

## **Public Open House**

Tuesday, June 21, 2011 from 4 to 6:30 PM CST

Central Branch – Kansas City Public Library

14 W. 10<sup>th</sup> Street, Kansas City, Mo. 64105

A public open house was held to discuss the Downtown Corridor Alternatives Analysis (AA) on June 21, 2011 from 4 to 6:30 p.m. in Helzberg Auditorium at the Central Branch of the Kansas City Public Library (14 W. 10<sup>th</sup> Street) in Kansas City, Mo. Short, identical presentations were given at 4:30 and 5:30 p.m. The purpose of the meeting was to provide targeted stakeholder groups and the general public and media with an overview of the Downtown Corridor AA as well as to:

- Share information about the:
  - Purpose and need for the AA.
  - How the AA differs from previous efforts.
  - Planning process and schedule for the AA.
  - Differences between transit modes, such as the modern street car and circulator bus.
  - Alignment alternatives for a potential, fixed-guideway starter line.
  - Eventual development of a Locally Preferred Alternative (LPA) and general financing strategies for it.
- Gather feedback on:
  - Purpose and need for the AA.
  - Preferred transit modes and starter line alignments.

A total of 113 people attended the open house in addition to the project team. Attendees included local public officials and staff, downtown residents, business representatives, neighborhood groups, umbrella agencies, advocacy groups, and television, print, and radio news media. Notice was provided via press release, [www.smartmoves.org](http://www.smartmoves.org), email blast, bus bulletin, Facebook, and stakeholder meeting announcements. An overview of the information presented at the meeting, general comments, comment card responses, and other comments are included below.

### **Handouts and Exhibits**

Handouts provided to meeting participants included:

- Meeting overview handout
- Project fact sheet

- Project comment form
- Meeting evaluation form

Meeting participants were encouraged to review the following exhibits:

- Welcome: Relevant meeting information
- Overview: Project description
- Process and Schedule: General project details
- Project Purpose and Need: Purpose and need statement
- Modes of Transit: Circulator bus and modern streetcar comparison
- How to Pay for It: Guiding principles and potential sources of funding
- Next Steps: Planning process activities for July – September 2011
- Stay Informed: [www.smartmoves.org](http://www.smartmoves.org)

### **General Summary of Comments**

Fifty (50) hardcopy and 14 electronic comment cards were returned to the project team plus other comments received in a variety of ways, e.g. by email, phone, or letter, during the weeks that followed the open house. Generally, the feedback received related to:

- **Improve transit downtown:**
  - For visitors, residents, and workers alike
  - Due to issues with the current bus system (general and MAX), e.g. timing/scheduling, confusing routes
  - Better connect destinations
  - Improve convenience
  - Decrease dependence on the automobile
  - Improve the urban core and spur development
  - Help Kansas City compete with other cities
- **Agreement on the purpose and need statement**, noting that the starter line could:
  - Trigger economic development and encourage infill
  - Support continual growth downtown
  - Represent permanent downtown investment
  - Create better transit connections and circulation, particularly for short trips
  - Be the beginning of fixed-guideway transit in Kansas City
  - Support tourism

- **Interest in the modern streetcar** because it would:
  - Use permanent rails
  - Be a predictable, fixed route circulator
  - Have a positive connotation/perception
  - Offer an easy riding experience
  - Demonstrate permanence of investment
- **Interest in all of the alignment alternatives**
  - Most comments focused on Main Street and the Main Street/Walnut couplet and other provided alternatives but one respondent suggested that Wyandotte Street be studied among the alignment alternatives.
- **Other comments**
  - Excited about the project.
  - Connections into or through the City Market – Additional detail and presentation requested.
  - Potential for expansion and connection with other transit routes
  - Integration and accommodation of bicycles with the starter line
  - Expanded bus service as a better mode choice than streetcar
  - Consideration and accommodations for the Performing Arts and Sprint Centers events and/or activities.
  - Request for additional streetcar details, .e.g. operations, hours of service, funding mechanisms, potential rider fares/ticketing, potential ridership, timing for construction, etc.

### **Verbatim Comments from Comment Cards**

The comment forms provided to meeting participants during the meeting and via the project webpage included the four questions below and resulted in the answers included with each.

- **Do you think there is a need for improved transit downtown? Why?**
  - Yes. Many times we (my office) want to go other places during the day for lunch, the walk from 10<sup>th</sup> and Main to Crossroads is just too long for a quick lunch. I used to live downtown and I would have much rather not used my car to drive and run errands.
  - Yes. For people living downtown – MAX was a nice try to get around the city but is late, makes irregular stops and is generally another bus route. For visitor – a simple system to drop them at all stops and city offices.

- Overall, yes. The MAX does a good job, but there are too many stops along the route. I think, a free, streetcar(s) would be more popular and would help KC be seen as a progressive city.
- Absolutely. Our public transportation is nearly non-existent. To recruit creative people to our city, to decrease our sprawl and wasted infrastructure dollars on it, and to bring us into the modern world, a real public transportation system is a must.
- I feel improved downtown transit frequency and appeal would benefit tourism, marketability, and access to downtown “attractions” for both suburbanites and visitors to the city. Urban dwellers would also benefit.
- Primarily as a means to increase connectivity from the River Market to Crown Center. Also as a tool for economic development.
- Yes, would encourage people movement, ease of access, fewer cars trying to park, people more apt to venture further for lunch/dinner/outings.
- Yes. It is hard to figure out the existing system. I can’t figure out the MAX system. What it is, where it goes, how much it costs. It looks like something I might find useful. I just can’t figure out how it works.
- Come on – R u kidding? Of course!
- Yes. Visitors to our city never get to see our beautiful city. They are just kind of lost downtown. I have talked with many of them over the years. We need the starter so people can get around downtown and hopefully want to expand it to other areas.
- Yes. Current bus routes don’t appear to be well utilized for short trips to and from different parts of downtown.
- Yes. Need less reliance on single passenger auto.
- Yes – Downtown is thriving but to maintain residential and employment growth, transit is required. Transit is essential to achieving our goals.
- Yes. It is too difficult to use the present system.
- Yes – But I do think the MAX service is a good start.
- Absolutely – Downtown is the perfect area to start developing a system to make KC less car-dependent.
- I rarely use transit because it isn’t convenient. I think transit will help increase residents (downtown) and help us become a major city and not just a region of suburbs.
- 1) Connecting KC’s various downtowns is important. 2) will promote living in urban core and sustain office/retail area.

- Yes indeed. The better folks can move around, the better the flow of commerce and \_\_\_\_\_ business that takes place in KC.
- Yes – Because the current system is atrocious.
- Yes, we need to keep up with our urban centers around the country. If we don't increase options, all we will have is a landscape of parking garages and lots.
- Yes – Short trips and tourists.
- Yes. I think it is time for KC to join other cities in providing an eco-friendly, mass transit option.
- Yes.
- Yes, become less auto dependent.
- Yes. Because right now downtown KC is still car-centric. Having a streetcar would help eliminate some two car dependence in downtown.
- Yes. Improved/alternate transportation will allow increased public opportunities to shop, dine, and live in the downtown area without working about parking/traffic.
- Keep from waiting on regular buses most up to an hour.
- Yes. I think improved transit to serve a growing residential population and visitors would be an asset to continuing the growth and development of downtown.
- Yes! In the last year gas prices seem to have pushed use up and the MAX/KCATA/Jo Bus are crowded, confusing, and not useful for day to day trips (groceries, household shopping).
- Yes. Cars take up much space, \_\_\_ physically and psychologically in our urban life.
- Yes – It would help people get from place to place with greater comfort.
- Yes, easy access to areas that fell too close together to drive to but feel like a long walk.
- Yes!! Autos dominate here...boo. Get us some bike, ped, multi-modal transit.
- Yes, there is a need for a spine-like service for the Metro.
- Yes. Kansas City used to have great streetcar live and downtown has suffered ever since they too that car out. KC is behind other major cities when it comes to mass transit.
- Yes, to connect and improve the urban core.

- No! Frankly, I am shocked and disappointed at the idea, when the greatest need for transportation is in the Northland (North Counties). Plenty of buses serve the downtown area as well.
- Timeliness – Bus always off schedule. Concise route.
- Yes – So long as there are economic development improvements that support additional ridership.
- Yes, because we have to start somewhere to replace the auto as the primary transportation vehicle.
- Residents and visitors need to be persuaded that driving around looking for parking places, especially when events occur that increase density, however temporary, leads to frustration and energy waste. A convenient, frequent alternative mode would do that.
- Yes. Simplifications of existing KCATA bus routes citywide.
- Yes. Rail has proven to add density over time which is essential to KC's long term success. Also, better transit is essential for many low income residents who rely on it for access to jobs.
- Improve transit in the whole region! We are behind other cities offering transit. This is a better investment than more roads and parking. Senior and low income population needs it. Others want it.
- Yes – Get rid of cars. Horrible to pedestrians.
- Yes, downtown has seen significant redevelopment in the last 5-10 years and the number of people traveling within the corridor seems sufficient to support a system. Reduces congestion, reduces emissions.
- Yes.
- Yes – All easily identifiable modes of public transportation for those of us who come downtown occasionally.
- Yes. We need to change the prevailing automobile-centric mindset and I think it'll take rail transit to do it.
- Yes. If Kansas City wishes to improve its urban core, then it needs a dedicated transit corridor. This means a dedicated right-of-way for either a streetcar or true BRT.
- Yes. Consistent, on-time, high-profile, high frequency, weekend and night time transportation is needed.
- Yes, with proper planning, downtown transit could be much faster than it is today.
- Absolutely. I work downtown and would love to see an improved transit system. I'm even more excited about the long-term possibility of a transit

system which helps me commute to work more quickly and efficiently, but I understand that this is an important first step. My primary fear is that all of this discussion and effort will result in a recommendation to simply improve the bus system. In my opinion, that would be a very disappointing and short-sighted proposal, even considering the obvious financial ease of such a recommendation. The reputation of the bus system is already low and its complete reliance on the existing traffic network will never allow it to be highly-utilized no matter the improvements. A rail system absolutely must be developed eventually for KC to be competitive, so we might as well start on it sooner rather than later.

- Absolutely. Our downtown is quite spread out considering the number of people. Bus routes weave about and are confusing to people who do not ride often. Evening stops are infrequent and make it difficult to count on the bus with waits up to one hour (ie, 51 on weekends).
- Yes. Downtown needs to be able to more effectively compete with Johnson County for businesses and jobs. One way to make downtown more attractive is increased transit access. That said, almost all of Kansas City's urban core is starved for good transit. Downtown is not unique in this need.
- Absolutely. Kansas City, being one of the worst metro areas in the nation in regards to transit, needs to start somewhere. Downtown KC is a logical place to start.
- yes. a transit system that is utilized by a significant % of the population decreases pollution, parking issues, and gives more people an option not to have to depend on personal automobile transit.
- Absolutely. Street cars will expand transportation options and put a focus on downtown KC as the center of this region. With this long-term public investment in transportation, it will attract private development and build the case for the return of the streetcars in KC.
- Yes. What really needs to happen is a reduction in parking while increasing transit service. Limiting the number of spaces, and taxing them, would increase the incentive to use transit.
- The busses seem to run pretty regularly and traffic isn't much of a problem. I'd like to see some more bike lanes, but I don't know what, if any problems exist now.
- Yes! The bus routes are spread out all over and none of few of them are designed for getting around within the greater downtown area.
- Absolutely. 1. The easier it is to get around, the more likely people will feel comfortable coming/being downtown (locals and visitors). 2. Existing business/residential will grow which will attract new business/residential. 3. The perception is that KC is trailing other cities.

- Yes. Tourists, gas costs, urban/pedestrian experience, lessening the need for garage construction, increasing pollution, aging baby boomers...

- Yes. Our city has a dire need for an extensive public transportation system. This will serve as a great starting block for further public transportation in the Kansas City metro.
  - Yes. Buses run routes that change streets on a whim. Very few direct routes. The number 51 route is a prime example.
  - Yes, lack of clear, consistent, modern transport option to travel in this corridor creates a STILL consistent need for travel in ones own vehicle leading to too many parking garages, surface parking lots, and limited parking spaces at various destinations in this corridor. You have to start somewhere/sometime and this is the best 'starting option' we have discussed. Utilizing Union Station is key IMO.
  - Yes! It would be great for visitors and downtown workers to get some of the car traffic off the road
  - Yes, downtown growth requires transportation from the edges to the core city. Innovative transit systems produce growth business such as street cafes and boutiques. Denver is the best example.
  - Yes. I don't go downtown too often, but when I do it's always an adventure finding somewhere to park. I usually end up at the Park and Ride at River Market and just take the MAX to the locations I need.
  - There is definitely a need for improved transit downtown. In these times of ever rising fuel costs, an attractive alternative to driving is a necessity. Since the density of jobs, retail and activity centers downtown permit walking to your destination once you arrive on transit, downtown is the ideal place to start.
  - Yes I believe there is a need. I am a downtown resident and I rely on public transportation. I feel that downtown needs more night and weekend transportation, especially if it wants to attract large numbers of people in to downtown's entertainment districts. Also, offering a safe alternative to drinking and driving.
  - I do think there is a need for improved transit downtown and in the suburbs.
  - Yes. I don't think traffic is terrible downtown, but it would make it more accessible, and people more productive - if you could read a book or work on the way instead of driving. You would think it would make nightlife safer and more profitable considering people could hang out for happy hour after work and take a train home instead of driving or just skipping out on patronizing downtown businesses.
- I think there's something psychological about a STREETCAR vs. a bus, that makes it seem more reliable (you can see the tracks) and makes people more likely to take it.
- Yes. If Kansas City wishes to improve its urban core, then it needs a dedicated transit corridor. This means a dedicated right-of-way for either a streetcar or true BRT.



- Yes. Consistent, on-time, high-profile, high frequency, weekend and nighttime transportation is needed.
- **According to the Purpose and Need Statement for the Downtown Corridor Alternatives Analysis, “The purpose of the project is to provide an attractive transit option that will more conveniently connect people and places within the downtown corridor, and support regional and city efforts to develop Kansas City and the downtown corridor as a more attractive and successful urban center...The project is needed to help the downtown corridor connect, develop, thrive, and sustain”. Do you agree with the purpose and need statement? Why or why not?**
  - Yes. Various parts of downtown are thriving and having something like the car transit connect everything, everyone and allow for future expansion, would help accomplish all of these things; develop thrive and sustain. We need this to keep up with other downtowns.
  - Yes – Emphasis on downtown corridor. Appreciate the starter line approach. Walk before running.
  - Yes. Kansas City will never be a town with huge mass transit ridership. Instead a streetcar system will promote development in downtown and help downtown workers, residents, and visitors more easily move between areas.
  - Yes. I would substitute [as follows] “...The project is needed to help the downtown corridor continues to connect, develop, thrive, and sustain the downtown corridor.”
  - Yes. A big gripe of suburbanites about visiting downtown venues is parking availability close to their events. This kind of transit would make events accessible from numerous parking opportunities all along the line. This would boost downtown business and growth.
  - Yes. As a downtown residents I would like to see continued growth in both population and density of service. I believe urban transit will also appeal to conventions and out of town tourists.
  - Yes.
  - Yes. Most importantly, it needs to connect with the suburbs. If you can make it easy to get downtown from the suburbs, companies will want to locate downtown. That is what will make downtown develop and thrive. Then the corridor transportation will make it easy to move around once people get downtown.
  - Yes – Get people out of their cars and put feet on the street – Even for only 2 or 3 blocks.
  - I do agree. There are lots of people living downtown again (once there were neighborhoods). Those have been destroyed and housing with it and now

lofts and condos and apartments are bringing people back to live, many near their work. Then with visitors, convention people, and a need for good transportation that is bike and pedestrian friendly and gets away from the cars everywhere.

- Yes. Downtown is too big, particularly from north to south, for people to walk to and from different areas.
- Yes. Other cities that have adopted this approach have seen their downtowns thrive.
- Yes, the statement should be even bolder in its vision. Downtown must become the most attractive and successful urban center.
- Yes. Because it is important.
- Sounds good to me.
- I would like to see the development this would generate (yes).
- I agree, the city can be an exciting place and if it is accessible people want to come. People enjoy the cities that have transit and talk about how great they area. If we don't have a strong core our strong suburbs may deteriorate.
- Yes. Strong urban core is critical for maintaining and growing a strong city. Fixed streetcar transit will connect various core areas of KCMO's downtown into one core – working together instead of cross purpose.
- Yes.
- Yes – Must be attractive, convenient, affordable, and provide connectivity throughout downtown.
- Doesn't talk about current lack of options for travelers who desire transit service. Yes, there are existing bus routes but too many stops and not friendly for the casual 1 trip per week ride.
- Yes – To encourage developing with the corridor.
- Yes. Downtown KC is not convenient for getting around. Parking is difficult. If you want to go to more than one locations, it is difficult to do without moving your car and dealing with the same problems at each location.
- Yes.
- Yes.
- Yes. See above.
- Yes.
- Yes.

- Yes because the character of the neighborhoods is already there but connectivity is needed to draw bigger development. Improved transit expands development options and helps keep up the momentum in urban living, while also connecting tourists to other hubs.
- Yes. It represents a commitment and instills confidence.
- Yes – I feel this is accurate and well thought out.
- Yes. Connection is key with development needed between the nodes. In between development will only sustain with the something that constant brings people to/past it.
- Yes. All good things.
- Yes.
- Yes. Those are the fair things all cities need to stay important and “influential”.
- Yes, I am in agreement with items circles [connect, develop, thrive, and sustain].
- No, I disagree for the reasons stated above. Therefore, what you are proposing sounds like a waste of money.
- Yes.
- Yes – These types of projects are only successful when they area community asset.
- I like the statement but it seems too wordy.
- Agree. Removal, elimination or diminishing private auto use will help enormously to remove barriers to the kind of circulation opportunities that encourage residents and visitors to slow down, experience vibrant street life and support development of same.
- Yes, in that more direct investment in fixed transit will be beneficial. In addition, further care needs to be made concerning commuter connections not only to Jacomo but also the SW segment of the city.
- Yes. I think it is important for a vibrant urban center, which KC badly needs.
- Yes, we need to encourage more urban development and more infill building. Would make KC more “cool”, attracting people. Need obvious ways for visitors to get around.
- Yes – We can’t survive without a strong downtown.
- Yes, it identifies the right motivating factors (development, desire for convenience) that have been lacking in other efforts to develop fixed-guideway system.
- Yes.

- [attractive and successful] brings a real energy to downtown.
- I agree it's a good, concise statement but it is pretty general, and I don't find the bullet point approach on the display boards to be entirely satisfactory. I want to see narrative that "hangs together".
- I agree with the above statement. Kansas City needs to connect its urban neighborhoods. A stable transit system would also encourage infill development between neighborhoods, such as River Market, Crossroads and Union Hill. Eventually, such a line should reach 47th Street.
- Yes
- Mostly but I would expand it out to include the urban core to the Plaza. I feel like connecting the river to Crown Center is a good starting point but doesn't really do a whole lot on its own. Two miles is easily walkable, bikeable, and there's already plenty of bus service. I also don't think it would stop people from getting in their cars. Connecting the river to the Plaza with rail is a game changer.
- Yes. I work in the downtown business district and would utilize a 'true' transit system almost daily. (my definition of 'true' means something beyond simply buses)
- Yes. I think that making the route attractive includes making rail opportunities available. Rail does not have the stigma that the bus has, and rail is a good gateway to other public transportation options. As the downtown corridor is comprised of many segments and sub-areas, it is important to bridge those areas together, not only for tourists, but for the thousands of downtown loop workers who still have never heard of the Crossroads, etc.
- Somewhat. It is not entirely clear from the statement which people would be served. Downtown residents? Downtown workers who live elsewhere? Tourists?
- Yes.
- yes, all of it.
- Yes. Kansas City is built on a north south axis, and making all of these districts (River Market, Downtown Loop, Crossroads, and Crown Center) into one downtown will assist in the continued prosperity of all of them. Plus, it helps connect tourists and convention goers to a broader range of hotels, dining, and entertainment.
- I agree. We are quickly becoming a no man's land for development and visitor conventions. We must keep ourselves viable or we lose more each week that goes by.

- No; downtown is developing, thriving, and sustaining pretty well as it is. Though disconnected, getting people out on the streets through walking/biking would be better.
- Transportation for the masses in the downtown area and across the metro is absolutely needed and important.
- Yes. It's necessary to ensure downtown continues to thrive and grow without having to add more parking.
- Well stated.
- Yes. Public transit allows an urban resident and visitor access to the community. With a growing "critical mass" businesses see the "supply and demand" which, of course, creates the jobs and tax revenue.
- Yes. Connecting the river market, downtown, crossroads and crown center allows people to move from destination to destination without the hassle of driving and parking.
- Yes. There is this 'gap' between the south side of the loop and Crown Center. A lot of empty store fronts, and sidewalks that are in terrible condition.
- YES!!!
- Yes, having traveled to downtown KC and the Plaza area for many years, I can tell you I hate driving downtown then walking miles to get around.
- Yes. Especially with the increasing costs of gas public transit is becoming very important.
- I absolutely agree with the statement.
- Yes, I do. However, I think that you also should look at possibly making the street car a 24 hour line. Many cities have 24 hour transit, however, Kansas City does not.
- I agree with the Purpose and Need Statement because downtown Kansas City has been neglected for far long and it seems now that we finally are bringing back the people and events to Kansas City and making it a more attractive urban center
- Yes. I think 'attractive' and 'conveniently' are more than just promotional words. If the system is easy for people to understand it would mean thousands more riders per year. Tourists and locals.
- I agree with the above statement. Kansas City needs to connect its urban neighborhoods. A stable transit system would also encourage infill development between neighborhoods, such as River Market, Crossroads and Union Hill. Eventually, such a line should reach 47th Street.
- Yes.

- **Which mode of transportation, such as the modern streetcar or bus with a dedicated travel lane, do you prefer most for the downtown corridor? Why?**
  - I would prefer streetcar. I do not think a dedicated travel lane for buses is the best solution to our transit issues. I think there is a benefit to fixed tracks on the roads for retail and vendors.
  - Modern streetcar. See comments Re: MAX.
  - MODERN STREETCAR! A streetcar system has an appeal that a bus system can't match. On top of that, a streetcar system, using permanent rails, will offer better development opportunities since the route can't easily be switched to a different street.
  - Modern streetcar. We have a rapid bus line (MAX) and it is a joke.
  - Streetcars have a much more "permanent" routing and dependability which will encourage establishment of businesses along the line.
  - Streetcar. Will be more recognizable as a "circulator" than another bus.
  - Streetcar – There is a "stigma" about buses to many people – We are way behind times and other cities!
  - Modern streetcar. It has a more upscale feel that I think will be more widely received. Too much negative connotation with "riding the bus".
  - Streetcar – Lacks the negative stigma of the poor people riding the bus!!
  - Streetcar. Its affordable and attractive. Doesn't take as long to build. Probably won't break us. We can build it in phases if we decided to expand. Take up less space.
  - Modern streetcars. People just seem to like fixed rail vehicles a lot more than even the nicest buses.
  - Streetcar appears to spawn development.
  - Modern streetcar will establish the permanence required to attract redevelopment and retain business.
  - Modern streetcar. Can be used to put people to work in construction, cleaner, more efficient.
  - I like the idea of a fare card and side load buses – We need fast load/unload.
  - Streetcar – Would be more popular, lead to further extensions.
  - Streetcar, there is a cool factor there. A bus is a bus.
  - 1) Modern streetcar – Feels more like true fixed rail which creates stability and raise property values along routes.
  - Streetcar.

- Streetcar – More efficient, cleaner, greener, should spur economic development.
- Streetcar – Buses have a bad reputation in KC streetcar mode has more appeal to young and new transit riders.
- Modern streetcar shows a change in mode of travel.
- Streetcar. The bus system in KC isn't used because it's not convenient. And I like the idea of using electricity rather than fuel.
- Streetcar.
- Streetcar, need to keep up with peer cities.
- Streetcar because fix rail provide \_\_\_\_\_, certainly, and energy to transit option. Buses will not and cannot do this.
- Streetcar. Fixed route makes less congestion and easier to use.
- Modern streetcar. Give us something exciting just like we were given MAX.
- Modern streetcar. I think an option w/built-in infrastructure will have a greater economic impact and also appears easier to use for people unfamiliar with transit.
- I prefer a streetcar for the character and novelty as well as increased capacity.
- Modern streetcar = Predictable, long term transit improvement. BRT appears to be successful in KC.
- Streetcar because it can be built more easily and provide a \_\_\_\_\_.
- Streetcar – Seems much more “temporary travel” and quick access on and off. More friendly to standing.
- I thought you said the streetcar didn't need a dedicated lane.
- Streetcar - It's more permanent.
- Streetcar. It is more convenient than the bus.
- Modern streetcar – Less expensive than light rail, like sharing with bus lane, steps 3-4 blocks (like), and help with economic development.
- The buses are already doing an excellent job, and the system is already set up.
- Streetcar.
- If the ridership is there, streetcar. Bus would be a lot more affordable.
- BRT is cheaper but streetcars are sexier, and to get the public to accept public transportation let's go with sex appeal first.
- Streetcar. Case studies, focus groups and anecdotal evidence support conclusion that people regard streetcar or fixed rail transportation over buses.

- Modern streetcar for clarity of route and permanence of investment.
- Modern streetcar. I think the permanence of rail is important for other lines to connect to it and to spark the development around it. It is cheaper to expand for increase ridership also.
- Streetcar but I use and like the bus too. Streetcars seem more permanent, dependable. I hope will create business development like trams and streetcars in Atlanta, Chicago, Seattle.
- Streetcar – Permanence makes it always visible. In people’s view bus disappears.
- Modern streetcar, especially if it can be operated with clean energy, for the noise reduction, and emission reduction benefits.
- Streetcar.
- Streetcar.
- Streetcar hands down. I’d like to see it in reserved lanes, even though that requires “prying” those lanes away from the traffic engineers.
- Whatever is chosen needs the following: off board ticketing, signal-priority, dedicated right-of-way. Ideally, the vehicles should travel down the middle of the roadway, with stations in the median. As such, I would prefer true BRT (similar to Cleveland's Health Line) to a streetcar that shares lanes with automobile traffic.
- Modern streetcar.
- I prefer modern streetcar with a dedicated lane. Without a dedicated lane and signal priority, I don't really feel like the expense of streetcar is worth it. Busses would be faster, and while that's not the whole equation, they're much cheaper. If a dedicated lane is an option for busses, why can't it be an option for streetcar? If a streetcar can get up to 40-50 mph, with a dedicated lane and signal priority, that'd be just as good as light rail. Especially if the Sanders commuter rail plan happens because those tracks would never connect to a light rail N-S spine since they're traveling E-W through the core.
- I 100% prefer a streetcar system. The buses just have too many flaws and too low of a reputation to ever be successful on the scale I envision.
- I favor a streetcar with a dedicated travel lane. The streetcar should be expandable to future North/South stops, capable to travel at a higher speed on long right of ways (50MPH+), and not easily impeded by traffic events such as Sprint Center events, First Fridays, rush hour (though rush hour is not normally that bad on proposed routes).
- I like certain aspects of both options, but ultimately I would prefer a modern streetcar with at-grade exclusive right-of-way and traffic signal priority.



Currently, a bus from River Market to Union Station can take 20 minutes. It would be a pity if the streetcar option didn't improve upon this.

- Modern Streetcar. The public needs to see something different in order to start thinking differently about transit.
- streetcars are easier to use
- Streetcar all the way. Buses with dedicated lanes can be moved and have proven to not drive private development decisions. Plus, we need to start thinking beyond the internal combustion engine as petroleum and the costs of maintaining bus fleets will increase over time.
- I support a streetcar system as long as it easily converts to something more modern such as Portland and other cities of similar size enjoy.
- Bus with dedicated travel lanes and tickets that can be purchased before boarding.
- Busses seem cheaper, more flexible and a better option all around. A streetcar seems mostly like a waste of money designed to be used by those who think busses are for poor people.
- Modern streetcar.
- Streetcar option is sexier and has a perception of being more modern and easier to locate/use
- I think to create a larger market you will have to appeal aesthetically which is anything but a bus. Modern streetcar. Or light rail. We need something more extensive than a bus system.
- If I had to choose between a streetcar or a bus, I would take the street car. At least it is on a direct route without changing streets.
- MODERN STREET CAR! As similar as the options may seem, it's amazing the 'Acceptance' and 'Willingness to Use' shown by citizens when the options is light rail/streetcar options. This mode is perceived as more SAFE, CLEAN, and ACCEPTABLE by a wider array of citizens than buses
- modern streetcar
- Modern street car along the lines of San Francisco would be the ultimate draw for tourism.
- I would prefer the streetcar. Personally I think that they look better and it offers (for the most part) a permanent route that buses just can't offer all of the time. Plus with a streetcar you can tell if it runs along a route because you can see the rails in the road. With buses you have to locate a sign to be sure and even then the routes can be confusing.
- For KC, modern streetcars are the perfect mode. Fixed guideway systems are

'permanent' and attract development. A bus can be there today and gone tomorrow and does little if anything to foster development.

- The Street car is my preference, because if this city wants to attract people and business's we need to give the impression that we are a modern and developing city that encourages environmental practices.
- Right now i use a car for my mode of transportation. And because of the poor public transportation
- The streetcar. I'd rather see something with it's own right of way, existing outside of traffic, whether it's above, below or around.
- Whatever is chosen needs the following: offboard ticketing, signal-priority, dedicated right-of-way. Ideally, the vehicles should travel down the middle of the roadway, with stations in the median. As such, I would prefer true BRT (similar to Cleveland's Health Line) to a streetcar that shares lanes with automobile traffic.
- Modern streetcar.

• **Which alignment alternative do you prefer most for the downtown corridor? Why?**

- Alt. 7.
- Couplet up Grand with City Market and reconnecting with \_\_\_\_\_ at Pershing. The Market and Crown Center must be included or the line is not valuable for KC residents or visitors.
- I would prefer either Main or Baltimore. Main is the logical first choice and offers a very straight route. The drawback to Main is that it is starting to get heavily congested in the loop with people coming downtown to park for P&L, Midland, and Sprint Center.
- I prefer a couplet route up Grand, through the actual city market, down Baltimore/Main and reconnecting to Grand in front of the Weston on Pershing.
- Main Street/Walnut, preferably on Main.
- I believe Alt #6 makes the most sense in terms of connecting both the River Market and Union Station. Mr. Kemper is already underway with "Grand on Grand" and Grand is sometimes closed for Sprint Center events.
- As long as it comes to the River Market, it is great. Our preference is to loop around the City Market rather than go through it.
- Modern streetcar bi-directional. 3 blocks to Sprint Center and 3 blocks to convention center. Right in the middle.
- Simple, re-concentrated single rail on Main – Closer to Kauffman than Grand.

- My only preference is to put it through the center of attractions when possible but not through a street that is closed a lot i.e. Grand Boulevard – Not great thinking or planning on that one – Wrecked our nice street with Sprint Center. Put it where it makes sense.
- I prefer utilizing Grand Boulevard and Main Street because they are often wider than other streets, and utilizing two streets has the potential of attracting more riders.
- Grand Street with one street. Direct line least cost. Other areas could have shuttle connections.
- Main Street is the best route serving the CBD and provides the best connection to expansion to the south.
- Electric.
- Alt 2 Main Street with River Market Loop also Alt 3 with River Market Loop. Central location.
- Couplet – Grand and Walnut.
- Baltimore route. It is close to the residents and convention hotels. It needs to run to attractions and neighborhoods. Residents will use downtown shopping if we can get to it without getting our cars and heading to the suburbs.
- 1) Up and back along Main Street 2) Up Walnut Street and back down Main Street.
- Main – Baltimore.
- Whatever route/concept selected, Main must be a part of it. Union Station must serve a hub for all future mass transportation –
- Alt 2 or 6. Central. Grand at Sprint Center closed too often, need strong connection to Union Station.
- Single route or couplet but couplet if they encourage wider development.
- Alt 6. You won't have to worry about interference from/with events at the Sprint Center. And the couplet "shares the love" more than the bi-directional option.
- Main Street.
- Keep together in order to be simpler to gain high ridership and demand for expansion.
- Main Street with a single lane. A single lane provides simplicity and Main is the most controlled route and is also not subject to the street closures of Walnut and Grand. Baltimore is too far west.

- I prefer bi-directional on Grand Boulevard. Main Street has MAX. Let Grand have something and I consider Grand as the main street of downtown.
- Single street down Main. One street is simple and easier for riders to use. Main is a straight shot from River Market to Union Station. Would be easy to add on to down to Plaza area. Loop through River Market to 3<sup>rd</sup> and Grand transit station.
- I'd like to see a system that is expandable in case light rail does pick up some day. We need more capacity as gas prices and vehicle ownership goes up and cleaner, quieter system to integrate into residential areas of downtown and maintain quality of life.
- Alt 3 – Would serve the most people with the least disruption and keep it simple.
- Grand singular – Connects key ideas. Grand and Main coupled – I know this isn't an option, but it would help influence t\_\_\_\_\_ downtown.
- Not sure, but leaning to single track because simplicity. Not Walnut (doesn't need as much help as others). Main or Grand. Maybe leaning towards Grand.
- Walnut through downtown – Alt 3. Having a rail on one street will be cheaper and will have less impact.
- Alt 6. It seems to affect the most people and real estate.
- Couplet is preferred – Because reaching more of the urban core.
- Single street routes.
- Alt 6.
- I prefer the Grand Boulevard only route – F or not, lay additional tracks after the public demands more service.
- Alt 7, Main Street/Baltimore Avenue because: 1) It's more equidistant from Sprint Center and Performing Arts Center/Convention Center, maximizing ridership 2) Works around potential disruptions on Grand from special events that would close off the street.
- Walnut/Main couplet.
- I prefer Walnut. I think it offers the best solution for both the River Market area and for Union Station. It also is more centered for better access to both Sprint Center and Municipal Auditorium. 2<sup>nd</sup> choice Grand. 3<sup>rd</sup> Main.
- Grand or Main – Both are more public and larger streets. Would fit with the new "Make Grand Grand" project. Needs to be where lots of people will congregate. Also Grand is wide and goes to Sprint Center.
- Whatever will maximize TOD and be likely to expand north and east.

- Undecided.
- Bi-directional, for economic development reasons.
- No preference.
- #1 – Walnut (bi-directional) because it offers the flattest profile for walking and street cars alike. I know there area major challenges on Walnut. So #2 is Main. Grand would be nice but it is our “one great ceremonial street” and streetcars (especially centenary) would interfere with that important civic function.
- The Grand Avenue alignment seems to be the best option. It would connect Crown Center, the Crossroads, the Power & Light District, the CBD and the River Market. It also offers multi-modal options in the form of Megabus (3rd and Grand), Amtrak and the proposed commuter rail system. The Main Street alignment would offer similar advantages. The Walnut and Baltimore corridors are too narrow for a dedicated right-of-way, with median stations. The couplet alignments could confuse potential users.
- Main St. Aesthetically, it would be the best option. It is the best centralized line. It allows for integration into the full downtown residential neighborhoods. It is close to the main downtown hotels, central to the business district, and would provide an easy centralized location. For tourists, People can easily remember 'find main street'.
- If there are dedicated lanes and signal priority, I would support Main. It bridges the gap between the convention center, P&L, and Sprint Center. It would also be a straight line all the way to the Plaza. If a couplet is required to obtain dedicated lanes, I would go with Main/Walnut because there aren't any 90 degree turns. If dedicated lanes are off the table, I'd go with Walnut because it has the least amount of traffic.
- Alt3 (Walnut street). This isn't even the most ideal for me personally (due to the location of my office), but it clearly maximizes the benefit to the most people while travelling directly through the best areas of downtown. Grand St. makes sense from the perspective of traffic congestion (since there is much less) but it is too far east and doesn't portray the best image of KC to visitors. Baltimore does not make sense at all due to the fact that it completely bypasses most of P&L and Crossroads which would prove to be a mistake in the long-run. Walnut is a beautiful street which traverses the best part of P&L and Crossroads while still being just a short block from Sprint Center. Hands-down the best option.
- My preference is for the Main and Walnut couplet, but I would also be for the Main only route. The couplet would work well in my mind because it would allow a right of way to be taken from each street, would expose riders to more businesses, allow an ease of recognition for Main=South/Walnut=North or the inverse, and encourage downtown riders to walk a block occasionally from one

direction to another (not unlike how subway entrances are often a block apart for the same stop).

- Delaware to Main Street seems the most logical choice, as it requires no turns. If the inconvenient and obnoxious Main Street MAX route convinced me of anything, it's that transit should go in straight lines as much as possible.
  - Both northbound and southbound tracks on one street - probably Grand Avenue.
  - Main Baltimore, it seems more point of interest centric. equidistant from the performing arts center and sprint center only a couple blocks away.
  - I believe that the best alternative is the Main Street/Walnut Couplet. By spreading the line over two streets, you can create a broader area that is walkable and prone to infill development. Main Street is the backbone of the City, and it naturally splits down Walnut after the railroad crossing. In the future, an expanded streetcar system should go all the way down Main Street to Waldo (via the Country Club Right-of-Way) as it once did. Bring back the trolleys!
  - Let's dedicate one street for this system. Main Street would be most desired. It places stops nearer the new Performing Arts complex. The younger crowd can walk to the Power and Light Dist.
  - Walnut bi-directional. This would balance both being in the center of the loop and traveling through dense areas. Another recommendation is to make Walnut like Nicolett Mall in Minneapolis, MN, where no car traffic is allowed, buses only. I would also like to see a bike lane mixed with the streetcar on Walnut with no auto traffic.
  - Only Main Street. No couplets... transit is hard enough to use if you're not a regular rider. Also, it should be fare-free!
  - Grand is not a good option because of occasional closures at Sprint Center. I like the couplet idea to share the benefits/costs with a larger pool of stakeholders. But it needs to be simple to find for people not familiar with downtown so I am leaning towards one of the bi-directional routes. I like the Main Street option except that traffic can already be pretty congested around 11th Street.
  - If I have to choose it would be the bi-directional on Baltimore. This allows (with extensions) for the Crown Center region, Union Station and the closest to Bartle and Kauffman. Those to the east have a younger demographic (P&L, Sprint).
- Main st.
  - South on Grand, north on Main; with stops at Crown Center and Union Station (big visitor areas).

- North on Walnut South on Grand, terminating at Union Station (return US to a transit HUB!) Placing the lines a block away will create more street walking traffic and provide consumers to businesses as citizens walk a block to return the opposite direction. Splitting the North and South would also seem to be more feasible in terms of street available to use. Separate lines would also appear to give a larger system appearance and encourage connector routes. Simple math also is that it would affect and service more locations.
- use main street both ways
- I don't care. Point to point is the most important concept. Anything from the river front to the plaza will produce ridership.
- The Main St. corridor is nice because it runs through the middle and offers about equal walking distance to most parts of the downtown loop. However I also like any of the couplet routes because I feel they offer benefits to a wider area.
- Either both ways on Main or one way on Walnut and the other on Main are the most centrally located so probably preferred from that standpoint. Grand being the widest street would be better from that standpoint.
- I prefer Grand Avenue, because the MAX already runs down main street, and having a MAX line and a street car might get clustered. Also, the city recently decided to renovate Grand.
- I would rather use public transportation because of the high prices facing are country,
- Alt 2 and Alt 6. Good and central. Could take it to the government buildings, or Power and Light/Performing Arts center, YJ's or the federal district on the east side of downtown.
- The Grand Avenue alignment seems to be the best option. It would connect Crown Center, the Crossroads, the Power & Light District, the CBD and the River Market. It also offers multi-modal options in the form of Megabus (3rd and Grand), Amtrak and the proposed commuter rail system. The Main Street alignment would offer similar advantages. The Walnut and Baltimore corridors are too narrow for a dedicated right-of-way, with median stations. The couplet alignments could confuse potential users.
- Main St.  
Aesthetically, it would be the best option. It is the best centralized line. It allows for integration into the full downtown residential neighborhoods. It is close to the main downtown hotels, central to the business district, and would provide an easy centralized location. For tourists, People can easily remember 'find main street'.

- **What other comments or questions do you have?**
  - I'm so excited! This will weave so much together.
  - No MAX! Timeliness and trendiness of modern streetcar a must. The River Market and Crown Center must be integrated stops. Excited to hear more! Great project.
  - Please involve downtown neighborhood association and downtown residents during the process to select the route.
  - \*) Put the maintenance shed just north of Washington Park by the railroad tracks. \*) Please do not pick up a bi-directional scheme down Grand. This could end up being an "edge" not a connector. Very little development is east of Grand. \*) Most importantly – This project must connect the City Market to Crown Center. It will be a grave failure to stop short of these 2 locations. We have to help pedestrians over our man-made hurdles – train tracks, 670, I-70.
  - I believe that most great cities have accessible public transportation. Once a starter line such as this is established, more will develop. Kansas City will become a great city.
  - By using Main/Walnut with the Grand Avenue redo occurring it would seem we would get the most bang for the buck – 3 streets of improved amenities. Also both Main and Walnut have lots of property available for infill. I would like to see the route to go through the River Market itself (Walnut). That may ease congestion in the Market on Saturday mornings, if suburban shoppers could hop on/off and park in one of the many surface lots on 7<sup>th</sup> and 8<sup>th</sup> Streets. Also important to have easy access to Crown Center with the aquarium opening next year. There should be an infill of family activity in the Union Station/Crown Center area.
  - SEE ATTACHED. City Market would like to meet with the consultants please.
    - Attachment: Transit Options – Pros and Cons
      1. Safety issue on weekends with the amount of people in the Market Square and traffic in the streets.
      2. What kind of sound or light warnings would take place when the car was coming and going through?
      3. Would it be possible to put in street blinking lights along the Market Square part of the route?
      4. We would still need to close the Market Square to other traffic on weekends so there would be some sort of gat at the 5<sup>th</sup> and 3<sup>rd</sup> Street entrance/exit that would open for the car to come through. If a manual thing would staff then be paid for from the transit?



5. Could increase attendance.
6. Could increase tenant sales.
7. If the two above work, then it would allow us to increase psf rental rates.
8. Would increase visibility inside the Market
9. Lots revenue through loss of concerts (\$45,000 – 70,000 annually)
10. Would benefit from the marketing of the transit system via route information and being a start/end point?
11. Would be a big re-education process, would this be included in the costs outlined for the project?
12. Lost parking spaces at circles could be recouped if installed along front of CM4.
13. Would get a lot of the decaying curb areas repaired and would get rid of the circle drive.
14. It would bring more commuters (downtown office parkers) to the area which would mean less available parking.
15. Would ATA line still run to the area?
16. There is also the option to open Main Street back up behind the shops if needed.
17. One person said it would make the Market sexy...
  - Need a transportation hub in the Crossroads to connect east-west.
  - Well I want to connect the 18<sup>th</sup> and Vine District with a loop from Crown Center to 18<sup>th</sup> and Vine and back to Power and Light District. I believe wonderful things will happen with that loop. Right now build the starter line and as soon as possible let's connect it to 18<sup>th</sup> and Vine with a loop.
  - Make the streetcar barn an attractive destination as well.
  - It is time to get this done. We will slip from a second to a third tier city if we don't.
  - River Market Community Association is split on whether streetcar should come through or circle around City Market area (safety of pedestrians was issue).
  - Will this replace the Main Street BRT? Who will operate? Baltimore is too far west.
  - Grand Avenue is River Market Neighborhood, not Walnut through City Market.

- Please be careful about integration with bicycle routes and include space for bikes on streetcar vehicles.
- Take the focus off of Main Street and put it on Grand Boulevard.
- This kind of project would really improve my quality of life by fostering more housing, generating more retail (Target?! Please!) and giving downtown tourists a novel way to see what we have to offer.
- Connect line directly to Union Station above all else.
- Riding cost? I like Portland's that you pay to get downtown, but then once downtown it is free. Quick encouragement for riders is key.
- Finally – Public transit for KC – Can only see positives for the urban core and KC.
- Go to Crown Center not through. Go through City Market.
- Thank you – And keep up the good work!
- Good job on presentation.
- Would vote for any of the routes.
- Please have a way to take bicycles on streetcar. Make sure it goes to Union Station! Have good ped friendly stops and include ADA needs. Grand couplet is good or Grand or Main straight lines.
- Combination property tax/sales tax within the district seems like the appropriate funding mechanism. If security needs can be met, showcase the streetcar in an architecturally stunning glass building when not in use.
- Transit for economic development. Period.
- Really exciting!
- This is an important project and could be a turning point for the city. To prosper, Kansas City must increase its population density. A denser urban core will need fast and efficient transit. However, it needs to be executed properly.
- Whether we go with streetcar or bus, off board ticketing should be a very very high priority. That is one of the biggest delays when riding 'BRT' through KC. That and the Main Street MAX should be straightened out. All those twists and turns more than doubles the amount of time it should take to get through downtown. Another thing on dedicated lanes, this is more than enough parking downtown to take away some on-street parking. Kansas City is the easiest city I've ever parked in. Parking is no excuse. Neither is traffic because we don't have any and there are plenty of streets to choose from when traveling from N-S through the CBD.
- This is an issue that I am very passionate about so please feel free to contact me if there is any way that I be of any assistance.

- My ideal vision for the streetcar would be a grassed over right-of-way, expandable to the North and South, running frequently (10 minutes or less), and consistently (even in evenings and on weekends). Fare would be free, as long as it is only a 2 mile line, since it would otherwise overlap existing service from the MAX. This free service would also encourage riders to explore other opportunities and become excited about future expansion of regional transit. While financing may be a concern, a free fare would be an investment in recruiting future transit riders and in promoting the great features of our downtown.
  - I recently visited the Phoenix light rail maintenance facility as part of a model/historical railroad convention. I have photos if anyone is interested.
  - I think it would be a grave mistake to not think about the future expansion of this initial streetcar system now. We need to strategically think about the historical precedence of the area as well as the potential for future growth and development. The right-of-way is already there on Main Street, and we have the ability to tie in the entire city to downtown with one, albeit large, public investment. We could revitalize and entire corridor from downtown to the Plaza and on to the streetcar suburbs built by JC Nichols that no longer have a street car.
  - Let's get on with it. Studies are going to kill it for another decade. We need to do a quick finish to the planning and put this to work!
  - In all honesty, a better alternative would be to expand bus service all over the metro, and not just one area. I would prefer to see a subway-style BRT system that connects all corners of the metro in dedicated lanes, with nice stations where passes can be purchased before boarding.
  - Need to quickly get a list of funding options and get moving on which ones are most feasible. Hopefully there will be enough funding to keep it fare-free!
  - I think the financial plan is the correct approach to avoid another city wide vote that will fail. Moving forward with a starter line will surely be a seed for further expansion as long as there aren't any missteps that generate negative public opinion.
  - Bi-directional would have "double" the car movement which is very important to show – Availability and for a two-mile distance is worth getting on for either direction.
- I propose we close main street to all car traffic and make it a streetcar/light rail system only.
  - Let us not study this to death.
  - Excited to see the next steps!
  - This must be only the first step in a total transportation system of spokes if you

expect to draw people downtown (DT). DT to sports complex, DT to airport, DT to Johnson County and DT to south county

- I'm hopeful the plan is for the Downtown-Union Station line to be only a starter line and an extension south to the Plaza would follow as soon as funding permitted. That is definitely the core route with the best ridership potential.
- Yet, again I would like to emphasize the fact that we need more night and weekend transit options for Power and light, The Sprint Center, Concerts, First Friday, Crown Center, Union Station, River Market, and Out of towners. The transit on night and weekends is lacking, and we need service during these times that runs late enough and often enough to be convenient So people will use it.
- It's about time...
- This is an important project and could be a turning point for the city. To prosper, Kansas City must increase its population density. A denser urban core will need fast and efficient transit. However, it needs to be executed properly.

## Other Comments

- **Downtown Neighborhood Association Position Statement:**
  - Residents of the Greater Downtown Kansas City area are passionate about improving the state of transit in our neighborhood. Evidence for the importance of transit to Downtown, and the desire to improve it, is seen in residents' consistent support for transit ballot initiatives. Transit is also a critical part of realizing the goals of the Greater Downtown Area Plan and extending the benefit of the investments already made.
  - As transit plans have come and gone, lack of coordination between interest groups has weakened previous proposals to the extent that Kansas City continues to sit on the sidelines of the modern transit revolution. However, the latest proposal for a Downtown Streetcar represents a tremendous opportunity to make a significant improvement for Downtown and a major step toward building a transit culture in Kansas City.
  - Because of this incredible opportunity, the neighborhoods of Downtown Kansas City would like to express our strong support for the streetcar project. We would encourage the project team to be innovative and consider any local funding options that can help make the project a reality and to do so as quickly as is prudent, setting aggressive timelines to begin realizing the benefits of this system as soon as possible.
  - We also offer the following recommendations:

- The system should utilize modern streetcar technology, capable of delivering a rider experience comparable to light rail. The route should utilize a single street for both directions of travel to eliminate rider confusion, with considerations made for the best solution for circulation at the ends of the route. The route should serve the River Market neighborhood on the north and adequately serve Crown Center and Union Station on the south.
- Approved by the Board of the Downtown Neighborhood Association
- Lindsay Tatro, Downtown Neighborhood Association President
- **Phone Calls**
  - Anonymous: Use Main Street – Let it rip. Accommodate Performing Arts Center traffic, so Avoid Grand. Is it possible to run the streetcar without overhead lines.
  - Anonymous: New to Kansas City and attended open house but learned nothing. Don't hurt Crossroads pedestrian traffic. Isn't this project like the MAX? What are the funding mechanisms?
  - Organizing for a Downtown Streetcar: Would like to submit letter of support from four affected neighborhoods (Columbus Park, Downtown Neighborhood, River Market, and Crossroads).
- **Emails**
  - I have read the FAQ and it did have a lot of good info. I have a few follow up questions that maybe you, or someone there can help answer about the proposed street car. I realize you are just in the study phase and may not have all the answers yet, but any details or thoughts on where things are leaning would be very appreciated.
    - I see that in the FAQ it states that "streetcars usually have signal priority". The MAX bus line was supposed to have signal priority as well, but somehow that got cut out along the way essentially neutering the express/speed part of the service. Is this a negotiable point of the project or is it a definite? (My opinion/feedback is that it is a must).
    - How exactly is signal priority defined?
    - Are dedicated lanes being pursued at all (in part or even just portions of the line)?
    - Is any consideration being given to speed/total travel time from River Market to CC?
    - Will there be street kiosk for pre-boarding ticket purchasing? (there should!)

- Is frequency of trip going to be a priority? (Frequency is good!)
- Is 24 hour service being considered? (I think it should)
- Will people be able to board with bikes? (they should!)
- Is it being considered to offer free service when this first opens? (get people used to riding it! or at least those who will be paying the transit district tax for it).
- If everything goes as smoothly as possible...best case scenario, when will I be able to ride this new streetcar? How long will the project take to build and be operational? If there are questions that cannot be answered yet b/c its still just a study, when will these questions be answerable? at what point in the process?

So in case you couldn't tell I pretty much asked questions to which my feedback or answer would be YES! as I know you are still collecting community feedback and wanted to give mine while also asking for some more info. As for the street it should be run on...Main is my pick. Any street besides Grand would be acceptable, but I am not a fan of the couplet circuits. Keep it all on one street for ease of use for those who are unfamiliar. Thanks for your time and responses! And please, get this thing done!

- **Letters**

- I am willing to offer thoughts pertaining to the Downtown Corridor Alternatives Analysis project presently being undertaken. I would appreciate your including these comments with others submitted to MARC as part of your public involvement phase of the project.
  - As you recall, I served on the Citizens' Task Force which developed a light rail proposal. You will also recall that I served as representative of the Clay County Commission on the North/South Transit Corridor alternatives analysis project, and later as a representative of the Clay County Commission which selected a consultant to perform the initial rail corridor analysis.
  - I am not writing today as a representative of anyone other than myself, though wished to identify previous responsibilities to emphasize my familiarity with critical issues pertaining to your present alternatives analysis project.
  - Transportation Mode: The first question is whether a street railway system or a MAX type bus system or some combination represents the best strategy for fulfilling Kansas City's needs.
    1. In general, I am of the view that a street railway system has better long-term potential for promoting redevelopment of

downtown's empty or underutilized land (I include most parking lots and especially flat parking lots as underutilized land). This property generates very little in tax revenue though demands costly services such as water and sewer service, even though only storm drains may be connected to the sewer lines.

2. Construction of a street railway route could—and should be augmented with a redesign of certain bus routes, combined with possible creation of certain feeder services which might at a later date be converted to street railways.
  3. Promoting mixed use (office/retail/residential) development is a highly desirable goal. A street railway system represents a long-term investment which is psychologically conducive toward promoting the long term redevelopment of downtown. I see this as desirable.
  4. On the display maps presented at your public hearings, you should only a few routes. I would recommend showing both rail routes combined with connecting bus routes illustrating how mixed use could be mutually supporting.
- Downtown Routes: It appears that the planning team recommends side-by-side street routes so that passengers would only need to know to walk one block in order to catch a car going in the other direction.
  - Grand Boulevard: I would not recommend any routing which includes Grand **Boulevard** (rather than Grand **Avenue** which is identified on your maps; it's been over a century since that section was known as Grand **Avenue**). There are two reasons I would exclude Grand Boulevard:
    1. Inadequate traffic demand along Grand. It may be desirable to include Grand at some later date in some later phase. However, Grand has too few traffic generators to be included when compared to other routes.
    2. Sprint Area. Management at the Sprint Arena has been uncooperative and, in fact rather demanding and arrogant when dealing with transit. There would be an inevitable conflict between needs of the street railway system and demands of the Spring Arena management. The initial phase should avoid areas of conflict and instead focus on opportunities which would assure short term success.
  - Walnut/Main or Main/Baltimore: Walnut would likely be less desirable than Baltimore as there are fewer office buildings near or adjacent to Walnut than Baltimore. Baltimore also has the Hotel Muehlbach and the Hotel President and is one half block from the Hotel Phillips. Main

Street includes the Power and Light District, several major office buildings, and the eastern edge of the Crossroads district, in addition to Union Station.

- Other Alternatives: Wyandotte is not included on the list of potential routes, though in my judgment, deserves consideration. Wyandotte includes the eastern entrance of the Municipal Auditorium/Bartle Hall Complex, the Kaufman Center for the Performing Arts, the Marriott Hotel, the Hotel Muehlebach, the Aladdin Hotel (Holiday Inn), the Crowne Plaza Hotel, and more of the Crossroads district than other streets.
- Comment Pertaining to the Kauffman Center for the Performing Arts: It is my firm conviction that the Kauffman Center will be a far greater traffic generator than what is now being considered. I also serve as editor of the newsletter for one of the Kansas City Symphony's volunteer auxiliary organizations, and am aware of events planned for two and three years hence which appear to be almost completely unknown among Kansas City's leadership. I *fervently believe* that the new performing arts center will have a far greater—and more *profoundly positive* impact on the downtown area than is presently realized.
- Downtown Routing Conclusion: My assessment is that a **Main/Walnut** routing through downtown has the greatest potential for success. Although this would spread the placement by two blocks rather than one, I doubt that two blocks spacing would significantly diminish ridership for downtown passengers.
- Union Station and Crown Center Routing: The proposed routing including Main/Pershing/Grand is the best alternative in the this area.
- River Market Routing:
  1. Owing to the remarkable transformation of the River Market area into a residential area, this presents the greatest challenge to define the best possible route. Delaware has the potential for re-evolving into a retail district while remaining commercial areas are likely to be transformed into residential. The Columbus Park area to the east of the River Market is also showing signs of regeneration and regrowth.
  2. I have no specific recommendations to make other than a streetcar line should serve the River Market, and that routing should avoid the hill on Fifth Street between Delaware and Baltimore.



3. I would encourage the planners to at least explore the possibility of using the former Kansas City Southern viaduct over the Crosstown Freeway. The viaduct was constructed when the Crosstown Freeway was originally built so that the KCS could continue to serve Folger's Coffee and the printing firms downtown from Grand Avenue yard (which served the then KCP&L steam plan). The Crosstown Freeway occupies the valley between the River Market and what is now Sixth Street. This rail right-of-way is essentially intact between Third Street and Seventh Street. Although this segment of the route would serve few passengers, it would be an easy logistical way of getting across a highway, and get into downtown where there is some employment and residential activity in and about the clothing district and what was a once time the theater district (the Savoy Hotel and Coates House are the last survivors from this period in Kansas City's history).
- Other Recommendations:
    1. I recommend that planners at least consider showing how revision of existing transit routes and/or creation of circulation feeder bus routes could be transformed into streetcar routes at a later date. One of the selling points (which was not well promoted) with the light rail plan was how the system could be expanded. Feeder routes which should be considered for future expansion would include:
      - 18<sup>th</sup> & Vine to the Crossroads at some connecting point on the streetcar route.
      - Union Station to the IRS building and to Federal Reserve Bank during certain hours.
      - River Market/Columbus Park circulator.
  - I hope these ideas are useful to you and the planning team which is exploring downtown street railway routes. As always, I am available to assist you when ever needed.