

RE: SLT STAKEHOLDERS MEETING

DATE: SEPTEMBER 6, 2001

**PLACE: SPRING HILL HOTEL
LAWRENCE, KANSAS**

STENOGRAPH REPORTER: GLORIA STEINLE, CSR

PROCEEDINGS

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2001

JOHN HUYLER: I'd like you to introduce yourselves. We'll start with Randy to just introduce yourself and answer these questions. Your name. How long you have lived around here and what organization, if any, that you're representing. Your wildest hope for this process and what you consider off the top of your head your two most important issue.

With that, we'll begin to make a list of issues. When we're through with that, I'll run through the agenda and expectations for the end.

My name is John Huyler. How long I've been here is three hours since we arrived this afternoon, and if you don't know, our organization is the Osprey Group. And those of you at the table, we've all spoken with you.

My wildest hope for this process is that it will be productive, and my two most important issues. I don't have any, which is why we're doing this.

DENNIS DONALD: I'm Dennis Donald. I'm John's partner with the Osprey Group. I've been here not only the last couple hours, but I've been here a couple days here in July. So I guess I'm more a resident than John is.

My wildest hope for the process would be the same as John's I hope it's productive and candid and civil and I hope we can hear one another.

My two most important issues are probably getting my two kids through college.

ANDY WESEMAN: Andy Weseman. I've been in the community for about 30 years. I came here from a small town in western Kansas. My goal my whole life was to land in Lawrence. I'm part of USD 497. I have been through my whole career.

My wildest hope is that we have an informed productive debate and discussion. And my most important issues are the education of our kids in this community and kind of modeling we do for them as citizens.

JOHN HUYLER: I'll ask Dennis to begin to start with issues particularly when they have some relevance with what we're doing here.

DENNIS DONALD: Education of kids and the way we engage in debate.

KAREN SWISHER: I'm Karen Swisher. I'm president of Haskell. I've been in Lawrence since 1996. So it'll be six years in June.

My wildest hope for the process is that everybody will go away satisfied with the outcome.

My two important issues are my responsibility as it relates to Haskell and the Indian Nation University and the stewardship that goes along with that. And for the environment.

JIM TERRENTINE: I'm Jim Terrentine. I've been in Lawrence since 1974. I've been in the Indian Hills neighborhood since this time. It's adjacent to some of the areas that may be affected by the trafficway, and I hope to come away with necessary information to take back to these people in the neighborhood so that they can understand what's going to occur and what the conditions will be. And I hope that the trafficway is built in a manner that will be most beneficial to the neighborhood and hopefully no negative impacts to them.

CAREY MAYNARD MOODY: I'm Carey Maynard Moody, and I've been here since 1981. I'm chair of the Wakarusa Group Sierra Club and chairman of the Kansas Sierra Club.

My wildest hope for the process tonight is all of us leave with tint of our lenses slightly different, and I think the process can help us do that as we listen to each other.

My issues are that I think our thinking is too narrow. The choices, even though they seem to be ample, are pretty narrow and that they are limited in the future orientation, and that there's too much rush.

STAN LOEB: I'm Stan Loeb. I've been in Lawrence since 1989. I represent the University of Kansas. My position with the University is acting director of the environmental studies program.

My wildest hope for this process is that we bring together the best information so that we can

make the decision based on rational thought and appreciation of the diverse views that humans have for the environment and for survival of this community.

The two most important issues are that we take a fair amount of time to address all the alternatives, including the no build alternative and that we make the best judgment as to what is the benefit to the community and the people and the environment.

SUE HACK: I'm Sue Hack, and I'm here representing the City of Lawrence. I'm City Commissioner and have been for five months, and obviously I'm on the upside of the learning curve. I teach here in Lawrence. I have lived here in Lawrence since 1975. I came here as a freshman at KU. I teach at Southwest Junior High right now.

I think in terms of my wildest hope, I hope we can each have an understanding of each other's positions and hope we can appreciate the differences that we all bring to the table. I would agree with Randy, I'm always concerned about whether as adults we can provide good role models for children. I hope we can do that in terms of being civil and appreciate each other's differences.

I think another issue for me is just the education, not only of our kids, but of all the citizens in terms of this process of what we're going through and respect people's differences.

LARRY PARKIN: My name is Larry Parkin. I represent Baker University. I've lived in rural Baldwin for over 10 years.

I too would hope through give and take propositions we can come to an agreement. There's been lots of meetings and discussions and probably more meetings, but sometimes we have to reach an agreement.

As far as my two most important issues, my responsibility to Baker University and to the Baker University wetlands future.

BECKY MANLEY: My name is Becky Manley. I'm here as a south of the Wakarusa resident. I'm new to this discussion. I was invited to participate nine days ago, but I've been trying my level best to gather information and opinions from people who live south of the river and also people who live in other parts of the community so that I can represent some

of their concerns and opinions as I've been able to collect.

I've lived in Lawrence since 1976. I don't represent any particular organization. My wildest hope of the process is that the viewpoints of those citizens of Douglas County who live south of the Wakarusa become part of this dialogue.

I think the two important issues surrounding this trafficway issue are from the perspective I'm trying to represent certainly, human, environmental and historical and cultural impact to any trafficway built south of Wakarusa. I do not believe these concerns have been addressed to the degree in any extent before.

And another important issue is that a decision not be allowed to be made in haste without considering all of the impacts on the area.

BOB JOHNSON: My name is Bob Johnson, and I've lived in Lawrence for 33 years. I'm here this evening because I am one of the three members of the Douglas County commission. I don't like the word wildest hopes, so I come to the table with expectation. And I also think as we sit here and talk, that each of us will try to hear what someone says, that we can agree with as opposed to searching for something that we don't agree with.

The two most important issues first is that we build the trafficway with a minimum negative impact on the wetlands, and that in the process we create an environment where we can have an expanded and improved wetlands for our community and for the regional area.

Second issue is that we do this in such a fashion so that it satisfies the needs for KDOT. But more importantly, it satisfies the needs of Lawrence and Douglas County.

JUDY DEHOSE: My name is Judy DeHose. As far as how long I've been here, as I sat in Boulder, Colorado, nothing is in black and white as native Americans.

I've always been here. I represent the natives of Haskell, being part of over 500 tribes that are affected. We've always existed. My tribe has always existed from the tip of Alaska to the tip of South America. My tribe has roamed all of the present America just as the many tribes have on the east side also. There has never been boundaries as far as state lines. So we have always existed.

For myself as Judy DeHose, I've been on the Board of Regents recently elected as chairperson and have become involved and continuing to educate myself as far as the activities in the last 10 years of this project.

What I also stated in Boulder was that in essence of time, time is not -- 10 years is nothing in comparison to the history of our people, the native Americans. Haskell University for 21 years was a place created to assimilate our children over 200 years ago.

Many changes have been made where there has been many growths. Now Haskell represents the university as an educational center for the youth of our people in the Indian country.

My wildest hope is that I hope everyone will listen not only with their ears, but I hope they will listen with their hearts.

The two most important issues, and again two is a very limited number, protection of the sacred site, the lands. As Native Americans, there's no separation between our land and ourselves. Also, the protection of the little piece of land left for the education of the children of our American Indian country.

The other issues I have is how do the other laws that are there to protect all of America fit in this whole process, such as the Endangered Species Act, Repatriation Act and freedom of religion. Thank you.

BILL SEPIC: I'm Bill Sepic. I'm with the Lawrence Chamber of Commerce, and I've been here about a year and a half. I hope we can achieve a broad community support out of this process and a couple of issues that are most important to us are a creation of a prosperous community and the completion of K10 bypass.

LINDA FINGER: Hi, my name is Linda Finger. I've been here 25 years. I work for the City of Lawrence for the director of planning for the City and County.

My hope for this process will be that we reach a decision that we can all live with this calendar year on the eastern lake. The process has gone on so long that the community needs to have a resolve.

My two most important issues are that any decision reached is a community decision and it involves all of the stakeholders. I'm not naive enough to think we're all going to come to the table

with 100 percent consensus. But I think we can all value the opinions of the stakeholders and see that we don't abuse that value.

And my second one is that I'd like to see that no compromises are made for expediency sake.

STAN ROSS: My name is Stan Ross. I'm one of the sponsors for the Wetlands Preservation Organization down at Haskell. I'm also there as a carpenter, and I've lived in Lawrence for 30 some odd years.

The wildest hope for the process is there's been so many different processes thrown at us, and I'm not sure which one to comment on. I guess my wildest hope is that we get an understanding of each other today.

What the students out at Haskell, their feelings and our alumni, and also, of course, for our organization leading into the two most important issues. One is wetlands preservation, not just here but all over the country. The wetlands areas we're just now beginning to understand what a vital role they play in the Indian environment as a life-giving force, as taking care of the glutes that we put into the soil and the water. We come to find these wetlands have a way of cleansing them. And as you matter of sacredness, I know that this is one of the reasons why these people hold these areas in such highest esteem.

One other issue is that we get to the real issue and that's why there's such a need for this road, and most importantly, I guess to let everyone out here know is that WPO we're not a bunch of radicals. We do get out and protest now and again, but I think that's something that was probably necessary earlier. And our students sure got a kick out of doing it.

DEBBIE PETERSON: I'm Debbie Peterson. Officially I'm a former president of the neighborhood association. I've lived in Lawrence since 1988, but before that I attended Baker University and I remember the election where a frog was on the ballot when this road was trying to be built back then.

My neighborhood is a very diverse neighborhood. There's a wide range of interests and expectations. I'm going to try and make sure that their voices are heard and not just my own. And so sometimes I might actually say things that I do not 100 percent agree with myself because I'm here to represent my neighbors also.

A summary of what they want to protect the most amount of wetlands in history while alleviating the traffic getting in and out of our neighborhood and keeping it the most economical we can. That's their issues.

STEVE SUBLETTE: My name is Steve Sublette. I have lived in Douglas County since 1954. I think that makes me the oldest -- longest resident on this panel. I taught school for quite some time and spent most of my time as a casual observer about the way things work or don't work in Lawrence and Douglas County.

After I retired from teaching, I thought it would be something that I owed to the community to get involved in the political process. And so I ran for the Wakarusa Township and got elected twice, maybe unfortunately.

I wear another hat. I'm a graduate of Baker University. Ivan Boyd was my major professor, and I spent quite a lot of time talking with him as he was developing the wetlands. We talked about some of the problems, and how we can do some things. I've known his son. We've been friends since he was a small child. So I have two hats.

My wildest hope is that we would make a decision in the relatively short period of time and that the transportation problems in Lawrence and Douglas County would be solved with the good sense that I'm sure the people of Lawrence and Douglas County do have.

The two most important issues for the township are transportation and transportation. We are responsible for fire protection and for maintenance of the roads. So whatever my heart says maybe one thing, but what I have to say for the township at the Baker University may not represent my views. I will do my best to take care of my constituents.

One of the concerns when my name appeared in the paper for one of the stakeholders for the Wakarusa township was for a very large number of calls and personal contacts on the street expressing their belief that this should be done, the road should be done now.

These are the common people, the guys who work around here, the people who fight the 31st Street problem on a daily basis.

ALLISON REBER: I'm with the Jayhawk Audobon

Society. I grew up in Lawrence. Additionally, I am a second generation Lawrence on one side of my family and fifth on the other side. I think it puts me in a fairly unique perspective.

To look at the history and look at the transgressions, and it's my wildest hope to heal some of these wounds.

In terms of the two most important issues. The Jayhawk Audobon, we are interested in preserving habitat and also interested in preserving education, which includes the land.

JOHN HUYLER: Thank you. It's an honor to have you here. You can hear all right, can you? Maybe the trade off is with air conditioning.

I would like to announce a few logistic things and then we can get on into it. The important agenda item is that we think that this is a unique enough opportunity for people to engage each other in the spirit that you have already expressed that want to keep it focused, and in spite of the fact it will be a long agenda, if we take a formal break we'll lose people for 15 minutes.

Having said that, you are of course welcome to get up and take a break when you need to. Please help yourselves. That's equally true for the audience.

The restrooms are kind of down a corridor. It's out there and to the right. It's out there on that part of the building.

Secondly, during this meeting as you'll begin to see both Dennis and I will alternate facilitating the meeting. Some of what we will do on the flip chart is for the benefit of focusing. So everyone in the room can see this.

In addition to that, there is a court reporter here. I never can figure out what these people do here. They do manage to capture what people say, and our anticipation at the Osprey Group will use that as a basis for writing a summary of this meeting. But I would like you also to know that through the HNTB website on this project, you will be able to get access to the entire transcript of the meeting. That will be a lot of words and an attempt not to lose the verbatim content of anything that was said here.

In addition to that, I would like to call your attention now to the meeting goals, and a lot of these are ways of bringing out specifically what you think you have already said.

There's a couple things that haven't been mentioned, and I think we'll alter the agenda a little bit accordingly.

We think that it's important to hear a bit of the most recent information about the South Lawrence Trafficway, but we realize that you've heard a lot and may have had the opportunity to show up here and seen the displays already. So we don't want it to be at the level of SLT 101. During this portion of the agenda, we want new information put on the table and for you to have the opportunity to ask for things you wonder about and don't know about. That's the information part of the things. Hear recent information about the SLT, providing information input to KDOT from this diverse group people of people who have been here and have diverse opinions and diverse and somewhat complimentary issues is the main focus of tonight's event. We are hoping and expecting that most of the agenda will be spent in that way and will have a way of digesting further focus that we can take or leave when we get here.

And thirdly, it's important to identify near the end of the evening additional information needs. If you come up with things that you need to know more about, there's already been comments about the relative maturity on the south river option and impact.

It's important that in order for you to do the kind of decision making that you've discussed that additional information needs to be clearly identified.

Those are the three goals, and in a moment I'd like to transfer those into the agenda. Before that, I would like to see if Mike Rees has anything else to add. I know you know Mike Rees as the main representative for KDOT, and I'd like to offer Mike the opportunity to briefly add anything else.

MIKE REES: On behalf of the Department, I'm appreciative of this group and appreciative, and I think everyone would agree that on the course of this project mistakes have been made, and I know I myself have made a few.

Probably the one that sticks in my mind and the one that I think had consequences from it comes from the aspect that I am an advocate by nature, training and experience. An advocate, hopefully your advocate and any advocate has a job as a perception of persuasion of trying to convince people of the correctness of a given opinion.

I started out in that role in this particular project. I realized fairly early on that number one that I wasn't going to convince anyone of this, and two, it was not appropriate to try.

And as a result of that, the emphasis of the work we're doing shifted over and a culmination of it here. A community is here to provide the information to go into the process. We work very hard at it.

I think we've had a good response from the community once we got started with taking that role and that position as to how to do this. So I think it's going to be very productive.

The second thing I would like to say is I brought with me an environmental impact statement. This happens to be the original final environmental impact statement for the first project.

The reason I brought it with me was because I would doubt very many of you would have seen that environmental impact statement. And as you go about your discussions and as you realize what your comments and what you have to say, it will end up in something like this. An environmental impact statement for this project will be much more substantial. So I think it's well for people to see what it is you're working towards.

The other thing is that at some point, and perhaps not necessarily tonight, we can use input as to how are we going to distribute the draft. We have gone through the effort on how to put it together. We've gone through the effort of what we're doing tonight, and we'll have a draft, and it's going to be at least this big and I don't know how to get it out so the appropriate number of people can see it. So I think it's critical that I think the draft be available to the public so you don't have to go to the library to thumb through it, at least the part you maybe can access the part and take those. I'm going to leave this here in case anyone would like to see a real life EIS.

JOHN HUYLER: Let me suggest that if you have any guidance for him as to how to get this out and as the process goes on, you can speak with him after the meeting, and I'm sure he'll stay around. Meanwhile it's important to focus on what we're doing here. Let's get on with that.

The agenda is divided into several sections. We would like in take a moment to have Terry come up from HNTB, the main engineering company doing the studies for the various alternatives and recent

information and new information and hear what you need to hear in addition.

We're allowing up to half an hour for that and we hope that it won't take any longer than that. We would like to have an hour and fifteen minutes for the discussion and to go in depth into the issues and some of the things that we asked you and several of you had pointed out. If I chose two issues, it would be these. We want to be able to go into depth and would explain the issues and have a procedure at that time and be sure from these people that if there's issues that are left out and haven't been mentioned, that we make sure and have them under consideration.

And near the end a lot of you have expressed hope that people listen to each other and reason together and nobody knows if this is going to succeed, but we are optimistic and I want to ask you at the end if this is useful for them and want to continue or if you think you've given it your best shot and go on.

Finally, there's a brief critique. We realize this is a long period and we told you where the food and the bathrooms are. Is this okay as an agenda? Is there anyone that would like to add anything? Let's get into it.

You notice that Dennis has been taking some notes on issues as they come forward, and I'd like to have you just take over for a minute and fill in anything I might have forgotten, and then we'll get on with Terry.

DENNIS DONALD: One of the things that I was struck by listening to people as they mentioned their issues. There are different kinds of issues per se. And I think one of the things in this field when people come away satisfied, it's not only the substantive issues addressed, like the wetlands preservation, cultural and historical issues, dealing with traffic issues, substantive issues. And many were more concerned with procedural issues, let's not go too fast.

And then the third thing is we have to have a process that seems fair and you have to have a feeling like you've been heard for all of these things to seem like they are the right way to debate.

I think what I wanted to help us move toward is saying if we look at the substance of issues, and I want to expand on this a little bit because I think there's a lot of other issues. We came up with lots of issues, and I think we want to get those on the

table and have you help sift through them to either enforce them and say that's right on target or reject it, expand upon it. However you feel about it, it will help by putting out a target to focus the discussion and see where we go with it.

The target is going to look something like this. I want to come up with some alignment options. There's five different options and a lot of different subthemes to those options, plus a no build option. Pick three of the options that you think will have the most merit and can be posted as trade-offs.

So if we look at an issue of being wetlands or traffic or protection of historical sites, how do those different issues play on those, which one is an advantage or which one is a disadvantage, and also which alignment do we have questions that are outstanding? Finally, are there some ideas that you all will have to improve, an idea on table?

When Terry goes through his presentation, which of these options would you pick as three that we can hone in on and you think have the most merit.

For example, when we did our interviews it was pretty clear to us that most people were talking about 32nd or 42nd as the preferred alternative in a general sense.

I think HNTB has five different alignments under 30 seconds. Maybe it should be 30 seconds under C or 30 seconds under B. Let's try and pick one that has the most miles an hour. Then we can critique it. What works and doesn't work and how could you improve it, and then pick some of the other ones.

John, can you pass this out. What I've got is a blank matrix that I'll share with you, and what it has on the top three different suggestions. And the suggestions I'm putting on the table is no build as one alternative, 30 seconds as one alternative and 40 seconds as one alternative.

The ones we heard had the most merit of the tradeoffs. If someone wants to argue that we should put 35th on there or 31st, we're open for this matter. This is just a beginning of model, and if you want to go with some of those we want to fill in the cells.

We want to focus what do we really mean when we talk about habitat protection. Is it better if we went south of the river or on 32nd or if we didn't go at all. How does that trade off with the traffic issues?

That's why we see this matrix. It's a vehicle for discussion. As Terry does his presentation, I

hope you give thought to which of the three at the top of the chart would you put down. Which ones would you and also beyond just those general ones if there's a specific subalignment like the interchanges that are on this configuration, that's preferred over this configuration. Maybe there's some kind of agreement among the group. What it also means too is that maybe you don't agree with any of it. The idea here is to have a vehicle where you can get input to preferences and trade-offs because KDOT knows that it's going to make a decision that's going to be ultimately unpopular.

The question is how do they take into account as much input as they get and make the best decision they can possibly make?

So this is the matrix we're all looking at for those of you in the audience. It's blank just like this one. After Terry does his presentation, we will give you one that's filled in, but of these might change because on the alignment you want to talk about this evening. I want to set this as a stage. Your challenge is as Terry talks about it which of the alignment options you'd like to talk about.

Secondly, which are the substantive concerns you want to make sure get into that matrix and I want to talk about this one or I want to know more information about this before I can make a decision, those kinds of things.

So with that, let me turn it over to Terry. You've got a half hour or less.

TERRY: My goal is maybe to kind of share a little bit of what's on the board here and what's been going on previously and maybe the new information we have, and I want to do that in a fairly quick fashion, and I want to leave time for you really to ask questions so I can better focus on things you might be more interested in.

So with that, I want to start out with what our role is in working with KDOT in being here.

As was mentioned, I work for HNTB. We're an engineering and planning firm, and our role in the project is to work with KDOT and really as Dennis said is to work with substantive issues and for each of the various alignments or alternatives. That's one of the other goals was to define what those alternatives would be.

I think most of you are aware that there's five corridors that we're studying, plus the no build, which are shown here.

Two of the new ones that were added are the 32nd Street and the 42nd Street alternatives. And those were added from comments that we got from groups like this that identified that 42nd Street was not studied previously, and 32nd Street was identified that mentioned as one that may present opportunities to potentially vacate 31st Street. Those are the two new ones.

I will say that our goal is to study each of these alternatives the same between all of them equally, and to present to KDOT and back to the public really an assessment of all of the issues related to each one of those alternatives, and we'll talk about those issues here in a moment.

I also want to share with you some of the processes and procedures, what it is we need to go through as we move on today forward.

And most importantly is our role to help get public input and share information with the public. And for me as far as that, I didn't get in on the introduction mode.

My hope is just by getting a group like this together. Because that's one of our charges is to get input from this type of group as well as the public and put that in a format, again in some basis like the matrix and document input we get, and that information we get back to KDOT and the public so they can understand what all the issues are and ultimately come to that alignment that will hopefully best address as many issues as we can.

For me in my career it's exciting to have this type of input to be able to really find the best solution we can for the alignment to address as many of the issues we can for this group and others and also provide a facility that's safe for the public.

A little bit about what our role is and what we're doing here. In addition to that also, we'll be involved in helping prepare the environmental impact documentation in working with KDOT and the Corps of Engineers.

With that I don't really want to spend a whole lot of time on the alignments. But as we mentioned, there's the five corridors plus the no build. There's maybe just a few nuances I might point out from the boards we've got here and maybe some of you have not seen them.

The blue areas are in the flood plain. Those are areas if there's a big storm, 100-year storm, those would be areas that would get water. There's also areas that are across. Those are areas where

you cannot build and you can't build structures. If we cross them with the roadway, we'd have to build a bridge. If you see where the red line is that shows the trafficway.

One of important issues that was identified earlier, and I heard someone say today is local access. And one of those nuances is how the traffic is handled, particularly between Louisiana and Haskell. Right now folks can use 23rd Street or 31st Street or go farther south.

Anyone of the alignments we have here we've been able to maintain the local roadways and when we maintain local roadways, we have provided access off the trafficway in one location typically on Haskell Avenue so that folks can travel internally, whether it be from the homes association on the east side of Haskell and maybe they want to go over to the school off Louisiana, they can do that off local roads, and as well then access the highway off of Haskell.

The other alternative is we might close down 31st Street. Then we would provide access off of the highway in both Louisiana and Haskell. Then we're providing that local traffic movement via Louisiana or Haskell to provide that local access in this case via the highway.

With that, I really don't want to spend a whole lot more time. If you have questions or something in more detail, we can certainly do that.

Some costs that are a little bit new data, we pulled information. There are preliminary costs based on preliminary planning of alignments. As we get farther down the road, we get more detailed. We'll have a little more defined numbers. The cost for each of the alignments include for 31st Street, 90 to 100 million dollars, and this is for the four-lane roadway, the exhibit over on the left here.

The type of roadway that this will become is similar, and this is in the future, to what you might find on K-10 between Lawrence and Kansas City. We call it a four-lane freeway. Ultimately, that's what will be constructed.

In the interim, it will very well look like how K-10 looks west of US 59 where there are two lanes out there and traffic is traveling both directions on two lanes.

That roadway has right-of-way actually at the other two lanes and in some cases interchanges can be added to intersections. So those numbers would be for that ultimate roadway. It may be just a two-lane roadway to start with which numbers would be less.

So 31st is 90 million and 100 million dollars. 32nd Street is 80 million to 100 million dollars. It varies a bit on which alternative you're looking at.

35th Street is 105 to 190 million dollars. And the one that's 190 is the one which we cross the floodway. We have almost two and a half miles of bridges. The 38th Street alignments are 110 million dollars, and then the 42nd Street alignments are 135 to 155 million dollars. These numbers also don't include any mitigation costs, which may certainly be required particularly with alignments whether it be 31st or 38th Street.

While I'm on mitigation, the exhibit over here on your far right shows at least some of the early look that's been made should any of the alignments go through the wetlands, and quite frankly they all would, even 42nd Street has some impact to the wetlands.

But that identifies some areas that could be provided for mitigation. Mitigation is basically if there's an impact, it's going back and providing, actually in the case of the wetlands it would be more than what you impact. And all those colors up there kind of shows those priorities. There's about I believe in the Baker wetlands total around 600 acres.

I think all those colored areas add up to a bit more than that. But areas that were initially looked at, that could be set aside and potentially provided to create wetlands and so forth. So a little bit on the alignments, the cost mitigation, traffic.

We hope to have traffic numbers for you today. As I left the office, we were still waiting on about 15 or 15 different configurations. We were still waiting for three or four from KDOT and any addition to that, and let me share a little bit about what goes into traffic. We do hope to have numbers next week to share with the group.

Basically the traffic information once you go through with it is one of the factors that plays into it is what's going to happen and what kind of growth will happen. When we do a design for a highway, we look out and design it for typically for 20 years and 25 years so traffic numbers and design looks out to the year 2025.

So one of the key inputs into that traffic model is what the land use is expected to be out in that future. And Lawrence and Douglas County planning, but over the past several months and I think periodically update what they anticipate what their future land use and growth will be.

So the information that's prepared by them had been put into this model so we can look at traffic numbers and how they made out. We're aware of what growth may occur in the future.

Also, the model includes existing traffic counts. It's kind of a base information, and in our case it was 1998 traffic data that was gathered on all the different roads so we understood what people were out there.

Also, you may be aware of a survey that was done. So if you were on K10, you probably weren't thrilled. But there were survey cards shared depending on what travel plans people had through the region. So that data was put into the system and each of these alignments was put into the computer model and each of the alignments have different scenarios on how local roads are handled.

So all of that information was put into the computer and just this week we've got information reports on how the traffic plays out for each of the alternatives, whether it be traffic numbers anticipated in this 2025 time frame, how 23rd Street might play out; how Haskell and how 31st Street might play out, and that's the outcome on the computer models based on how the information is put in. We almost have it all.

If any of you have been on a computer, you want to make sure it's logical, and that's going on again and hopefully next week we'll have more definitive answers for you.

LINDA FINGER: What was used in the model was a 2025 land use plan, which is not an adopted plan by the City Planning Commission. It was something given to the consultants to make a projection based upon existing alignment of 31st Street. That was not projecting out south of the river or any of the other alignments. There's actually a special Planning Commission subcommittee that's meeting to look at the alignments.

TERRY FLANAGAN: I appreciate you saying that. It's another part in debugging the situation. It's actually a representative of city planning and the Planning Commission is anticipating.

JOHN HUYLER: Obviously, we hope to bring this and hope to get it into people's hands. When you signed in, many of you gave your e-mail address, and let me suggest that I can pass around a list here and

if you would like to receive this data and subsequent stuff by e-mail then please put your name on this or if you put your name on this list and don't want to get it, indicate that too.

TERRY FLANAGAN: With that let me just very quickly talk about the process and procedural issues that was mentioned earlier. As you may all be aware, the kind of restudy started back in May, June time frame. And we started out many of you have seen the brochure and getting the information out to people.

There's been several public meetings that have occurred, this being one of them. The interviews that occurred previously with this group. There's been one last Thursday. There was a public meeting. We had an opportunity to meet at Haskell with some students yesterday. But goals over the last several months was to visit with people and get issues right on the table so we can take there information into account, and I'm real interested to see this grow. This is the type of information that we're putting together and how we're assessing how each of those alternatives, each of these issues. So we've got a lot of input through that process as well as in addition to any alignment alternatives we started. We got costs. We have started preliminary alignment. We've got preliminary wetlands information on how each of these alignments impacts it, and we'll look again at all of those items as to how they play out.

And then as well there's been other opportunities. Publicly there's a website. There's a telephone survey occurring here over the next several weeks to get input from not only the community but from the regional area as well. There's a lot of sources of input. We try to get as much input as we can in our charge and get it in a format.

In some respects like we can go through it later, so we can all sit around the table and see how things line up for any one of these alternatives for any of these issues. We can probably pick which one we feel is most appropriate.

The challenge for all of us is when you add all of these up, and you start to see well, this alternative may be better for this issue or that issue. And that's the challenge we want to listen here, but ultimately we want to understand which one really most appropriately or can best meet the goals of the group, the community and transportation as well as for the State.

As we move forward, and the process moves on,

once we've completed this information, and it will be enrolled into this preliminary environmental impact statement, and that will become available as Mike said and shared with the group with the Federal agencies and there will be a public hearing after it's been public and made available to the public and hear comments on it and information.

Typically there will be a preferred alternative and included in the preliminary documentation. Although, there doesn't have to be. And we'd anticipate one defined as part of it. And then there's a public hearing for input and after that we will go to the final environmental impact statement and then there's a record decision made and then after that there would be a permit that the Corps would issue after their review that would allow for construction of whatever alignment would be identified as preferred or basically selected.

When that all happened over the next several months and possibly the earliest would be that the decision would be Spring of next year and in the Summer. I think that's as far as it goes.

JOHN HUYLER: We've got half an hour or so allocated for this, and as I mentioned when we went through the goals for the meeting, there's the informational part and we just got into the issues and concerns part which is really the help of the meeting and what additional information.

I'd like to ask people at the table if you have any additional questions to what Terry has said and ask the same of the public. If you have any questions of what he said so far and then get into the issue part of things and have the exchange at the table and have the same opportunity again to have the opportunities to state issues they think have not been brought up yet. And finally, first of all at this table let me just go around and nod or raise your hands. Do you have any particular questions of Terry?

ALLISON REBER: I wonder if there are plans at all to look at other alignments other than what we see? Is it what we see is what we get?

TERRY FLANAGAN: Based on the info, it may be refined. There's an opportunity to look at others. I'd also point out too that as this information becomes more available; for example, the historical sites that are identified back here and some of those

are on the 42nd Street alignment, those would suggest that the 42nd Street alignment could be shifted and refined to avoid those things. Those kind of refinements are going to have to be made.

STEVE SUBLETTE: I have a question for Mr. Rees dealing with money being spent in Johnson County on Santa Fe Drive. There's bridge expansions and four lanes. I think it stays pretty close to the county line. This obviously is going to have an impact on Douglas County? That is now what we call 10100 Road. What are the plans for this particular corridor, and I know this is probably on HNTB, but at least addressed on a State level.

JOHN HUYLER: It's about 10100 Road.

STEVE SUBLETTE: I see nothing in Douglas County but in Johnson County Santa Fe Drive coming out of Olathe being four lane, bridges are being provided. A lot of money and possibly State monies of transportation will be expended over this, and is this a plan or has there been consideration of the impact of bringing Santa Fe Drive straight west essentially to the south side of Clinton Lake?

MIKE REES: Not that I know of. There was a corridor study that picked up north of Highway 24, south of Lawrence and Highway 56 and 24 Highway and the Turnpike and possible new routes were studied and that particular effort, and I believe that a southern route at that time that would be south of Lawrence, south of Highway 56 turned out to be not a viable alternative at this time. So the route you're talking about, that would be in that area, that would not be an answer.

STEVE SUBLETTE: So the State is not really concerned with what's happening down there as we speak. They are just going to run over the County line and stop?

MIKE REES: I can't say whether the State is concerned or not. That's not something I worked on. If that's something you would like an answer on, I think we can get one for you. But that's not part of the work we've done on this project.

JOHN HUYLER: If your question was in this context, I think the answer is no.

ALLISON REBER: But it's relevant.

MIKE REES: All traffic needs in the State are relevant to each other in some respect. Whether or not a southern route that is more south than 42nd Street that is considered the answer is yes. At the time of that study, it was not determined to be a feasible road to pursue.

JOHN HUYLER: Other questions?

BOB JOHNSON: Do you know and can you tell us approximately how many acres of wetlands would be impacted by each of those alignments, not the number of acres that might be involved in mitigation, but the actual number of acres that might be impacted in construction of those alignments, and can you put that on the chart? If you can see if it's no acres or 300 acres?

TERRY FLANAGAN: I can give you a ballpark.

BOB JOHNSON: I think it's relevant.

TERRY FLANAGAN: Sure.

SUE HACK: While you're doing that, is the window of time for putting input at the end?

JOHN HUYLER: There's three windows of time. When we do questions of this, we'd like to have the public if they have any additional questions and when we've gone through with the group getting issues, they'll have another opportunity.

TERRY FLANAGAN: These numbers are basically within Baker. The chart back there shows the wetlands that have been identified as probable wetlands, and they are not in these numbers. Those are the numbers, the new information.

JOHN HUYLER: We'll call that acres of wetlands.

TERRY FLANAGAN: When I say Baker/Haskell corridor, 31st Street is about 25 acres; 32nd Street is about 25 to 40. The numbers also don't include if there was some sort of noise berms or some sort of trails that might be added. That would be on top of these numbers too. 35th Street is about 35 acres or

so. 38th Street is 10 to 20 acres. And then at this point based on 42nd Street would be zero.

Again, additional wetlands on the other side of Baker would add numbers, 42nd Street included.

JOHN HUYLER: Thanks, Bob. Questions now on this information that's been put forward?

STAN ROSS: It's the belief of the wetlands Preservation Organization when we talk about wetlands, 10 acres here, 15 acres here, one thing that we have an understanding of is that a wetlands complex has a beginning and an end, and it's our belief that the Baker/Haskell wetlands complex runs from Haskell to the river. It's not segmented the way you all are attempting to do, and that's the belief of our organization, and that is why we are intent on preservation of anything north of the river.

JOHN HUYLER: Other questions? So for members of the public. Thank you for coming, and I'd like to offer you the opportunity to ask questions about this, and then we'll get into the issues part, and I'll start here. Please identify yourself.

HANK LOWENSTEIN: I've been in the alliance for the last 31 years. I'm trained as a biologist, so I have an actual understanding. So I've been on the Baker wetlands on and off studying different organisms there.

However, one of the things you really mentioned, which caught my attention was the traffic flow study. One aspect of it in addition to local traffic was the traffic flow from Topeka to Kansas City. That has a direct bearing on this man's question over here to KDOT and the overall impact to the traffic flow. Is there room for another route? And it seems to really benefit the community, the whole area in larger scope rather than one little area here because the traffic flow really is Johnson County. A lot of people there said they are not directly involved, but this is an actual part of the traffic flow that you mentioned.

JOHN HUYLER: Is your question about the parameters of the traffic model?

HANK LOWENSTEIN: I'd like to focus people's attention on different issues rather than these alignments, but the traffic within the whole region

and 56 alignment may have been at one point may have been rejected for some reason.

And people are also saying about the alignment south of the river as being new. When I was involved in 1988, I saw a plan from KDOT dated 1974 with a below the river alignment. So this is really not a totally new concept. I'm surprised when people don't realize this, but the original plan for a bypass for a road that was in 1974 and showed south of the river. This is not a totally new concept. There's a lot of information that as a biologist I would like to provide as a substantive nature. It is a value not just as a general wetland area but as a specific area. I think with that information the community as a whole would have a better opportunity to make these types of evaluations in terms of how valuable this particular problem is and what are the traffic flow problems and to actually evaluate all of these quantitative information that I see, and I'd like to be one of those people to provide some of that.

TERRY FLANAGAN: I'd like to take you up on that and exchange cards and get a hold of you on that. The traffic issues that Mike eluded in the study that was done, and certainly I'm sure we can make it available. But as I understand it, the study that was done today the region Topeka, Kansas City 24 Highway. We looked at 24 Highway and I-70 and 56 and the results of that were that particularly 24, I-70 and K-10 corridors were very important. This was the K-10 corridors as a vital element of that entire corridor, and I think as Mike said 56 became of lesser importance.

JOHN HUYLER: Other questions from the audience? Please limit these to questions and when we get to the issue part, we'll come back to that. Yes, sir.

BRUCE MCCLAIR: My name is Bruce McClair, and I represent Wakarusa Homes, and is one of the ones that would be wiped out. I would like to know how KDOT got information for the flood plain. Your information is not correct. It would only take a rain of 5 inches to push the flood plain probably a quarter of a mile closer to Haskell. What impact will the road and construction have on the Tonganoxie and aquifer, which would be under construction?

TERRY FLANAGAN: The first one is there was a previous FEMA map that showed where the flood plain

was. Every once in a while they come back and look at the development. There was an update done several years ago, and it's the one I don't know if it's officially adopted yet. But I think the local community and certainly we've shown here as where the current boundaries are.

The question on impacts to the aquifer with the concern of any roadway construction how it might impact drinking water through the areas. There has been some geology done in the area, and I'm not a geologist, but those would be taken into account to make sure there wasn't any water. Those are things that would be taken into account. Something we can certainly address.

JOYCE WOLF: I'm Joyce Wolf, and I have a question on the second point up here that says traffic and the way you explained it, it sounds like it's strictly a study of the numbers, the vehicles and my concern would be traffic safety and most of the alignment that I've seen connected Noria Road, which is an extremely dangerous connection, and if it were possible to connect further east, I think that would be highly preferable because right now I don't know how many fatalities there have been, but I know there were a number of accidents at that intersection because of the speed of the cars that are going through and the people that want to cross and take chances and put out in front of trucks and other vehicles, and I think traffic safety is a real basic issue that needs to be addressed.

TERRY FLANAGAN: Very good. And that in any design we do for alignments is one of the guidelines and one of the ways that's right out there now is an integrated intersection. Folks are trying to get across with the high speed of traffic.

The proposal is to make that an interchange and we won't have that type of movement. A very good comment, and one we will take into account.

JOHN HUYLER: Let's move on.

TERRY SCHUSTER: I'd like to know what the need is for this project.

TERRY FLANAGAN: The purpose and need statement is something that will be part of the environmental documentation. It's basically to help address a critical piece of the State highway system, the

region as well as the community and it's been said around here there's issues related to the traffic handling, safety and so forth.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I don't think you can do this discussion without supplying what the purpose and need. It says the purpose of the road is to build the road. That's not a need.

TERRY FLANAGAN: If you were here earlier, the issues were identified. It's about traffic moving people in and around the community and throughout the region is the primary purpose. Mike, do you want to add to that?

MIKE REES: The purpose and need statement are two different things. The purpose is to justify that there has to be a need to have a purpose. That is the purpose. The underlying need is stating the traffic values, projected traffic volumes. It's like the turnpike, it's at capacity.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: These people can't discuss alternatives unless they know what they need.

MIKE REES: I don't have these figures with me. Believe me, they are there. 23rd Street currently serves as a connecting street to K-10. It's not a satisfactory connecting street. One of the needs is to provide a better length of K-10 traffic around Lawrence based on the traffic, and that is one of the things that justifies the need, the need that justifies the purpose.

TERRY FLANAGAN: One more thing and Mike mentioned the traffic volumes. The traffic volume is 40,000 to 60,000 cars a day range, which is basically in the 20-25 year and it's all based on the anticipated growth through the corridor, and that's basically a 4-lane road.

TERRY SCHUSTER: Are you saying the purpose is to decrease the traffic volume east to carry the traffic?

TERRY FLANAGAN: No. It's to address carrying traffic.

TERRY SCHUSTER: From where to where? Around or through Kansas?

MIKE REES: Currently the K-10 traffic is going clear down on 31st Street onto 23rd. 23rd is a connecting length that the department has established for that traffic. The justification for building a road is based on either current traffic data or projected traffic data or both.

TERRY FLANAGAN: Let me clear this --

TERRY SCHUSTER: I want the result of the meeting --

JOHN HUYLER: Instead of this basic issue, but let's take on with it and go deeper. Let's allow us all to focus on this and other issues. Let's turn it over to Dennis, and I thank you all for your questions.

DENNIS DONALD: One of the things we're doing here too is we're on two tract. The primary focus is the people at the table to have a chance to discuss these issues, and if we have time we'll open it up to the public. But we do is a very limited amount of time. What we're going to try to do is create a structure, and that's the matrix I introduced earlier.

So what I want to have us first talk about is if we could narrow ourselves down to three different alternatives that you felt both had merit and could be illustrative of how these different alignments might address these issues. I'd like to hear proposals for what the three might be from this group right here.

DEBBIE PETERSON: Before we do that, I have question. How far south of the river do they envision our County going? Do we see ourselves as a town that grows around two rivers as a town that doesn't grow south of the rivers. If we have a town that grows south of river? I know we're going to grow there and I wondered how the City is envisioning planning, whether they see us growing south of there.

JOHN HUYLER: Linda has changed forms. Linda had to leave.

RON PURFLINGER: I'm Ron Purflinger. I'm chairman of Lawrence/Douglas Planning. I'm the civilian part of that. We're already growing south

of the river. And we really have a couple of choices. But the thing I need to preface this with is as a Planning Commission our job is to help plan but not just tomorrow and the next day but way in the future. We have been planning the way people save for vacation. We need to start planning long-term down the road.

If there was anything I could say for that lady in the audience, we need to plan or we're going to have issues that are going to crop up.

Lawrence is going to be able to grow currently to the west only. We haven't got the ability to move. We've got a little bit to the northwest. It's for a lot of reasons, not only transportation.

The prospect of going south of the river is one we're discussing is something that certainly has been waiting in the wings for a long time. But there's infrastructure issues that have actually probably a greater effect on south of the river residential or commercial development than what this road would have. Because with the road you can restrict access. We can do a lot of things to control development.

DENNIS DONALD: Let me put on the table and say I have proposed that you have got three alternatives no build, 32nd and 42nd. How do you feel in terms of the range of options that are before you? Anybody want to argue for 31st, 35 or any subthemes within

DEBBIE PETERSON: I know that many people in my neighborhood can't envision a no build and they are surprised that 31st is not advocated more strongly because there's already one there, whereas 32nd, 35th and 38th all cut in this a road through the wetlands, and it doesn't make sense.

DENNIS DONALD: If anything, you might subtract the no build and put 31st in its place.

ALLISON REBER: We haven't explored the southerly alignment very well, and we've been talking about protecting the wetlands, and we have all these alignments that go through the wetlands. I would prefer southerly alignments.

STAN ROSS: With those options 31st, 38th and 35th all being a no build, why are they still on the board now?

DENNIS DONALD: I'm not sure I understand.

Since they were rejected once in planning?

STAN ROSS: Why are they on the board if they were rejected once?

MIKE REES: Because we are required to study all reasonable alternatives. There never was a determination that any of the routes were unacceptable. The earlier Federal highway decision was only that there would be no alternative chosen unless Haskell consented to do it. Since all of them were still reasonable alternatives in an engineering point of view with the addition of 42nd Street, which was put in with the perception that the community wanted us to study 42nd Street.

DENNIS DONALD: I'm going to have to stay with the group right here. If we open it up to the audience, we're going to go in different directions.

JIM TURRENTINE: I have a disadvantage that I want to put on the table to all of the members to consider all of the options. If the SLT is in the Wakarusa flood plain. It will require huge amount of hills. The Naismith Creek tributary in our neighborhood drains into the Wakarusa flood plain which is flat and drains very poorly. How will KDOT prevent the trafficway from backflooding in the Naismith Creek? How can the SLT be built in a way that can increase disparity to the Indian Hills neighborhood?

JOHN HUYLER: This is the kind of thing after we decide which roads we want to discuss. This is a very appropriate kind of comment to make. Let's try to pick which ones we want to be talking about. What I'm hearing is 42nd, 32nd and maybe 31st and maybe no build. The four alternatives, we won't get through four. So what I would like to do is we start talking about south of the river not as 42nd but something maybe more broadly defined. Can you all live with that in the direction to go? What I want to do is keep this in mind, and what I noticed you starting filling in the matrix, and I'm hesitant to pass out one that has our thinking on it, but I think I will to add fuel to the fire.

What this has is things that we have picked up in our interviews and discussions with other folks. For those of you who have not started filling up the matrix. And what you can do is say this is

ridiculous, this really makes sense or really what you missed was this key variable.

I don't think we have enough for everyone in the audience. I think we've got 25 or so.

What I would like you to do and this is a combination of things we learned in our interviews. They reflect some of the issues that were raised up here in our conversation earlier.

I would like to ask you all to start thinking about and start looking at the 42nd or more generalized option on the right side first. Which ones would you add to the list and what would you delete? What would you enforce and I'd echo that concern exactly. And start looking primarily, well look at all four of the rows across advantages, disadvantages. What are the biggest questions you have south of the river and some areas or ideas to improve that area.

And, again, I'm not going to try to order this but the reporter will catch your thoughts. Beck first and Steve.

BECKY MANLEY: Maybe I didn't emphasize this as one of the most important issue of human impact to the you list over there.

STEVE SUBLETTE: We say 42nd Street alignment avoid impact on the wetlands. Essentially what you're talking about is avoiding impact on existing Baker wetlands. Anything that you do that crosses the Wakarusa river is going to have an effect and it's going to also affect the Baker wetlands in terms of range. But this entire area could be considered either a potential or a previous wetlands. So point A, the impact on wetlands disappears. If we're just talking about the logic of what you've got down there strike line 1 because it does have an impact on existing wetlands. Unless you take it across the dam out west of town. Otherwise any place it comes across, you're going to be on lands that was at one time a wetland and could be a wetland again. And we're looking at mitigation costs on that as well.

DENNIS DONALD: Steve, also thinking along lines, Terry talked about it, this was Baker wetlands.

STEVE SUBLETTE: We are going to talk about it as avoiding the impact on the wetlands, then there's no way that anything goes from the existing area 31st

Street across onto south of the river. It is all going to impact the wetlands.

ALLISON REBER: I would seek to clarify it.

We're not talking about wetlands in general, we're talking about a wetlands that has already been established, an environmental area. You don't impact an established wetlands.

BECKY MANLEY: What we're looking at here comparing the environmental area an environmental implications from road construction and road existence on the Wakarusa as a whole. The Wakarusa below Clinton dam is not a dead ditch. The Corps of Engineers will need to study the environmental study on road construction, runoff, pollutants from traffic from road bed. Water quality issues and existence of road, noise, traffic noise and air quality impacts on wild life in the entire Wakarusa river corridor.

These 42nd Street alignments show coming very near the Wakarusa. In my mind, no attention has simply been paid to the environmental impacts in 18 favor of the emphasis of such impacts on the wetlands.

People who ordinarily be interested in this in the environmental impacts along the Wakarusa corridor had to pick their battle and environmental impacts. The road crossing the Wakarusa been set aside. These are legally required to be studied, and I think that people should know that.

JOHN HUYLER: That's also one of the big question marks in your mind are what are the environmental impacts south of the river?

BECKY MANLEY: I would certainly like to know how much study has been done of this corridor and regarding the impacts of these alignments specifically or alignments that cross this area.

JOHN HUYLER: Okay.

CAREY MAYNARD-MOODY: Becky brings up a point which is dear to my heart. There's a group in town called Alliance for Conservation of Open Space, and we've been working really hard. We're a grass roots group who have a vision of open space in Douglas County and to be dictated where that will be devised. Pavement seems backwards to us. We should have a

vision first. It's going to take time. We can't be hurried. And that was one of the important issues that was important. This is something that may be part of our community's vision for open space.

We don't have a whole lot of bridge native habitat environments. So this is a very tense, a very sensitive issue.

DENNIS DONALD: Other comments on 42nd Street?

BOB JOHNSON: This is probably more editorial. You say next to last bullet, recognizes that the SLT does little for 23rd Street congestion. It would be more appropriate to say it does nothing for 23rd Street congestion and makes it less of an advantage. Do you see what I'm saying?

And so we don't want to edit this to death, but under disadvantages, this should be done in the disadvantages. This clearly in my judgment is not an advantage.

Under disadvantages, the fourth bullet, says vacation of 31st Street more difficult. I would say vacation of 31st Street, not possible.

And then the last thing down there, the last bullet under disadvantages. It does little for city traffic congestion. It does nothing for city traffic congestion.

And a bullet that should be in there by default imposes an enormous cost to city and county for improvement of 31st Street.

DENNIS DONALD: That's something we didn't have here at all.

BOB JOHNSON: It's really big. I'm speaking from a local perspective. It's not a KDOT issue, but it will become by default a horrendous cost to citizens of Douglas County.

BECKY MANLEY: I think the bullet should be added consideration of human impact of any route south of river in terms of not only displacement of homes which find themselves in the actual right-of-way, but the effects of traffic noise in particular, loss of privacy, possible air quality issues that are associated with living within any certain distance, third of a mile, half a mile from a four-lane expressway carrying 40,000, 50,000 vehicles per day.

There's a significant human impact that is

largely escaped in that sense on residents currently living in the area and have been there for generations compared to alignments that don't travel through the areas that are already populated.

On two particular 42nd Street alignments shown on the maps using publicly available addresses and rulers, calculators and come up with numbers that surprised me how many homes are within one-third and a half a mile corridors.

I tried an experiment at golf course interchange and other quiet areas and listened to traffic noise from K10. I noticed that some people along K10 are closer than that, but that noise level would be a hardship for people to live in that sort of environment.

STAN ROSS: The 42nd Street alignment as far as my group is concerned would satisfy a lot of our problems that we have here. But first let me start to say as far as south of the river people is concerned, the road would satisfy a lot of our problems we have here.

But first let me start by saying as far as south of the river people are concerned and the families that this road would displace, we are not totally deaf to their feelings.

After all, this type of feeling they are experiencing has happened to our people for hundreds of years. We're saying that we would like for them to know that we realize what pain they are going through right now. And at the same time, the same things that they are going through which we have gone through has surely strengthened our resolve and in preservation of these wetlands, nothing north of the river as far as construction.

Now, I notice down here they talk about limited infrastructure on 42nd Street. It's our belief in actuality that all of these alignments, 31st, 35th, 38th, they all really have to do with infrastructure. And what we're really talking about here is sewer lines. They've stated they are growing to the west.

All of the sewage right now runs through Haskell property. It runs into five pumps that sends it on to the sewage treatment plant in east Lawrence. They are overloaded now. They were overloaded five years ago, and I still have seen any let up on construction.

South of the river development, you need infrastructure down there. There would be a lot more homes in that area right now if there was more

infrastructure down there. In other words, if there was water down there.

They don't have water. It comes from Clinton Lake. Baldwin gets their water from Clinton Lake. We feel people are skirting around the issues here. That's the reason for this roadway.

KDOT said itself that any of these alignments, including 31st Street, is not going to do very much for traffic on 23rd Street. That was created by planning of 23rd Street. There's too many curb cuts and KU is there and Haskell is there.

But I think it's time for us to stop beating around the bush here about the true need for this road and specifically on 31st Street.

DENNIS DONALD: I'm having trouble. Don't beat around the bush. Tell me, what are you saying? Are you saying that we don't want it on the wetlands but we also are sympathetic, so you're saying --

STAN ROSS: This 42nd Street alignment is not far enough south. You need to look at Wells, Overlook Road. I'm not sure of the number.

One of our alumni's years ago when this whole thing came up said that's where that road needs to go. He was a visionary. He realized how growth was growing. They are not going to let us develop in the wetlands. The cost is too great and there's too great of a risk there.

So south of the river is a potential area for growth, and it's going to happen and I might do a little editorializing also. In Lawrence we have people moving here --

DENNIS DONALD: I want to keep it quick.

STAN ROSS: That's all well and good. Having lived here for 30 years and enjoyed what makes Lawrence such a compatible place to live with all this development and everything we keep building and building. And for some reason I get the idea we want to be like Johnson County. But yet we have streams of traffic going back and forth every day to Johnson County but choose to live in Lawrence. Why is that?

We need to ask ourselves that question along with the planning of this road. In order for us to preserve what it is we have that is so great, that needed to be added to the mix.

RON PURFLINGER: One of the advantages that I

see south of the river alignment is we have the ability to plan it. By using limited access at the beginning, you may find that development in 20, 30, 50 years, you may require different access points but at least this way we're getting something ahead of it.

One of the big problems we have with the development that's occurred in Douglas County over the past 30 years that I've been here is that we really didn't follow good planning principles until a few efforts a little late in the game, and that's why we've got 23rd, and that's why we've got 31st Street and Louisiana and another one on 6th Street. This is really a golden opportunity for planning.

In response to why are things the way they are. Our world has changed dramatically. And the people who live here may not be living here by choice other than it's the middle ground between a job in Topeka and Kansas City, and it's something they have compromised on. It's the nature of society when you have two earning families, especially when they don't have a high degree of education, they are not going to land in that perfect spot, and they are going to have to commute and we've got a geographical destiny that has inflicted a lot of this on us, and if we were west of Topeka, we wouldn't be having that discussion.

But we're not west of Topeka, and that's why this connecting link is vital from a planning standpoint. It's a popular activity in this town to complain about planning and tying the ankles of those who try and plan it.

JIM TURRENTINE: I want to editorialize and correct the 32nd Street advantage.

DENNIS DONALD: May I ask you to stay on 42nd a while. Then you can be first for editorializing. Any other comments on 42nd Street? Addition? Deletions? Let's go to 32nd.

JOHN HUYLER: The kind of thing we hope to do, I know that various of you you feel more passionately about one thing or the other, and I want to make sure everyone has the opportunity to speak before we leave south of the river options, is there anyone else who would like to say anything?

BECKY MANLEY: Since this may be the only opportunity to bring this up, the idea of the loss of

sites of historical importance along the corridor shown really hasn't been discussed in the public arena, but there are a number of important sites and areas south of the Wakarusa in sections 19 and 20 from alignments in the past that related to pre Civil War conflicts in the bleeding Kansas and underground railroad operations on the very soil the road will cross. There are grave of poor farm residents who may be in marked and unmarked graves who may be buried in the path of the trafficway.

Other sites of importance date back to the 1850's ruins and known site and known staging areas for various activities that were important in the history of our country predating leading up to events that caused the Civil War to break out.

I've made a map that shows in the limited amount of time I had some areas of historical sections that were identified and in an archeological survey done that mentioned these sites and pre Civil War events, as well as other items that I've come across with private research.

There are five dots on here that represent known or suspected way stations of the underground railroads. These sites may not be well known to a whole lot of people. They're historic homesteads. These facts are already in KDOT's hands, and I fear the general public may not be aware.

JOHN HUYLER: How many copies do you have?

BECKY MANLEY: One and I'll pass it around. I apologize for the historical inaccuracies. There's a lot more research about local history by people much more knowledgeable than me. Thanks for the opportunity.

JOHN HUYLER: Let's move on now to the 32nd Street alignments. What's the advantage of 32nd Street alignments. I hope we have input from everybody. Let's start with you, Jim.

JIM TURRENTINE: The advantage of the 32nd Street point of view minimizes Louisiana traffic input. So alignment D is connected to Louisiana. Only the portions not connected to Louisiana have that advantage on the 32nd Street alignment D. It connects right onto Louisiana and negates that.

JOHN HUYLER: At the top it says alignment C. Is it accurate relative to alignment C or not?

JIM TURRENTINE: Yes. But you were generalizing earlier on the 32nd alignments to cover all alignments. And the other thing we have about the 32nd alignment with respect to, or any alignments, with respect to the trafficway is that the people in our neck of the woods are concerned about the safety of the children going to and from the schools on Louisiana Street. And any deterioration of the traffic caused by increased traffic resulting from the presence of so people in the neighborhood. Whatever options would minimize traffic in the neighborhood, they would like to know which traffic options would minimize the impact on Louisiana or Indian Hill's neighborhood.

JOHN HUYLER: Let's hear from others about 32nd Street. Who else would like to talk about 32nd Street?

RON PURFLINGER: I'm following Bob's lead under advantages. It says release congestion on 23rd Street. I think realistically with the limited access points, any alignment of trafficway currently designed would have minimal impact on the traffic on 23rd Street.

I think we ought to not consider it as an advantage. It doesn't exist. And allowing vacation of 31st Street. If you're going to leave it there, you've got to put it under disadvantage. We've got a neighborhood that's quite significant that's developed to the east with the potential for probably another development of at least twice that size that would then be forced to either go to a State highway to get any place locally or if 31st Street is vacated. Really it has as many disadvantages as well as advantages.

STAN LOEB: My point is the University of Kansas owns property, 20 acres on the southwest corner of Haskell and 31st. The 32nd alignment appears to go across the property. Does it go across?

TERRY FLANAGAN: Yes, it does.

JOHN HUYLER: Any alternatives?

TERRY FLANAGAN: All 32nd alternatives will transgress that property on KU?

STAN LOEB: Yes, they will all transgress?

TERRY FLANAGAN: Yes.

SUE HACK: There may not be mitigation for traffic numbers on 23rd Street. There may be a possibility of weeding out some of the traffic. It now takes to go east/west might go to 23rd where some of the regional traffic will go to 32nd where they might not go to 42nd. So there might be the possibility of returning many of these neighborhood streets, and that's a debatable issue. But it's a comment that I heard may be a possibility. So it could be considered an advantage.

JOHN HUYLER: Terry, let me ask you a question. When you get these traffic numbers, will these kind of balances be deflected?

TERRY FLANAGAN: Yes.

JOHN HUYLER: Carey next.

CAREY MAYNARD-MOODY: Number five under advantages and 32nd Street alignment allows expansion of wetlands. Is that the mitigation you're talking about?

JOHN HUYLER: Yes.

CAREY MAYNARD-MOODY: It's just maybe the language needs to be tidied up. I think you need to talk about what kind of wetland you are talking about. Language is really critical in this.

JOHN HUYLER: We're using this as a catalyst.

JOHN HUYLER: Bob.

BOB JOHNSON: I think it's important to make comments with the possible vacation of 31st Street. I doubt that there's anybody in this community representing the City or County who would voluntarily step up and say it maybe a good idea to vacate 31st Street. I think that issue is on the table because it was requested by the Department of Interior of Indian Affairs, and two people appeared before the County Commission, not speaking for Haskell and not speaking for the Alumni Association, but identifying themselves as the Alumni Association. And those

people specifically asked the County Commission to vacate 31st Street. So I think that's why it's there.

When the County Commission as a body has not discussed that issue. The County Commission as a body has not given any indication as to whether or not they would do it. What I have said publicly as a chair person is me personally my vote is I would be willing to consider that if in fact the trafficway is built, an alignment that is so close to 31st Street that it would provide the services that 31st Street provides the City.

If it's not built close to 31st, I would not vote vacation of it. What I was trying to do was ask people who asked for the vacation of 31st to come forth and say if 31st Street is important to me to be vacated, then we would agree to put something in its place, and that's not been done. I think it is fair to leave it on the table, but I think it's fairly important to understand the context which it got on the table.

JOHN HUYLER: Allison.

ALLISON REBER: I wanted to address some of the concerns of Jayhawk Audobon's concerns. First of which when you run a road right through that area, you're taking out the boardwalk, which is primarily used by the public as a front door to the wetlands property.

Secondly, when we put a road through there, we've got pretty serious noise concerns that need to be addressed. Which brings me to the final point, which is mitigation plans. And we are extremely concerned that KDOT does not have the ability to pull off a mitigation plan that would effectively protect this area.

JOHN HUYLER: Becky.

BECKY MANLEY: I wanted to ask Allison to expand. Could you explain what the thinking is concerning the various state of three to four to five acres of adjacent land being offered to mitigation and why possibly, address the fact that the possibility that this opportunity to protect and preserve additional habitat not only as wetlands but simply from development may not occur again.

One of the arguments in favor of leaving the status quo rather than taking the advantage of

additional acres of wetlands that would be the subject of scientific research and inquiry during their restoration as well as expanding the ultimate size of the wetland by almost twice.

ALLISON REBER: There's two primary concerns. The first is that it's to protect the area from development. That is effectively done because that's identified as wetlands.

And, secondly, you've got an area that's used for environmental education, and if you can't hear yourself think, that's not a real problem.

If you're listening to bird calls and frog calls and salamanders walking across the footpath, you can't hear it to tell the kids. That's a general public issue as opposed to a private land observation.

BECKY MANLEY: Point well taken and there are concerns, we have salamanders and birds.

ALLISON REBER: But they are not used as public education.

JOHN HUYLER: Steve.

STEVE SUBLETTE: The Wakarusa township has voted to support the 31st Street or 32nd Street alignment for the trafficway because of the significant impact of the lack of the trafficway has on our roads now and significant impact that any building that takes place will have on the roads of the Wakarusa township. We feel that the best alignment would be on 31st or 32nd Street.

JOHN HUYLER: Any of the rest of you want to speak about that?

STAN ROSS: Speaking of the 32nd Street alignment, it's been said that this alignment is significantly south of Haskell to reduce impact. In actuality, it's a mere footstep away from Haskell's southern boundary.

Our land does extend across 31st Street to the levy, and we're still not sure about the mitigation project that they are talking about.

I might add that when you talk about mitigation of these 300 or 400 acres that they are proposing to develop southwest of the Baker wetlands, that is prime farmland right now. And farmland is something

that is shrinking in our county daily. And I think efforts should be made to preserve this and not turn it back into a wetlands, which it may or may not have been.

And I think one thing that needs to be understood about mitigation, these wetlands have been here for thousands of years. These wetlands were here long before Baker. Baker didn't create these wetlands. Baker has somewhat enhanced the wetlands supposed to be wet soil or a group of ponds supporting wetlands and wild life. I'm still in debate myself about that.

But as far as mitigation measures, I do not think they are adequate for 32nd Street, and of course my organization adamantly opposes as I said before anything north of the river.

STAN LOEB: Just a clarification in the area of impact that was brought up that came to my attention by a colleague that studied the organisms. But I was curious to the fact that beginning on the 11th of this month and peaking on the 18th is the Monarch butterfly migration utilizes everything south of 31st, but the majority of them will be utilizing the wetlands.

I don't know if that issue has been addressed as potential impact on an organism that uses the bypass as a throughway as major portion of migration. I'd hate to see all the Monarchs on people's windshields.

ALLISON REBER: This is one of the few places that people come to do this, and Baker wetlands is bringing people to this area to do Monarch tagging.

JOHN HUYLER: Is there anyone one who would like to speak on 32nd?

KAREN SWISHER: Mr. Johnson's comment, I like to expand on that. The reason the vacation of 31st was imposed was because of the concern for what appeared to be building momentum for 31st becoming a de facto trafficway and surely it would be expanded and without saying so becoming a trafficway. That was the reason for the responses to the offer, and I want to emphasize that our position that was presented that any trafficway SLT would be sufficiently south of 31st Street to negate any impact on grounds administered by urban fares by Haskell, and anything that would have any adverse impact on Haskell and Baker wetlands would not be acceptable, would not be

a preference. I wanted to offer that as a clarification for that offer.

JOHN HUYLER: My next suggestion is that we should allow the little broader discussion of 31st Street. It's very helpful to hear from your point of view, your background on that and your position on that and your thoughts about it and equally, Karen, it's helpful to hear some of Haskell's perceptions of that.

I would like to have you clarify more, but let's also allow anyone else to get in their opinion about the issues that are raised or not solved in. The question of 31st Street with or without vacation.

BOB JOHNSON: I do have to make an observation about the butterflies. I think it's wonderful that we tag the Monarchs in the wetlands. I think it's wonderful that we see the Monarchs wherever and whenever it flies. I'm reminded of the eagle that wouldn't come back to Lawrence when we cut down the tree on the Kansas River. And, in fact, we have more eagles visiting in Lawrence. I don't want us to get so caught up in something that's happening that we lose sight of what's going on year after year after year.

ALLISON REBER: Sure it goes on, but does it go on in a backyard setting or does it go on in a very nice environmental area. That's where it should be going on under the auspices of environmental education.

DENNIS DONALD: Before we go on to the no build, one path which Debbie suggested earlier was that 31st ought to be on the table as an option. I think other people said that as well. If 31st were here, how would your comments differ as far as pluses and minuses, advantages and disadvantages?

It seems to me as a clear impact on Haskell or 32nd Street, but speak to 31st, how different would that be from 32nd in your mind to 32nd.

KAREN SWISHER: Well, obviously the impact spoken about before of 32nd Street is not that far from 31st Street. Obviously there's going to be the same sort of impacts that referred about the other. The proximity to our land, protection of Haskell's property and that's obviously still a concern.

DENNIS DONALD: Debbie, you mentioned some time ago as something that ought to remain on the table as a priority.

DEBBIE PETERSON: The highway person's logic, a road that is already there and an area that's already impacted by a road. Animals that have had to adapt to a road already.

There could be things done to the 31st alignment to improve it for the animals and for the drainage, such as raising it up a little bit more, all sorts of creative ideas to facilitate the movement of animals to get water. Yes, it increases the cost, but the highway man looks at this three versions that go through the wetlands in areas there are that are not used to human traffic. We have to start all the way down and build all the way up, and we have part of that in tact, and it just seems more logical to me to be on 31st.

RON PURFLINGER: When 31st Street was originally proposed, I was in high school. Things have changed a lot and the development in your neighborhood is one of the big things that has changed. When you talk about 31st Street alignment, one is that you're going to have limited access or you may not have access. Two, you're going to be talking about a totally different speed level instead of a relatively benign 45 miles an hour that can be accomplished, you're going to have 65 and 70 miles an hour speed limits. So you get those two issues involved and as times progress it makes 31st Street a less logical choice from a planning perspective, and the access issues on 31st Street are pretty perplexing from what we've been able to understand.

DENNIS DONALD: Stan.

STAN ROSS: Speaking of the 31st Street alignment, the wetlands preservation Organization states that we realize that the probability of Douglas County or the City of Lawrence giving up 31st Street are pretty remote and we realize that 31st Street is there.

What we would like to see happen to 31st Street is it stay exactly like it is, put the 30 mile speed limit on it. If the City wants to put traffic lights on it, we're in favor of it. But we are concerned about the traffic and the human traffic.

Our students have to get back and fourth to

those wetlands and raising the road, it's not we're not thinking anywhere along those lines. The mere fact that 31st Street is there, and I've got a copy of the original grand easement of the property right here, and I've looked at it, but we also know that this area, the wetlands is important to Haskell as far as an educational tool along with our other problems, other aspects of having this on our property.

For a road to go through there with truck traffic, and we're talking a large amount of truck. We're talking definite noise pollution, possible environmental pollution and not to mention wildlife is basically night life. Most of the animals down there they do most of their traveling down at night. They go across the road. They haven't adapted very well to going across the road. They are still lying on the side of the road.

DENNIS DONALD: A couple of you have not taken advantage of the opportunity to speak. Does anyone else want to make a comment.

BOB JOHNSON: I think that if you just look at the numbers, logic would tell you that you ought to build it on 31st Street. But this is more than just looking at numbers. It would seem to me as a community we ought to find a way to accomplish our objectives and respect the wishes of Haskell.

Haskell is an absolutely critical neighbor of our community, an enormous resource and it seems to me to be a major issue, and Haskell has clearly expressed themselves. They don't want the trafficway or de facto trafficway, and we ought to do everything to accommodate that wish. And that would lead into no build and that would lead into that.

DENNIS DONALD: Let's talk about no build. Bob, do you have any thought on that?

BOB JOHNSON: The real problem with no build is not no build and therefore no consequence. It's no build and increasing consequences of what's happening today that none of us like, and especially Haskell. Because 31st Street probably would not de facto become a trafficway. But 31st Street would become an enormously heavily traveled city street. It will cost us a lot of money, taxpayer money, to improve that street. It will also cost a lot of money to extend it to the east and bear significantly more

traffic than Haskell ever wants and cause more damage to what Haskell says is critical and important to them. And it seems to me that we simply put our heads in the sand when we say no build, as if we were to vote no build the traffic will not increase, there will be no growth. No build is simply not an option.

CAREY MAYNARD-MOODY: Unless we're not creative, and I think we haven't been as resourceful as we can be, especially working with Mark. And it's a mystery to me why KDOT in their long-range planning study failed to work with Mark in being resourceful and is exploring the feasibility of commuter rail. There are ways to mitigate that other communities are doing.

When the doors get slammed shut every time the notion of multi motor transit comes in, kdot says too costly and not done in Kansas and we don't have the population to support it. So it fails all the screening. But I really think that that's going to end that we need to start thinking about it sooner than later and this is the perfect opportunity to start thinking about other options, and I think we're cutting our noses off to spite our face. I think the only way to get people is by cars and truck and Kansas isn't alone in that. It's a national problem.

But the governor of California did something really radical last week. Some of you may remember there would be a moratorium on paving and Kansas ought to hook on what's coming down the pipe. But laying the pavement is important sometimes, and I think we can take our time and be very thoughtful and choosy about when that time is and when it's going to be and we can't be rushed and the alternatives that have not been explored, but I haven't seen reports from KDOT about alternative transportation planning in the Kaw River Valley, and I think that's got a place at this table, and we've been not allowed to bring it here, and I think it's a possible solution.

RON PURFLINGER: Actually, there's a study being done on commuter rail in the Topeka, Kansas City corridor. One of the problems with no build that I can see is we develop a disconnection from the movement from the east to the west and yet in our planning efforts we've tried to establish a research part corridor, an office corridor on the western side that takes just as long to get to the city limits as it does to get from the city limits to the next city. And that's been a real stumbling block in the

development of that as well as the stumbling block in development of jobs that might be more attractive than what we currently have to help flush out the economy and the job base. We've got a resource

that's being utilized in traffic and the no build doesn't address that. And, likewise, we're not talking about building a interstate system here. We're talking about building a little piece of road every day all over the world.

And one of the big disadvantages means we've been unable as a community to wrestle and come up with a palatable solution to a relatively simple problem, and that's really a big deal to me.

I used the trafficway as an example at the American Planning Association Conference in a three-hour session at a public meeting and set up this little round table and said come up with an issue that might illustrate how you could better use public meetings, and I said guys, give me five minutes and I'll explain one to you. And I had people coming from all over the country, and I had one from Olathe and when I said SLT he said, "He's got the topic." We really need to go up and stop looking at all the negative aspects and start finding something that's positive and build on top of that rather than throwing up our arms and saying there's always going to be a problem. In every aspect of our lives there's always going to be a problem. But the success and value of our efforts in society is determined by how we look at those problems and how we evaluate them and take the positive aspects and start building on them and that's why it's so important.

DENNIS DONALD: Do you think that if this group were to meet a couple more times, do you think it's possible to come up with a solution.

RON PURFLINGER: I think if we systematically started looking at the impacts and different areas and started weighing them and put assigning values, and this is something one of our planning commission members developed a preliminary model and I haven't had a chance to look it over, but I know someone has been very concerned about this project for quite a while, and it showed a lot of promise because it allowed you to breakdown in a matrix the different issues on all the different alignments, and we walked into the process knowing that someplace is going to

get hurt. It's inevitable. A lot of people get hurt. Our children get hurt because we minimize the opportunities for them. So we start establishing values, different things and we say we don't know where this is going to lead and when we get there we know we've done the best job. And when we finish our mission, we'll run the course and we'll not let us beat ourselves in this particular endeavor.

DENNIS DONALD: Bill.

BILL SEPIC: You asked us some questions and one of your questions was what's your best possible outcome and that's your wildest hope. One question that needed to be asked is what's your worst possible fear because that puts all the agendas out on the table. No build is the chamber's worst possible fear for a lot of reasons that Ron had discussed, and as we take a look and look at the last how many hours, we've talked a whole lot about why these plans don't work, and we need to rephrase the question and get back to what you were saying, how could we finish this? How can? Rather than why doesn't 42nd work? Why doesn't 32nd work? How can we all come together and make it work? It may not be any one of the suggestions or it could be one of them. But my guess is if you put the group together a couple more times with a how can it might achieve some broad base.

DENNIS DONALD: Sometimes it seems like when you have these first meetings when everyone has to talk about my concerns, and so maybe you're right a couple more times and you say we've done that part and if there's a solution in this pile here.

SUE HACK: I think echo what Bill said. Many people of this table are known by quotes in the paper. It's nice to hear and learn about things. I'm now learning about south of the river, and I've had a chance to meet with Bob and we talked about things. I'm learning about concerns about south of the river and concerns over this, and I think we develop an appreciation of each other as people and breakdown some of the if that person's for it than I'm against it. And I don't think we need to put ourselves in that position ever.

And I agree, I don't want to meet to death, but the only way we can get this accomplished is if we look at this from a positive standpoint and to get to know each other better and do some compromising.

STEVE SUBLETTE: The only viable option for the Wakarusa township because the township roads are being used as a de facto bypass by trucks and cars on Louisiana Street. We want something done now to help solve our problem. I realize you said that as an elected official I must look at the interest of the people in the Wakarusa township and their roads are being beat to death because we have delayed an answer to this traffic problem.

JIM TURRENTINE: If the no build option could be adding lanes to 23rd to carry the traffic through the thing, would that be a positive input? Could you actually retrofit 23rd Street, put additional lanes on it? Buy up all the curb cuts?

DENNIS DONALD: Retrofit 23rd to accommodate K10 traffic?

JIM TURRENTINE: It is K10 right now.

DENNIS DONALD: Let me ask Terry.

TERRY FLANAGAN: That's certainly is an alternative. It's certainly something we can address. I know from my understanding of the previous studies, as you said your curb cuts would be a lot.

JIM TURRENTINE: Maybe it's not an issue anymore. It's certainly one that is open for discussion.

TERRY FLANAGAN: That's an option at the --

JIM TURRENTINE: Buying additional curb cuts, adding additional lanes will it solve the problem?

JOHN HUYLEY: I don't think businesses would want to see it become a trafficway.

JIM TURRENTINE: They can buy them out so they can move other places.

SUE HACK: When you're up against schools, that's the problem with working with traffic studies, the way the land is configured there's no room on the north side, more room on south side.

JIM TURRENTINE: Just wipe out the whole section to solve their problems with traffic.

JOHN HUYLER: I think there is a study on 23rd.

RON PURFLINGER: 23rd Street is a unique animal, and we're going to have to get it under control one of these days.

One of the problems is it is an established commercial corridor. Just the land alone would be valued between \$6 and \$9 a foot. You know, you'd start adding the building and if you get down just from Louisiana to Iowa, a primary commercial street, you would be removing maybe two or three hundred million from tax rolls, and then spending that much to buy the property. So it's not only spending a lot of money, to acquire money you're buying the highest priced property. Then you turn around and take that property off the tax roll, and I think some of our school systems might be upset with that.

RANDY WESEMAN: We'd be more than a bit upset.

RON PURFLINGER: That's easier said than done.

BOB JOHNSON: I've said that before. 23rd Street is the biggest single asset this community has from a building standpoint. It reminds us every single day what one should not do.

DEBBIE PETERSON: From what I'm hearing, I have a feeling we can scrap the no build option, and we're not going to use that.

CAREY MAYNARD-MOODY: I would object.

DEBBIE PETERSON: A majority of people vote. You've got to start weighing and balancing stuff. What options can we scrap? What options could we make adaptations to so they work.

CAREY MAYNARD-MOODY: Public transportation.

DEBBIE PETERSON: I don't know if we're ready to address that with this group. It's something that needs to be added. Anyone that tries to get to Kansas City or Topeka knows there needs to be public transportation, but it's not happening soon, and there's still the local transportation.

JOHN HUYLER: Debbie is challenging us. Anybody else want to speak to that one?

RON PURFLINGER: That's part of trying to build on what does have value. Get rid of the things that don't have value and set it aside.

I think if there was a consensus to take the valuable time we've got and do the doable rather than discuss things that aren't doable.

DENNIS DONALD: Allison, you had a comment?

ALLISON REBER: I guess it comes to a concern that the process that includes discussing and documenting the advantages and disadvantages of all of the options, including the no build option.

DENNIS DONALD: I think it's going to be there.

STAN LOEB: If you avoid it, you'll hang yourself if you don't have it. It doesn't mean it's the most viable. I'm not judging you. It's just you can't take it out. It has to be documented and in context with every other option.

DENNIS DONALD: I think Debbie is talking on another level. Every one of these is going to be in the EIS. The question is what does the community want to do?

ALLISON REBER: Are we really not having the cart before the horse? If you ask us the community representatives, to tell you what the preferred alignment is prior to EIS being complete, have we not done something wrong?

STAN LOEB: We have gone on long enough now where we have points clarified, but I don't think in the last 20 minutes or 30 minutes that you should resolve and throw out options.

DENNIS DONALD: I don't think we're going to try and do anything like that. But still the question is could this group without going through the EIS process come to any agreement, and I'm not sure you need to. What KDOT has asked for is not consensus. I'm saying it's some of the community dealing with this uncompleted road for a number of years. And I'm sensing that many with exception would like to see some kind of answer that deals with the problems.

RON PURFLINGER: This group is a small part of a very larger process. So the discussion of a no build in the terms of the EIS is really different than what I think the Osprey Group was brought to do.

The Osprey Group was brought to try and tap our heads a little bit and see what comes out.

I would like to expedite with the time we had and with this type of facilitated discussion to see what needs to come out. There used to be a saying that the sun was going to burn out in two hundred million years. So you have to finish I-35 in the dark.

The SLT we can probably throw that in there if we continue discussing it at this rate. We can try to find the doable and find some direction.

DENNIS DONALD: Let me turn it over to John to talk about where we would go from here and bounce it off of you.

JOHN HUYLER: When we started, some of you said what your wildest hopes were, and I said I think it's been better than civil. I think it was productive.

I think the question before you is, given what we know about how the EIS is involved, given how we also know in the past how the community of Lawrence has not been able to get together in the face of the SLT.

Do you think it's good use of your time to meet a couple more times having been informed by what you heard here and keep having this kind of a civil and hopefully creative dialogue in order to a uniformed process. Everyone has got plenty of meetings to go to. We don't presume that you need more meetings, but I do believe that there's the possibility for understandings that didn't exist before. I think, Sue, you said point blank and, Bill, you said that point blank. You can say I'm wrong with this, but let me put on the table a proposal for two more meetings in which we do the same thing but we conform by the discussion. It can happen after we done our summary and you can read the transcript. Let me see where each of you is coming from and which of you would be interested.

RANDY WESEMEN: Yes. I don't think we have any choice but move forward with the discussion.

JOHN HUYLER: You'd be willing to do it again?

RANDY WESEMAN: I love meetings.

JOHN HUYLER: Karen?

KAREN SWISHER: I'm pretty good at meetings.

JIM TURRENTINE: Generally I seen it to be a little more productive and move along faster. Have a subset, not quite this many people and then have those people come back to the whole group.

JOHN HUYLER: Do you want to be on or off that subset?

JIM TURRENTINE: I'd like to reserve the meeting to the second time, depending on what happens the next time.

JOHN HUYLER: So one more?

JIM TURRENTINE: Yes.

CAREY MAYNARD-MOODY: I'd like to reserve meeting the second time, depending on what happens then.

JOHN HUYLER: So one more?

CAREY MAYNARD-MOODY: One more.

STAN LOEB: The University of Kansas will always be in attendance.

SUE HACK: I think I'm very interested, and I think we all ought to be together. I think we've come a long way.

LARRY PARKIN: No. It had to be more productive.

BECKY MANLEY: I think the initial meeting. I fear if someone steps out the representation will not be complete.

JOHN HUYLER: Becky said if someone stepped out, the representation would not be complete. So we should hold seats open and ask the question who needs to be here.

BOB JOHNSON: I don't think anyone will ever accuse us of being hurried in this process, but I'm kind of in the same boat with Carey and Sue. If we have two more meetings, I'll skip the next one and go to the last one. If there's a need for a meeting, we'll reach no conclusion in the next one, and I hope we can do it for one more.

JOHN HUYLER: What if it were one more and at the end of that, but we would do our best to not have it take more than one more time?

BOB JOHNSON: I'd come to one more.

SUE HACK: Ron bought up, if we could get some sort of process going and get us moving around little dots to get things going so we can get a sense of what we are and what it's about. That might be a good productive method.

JOHN HUYLER: If we all agree, plus we are all informed about what happened tonight, we can engage you much more.

JUDY DEHOSE: I was in the meetings held Boulder and we discussed this and it was pretty much what we did tonight. But we went more into details of each of the alignments. It's my understanding that if the comments that the Board of Regents made, that was the very first time that KDOT ever came to give them all the detailed information, and that meeting didn't turn out to be as confrontational as though, and they had gotten more information from that one meeting than they have ever gotten in all these years.

So I'm kind of thinking as a newcomer that this whole process I think what we're doing now is 10 years later. I think this should have been done 10 years ago with all the input that we're getting tonight. But I think we all understand where we're coming from. I think the bottom line, is the ones that play a key part in this whole thing is the wetlands and it's location between three educational institutions of Kansas, KU and Baker and Haskell.

And that has to play a major part in all the development.

Yes, the community does exist but I understand, understand half of them have jobs elsewhere. So we need this road to get out to get to work. This gentleman here is the planner and he's talking about planning 25, 50 years in the future. Yet I hear of

concerns that are basically within neighborhood owners within little sections.

I think we need to be planning with this plan out there to make sure Topeka is growing, Kansas City, Missouri is growing. Pretty soon they are all going to be connected. What does this do to traffic in the long-range plans. And that has to be considered not just taking care of 23rd Street, but taking care of 31st. We're talking big time here.

And something that has to be considered, but I've been sitting here listening to all of you and I'm really glad to hear all of what your point of views are, and if we can sit at a table and discuss in a civilized manner, and we are all citizens of Kansas and we all have to live together, tomorrow, 100 years from now, and I think the past history has happened. But right now Haskell has just a little piece of land, and we would like to protect that and even though 31st goes right across there, we still don't like it, but we may have to work with it, and I'm not sure how that's going to go, but there's many major problems that faces Kansas.

So I think a meeting like this for me is productive for the first time.

RON PURFLINGER: I would like to see this thing continued because the important thing that I would think should whoever sets up a process that has an end that has a goal and we find that goal and realize there's going to be disappointments and we have to make a decision because the worst thing that can happen is for us as a community to give KDOT no direction, and then complain about the result. And that's what we've been doing now for 15 years, and it's got to end.

STEVE SUBLETTE: We had a vote 10 years ago that said complete the traffic, Ron, but there was fellas that changed that but ever since we started, we haven't given any decision. If this is going to have any purpose, if this meeting was going to have any purpose, you've got to get this.

STAN ROSS: We would like to have another meeting, but we would like to take the opportunity of these other meetings to get an understanding or give you an understanding of where we come from. The educational, environment, historical impacts of building this road through the Haskell property, we haven't even scratched the surface of it yet. We

would like the opportunity to share this and we would be happy talking about a bypass. Do you remember what the first bypass was in Lawrence? They said it was 23rd Street. Do you know what that second bypass was? A street. That may tell you where this might be heading.

DEBBIE PETERSON: A lot of people in my neighborhood haven't had the opportunity to hear them and now I can share with them. There are some neighbors that feel they are ready to sue, and they don't feel they got what they voted for.

STEVE SUBLETTE: I would go to one more meeting if you can put out something came to this meeting with that sheet what progress has been made and what effect this will have on KDOT and then show me what kind of an effect we have with one more meeting. Otherwise, it's pointless.

ALLISON REBER: I agree. I would be interested in one more meeting. However, I would not want the outcome, whatever outcome out to affect the EIS process.

JOHN HUYLER: So based on that our proposal, we would like to do a summary as we said. You can all have access to the transcript. I think it's going to take very careful work with you, not only about the goals of the next meeting, but also about the process we viewed. So I would think we don't want to rush that meeting. It should happen a month or so down the road so that there's time to do it right rather than fast. I would ask you if you would like them to go for one more meeting or by email.

JUDY DEHOSE: I don't think there's a way that a decision on the advantages and disadvantages of 42nd Street could have been made tonight because we had many questions in Boulder, which the main issue was probably in all the alignments. It's going to save time and we're talking how much time we're talking about. I mean that hasn't even been done, and the one thing that came out of that Boulder meeting was that there was hope that 42nd was actually being addressed. 42nd Street was actually on a map as it was bought up.

JOHN HUYLER: I will state the area we have to take in structuring in the next meeting. And, Larry,

would you work with us to find someone from Baker that would participate?

LARRY PARKIN: You have to get a direction, not four hours of chatter.

JOHN HUYLER: And we'll talk with you about how to do that.

STEVE SUBLETTE: I don't want to meet until we have the environmental statement completed.

JOHN HUYLER: That seems like a counter proposal at this point in time.

STEVE SUBLETTE: We want to move this forward. If we're going to be blowing smoke, I don't want to be part of it.

JOHN HUYLER: We'll meet with you individually and pick a date and have one that's agreeable with all of you. We appreciate and are grateful for all of you to be here. If you want to reserve a seat or if there's another organization that wants to reserve a seat at the table, let us know.

BOB JOHNSON: Excuse me, John. I'm not sure I agree with that because we can go on and on and on and if you leave that door open and we can come back with twice as many people. I think you started it, you should follow through with it.

JOHN HUYLER: I would certainly use it. There's a whole lot of help.

BOB JOHNSON: There's a whole lot of reputations around this table.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I also feel that when you talk about the history of this area, to say that it's strictly a matter of Native American history is what has occurred here. the history here is part of a particular representatives of history. It is local history of Lawrence as the underground railroad and bloody Kansas, what happened at Haskell. Haskell being the largest boarding school, it being the principle discrimination camp.

I want my two children to recognize it as something that existed here and that there's a future in our community in what happens to these wetlands,

This is part of us. This is part of our local history. Something that my children should recognize, our sense of Lawrence, and I'm not talking it all in a negative sense, but I don't see that element learned here.

JOHN HUYLER: Thank you.

AUDIENCE MEMBER:

JOHN HUYLER: Let's do a critique of this meeting. Bob, when in the last minutes of this meeting, can you give us the updated matrix, the advantages and disadvantages? We'll try to summarize from the matrix.

I would like to just get a brief critique of this meeting by putting two columns, plus and minus to summarize what worked and what didn't work. What the food was like. Let's hear from the group so we can improve things next time.

CAREY MAYNARD-MOODY: Bringing us closer together. Sitting too far apart. Too much distance and I was pretty cold, but I know I was under a vent.

BOB JOHNSON: I got nervous with the public at my back.

JOHN HUYLER: We'll have the public at our back.

SUE HACK: I think it was a huge group. People represented different facets of Lawrence, and I think it's a long time without a break or getting up or moving around or reconfiguring things. I think from an educational standpoint.

JOHN HUYLER: It's a long time for us too. However long your meeting goes is how long our meeting goes. If it's four hours of business will take up that long of time. I wonder if we need to start differently? We wanted people who had jobs to take them to five or seven to come. I think we better talk to you individually about it. There's always a Saturday option.

CAREY MAYNARD-MOODY: If you save half hour introductions.

JOHN HUYLER: Other comments?

LARRY PARKIN: More structure and ending goals and not just hanging.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I would appreciate a microphone. I suspect I heard 40 percent of what was said. So I don't think very well kept up on what was going on.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: I am really glad to be here tonight. I'm glad everyone is here to discuss this issue. However, what comes to my mind is that everyone should realize that I think we need more information. This is just the tip of the iceberg and there's a lot of details about every aspect that needs to be discussed. General views and opinions, but I think we need more information about the wetlands, the organisms, the road, different alternatives. I don't see this as an incomplete project at all because this is the way it was presented.

My wife used to ride a school bus across with the 1250 Road which is 35th Street when the wetland stopped being farmed. To the gentleman from Baker, the Baker wetlands is a natural resource, but it isn't in fact true that the Baker wetlands are natural. How much of it is man made and how much it is natural.

JIM TURRENTINE: The Baker wetlands were attempted to be turned into farmland and that failed.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: There was an editorial paper September 4 from a gentleman who lived in Douglas County for years.

He stated that as he called them the Haskell bottoms were farmed up until the 1960's. I remember riding school bus down a dusty road through the wetlands, but most people believe it's a natural area.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: No, ma'am. The misinformation that these people are expressing is the exact reason why these people, that's why the WPO is having problems explaining why we don't want them on the wetlands complex, and there's a lot of misinformation being relayed to the City. It's always been a wetland.

AUDIENCE MEMBER: Something might be of interest to you. All the people in the planet have a time

line. The time line for the City, the County, the school districts all of KU, Baker, Haskell and the time line of everything that has occurred from the trafficway from the beginning and go back to the aboriginal tribes that belong here and who can have aboriginal rights and that's when this whole bottom thing started. You have to look at everything.

JOHN HUYLER: I want to thank you for coming and taking your time in engaging in this.

C E R T I F I C A T E

I, GLORIA J. STEINLE, a Certified Shorthand Reporter in and for the State of Kansas, do hereby certify that I appeared at the time and place first hereinbefore set forth, that I took down in shorthand the entire proceedings had at said time and place, and that the foregoing constitutes a true, correct, and complete transcript of my said shorthand notes.

Gloria J. Steinle, CSR