-Principal In Charge)
Thomas Morefield/CFS Team 816-783-1607/tmorefield@bnim.com
(Public Engagement and Planning, BNIM)
Tom Evans/Trekk 816-874-4655/tevens@trekllc.com
(Traffic Engineer)
Rick Walker 816-333-4477/rwalker@cfse.com
(Senior Design Engineer)

Steering Committee Members Present (11):

Nan Johnston, Mayor/Parkville 816-741-7676/njohnston@parkvillemo.gov
Mike Duffy/Riverside 816-372-9017/mduffy@riversidemo.com
Ed Bradley/Main Street Association 816-584-3130/ed.bradley@banklibertykc.com
Alicia Stephens/Platte County EDC 816-270-2109/astephens@plattecountyedc.com
Erik Bergrud/Park University erik.bergrud@park.edu
(for Laurie McCormack)
Marsha Van Dever/Parkville Chamber info@parkvillechamber.com
(for Daren Higerd)
Susan Barry/MoDOT susan.barry@modot.mo.gov
Shelie Daniel/MoDOT shelie.daniel@modot.mo.gov
Dan Luebbert/Platte Co. Health Dept dan.luebbert@plattehealth.com
Mike Kellum/Parkville EDC mkellum@parkville.gov
(for David Jones)
Beverlee Roper/Platte County beverlee.roper@co.platte.mo.us
(for Daniel Erickson)

Staff Members Present (3)

Stephen Lachky/MARC 816-701-8247/slachky@marc.org
Lauren Palmer, Parkville 816-741-7676/lpalmer@parkvillemo.gov
Tim Blakeslee, Parkville 816-741-7676/tblakeslee@parkvillemo.gov

I. Summary of Second Round of One on One Meetings

Goal: Present summary of Comments to the Steering Committee after local property owners expressed their thoughts of the corridor conceptual alternatives.

Progress: Ten additional one-on-one meetings were held through the last two weeks of September in order to keep individual property owners engaged with the alternatives we are looking at for the corridor. General feedback was:

1. All we spoke with were very supportive of the City moving forward with the project.
2. All preferred the plan keeping the sidewalk and multi-use path as components of the project.
3. Many expressed the need for the project to provide connecting pedestrian access to the adjacent neighborhoods/businesses.

Specific comments received were:

1. In front of doctor's office along west side of Route 9 north of Lakeside Drive, make sure the plan provides for parking modifications and improvements along the sides of the business.
2. Near 12th Street, the project needs to accommodate pedestrians getting to the Platte County Health Department facility. They would also support re-terracing of their frontage when improvements are made.
3. Between 6th Street and 2nd Street, many property owners along here would like improvements to be less intrusive on their frontage. Would support a two-lane roadway section between 5th and 2nd Streets and still include multimodal elements.
4. Pedestrian crossing will be needed at key intersections.

II. Review of Project Preliminary Design

Goal: Present Project sections as identified through September.

Progress: The typical sections that were most preferred at the public meeting were presented to the Steering Committee. Also, the 12 project sections were shown as well. The 11 project sections are:

1. Route 45 to 62nd Street
2. 62nd Street to Parkville Athletic Center
3. PAC to Lakeview Drive
4. Lakeview Drive to 13th Street
5. 13th Street to 12th Street
6. 12th Street to 7th Street
7. 7th Street to 5th Street
8. 5th Street to 2nd Street
9. 2nd Street to White Aloe Creek
10. White Aloe Creek to Park University Drive
11. Park University Drive to Coffey Road
12. Coffey Road to Mattox Road

The Project Team held a discussion with the Steering Committee concerning the option of constructing the 2-lane typical section downtown, between 2nd Street and 5th Street rather than the 3-lane section. The Team is recommending this for several reasons:

1. Less right of way impacts to properties,
2. Minimal northbound left turn movements exist and are unlikely to grow due to residential land use along west side of Route 9,
3. Provides a solution that will handle traffic and have stronger stakeholder support.

III. Review of Project Prioritization Method

Goal: Discuss the prioritization criteria used to initially score project sections.

Progress: Reviewed the use of the Mid-America Regional Council's transportation project prioritization criteria. The Project Team recommends using these criteria as a starting point for selecting sections to go forward first. We will still need to look at constructability issues as an additional factor in section prioritizing. In general, the highest priority sections are: the projects between Route 45 and the Parkville Athletic Complex (PAC); and the projects downtown (6th Street to Park University Drive).

IV. Review of Project Cost Estimates

Goal: Review the Project Team's early cost estimates with the Steering Committee.

Progress: The Project Team calculated conceptual cost estimates for all project section to enable the Steering Committee to understand the magnitude of each project. The estimates will need to be refined as we move from preliminary design into final design. The estimates are:

1. Route 45 to 62nd Street,	\$726,826
2. 62nd Street to Parkville Athletic Center,	\$786,389
3. PAC to Lakeview Drive,	\$1,263,445
4. Lakeview Drive to 13th Street,	\$2,814,966
5. 13th Street to 12th Street,	\$393,711
6. 12th Street to 7th Street,	\$674,972
7. 12th Street to 5th Street,	\$554,588
8. 5th Street to 2nd Street,	\$290,613
9. 2nd Street to White Aloe Creek,	\$707,519
10. White Aloe Creek to Park University Drive,	\$258,453
11. Park University Drive to Coffey Road,	\$2,291,574
12. Coffey Road to Mattox Road,	\$350,778

TOTAL: \$11,113,838

V. Update on Envision Tomorrow Process

Goal: Discuss the progress the Project Team has been making with the use of the Envision Tomorrow software provided by the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC).

Progress: Thomas Morefield reviewed the on-going work with the MARC staff and the software tool. We are producing different scenarios based on the corridor master plan and assumptions coming from our project development work and loading these into the software. From that point we expect to produce some economic analysis numbers and then will look at funding opportunities.

VI. Review Project Schedule

Goal: Review project schedule if time available.

Progress: Addressed with Upcoming Activities.

VII. Upcoming Activities

Goal: Plan upcoming activities.

Progress: Update Board of Aldermen on October 20, 2015
Public Meeting on October 29, 2015

VIII. Adjourn

Overarching Theme/Vision from the Downtown Master Plan

“Preserving the character of Downtown, while capitalizing on opportunities to enhance commerce, economic activity, and community interaction is critical to the future success of Downtown Parkville.”

Guiding Principles

- *Preserve and enhance the vitality of downtown Parkville as the economic and community center of the city.*
- *Respect the character of Parkville – quaint, historic, charming, quality of life.*
- *Focus on making connections – East St. to West St.; Commons to downtown; Parkville to Riverside; southern Platte County to downtown Kansas City.*
- *Minimize negative impacts on adjacent property owners. If/when negative impacts are unavoidable, consult key stakeholders and encourage participation and ownership in discussions of trade-offs.*
- *Appreciate the importance of parks and natural resources to Parkville; minimize negative impacts on cemeteries, Parkville Nature Sanctuary, riverfront parkland, etc.*
- *Create and support opportunities for compatible economic development.*

Key Objectives

- *Mitigate safety and capacity issues, and minimize traffic conflicts, on Route 9.*
- *The north-south multi-modal trail connection from Route 45 to downtown Parkville is a high priority.*
- *Access control throughout the corridor needs to be addressed.*
- *Enhance aesthetics and pedestrian movements, particularly in proximity to downtown Parkville and Park University.*
- *The East Street “complete street” redevelopment concept is a high priority.*
- *Accommodate compatible new development and redevelopment along the corridor.*
- *Need to understand desired improvements in order to negotiate and finalize incentives (as needed) to prompt development and finance infrastructure.*
- *Need to ensure corridor can handle traffic impacts associated with growth.*
- *Reduce future construction costs by facilitating the reservation of right-of-way for future improvements.*
- *Position the participating municipalities to compete in future transportation grant cycles for eligible improvements in the corridor.*