POLICY BOARD AGENDA - REGULAR MEETING

1. Call Meeting to Order and Introductions
   (Bryan Culver – L-DC MPO Chair)

2. Action Item: Approval of Minutes from the January 21, 2015 MPO Meeting
   (attached draft)
   (Bryan Culver – L-DC MPO Chair)

3. Discussion Item: Old Business and Correspondence
   (Scott McCullough – MPO Secretary)
   a. Project Updates (attached memo)
      • MPO Tell Us Portal/Public Participation Plan
      • Competitive CPG Studies- Transit COA, Bike Share Feasibility
      • Coordinated Public Transit & Human Services Transportation Plan
   b. Recent TAC meeting minutes
      • January 5 Regular Meetings – approved and posted online at www.lawrenceks.org/boards/technical-advisory-committee

4. Discussion/Action Item: Kasold/E1200 Rd Closure – South of 31st
   The Policy Board will receive a presentation from KDOT regarding their plans and timing
   for the closure of Kasold Drive South of 31st Street. Policy Board members will discuss
   the timing/impacts of the proposed closure on the transportation network and provide
   comments to KDOT, which shall also be shared with the City of Lawrence and Douglas
   County Commissions.

5. Other Business

6. Public Comments
   This item is to allow brief public comments on items not listed specifically on the
   agenda. Comments from each individual or organization will be limited to five minutes.

7. Adjournment
   Next Meeting: The MPO Policy Board will meet next for its regularly scheduled meeting
   on March 17, 2016 or another date set by the MPO if needed.

Special Accommodations: Please notify the Lawrence-Douglas County Metropolitan Planning
Organization (L-DC MPO) at (785) 832-3150 at least 72 hours in advance if you require special
accommodations to attend this meeting (i.e., qualified interpreter, large print, reader, hearing
assistance). We will make every effort to meet reasonable requests.

The L-DC MPO programs do not discriminate against anyone on the basis of race, color or
national origin, according to Title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964. For more information or to
obtain a Title VI Complaint Form, see www.lawrenceks.org/mpo/title6 or call (785) 832-3150.
1. **Call Meeting to Order and Introductions**
Bryan Culver called the meeting to order at 3:00pm and introductions were made. Ashley Myers was introduced as a new transportation planner, Adam Weigel was introduced as the new transportation planning intern, and Jimmy Wilkins was introduced as the new City of Lecompton representative.

2. **Action Item: Approval of Minutes from the August 20, 2015 MPO Meeting**
Bryan Culver presented the minutes and asked if there was any discussion. There was none. Approval of the minutes was moved by Jim Denney, seconded by Cory Davis and passed unanimously (7-0).

3. **Discussion Item: Old Business and Correspondence**
Jessica Mortinger provided highlights from the project update memo. She shared quick updates on the Regional Pedestrian Plan, the Public Participation Plan, and the RFPs sent out for the Bike Share Feasibility Study and the Transit Comprehensive Operations Analysis. Bryan Culver asked if there were any comments or questions. There were none.
4. **Action Item: Election of MPO Policy Board Officers for 2016**
Bryan Culver called for nominations. Jessica reminded the group that the current Chair is Bryan and the Vice Chair is Cory Davis. Nancy Thellman made a motion to reappoint current leadership, seconded by Stuart Boley. The motion was passed unanimously (7-0).

5. **Action Item: Review and Approval of the 2015-2019 Transportation Improvement Program Amendment #3**
Jessica Mortinger described additions and changes to the TIP. The draft TIP amendment was out for public comment from December 29th to January 14th, 2016. No comments were received during this time. The Technical Advisory Committee approved the amendment at their January 5th meeting. Jim Denney asked about K-10 Access Point Consolidation, MPO #205, reducing project costs from over $20 million to $1 million. Ms. Mortinger responded that reduction is partly because of the turn back of 23rd street to a local road, and because some of that funding has been programmed separately in the access consolidation projects added in this amendment. A motion to approve the amendment was made by Matthew Herbert, seconded by Jim Denney and passed unanimously (7-0).

6. **Action Item: Functional Classification Map Update**
Jessica Mortinger described changes have been made due to federal legislation regarding principal arterial streets being added as part of the National Highway System (NHS) and the reporting associated with them. KDOT suggests downgrades to minor arterial for many streets that were classified as principal arterials, so they are not pulled into the NHS. These changes will only be made to this map, which is used by the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA). Ms. Mortinger noted that on the local map called the Major Thoroughfares Map, which is used for development purposes, the segments will remain as principal arterials.

Ms. Mortinger also noted that KDOT requested a downgrade to Kasold south of 31st. Kasold Street south of 31st. KDOT is now planning to close access from Kasold to K-10 when the SLT east leg opens in October 2016, instead of when the SLT goes to 4-lane, at a later date. A future amendment is pending, once the City/County agrees to KDOT’s plan and timeline for closing Kasold. Jim Denney asked if supporting this item meant supporting the closure of Kasold. Ms. Mortinger said no, a future amendment would be made if Kasold was to be downgraded.

Mr. Denney asked if there was a problem with having the same road with two different classifications on two different maps. Scott McCullough said that the local map determines the design and it is clearly labeled in the City/County Development Codes. Ms. Mortinger said that there are already roadways with different classifications on the maps, which is why there are two separate maps. Cory Davis made a motion to approve the Functional Classification Map update, seconded by Nancy Thellman. The motion was passed unanimously (7-0).

7. **Discussion Item: Pedestrian Bicycle Issues Taskforce Advisory Committee Recommendations**
Ms. Mortinger said the Pedestrian Bicycle Issues Taskforce Advisory Committee was created by the Lawrence City Commission to make recommendations on a variety of bicycle and pedestrian issues, including the review the advisory/committee structure for the bike/pedestrian issues. The taskforce’s draft recommendations will be released for public comment on January 25, a public hearing will be held on February 3rd in the City Commission meeting room at 5:45pm (6 East 6th St, City Hall), and a Lawrence Study Session will be held on February 9th at 4:00pm (6 East 6th St, City Hall, City Commission Room).

Marilyn Hull gave a brief overview of what the taskforce has been working on with regards to the
recommendation they will give for a new advisory committee. She said she and Charlie were at the meeting today to gather input from the Policy Board on the advisory structure to improve decision making around transportation issues. Charlie Bryan explained the taskforce's process of evaluating other committees and the reason for their recommendation to consolidate the Traffic Safety Commission (TSC) and the Bicycle Advisory Committee (BAC). Mr. Bryan said their recommendation will not specifically identify the TSC and BAC to be consolidated, that will be left up to staff and the City Commission.

Stuart Boley asked if the other 7-8 committees were considered for consolidation. Mr. Bryan said that it was difficult to imagine taking away the complex responsibilities for any one of those groups. Mr. Boley asked would vacation of pedestrian easements need to be approved by this group. Scott McCullough said that it would depend on the scope of the group, but usually those do not go through any committee. Mr. Bryan said this new committee needs to be cognizant of all transportation types. Mr. Boley asked if the taskforce had considered the culture change/extra time that this new group would need to take on. Mr. Bryan agreed that this new group would need to spend more time than either TSC or BAC members spend currently, probably 8 hours per week.

Mr. McCullough said the BAC is quite active, does a lot of things in the community, if the new commission doesn't fill all of those roles he suggested a BAC subcommittee of the MPO might preserve those functions. Ms. Mortinger said that if this new group does not serve the county, some group will need to fill that role. The BAC could become MPO subcommittee and meet 2-4 times per year. Since the MPO will still need a voice for bicycling issues in the transportation planning process. Mr. Bryan said he realizes that the BAC has advocate voice; something the taskforce discussed was what should be the role of the advocacy voice in this process. Mr. Boley said he served on the TSC and he did not feel like it was an advocacy group. It simply responded to community concerns. He asked Mr. Bryan what the taskforce felt the TSC was missing. Mr. Bryan said the taskforce felt the TSC was missing. Mr. Bryan said the taskforce felt that the TSC is reactive not proactive and the taskforce is looking for a new approach that thinks more holistically about transportation issues and what is best for the community of all users.

Nancy Thellman expressed concern that rural/county voices could be lost if the new transportation board/commission becomes Lawrence focused and no other group remains. This needs to be a much longer conversation with county/smaller communities’ staff. Keith Browning said it was his impression from TAC that this new group would give approval for county road projects. This concerned him. Mr. Bryan said yes, for example the Kasold project and the annual street maintenance program would go before the new group to receive public comment. Mr. Browning and Ms. Thellman agreed that there was value to maintaining a countywide perspective, and it may or may not be at this new commission, depending on their scope of work.

Mr. Boley said that having a committee such as this saves the City Commission time because hearings could be held at the new commission level and not need to be held at the City Commission level. The City Commission would be given a report of the vote and why members voted the way they did, which would inform the City Commission as they make their decision. Matthew Herbert expressed concern that approval at the level of this group would give people false assumption that it would be approved at City Commission level and be funded. For example, approvals of projects from TSC have come before City Commission without funding identified to implement them.

Jim Denney asked what the scope of the group would be, wondering if they need to approve every project related to transportation. Mr. Bryan said that is something they are unsure of at the time. Bryan Culver suggested that the group would need triggers to determine what kind of things come
before the committee. Mr. Bryan agreed that, like the HRC, a guidebook could be developed to state what goes before the committee and what the staff could handle administratively. He also said he was unsure how the committee would be staffed. Mr. Herbert asked if the City Commission would need supermajority to overrule its approval. Mr. Bryan said that would be up to the Commission. Mr. McCullough mentioned that the Planning Commission has that power because of state statute. Mr. Herbert said that especially if the group was composed of advocates, it is not a good idea to require a supermajority to overrule. Mr. Bryan responded that it is difficult to determine where advocates fit into the democratic process.

Ms. Mortinger said that MPO Policy Board will need to be involved in the process and continued discussion as the taskforce’s recommendations are accepted and/or implemented. Mr. Culver said it was good to see how the taskforce has progressed and asked if anyone had other thoughts. There were none.

8. Other Business
Bryan Culver asked for a motion to move future meetings to 3:00pm-4:30pm. Matthew Herbert moved, Jim Denney seconded and passed 6-0-1 with Stuart Boley abstaining because he left the meeting at 3:54pm before the vote. Pending his agreement, future meetings will be held at 3:00pm.

9. Public Comments
There was none.

10. Adjournment
The meeting adjourned at 3:57 pm.

Next Meeting: The MPO Policy Board will meet next for its regularly scheduled meeting on February 18th, 2016 at 3:00pm in the City Commission Room at Lawrence City Hall (6 East 6th St).
Memorandum

TO: L-DC MPO Members
FROM: Jessica Mortinger, Senior Transportation Planner
       Ashley Myers, Transportation Planner
CC: Scott McCullough, Director of Planning & Development Services
Date: February 11, 2016
Re: MPO Activity Updates

The following list is a summary of selected projects and a brief description of recent MPO staff work since the last MPO meeting held on January 21, 2016

**MPO Tell Us Portal/Public Participation Plan** – The MPO developed a MPO specific public participation portal called “Tell Us”. It is like the “Lawrence Listens” portal, but branded for the MPO. The Public Participation Survey was conducted January 26th - February 9th. The results of the survey will be incorporated into the draft Public Participation Process, which will go for a 45 day public comment period in February/March.

**Competitive CPG Studies- Transit COA, Bike Share Feasibility** – Proposals were submitted on January 26. The Transit COA and Bike Share Feasibility RFP selection committees met to review proposals. Firms will be interviewed and selected ASAP.

**Coordinated Public Transit & Human Services Transportation Plan Update** – MPO Staff met with the Regional Transit Advisory Committee (RTAC) to update the Douglas County CPT-HSTP. A rider survey was developed and will be administered in the 2nd/3rd week of February. MPO staff will conduct ride-along surveys and client interviews to gain rider input. Staff anticipates bringing a draft for MPO consideration this spring.
E 1200 Road/K-10 Intersection
10-23 KA-3634-04
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• K-10 West Leg Concept
• E 1200 Road/K-10 existing intersection conditions
• Impacts of East Leg SLT Opening
• Mitigation of impacts
• Closure Decision
K-10 West Leg SLT Concept
Existing Intersection Conditions

- K-10 is a two-lane highway, posted 65 mph
- 7,500 ADT on K-10 (both directions)
- E 1200 Road is a two-lane road, posted 30 mph
- 2,700 ADT on E 1200 Road north of K-10 (both directions)
- 800 ADT on E 1200 Road south of K-10 (both directions)
- 32 Conflict points for typical 4-leg intersection
  - Left turn movements operate at level of service D in peak hour
- Five crashes in a 4-year period
  - Rate of 1.25 crashes/year
  - 60% severe (T-bone)

Note: ADT = Average Daily Traffic
Impact of East Leg SLT Opening

- Traffic entering intersection = 18,300 ADT
  - K-10 traffic increases to 16,800 ADT
  - Negligible change to E 1200 Road ADT
- Left turn movements operate at level of service F in peak hour
  - Greater than 120 seconds of wait time
  - Encourages risky driver behavior
- Crash rate increase to 3.1 crashes/year
  - 12-13 crashes in a 4-year period
    - 60% (7-8 crashes) likely to be severe
- Safety concern in doing nothing
Mitigation of Impacts

- Reduce conflict points (Right-in, Right-out)
  - Requires acceleration & deceleration lanes to meet criteria (impacts bridge over Yankee Tank Creek)
  - Requires physical separation of eastbound and westbound lanes on K-10
  - Results in anticipated crash rate of 1.3 crashes per year (5-6 crashes in a 4-year period)
    - Reduces crash severity (4 conflict points)
- Inconsistent with ultimate freeway configuration
- Approximately $1.6 M to construct “temporary” configuration
Mitigation of Impacts

- ELIMINATE conflict points (Cul-de-sac)
  - Zero conflict points
  - Consistent with ultimate freeway configuration
  - Approx. $335,000
Closure Decision

• Eliminate E 1200 Road/K-10 intersection prior to or concurrent with East Leg SLT opening
  • Maximum safety benefit
  • Consistent with ultimate configuration
  • Lowest cost
  • Responsible action both in short and long term
• Ongoing operational/safety analysis at County Road 458 and US-59 intersection
  • Signal Warrants
  • Geometric Improvements