

South Metro Connection

Open House Public Meeting Comments

June 5, 2007

Written comments submitted at the meeting:

1. The plan looks good (179th)
2. This is a really bad idea. The main purpose of the SMC is to connect to the intermodals in Grandview and Gardner. It will result in high speed truck traffic through southern Johnson County, jeopardizing public safety and property values. The JoCo Commission is pursuing this for developers and tax dollars, not voters. I have written and called Commissioner Surbaugh and Commissioner Lindstrom, and not received even a courtesy reply. They should be voted out of office at the next election. The excuse that the SMC will enable Cass County people to commute to JoCo is bogus. The politicians are lying to us. The SMC is mainly for truck traffic and should be done, if at all, further south in Miami County.
3. It looks like the proposal impacts the fewest people, unless the route is in Miami County. I believe 179 St. should be kept open for local traffic. It should not be cul-de-sac-ed between Nall and Mission.
4. This study is so bogus! There are no representatives from our area on the study. You are ruining southern Johnson County and our peace and quiet rural life. You just want to move the big trucks from Richards Gebauer to the railway hub in Gardner – no concern for the citizens and taxpayers.
5. Concept 3 appears to impact the fewest residents. It is also considerably north of the original concept of several years ago that would have wiped out old Stilwell and displaced an entire community. Making it a parkway would be more suitable to Johnson County. Would also encourage the development of the walking/bicycle trail for safety. Should this plan be approved, we would not object.
6. Good where you have it proposed at. Little disruption to homes, businesses, historical sites and schools.
7. The chosen parkway alignment looks great. It makes sense to tie into 179 St at 69 Hwy. The parkway will not detract from the existing rural character. Good job.
8. What is the impact on west of 69 highway? I cannot see the need for this road construction.
9. With the info that you are showing, I agree with your choice of concept 1(N. Cass Parkway to US 69 and 179)
10. Concept 3 makes sense! Using parkway and grass median – less displacement of homes and lives, most economical in cost. But, you need representatives from Stilwell area. We are the most affected.
11. It would seem to me, as a resident at 183 and Mission Road, that a far southern concept would affect a lot less people, possibly 207 to 215 St or even south of that. Many more people coming off of 71 highway to 69 highway could use this route plus widen 69 to 6 lanes to Louisburg and 71 highway to at least 6 lanes to Harrisonville and this would help the problem. It would help to widen 151, 159, 175, 199 to four

South Metro Connection - Open House Public Meeting Comments - June 5, 2007

lane to ease all flow not just to appease Cass County!

12. There will be more people coming from Cass County into Johnson County than vice versa. Let them foot a large portion for the cost. Do not believe in taking peoples houses or farms. This plan will increase heavier truck traffic-(it was stated from our leaders that when Wal-mart was built-trucks wouldn't be allowed on Metcalf. I live on Metcalf, come watch from my yard.) This whole project needs to go through Miami County as by the time you build this, it will be antiquated so put it there now so we don't have to spend the money for another study or another road.
13. Several things interest/bother me about the South Metro Connector Plan in its current form. Not enough people were notified. Seems that major network or roads is being proposed piece by piece so as to quell opposition. Improving current roads would reduce travels times from 43 to 27 minutes – current plan reduces travel time to 21 minutes but has much more severe environmental impacts. My property value will drastically fall. If proposal is passed in its current form, my fathers land will be taken in order to build improvements on Mission Road. Again, arterial roads are not being discussed but are obviously being considered. Preparing for projected growth with gas prices soaring and a housing market collapse on the horizon is just plain stupid. Too costly. Environmental impacts.
14. Will truck traffic be limited to 18K or less and 0600 to 2200 hours or is this going to be Walmart Expressway.
15. I do not want this highway going through the neighborhoods. The reason we just spent $\frac{3}{4}$ of a million dollars on a house to fix up with land is to get away from this. Please listen to our concerns. There is a lot of opposition to this.
16. I live at 16845 Mission Road. My father built our house himself. I have lived in the house he built for our family for 26 years. I moved in 2 weeks after I was born. This house is everything to me. My parents are leaving it to me. This isn't about money, it's about my home. You don't seems to care about anyone's home. This parkway is ridiculous. There's no need for it. You could use existing roads and cut the time down to 27 minutes. The parkway will cost over \$200 million dollars and cut it down by 6 more minutes. 6 minutes! Why displace homes, destroy the environment, and spend millions of dollars for an extra 6 minutes. Not only that but the county is trying to sneak the project through. Half the people at this meeting were never notified and this is being done 5 miles at a time. This is extremely unethical. I'm disgusted with Johnson County.
17. Economically: How much time is saved traveling on this parkway versus time saved by improving existing roads. 6 or 7 minutes are not worth the price. Health issues: Tire particle dust and asthma, extended medical costs for life. I know you are aware of this issue and hope that no one brings it up. I will be happy to inform the public. Tire dust also affect aquatic organisms and you are planning to go over the river. So I guess this will affect your environmental study as well. Will you publish your findings?
18. I live in a house which basically borders the proposed route. Last year when we first received the news of this ludicrous unnecessary proposal, I expressed my opinions. My voices have not changed. You still will be destroying a virgin woodland area (untouched for over 100 years +). You will be destroying several homes in my area. You could avoid this by going slightly south through farmland. You will be building on

South Metro Connection - Open House Public Meeting Comments - June 5, 2007

land less riddled (sink holes and underground caves) Essentially there is no logic, no practicality on the proposed route once it crosses into Missouri. Please rethink this route to go through south of us and do not destroy the most beautiful natural wood land area in Cass County. Or better yet, why don't we build it through your yard. How you all sleep at night is beyond me.

19. No Need. If a road is needed it should be moved farther south. 1) I totally disagree that there is a need for a parkway along 175 Street. 2) The 150/135 was widened to accommodate traffic flow between 71 and 69 highways. It is 4.5 miles south. There is no need for another major roadway this close. 3) Will destroy the wildlife. 4) Will destroy our quality of life. This is a nice quiet area to live in. We do not need semi's and cars speeding by polluting the air with toxins and noise. 5) We pay Johnson County taxes we do not owe Cass County a road. 6) The proposed parkway is in Stilwell – not Overland Park or Belton/Raymore. 7) This is nothing but a high speed truck route.
20. I was very disappointed in the purpose of tonight's meeting. Even this form says, "Public Meeting" but all it was was a poster board display of stuff that's pretty much all on the website. When I spoke to the MARC representative, his answer to most of my questions was, "I don't know." I guess I should be glad he didn't just make up an answer. At least he was honest! I feel this road is poorly thought out. For one thing, you'll be destroying at least 40 acres of woods that have remained untouched nearly for over 100 years. You'll also be building a stable (in theory) road over many sinkholes and caves (the land off of Miller Road). Did you know that? You've also already succeeded in severely depreciating many people's retirements (their house and land) for a road that I've heard no public support for. Am I supposed to congratulate you? Did you know that just south of Miller Road are big, open fields, places with no houses to destroy? Perhaps you should consider ending the road there (183 or 187). But does it really matter what I think? Don't worry, you'll hear it, but will you be listening?
21. No doubt JoCo wants this truck route between Richards Gebaur and Gardner for their own self aggrandizement. This road should be built further south at 223 and/or in Miami County. The area you propose has many hilly forested natural features which should be preserved. This is not a problem at 223 and south. I think it is important that various environmental protection and nature preservation organizations and well us government agencies for protection of rare native species of plants and animals review this project. It is also important to determine if there are Native American burial sites in this area.
22. Personally – I was not informed of this plan or any meetings. I've been on the tax records in the study area for 26 years. You know how to find me. We don't need any parkways. People move out south because they like it the way it is. People have free will and can choose to live near a highway if they want. Perhaps they move out south because they like the topography today. Why aren't you telling people about the arterial roads and how many more people will be displaced because of them. We were told tonight: 1) no plans for arterial roads. 2) Mission Road will be straightened to 4 lanes with a median and I will lose my home. 3) No plans to straighten Mission Road. Six weeks ago KCP&L told us that they are moving all poles in order to straighten Mission Road. What is the truth. I believe KCP&L because they have no agenda. We live in a unique area of Johnson County and you want to destroy this beautiful area. I am against any of your plans. Stop the urban sprawl.

South Metro Connection - Open House Public Meeting Comments - June 5, 2007

23. We moved to Stilwell July 1977 to get away from Parkways, Shawnee Mission and other. We have no desire to watch our ground become the front yard to the proposed interstate. There will not be a parkway. A full fledged interstate. Where does the fuel come from for these cars. What happened to the 207 Street corridor of 15 years ago. If you don't build it they will not come. I do not want to live at the new 135th and Metcalf.
24. I followed this from the beginning and found the entire process to have been disingenuous. Of the 23 PAB members, only 8 showed up for the last meeting. What sort of local representation is that? It is my conclusion that this has been a well orchestrated dog and pony show with a pre-determined outcome. Our local representatives should be ashamed of themselves for supporting this. – "Dave"
25. The idea is sound but as is typical with Johnson County planning the plan does not address a major issue. What will this do to the already heavily traveled 69 highway? Additional non-tax paying citizens of Cass County, MO will further congest this already heavily congested highway. In my opinion our tax dollars would be much better spent widening and improving 69 highway WELL before we explore any plans to add a road helping non-taxpayers of the county. FIX 69 highway first then we'll be in a better position to determine the need of an E-W road connecting Cass and Johnson Counties.
26. CARNAP clearly states that the road would not be used for truck traffic – what we hear and read is that the road will be used for truck purposes. The county commissioners need to review what they voted for and stick with it.
27. This is travesty!! How can you continue to deny that the railroad is driving this – with such a huge outcry from the public against such a road! Take it farther south and make the trucks inconvenienced, NOT the people of Johnson County!
28. We are not clear on how this highway will impact the natural beauty of the area. I don't believe that it will be preserved. I also believe that there will be a lot more development than we are being told. It also concerns me that there was no representation from Stilwell. We are not part of Overland Park. What about the noise? What about the crime that development brings – we are very short on law enforcement – is OP going to provide it? OP will sure benefit from the highway.
29. Provide more information to the public. Have public meetings. Is there TIF money involved? What will be done to buffer sound? Provide information on the study about tire wear and public health of these near the highway. If this will not be built for 10 to 15 years why is it not located further south in farm country? A land stip could be purchased now. People could then build close to the highway but would be there choosing. This has been to secretive. People finding out from the newspapers that their house and property will be gone! I am against this until further educated about it.
30. Please consider the existing character of the area you wish to put this road through. Go south while you still can. There is no support within the southern Johnson County area. We do not need this road, we do not want this road, we do not want the trucks, we don't want the noise. Do not build this road! Do not destroy our property values!

South Metro Connection - Open House Public Meeting Comments - June 5, 2007

31. I understand that Johnson County officials want this road here and not further south in Miami County. I think Johnson County residents do not want this road and would prefer to see it in Miami County. Especially if it's going to have major truck traffic, necessary to connect Gardner intermodal with Richards Gebaur. Area residents are totally against this road at the location you are favoring. Area residents do not see an overwhelming reason for improved commuter traffic to Cass County.
32. Reduce size of road and maximum speed limit on highway to be 45 mph same as west on 179 and 60 highway. Consideration should be given to the number of homeowners for amount created by this parkway. Member of delegation indicated speed limit could be as high as 60 mph. Any consideration given to the highway like Scottsdale, AZ with a coating that reduces noise by at least 40%.
33. We see no demonstrated need from Johnson County to convenience traffic from Cass County. The speed limits are posted too high and will service heavy truck traffic between Richards Gabauer terminal and the terminal in Gardner. We know the plan is discussed or approved to continue through to Olathe and on to Gardner. The proposed plan goes through environmentally sensitive areas. No one in the proposed path wants this. It will increase traffic which we all moved south to avoid. It will decrease property values! What benefit is there to South Johnson County to put in a \$90 million road that will only benefit Cass County. The proposed curve to control speed going through the farmland on 175 and Kenneth is right up to our property line. Why can't it cut closer to 175 Street? We are absolutely against this!
34. Improve existing N&S roads first.
35. It sucks! 55 mph is excessive.
36. It is not needed — only doing for private developers to make money.
37. We don't want it! 175th and Nall, Slegman Farm
38. Please leave Stilwell out of this!
39. I feel better. A parkway will fit in better with Johnson County. Parkway with curves, trees, flowers, grass, bike paths. Looks like Mission Viejo, California Plans.
40. Need to stop, step back and assess the issue and proposal. Is there really a need/demand for the E/W road? If so, need to get blinder off and look at today's world (intermodal, current and future growth, etc.) Putting parkway in middle of existing developments wouldn't seem to be best solution. Need to be sure to do environmental impact studies and include solutions to reduce environmental impact (no tracks, rubber road surface, etc.) Listen to Advisory Board input. At this point, it seems to be ignored.
41. I am completely opposed to this road. It makes no economic sense for the South Johnson county residents. Why should we pay for connecting Richards Gebaur to the rail hub in Gardner. No semi trucks in south Johnson County.
42. We live on 175th Street and will be able to see and hear this parkway. We obviously would prefer it never happened! However, as it apparently is going to happen I hope that: 1) Heavy truck traffic will be limited or eliminated. 2) The parkway is naturally landscaped with nature/hiking/biking trails. 3) That noise reductions in same natural

South Metro Connection - Open House Public Meeting Comments - June 5, 2007

way may be implemented by a plethora of trees, trees, and more trees! There's time.

43. My wife and I live on 175th Street. We are or will be affected by this proposed parkway. I understand that you have done many studying that indicate a need for an east-west passage somewhere in our area. My biggest concern is that you have not fully taken into consideration the fact that we will have an intermodal truck/train station on both sides of us and I cannot help but think that this road will be used by some of these trucks. I am opposed to this project for that reason. The county says they don't have the money for this road. Why not invest that money in a freeway across farm fields further south of the proposed area to allow these large trucks an east-west route from I-35 to 71 to 170 that would help with commuters from MO to KS and vice versa as well as truck traffic. I would be happy to wait for money for our local roads to be improved.
44. If the road is approved, you need to compensate the property owners who are being impacted. Homes were bought at prices that didn't factor in a road in the backyard. Values will drop and innocent homeowners shouldn't have to pay the price of a new county benefit. Maybe eliminate property taxes or buyout homes at appraised value. What will this do to commercial zoning?
45. I am pleased to see that the major improvements appear to be destined to happen along 179 and not 199. Our home is just SE of 119 and Nall.
46. As a resident of Stilwell I do not want any type of road, parkway, highway, etc. cutting through my peaceful, rural community. We moved to Stilwell to get away from "progress". We drive extra miles into town to go to work. The people of Cass County can do the same. Leave Stilwell the way it is – a lovely, quiet, peaceful community.
47. Bad, bad plan. If you think we need east west access, go a mile or two south and build a freeway on farming ground not our residential areas.
48. First of all, I wish to thank each of you for meeting with me and my wife, at our home, the evening of 22 May 2007 to discuss this project. The following comments are not intended to encourage or discourage the project, but rather to look at it from a taxpayer and practical standpoint. I know that other will propose completely different routes, but that is not my purpose here. As I contemplate what I know about the proposed parkway from 79th and State Line Road to 79th and Metcalf Ave. (about 3 miles) using information gathered from you, the Johnson Co. website, and the newspaper, I find several bothersome things in the proposed parkway design and route. A. By crossing 175th St. twice, it violates the county policy of reserving section line roads as "Arterial" roadways. It would be very difficult and costly to improve 175th St. once the parkway crosses it. Also, it may be necessary to improve 175th St. before the parkway is constructed, which would then add to the cost of the parkway. I foresee that 175th street may need to be extended from Nall Ave. to Metcalf Ave. for the benefit of local residents and to permit access a large amount of acreage which now has no easy access. It would also provide a direct connection from Metcalf Ave. to M58 (at 171st and Holmes Rd.) and on into Belton, MO and beyond. B. While straightening Mission Rd for a proposed intersection north of 175th St. looks simple on a flat piece of paper, it would mean moving it from the valley where it now runs to the top of the bluff and then back down to the valley on the other side. That would destroy the scenic beauty of Mission Rd, disrupt several

South Metro Connection - Open House Public Meeting Comments - June 5, 2007

residences, and necessitate constructing a large bridge crossing the present Mission Rd. and the adjacent creek to the west. C. The route crossing 175th St. twice is longer and much more costly than to stay south of 175th St. In addition to the bridge in b. above, the longer route would require an overpass at 175th St. west of Kenneth Rd. and additional overpass back across 175th St. just west of Union Pacific railroad tracks. The terrain south of 175th St. is friendlier for road construction. Crossing the easternmost creek just west of Mission Rd. should require only a large culvert and not a bridge. That fact that the more direct route would need to pass through the northern part of land that the County has purchased for a future park (a small percentage of that land at that) does not justify the longer and much more costly route to the north. The cost savings of the shorter and less difficult route should more than offset the cost of purchasing additional parkland to replace that occupied by the parkway. NOTE: The County did not mind proposing that JCCC expand into an already developed park, if offsetting parkland was purchased elsewhere. Less right-of-way should be needed going through parkland since it is a natural buffer. Also, the park would be a good place amenities. Either route will require bridging across the westernmost creek and the nearby Union Pacific railroad tracks. D. You told me that a 300-ft. right-of-way was being sought. The county standard for TYPE III Parkway is 150 – 200 ft. of right-of-way. Therefore, it would seem that less right-of-way should be sought in general and a minimum where there are existing dwellings. Ballooning in open areas could accommodate amenities. Please be practical and keep politics and grandness out of the project. Remember the profound words of wisdom; "There is no such thing as a free lunch." This is especially true when dealing with Uncle Sam.

49. To all Commissioners! 1) Tell the real truth – when is the next 5-10 miles, then the next leg, then finally to I-35. 2) Re-name the project for what it is (CCBN) Cass County Burlington Northern! 3) Annabeth – forget about leaving a legacy! 4) By the time this project is engineered it will have no money to build it. 5) Move it south to about Miami County. 6) Tell the truth – if you will the project is dead. Do the people that donated money or land to the arboretum know your final plan and how you are violating your commitments to them? Talk to Crosby Kemper or Denny Baum.
50. A lot of people at the meeting were agreeing (and some were demanding) that the road plans should be further south. I agree that a new road (if built) should be at least south of 199th Street. To meet future planning, the road should be built in northern Miami County. P.S. We own 18 acres at 181st & Mission Road.
51. Well, I went to your presentation meeting the other night. That was quite a smoke and mirror show there.....Let's have a quiet little parkway to link one nature preserve to another.....If you were concerned about nature at all, the highway would not go right through the most undeveloped land around. Bottom line, TAKE YOUR TRAFFIC SOMEWHERE ELSE.
52. Connecting the future North Cass Parkway with US Highway 69 with a parkway is a great idea and makes a lot of sense for both the nearby regions in Missouri and Kansas. I live in the third house from the current west end of Hubach Hill Road, which on your map entitled "South Metro Connection Study Area with North Cass Parkway Alternatives," is shown (in green dots) as an alternative route for the proposed North Cass Parkway. In an article in Belton's The Star Herald newspaper, the following statement was made: "MARC representatives say they are examining the connection point, as well as modifications to the North Cass Parkway to meet the needs of the connection." QUESTION: WHAT "modifications to the North Cass

South Metro Connection - Open House Public Meeting Comments - June 5, 2007

Parkway to meet the needs of the connection" are being considered?

53. I reside at 17355 Mission Road. This proposed highway project has a DIRECT impact on my Property Value and Quality of Life. Although I do appreciate the concept of planning for the future - this plan is being proposed in an area that should have been considered 10-15 years AGO. The idea of planning in this area for a project 10-15 years into the future does not make any sense. Your BEST alternatives should be much further SOUTH. If you are trying to plan 10-15 years out you should be seeking an alternative in a less developed area out SOUTH in Johnson/Miami counties where there is plenty of flat open farm land (has any one in your group driven to these areas?). This is the land you should be acquiring NOW before it soon is developed. You should buy this land NOW for a project of this magnitude 10 years out.
54. As a resident of Johnson County I see absolutely no need for a highway connecting rural Missouri to rural Kansas. The traffic in that area of the county is minimal with minimal to no large employment centers in south Johnson County. US69 should be the main concern in this area. A 6 lane north south highway would serve the constituents of south Johnson County in many more ways than a highway connecting to rural Missouri. It seems there is a alternative matter planned for this roadway which is not being presented to the public. That being a route for commercial truck use to go from Richards Gebaur to Gardner, KS to facilitate intermodal traffic. This would not only ruin all property values in the impacted area, it would most likely destroy all wildlife in the area. I think your proposed route is ridiculous to say the least, you are planning to build a highway through some of the most rugged and natural terrain in Johnson County. You will meet serious opposition to your project, most likely ending in litigation.
55. On a selfish basis I like it because it is not in my back yard. It does cause tremendous pain to those close to it and I fully understand that. I appreciate the public meeting because everyone gains further insight on how to develop this Parkway. I would want to see restrictions on the size of the trucks and particularly semi's from using this parkway unless they are making a delivery in the to be defined immediate area of the parkway. If it takes a costly toll for the semi's I would want that if need be. Everyone is extremely worried about the major railroad yards using this parkway. Please eliminate that worry. The animals in the area of the parks need separate under highway passages (railroad bridge doesn't count) to move about their habitat on both sides of this Parkway. There are a lot of deer who use this area. Parks and Recs. should look into this with you. They do provide these types of animal passageways in Colorado. Animals need safe habitat and it wasn't provided at my request when they constructed 179th street near the Arboretum. It is also a selling point to the community out here if you design one or two along this Parkway, thus pointing out it is a true "Parkway".
56. Well, I went to your presentation meeting the other night. That was quite a smoke and mirror show there.....Let's have a quiet little parkway to link one nature preserve to another.....If you were concerned about nature at all, the highway would not go right through the most undeveloped land around. Bottom line, TAKE YOUR TRAFFIC SOMEWHERE ELSE.
57. I attended the South Metro Connection Public Meeting on June 5, 2007 at Lakewood Middle School. As a home owner just West of US-69, and just North of 179th Street, I feel I have a vested interest in this decision. Unfortunately, I was unaware of any

South Metro Connection - Open House Public Meeting Comments - June 5, 2007

of these plans until the article appeared in the Kansas City Star paper in late May/early June. After attending this public meeting, I have several comments:

- 1) One of the reasons I moved to my current residence is because of the rural lifestyle it offers. I would not want this rural style to change as dramatically as this MARC plan proposes. Even though this study is East of US-69 on 179th Street, it will have a direct and negative impact on all of the homes current located along 179th/175th West of US-69. Increased traffic, increased noise, reduced safety, and a reduction in home value are just a few that come to mind.
 - 2) What is now a growing residential area will become more commercial, and with a significantly increased traffic pattern. If I wanted this type of neighborhood, I would have moved into a house at 95th and Metcalf.
 - 3) I think your "study area" was too narrow. Looking only between 175th and 199th streets left out any possibility of making a road connect to the North Cass Parkway or US-71 Highway via less populated areas South of 199th. South of 199th is not as developed and would be able to connect all of the way from I-35 and US-71 much easier. If you do not want to go South of 199th, why not link into a road that is already a Parkway like 151st, which goes all the way to Holmes.
 - 4) And finally, has an environmental study been done on how a "parkway" will impact the area it will cut through from US-69 to Holmes?
58. Given all of the above, I am NOT in favor of this version of the MARC South Metro Connection Study. I believe that there are other alternatives which would be less intrusive to this Study's area, which appears not to be considered.
59. Getting into how we actually use our tax dollars, I believe that we should be looking to improving our existing roads and infrastructure which need updating, replacements, or, as this study mentioned, some "missing links" that would connect the east-west routes as needed.
60. I am absolutely apposed to this area being used. I am directly affected, and everyone around me feels the same! This area is not rapidly subdividing, as you noted, because that is what we all wanted. We all live on acreage for a reason! We treasure the quiet and no traffic. We pay high taxes now, we have the right to keep our area, as is, the way we want. I thought his was a free county. I don't want Missouri having a short cut to my backdoor. We will be crime ridden as they are now! This road would give easy access to criminals in and out. There are other worthy alternatives. I don't believe this isn't a truck route. This is for the trucks specifically. I don't want the noise pollution, air pollution, trash and crime. Build this road in an area already developed into urban sprawl. Go away! Leave us alone!
61. Much time, effort and money is being spent to hear what the public in southern Johnson County thinks about this new roadway – so, why isn't anyone listening? I have yet to talk with someone who is for this project. "Anyone" is HNTB, MARC, Johnson County Planning, Public Works and at least a few of the Johnson County Commissioners. I don't get it! What and who is actually driving this issue? If this project is not an "eminent domain" issue, how will the property be taken from those that don't want to sell? I have heard that they NW Kill Creek Area project still hasn't the funds to move that along. How unfair that areas are marked and held. Results are a black cloud hanging over property owners and nearby areas – an yes, this has a very negative impact on the community!

South Metro Connection - Open House Public Meeting Comments - June 5, 2007

62. On you "Frequently Asked Question" South Metro Connection Study, June 2007, question 4 answers: "the connection with the North Cass Parkway would be less direct and would create additional travel with a longer route. These factors would increase construction cost, right of way impacts for the project, and it overall traffic effectiveness." They why doe it curve north from 199th to 173rd and then back even further south instead of cutting straight across or curving only to the south? Why do the easements vary so much on each side of the parkway? Why should those of us who live near this road have to give up the peace and quiet we moved out here for, so that people in Cass County can drive to Gardner for their jobs? They made their choice where to live and where to work. Why should I be penalized for their choices? Why is my quality of life being sacrificed to improve theirs? On of the reasons sighted for this particular alignment says "it provides connection between area parks", actually it cuts off the shortest connection between the park near 175th and Mission and the Baum Nature Conservancy. They will each be at the end of the 175th Street cul-de-sac, with direct connection cut in half by the parkway.
63. It is hard to believe that any comments made by the people in the "study area" are actually considered. A fair amount of up service has been given to public input – but myself and many of my area want to see HNTB and local officials put due weight on our input. I personally feel helpless as a voter and a taxpayer that my voice will not be heard or valued. I believe forces beyond the citizens are pushing this issue as they have for 15 years. In the beginning of the process it was presented as a benefit to our local area with safer roads, shorter travel time, etc., how we are told that this would benefit the region and works like "greater good" are used. As I walked through the open house and saw the large post its with extremely positive comments, I have to tell you I waited for 75 minutes and did not see one person post a positive comment. If such comments are valid, can you please authenticate them with some identification? I would in no way confront such individuals, I simply want to see that these comments are real. After talking to many people for a year I have yet to meet anyone who has said something like "great idea, well done, we sure need this!" In short, we will fight this, I vote in every election and hold officials accountable.
64. I like the plan to develop 179th street. I live near 199th and that is close enough for me.
65. Fantastic proposal and location, however only do it if it does not connect thru to US Highway 71. Also improve 199th Street with bridge over railroad tracks, just east of Metcalf.
66. I feel this is an already "done deal." It is being forced on a small "rural" area. Our life will be forever changed by something that is twenty years to late for the area. it should be done in Miami County where there is a lot of undeveloped land. This concept and plan is not appropriate for the Stilwell area. You should all be ashamed and forever remember a small town destroyed by each of you. I hope on down the road this will all come back to bite you, as it is us. Please do not act like we are a bunch of hicks and you talk down to us. Why do you feel must fool us? You are not. I payed earning tax to MO for years to help pay for the roads I travel on. Yet you are telling me now I will pay for MO to work in KS. Taxes, gas tax, property tax, tax will all increase – sewers are next. A great many of us will loose our house for these reasons. Thank you.
67. We attended the recent Overland Park meeting, and have carefully considered and toured the proposed South Metro route through Johnson County. We are writing to be very clear that we are opposed to the proposed route. We feel the study criteria

South Metro Connection - Open House Public Meeting Comments - June 5, 2007

and parameters were flawed, and your office has produced a flawed recommendation that is so narrow in scope that it can never meet the future transportation needs of the area. The study has to be expanded to include realistic models of the area's proposed east-west and overall transportation requirements for the next twenty to thirty years. This has to include a realistic study area expanded to include growth and infrastructure needs of the Johnson and Miami County areas at least as far south as 229th Street, and preferably down to Kansas Highway K-68 (Louisburg).

It is impossible to support the outdated proposed route across Johnson County presented at the meeting. We intend to vigorously oppose this proposed routing, including every available legal remedy to re-set the study parameters and provide a more realistic route further South that will meet the taxpayers future requirements. Change this recommendation, take it back to your sponsors / clients and back to the drawing board, and come up with the right recommendation for the future, not for twenty years ago. If not, we'll see you in court over and over again.

68. South Metro Connection Team:

These are a few follow-up comments from the June 5 Public Meeting. As the planning continues to move forward, please take into account the following concerns my family has, and which I think are shared by many people who live in the area being studied:

One of the biggest concerns is that the rural nature of the area needs to be maintained. This part of Johnson County is unique in its rural nature, and that is why my family chose to buy a home in this area. Even as the population continues to increase in this area, it should be a primary goal to keep the area from becoming overly "suburban". There are plenty of areas in Johnson County for people who want to live in a suburban area, and this part of Johnson County provides an option for families who want to live in a more rural setting.

My family would like there not to be negative effects on north-south travel. North-south travel on US-69 and other roads is already congested, especially during morning and afternoon commutes.

- 1) We would like to have a minimum amount of traffic noise.
- 2) We would like to have a minimum amount of light (from vehicle headlights or other roadway-related lighting).
- 3) As you consider alternatives, please take these concerns into account.

Written comments received following the meeting:

1. After reading the "South Metro Study – Quick Facts," I have come up with several problems with this South Metro Connection Parkway. What reason is there to connect all the parks? Will people be trying to visit them all in one day? And why does this new high school need to be linked to them? Why do we need to connect to the North Cass Parkway? People choose where to work and where to live based on their own preferences. We chose to live here because it is peaceful, quiet and rural. Why should my quality of life be ruined to provide a better quality of life for everyone else that made their own choices and now wish they hadn't chosen to have work and home so far apart? People who live in neighborhoods made that choice. They are used to having roads and people all around them. I chose to live where there aren't many other houses, people or roads. So put this parkway close to the neighborhoods that will use it and are used to it, rather than forcing us to live in a situation not of

South Metro Connection - Open House Public Meeting Comments - June 5, 2007

our choosing. If a road really needs to be built, why not make the road straighter rather than making it go north and then back south? It would be a lot less expensive and shave travel time for those who want it. What's wrong with making 143rd Street four lane all the way across? They are both almost there now and already being used for traffic flow. And if an interstate is planned for the 207th area, why do we need a parkway at 175th/179th? Why do some people who have helped with the study say it will be a 45mph parkway and some say a 50-55mph parkway? Can we please have the whole truth? Why are the majority of the members on the MARC board from Missouri when it impacts people in Kansas so much? And why are these board members appointed instead of elected? They could have a huge impact on our quality of life and yet we have no say. Thank you for listening to my concerns. I hope to hear back from you.

2. Can you please tell me when the next anticipated or scheduled Public Meeting will be regarding the South Metro Connection? Also, what is the anticipated schedule or date for a final decision for this parkway and how will I be notified?
3. "Could this be a bigger bullshit ploy to get trucks back and forth between the Gardner intermodal and Richards-Gerbauer? Who gives a crap about making people in Missouri's commute to JOCO shorter? Move to Johnson County if you want a shorter drive to.
4. I am in favor of your current plan Spring 2007. Please keep me informed of your future action or plans. Thank you.
5. I am writing regarding my concern for the location of the proposed highway. We are long time Stilwell residents, but have 60 acres in Cass County that is where we have planning to build our retirement life. I have been to all meetings and have followed the study not only for myself in Stilwell but as a real estate agent selling to concerned clients in the "study area". I have followed this study as closely as possible, yet the first time I came aware that it was going right through 20 acres of my farm in Cass County was when I saw the preferred route on the front page of the KC Star. We had already boxed up nearly all of our belongings, have put in driveways, fencing, new barns, etc. on the farm and were ready with our finalized home plan to begin the construction pieces. Our house we live in with all kids grown and out was ready to go on the market. For 12 years we have turned down many very appealing offers to purchase this farm. We wanted it for ourselves because of its unique character and privacy. I have accumulated a vast amount of history on this property which includes a grave with headstone dating 1851, the creek, limestone bluffs, diverse trees and wildlife as well as the old buildings should be preserved – the highway going south through vacant ground. More information has been to HNTB Joe Brand.
6. I do not feel this "parkway" is necessary for our area. It has been admitted there are no funds for the project. It has been admitted by a commissioner that portions will be zoned for business. In our unincorporated area that means sewers must be placed and yet the "powers that be" deny this. Why must my tax dollars be used to help Cass County, Missouri citizens? Do they pay an earning tax to Kansas? I think you know the answer. How can our elected commission continue spending our tax money with a clear conscience on projects the community does not need or want?

South Metro Connection - Open House Public Meeting Comments - June 5, 2007

7. I support the South Metro Connector and it appears to me that Concept 3, Option 1 makes the most sense. You can't please everybody.
8. I was shocked to think that a road would be built thru any area not already designed for traffic! 187th Street already exist, 195th Street already exist, 199th Street already exist, anyone being near these roads has already made a choice to live near such access. 150 Highway provides a direct route from east to west. An improvement of that system would seem to be the more logical decision. I seriously question the demographics used for this project, Kansas City now grows in all four directions, grow to the south will not be at levels of the past. Finally, this is a poor idea! Probably driven by greed.
9. My husband and I are one of the two Missouri property owners in the direct path of this proposed road. The prospect of construction of this highway is devaluing our property and we will not be able to sell our home at a fair market value. We have lived in our home for 12 years. It is located on 10 very private and heavily wooded acres which is a part of over 70 acres of prime timber. Besides the sentimental and financial commitment that we have, there are several environmental issues. There are trees over 200 years old, we have a large FEMA creek that runs through the two properties and the terrain is so rough that an overpass will have to be built from the back to the front of the property. These woods are also a home to many native flowers and trees, migratory birds and animals. There are also a number of natural gas wells to be contended with. It would be a shame to disrupt all this when the parkway can be routed south of us and be built cheaper on open and flat farm ground. You say this parkway is 10 to 15 years away and there is no funding in place. I recommend you go back to the drawing board and propose to Cass County that this East - West corridor needs to go much further south to handle the future population growth. You also need to recommend that Holmes Road (State Route D) be made into a 4 lane highway from Hwy 150 to Hwy 2 in Harrisonville, MO to handle the North - South traffic. Then improve the existing East - West arterial roads to allow people to get to 71 Hwy, Holmes Road (State Route D) or 69 Hwy to continue their commute to where ever they are going.
10. Thanks for the update. The preliminary alignment looks great.
11. The area from Holmes and 181st to State Line is heavily wooded and you would destroy an existing "rural" neighborhood. 187th is an existing road with no trees or homes. Your plan shows the road going between the 2 donated green spaces when they could be one. The current Cass County roads are desperately in need of repair, where is this money coming from? The route of South Metro Connection Study is based on the N. Cass Parkway, later changes has been pulled from the HHIC agenda – not approved – why is this study even going forward? In your study you claim this route has reasonable construction cost 5-8 miles for \$91 million? What is the average cost per 1 mile of road? Does the \$91 million include an overpass at approximately 179th and Miller Road? It is not on your map and Mill Creek is a gully at this point with a huge drop off!
12. The South Metro Connection and its interface with North Cass Parkway in Cass County Missouri is flawed in their conceptual designs and out of date with the real needs in the surrounding communities.
 - 1) The rapid growth of business and housing in the Southern part of Johnson County and Belton area has not allowed planners the time to design the

South Metro Connection - Open House Public Meeting Comments - June 5, 2007

appropriate infrastructure with any confidence. The combined efforts for business and the housing community, city and county planners to design and build a working infrastructure will be the answer. This is not a political platform. This should be a community betterment program.

- 2) The proposed route is too far North to be an effective East/West traffic corridor. It is too close to 135th Street in Kansas and 150 Highway in Missouri. It needs to be placed further South so it may provide better access to existing road structures and open land opportunities.
 - 3) The unique terrain complicates construction and impacts the environment. This is a heavily wooded area with parks, hills, creeks, pristine countryside with surrounding housing developments, and wildlife. There are numerous sinkholes, 100 year old trees and pockets of natural gas in the area, some very close to the surface and can be seen bubbling at the surface in extremely wet conditions.
 - 4) Projected highway construction cost will exceed 91 million dollars. That is over 18 million dollars per mile of construction for this Project. Outrageous.
 - 5) Throughout the surrounding area it will create noise and vehicle exhaust pollution.
 - 6) It will create excessive truck traffic.
 - 7) It will displace people from their homes.
 - 8) It will de-value property.
13. It may be important to business and the legislative people who work with governing bodies in Cass County and Johnson County to have a road-linking Johnson County and Cass County but this 4-lane Highway is not high on my priority list of a road to be improved. My main concern is big trucks congesting the already heavy traffic on 69 Highway and coming near homes, demolishing homes, and bordering parks, nature conservancy land, the Girl Scout camp, near a future high school and the Overland Park Arboretum. A 4-lane road will increase the noise, traffic and safety of travel on and around this road. This road will diminish the quality of life in this area. It will devalue our property and raise our taxes. Both Johnson County and Missouri residents, who are not in this area, do not appreciate the negative impacts of this road. If what you say is true, that you only want some east-west through streets, start with the obvious and improve existing roads, 199, 191, 183, 175 and pave those roads from Cass County. I think it is unnecessary to have a highway that will carry traffic at 60 miles per hour. If trucks are allowed on a new road there is no way to control the amount of truck traffic or how many trucks use the road. There is no way to keep freight trucks from using the road. If trucks use a 4-lane road it turns into a highway. The so-called support for east-west travel between Johnson County and Cass County does not necessarily mean the residents of the counties want a 4-lane Highway. When you refer to a Parkway I think of Ward Parkway and the speed limit is 35 miles per hour and no trucks. Design of a road that will allow traffic of 35 miles per hour. In this way you will have a lot more options regarding the route and less criticism. In your flier "Frequently Asked Questions South Metro Connection Study" "number 16 you state this 4 lane road is not an intermodal connection for trucks and there will have to be a proposed Highway for truck traffic. I think you

South Metro Connection - Open House Public Meeting Comments - June 5, 2007

need to address HOA, how the road is going to be paid for and how much it will raise taxes. Not only increasing taxes on a local and state but also federal taxes. We in Aubrey Township do not need a 4-lane Highway, do not want a 4-lane Highway. I especially think the people of Johnson County do not want to pay, we do not want. By having a 4-lane road you only encourage more strip malls and gas station development. You say this will not take place for 10 years and according to the KC Star the small number of participating concerned residents of Cass County are being told it will be 15 years.