The Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) held a Virtual Public Information Open House for the South Lawrence Trafficway (SLT) Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (SEIS) starting Thursday, May 14, 2020 and ended Thursday, June 4th, 2020. Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, the meeting was presented and hosted virtually at www.slt-ks.org although the community had the opportunity to request hard copies or meeting materials. The original end date was May 28 but to maximize community input, the date was extended an additional week. Participants were provided with a link to an online comment form and the project team email addresses to provide comments and questions.

The purpose of the virtual open house was to present project updates and share the Reasonable Alternatives for the SLT improvements. The purpose of the SEIS is to help KDOT evaluate the options for improving the SLT to enhance safety and improve congestion while trying to minimize impact to the environment.

Two hundred two (202) people signed into the meeting using the Public Information Management Application (PIMA) and two sets of hard copies were sent via mail. One hundred fifteen comments were submitted and documented in the PIMA application.

**Key Findings**

In general, people are supportive of the improvements to SLT. The comment form asks participants to identify topics that apply to their comment. Below is a table that provides what topics were selected. Multiple topics can represent a single comment.
Common themes through the comments include:

- Safety throughout the corridor is a concern but the intersection of Wakarusa and K-10 stands out as a major concern for traffic and pedestrians and bicycles.
- Access at Farmer’s Turnpike is another concern as participants do not want to lose this access.
- While some participants are open to tolling, many people are against tolling options.

In the sections that follow, comments and themes for each category presented are summarized.

**Meeting notification**

An electronic postcard invitation was sent to the Advisory Committee as well as the online database consisting of 838 emails to advertise the virtual meeting. KDOT sent out a media release announcing the meeting and posted on the @NEKansasKDOT Facebook page and the @NEKansasKDOT Twitter account. The Lawrence Journal World included the meeting in two articles:

- May 12, 2020: Some city leaders open to idea of tolled express lanes on SLT as long as existing lanes remain free
- May 13, 2020: KDOT to update Lawrence City Commission on SLT expansion project, including options for tolling

Prior to the meeting the project team presented to the Lawrence City Commission, the Douglas County Commission and the Lecompton City Council to provide updates and announce the public meeting. A virtual presentation was given to the Lawrence City Commission on May 7 via Zoom which is open to the public and broadcast on local TV. The project team also made in-person presentations to the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce and a Lawrence Rotary group. The City of Lawrence, Douglas County and the City of Lecompton helped share the public meeting information through social media and newsletters. The Lawrence Chamber of Commerce shared the information with their membership.
Meeting Exhibits and Materials

The meeting was set up through ESRI Story Boards and provided the following categories:

- Project background
- Three Reasonable Alternatives
- Tolling as a funding option
- I-70 and K-10 Interchange Alternatives
- Additional project improvements
- Public input

In addition to the virtual exhibits, participants had the ability to review project factsheets with similar information. Factsheets are attached.

The following is a summary of the information provided and common themes we heard from participants in their comments.
Project Background

This section provided general information about the South Lawrence Trafficway Project. It included the history, study area, SEIS process, purpose and need, Alternatives evaluation process and the schedule.

The main comments in this section are regarding the schedule as many would like to see the improvements completed as soon as possible and looking for a more defined timeline.

Three Reasonable Alternatives

The three Reasonable Alternatives, including No Action, Add Capacity Freeway and Add Capacity Tolled Highway, were presented in this section with static images highlighting potential improvements.

Comments included several similar themes:

- Reasonable Alternative 2, Add Capacity Freeway, is the most favored alternative. Many commenters are opposed to tolled lanes, however there are some that are very supportive.
- Safety and congestion are concerns along the corridor.
- A few people found the Express Toll Lanes option confusing or thought it may pose a safety concerns with travelers moving back and forth between the “free” lanes and Express tolled lanes.
- Many participants also commented that they felt four lanes would be best instead of six lanes.

Tolling as a funding option

This section introduced the tolling legislation that was passed in 2019 which would allow for only the new lanes to be tolled and that all tolls collected on the SLT could only be used on SLT. If tolling is to be considered, a tolling alternative had to be developed.

Some of the comments that demonstrate the common themes include:

- “I do not feel that people of northern Douglas county should have to pay a toll to use a road that gives us access to meet our basic needs.”
- “I support the SLT tolling of new express lanes, leaving existing lanes free to use.”
- “I would support Alternative #3 if tolling a portion of the road will speed up the upgrades to the western leg of the SLT.”
- “I think that K-10 should not be a toll road and that other taxes should be used to fund the project. I do not think that, given the short distances between interchanges, free and tolled lanes is a safe and feasible fundraising idea. I feel that the confusion of toll lanes and free lanes on a roadway so often used for local traffic is not a feasible fix for the traffic issues the SLT currently faces.”
I-70 and K-10 Interchange Alternatives

Three interactive maps were provided in this section for participants to review the alternatives for the north end of K-10 at I-70. The three alternatives for this portion of the project include:

- Alternative 1: Two interchanges with NO access to Farmer's Turnpike from SLT.
- Alternative 2: Two interchanges WITH access to Farmer’s Turnpike from SLT.
- Alternative 3: One large interchange.

Alternative 3 was the most favored alternative, followed by Alternative 2. While there were a few comments in favor of Alternative 1, most commenters do not want to lose their access to Farmer’s Turnpike.

Additional Project Improvements

This section included proposed improvements to K-10 and Wakarusa Drive and temporary safety improvements at K-10/27th Street and Wakarusa. This area was of interest and many participants provided comments as it is a busy intersection with the Youth Sports Complex as well as many residents in the area.

Safety, for drivers, pedestrians and bicycles, is a top concern in this location and another concern a few people expressed is the noise pollution. While not every question was the same, there were a few comments that asked why the specific proposed design was selected over other options.

Example comments include:

- “As for the safety improvements proposed for K10/27th St and Wakarusa Dr seem geared more towards improving the safety of people driving vehicles, rather than the more vulnerable people walking and biking the Lawrence Loop. How about adding a refuge island for the expansive crosswalk across K10? Or not making people backtrack to get to a crosswalk to cross Wakarusa Dr?”
- “I completely agree for the need of the K10 Wakarusa overpass. This is a dangerous intersection!”
- “The 27th street/Wakarusa street interchange is not very well thought out for all who live east of the intersection. No one from the east can inter the SLT. We have to go one way onto Wakarusa to 23rd street. What about all the damn road noise at all times, on this stretch of road. (Stop light on K10 and 27th/Wakarusa) How come no one post noise control signs near this intersection. Tractor trailers are using their jake brakes. NOISE POLLUTION!!!!”
- “I would like to know why a Diamond interchange is not used at Wakarusa Dr.”

Comments

One hundred fifteen comments were submitted and documented in the PIMA application. Most comments were completed directly in PIMA but some participants did submit emails to the
project team that were manually documented in PIMA. There were also participants that submitted multiple comments.

The complete list of all comments is attached. Comments are broken up to represent the meeting categories, unless they are general and about a specific topic.

The PIMA tool allows commenters to identify the area of concern when submitting a comment. Red identifies not in favor, yellow is neutral and green is in favor. Below is a map that the participants provided a pinpoint to identify their location of concern. The north end is where the red dots are placed. Yellow and green are dispersed through the corridor.

The comments provided that are represented by the red dot are about the access to Farmer’s Turnpike. All three comments note that they do not want access cut off from Farmer’s Turnpike. One comment also provides input that they would like to see improvements to US-40.

In general, people are supportive of SLT and want to see the improvements done quickly. Safety, access and tolling are the top concerns as indicated by their preference of alternatives.
Virtual Public Information Open House
Comments

As of June 11, 2020, one hundred fifteen comments were submitted and documented in the PIMA application. All comments are below and are verbatim and not corrected for spelling, punctuation or grammar.

Comments are broken up to represent the meeting categories unless they are general and about a specific topic. If a participant provided a comment about multiple categories, the comment is divided so each portion is listed under the applicable category.

Traffic
- As a regional commuter between Topeka and Olathe on a weekly basis this highway bypass needs to expanded quickly. There is so much city and commercial traffic that this portion of the road is awful to get through. I can't tell you how many times I see a slow moving car with 10-15 cars behind them all wanting to get through quicker. Something needs to be done quickly.

Noise
- Hello, regarding the SLT project for the west side of Lawrence. Is there or are there any plans for a noise barrier? The roar of the 2 lane can be quite annoying, I have monitored the sound with a Db meter at times and am surprised at the reading, depending on whether there is any wind, or direction of wind. Can only imagine what it will be with 4 or 6 lanes, plus with Clinton State Park on the west side and all the open ground, there is pretty good movement of deer through the area.
- Would like to have sound barrier between housing and the SLT where houses exist near the roadway.
- I am curious what will be done if anything about the road noise where the road will be close to residences, particularly near Wakarusa.
- When expansion happens there needs to be noise mediation between 6th Street and Bob Billings. The current traffics rattles our windows at all hours of day And night, especially the hand brakes and straight pipe semi’s. Noise barriers are a MUST!!
- As a private home owner with property backing up to the SLT and situated close to the intersection of Wakarusa and 27th, I have one request. I hope that you would greatly consider a sound barrier being built along the eastern side of the SLT to reduce the traffic noise in the residential neighborhoods. The barriers could be similar to the current barriers along the eastern leg in the Haskell bottoms. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

Safety
- The traffic into the Soccer Fields is too congested on practice days and especially on game days. The intersection is not designed for that level of traffic, and it is very dangerous for bikers and pedestrians. That is the biggest problem with the SLT as I see it. Otherwise, I'm very happy with the SLT.
• Please provide a better entrance/exit to ball fields.
• Dumping a large volume of traffic onto E 600 Rd. would cause huge issues at intersection with Hwy-40 plus significantly increased potential for accidents along Hwy-40 to the east due to tight right of way corridor, numerous hills & corners.
• The state created a self-evident extreme hazardous condition by completing and opening the eastern portion of the SLT, feeding two heavily utilized westbound lanes (aggravated by merging US 59 traffic, into a single westbound lane. My life and that of my wife have been jeopardized by an eastbound driver that decided to pass a long line of eastbound vehicles at dusk, causing us to avoid a high speed head-on collision only by swerving onto the shoulder. The volume of traffic is a daily safety hazard. The state should immediately implement the simplest remediation possible by adding two more lanes at state expense. If traffic engineers want to study some other ideal" configuration there will be plenty of time to do so after the existing threat to lives and property has been resolved. The state's past actions have caused the present threat; it is unreasonable and unsafe to delay a solution solely to consider tolls or more complex solutions. Other state highway projects may have had priority before this threat arose.
• Safety - The 27th Street/Wakarusa Drive interchange is very dangerous and unsafe. How long can this situation be permitted to persist? At what point will this interchange need to be closed, as was done with the SLT access at Kasold Drive, for safety purposes? YSI - Why is there no mention of relocating the YSI complex (just as hundreds of acres of the Baker wetlands were relocated to build the east leg), in order to build an interchange at south Wakarusa Drive instead of 1-2 miles to the east. The fact that KDOT owns a tiny parcel of right of way is not a meaningful consideration in determining the location of the interchange and constructing an interchange at this location would only result in increased construction costs.

Bike/Ped
• I support expanding / preserving the bike/pedestrian system that parallels SLT
• I'm very concerned about pedestrian and bike safety at Wakarusa and K10. I support a separated grade crossing that allows people to easily remain on the Lawrence Loop Trail.
• I also support preserving and improving the bike/pedestrian/alternative transportation pathways parallel to the SLT and would support adding similar extension for bike/alternative transportation on the K-10 corridor east to Lenexa.

Environmental
• Environmental issues. I strongly recommend clearly identifying those issues that have to be complied with because of statutes and regulations or Executive Orders, and those that are based on great recommendations from Environmental/Historic Preservation professionals. And last but not least, issues brought for consideration by the public as simply preferences of the local community.
• I am a professor of Environmental Science at Haskell. Maps to evaluate the study area and landcover/use around the area of impact for project are too small (too coarse detail) to make an informed judgement by citizens who are not intimately familiar with the landcover of the city already. Maps must be higher quality! I am using a high-end laptop,
and am unable to see enough detail. You have to include landcover/landuse features clearly in these maps, and make them expandable to a high degree. That said, the construction alternatives must include one in which we include water flow structures under the SLT (open water channels - constructed streams, ditches, sloughs as well as underground tubes). This alternative would include allowing water to flow under the eastern leg that divides the Haskell and Baker Wetlands for flooding abatement as well as aquatic wildlife passage (fish, turtles, etc...). Some of these open channels could be added as we create underpasses, improvements etc... at the intersections along the SLT. This is part of the environmentally sensitive improvements to the SLT that were ignored in the initial construction of the SLT. Essentially, one of the major problems that needs to be improved in this new project is that the SLT has created a raised burm all along the south and west sides of Lawrence (essentially a dam) that keeps hydrologic flow from occurring, and is causing much more water to accumulate on the Haskell side of the wetlands than in the past, for example. The extent of water has been noticeably growing on the Haskell side since the 2016 construction. This will happen and is happening elsewhere on either side of the SLT as well. Hydrologic flow and connectivity has really been ignored or not well thought out along most of the sections of the original SLT, and this "improvement" initiative we are working on now would be the opportunity to "really" improve the SLT in the ways suggested in this comment while improving access and making the road safer at the same time. This should be a goal of the improvements. I believe improving the environmental damage that was done by the previous incarnation of a road project is one of the legitimate goals of an SEIS and any improvement proposals for an existing roadway. This project is not ONLY to be about its impacts on traffic as our community is NOT ONLY ABOUT TRAFFIC. If that were the case we would have a hard time living in this community and sustaining a healthy well-rounded population. My students are very badly impacted by the roadway as it is, and our time in the wetlands during field labs is drowned out by exhaust and loud trucks on 31st street and the trafficway. We are not able to use our wetlands to their fullest as they represent most significant outdoor teaching lab Haskell Indian Nations University had. I will add more in a future comment if I have time.

- Has the wetland issue along the existing roadway been resolved? In the past there was a concern with Lake Alvamar not meeting the safety requirements for dams. Is flooding of the highway as the result of a dam breach still an issue?

Funding

- Please pursue the toll lane option for completion of the SLT.
- Would prefer no tolls.
- Requiring K-tags to use the express toll lanes has some serious equity issues - under-banked drivers will be relegated to the lower service level lane. How will out-of-area drivers, without K-tags, be able to grasp that they can only use the untolled lanes?
- I do not support toll lanes. Keep all lanes non-toll.
- NO TOLLS, one of your four objectives is to support local growth, a toll road will not do this!!! Alternative 2 is what we have always been told would happen for the last 30 years when it happens, not a toll road!!!
• I think we should limit commutes between Topeka and KC by tolling the South Lawrence trafficway.
• No Toll road
• Am proposing that the toll be the option to fund the SLT project.
• Why can't the recently signed $10B - 10 year infrastructure bill provide funding for this expansion to four or six lanes without the need for tolls?
• I support the SLT tolling of new express lanes, leaving existing lanes free to use
• No more toll roads to Lawrence. If highway projects need tolling to pay, put them in another part of the state.
• I do support an express and/or tolled lane to help reduce overall cost & potentially improve safety.
• I do not feel that people of northern Douglas county should have to pay a toll to use a road that gives us access to meet our basic needs.
• Please do not make it a toll road
• NO TOLL ROAD OF ANY KIND! When will you actually start to widen/improve the road? Give me just a date or approximation - no a bunch of boilerplate about why you can't do anything.
• Non-Toll expansion is the best alternative. Toll roads are the least effective mean and cost the general public user and commercial user a higher cost per mile, then non-tolled roadways, ref. A Financial Analysis of Toll System Revenue: Who Pays & Who Benefits to help add to the highway fund."
• Finally, we do not prefer the tolled lane option to pay for this project--the need for the West Leg expansion was abundantly clear for years before the east leg of the traffic way was completed, and the funding for that expansion should have been included in the state's plans all along. Tolling, even if optional, places an unfair burden on local users of the roadway to pay for this expansion that is, fundamentally, driven by regional transportation needs.
• Absolutely opposed to toll options.
• Also, I'm cheating here just to save time, but I would like to comment on the concept of tolls for K-10 for an express lane. I have absolutely no problem with it. People here are incredibly spoiled - in big cities, it's just matter of course to pay for faster commute. As long as there is a free option, what is the big deal. Don't cave!
• Also I am good with Tolling to help solve funding.
• We use the SLT every single day to commute to work. If a tolled option was approved and built we would simply divert our traffic patterns to using the existing lanes which I imagine a lot of others would do as well. This would not reduce accidents or traffic volume except to those of more privilege and means. No employer is going to consider a pay raise for a voluntary toll fee. Those who use a toll road do so understanding in advance where to live, costs, fees, commute time, etc. Do not take a small existing free access" stretch of highway and mandate a new small stretch built for safety and/or KDOT will use the never ending fees/tolls as income."
• However, make one thing clear - NO TOLL ROAD! I SAY AGAIN - .NO TOLL ROAD OF ANY KIND! I paid for road improvement already by paying my taxes. Now do yours and widen the road and do away with that ridiculous and dangerous stop light - Overpass - Yeah!
• Funding should not be by tolling. Transportation funding should be vehicle registration or partnership with the City of Lawrence, Douglas Co and State - so this includes commuters from Topeka and Kansas City, KS.
• I think that K-10 should not be a toll road and that other taxes should be used to fund the project. I do not think that, given the short distances between interchanges, free and tolled lanes is a safe and feasible fundraising idea. I feel that the confusion of toll lanes and free lanes on a roadway so often used for local traffic is not a feasible fix for the traffic issues the SLT currently faces.
• I would support Alternative #3 if tolling a portion of the road will speed up the upgrades to the western leg of the SLT.
• Additionally, I am vehemently opposed to partial tolling. Traffic will continue to be heavy and unsafe on the toll-free portion of the road, and those (like my spouse, heading to US59 SB for emergency call reasons) having to exit from tolled to toll-free to change highways will be caught up in that traffic backup, or will have to use the more congested toll-free lane to avoid the transition. Neither of those is a safe option. Additionally, this would make Lawrence the only community in Kansas completely belted by tolled highways. The KC metro area is toll-free, and Topeka’s Wichita’s immediate beltways are toll-free.
• We also feel all lanes should be Toll Free.

Reasonable Alternatives
• Add Capacity Freeway
• Take no action is not a reasonable alternative. The two lane portion of the SLT is dangerous. After several close calls I have stopped using it entirely. Fixing the issues and expanding to four lanes as either a tollway or freeway would both be preferable to how dangerous this leg is now.
• I love Reasonable Alternative 3 - Add Capacity Tolled Highway for the South Lawrence Trafficway (SLT) Project because with the tolling option the project is basically going to pay for itself in no time.
• Alternative # 2
• Based on location of SLT and urban/rural community around or nearby it. The option for a 4 lane roadway with green median, one toll lane per direction, seems to me to be the most reasonable improvement proposed
• I guess I'm confused as to who is going to take the toll road when a free lane is there as an alternative. Why would a person pay to drive in lane 1 when lane 2 is free? Change the law, toll the whole road until it’s paid for and build it soon, it’s very dangerous and lives are being lost. Traffic is out of control. Build it four lanes with grass for now with the option to add two more lanes as needed. A four lane road will move alot of traffic. Configure the 27th street interchange so Wakarusa Dr can be extended south to 458, as I think there would be alot of use for that and it would also relieve traffic on and below the dam. Do NOT fund it with taxes! That means only local people would be paying for it, when alot of out of town and out of state people use it,too. Charge a toll so everyone that wants to use it, pays for it. Get that law changed and toll the road, but get it built.
• Not very fond with the choices at all! Do not want a toll road lane or lanes. Who keeps fighting for the rights to a toll lane?
I am not in favor of the toll configuration that is presented. This is such a short stretch of highway to have such a confusing option. I would be stressed if I found myself behind a slow moving vehicle and have to decide if I can pass or not. Also, how do you charge vehicles who don’t have KTags? Will those drivers get a free ride?

Second, I like most do not want to see our taxes go up to expand the number of lanes. However, I do see a problem with express lanes. The big increase between US-59 and I-70 on the west side of town was supposedly increased truck traffic coming up from I-35 to US-59 to K-10 to I-70. If you make an express lane, then you still have the remaining lanes clogged by this increased truck traffic. Why not force commercial trucks and other large vehicles to use these toll lanes to keep the free lanes from clogging up from all this anticipated commercial traffic? Simply making express lanes for some individuals who want to pay to go faster will only frustrate the average driver (especially those with local destinations) who is in slow traffic due to increased commercial traffic that is not local. If more lanes are to increase capacity for such anticipated commercial traffic, then let them bare the burden of these increased lanes -- not local drivers.

I strongly prefer the 4 lane over the 6 lane option. In fact I feel the West leg of the SLT should be rebuilt/expanded to match the newer Eastern portion. I am not in favor of a toll lane, unless that is the only way it would be improved in a timely manner.

I favor the tolled alternative funding option.

I support the tolling option for the SLT highway

I am in favor of add capacity freeway

A better explanation is necessary for the comment, “Interchanges in the area would still be accessible via the express toll lane or the toll-free land, but there may be certain locations where drivers will have to decide which lane they want to be in to access the local street network.” That is a significant “but,” and will undoubtedly affect County residents on their perception of how the express toll lane system will function and impact their driving habits. For example, my experience in similar situations is that the free lanes are frequently required to exit at every interchange while the toll lanes continue to travel unimpeded. Potential travelers of the SLT need to know this as part of the financing decision process.

Expansion to 4 lane divided MUST move forward rapidly. Existing two lane is highly unsafe. Volume has increased massively since East leg completion. Express lane tolling only on the West leg seems odd but I am generally in favor of user pays options.

I am open to the concept of a separate toll road while keeping a local traffic lane but my concern is only having one lane of each in the 4 lane plan. People do not drive the same speed, a lot of people go faster than the speed limit and when they come behind a slower vehicle and have no way around, they follow dangerously close (tailgate), they get angry and become a hazard to others on the road. That is already happening now with heavy traffic and no room to pass. The 6 lane option would be better but you still have the same issue with the local lane. At least it should be less of an issue. It seems that having a toll road and local road together like that will make it more complicated and confusing. I think I still favor not having a toll road but if the only way we can get the improvements completed in a reasonably timeframe is to include the toll option then I favor the 6 lane concept.
• I prefer Alternative 2 (expanding to 4 to 6 lanes). Alternative 2 is very much need for safe travel on the western portion of the SLT. I think the environmental concerns along the western portion identified for expansion for Alternative 2 are minimal and can be easily mitigated. I strongly support a new design for the 27th Street interchange.... needed for vehicle and pedestrian safety.

• I truly appreciate the time and effort you have put into the planning of this project. I completely support the largest most comprehensive alternatives. Biggest interchange at K-10 and I-70, Safest intersection at Wakarusa and connection with 31st street. 6 lane toll road. I would also love for this project to be completed as quickly as possible.

• I have and still remain opposed to the idea of any tolling options for the SLT, as it keeps the free lane status quo. The overwhelming reason for why traffic has increased on the SLT since the east leg opening is that it offers a viable, free alternative for commuters traveling to and from the KC metro over the Turnpike. Drivers will still utilize the free lane as much as possible, creating bottlenecks and not solving the safety concerns that are driving this project. Another basic purpose behind widening K10 is to increase the flow of traffic through this congested artery--especially given the rapid influx of larger vehicles that often drive at slower speeds compared to commuter traffic. A four lane road with a single express lane does not solve this basic need as traffic will remain segregated in their set lanes. A six lane road does solve this issue for the tolled portion, but the west leg does not need a 6 lane road at this time and would be a waste of money to build and maintain. A four lane, non-tolled road is the simplest, most cost effective way to meet the growing needs of this section of roadway. In addition, if traffic bottlenecks develop over time, this will deter local residents from using the SLT and fail to lessen the traffic volumes on local city streets. I feel that the reason why public opinion increased so favorably towards the express toll option is for this very reason--that they still plan on using the free lane option. If the funding is spread out among the various local and county taxes and fees proposed in this study, the overall impacts on residents should be minimized. I worry that if tolls fall short of forecast owing to the free section of road still being utilized, local and county residents will end up bearing the cost of the road in the end.

• 1) It is imperative the SLT lane capacity has to be increased from the current two lanes to a minimum of four lanes. That is a no-brainer!!

• Option 2 is by far the best....a tolled version would not be practical....it would be dangerous and cumbersome. Truck Drivers probably would bypass the toll and use the non toll section creating increased traffic....or no one would use it...

• As someone who lives in the community Northwest of this traffic way I really feel the add capacity freeway is the only way to go. I feel the majority of people currently using the trafficway will not use tolled lane if they are available and the congestion will stay just as bad as it currently is, if not worse. I also can imagine people using the tolled lanes as a passing lane when needed if there is only a "buffer" zone and not concrete barriers. This raises some safety concerns. Another concern is the merging scenario in and out of the tolled lanes to access exits. I feel the merging increases the # of lane changes a person would have to make while navigating the highway, and as drivers are already frustrated about that road, other drivers may not allow those merges to happen kindly causing more accidents. I think tolled lanes will be more dangerous than the current traffic pattern/flow.
• I am in support of Reasonable Alternative 2 - Add Capacity Freeway. It is the only way to improve safety and congestion without adding cost to the local tax payers. Funding is a KDOT/State of Kansas/Political issue, not citizens who use the highway.

• My vote on the 3 options would be the toll road option first and then the freeway.

• Toll option. Is there a way to ensure through heavy traffic is forced to take the toll lanes and not clog up the general purpose lane? I already see quite a bit of heavy truck traffic on K-10 and US 40, with what I presume is the preference to avoid using the KTA. I am not faulting the preference, simply want you, the transportation professional to be aware of it and see if there is a safe solution. I prefer toll roads with easy payment options like reading registration plates WITHOUT a penalty for the out of state driver that doesn’t have an account with K-Tag.

• Of the three options I would prefer the 4 lane road with a toll lane on both sides.

• I don’t think a tolled option between the Turnpike and US-59 makes sense, especially if the goal of the project is safety because you need that extra left lane in order for cars to pass one another. Two tolled lanes on an existing 2-lane Highway with a concrete barrier also does little to improve mobility and capacity. But If you want to add a tolled lane at some point on K-10, you should do so from East Lawrence at 23rd Street, all the way to the I-435 interchange because a Free, 4 lane highway already exists there. And is more heavily traversed as a link between to quickly growing areas, Douglas and Johnson counties.

• We support upgrading the west portion to be equivalent to the east portion of K10, Alternative 2, with the addition of overpasses and ramps equivalent to those on the East portion of K10 east of Iowa. Bike and pedestrian crossings should be accessible and safe. Address any environmental concerns similar to the east portion. We oppose tolls and toll lanes--this looks too complicated and we think semi traffic will avoid the toll lanes.

• I am in favor of the expanded capacity freeway option. My second choice would be the expanded capacity tollway, but perhaps with an option for those who carpool to use the express lane for free. This would bring some benefit to the environment by encouraging people to carpool, as well as still provide a funding option for the project with single occupant vehicles in the express lane paying a toll.

• The main concern is safety. Greatest danger currently is traffic light, but traffic volume congestion will continue even when crossing at light is eliminated. All lanes should be available without forcing choice to pay or not. With toll you will have a lane largely unused by local traffic plus a continuation of congestion safety issues in other lane.. Priority however is to remove the dangerous current traffic light. Build a bridge somewhere NOW.

• I strongly prefer the No Action alternative. The current infrastructure is good enough and I have never been on the road when I felt like it was congested. Seems like an enormous waste of money and resources to me at this point. I would rather than lower taxes for Kansans or spend the money on something else (improved recreation facilities, wetlands habitat, or safer bike/ped across Iowa next to SLT).

• The four lane option with no toll seems the make the most sense and will be the least cost and least expensive to maintain. Ultimately the most simple option will also likely be the most safe. There are some tight spots on this route and trying to fit in additional lanes and toll apparatus seems unnecessary.
The use of toll lanes is not safe for this project. It will result in insufficient traffic using the left lane leading to congestion in the right lane, which is made worse because vehicles in the right lane will be forbidden from moving left to allow slower moving vehicles or large groups of vehicles to merge onto the freeway. The need for a direct freeway route between Johnson county and places west including Topeka, western Kansas, and states west has been plainly known for decades and grows everyday. The tolling ideas presented here are plainly unfeasible and should never have made it out of the initial design phase. This route is; a major daily commuter route (Lawrence-Topeka Metro), a major intrastate route (Johnson County to Topeka, Salina, etc) and an interstate route (middle to South KC Metro from I-70/I-470 all the way to this project area and to points along I-70 coast to coast). Because of its importance to all, the use of general transportation funds is the most appropriate source of funding. As well, all practical effects to expedite the project should be taken.

My preference is the Add Capacity Freeway by upgrading the West Leg to at least a median divided fully access-controlled four lane freeway with the ability to expand to six lanes in the future. This would maintain K-10 as a free facility supported by fuel taxes and state funds which the public has expected for over 30 years. In my opinion the Ad Capacity Tolled Highway Alternate as a four lane freeway presents several operational and safety concerns. Without a barrier to separate the toll lane from the general purpose lane faster traffic will encroach on the toll lane to pass the slower traffic much as I frequently observed in Phoenix with their Express Lanes. The 2 express toll lanes with crossover points are confusing to drivers and present weaving and merge problems. With only the one general purpose lane faster traffic can not pass slower traffic which could create further congestion at the crossover points.

North End Design

I am in favor of interchange options 2 or 3. I am vehemently opposed to interchange option 1. My family would be cut off from access to K10 by option 1 and my on-call spouse would be unable to respond to emergencies in a timely manner as a result. Pushing local rural traffic to on-grade gravel roads is not a safer alternative than retaining Farmer's Turnpike access to K-10/SLT.

Alternative # 3 takes my vote
We do not need another turnpike exit. Access from the Farmers Turnpike (DGCO 438?) should NOT be blocked from K10.
Please keep k-10 access to farmers turnpike
For the I70/K10 interchange at the Farmer's Turnpike, I prefer option 3. The other two options are less safe and could cause more problems when we are looking for more comprehensive solutions. It would also fit with the style of the interchange on the east end of Lawrence.
As to the 3 alternatives to the western terminus into i-70. #1 is completely out of the question as it cuts off access to Farmer's Turnpike. #2 I think more people would have been happy with this one HAD it included improvements to US-40 as was the case in alternative #1. You are doing all this planning because of anticipated transportation growth in the area. So how can you justify ignoring US-40. It is two lane, winding, hilly, and has NO shoulder. Why wasn't improving US-40 from the hill west of 600 Rd all the
way to 6th Street where it meets up again with K-10/6th Street including in improvements in alternative #2? I think if you had improved alternative #2, more would have considered it. I can see the eventual need for an I-70 toll exchange at 600 Rd, but without serious improvements to US-40, it would be dead in the water. So like most I guess I'm forced to go with alternative #3, but only because #2 was not thoroughly thought out. I seriously think you should improve #2 alternative to include US-40 improvements, and THEN see if its popularity improves when presented to the public.

- Prefer Alt 1 interchange. Farmer's turnpike access separate from the K10 interchange would seem to reduce volume at the K10 interchange thereby helping flow and safety. Concerns with Alt 1 option is increased volume on US40 with its many sharp corners.
- I-70 and K-10 Interchange Alternatives - As a Jefferson County resident who works in SW Lawrence, I depend on the SLT to get me to work everyday. Option 1 where access to the SLT would be removed completely would be a huge disappointment and add a lot of unnecessary frustration to myself and many other Perry/Lecompton residents who use the interchange daily.
- I support Alternative 3 which provides access to Farmer's Turnpike from K-10.
- OPTION 2 is clearly the most practical. 6th street going out to highway 40 and the 800 rd intersection is a very dangerous situation. Deaths have occurred at that intersection. Drivers come up over the hills to fast and it is a passing zone!! Passing zone should not be at an intersection.....the shoulder along this section of highway 40 is way too small....
- RE: 1-70. You do not have Farmer's Turnpike on the maps, so we cannot tell what you are describing. Do these alternatives mean the north Lawrence exchange will close? We think we should keep all three exchanges.
- For the K-10/I-70 interchange, I am in favor of one large interchange. I think it is important to continue to provide access to/from Farmer's Turnpike.
- I prefer the third interchange option.
- I think access to the Farmer's Turnpike needs to remain open. Highway 40 is not the safest of roads and putting more cars on it is not wise. I vote for the 3rd option of the turnpike options.
- I truly appreciate the time and effort you have put into the planning of this project. I completely support the largest most comprehensive alternatives. Biggest interchange at K-10 and I-70, Safest intersection at Wakarusa and connection with 31st street. 6 lane toll road. I would also love to this project to be completed as quickly as possible.
- I am in favor of option 3 of the all access to Farmers turnpike. The ingress and egress of thousands of acres would be effected if access were close from K-10 to Farmers Turnpike. Many of the land owners bought farms in the area due to its convenient access. In fact, I could see some future extension north of K-10 across the river and connecting to 59. Rural businesses, industrial buildings and the future economic impact are key reasons to leave the access to Farmers Turnpike. All could be negatively effected by closing the access from K-10 to Farmer's Turnpike.
- Favor alternative 3 for interchange.
- This is a very complex project; thank you for putting all the maps online and trying to explain all the different alternatives. My family lives on 800 Rd and we use Farmers Turnpike to I70 everyday to get to work. The current intersection is extremely dangerous - I realize many safety precautions have been put in place such as lighting, and we appreciate it! We would actually prefer access to I70 from 600 Rd because that would
facilitate traffic and tourism into Lecompton. We hate the idea of a huge exchange all in one place because we will be able to see it from our house, but if that it was is ultimately safest for the public, I guess we'll have to live with it. I hope the environmental footprint will be as small as possible.

- I’m primarily focused on the k-10 70 options. Option 1 puts a lot of individuals out of their way to get to and from their homes close to or East of the current interchange. It does increase safety on 40, but would impact a lot of farms along that road. It’s an Ag based area. Lots of slow moving machinery and hills. Option 2 with access also seems unnecessary on the west addition to 600. If you’ve got access to the farmers turnpike from 70 the entire on/off section at 600 becomes pointless. Waste of funds. Option three seems to impact the fewest properties and allows function to continue as is. It’s primarily undeveloped farm land and any house already there is well aware of the highway. The only home in that area looks directly at a toll booth.
- My wife and I are in agreement with the committee's I70-K10 interchange recommendation at the Farmers Turnpike.
- Single but large intersection
- I agree that Alternative 3 for the I-70/K-10/Farmer's Turnpike interchange is the best design going forward. I do not think that Farmer's Turnpike should be cut off and I do not think that a new interchange from I-70 to Farmer's Turnpike is ideal.
- While I do not live off farmers turnpike I think alternative 2 makes the most sense without a massive and unnecessary interchange at the current Wakarusa/I70 intersection.
- Alternative 3 seems best. One interchange assuming it costs less. Nice to have Farmer's Turnpike access still.
- I live near the K-10 farmers turnpike intersection. I believe either alternative 1 or 2 for the int3rchanges makes the most sense. Alternative 3 and it’s gargantuan size seems unfit for the area would be hugely expensive and add value for a tiny number of residents.
- I am in favor of alternative #3 at I-70.
- I still believe Alternative 1 is the best solution for the north K10/I70 connection. This spreads out the traffic and makes for much safer design. Alternative 3 puts everything in one place. It is large and if I understand 4 stories tall. This doesn't seem to fit well with the nature and natural beauty of the area surrounding of the current intersection. By spreading it out it will look much better in the long run. I picture what is currently at K10 and I435 in KC when I see option 3 in my mind. Huge and really not a good look for entering into NW Lawrence. Plus, as Lawrence grows to the NW this will become right in the middle of future development. Keep it small and provide more access by dividing up the intersections into two with Alternative 1.
- The single expanded interchange at I-70/K-10 is our preferred alternate.
- I would propose an alternative using the I-70/Lecompton Rd. Interchange of Alt. 1 and the I-70/K10 Interchange with access to Farmers Turnpike of Alt. 2. The diamond interchange at Lecompton Rd. would be much more familiar to Kansas drivers. Alternate 3 presents too many decision points too close together for the unfamiliar driver. They would have to decide which lane to be in to continue to their desired destination either Farmers Turnpike, WB I-70, or EB I-70 in less than 1/2 mile (or 26 seconds at 70mph).
Regarding the I-70 and K-10 Interchange Alternatives I like alternative #3 because it will provide access onto the SLT from Farmers Turnpike and I-70 from Farmers Turnpike.

Alternatives 2 and 3 for the interchange at K-10/I-70 would work. Cost should dictate the choice. Alternative 1 is a non-starter unless there are extensive improvements to E 600 Rd and US-40.

I prefer the one large interchange with full access alternative.

I like Alternative 3, one large interchange that provides access to/from KTA, SLT, and Farmer’s Turnpike. I don’t like the intrusion that would be caused by a second interchange at 600 Rd.

We need to acknowledge that by selecting “Alternative 3, Single But Large Interchange,” in the I-70 & K-10 interchange options, that the ultimate need for the Lecompton Road interchange will not be eliminated. As Lawrence grows in the only viable direction (west), a future interchange will most likely be required.

**Wakarusa**

- I strongly agree with the K-10, Wakarusa Drive Improvements with an overpass and the interchange moved to the south of Pat Dawson Billings Nature Area
- The Wakarusa Dr. interchange needs to move further west. The alternative developed by WSP looked great.
- I like the proposed long-term solution for the Wakarusa intersection.
- I support making K-10 an overpass over Wakarusa and continuing Wakarusa south and along K-10 to the next proposed interchange. This would make the interchange much safer by eliminating the spotlight. I also support this giving the youth sports complex additional entry/exit points which would elevate the traffic congestion that so often occurs.
- As for the safety improvements proposed for K10/27th St and Wakarusa Dr seem geared more towards improving the safety of people driving vehicles, rather than the more vulnerable people walking and biking the Lawrence Loop. How about adding a refuge island for the expansive crosswalk across K10? Or not making people backtrack to get to a crosswalk to cross Wakarusa Dr?
- Also we are supportive of the new Wakarusa interchange, particularly if development of that interchange leads to safer access to the youth sports complex and the arboretum. The sports complex desperately needs a second entrance/exit for safety reasons, so that needs to be part of the planning and implementation of these changes.
- I would like to know why a Diamond interchange is not used at Wakarusa Dr.
- I live on the edge of SW Lawrence, and I mean the very edge as there is no development between my property and the SLT. My house is three blocks from the K-10 exit for Wakarusa Drive and 27th Street. I have lived here for 14 years. Here are my recommendations: 1. Eliminate the traffic light at the exit for Wakarusa/27th. The signal backs up traffic during the rush hour. Also, semis going the speed limit of 65 or above have to use their engine/Jake brakes to stop at the light because due to the curve east of the signal truckers can’t see the signal in time for more gradual slowing. These engine/Jake brakes cause loud noise. 2. The traffic light needs to be eliminated also because of the peculiar nature of the intersection of the highway, Wakarusa, and 27th. Traffic does not flow well on Wakarusa and 27th due to the effect of the light and the
exiting of traffic from SLT to go on either Wakarusa or 27th and vice versa. 3. For now until the road is widened to four or six lanes, reduce the speed limit to 55 from I-70 until the SLT becomes a four lane highway. This will improve safety and eliminate some of the need for engine/Jake brakes by eastbound semis. Thank you for your attention.

- I'm in firm support of adding a bridge over the current K10/Wakarusa Drive intersection. That section of road is incredibly unsafe for pedestrians and drivers. As a resident who lived in that area for some years, my family and I came to loathe using that intersection at any time of day. People driving along K10 seem unsure how to handle the stop light when it is green. Speeds range from 35 to 70 mph and that is for people who are driving straight through and NOT turning off K10. As a pedestrian, all too often vehicles will turn into us as we were crossing the road even when we had a signal saying it was safe to cross. Drivers like to cut the corners short as well which becomes a safety issue when you are waiting to cross the road at the cross walk. Even having moved across town I still regularly drive out to that area for the walking paths, less so now due to the pandemic.

- Has extending Crossgate Dr. from the north to the proposed interchange been discussed? I would support the proposed intersection improvements. The sooner, the better!!

- On page 4, Wakarusa Drive Interchange Alternatives shows the proposed future Wakarusa Drive & K-10 interchange 1.25 miles to the east. Why? What is the specific purpose of this location? To save in costs, it should be moved west; to be more useful, it should be moved further to the east to align with 31st and Kasold. Also, on page 4, Wakarusa Drive Interchange Alternatives, bullet 3 says, “Optimizes use of existing KDOT right of way; allows for future connection to 31st street.” This statement needs much more explanation since the connection to 31st street has been a point of contention. The how and where of this potential connection needs to be explored in more detail. In the same section, but under the “benefits,” bullet 4 discusses “future development.” What is presumed that the people of Douglas County do not know? No future planning documents show any future development at this location. The interim safety improvements, page 4, show the elimination of the west-bound traffic on 27th Street access to K-10. This may be acceptable for a few months as a short-term remedy. But considering the effort necessary to retreat to Inverness, back to Clinton Parkway, and then to Wakarusa just to get on K-10, it is unacceptable. Furthermore, the restriction of left turn will drive traffic into the adjacent neighborhoods and promote traffic violations by ignoring the pavement markings and restrictions. It is possible to design a system of coordinated traffic signals to allow full access from 27th Street to K-10.

- I completely agree for the need of the K10 Wakarusa overpass. This is a dangerous intersection!

- I truly appreciate the time and effort you have put into the planning of this project. I completely support the largest most comprehensive alternatives. Biggest interchange at K-10 and I-70, Safest intersection at Wakarusa and connection with 31st street. 6 lane toll road. I would also love to this project to be completed as quickly as possible.

- Interchange updates are very much needed at the K10/Wakarusa interchange - traffic can get backed up during the evening commute all the way back to the Iowa Street interchange. I approve of the interim safety updates to the Wakarusa interchange while a more permanent fix is in the works. For the permanent interchange design, I echo the
concerns of the focus groups, and I agree that it will vastly improve safety for vehicles, bicycles, and pedestrians. I don't know that it would really add that much more time to get onto K-10 with the new interchange since you would have a constant flow of traffic with no traffic light. Additionally, I'm not sure that you would find a better option as there is not much room to add to the current interchange location without vastly disturbing the surrounding property/neighborhood.

- **K-10 and Wakarusa Drive Proposed Design**
- Wakarusa bridge to the sports complex has to be done, another highly dangerous area.....the curve at clinton parkway near the lake is too curved, need to be redesigned to be more subtle....thanks for your considerations.
- I also support the new configuration for Wakarusa street, extending down to separate entry exit ramps. This would also make access to the Sport complexes a lot safer. I would like to also see more access to the Lawrence Loop Trail System with proper drainage. There is a massive issue with flooding at the Louisiana Street entry point on the East leg of the SLT. Anytime it rains the whole trail floods and renders it useless for days.
- One important exception: I think Wakarusa Dr intersection should be an interchange similar to the other intersections at 6th, 15th, and 23rd. I strongly support funding to improve this intersection to make it safer and less congested. If possible, putting the interchange at the current intersection is my preference to avoid having to build a long road to the interchange as is proposed in option 2 and 3.
- 2) The traffic light at the K10 (SLT) and Wakarusa Drive location has to be changed. If you've ever been through this light between 4:00 and 6:00 weekdays, or a Saturday or Sunday morning during, softball, soccer or football season you will know what I am talking about. It's almost criminal" the resources spent on the exit at K-10 (SLT) and Bob Billings way (15th street) instead of using it to improve the K-10 (SLT) and Wakarusa Drive traffic light was STUPID!!. If you've ever been down K-10 (SLT) during the evening rush hour there is literally no one using the Bob Billings exit but there are miles of traffic backed up at the traffic light at Wakarusa.
- I really like the plan for Wakarusa K-10 implementing the bridge and extending Wakarusa. The 27th street intersection to K-10 is VERY dangerous as it is, for vehicles, pedestrians, and cyclists. And the drivers rarely observe the sign to yield for bikes/people. My second choice would be the 2nd Reasonable Alternative but really prefer the plan for K-10/Wakarusa.
- The Wakarusa Drive improvements laid out in this plan are good. Environmental impact is not a concern as this is currently farm ground that likely has just as much negative impact on the environment as this roadway plan would. The planned interchange is the best safety option due to use of the best sight lines and distances for merging. Additional drive time to access off Wakarusa is minimal.
- While the proposed Wakarusa interchange does indeed line up with 31st St., I have not heard of nor does it seem viable that 31st St. will be extended anytime in the near future. The surrounding flood plain will make economic development along such a corridor difficult. It will take an overloading of the Clinton and Iowa intersections leading onto the SLT to force this extension. Until this extension takes place, we will be left with highly underused ramps on the western side of the interchange. Unless people are driving to the sports complex, there is no compelling reason to use these ramps with Clinton's
ramps just upstream to serve SW Lawrence. One possible alternative to split this difference is to only build the ramps on the east side of the overpass until the 31st St. extension takes place. Meanwhile, two ramps could be built leading onto westbound K10 and coming off of eastbound K10 at the K10 overpass over Wakarusa (at the current traffic light). This will allow local traffic to still have access to the road and minimize drivers having to double back over their tracks.

- Below is an outline of what we discussed regarding the SLT intersection with 27th & Wakarusa Drive. 1. Create two designated right turn exit lanes starting approximately ¼ mile east of the intersection for west bound SLT traffic to exit onto either Wakarusa or 27th. Through traffic from 27th to Wakarusa can be governed by a flashing red light. 2. Create an onramp on west bound SLT commencing at the northwest corner of the intersection for approximately ¼ mile. 3. Create a ¼ mile long right turn exit and entrance ramps on east bound SLT at the intersection. 4. Eliminate left turns onto SLT in and out of the Clinton Lakes Youth Sports Complex and Lawrence Rotary Arboretum by using and existing service road that connects 27th to E 900th Road, which connects to SLT at Clinton Parkway. 5. East bound traffic from north of the SLT would use Clinton Parkway to the SLT or Iowa Street to access eastbound SLT.

- As I live off of 27th St. and utilize the 27th St./Wakarusa traffic interchange every day on my way to work in Topeka. I was disappointed to see the proposed interim change in traffic flow patterns that will make it unrealistic to use this interchange heading into work. Furthermore, given how events unfolded at 1200 Road that led to its eventual closure, I think traffic on 27th St will try and make u-turns around the barriers to attempt to gain access to K10, negating the purported safety improvements this design change is supposed to provide. At the last public meeting I proposed, and still stand behind, that a more cost effective way to improve the safety of this intersection is to 1) adjust the timing of the traffic lights so that traffic coming across from the sports complex and from 27th/Wakarusa have their own dedicated, time-separated green light and 2) prohibit right-hand turns on red for K10 traffic attempting to turn on 27th St./Wakarusa. The merging of traffic from 27th St./Wakarusa onto K10 is doable and I've noticed no problems with drivers conducting this maneuver. It is when oncoming traffic from the Sports Complex and/or K10 is introduced into the equation that the safety of this intersection becomes compromised. I feel like these small signal adjustments balance both the increased safety needs of this intersection and local accessibility.

- The 27th street/Wakarusa street interchange is not very well thought out for all who live east of the intersection. No one from the east can inter the SLT. We have to go one way onto Wakarusa to 23rd street. What about all the damn road noise at all times, on this stretch of road. (Stop light on K10 and 27th/Wakarusa) How come no one post noise control signs near this intersection. Tractor trailers are using their Jake brakes. NOISE POLLUTION!!!!!

- I am in favor of the Wakarusa improvements
- Two Comments as to additional improvements to ancillary roadways & intersections. 1 Wakarusa and the SLT should have been a grade separated intersection from day one. Doing that as part of this project is highly recommended and will increase safety at this area greatly. 2. Before losing the 27th intersection, I would have said it was greatly needed. Perhaps it is from the south; but it adds to greaty to the congestion near the
Wakarusa and SLT intersection and I would not support it being reconnected to the SLT. It seems more like a want than a need.

Road Design Misc.

- The presentation is confusing. It probably looks great on a big screen. If express lanes are included, please put in substantial concrete barriers not grass or buffers” that would not protect from crazy lane changers.
- 1-70 east exchange eastbound on 1-70: exit sign does not appear before the exit ramp, but after. Move the sign to before the exit ramp.
- Adding personal vehicle capacity to this corridor is an inappropriate step in the wrong direction. More should be done to improve our public transit options, biking, and walking - while simultaneously making efforts to reduce the amount of trips taken by car. These expanded capacity proposals will only further promote car dependency, and ultimately exacerbate climate change and worsen our air quality. There are a vast number of alternative ways to spend this money more sustainably. Please, do not add vehicle capacity to this roadway.
- An interchange w/o access to N1800 Rd. seems like a big step backward.
- What is your best estimate as to when (month/year) the the heavy equipment will move in and the western leg of the SLT will start to be expanded to 4 lanes?
  NOTE: If you have one of those persons on your staff that advocates for "diet" roads, streets, and high ways, send him back to designing carnival rides or whatever. Diet highways have proven NOT to work with the SLT going from 4 lanes down to 2. The proof is right there.
  You later questions asked to pinpoint the areas of concern. I would have prefered more than one spot. Perhaps an eclipse for where you are concerned. Since that wasn't an option, I pinpointed a part of US-40 just west of 600 Rd. That hill on to the bridge over K-10 at 6th street should ALL be improved. Improve that area, and then alternative #2 might be more reasonable.
- Does the capacity/LOS analysis dictate a directional interchange at the intersection of the Turnpike and K-10 highway? Could the existing interchange configuration be utilized after the construction of the two additional lanes on K-10? Are there any options for increasing the radius of K-10 at the interchange with Clinton Parkway? If you haven't already, I suggest looking at a roundabout interchange at K-10/Wakarusa Dr. similar to the interchange at K-7/Johnson Dr. in Shawnee, KS. It may be more fiscally responsible to purchase several buildings in order to construct an interchange at this location. Do not leave an at-grade intersection here!!!
- I have been involved in Douglas County real estate for fifty years as a broker and owner being particularly active in the western portion of the county. I also have a interest in local history and particularly social geography. KDOT Engineers have a challenge building a cohesive Eastern Kansas highway transportation system tying together population centers first based on wagon roads and river systems. Establishing N/S connectors is important along with improved interstate highway networking between the metropolitan areas. The option to include a new I-70 exit at E 600 (Lecompton Road) is by far the greatest benefit to the greatest number of people in the overall and to the Eastern Kansas transportation network in the long run. I watched with interest in the...
early 1980’s as developer interests (now all dead) bought up western Douglas County farms in anticipation of SLT Phase 1. Many people thought the route then should have been to this proposed intersection. And yes I realize the dream of having a new Kansas River bridge connecting the original SLT with Hwy 59 coming from the north. A great idea but it hasn’t worked out. It might still in the next forty years but there are certain pressures today to accommodate. What has happened is that industrial development interests have bought up almost all tracts along Farmers Turnpike from E 600 to E 1200 (Kasold Ave) and managed light industrial zoning 2,000 feet deep going north for most of it and industrial zoning for all of the ground between Farmers and I-70. What we have is a de-facto industrial park needing access to the interstate. The new exit will be getting a lot of trucks as will Farmers. Also residents coming from the north and from western Douglas County need access without going further into congestion. KDOT currently has plans for the westward improvement of old Highway 40, aka “The Oregon Trail” and aka “The Denver Road” and now as known as “West 6th Street. Current concepts include extending four lane west from SLT to E 700 (Kanwaka Corner) where it connects to Stull Road becoming 45th Street in Shawnee County. Residential developer interests hold a fair number of farms in the area. Lots are selling. Your consideration should assume a full house between Lawrence and Topeka. Highway 24 along the river on the north also needs an additional connection to I-70 as the northern rural counties develop. All of these trends will cause an influx of traffic flow along the corridor between Topeka and Lawrence.

- The Interchange at K-10/Iowa St should be considered for a much higher capacity interchange. I suggest a divergent diamond interchange, especially given the already stretched traffic capacity of Iowa St and the foreseeable increase in traffic both from the SLT expansion and the forthcoming commercial expansion on Iowa St south of K-10. The current and increasing semi-truck traffic that comes up from the distribution centers to the south also warrants this kind of interchange.

- 3) Is the traffic exiting and entering K10 (SLT) to enter or leave I-70. Since the completion of the K10 (SLT) eastward from Iowa to east Lawrence Google maps now directs traffic including major truck traffic from the south KC to Lawrence area to take K-10 from the KC metropolitan to Lawrence and take the SLT to the I-70 exit. Truck traffic has significantly increased since the opening of the stretch of SLT. My opinion for a solution: 1) Widen the southwest leg of the SLT to four lanes. 2) Take the K-10 (SLT) over the Wakarusa cross over to the ball fields and eliminate the traffic light. Of course entrance and exit ramps would need to be installed but it appears there is plenty of space available to the south of the SLT in this location. 3) Move the I-70 access from the SLT to a different location. I believe the proposes have it moved to the “Lecompon Curve” location. Close the current access I-170 to SLT location but continue to allow access from farms turnpike to SLT WITHOUT a toll. I know that concern is the merging of traffic coming off I-70 and merging on to SLT and then have the farmers turnpike traffic merge into traffic at the same location but no matter where traffic mergers there is a risk. I have to go through the I-435 and I-35 traffic merge in Johnson County where KDOT spends millions of dollars to minimize risk but every morning that is the most treacherous part of my journey to work. An "express toll lane" is ridiculous and will cause more problems than eliminate. So I hope that is not a serious option. Why doesn't KDOT ask the City of
Lawrence to pay back the money spent on that STUPID 15th street exit and apply that money to this improvement."

- I realized on the first two comments that I sent, I forgot to indicate if I was not if favor, neutral, or in favor. I left the slide at neutral by mistake. I am definitely in favor of the improvements to the west leg of K-10. Some parts I like better than others, see other comments, but anything is better than what we have now.

- The first observation that John and I must make is that there is *no* good outcome to adding volume to a badly designed Western leg of the South Lawrence Trafficway, as it will only increase the number of accidents, injuries and deaths that have already occurred there since its construction in 1996. Many of the accidental injuries or death(s) happened because of completely predictable behavior at intersections designed as frontage roads or cross streets; a direct result of the initial rush to build a highway as a city street (with crude exits or simple intersections at Kasold, Wakarusa and Clinton) and essentially ignoring the complexity of the Farmer's Turnpike all but yards away from the Lecompton toll intersection nearby, and worse, constructing simply stupid entrance/exit ramps at that exchange. Despite the years of opportunity to plan the seamless integration of an older, western leg segment with the newer, better designed eastern leg of the SLT, and creating logistical solutions to several intersection choke points along it, the three "reasonable" proposals in this SEIS deal exclusively with ADDING VEHICULAR CAPACITY to the western leg instead. Nothing regarding pedestrian or vehicular access that was done on the eastern leg of the SLT is incorporated, so far as we can see, in these so-called "reasonable" proposals. Are you building a bridge over the Wakarusa Street Intersection similar to the Haskell or Bob Billings interchanges? Or, at a minimum, do these proposals copy the Louisiana/31st street pedestrian tunnel access, in order to improve the lethal conditions for children and families walking across K10/SLT to the Holcomb Park Complex on the other side? Are there plans to replicate the eastern confluence of the K10/East Hills Industrial Park/East 23rd Street/SLT exchange at the western confluence of the SLT/Lecompton-I70/Farmer’s Turnpike exchange? All local, regional and state agencies should be *well aware* of the rush to bring warehouses, manufacturing, housing and entertainment development west and north of the SLT. If not... then we are stunned and at a complete loss to understand the institutional disconnect between the eastern terminus and the western terminus of the South Lawrence Trafficway. It wasn't so long ago that Clinton State Park became a proposed site for commercial development. Before that, there was a proposal to develop housing and retail on the scale of the city of Eudora west of the SLT/Bob Billings exit. However, it quickly became apparent to all that any increase in traffic in that area would cause liability to both the county and the state, primarily because of the deathtraps along the western leg of the SLT. Now come these allegedly "reasonable solutions," which will also exacerbate the poor design of intersections along the same stretch of the SLT. How will these solutions relieve that liability? In our opinion, the SEIS "reasonable solutions" to the western leg of the SLT are completely devoid of the safety of pedestrians, as well as slower RV campers and commercial truck drivers along that roadway. It completely ignores the active development and expansion of land along most of its length, not to mention the immediate plans to develop a new mixed-use mall at Iowa/I59 and the SLT. In regards to capacity for future use, it is also a guaranteed waste of state and federal monies by comparison, because it promotes *speed* on the western leg of the SLT.
rather than "safe access" to, over or under it, as demonstrated with the eastern leg. Predictably certain future development in that area will exacerbate dangerous and careless lane changes and speeding, and increase blind head-on or T-bone crashes of vehicles, much less pedestrians, unless those design flaws are fixed before *any* lane widening occurs. Sincerely, Deborah Snyder and John Richardson Centennial Neighborhood Association Original Founding Members 1909 Maine Street Lawrence, KS 66046

- For the interim improvements, will there be takings” concerns from the owners of the Aberdeen Phase II apartments? Limiting access to westbound K-10 adds a mile of travel I would be very upset about westbound traffic being barred from getting on K-10. 24th Street will be backed up at Wakarusa with dozens of cars every morning."

Misc.

- Let' see - 3 years for an environmental impact study, 1 more year to revvew and update the study,3 moe years to get approval to widen and upgrade the western leg of K10 (NO TOLLS OF ANY KIND!!!), the another 3 years to get funding, and still another 3 years to build the thing. You should have started a long time ago. I'm 77 and I doubt if I'll ever see the thing widened and that fool stop light at Wakaruse gone. BUT by slow walking the thing, it does provide jobs for state employees.

- You are about 6 years behind. You should have started planning and environmental impact statements when the eastern leg was approved for 4 lanes. If you go K10 to Interstate 70, the ONLY stop light between Kansas City and Denver is at K10 and Wakarusa. Why? It is uber dangerous there. You are slow walking the thing now. Of course you have no money now because of Browback, Wagle, and the other idiots in Topeka.

- Why was zip code 66073 (Perry) not represented on the committee? Please let us know...thank you.

- Thank you for the opportunity to review the alternatives proposed, to study them, and to make informed recommendations. Transparency - Public needs to be better informed about ongoing design work that is currently in progress. Outreach - KDOT needs to coordinate with landowners and other persons or entities likely to be impacted by improvements to the SLT. Coordination - This project impacts multiple units of government (federal, city, county) in addition to the state. Effort needs to be made to address the concerns of all public entities, not just KDOT, and see that they work together, not as independent silos. Cost considerations need to be based on the total costs to the taxpayers from all sources of revenue/funding. Urgency - What efforts are being made to undertake these improvements ASAP, since no one disputes that they are badly needed. Everyone understands that there are bureaucratic hurdles and financial constraints, but who is working to overcome these obstacles and avoid the excessive delays that were encountered in building the east leg. Balance - Effort needs to be made to strike a reasonable balance between the need for the efficient flow of east/west traffic (Johnson County to Topeka), as well as local traffic in Douglas County, including north/south traffic from Lawrence to areas south of the Wakarusa River. Currently, north/south travel is very difficult. The project needs to address this problem, not compound it. Prioritize - Certain parts of the project such as the location and configuration of the K-10/I-70 interchange are controversial and may take a long time to
resolve. But meanwhile, work should move forward on other parts that everyone agrees
are necessary. Don’t let one area of disagreement stall the entire process. IKE - Need to
explain how the SLT project fits in with the broader state-wide highway improvement
program that was recently announced.