



# City of Andover

## US 54/400 Corridor Study Appendix

December 2011



This plan has been prepared by Parsons Brinckerhoff and their subconsultants for the City of Andover, Kansas.

**Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.**

225 North Market  
Suite 350  
Wichita, Kansas 67202  
316-263-6121 phone  
316-253-8989 fax  
www.pbworld.com

Project Manager: Michelle Winkelmann  
winkelmann@pbworld.com

**City of Andover**

Director of Public Works  
1609 E Central Avenue  
Andover, Kansas 67002  
316-733-1303 phone  
www.andoverks.com

Project Manager: Les Mangus  
lmangus@andoverks.com

**Project Team:**

Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc  
Huffman Corridor Consulting  
Poe & Associates, Inc.  
TranSystems

**Copyright © 2011**

Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. All rights reserved.

*This report is copyright. Apart from any fair dealings for the purpose of private research, criticism, or reviews, as permitted under the Copyright Act, no part of this document may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted, in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, recording or otherwise, without the written permission of Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc.*

**Disclaimer**

*The content of this document is furnished for informational use only, is subject to change without notice, and should not be construed as a commitment by Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. Every effort has been made to ensure that the information contained herein is correct. Parsons Brinckerhoff, Inc. assumes no responsibility or liability for any errors or inaccuracies that may appear in this document.*

*The suggestions and recommendations made in this report are for the purposes of discussion and debate in regard to corridor redevelopment. Some of the ideas contained herein have regard to private and public lands. These ideas have been developed as a professional service without the full consultation of property owners.*

# Table of Contents - Appendix

## Appendices

- A. Meetings Summary and Comment Cards
- B. Preferred Alternative Design Parameters
- C. Traffic Analysis
- D. Access Control
- E. Parcel Analysis
- F. Environmental Summary
- G. Design Guidelines



# Meetings Summary and Comment Cards



## Public & Stakeholder Participation – Summary of Meetings

### Core Team

A project core team was established to provide a forum for the City of Andover and study partners to directly communicate with the design team regarding progress on the project and to receive input on key issues and address study concerns.

Core Team Members included representatives from the following agencies:

- City of Andover
- Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT)
- Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (WAMPO)
- Federal Highway Administration (FHWA)
- Butler County
- Sedgwick County
- City of Wichita

### Meetings Summary

#### June 23, 2009

The purpose of the initial meeting was to allow the Core Team to provide input on the range of community needs and the range of impacts and perception to help define the goal and objectives for the project that are achievable. Nominal group technique was used to poll participants for their insights into what SHALL, SHOULD and MAY be required for a successful project. The design team prioritized the input of the study partners in conjunction with input from City of Andover officials to develop the project goal and objectives. The knowledge obtained helped guide the design team's process in developing alternatives that addressed the project issues identified.

#### September 22, 2009

The second Core Team meeting allowed the study partners to review and comment on the proposed development and vision based alternatives. Four options were presented for discussion purposes with features of each option that could be used interchangeably with features of others. The knowledge obtained guided the design team's process in refining alternatives that addressed the project issues identified.

#### November 17, 2009

The third Core Team meeting allowed the study partners to review and comment on the revised vision based alternatives. Comments from this meeting guided the design team's decision to move forward with a single preferred alternative. This alternative would be refined based on land use and potential redevelopment, drainage impacts and the traffic analysis.

### **May 6, 2010**

Key findings from the preliminary environmental review, traffic data and assumptions, the planning perspective and vertical profiles options were presented to the Core Team. Study partners were asked to comment on the preferred alternative and complete the comment form to be used for public survey. The knowledge obtained from the Core Team and public comment guided the design team's process in selecting a profile alternative.

### **June 22, 2010**

At the final Core Team meeting the design team presented the preferred alternative in conjunction with the study objectives.

## **Public Officials**

A series of meetings were held with public officials to keep community leaders apprised of project progress. The meeting discussions provided the Andover City Council, Andover City Planning Commission, and Andover Site Review Committee opportunity to provide input on key issues and address study concerns with the design team.

## **Meetings Summary**

### **June 23, 2009**

The Design Team conducted a workshop for members of the Andover City Council, Andover City Planning Commission, and Andover Site Review Committee. Nominal group technique was used to poll participants for their insights into what is required to make their community successful over the planning horizon and what would inhibit the success of the community. The meeting was concluded with an open forum discussion on the question of how US54/400 fits with their vision of a successful community. Responses were collected in each of four work groups, categorized and prioritized as follows:

- **Quality of Life:** Quality of life was the central theme of discussion in all four work groups. Participants felt strongly that, in order to be successful, Andover:
  - Must not lose its sense of community, and its small-town atmosphere
  - Must avoid chronic business vacancy / blight, and must actively pursue specific opportunities for compatible economic development
  - Must take proactive steps to avoid population decline with particular emphasis on youth, and must bring jobs and activities to the community that will encourage youth to remain
  - Must take proactive steps to achieve integration of open spaces, land uses, and modes of travel
  - Must work for a positive relationship between government and
  - Must maintain high achievement in all performance measures in the public school system (4 occurrences of this theme).
  - Must continue sufficient infrastructure planning and maintenance, including reserve for replacement (3 occurrences of this theme).
  - Must pursue jobs that will allow citizens to live AND work in the community
  - Must maintain its own identity, and not be swallowed by Wichita
  - Must avoid deterioration of property values, poverty of its citizens, and high taxes with no visible benefit.

## Public & Stakeholder Participation – Summary of Meetings

- **The Role of US54/400:** The role of US54/400 in the quality of life of the community was discussed in an open forum discussion; however, traffic concerns, including congestion, safety, air quality, loss of market area, noise, and accessibility were a prominent feature of the Nominal Group discussion. There were 19 occurrences of traffic related concerns expressed by the groups, more than any other single topic. Participants felt strongly that traffic problems would do more to undermine the quality of life in the community than any other single contributor.

The design team prioritized the input of the City of Andover officials in conjunction with input from study partners to develop the project goal and objectives.

### **June 22, 2010**

The Design Team updated City officials on the study progress at a workshop for members of the Andover City Council, Andover City Planning Commission, and Andover Site Review Committee. The preferred alternative was presented in conjunction with the study objectives with the emphasis and core presentation addressing urban design and planning options. As a result of the meeting discussion an Advisory Committee consisting of a select group of representatives from each of the City Council, Planning Commission and Site Review Committee was formed to help guide the design team's process in establishing the purpose and developing the goals of the planning effort.

### **August 3, 2010**

The Advisory Committee was given the opportunity to confirm the planning area boundary, review the draft land use plans, road hierarchy and street sections and discuss policy themes. The knowledge obtained from the Advisory Committee guided the design team's process in establishing the planning area, identifying the land planning framework and developing vision themes based on existing adopted public policies and a public process.

### **September 27, 2010**

The design team conducted a workshop to allow City Council, Planning Commission and Site Review Committee members the opportunity to review and pose questions and concerns regarding the recommended planning area, vision themes and land planning framework.

### **October 25, 2010**

The design team presented local corridor redevelopment challenges, examples of phasing corridor development and examples of recent corridor development to the City Council, Planning Commission and Site Review Committee members. Meeting attendees discussed the corridor vision themes and were asked to prioritize project values as determined by the Advisory Committee.

### **November 15, 2010**

City Council, Planning Commission and Site Review Committee members were given the opportunity to discuss how a compact development form preserves small town character and the advantages and disadvantages of planning now for the future. The design team presented options on how the corridor could evolve in the next 50 years, discussed the public input needed at this time, and reviewed the data from the evaluation forms.

Public officials prioritized the top five highest project values:

- Should approve development based on long term development vision
- Should create walkable neighborhoods that reduce the need for vehicles
- Should provide a variety of housing choices
- Should connect parks & open space
- Should increase corridor densities to achieve vibrant mix of uses.

As a result of the meeting discussion public officials approved the direction of the planning effort.

**May 17, 2011**

City of Andover Planning Commission members were given the opportunity to review and discuss the study information as presented in an outline of the study report by members of the study team.

**August 16, 2011**

City of Andover Planning Commission members were given the opportunity to review and comment on the draft study report presented by members of the study team.

## **WAMPO Updates**

Representatives from the Wichita Area Metropolitan Planning Organization (WAMPO) attended the public meetings and were key participants in the Core Team meetings. To keep WAMPO apprised of the study progress and recommendations the design team presented study information at the following meetings:

**December 8, 2009**

The initial presentation to the WAMPO Transportation Policy Body (TRB) introduced the study area, purpose and need, anticipated schedule and agency engagement.

**July 27, 2011**

Members of the design team met with WAMPO Staff to present the preferred alternative in conjunction with the study objectives

**August 22, 2011**

Presentation to the WAMPO Technical Advisory Committee (TAC) provided an overview of the preferred alternative in conjunction with the study objectives.

**November 8, 2011**

Presentation to the WAMPO Transportation Policy Body (TRB) provided an overview of the preferred alternative in conjunction with the study objectives.

## Public & Stakeholder Participation – Summary of Meetings

### Community Stakeholders

Meetings were held with organizations, individuals and the public to gain feedback from the community.

#### October / November 2009 Meetings Summary

##### October 22, 2009

Study material was presented to the Andover Rotary and Andover Chamber of Commerce. The purpose was to gain community feedback from individual perspectives. Comment cards were distributed at the meeting and made available both Andover City Hall and the Andover Chamber of Commerce. Electronic versions of the comment forms were made available on both the City of Andover and Andover Chamber of Commerce websites.

- 19 Rotary members were in attendance
- 12 Chamber guests were in attendance
- 14 comment cards received
- 8 emails received

##### October 26 and October 27, 2009

Individual stakeholder interviews were held with Andover Schools USD 385, Andover YMCA, and local developers and property owners at the Lodge at Central Park in Andover.

- 10 individual stakeholders contacted
- 5 appointments scheduled
  - 1 scheduled appointment canceled
- 2 declined appointments
- 2 never confirmed appointments
- 1 requested conference call

##### Priorities based upon use:

- Area Residents highest priorities were access, traffic needs, and economic development; lowest priority was a wall effect of dividing the community.
- Adjacent businesses and land owners highest priority was access; lowest priority was congestion.
- Combined highest priorities were economic development and access; lowest priority was congestion.

##### Information themes from stakeholders ranked highest to lowest in priority:

- Safety
- Access

- Improve the intersection of US54 and 159<sup>th</sup> now
- Pedestrian access
- Favor a depressed freeway over an elevated freeway
- Preferred mile line node interchanges – direct ramp access to Andover Road
- Not directly impacted
- Timeliness of project completion
- Right-of-way and setbacks
- Favor an elevated freeway over a depressed freeway
- Extended interchange is favored – no direct ramp access to Andover Road
- Construction interference

### **October 26, 2010**

To update community leadership and gain additional feedback the design team presented the goals of the planning effort and corridor vision themes to the Andover Chamber of Commerce.

### **December 8, 2010**

To update community leadership and gain additional feedback the design team presented the goals of the planning effort and corridor vision themes to the Andover Connect group.

### **Public Meeting Summary**

#### **May 6, 2010**

Citizens attended a public meeting for the proposed improvements for the East Kellogg freeway from Sedgwick/Butler County Line east to Prairie Creek Road. The Study Team members were present to answer questions from the public. They were explained the different options with the aid of concept drawings. The main purpose of this meeting was to present the proposed concepts for East Kellogg Improvements to the public and gain valuable public and stakeholder feedback to the options being presented.

#### **Public Comment**

The request for public comment was noted at the May 6, 2010 public meeting, posted on the City of Andover's website and advertised on Andover's Channel 7. Comment cards were available for the public from May 6, 2010, to May 21, 2010. The data from the comment forms was compiled and analyzed to help the Design Team understand the general public perception of the concepts and the freeway.

Based on comments and feedback given, the prevalent comments received were the following:

- In general, the area residents do not prefer the artwork on highway walls.
- In general, the area residents prefer the maintaining of roadside landscaping.

## Public & Stakeholder Participation – Summary of Meetings

- The area residents prefer East Kellogg to be a depressed freeway and to go under Andover Road

Other Statistics of note:

- Total Comment Card Respondents: 26
- % Residential Commuter: 65%
- % Core Team: 35%

### Real Estate Professionals Feedback

To gain a local perspective on the conceptual urban development plan, meetings were held with local developers and marketing professionals.

#### October 26, 2010

Individual stakeholder interviews were held with five local developers. The overall response of the developers to the urban development concept was positive. The following feedback was provided:

- Capturing the majority of future trips (density) within the US54/400 corridor would be good for the community. The higher densities would promote development.
  - One developer thought that the density plan was too high and could not be obtained
- Andover has an upper end school system which is a great asset and draw to the community
- Andover needs more mixed use development
  - Retail alone will not drive development
  - Increasing residential densities make development more viable and multi-family would lead the way to mixed use. There currently is a void in multi-family options in the Andover community. There is a 'for sale' market or non-assisted multi-family if the community would not oppose it.
- There was consensus that a development plan was necessary; however, there were differing opinions regarding the role the City of Andover should have in restricting development.
  - One developer opposed any restrictions on developers noting that developers need the flexibility
  - Two developers were in favor of the City controlling development through policy. Dictating policy would maintain a level of quality of development throughout the corridor

#### November 8 and November 15, 2010

Individual stakeholder interviews were held with three local marketing professionals. The overall response of the marketing professionals was positive and consistent to feedback from developers. The following points were offered:

- The corridor has development and redevelopment potential
- The marketing effort should be at a regional and national level
- The plan is long term and a significant absorption period should be assumed

**This page was left intentionally blank.**

**US54/400 Improvements**  
from County Line east to Prairie Creek

We want your input!

Name & Address (Optional)\*

Name: \_\_\_\_\_ Email: \_\_\_\_\_  
Address: \_\_\_\_\_ Phone: \_\_\_\_\_

\*Name, address, email, and phone number are only needed if your input requires a response.

I am interested in this project as a....

- Area Resident                       Adjacent Business Owner  
 Daily Commuter through the Corridor    Other: \_\_\_\_\_

Based on your overall experience including both driving and visual aspects, rank in order of preference the section of the US54/400 freeway through Wichita: (1 = lowest preference, 3 = highest preference)

Depressed freeway "East Kellogg" from Hillside to Rock 1   2   3



Elevated freeway "Kellogg Flyover" through the Wichita Central Business District 1   2   3



Elevated freeway "West Kellogg" from Maize to Tyler 1   2   3



Which amenities of the US54/400 freeway through Wichita would you like incorporated at Andover?  
(If you need more room, use blank space at end of survey)

Which amenities of the US54/400 freeway through Wichita would you not like incorporated at Andover?  
(If you need more room, use blank space at end of survey)

**US54/400 Improvements**  
from County Line east to Prairie Creek

We want your input!

Would you support local financing mechanisms such as special taxes, assessments and/or developer contributions to pay for improvements to US54/400?

Based on an estimated construction cost of \$100 Million in today's (2010) dollars to improve US54/400 to a freeway system with one way frontage roads (base option would elevate US54/400 over Andover Road using retaining walls), what additional amenities would you be willing to support through local financing:

(Y = would support, N = would not support)

\*Additional \$ 20 Million dollars to elevate US54 on a structure throughout the corridor Y   N



\*An elevated structure throughout the corridor means that US54 would be set on piers above the crossing streets and would allow an open view from north to south under the bridge. Examples are the Central Business District and the Canal Route in Wichita.

\*Additional \$ 10 Million dollars to depress US54 under Andover Road Y   N



\*includes construction cost for a storm water pump station as well as additional cost required to construct a depressed retaining wall system  
\*\* annual operation and maintenance cost for storm water pump station are not included

Additional \$ 4 Million to bury electric transmission line Y   N



Additional \$ 6 Million for custom treatment of retaining walls and bridges  
--Examples of generic treatment (no additional cost) Y   N



--Examples of custom treatment (additional cost)



**US54/400 Improvements**  
from County Line east to Prairie Creek

**We want your input!**

In your opinion should US54/400 be elevated (over) or depressed (under) Andover Road? (circle one)

**Over**



"elevated w/bridge"  
(additional cost)



"elevated w/walls"  
(no additional cost)

**Under**



"depressed freeway"  
(additional cost)

**Additional Comments:**

[Empty text area for additional comments]



**Thank you for sharing your perspective!**

*Comments will be accepted for the project record today, May 6, 2010, through May 20, 2010. Should you require additional time to prepare your comments, you may mail this self-addressed form no later than May 20.*

----- FOLD HERE -----



**US54/400,**  
County Line east  
to Prairie Creek  
5940 E. Central,  
Ste. 200  
Wichita, KS 67208

Place  
First Class  
Postage  
Here

US54/400, County Line east to Prairie Creek  
c/o Mike Thompson  
5940 E. Central, Ste. 200  
Wichita, KS 67208

SECURE HERE





US54/400 Corridor Vision Themes

Vision themes have been developed based on existing adopted public policies and a public process. They are statements of intent that reflect the character of Andover and identify elements that must be employed in any future design work or policy adoption.

**Revitalizing the US54/400 corridor will require maintaining the established “small town” character.**

- Corridor design should honor the form and function of Andover.
- New buildings should incorporate design that respects the architectural style of existing key buildings.
- The downtown area should be connected to the corridor through the use and placement of similar streetscape and identity treatments.

**Creating memorable destinations will require creating authentic and diverse public places, while expanding the range of attractions and economic development opportunities that the corridor offers.**

- A variety of civic uses should be located in the corridor to strengthen it as a civic destination for the neighborhoods and the region.
- The backage roads should be enhanced as diverse, pedestrian oriented shopping streets integrated with living spaces and working spaces.
- Andover Road should be enhanced as a regional gateway to downtown.
- Corridor streetscape areas should be designed with consistent materials to provide an enjoyable and safe experience for the pedestrian.
- Parks and open spaces should support a variety of events and activities.

**Integrating the neighborhoods will require a mix of infill housing and services for local neighbors.**

- Corridor densities should be increased and include a vibrant mix of civic, office, retail and residential uses.
- Underutilized buildings and parcels should be redeveloped to contain a mix of uses, such as office, retail and housing.
- Adjacent neighborhoods should be revitalized in accordance with accepted neighborhood plans to maintain the quality of the neighborhoods and attract new families within the corridor.
- A variety of housing choices should be provided in the corridor to create seamless residential neighborhoods.
- Parks and open spaces should be connected to regional parks and destinations through a bike and pedestrian trail system.

**Achieving a more accessible corridor will require improving the transportation system to minimize barriers and provide regional transportation alternatives.**

- Andover Road, near the corridor area, should use several means for slowing down traffic to allow safer pedestrian crossings.
- Parking should be integrated with corridor uses and be sufficient in terms of quantity and location.
- Future transit connections and stations should be identified within the corridor and integrated with local and regional transit connections.

**Realizing a sustainable high quality of life will require balancing the needs of social issues, the natural environment, and economic development.**

- Preserve contiguous open spaces for environmental corridors and recreation
- Create solutions that reduce net energy needs.
- Minimize reliance of ground water use by implementing water conservation practices.
- Create walkable neighborhoods that reduce the reliance on single occupancy vehicles.
- Approve development applications that integrate Andover’s long-term development vision.



US54/400 Evaluation Criteria

| No.  | Evaluation Criteria<br>(Determined by Advisory Committee comments)<br>(Project Values)   | Combined Average Weight - Importance Ranking | Alternatives<br>(Evaluation by Project Team)<br>(Technical Performance, Scale 1 to 10) |       |       |
|--|--|--|--|-------|-------|
|  |  |  | Alt 1  | Alt 2 | Alt 3 |
| 1  | Corridor design should honor the form and function of Andover.   |  |  |       |       |
| 2  | New buildings should incorporate design that respects the architectural style of existing key buildings.   |  |  |       |       |
| 3  | The downtown area should be connected to the corridor through the use and placement of similar streetscape and identity treatments.  |  |  |       |       |
| 4  | A variety of civic uses should be located in the corridor to strengthen it as a civic destination for the neighborhoods and the region.  |  |  |       |       |
| 5  | The backage roads should be enhanced as diverse, pedestrian oriented shopping streets integrated with living spaces and working spaces.  |  |  |       |       |
| 6  | Andover Road should be enhanced as a regional gateway to downtown.   |  |  |       |       |
| 7  | Corridor streetscape areas should be designed with consistent materials to provide an enjoyable and safe experience for the pedestrian.  |  |  |       |       |
| 8  | Parks and open spaces should support a variety of events and activities.   |  |  |       |       |
| 9  | Corridor densities should be increased and include a vibrant mix of civic, office, retail and residential uses.  |  |  |       |       |
| 10   | Underutilized buildings and parcels should be redeveloped to contain a mix of uses, such as office, retail and housing.  |  |  |       |       |
| 11   | Adjacent neighborhoods should be revitalized in accordance with accepted neighborhood plans to maintain the quality of the neighborhoods and attract new families within the corridor. |  |  |       |       |
| 12   | A variety of housing choices should be provided in the corridor to create seamless residential neighborhoods.  |  |  |       |       |
| 13   | Parks and open spaces should be connected to regional parks and destinations through a bike and pedestrian trail system.   |  |  |       |       |
| 14   | Andover Road, near the corridor area, should use several means for slowing down traffic to allow safer pedestrian crossings.   |  |  |       |       |
| 15   | Parking should be integrated with corridor uses and be sufficient in terms of quantity and location.   |  |  |       |       |
| 16   | Future transit connections and stations should be identified within the corridor and integrated with local and regional transit connections.   |  |  |       |       |
| 17   | Preserve contiguous open spaces for environmental corridors and recreation   |  |  |       |       |
| 18   | Create solutions that reduce net energy needs.   |  |  |       |       |
| 19   | Minimize reliance of ground water use by implementing water conservation practices.  |  |  |       |       |
| 20   | Create walkable neighborhoods that reduce the reliance on single occupancy vehicles.   |  |  |       |       |
| 21   | Approve development applications that integrate Andover’s long-term development vision.  |  |  |       |       |
| <b>Maximum Possible Score</b>                                    |  |  |  |       |       |
| <b>Alternative Raw Performance Score (Sum of All Raw Scores)</b> |  |  | 0  | 0     | 0     |
| <b>Weighted Score (Individual Criteria Weight x Raw Score)</b>   |  |  | 0  | 0     | 0     |
| <b>Percent of Maximum Possible Score</b>                         |  |  |  |       |       |