

**Commuter Park and Ride
Steering Committee Meeting Notes**
June 6, 2013
11:00 a.m. to 12:00 p.m.

Attendees

Name	Organization	Email	Phone
Eileen Horn	Lawrence/Douglas County	ehorn@lawrencecks.org	785-330-3121
Chris Tilden	Lawrence/Douglas County Health Department	ctilden@ldchealth.org	785-856-7312
Keith Browning	Douglas County Public Works	kbowning@douglas-county.com	785-832-5293
Bob Nugent	Lawrence Transit	rnuget@lawrencecks.org	785-832-3464
Chuck Soules	Lawrence Public Works	csoules@lawrencecks.org	785-832-3123
Allison Smith	KDOT	allisons@ksdot.org	785-296-0341
Todd Girdler	L-DC MPO Staff	tgirdler@lawrencecks.org	785-832-3155
Jessica Mortinger	L-DC MPO	jmortinger@lawrencecks.org	785-832-3165
Britt Crum-Cano	City of Lawrence	bcano@lawrencecks.org	785-832-3472
Peg Livingood	KU-DCM	peggyl@ku.edu	785-864-5627
Jim Meyer	URS	jim.meyer@urs.com	312-577-6458
David Kocour	URS	david.kocour@urs.com	913-344-1058
Nalini Johnson	URS	nalini.johnson@urs.com	913-344-1033

Following introductions J. Meyer began the meeting with a Powerpoint presentation. The following notes provide reference to the slides and comments or questions generated as a result.

1. Meeting Agenda
2. Project Schedule – the first open house was held on Wednesday, June 5th. Online mapping has been active for approximately one month and will continue until mid-July. During the next month the project team will be reaching out to agencies/stakeholders to schedule meetings. An online survey will be available in August. A second open house will be held at the end of September or early October. A draft report will be available in October with a final report due by the end of the year.
3. Interactive Online Mapping – have received approximately 30 comments from the park and ride interactive map, and a few additional comment cards provided at the June 5, 2013 public meeting. Most comments are coming from bike users or people interested in the bikeways system.
4. Key Themes from Open House
 - a. Need for existing and future park and ride locations to connect to local bus services.
 - b. Utilize the park and ride locations for KU events

5. Evaluation Methodology – The purpose of the Commuter Park and Ride Study was provided. Potential park and ride sites have been previously identified in a number of studies. The project team began with the premise of providing facilities for the Lawrence Area and for the communities of Baldwin City, Eudora, and Lecompton. The evaluation criteria was presented to the Steering Committee and discussion followed:
 - a. Access to I-70 and other major corridors is important to consider, along with adequate transit connections. The I-70 Commuter Bus Feasibility Study is looking at the potential for regional bus service along the corridor; however, this study will not identify potential park and ride facilities or explore detailed connections to local transit services. This is where this study comes in. Question: how far do we go in identifying these areas? Level of specificity, type of facility, agreements, full build out of a publicly- owned facility versus striking agreements or continuing informal relationships with parking lot owners around town, etc.?
 - b. Looking at the potential to serve Baldwin City, Eudora, Lecompton. Will likely result in different facilities.
 - c. Two types of commuter facilities discussed – 1) Rideshare function that addresses auto/rideshare uses only vs. 2) full park and ride facilities with connections to regional and local transit, while also accomodating carpooling/ride sharing. Need evaluation criteria and objectives.
 6. Potential Locations – Rideshare; park and ride
 - a. KU Park and Ride is open to students, faculty and staff with designated parking permits and to the general public with ten hour metered parking. This is really the only formal park and ride that currently exists in the Lawrence Area.
 - b. Comments from SC members: Is it feasible for the City to buy and develop a greenfield site for a Park and Ride facility as opposed to a site that is already developed with existing infrastructure. From a Public Works perspective is it better to lease and negotiate with current lot owners than to pave and put stormwater improvements in to create a new facility. Likely to be expensive. The response from transit operations staff was that in some cases it is too late to negotiate since we are already in the midst of informal rideshare operations occurring on these prove lots and we already need some park & ride lots with convenient ties to local transit routes. If we had wanted to negotiate with private property owners to formalize those informal rideshare lot activities and/or to use part of private lots for full service park and ride locations – then those negotiations should have happened long ago.
 - c. It is also important that any site that is being considered be treated carefully with the public. Otherwise the land will go up in price if the owners get wind that the city has interest in a particular site, thus raising the value / cost of the site.
 - d. J. Meyer indicated that a certain level of detail is required in order to be able to overlay specific concept plans custom-made to a particular location. Each site would be treated differently as far as the proposed design. We need to know where, relative to the system, the land would be, in order to determine what the best configuration and type of development would be ideal for that site in order to provide the right park and ride solution. For example, regarding a 2nd Street location, an L-shape using adjacent parcels would provide for internal circulation and an alternate access into the park and ride facility which would be the ideal development.
 - e. SC member: Can we put a caveat in the report about potential locations and best practices or siting criteria for park and ride facilities without showing specific site details? Perhaps a large circle overlaying a few adjacent parcels to show the general

- vicinity for a proposed park and ride when presenting the proposal to the public. Response: each site is unique and will likely require different levels of analysis.
- f. Land use around the K-10/US40 interchange is pretty dynamic right now. Difficult to identify specific park and ride opportunities at this time.
 - g. Each potential site will need to be looked at individually as it appears there is no cookie cutter approach that can be used for every site. Are there any city/county properties that could be utilized?
 - h. One has already been identified at the former Farmland site. However, this site has already been platted and the parking provides for only 20-30 spaces, not enough for a park and ride facility. Can the area be expanded to the parcels west of the Farmland site, where there are properties that are somewhat blighted? It is understood that the owners have had a difficult time filling the commercial spaces and they might be willing to sell. There is a trail around there and it would be a good bus transfer point to switch from/to bikes/transit/autos.
 - i. K-10/US 59 location has the theater lot which is empty most of the time, but land to the east of US59 is off-limits. What would a park and ride agreement do to the theater near K-10 /US59? Is there some way to encourage off-loading at various points? A positive is that there is a trail that runs between K-10 and the theater lot. In fact, there are bike racks on hotel property, indicating that hotel guests might be encouraged to ride.
 - j. Facilities need to be safe and secure. Other jurisdictions with park and ride facilities near interstates involve Highway Patrol monitoring the facilities to avoid giving criminals a signal that the cars are not being monitored by owners nearby because they are in other locales further away. Also, other lots are sometimes used to showcase cars with "for sale" signs. In these cases, the troopers would tag these autos. People want to know their car will be okay and there when they get back. Another option is to ask the Police Department to drive by at least once a day?
 - k. Eudora would like to access the K-10 Connector which is not at capacity contrary to belief.
 - l. The current situation at Eudora with cars parking on ramps, shoulders, and ditches at K-10 interchange is somewhat of a problem. City has plans for the KDOT owned land on the south part of the city to be used to help alleviate that problem. KDOT was talking about giving some property to the City and should probably be investigated. A. Smith said she would followup.
 - m. There is a need to formalize the Eudora Church Street site, which has 24-hour truck parking as well.
 - n. The 23rd Street corridor has no city-funded facility because the commercial lots are too expensive per square foot relative to other locations in town. The north side of the City presents better opportunities in this regard.
 - o. Could you mark parking spaces with a green color striping in some parking lots to denote park and ride parking spaces.
 - p. Need to look for shorter term cost effective solutions and then identify longer term solutions.
 - q. One member envisions the park and ride lots evolving over time by starting with a rideshare lot.
 - r. What about the empty lots at Clinton Parkway and Wakarusa?
 - s. What about the ballfields there?

- t. What about the sports facility below Clinton dam that nobody really uses during the day, or Holcolm? What about other parks? This area would be a rideshare possibility, because there are no real transit connection opportunities or justification. What about Rock Chalk Park?
- u. There is a spot where the bank used to be right outside Baldwin City.
- v. What about creating partnership agreements with other providers such as Greyhound, KDOT, other transit agencies, airport shuttles, etc.?
- w. Can we organize text by short, medium and long-term priorities and proposals by location? Can URS provide a resource for best practices, wayfinding, website, information about how to use the facility, incentives, signage, bus/no bus, enhanced connectors to local transit or destinations, etc.? Are there any guidelines for how many parking spots a park and ride should have? Can URS research more on specs of a Park and Ride facility? Alternatives? What do they look like? Modes of transportation covered or encouraged?
- x. What about environmental issues such as emissions such as encouraging electric or hybrid vehicles? We are not eliminating trips, just vehicle miles traveled by auto when transportation alternatives are provided. If the area becomes non-attainment the MPO will need to encourage things like park and ride that will reduce VMT.
- y. Will look for opportunities to provide connectivity to bike/ped trails. “Build it and they will come”. Add bike racks at transit stations to increase bicycle use. Pedestrian and bicycle amenities encourage use of alternative modes of transportation. Can we identify pedestrian amenities that would be needed to improve use?