



CHAPTER V

Comments and Coordination

The Missouri Department of Transportation (MoDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) have provided numerous opportunities for participating in the study of needs and possible approaches to improvement of I-29/35/US 71 from north of Missouri Route 210 in Clay County to the northwest corner of the downtown freeway loop in the city of Kansas City. The project also includes the north side of the downtown Central Business District (CBD) Loop. This chapter summarizes the public involvement and agency coordination programs that have taken place during project development.

A. Public Involvement

Recognizing the importance of community understanding of and support for the project, MoDOT and the I-29/I-35 EIS and Location Study team have provided a wide range of opportunities and events for public and agency input and discussion for this project.

Those activities have been closely coordinated with the Paseo Bridge Rehabilitation Project, as the two separate projects encompass the same bridge structure and, in the public's eye, are closely related. A wide range of stakeholders and interested members of the public, from recognized leaders in the business community to residents of public housing units near the project area has been engaged. Equally important, a range of venues and alternatives was created for the public to learn about the project and to provide input based on individual's preference of communication styles, from one-on-one meetings to public forums to information posted on the internet.

1. PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PLAN

A comprehensive and detailed public involvement plan was developed at the outset of the project. The plan was designed to maximize opportunities for two-way communications and to build understanding and trust in both the community and within agencies.

a. Goals

Several goals relative to the implementation of the public involvement plan were established including:

- Effective, two-way communication with stakeholders and the public resulting in:
 - Informed consent for the preferred improvement approach, and
 - Completion of the EIS process on time and on budget.
- Stakeholders and the public know where and how to request project information and give their input.
- The public involvement process is fair, open and responsive to input in the eyes of the public, media and regulators.
- EIS recommendations coordinate with related projects where appropriate, and likewise, those projects incorporate key EIS recommendations.

b. Audiences

Businesses, organizations and individuals who could have an interest in the project were carefully identified. This information was used as the foundation of the project's mailing list, members of which received meeting and public hearing notices as well as copies of project newsletters (See Table V-1). This list also includes commuters and residents within the study corridor and totaled nearly 1,000 stakeholders in all.

**Table V-1
Public Involvement Audiences**

Businesses	Public Agencies
Barge Companies	City Market Oversight Committee
Isle of Capri Casino	City of North Kansas City Fire Department
ADM	City of North Kansas City Parks & Recreation
Burlington Northern Railroad	City of North Kansas City Planning & Public Works
Cerner	City of North Kansas City Police Department
North Kansas City Hospital	City of North Kansas City School District
Bank of America	Clay County Highway Department
City of KCMO Employees	Clay County Planning and Zoning
Commerce Bank	Federal Emergency Management Agency
DST Systems	Federal Highway Administration
Federal Government Employees	Gladstone, MO Planning and Development
H & R Block	Housing Authority of Kansas City
Kansas City Southern Industries	I-70 EIS Team
Southwestern Bell	I-70 MIS Team
UMB Bank	Jackson County Public Works
Elected Officials	Kansas City, MO Entertainment District Traffic Study Team
City of North Kansas City	Kansas City, MO Fire Department
City of Northmoor	Kansas City, MO Parks & Recreation
City of Riverside	Kansas City, MO Planning & Development
Clay County Commission	Kansas City, MO Police Department
Gladstone, MO	Kansas City, MO Public Works
Jackson County Commission	Kansas City, MO Register of Historic Places
Kansas City, MO	Kansas City, MO School District
Liberty, MO	Kansas City, MO Water Services – East Bottoms Unit
Missouri State Legislature	KCATA
Platte County Commission	KCI
U.S. Legislature (Missouri)	MARC
Civic Groups	MAST
Black Chamber of Commerce	Missouri Department of Conservation
Black Economic Union	Missouri Department of Natural Resources (SHPO)
Civic Council of Greater KC	Missouri Department of Transportation Central Office
Clay County Economic Development Council	Missouri State Emergency Management Agency
Clay County Industrial Development Authority	North Kansas City Levee District

**Table V-1 (continued)
Public Involvement Audiences**

Civic Groups (continued)	Public Agencies (continued)
Convention and Visitor's Bureau	Platte County Planning Department
Convention and Visitor's Bureau Bridge Committee	Platte County Public Works
Downtown Council	Port Authority of Kansas City, MO
Economic Development Corporation of KCMO	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers – KC District
Gladstone Chamber of Commerce	U.S. Coast Guard Eight Coast Guard District
Greater Kansas City Chamber of Commerce	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Greater Kansas City Foreign Trade Zone	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Hispanic Chamber of Commerce	U.S. Federal Transit Administration
Hispanic Economic Development Corporation	U.S. Fish and Wildlife
Jackson County EDC	Neighborhood Groups
Kansas City Area Development Council	Chouteau Court (HUD)
Kansas City Industrial Foundation	Colonial Square Homes
Market Area Development Corporation	Columbus Park
Missouri River Crossing Committee	Guinotte Manor (HUD)
North Kansas City Business Council	Northland Neighborhoods, Inc.
North Kansas City Office of Economic Development	Pendleton Heights Neighborhood Assoc.
Northeast Industrial District	Riverview (HUD)
Northeast Kansas City Chamber of Commerce	Not-For-Profits/Advocacy Groups
Northland Regional Chamber of Commerce	AAA
Platte County EDC	American Trucking Association
	Don Bosco Center
	Heavy Contractors
	Kansas City Wildlands
	Missouri Watershed Information Network
	Owner-Operator Independent Drivers Association
	Sierra Club

* Names in bold indicate key stakeholders.

c. **Issues and Approach**

Early in the development of the public involvement plan, consultant and MoDOT leaders met to identify critical public involvement issues and communication needs.

After reviewing the Northland-Downtown EIS and conducting field interviews through the rehabilitation study to identify possible public concerns and issues and priorities, the team participated in a consensus building exercise to determine the level and type of communication appropriate for project components.

2. NEWSLETTERS

A newsletter entitled "Road Notes" was created for distribution at key project milestones to the project mailing list as well as being placed in public libraries, community centers and other central locations. Additional copies were distributed to organizations and businesses on request.

The first newsletter provided an overview of the project. The second newsletter was an overview of project status. The newsletters include information on how to forward written, verbal or e-mail input or questions to project stakeholders. A copy of the project newsletters can be found in Appendix H.

3. INTERNET

Project information was posted as part of the Missouri Department of Transportation's official web site, under District Four's "Major Projects." Postings included copies of newsletters and public meeting exhibits, which include other relevant project information.

4. MEDIA RELATIONS

Extensive media relations were conducted prior to the pre-location public meeting. Additional contacts are planned for the formal document review and public hearing process. The pre-location public meeting received extensive coverage in the *Dispatch Tribune*. A series of editorials in the *Kansas City Business Journal* also highlighted the importance of the bridge type selection process.

5. PRE-LOCATION PUBLIC MEETING

MoDOT and the study team hosted a public information meeting on September 28, 2004 to gather public input on I-29/35 EIS and Location Study feasible concepts prior to screening of the concepts to be considered for detailed evaluation. Hosted in an open-house format, 86 members of the public, including local elected officials and representatives from the media, attended.

a. Exhibits

To facilitate discussion of the project, exhibits outlining the EIS study process and the range of feasible alternatives were presented. Both verbal and written comments were collected for consideration during the alternatives screening process. The exhibits illustrated various topics, including project Purpose and Need; the EIS process; cultural resources; public transit, bicycle and pedestrian access; interchange and bridge concepts; the Paseo Bridge rehabilitation; and the role of the public.

b. Publicity

The Public Meeting was publicized in the following ways:

- Mailed meeting announcement to 325 entities listed in the project database
- Posted on the MoDOT web site
- Posted on the Kcrivercrossings.org web site
- News release/advisory send out with fact sheet(s) two weeks before the September 28th Public Meeting to:
 - *Kansas City Star*
 - *Northland Journal*
 - *Northeast News*
 - *Dispatch Tribune*
 - *Sun-News*
 - ABC's KMBC TV-9
 - Fox 4's WDAF-TV
 - CBS's KCTV-5
 - NBC's KSHB TV-41
 - Entercom radio stations' news department
 - Susquehanna radio stations' news department

The meeting enjoyed pre-event coverage in the *Dispatch Tribune* and the *Kansas City Business Journal*. Media coverage at the event included both print and electronic outlets.

- **Print Advertising:** Two ads were placed two weeks before the public meeting in:
 - *Kansas City Star* Northland Neighborhoods section (publishes Wednesday).
 - *Dos Mundos* (English/Spanish bilingual newspaper) (publishes Thursday).
 - *Northeast News* (English/Spanish bilingual newspaper) (publishes Wednesday).
- The same ad was placed the week before the Public Meeting in:
 - *Kansas City Star* Northland Neighborhoods section
 - *Dos Mundos*
 - *Northeast News*
- **Radio Advertising:** Developed and placed sponsorships with Metro Networks for two business days leading up to the September 28th Public Meeting, with 42 sponsorships reaching approximately 134,000 adults aged 25-54.

c. Comments

More than 30 written and e-mail comments were received from the public. Additionally, team members documented verbal comments made during the open house. A Spanish/English interpreter was present to facilitate discussions about the project and collect comments from Spanish-speaking participants.

A number of the comments reflected concerns relative to the upcoming rehabilitation and closure of the Paseo Bridge, including timing of closure, access across railroad tracks that are often occupied by stopped trains, and impacts to Columbus Park. Many comments were related to specific interchange designs and potential impacts to property or access. Common themes related to the proposed action included:

- Desires for a fiscally responsible solution balanced with the need for aesthetics;
- Questions about transit as a possible solution;
- A desire for HOV lanes;
- Concerns about pedestrian access;
- Questions about the need for eight lanes versus six; and
- Questions about re-use and preservation of the Paseo Bridge.

Also, there were several questions related to the study process, including the determination of study limits and how impacts were determined, along with concerns about how the study relates to and impacts community growth and future land-use.

As a follow-up, exhibits from the meeting and the meeting notes, including details of public comments and input received at the meeting, were posted on the project's web page. A notification of those postings was mailed to addresses contained in the project database.

A copy of the meeting notes from the public meeting, including details of public comments, are included in Appendix H.

6. MISSOURI RIVER CROSSING COMMITTEE

Representatives of MoDOT and the consultant attended and participated in the regular meetings of the Missouri River Crossing Committee, a joint committee of both the Greater Kansas City Chamber and the Northland Chamber. This committee had been formed during the

Northland-Downtown MIS to promote the completion of transportation projects which would improve movement across the Missouri River. Representatives from the business community as well as other civic organizations and legislative representatives or their staff are regular meeting participants. Key issues of this group are the study process, construction timing, funding issues and a growing concern about aesthetics and bridge type.

7. COMMUTER, BUSINESS, NEIGHBORHOOD AND STAKEHOLDER OUTREACH & PRESENTATIONS

Early and ongoing engagement with stakeholders, potentially affected property owners and other interested members of the public is a project priority. In the period between February, 2004 and November, 2005 meetings with various stakeholders have been held on more than 45 occasions, including attending six Columbus Park Neighborhood Association meetings, and one-on-one meetings with impacted property owners, including the Isle of Capri casino, North Kansas City Hospital and Wagner Industries. A detailed log of meetings, presentations and other contacts during the course of the study is included in Table V-3.

8. KEY STAKEHOLDER MEETINGS

A series of meetings with stakeholders was held to discuss key issues and gain community feedback. Detailed meeting minutes are included in Appendix H.

Meeting dates and topics discussed included:

- September, 2004 – Project overview; small group review of alternatives
- January, 2005 – Northland~Downtown MIS review; EIS scope, components and schedule; alternatives and possible impacts discussion
- February, 2005 – Project update and schedule review; working sessions and alternatives review
- March, 2005 – Decision making-process; bridge type and engineering review; bridge location options and constraints; technical data review
- June, 2005 – Alternatives review
- November, 2005 – EIS update and next phases of the project

Invitees and participants in the Stakeholder Meetings included representatives of the organizations listed in Table V-2. Table V-3 includes the Public Outreach Log.

**Table V-2
Public Involvement Audiences**

BNIM Architects	Missouri House – District 31
Civic Council of Greater KC	Missouri House – District 37
Clay County EDC	Missouri House – District 40
Columbus Park Neighborhood Association	Missouri House – District 41
Downtown Council	Missouri River Crossing Committee
Federal Emergency Management Agency	Missouri Senate – District 9
Forest City Enterprises	Missouri Senate – District 10
Greater Kansas City Chamber of Commerce	Missouri Senate – District 11
Greater KC Chamber	Missouri Senate – District 17
GSA	Nicholson Group
Guinotte Manor	North Kansas City – City Administrator's Office
Highways and Transportation Commission	North Kansas City – Economic Development

**Table V-2 (continued)
Public Involvement Audiences**

Housing Authority of Kansas City	North Kansas City – Mayor’s Office
Isle of Capri Casino	North Kansas City – Parks & Recreation
Kansas City EDC	North Kansas City – Planning & Public Works
KCATA	North Kansas City – Police Department
KCMO – City Council 1 st At-Large	North Kansas City – Public Works
KCMO – City Council 1 st District	North Kansas City Business Council
KCMO – City Council 2 nd At-Large	North Kansas City Levee District
KCMO – City Council 2 nd District	Northeast Industrial Association
KCMO – City Manager’s Office	Northland Regional Chamber of Commerce
KCMO – Environmental Management	NT Realty
KCMO – Mayor Barnes’ Office	Port Authority of Kansas City
KCMO – Parks and Recreation	Regional Transit Alliance
KCMO – Planning & Development	Singleton & Associates
KCMO – Public Works	State Emergency Management Agency
KCMO – Water Services – East/Levee	Taliaferro & Browne
KDOT	U.S. Coast Guard – 8 th District
Legal Aid of Western Missouri	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
MARC	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Missouri Department of Conservation	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Missouri Department of Economic Development	U.S. House of Representatives
Missouri Department of Natural Resources	U.S. Senate

**Table V-3
Public Outreach Log**

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
February 27, 2004 Sheila Tracy, NKC Chamber of Commerce	Discuss Rehab		Provided suggestions on groups/businesses to meet with; team added those groups to contact/stakeholder list.
February, 2004 Isle of Capri	Discuss Rehab		Interested in plans for a new bridge structure, since they are interested in building onto their site.
March 2, 2004 Ron Achelpohl and Fauna Dean at MARC	Discuss Rehab		Rideshare discussions in association with rehab
March 25, 2004 Marlo Darrington, Downtown Council	Discuss Rehab		Provide information about rehab
May 12, 2004 Dale Thomas, Platte County Public Works	Discuss Rehab		No major concerns
May 13, 2004 Cerner Corp	Discuss Rehab		Concerns about traffic on 210 Concerns about commuters from Johnson County

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
On May 14, 2004 Representatives from the City of Kansas City and from ReStart inc.	Vacation of Harrison Street between 8th and 9th streets		ReStart has plans to develop a courtyard and improved entrance into their facility (approximately \$7 million). We explained the I-29/35 EIS process and schedule. We believe the temporary solution is a rededication clause where the property would be deeded back to the city when it is required for construction of the new solution. Evelyn Craig is the Executive Director of ReStart and wants to be included on our mailing list. Also spoke with Barb Hayes a few times after the meeting to clarify items stated in the meeting so that it could be relayed at their board meeting.
May 19, 2004 Columbus Park Neighborhood Association	Discuss Rehab		Traffic (particularly trucks) through Columbus Park -- now, during rehab and in the future
June 8, 2004 Steve Noble, KC Planning and Development, and Tom Knittle, BNIM	Redevelopment effort sponsored by KC		BNIM is developing an urban design framework for a 16 block area in the NE corner inside the loop. This framework will set guidelines for development in the area and should be completed in mid-August. The team reviewed the I-29/35 EIS process and schedule.
June 9, 2004 North KC Hospital	Discuss Rehab		Concerns about congestion on 210
June 28, 2004 Mark Kind, The Business Journal, and Kevin Collison, The Kansas City Star	Development in the downtown loop and proposed transportation improvements		Brief descriptions of the results of the MIS and what was being done with the EIS. They asked about the coordination for everything happening in the loop so we explained about coordination with all of the development efforts, mentioning the Oversight Committee and the Technical Team and their purpose being communication and coordination. Kevin said he would like to be informed when the Oversight Committee started meeting.
June 28, 2004 Charlie Warren, Midwestern Theological Baptist Seminary	Regarding the vacation of Harrison Street		Explained the EIS process and schedule. Also let him know that we had spoken with Restart and that there could be a temporary solution - the agreement to vacate Harrison would include a rededication clause that where the property would be deeded back to the city when it is required for construction of the new solution.

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
July 1, 2004 Gary Baker and Steve Rinne, Downtown Community Task Force	Regarding plans for Margaret Kemp Park (9 th & Harrison)		<p>They are planning on providing a community center, about a 100,000 sq ft, for the homeless at the park located west of Harrison Street between 9th and 10th. The center will include a satellite office for library services, Goodwill will move its job program to the new center and there will be food services and facilities. They had seen the loop diagram from the I-70 study and were interested in the ramps at 9th and 10th Street. We updated them on the I-29/35 EIS and the I-70 MIS. We told them that the conceptual strategies are slightly different than what is shown on the diagram. We committed to working with them to miss their site as much as possible. They were going to pursue hiring a consultant to draw up the site plan for the new center. We agreed to meet with their consultant to review their site plan and compare to our concepts to identify any issues.</p>
August 12, 2004 Northland Chamber Board	Presentation on rehab and bridge options		<p>Primary concerns include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • New bridge type/aesthetics • Coordination with coast guard and impacts on bridge types • Issues related to history/unique-ness of existing structure • Detours during rehab
August 19, 2004 – Tim Kristl	Paseo Bridge Rehabilitation and EIS		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Facilitating ongoing discussions with the Missouri River Crossing Committee/future agenda items • Upcoming Stakeholder Meeting • Upcoming Public Meeting
September 13, 2004 – Isle of Capri Casino Rob Norton - Vice President and General Manager; Mike Tamburelli, Sr. Director of Operations	EIS		<p>The purpose of the meeting was to introduce the project to the Isle of Capri given the potential property impacts of the proposed action. The project team presented information about the project, including showing some initial project concepts. It was explained that these concepts would be shown at the upcoming stakeholders meeting and public open house meeting.</p> <p>Rob Norton stated that they appreciated that the project team initiated the meeting. He did state his preferences that the project impacts this property as little as possible. He indicated that there was little area to expand the casino. He also stated that</p>

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
			the casino has expansion plans. The first phases of the expansion are on the east side of the Front Street (the side where the casino is). A later phase would be to build a hotel and provide for RV parking on the west side of Front Street. Given that, the Isle of Capri would rather see the expansion take place on the west side of I-29/35. He did respond favorably to the folded diamond concept and the direct connection of Front street over I-29/35. Mr. Norton indicated that he would like to work cooperatively with MoDOT on the project and that he recognized that the project will benefit his operation.
September 14, 2004 – Key stakeholder meeting			See detailed meeting notes
September 15, 2004 – Columbus Park Neighborhood Association meeting	The project team provided an overview of the EIS and presented build concepts in the area around Columbus Park.		The response was favorable to the concepts, they felt the concept was much better for them as compared to the concept presented as part of the I-70 MIS. They responded favorably to the extension of Independence Avenue to connect at grade with M-9. They hope that that connection will reduce truck traffic in the neighborhood, on 5th and 3rd streets. They liked the idea of buffering traffic impacts along Independence Avenue by shifting the roadway south or by providing any other means to discourage use of these streets for through traffic. The idea of the need to expand I-29/35 at all was discussed. Would not adding capacity just add traffic, they asked? They asked would not transit strategies be a better solution? The project team responded that these were good questions and that we will do a comparison of traffic use and impacts with a four, six and eight lane interstate. Also, the BRT system was described. They also would like to see impacts minimized from the mainline expansion.
September 16, 2004 – Missouri River Crossing Committee meeting			Provided project update, announced public meeting
September 14, 2004 – Project Database			Mailed “Road Notes” on project to project database.
September 28, 2004 – Public meeting			See detailed meeting notes

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
<p>October 7, 2004 – Columbus Park Neighborhood Association Representatives</p>	<p>Concerns and issues related to rehab and new construction</p>		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Rehab detours will encourage through traffic; need other alternatives • Want to limit traffic through neighborhood, particularly trucks • Desire traffic-calming measures in neighborhood – CP to set up meeting with KCMO to discuss options on city streets • Believe that transit should be part of the solution • Concerns that they were not included in the MIS process • Continuation of Independence to west will increase traffic in neighborhood • Concerns about air, noise and water impacts to neighborhood, particularly low-income and disadvantaged residents • Discussion of residential and commercial development occurring in the study area and encouraged the study team to make a thorough analysis of future land use • Concerned about designs that will encourage homeless camps and activity • Would prefer that Independence Avenue not be continued west of the Cherry Street extension. While they like the idea of reclaiming some land currently occupied by Cherry, they are concerned about any alternative that increases traffic on Independence Avenue. • Do not like the alternative that includes a ramp from SB I-35/I-29 that intersects with Independence Avenue to the west of I-35/I-29. • Discussed a number of alternative configurations for Independence, Cherry and Admiral. • Desire for documentation that the MIS study board did not include Columbus Park representatives. • Desire to have the River Market business community and residents more involved, as well as Columbus Park residents. • Aesthetics and the historic nature of the neighborhood need to be added. • Under alternatives, neighborhood would like a discussion of

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
			<p>alternative truck routes; intermodal technologies, HOV lanes, routing traffic around the city, coordination with Operation Greenlight with MARC, and other methods, other than highway construction, for dealing with congestion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Hard statistics would be useful. Documentation says that accidents are increasing in the corridor. How many, when, what's the cause, and what types of accidents are they? • Residents feel adding more lanes will only cause a larger congestion problem in the future and that MoDOT's traffic engineers agree with this assessment. • Note the difficulty to responding appropriately to transportation changes in large public meetings without prior preparation. • Would like the study's assumptions and parameters communicated, including standards and best practices. • An understanding of MoDOT's commitment to ongoing road maintenance would be helpful. • We would like a holistic approach to this project, tying in other River Market improvements, just as 2nd and 3rd streets, with this effort.
October 21, 2004 – Civic Council	Bridge and EIS; particularly impacts to loop.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The Civic Council's area of focus is the east side of the CBD loop. They are interested in how I-29/35 ties into this part of the CBD. 2) They are not trying to interject this committee into the EIS process, but encourage persons with the Civic Council that are also part of the chamber to participate with the Bridge Committee or other ways. 3) Jonathan Kemper discussed his thoughts on a new bridge. He said this was an opportunity for a landmark and identity bridge. He did not want the bridge decision to be made quickly based only on economics. He does not want to see a girder style bridge across the river. He felt that for a fair comparison to be made, that a graphic depicting a great bridge needed to be presented. There needs to be local advocacy to get a great bridge. They also need to get the Paseo Bridge replacement into the next

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
			Transportation Bill. 4) Tim Kristl indicated that these issues could be undertaken by the Chamber's Bridge Committee.
October 22, 2004 – Downtown Council	EIS		Clyde Prem made a brief presentation of the EIS and discussed the efforts to complete a CBD loop master plan. The DTC asked that a separate meeting be set up to discuss the master plan and for them to have an opportunity for input. They discussed the idea of taking a bus around the loop in order to look at the site. This event would be set up by the DTC.
November 17, 2004 Columbus Park Neighborhood Association	EIS and Rehab Project Update		Kent Johnson attended the neighborhood's monthly meeting, distributed copies of the most recent rehabilitation information and was available to answer questions.
November 18, 2004 Missouri River Crossing Committee	EIS Update		Clyde Prem gave an overview of the project for the group, which included Commissioner Hartsfield. Questions included how the overall process works in terms of approvals.
December 3, 2004 Chamber of Commerce, NKC Chamber and Civic Council with Joel Blobaum, Linda Clark, Lee Ann Kell and Pete Rahn	EIS/Bridge		The group reiterated their desire for a "signature structure" to MoDOT staff and leadership. Also indicated a willingness to work with MoDOT on financing, etc.
December 3, 2004 Columbus Park Neighborhood Association	EIS and Rehab		Follow-up regarding neighborhood concerns; HNTB told them that team members were meeting with KCMO that day to discuss concerns related to through-traffic.
December 3, 2004 Loop Oversight Committee	EIS and coordination with other Loop projects		Project update, stakeholder outreach plan
December 8, 2004 Key Stakeholder Group	EIS		Letter of invitation for Jan, Feb & March 2005 meetings
December 9, 2004 Project Database	EIS		Postcard highlighting public meeting documentation posted on MoDOT web site.
December 2004 / January 2005	EIS and Rehab		Ongoing e-mails and discussion with KCMO and Columbus Park relative to EIS concerns, truck traffic, etc.
January 6, 2005	EIS		Reminder letter for January 26 meeting.
January 19, 2005 Columbus Park Neighborhood Roads/Transit subcommittee	EIS and Rehab	4	

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
January 19, 2005 Columbus Park Neighborhood	EIS and Rehab	16	Attended monthly neighborhood meeting and presented updated information on alternatives and rehab.
January 20, 2005 Missouri River Crossing Committee	EIS and Bridge	24	Update on EIS Discussion on financing and acceleration of project because of Amendment 3 Outline of plan to discuss bridge structure and design options
January 26, 2005 Stakeholder Group Meeting	EIS	55	See meeting notes
February 2, 2005 Stakeholder Group	EIS		Mailed 1/26 meeting notes to participants and invitees.
February 2, 2005 Downtown Council/EIS	EIS		Responded to questions about: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Train traffic parked on tracks ▪ Pedestrian/HS student safety along 210 ▪ Outstanding questions in public meeting summary
February 3, 2005 Columbus Park	EIS		Received request for copies of maps from JoMarie Guastello; maps provided on 2/8/2005
February 4, 2005 Columbus Park	EIS		Received request for copies of maps from Kate Barsotti; she will coordinate with Ms. Guastello to see maps.
February 4, 2005 GBA – Don Horine	EIS	1	Provided a pdf of concept for the areas between Armour/210 and 16th Street.
February 8, 2005 Wagner Industries – John Wagner & Kevin Service	EIS	3	Provided overview of project and discussed possible impacts and trade-offs to various options. Concerns about impacts to parking, building and undeveloped property, as well as access to building with possible closure of Macon.
February 16, 2005 Columbus Park Neighborhood	EIS and Rehab	18	Attended monthly neighborhood meeting. Answered questions about schedule and process. Neighborhood is concerned about proposed closure of Harrison and Troost, possible need to relocate monument and night construction during the rehabilitation.
February 17, 2005 Missouri River Crossing Committee	EIS	24	Presented an overview of the bridge type selection process, critical constraint issues and a gallery of bridge types, including information about typical uses and challenges with each type.
February 17, 2005 Stakeholder Group		52	Reminder postcard for 2/23 meeting sent.
February 23, 2005 Stakeholder Group Meeting	EIS Alternatives and updates		See meeting notes.
February 24, 2005 Columbus Park/Kate Barsotti		1	Requested electronic copy of MIS be delivered today. Responded on Friday morning that the document is not

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
			available electronically; provided hard copy for Ms. Barsotti to pick up at HNTB.
March 8, 2005 Stakeholder Group			Mailed 2/23 meeting notes and copies of concept map to meeting participants and invitees.
March 9, 2005 MARC Bicycle/Pedestrian Advisory Committee		?	<p>Provided project overview and heard the following comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ MoDOT should also represent the needs of bicyclists and pedestrians in addition to highways. ▪ There is an opportunity to improve the bicycle and pedestrian system. This \$200 million project should have a bicycle and pedestrian component. This connection should not just be a dream. One way or another, a bike/ped component must be part of this project. ▪ They want to see a bike/ped project included in the EIS, whether it is attached to I-29/35 or placed at the HOA bridge. ▪ It is important to Metrogreen to have this connection. This group and other supporters need to let the state know how important this project is. ▪ There needs to be a safe crossing of the Missouri River available to bicyclists and pedestrians. ▪ One person commented that we need to work together to get this project done. That the greatest need is to serve businesses and trucks. ▪ They cited the Page Avenue Extension, that when MoDOT was faced with a law suit, that they provided very good bicycle and pedestrian accommodations.
March 16, 2005 Stakeholder Group	EIS		Mailed reminder post cards about 3/30 stakeholder meeting.
March 16, 2005 Columbus Park Neighborhood	Rehab and EIS	20	Attended monthly neighborhood association meeting. Updated on rehab, issues related to night work. Showed current alternative concepts, discussed neighborhood concerns relative to connections to/from Troost, Independence Ave. and through traffic.
March 17, 2005 MRC Committee	EIS	15	Provided group with update on EIS schedule and activities, as well as funding and state-wide project prioritization process.
March 18, 2005 John Wagner, Sr.	EIS	1	Showed concepts and discussed possible impacts to property.

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
			Concerns about losing Macon and access to west side of property.
March 22, 2005 NKC Office of Economic Development – E-mail	EIS		Primary concerns about this project are Access into the Paseo Industrial District from Northbound I-35 (onto Levee Road or Bedford Street) and the Taney intersection issue.
March 30, 2005 Stakeholder Group	EIS – Bridge Location Impacts and Traffic Analysis	51	See detailed meeting notes
April 1, 2005 Downtown Council	EIS	n/a	Responded to request for a copy of the presentation from 3/30. Also requested map/information on traffic outside of study area, information on signal synchronization, copies of elevation drawings, information on aesthetic treatments. Responded that we are happy to share information developed for the EIS, some of their requested information is not yet developed and some is beyond the scope of the EIS.
April 7, 2005 Port Authority	Impacts of Front Street interchange on the potential development on the land on the west side of the interstate. This is the 55-acre parcel being developed by Forrest City.	12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The City of Kansas City owns the land inside the two loops on the west side of the interstate. This land is also part of the 55-acre parcel. Possible development: 700-800 residential units, 30,000 sq.ft neighborhood commercial, perhaps 200,000 sq.ft. office later. Civitas is doing the land plan and should have a draft by the end of April. <p>Interchange discussion:</p> <p>Alternative “A”: The folded diamond interchange does not allow connectivity between areas inside the loops with development to the west, basically leaving the area in the loops undevelopable.</p> <p>Alternative “B”: The single point urban interchange would also benefit the Isle of Capri Casino in that existing Front Street right-of-way could be vacated allowing for more room for them especially since they want to build a hotel.</p> <p>Either alternative must deal with how the interchange interfaces with a road through the development site. The developer would like to see the road moved to the southern part of the site.</p>

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Remediation is complete on the east one-half of site, will be underway on the west one-half this September. Site fill for development can start this summer. • Funding and decision timetable: MoDOT Commission will decide at its May meeting if I-29/35 (from the NE loop to 210) will be included in funding. \$195 million is currently being considered. The project would be MoDOT's first design-build project. • EIS schedule: A pre-draft report for MoDOT's review is due in two weeks – this will not include a recommended preferred alternative. Stakeholder meeting in May. Draft EIS with preferred alternative is due in June. Review period follows. Final text in December 2005. Federal OK in March 2006. • Development concerns: Do not want to encourage east-west traffic through this site on Riverfront Drive. Avoid routing extra truck traffic through Columbus Park and River Market. Would like to link to Columbus Park neighborhood using Lydia, Gillis, or Campbell/Charlotte streets to bridge over the railroads. The Port Authority has discussed moving the BNSF track to the south with the BNSF, but not with the UP which owns the land between the BNSF and UP tracks. Could the interchange be relocated further south to discourage through traffic on the site? <p>From Mike Burke, three assumptions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The city and Port Authority support Alternative "B" – the SPUI. 2. Developers do not want a four-lane roadway adjacent to Berkley Park. 3. Will need a commitment from the Port Authority and/or city to construct a southerly street that would link with the interchange. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • From Clyde Prem: HNTB and MoDOT will need help to justify

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
			<p>recommending the higher expense of Alternative "B" – which is perhaps in the \$10M range.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Summary: Due to upcoming deadlines, a rough solution is needed to balance the street locations and the development pattern within two weeks. T&B will prepare rough hand sketches of modifications of interchange alternatives that could be compatible with site development options. This will require interaction between T&B and Civitas. Will meet again in two weeks – time not finalized.
April 12, 2005 Stakeholder Group	EIS		Mailed 3/30 meeting notes to stakeholder group.
April 15, 2005 Downtown Council Parking and Transportation Committee	EIS Alternatives	9	<p>The team gave a brief overview of the current schedule for the EIS. The Draft would be out mid-summer for public review and comment.</p> <p>The team also recapped some of the public involvement activities, specifically the Monthly Stakeholder meetings, and other coordination that is going on, such as with Columbus Park, North Kansas City, KCMO, etc. She also mentioned that the next Stakeholder meeting would be mid-May.</p> <p>The team gave an overview of the proposed improvements along the I-29/35 corridor, with some discussion focusing on the alignment alternatives at the river crossing. The majority of the discussion focused on the alternatives being considered for the north leg of the downtown loop. There was some discussion regarding the elimination of access points on the north leg, John Yacos asked if there was a simple layout that compared where the current access points are and where the future ones would be.</p> <p>There was some discussion regarding the Broadway Interchange. There was some concern that a single point wouldn't address capacity needs and would restrict access in to downtown to much.</p> <p>The team also touched briefly on the opportunities for local participation to make additional improvements that would help to provide better</p>

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
			<p>connectivity between downtown and the River Market area, such as compressing a portion of the frontage road to provide additional space for development and lowering M-9 to provide at grade intersections.</p>
<p>April 15, 2005</p>	<p>Alternatives North of the River</p>	<p>11</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Current clover leaf design works and does not need to be improved; not a significant source of accidents. Six-lane improvements to I-29/35 would require the replacement of the bridges over Armour. This in turn would alter the geometry of the clover leaf, making it worse than it currently is, and that the current clover leaf geometry is substandard. • The NB on ramp (Ramp 1) from Armour to NB I-29/35 is currently designed as a three-leg intersection. This design allowed for no impacts to the property on the south side of Armour. NKC desires it to be a 4 leg intersection with a road opposite the ramp. NKC has, or is in the process of, purchased these properties and has a developer ready to develop the land south and east of I-29/35 and Armour. NKC has invested some \$3 million in property and \$1 million in demolition. They do not want to lose this investment. • Concern that the SB exit to Armour, Ramp 2, did not provide enough stacking for the vehicles in the current display. The previous display showed very long lanes for stacking. Storage lane lengths would be calculated in the final design and that both were just pictures of how the interchange could look for the concept design phase. • Taney St. NKC does not agree with the Cul-de-sac shown on Taney St. The lunch time traffic circulation would be affected and could affect the businesses. The retail sales tax could be reduced. It cuts off direct access from Armour to the businesses on Taney. The city noted that the Cul-de-sac would have to be sized to accommodate 18 wheelers. The design also impacts emergency response to the

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
			<p>businesses. A compromise would be to allow right in/right out access. Again, NKC believes this will impact emergency response and will impact the businesses. The emergency services generally will be coming from the west, where there station is.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ozark St. NKC does not want to remove left turn from SB Ozark to EB Armour. This will affect many residents and would cause those residents to pass through residential streets to get to Armour. Ozark is a major connector road connecting the Park and residents to Armour. A compromise would be to line up the SB on ramp (Ramp 4) with Ozark. This would cause a property to be completely purchased. The current design shows this property to be minimally impacted. • 19th St was discussed. There have been plans or discussions to connect the east to the west. This would help the development of the east side of I-29/35. If this were to be done, this project would be the best time to build the I-29/35 bridges over 19th St. • 16th St. was discussed. The industrial area to the west generates a lot of truck traffic. The truck traffic now follows the truck route from 16th St. to Lynn to Armour. NKC would like to move the trucks off of Armour and have them exit/enter at 16th St. They would like to see a full interchange at 16th St. Jerry Irvine noted that this interchange would be too close to the Armour Interchange. In order for this to work, NB I-29/35 traffic would have to exit at 16th street and continue to Armour via a frontage road. It could be possible for a ramp from 16th St. then be built to connect to I-29/35. Likewise, Armour road traffic wanting to enter SB I-29/35 would have to continue to 16th Street via a frontage road. An off ramp from SB I-29/35 to 16th St. could be possible. This would be similar to the US 71 exits at Red Bridge Road and Longview Road. This was only discussed as a

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
			<p>possible solution. Obviously, there would be additional right of way impacts to the west side of the highway as well as to the east side, where NT Realty already has plans and a permit to begin construction.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Existing culvert under I-29/35, north of Armour was discussed. NKC would like to have this enlarged to allow pedestrian/bike traffic that is anticipated between the park on the west and the park on the east. They also think that the culvert is sized too small and is a source of flooding in the immediate area. • NKC believes the majority of the traffic growth in the area will be from NB I-29/35 to EB 210. • NKC believes the "box" diamond concept at M-9 will cause more problems with the truck traffic due to the signals.
May 16 – 18, 2005 Columbus Park	Follow up to October Meeting	2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Expressed concerns that public hearings have not been held according to standards; that draft document distribution has not taken place appropriately. • Responded that hearings have not yet been held and that draft document distribution will follow NEPA, federal and MoDOT guidelines.
May 18, 2005 Columbus Park	Follow up to October Meeting	5	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sent follow up documentation and information to group
May 19, 2005 Key Stakeholder Group	Draft EIS - Recommended Preferred Alternatives	125	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Sent meeting notices for 6/1/2005 meeting
June 1, 2005 Key Stakeholder Group	Draft EIS - Recommended Preferred Alternatives	50	<p>Provided a review of recommended preferred alternatives. Group concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Continuation of discussion of project need and other alternatives to widening and a new bridge (re-routing, transit, etc.) • Discussion of need for bike/ped crossing over the Missouri River • See also detailed meeting notes
June 8, 2005 Port Authority	Front Street Alternatives	1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Request for maps of alternatives at Front Street and traffic information.
June 9, 2005 Columbus Park/Mike Sturgeon		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Forwarded copy of MoDOT's Improve I-70 "Environmental Methodologies" Technical Memorandum

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
June 15, 2005 Key Stakeholder Group		125	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mailed June 1 meeting minutes
June 29, 2005 Missouri Bicycle Federation		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E-mailed group president re: concerns raised at June 1 meeting
July 1, 2005 Kansas City, MO		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Posted copies of concept map puffs to ftp site in response to a City request
July 15, 2005 Downtown Council Parking and Transportation Committee		12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Members of DTC staff and board presented information on the EIS; DTC is concerned about the need for an overall loop plan to coordinate this study's efforts and other upcoming studies. Concerns were also voiced about the impacts to minority and low-income populations near Columbus Park
July, 2005 Bike/Ped Committee			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> MoDOT Staff attended regular meeting. Bike/ped advocates again expressed their desire for a protected crossing over the Missouri River. As the I-29 Corridor is a project with funding, they desire to have that crossing constructed as a part of this project-
July 20, 2005 Missouri Bicycle Federation Kansas City Bicycle Federation		2(+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to organization clarifying responses to concerns
July 20, 2005 Columbus Park Neighborhood Assoc		2(+)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter to organization clarifying responses to concerns
July 21, 2005 Missouri River Crossing Committee		15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on EIS, funding and steps to construction
July 21, 2005 Key Stakeholder Group		125	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update postcard on rehab, EIS and design/construction process.
July 21, 2005 Isle of Capri Casino		2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> E-mailed preliminary concept maps in response to request for information; SPUI design may impact development/growth plans for the Casino.
August 16, 2005 Downtown Neighborhood Association		20	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on EIS; Mike Sturgeon also presented on EIS
August 18, 2005 Missouri River Crossing Committee		15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Update on EIS, funding and steps to construction
August 18, 2005 – Present Bike/Ped		350+ e-mails	<p>E-mails all stating: I believe that the upcoming Paseo Bridge reconstruction provides one of the very few opportunities in the near future to create a Missouri River bicycle/pedestrian crossing in this</p>

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
			<p>area. Therefore the Paseo Bridge project must include a separated bicycle/pedestrian crossing facility that will interface with local roads and trails on both sides of the river.</p> <p>I believe that there is currently no safe and convenient way for bicyclists or pedestrians to cross the Missouri River near downtown Kansas City, Missouri. I believe that bicycle and pedestrian friendly Missouri River crossing points are essential for transportation, recreation, tourism, and economic development.</p>
August, 2005 Joe Serviss		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter requesting Bike/Ped accommodation on new bridge
August, 2005 MARC Bike/Ped Committee			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participate in discussion; request that MARC take lead in process of how and where Bike/Ped should be accommodated
August 29, 2005 KC Star – Brent Hugh, Executive Director Missouri Bicycle Federation		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter requesting crossing be placed on new bridge
September 5, 2005 KC Star – Op Ed			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Editorial in favor of Bike/Ped accommodation on new bridge
September 14, 2005 Mayor Bruns, North KC		1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter expressing City concerns and requesting meeting with project team
September 21, 2005 Cooperating Agency meeting	Draft EIS- Preferred Alternative	15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Presentation of the Preferred Alternative as it appears in the DEIS and solicitation of any agency comments.
September 21, 2005 Missouri River Crossing Committee		15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Traffic information; presentation by Russ Johnson on need for Bike/Ped accommodation
September 30, 2005			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Newsletter / Project update.
September 30, 2005 North Kansas City – Mayor Bruns		2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Meeting held as a follow-up to the meeting held on April 15, 2005 and to North Kansas City's letter of September 14, 2005 Discussed North Kansas City's concerns with layout of 210 interchange and need to accommodate future development plans.
October 11, 2005 Clay County, Missouri			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Resolution in support of a separated multi-use pedestrian transportation connector on any new Paseo Bridge.
October 19, 2005 AIA Kansas City			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter outlining desires for further study of the Downtown Loop system, impacts on existing neighborhoods, traffic, HOV lanes and bicycle/pedestrian

Draft Environmental Impact Statement

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
			accommodations.
October 20, 2005 Missouri River Crossing Committee		15	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated group on Draft EIS status and discussed possible design/build approach
November 3, 2005 Stakeholder Group	Update on EIS and discussion of design-build goals		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> See meeting notes
November 8, 2005			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter in response to the AIA Kansas City Position statement of October 19, 2005
November 9, 2005 City of Riverside, Missouri			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter containing resolution in support of multi-use pedestrian transportation connector.
November 10, 2005 R.M. Trout			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter in support of the position statement given by the Kansas City Chapter of the AIA.
November 17, 2005 Missouri River Crossing Committee		24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated group on Draft EIS Status and design-build process.
December 14, 2005			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter in response to Clay County Resolution of October 11, 2005.
December 14, 2005			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter in response to R.M. Trout letter of December 14, 2005.
December 15, 2005 Missouri River Crossing Committee		24	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated group on Draft EIS Status and design-build process.
January 5, 2005 Downtown Council Parking and Transportation Committee		12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Updated group on Draft EIS and presented traffic model information. Group's primary concerns were connectivity and coordination with downtown street improvements and developments, and ensuring that plans do not create congestion or otherwise undermine downtown redevelopment. Team told group that continued coordination would go on, and more information about traffic patterns would be presented to them later in the first quarter.
January 18, 2006 Northland Regional Chamber of Commerce			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Letter of support for the I-29/35 Corridor and Paseo Bridge improvement recommendations.
January 25, 2006 Randall Perkinson		E-mail	Questions about the status of the document. Informed them that the team is hopeful that it will be ready for public review hopefully before the end of the first quarter.
February 1, 2006 Downtown Council		E-mail	Questions about the status of the document. Informed them that the team is hopeful that it will be ready for public review in either March or April.

Meeting/Event	Agenda	Attendance	Key Themes & Comments
February 28, 2006 Wagner Industries		Phone Call	<p>Mr. Wagner Sr. called wanting to know about the status of the project and the possible need for some of their property for the project. He is concerned about several things, including:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - property impacts - maintaining access to and from his business during construction and after - proximity of the project, especially in terms of noise of trucks braking on the ramps - concerns about Bridge Option "C" which would have significant impacts on his property and business <p>He was given information about the document, and told that the possible impacts to his property would be detailed in the Draft document. Discussed the need for him to comment during the formal comment period, and that the design-build portion of the project would be moving forward very quickly, with property acquiring coming first and a targeted completion date of late 2011. He noted that he had received a call from Brian Kidwell, and he was encouraged to return that call.</p>
March 1, 2006 AIA		Phone Call	<p>Questions about the status of the document. Informed them that the team is hopeful that it will be ready for public review in either March or April.</p>

9. SUMMARY OF PUBLIC COMMENTS

Comments on the proposed I-29/35 EIS were received through a number of media. Comments have been given via letters, e-mails and comment forms. There have been a number of public comments gathered prior to the release of the DEIS. Comments have come in that are both, in favor of, and against the improvements as they have been presented in various meetings and in information distributed to the public.

Some of the comments have mentioned concerns that are related to air and noise impacts that might be caused by the improvements, particularly from those individuals living within the study corridor. More information on air and noise quality can be found in Chapter III, Section B. 1 and B. 2 and in Chapter IV, Sections G and H.

There have also been comments that the project will mainly affect minorities or individuals with lower incomes because of the location of the proposed improvements. Information related to social/environmental justice impacts can be found in Chapter IV, Section B. Right-of-way acquisition information is available in Chapter IV, Section C.

Another subject that has received several comments is traffic and congestion. There is a concern by some that by increasing capacity and improving traffic flow will cause even more people to drive and use this route. Some of the comments are directed at improving traffic flow at the other bridges and interchanges in order for the proposed improvements to work. The traffic analysis for the project can be found in Chapter II, Section G. Information on travel patterns and accessibility can be found in Chapter IV, Section B. 2.

There have been comments related to improvements at the Paseo Bridge. Some of those commenting have said that MoDOT should do whatever is most economical and others have said that aesthetics are important to this project and should be included in the cost. Some have expressed concerns about maintaining traffic during construction and that companion structures would be the best solution. There is also a concern about the possible demolition of the bridge as a historic structure. Discussion of the Paseo Bridge analysis can be found in Chapter II, Section, F. 1 and information on the River Crossing Subcorridor Reasonable Alternatives can be found in Chapter II, Section H. 2. Information about traffic impacts during construction is located in Chapter IV, Section S. 7.

Another area of concern that has been brought up by several individuals and civic groups is the need for bicycle/pedestrian accommodations across the Missouri River. It is thought that there should be more focus on other modes of transportation and for improving the connection between downtown Kansas City and North Kansas City. Pedestrian and Bicycle Considerations are discussed in Chapter IV, Section F.

Examples of correspondence received from the public can be found in Appendix H, Public Comments and Coordination.

B. Agency Coordination

Resource agency coordination has been ongoing throughout the development of the I-29/35 EIS. Environmental scoping to identify issues and concerns affecting the definition and evaluation of the alternative improvements occurred throughout the study. In addition to the formal scoping meeting, progress meetings and individual meetings were held with various agencies to discuss environmental issues and concerns in more detail. Copies of written correspondence regarding the I-29/35 EIS are provided in Appendices G and H.

1. ENVIRONMENTAL SCOPING MEETING

On May 12, 2004, an environmental scoping meeting was held at the North Kansas City Community Center in North Kansas City, Missouri. Prior to the meeting, special invitations were issued to public agencies. Accompanying the invitation was an information packet about the project, including a map of the Study Corridor. A "Notice of Intent" to perform the study and announcement of the time and date of the scoping meeting was published in the Federal Register on April 21, 2004. A copy of the Notice of Intent is located in Appendix G.

The agencies and groups invited to attend the meeting are listed below. All agencies and groups were provided the documentation from the meeting and any materials handed out at the meeting.

- **Federal Agencies**
 - U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE), Kansas City District (X)
 - U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
 - U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA)

- Federal Emergency Management Agency
 - U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD) (X)
 - U.S. Coast Guard – Eighth Coast Guard District (X)
 - **State Agencies**
 - Missouri Department of Conservation (X)
 - Missouri Department of Natural Resources
 - State Emergency Management Agency
 - Missouri Department of Economic Development
 - **Local Agencies**
 - Housing Authority of Kansas City (X)
 - The Port Authority of Kansas City, Missouri (X)
 - North Kansas City Levee District
 - KCMO Department of Parks and Recreation
 - KCMO Water Services – East Bottoms Unit
 - KCMO Public Works
 - KCMO Planning and Development
 - City of Kansas City, Missouri (X)
 - North Kansas City, Missouri (X)
 - North Kansas City Parks and Recreation Department
 - Mid-America Regional Council (X)
 - Kansas City Area Transportation Authority (X)
- (X) – attended scoping meeting

At the scoping meeting, an overview of the study was presented including a presentation of the purpose of the project, socio-economic and environmental issues. Issues discussed by the participants included the following.

a. Project Overview

A project overview was provided as part of the scoping meeting. The project begins just north of Missouri Route 210 in Clay County and continues south on I-29/35 to the northeast corner of the downtown freeway loop in Kansas City. The project also includes the north side of the downtown loop designated as I-35/70.

b. Proposed Action

The proposed action includes evaluating operational and capacity improvements for I-29/35 from M-210 to the north loop. The proposed action will also look at whether to complete a major rehabilitation of the existing bridge and construct a new companion bridge or to construct a replacement structure at the Missouri River Crossing. The proposed improvements for I-29/35 will be compatible with the overall master plan for the CBD Loop.

c. Environmental Considerations

Background information was provided on environmental issues addressed in the EIS. The Study Corridor is a developed urban corridor. Many of the potential impacts will be to the built environment more so than to the natural environment. There are a number of parks within the Study Corridor, including River Forest Park, Kessler Park, Richard L. Berkley Riverfront Park, Columbus Park and West Terrace Park. A cultural resources survey will identify any sites or structures that may be eligible for inclusion on the National Register of Historic Places.

Other considerations include hazardous waste sites, low-income or minority neighborhoods and some possible threatened and endangered species issues. An environmental justice analysis will be completed, based on information from the year 2000 census.

d. Engineering Considerations

A number of alternative improvement concepts are considered in the EIS. The No-Build Alternative considers improvements to the pavement and some reconstruction concepts. The Build Alternatives look at the mainline and adding lanes for a total of eight. The options include use of the existing pavement as four-lanes in one direction of traffic and then widening to one side or widening on the centerline. The interchanges within the Study Corridor are also being carefully examined for safety and design improvements. The Study Corridor is pretty tightly confined by the industrial area north of the river, the railroad corridors and development plans for the riverfront.

e. Paseo Bridge

The options for the bridge include building two new structures, replacing the existing structure with one large new structure or adding a companion structure and rehabilitating the existing bridge. There have been discussions with the Coast Guard regarding the pier locations. The bridge is also over 50 years old so it is historic and there will be a Memorandum of Agreement on the bridge between MoDOT, FHWA and the SHPO.

f. Issues Raised

The agencies that attended the Scoping Meeting raised some questions or concerns related to the proposed action. As part of the discussion on the Paseo Bridge, there were issues raised about the span between the bridge piers and the possible impacts of the bridge demolition. There were also questions about how commercial properties in the Study Corridor might be impacted by construction. Also discussed were concerns about the impacts on the public housing projects within or adjacent to the Study Corridor. All of these issues are addressed in the EIS.

2. COOPERATING AGENCY MEETING

On September 21, 2005 a meeting was held to provide an update to the Cooperating Agencies for this project. Special invitations were sent to those agencies which include EPA, USACE, Coast Guard and HUD. The USACE was the only agency in attendance at the meeting as the other agency representatives had conflicts, most due to the aftermath of Hurricane Katrina. An update on the project was given, along with an overview of the Preferred Alternative. There was also discussion about permitting responsibilities between the agencies and an overview of some of the concerns that have been heard through the study process.

3. AGENCY COMMUNICATIONS

Agency coordination and communication facilitated the gathering of the appropriate information for the preparation of the EIS. Table V-4 is a list of the agencies and individuals contacted by the project team to provide the necessary information.

As Cooperating Agencies, the EPA, USACE, Coast Guard and HUD were given the opportunity to review the Preliminary Draft EIS and make comments. Comment letters were received from EPA, USACE and the Coast Guard. Each made comments in relation to their specific areas of concern, including permitting for the construction of a new bridge and its effects on waterborne commerce, wetlands impacts and the wording of the proposed action for the project, respectively. Those comments have been addressed in the document in those sections suggested by the agencies. Comment letters from the agencies can be found in Appendix G. HUD did not have any comments on the Preliminary Draft EIS.

On February 24, 2006 a meeting was held with the USACE to discuss comments and concerns on the preliminary Draft EIS. This meeting resulted in the comments that can be seen in Appendix G. An informal coordination meeting with FHWA, MoDOT and USFWS was held on March 24, 2006. The meeting was to talk about updated habitat information gathered at the Missouri River related to the Pallid Sturgeon.

**Table V-4
Agency Communications in Preparation of the DEIS**

Name	Title/Section	Agency
Roger Wiebush	Bridge Administrator	U.S. Coast Guard Eight Coast Guard District
Joe Hughes	Chief Regulatory Branch	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Kansas City District
Charles Scott	Field Supervisor	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Joe Cothorn	NEPA Director	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
Andrew Boeddeker	Regional Director	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
Kay Carder		Federal Emergency Management Agency
Jeffrey Lines	Special Master	Housing Authority of Kansas City
Steve Abbott		City of Kansas City, Missouri Parks and Recreation
Pat Sterrett	Executive Director	Port Authority of Kansas City
Leon Stabb		North Kansas City Levee District
Wayne Cauthen	City Manager	City of Kansas City, Missouri
Steve Noble	Manager, Transportation Planning	City of Kansas City, Missouri Planning and Development
Pam Windsor	City Administrator	North Kansas City, Missouri
Mell Henderson		Mid-America Regional Council

4. TRIBAL COMMUNICATIONS

On April 5, 2005, FHWA sent correspondence to the following tribes in order to advise them of the proposed action and the preparation of the EIS and invite their participation: Otoe-Missouria Tribe of Indians, Oklahoma; Sac & Fox Nation, Oklahoma; Sac & Fox Nation of Missouri in Kansas and Nebraska; Omaha Tribe of Nebraska; Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma; Osage Tribe, Oklahoma; Iowa Tribe of Kansas and Nebraska; and Sac & Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa. Responses were received from the Iowa Tribe of Oklahoma, the Osage Tribe and the Sac & Fox Tribe of the Mississippi in Iowa. Each of the responses asked that the tribes be notified if there are any archeological discoveries during the course of the project. Correspondence from FHWA and the tribes is located in Appendix G.

5. CULTURAL RESOURCES FIELD COORDINATION

On December 1, 2004 a cultural resources field coordination meeting was held. Participants included the MoDOT, FHWA, SHPO, the Landmarks Commission of Kansas City and the consultant team. The purpose of the meeting was to allow review of the cultural resources identified during the cultural resources investigations and come to an agreement as to which resources are possibly significant and which ones are not. The meeting and the field review facilitated the acceptance of the final cultural resource report and the information contained in this document. Further information on cultural resources can be found in Appendices E, F and G.