





Acknowledgements

The Johnson County Gateway: I-435/I-35/K-10 Interchange Concept Study Report involved input from many team members from the Kansas Department of Transportation, HNTB and from community leaders throughout the region. This report acknowledges and expresses our appreciation for everyone's efforts.

KDOT Staff

- Scott King
- Burt Morey
- Thomas Dow
- Gary Chan
- Mark Hoppe
- Jonathan Marburger
- Kelly Cool
- Kim Qualls
- David Schwartz

HNTB

- Joe Brand
- Cameron McGown
- Robyn Arthur
- Kip Strauss
- Jared Miller
- Cindy Doran

Federal Highway Administration

John Knowles

Johnson County Gateway Advisory Group and Study Partners

- Alice Amrien, Johnson County Transit, Olathe
- Mac Andrew, Johnson County
- Marlin Berry, Olathe School District

- Kent Lage, Johnson County
- Donald Emrich, Farmers Insurance HelpPoint (KC Care Center), Olathe
- Robert Gardner, JC Penney Co. Logistics, Lenexa
- Tom Gerend, Mid America Regional Council
- Tim Green, City of Lenexa
- Gene Hallinan, Centerpoint Medical Center, Independence/Overland Park
- John Knowles, FHWA, Regional
- Alonzo Linan, City of Olathe
- Dan Miller, City of Overland Park
- Tom Peterson, City of Olathe
- Brian Pietig, Johnson County
- Mike Purtle, Sysco Food Services, Olathe
- Tom Riederer, Southwest Johnson County Economic Development Corporation
- Kristin Riott, Bridging the Gap, Regional
- Patrick Robinson, Allen Group, Gardner
- Erik Sartorius, City of Overland Park
- Steve Schooley, City of Lenexa
- Blake Schreck, Lenexa Chamber
- Matt Shatto, City of Lenexa
- Kendell Shull, Quest Diagnostics, Lenexa
- Mark Stuecheli, Overland Park
- Nikki Vangelatos, JC Penney Co. Logistics, Lenexa
- Carl Walston, Resident, Lenexa
- Douglas Wood, Johnson County







Federal Highway Administration





I-435/I-35/K-10 Interchange Concept Study Final May 2011

Prepared for Kansas Department of Transportation

Federal Highway Administration

Mid-America Regional Council

Johnson County

City of Olathe

City of Lenexa

City of Overland Park

Prepared by HNTB Corporation











Table of Contents

1.0 Introduction
1.2 Study Area
 2.0 Study Methodology
3.0 Existing Conditions
 4.0 Future Conditions
 5.0 Stakeholder Engagement
6.0 Purpose and Need for the Project

7.0 Ultimate Concept	31
7.1 Screening of Concepts	
7.2 Traffic Methodology	
7.3 Advanced Traffic Analysis of Concepts	
7.4 Preferred Improvement Concept	
7.5 Additional Transportation Enhancements	
8.0 Phasing Plan	58
8.1 Construction Phasing	
8.2 Interim Traffic Analysis	
8.3 Cost Estimates	
8.4 Summary	
Glossary and Acronyms	66
Tables	
Table 1 – Data Collection	2
Table 2 – Existing Bridge Summary	3
Table 3 – Existing (2007) Daily Two-Way Traffic	8
Table 4 – Existing (2008) Mainline Directional Peak Hour Traffic, Truck Percent & Truck Volume	8
Table 5 – Existing (2008) Interchange Peak Hour Traffic, Truck Percent & Truck Volume	8
Table 6 – Existing CCTV Camera Locations	14
Table 7 – Existing Dynamic Message Signs	15
Table 8 – Community and Public Officials Briefing	29
Table 9 – Initial Concepts Screening	34
Table 10 – Traffic Evaluation Summary	47
Table 11 – Initial Measures of Effectiveness	51
Table 12 – Interchange Alternatives Evaluation	52
Table 13 – 2030 Peak Hour Trip Generation BNSF Intermodal Facility and Logistics Park	56
Table 14 – 2030 Trips Generated by the BNSF Intermodal that Pass through the Johnson County Gateway	57
Table 15 – Johnson County Gateway Cost Estimate	64
Table 16 - Johnson County Gateway Cost Savings	64
Figures	
Figure 1 – Study Area	1
Figure 2 – Traffic Forecast Methodology	
Figure 3 – Pavement Conditions	
Figure 4 – Existing Acceleration, Deceleration, and Weaving Length Deficiencies	
Figure 5 – Existing Horizontal Design Deficiencies	
Figure 6 – Existing Vertical Alignment Deficiencies	5



gure 7 – Existing (2008) AM Travel Patterns	6	Figure 44 – Concept 4C – No Direct Access to Renner or Lackman	33
gure 8 – Existing (2008) PM Travel Patterns	7	Figure 45 – Direct Access within the "Box"	. 33
gure 9 – AM Peak Hour Existing (2008) Traffic	9	Figure 46 – Concept 4B3	. 34
gure 10 – PM Peak Hour Existing (2008) Traffic	9	Figure 47 – Concept 4A (Full Direct Access)	35
gure 11 – AM Peak Hour Existing (2008) Level of Service	10	Figure 48 – Concept 4B3 (Partial Direct Access)	35
gure 12 – PM Peak Hour Existing (2008) Level of Service	10	Figure 49 – Existing and Future Build AM Peak Hour Traffic Demand	. 37
gure 13 – Highway Crash Rates Compared to the Kansas Statewide Average	11	Figure 50 – Existing and Future Build PM Peak Hour Traffic Demand	
gure 14 – Crash Locations (2007)	11	Figure 51 – Concept 4A – Full Direct Access AM Peak Hour Level of Service	. 38
gure 15 – Percent of Crashes by Type	11	Figure 52 – Concept 4B3 – Partial Direct Access AM Peak Hour Level of Service with Change from Concept 4A	. 38
gure 16 – 24-Hour Crash Distribution	12	Figure 53 – Concept 4A – Full Direct Access PM Peak Hour Level of Service	. 39
gure 17 – Johnson County Transit Commuter Routes	13	Figure 54 – Concept 4B3 – Full Direct Access PM Peak Hour Level of Service with Change from Concept 4A	. 39
gure 18 – Johnson County Transit Other Bus Routes	13	Figure 55 – AM Peak Hour Freeway Congestion	40
gure 19 – Johnson County Plats (1949 to 2007)	16	Figure 56 – PM Peak Hour Freeway Congestion	4(
gure 20 – Population Per Square Mile (2000)	16	Figure 57 – Concept 4A Full Direct Access Arterial Analysis	4
gure 21 – Projected Population Per Square Mile (2030)	16	Figure 58 – Concept 4B3 Partial Direct Access Arterial Analysis	
gure 22 – Employment Per Square Mile (2000)	17	Figure 59 – PM Peak Hour Travel Time (Routes 1 and 2)	42
gure 23 – Projected Employment Per Square Mile (2030)	17	Figure 60 – PM Peak Hour Travel Time (Routes 3 and 4)	42
gure 24 – Regional Traffic Generators	17	Figure 61 – PM Peak Hour Travel Time (Routes 5 and 6)	43
gure 25 – Future Planned Roadway Projects	18	Figure 62 – PM Peak Hour Travel Time (Routes 7 and 8)	43
gure 26 – Future 2040 No-Build AM Traffic	20	Figure 63 – AM Travel Distance Per Vehicle (Vehicle Miles Traveled)	44
gure 27 – Future 2040 No-Build PM Traffic	20	Figure 64 – PM Travel Distance Per Vehicle (Vehicle Miles Traveled)	44
gure 28 – Future 2040 No-Build AM Level of Service	21	Figure 65 – AM Travel Time Per Vehicle (Vehicle Minutes Traveled)	45
gure 29 – Future 2040 No-Build PM Level of Service	21	Figure 66 – PM Travel Time Per Vehicle (Vehicle Minutes Traveled)	45
gure 30 – Visitor Dashboard Linking Spikes in Website Use to Events From		Figure 67 – Annualized User Benefits	46
February 15, 2009 to November 18, 2010	23	Figure 68 – Mainline (Gold)	
gure 31 – Online Survey 1 - Interchange Use	24	Figure 69 – Collector Distributor Roads (Purple)	48
gure 32 – Online Survey 1 - Biggest Issue	24	Figure 70 – Local Service Roads (Blue)	48
gure 33 – Online Survey 1 - Areas of Concern	25	Figure 71 – Preferred Concept (AM Level of Service)	49
gure 34 – Online Survey 1 - Work/Home Location of Respondents	25	Figure 72 – Preferred Concept (PM Level of Service)	50
gure 35 – Online Survey 1 - Feedback on Kansas Highways	25	Figure 73 – Reserve Capacity (AM and PM Peak Hours)	50
gure 36 – Online Survey – Trade-off between Access and Mobility	26	Figure 74 – Impacted Detention Areas	53
gure 37 – Online Survey 3 – Is Existing Access Adequate?	26	Figure 75 – Regional Truck Distribution	57
gure 38 – Facebook Page for Johnson County Gateway	27	Figure 76 – Project 1 – Yellow Project	58
gure 39 – Concept 1 – Additional Mainline Capacity	31	Figure 77 – I-435 and US 69 Red Project	59
gure 40 – Concept 2 – Additional Mainline Capacity and CD Roads	31	Figure 78 – Problem Areas Identified by the Public	59
gure 41 – Concept 3 – Additional Mainline Capacity and CD Roads and Braided Ramps	32	Figure 79 – Project 2 – Orange Project	60
gure 42 – Concept 4A – Full Direct Access	32	Figure 80 – I-435 and US 69 Purple Project	60
gure 43 – Concept 4B – Partial Direct Access	33	Figure 81 – Project 3 – Green Project	6

I-435/I-35/K-10 Interchange Concept Study



Figure 82 – Project 4 – Red Project	6
Figure 83 – Regional Phasing Plan	6
Figure 84 – Construction Sequence	6
Figure 85 – Yellow Project plus I-435 and US 69 Red Project Travel Time Results	6

Appendix

Appendix A – Plate Drawings

Appendix A: Plate Drawing Index

Appendix A: Plate Drawings

Appendix B – Traffic

Appendix B-1: Existing (2008) AM/PM Freeway Peak Hour Traffic

Appendix B-2: Existing (2008) AM Arterial Peak Hour Traffic

Appendix B-3: Existing (2008) PM Arterial Peak Hour Traffic

Appendix B-4: Existing AM Level of Service

Appendix B-5: Existing PM Level of Service

Appendix B-6: Future No-Build Additional Freeway Lanes

Appendix B-7: No-Build (2040) AM/PM Freeway Peak Hour Traffic

Appendix B-8: No-Build (2040) AM Arterial Peak Hour Traffic

Appendix B-9: No-Build (2040) PM Arterial Peak Hour Traffic

Appendix B-10: Future 2040 No-Build AM Level of Service

Appendix B-11: Future 2040 No-Build PM Level of Service

Appendix B-12: Future Build 4A Ultimate (2040) Freeway AM/PM Peak Hour Traffic

Appendix B-13: Future Build 4A Ultimate (2040) AM Arterial Peak Hour Traffic

Appendix B-14: Future Build 4A Ultimate (2040) PM Arterial Peak Hour Traffic

Appendix B-15: Future 2040 Build with Ramp Metering AM Level of Service

Appendix B-16: Future 2040 Build with Ramp Metering PM Level of Service

Appendix B-17: Detailed Level of Service Results

Appendix B-18: Assessment of Managed Lanes

Appendix B-19: Intelligent Transportation Systems Analysis

Appendix B-20: Auxiliary Lane Assessment

Appendix B-21: Orange and Green Project Interim Analysis

Appendix C – Miscellaneous Information

Appendix C-1: Design Criteria

Appendix C-2: Typical Sections

Appendix C-3: Summary of Proposed Bridges

Appendix C-4: Drainage Study

Appendix C-5: Environmental Investigation Memo

Appendix C-6: Remediation of Undermined Areas Memo

Appendix C-7: Preferred Concept Map

Appendix C-8: Project Phasing Map