

DRAFT

JOINT MEETING

OVERLAND PARK CITY COUNCIL AND PLANNING COMMISSION

January 4, 2010

Mayor Carl R. Gerlach called the Joint Meeting of the Overland Park City Council and the Planning Commission to order at 6 p.m. The following members of the City Council were present, constituting a quorum:

Mr. Fred Spears, Council President; Mr. Terry Goodman; Mr. George Kandt; Mrs. Terry Happer Scheier; Mr. David White; Mr. Jim Hix; Mr. Dave Janson; Mr. John Skubal; Mr. Curt Skoog; Mrs. Donna Owens; and Mr. Paul Lyons. Mr. Dan Stock arrived at 6:05 p.m.

The following members of the Planning Commission were present, constituting a quorum:

Mr. Richard Collins, Chair; Mrs. Janie Thacker, Vice Chair; Mr. Dave Hill; Mr. Bob Gadd; Mr. Edward "Ned" Reitzes; Mr. Mike Flanagan; Mrs. Kim Sorensen; Mr. Dave Troester; Mr. John Brake. Mr. Tom Lance and Mr. George Lund were absent.

Also present were: Mr. John M. Nachbar, City Manager; Mr. Bob Watson, City Attorney; Mr. Bill Ebel, Director of Planning and Development Services; Mr. Doug Brown, Director of Public Works; Mr. Bryan Dehner, Fire Chief; Mr. Dave Scott, Chief Financial Officer; Mr. John Rod, Community Planning and Services Manager; Mr. Doug Johnson, GIS and Support Services Manager; Mrs. Leslie Karr, Current Planning Manager; Mr. Erik Sartorius, Assistant City Manager/Director of External Affairs; Mr. Mark Stuecheli, Senior Transportation Planner; Mr. Bill Heatherman, Supervisory Civil Engineer; Ms. Danielle Zeigler, Planner; Mr. Sean Reilly, Communications Manager; Mr. Rob Welton, PC Technician; and Ms. Pamela Blaszyk, Recording Secretary.

TOPIC: HOW SHOULD WE GROW AS A METROPOLITAN AREA OVER THE NEXT 30 YEARS.

Community Planning and Services Manager John Rod introduced Mr. Frank Lenk from the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC). He noted that Mr. Lenk was going to discuss the growth of the metropolitan area in the future. Mr. Lenk has presented this topic to the MARC board, and various jurisdictions in the metropolitan area to obtain some feedback. Mr. Rod noted that Mr. Lenk would be discussing a baseline scenario for the growth of the metropolitan area versus an adaptive growth scenario.

Mr. Frank Lenk, Director of Research Services, MARC, indicated that as the region's metropolitan planning organization, MARC is responsible for putting together a long-range transportation plan for the region entitled Transportation Outlook 2040. He indicated that they are trying to forecast how the region is going to grow in the next 30 to 40 years. He has been working for MARC for the last 30 years, and some of his forecasts have not been realized. However, they must have something on which to base their plans, and gradually their tools have improved. As a part of the long-range transportation plan, they do economic and demographic forecasting. They look at

the overall level of growth in the region and allocate that growth to sub areas. Traditionally transportation plans address system performance, system condition, safety, and security, which are all in support of a vital economy. In addition, they are looking at the role of transportation in making attractive places where people can live and work and its impact on public health in terms of facilitating more active styles of living. Sometimes they look at climate change, energy use, the environment and the preservation of natural resources, especially along the streams. They also look at accessibility so everyone has access to the services the region can provide.

As they look 30 to 40 years in the future and the trends between 2000 and 2040, they use their regional forecasting model to look at how Kansas City competes against the rest of the country. The population in the metropolitan region was 1.8 million in 2000. The model indicates that they will grow from the current population of 2 million to 2.5 million by 2040.

When they allocate growth to subareas, they start with the region's current land use pattern. They identify various uses such as residential and note the areas that are still largely vacant. They collect this data from all of the county assessors around the region, and they look at the plans from the local governments. They assemble all of the data and use consistent classification. They are planning for a region where development occurs everywhere. The vacant land goes away in this picture. When they collected the plans and applied the densities of the land uses that are associated with the plans, they found that they were planning an ultimate build out for a population of approximately 5.5 million. They are only going to have approximately 2.5 million people in 2040; however, they are planning to build infrastructure in the hopes of supporting 5.5 million people. He wanted to show a couple of different scenarios of what could occur when they put 2.5 million people in an area that could accommodate 5.5 million people.

The baseline scenario is based on past trends continuing unabated. This scenario was developed with history being extended into the future. There is an area of decline in the metropolitan center, and it is surrounded by fairly stable centers that are further surrounded by an area of growth that extends out into the rural places.

The adaptive scenario depicts a future that would not be like the past. In light of higher gasoline and energy prices, perhaps people are more interested in conserving energy. Life styles are changing. Only 22 percent of households in the region are comprised of married couples with children, and 78 percent of the households in the region do not fit into that category. Mr. Lenk asked what housing would look like for the 78 percent. With the alternative scenario, they are imagining a future that is more efficient and significantly different from what past trends would indicate. With the adaptive scenario, they have placed the population through their transportation zone system, growth occurs everywhere and all areas are healthy. Mr. Lenk noted that most people would say that the adaptive scenario is great, but they would wonder if it could be achieved. Under the baseline forecast, they are consuming about 275 square miles of vacant agricultural land. When they apply infrastructure costs on a per acre basis for the roads and the extension of sewer lines, the cost over a 40-year period is approximately \$8.7 billion. Under the adaptive scenario, less land is consumed and the cost for infrastructure is approximately \$3.4 billion during the same 40-year period. Under the baseline scenario, transit becomes less viable. Under the adaptive scenario, transit becomes more viable because development is focused along the corridors. There are more congested links under the baseline scenario than under the

adaptive scenario. Both of the scenarios are based on 2010 transportation networks. They have not added any new roads beyond what is there today. More infrastructure investment would be required under the baseline scenario to deal with more congestion.

Another way of looking at the roadway congestion is that about 20 percent more links are congested under the adaptive scenario than what is there today. They are adding one half million people, so some increase in congestion is expected compared to an 80 percent increase in the number of links under the baseline scenario. However, travel times decrease under the adaptive scenario because people are closer to the things they want to see and do, so they would take shorter trips.

Regarding the population change by county, Johnson County does roughly the same between the baseline and adaptive scenarios. The biggest change would be to move people out of what are now unincorporated areas and put them in cities where they could be more efficiently served. The biggest gainers in population growth are Wyandotte County and Jackson County, which would have some substantial development and reinvestment under the adaptive scenario. Cass County and Leavenworth County have the biggest differences in population change between the baseline and the adaptive scenarios. Leavenworth County's growth is faster under the baseline scenario than it would be with the adaptive scenario. Cass County is in line with that with growth under the baseline as well. When they showed their conclusions to the MARC board of directors, the representative from Cass County observed that under the adaptive scenario they have approximately 100,000 fewer people than under the baseline scenario. The representative added that was good, because they could not handle another 100,000 people in addition to the growth of 50,000 that is already forecast for Cass County. It would be too expensive to serve 100,000 more people with the required infrastructure.

The MARC board achieved a consensus that the adaptive scenario was attractive and they wanted to pursue it and determine if they could move the region in that direction. However, the question was how far and how fast would the region be willing to move towards the adaptive scenario.

Overland Park does better under the adaptive scenario. They included as best they could the Vision Metcalf plan in the data with a lot of redevelopment in that corridor. Overland Park has approximately 25,000 more people under the adaptive scenario than under the baseline scenario. The adaptive scenario reflects a change in how the region is built, but it is not a complete remaking of the region. The redevelopment is occurring only on 12 percent of the land, and it is just moving 11 percent of the population, so 89 percent of the people would be living in the same kind of areas where they currently live. The adaptive scenario is built on the local plans around the region. They looked at the comprehensive plans of all the cities, and all of the plans incorporate an idea of sustainability. They all reflect a desire to build higher density and more mixed use development with more of a focus on redevelopment. The plans are also more pedestrian friendly with options to walk and bike, and they also make available more transit so people can use transit on a regular basis. There is more of an effort to preserve the natural environment. These factors begin to define a regional direction. In addition, the MARC board and other regional organizations have adopted a vision of becoming America's green region. They desire to be sustainable in all dimensions, which would include having a vital economy, taking care of their

environment and meeting the needs of the people. This is all being considered in conjunction with the policy framework for Transportation Outlook 2040.

In an attempt to determine what sustainability might look like in this region under the adaptive scenario, they are working with a Technical Forecast Committee, of which Mr. Rod serves as co-chair along with Mr. Steve Lebofsky of Kansas City, Missouri. The Technical Forecast Committee is trying to define areas that could be redeveloped at high densities. Generally, these areas are older commercial centers. Commercial centers have a relatively short life span at their initial level of retail activity, and they tend to be redeveloped often. They have a map on which they have identified these centers at different levels and stretched them out along key corridors. They are using the existing nodes and corridors that have been identified from information that was gathered over a two-year period. This map will always be in flux, and it will be edited as new development possibilities occur. Particular corridors were identified as having a high priority, including corridors for bus rapid transit or potential light rail corridors. They also prioritized historic city centers. Every city has a downtown area, like Downtown Overland Park, that was built at a time when a good pattern was more narrow and more walkable. They want to make sure that the areas that are already pedestrian friendly will stay that way and improve. They also protected several stream ways along the flood plains or areas with a high quality of natural resources.

When they showed the adaptive scenario with several presentations around the region, most people liked the scenario. Approximately 1,000 people participated in their Imagine KC, which was held on television last spring. There were off-line and on-line components of that effort. When he presents the adaptive scenario, although people like the concept, they do not know exactly how it can be achieved. When they look at the adaptive scenario, they are not talking so much about where they do not want growth. They are talking about where they do want growth. The question is if they can attract growth to the places where they can provide services more efficiently. They want a region that is more affordable. The adaptive scenario is the low tax, low cost way to grow. It would be more attractive, competitive, cohesive, equitable, vibrant, green, and better connected. The adaptive scenario helps them to reach all of these goals simultaneously. When they do visual preference work and show a picture of the adaptive scenario, everyone likes it the best. The question is how can they get there.

A number of external factors seem to be pushing them in the direction of the adaptive scenario including climate change, the likely regulation of green house gas emissions, and rising fuel and energy prices that are, in part, the result of a desire to preserve their natural resources and not consume any more green space than necessary. There are demographic shifts. The majority of households are no longer the nuclear family. They have more minorities and immigrants in the region, and they tend to be attracted to urban living. Housing shifts are occurring. As baby boomers age, they are looking for housing that requires less maintenance and smaller yards. There are economic shifts. A lot of the housing was built when people were able to get credit more easily. Credit is not going to be as easily obtained in the future, which will constrain the size of homes and the amount of housing activity. This will also constrain local governments. More local governments are strapped for cash, because retail sales revenues have been flat recently. Also, they keep trying to grow themselves out of a problem that creates a greater need for infrastructure that has to then be maintained. In many parts of the region, the infrastructure has become unaffordable. The economy does run on talent and innovation, especially in this century. Talent and innovation tend to occur with diversity, which tends to increase with density.

When they talked about the adaptive scenario with the MARC committee, they indicated that the external factors would get them half the way there. The external factors alone on average would allow them to accommodate 20 percent of the region's growth in existing areas. With the adaptive scenario, 60 percent of the growth is in new areas and 40 percent of the growth occurs in existing areas. The question is what it would take to have 40 percent of the growth occur in existing areas.

They have identified some policies that they thought would help to work towards the adaptive scenario. Some policies would be relatively easy to carry out and others would not. One policy would be to increase the level of transit service along the high priority corridors. Another strategy would be to coordinate sewer policies, so there is some trigger for when they build new sewers. They would also want to give priority in their transportation funding to the corridors they have identified.

Other policies that will be needed include establishing redevelopment targets locally. They need plans to clearly define their priority areas for redevelopment. There is an edge with new development. Bankers and developers know where that edge is located, and they know what is next. When they know what is next, they can plan in advance, they can buy the property in advance and be ready when development comes to that area. In contrast, redevelopment is scattered all over the City, and there is no edge to it. If they developed a public policy that would create an edge for redevelopment, that would help to make redevelopment more attractive and bring private sector dollars into the process, because there are probably not enough public sector dollars. They could provide density bonuses that allow higher density in exchange for more amenities or greater quality of life considerations. Perhaps there could be density minimums in certain corridors.

The policies become progressively more difficult. One policy could involve impact fees. While most local governments use impact fees, they could be used in a way that directs development to where there is already infrastructure. Intra county (not regionalized) tax base sharing could help to limit excessive competition for retail development that leads to competition for more rooftops to support the retail, which then needs more retail. They could have interlocal agreements to not provide incentives for green field development, or they could have new incentives for redevelopment. One idea is if people are saving \$5 million by not having to build as much infrastructure, perhaps they would bring that savings forward and finance some of the redevelopment costs out of those future cost savings. Finally, they need a dramatic improvement in the quality of life in the urban core and disadvantaged areas, especially in the area of schools and public safety. Schools and crime drive a lot of residential decisions. The Technical Forecast Committee felt that this would be an important aspect for fully achieving the adaptive scenario with 40 percent of their growth being accommodated in existing areas.

Mr. Lenk asked what the City would be willing to do. They have identified what their goal is, and the question is how can they get there. The Technical Forecast Committee has identified the kinds of things that are necessary for them to achieve the adaptive scenario. Now it is a policy decision. The City must determine what they are willing to do, so they can make a forecast of how far they can get and how long it will take to get there.

Mr. Rod stated that he wanted to discuss where they have been historically and how that leads into the discussion of the baseline and the adaptive scenarios. The starting

point is to look at past factors, which have a strong influence on future development trends and growth areas. There are positive factors that attract people into areas and negative factors that influence decisions to move out of areas.

In looking at the past 38 years, three counties of the most interest in terms of the past trends are Johnson County, Jackson County and Wyandotte County. Also from a historic standpoint, Platte County and Cass County have a history that is parallel to what was experienced in Johnson County with gradual growth over a long period of time. In 1970, Johnson County had a population of approximately 217,000. With steady growth, Johnson County had a population of 270,000 in 1980. In 1990 they had a population of 355,000. In 2008, Johnson County had a population of 534,000. From 1970 to 2008, the population in Johnson County increased by 316,431 or 145.4 percent. In contrast, with a population of 654,558, Jackson County was almost three times as big as Johnson County in 1970. The population in Jackson County declined and then increased again to the same 1970 population level by the year 2000. By the year 2008, Jackson County actually had an increase in population. Overall, from 1970 to 2008, Jackson County had an increase in population of 13,859 or a little more than 2.1 percent. In 1970, Wyandotte County had a population of 186,845. It has gradually declined although that decline has tapered off in the last decade since 2000. From 1970 through 2008, Wyandotte County had a decrease in population of 32,558 or a -17.4 percent.

In looking at the long-term trends, it is evident that they are difficult to change over a period of time. When change does come, it usually occurs gradually. With the baseline and adaptive scenarios, they are looking at a 40-year period of time between 2000 and 2040. The two scenarios are only being applied at this time to the MARC planning area, which consists of seven counties. The metropolitan area is defined for the census as a 15-county region. However, the MARC board plans for seven counties, which are the core counties within the 15-county metropolitan area. Noticeable differences are evident between the historic trends and the trends that are carried forward by either the baseline scenario or the adaptive scenario. This is especially true when they are comparing the three main counties of Johnson County, Jackson County and Wyandotte County.

Mr. Rod referred to a chart entitled a Comparison of Baseline and Adaptive Scenarios with Historic Trends. From a historical standpoint, they are looking at the metropolitan county trends from 1970 through 2008. The baseline and adaptive scenarios covered the period from 2000 through 2040. There was an overlap with the historic data and the baseline and adaptive scenarios between 2000 and 2008. In looking at Johnson County from a historical standpoint, the population grew by 316,431 between 1970 and 2008. Under the baseline scenario, which is different from going forward with the historic trends, Johnson County is projected to grow in population by 195,347 with a 43.3 percent increase. Under the adaptive scenario, the population is projected to increase by 201,649 or 44.7 percent. A good measure as to how they are proceeding with the projection is to look at what has happened between 2000 and 2008. In that period of time, Johnson County has continued to grow in population by 83,007, and the growth is basically following along historic trends. Jackson County had an increase in population of 13,859 from 1970 to 2008. Under the baseline scenario, Jackson County is projected to increase in population by 127,364 or 19.4 percent. With the adaptive scenario, Jackson County is projected to have an increase in population of 196,181, which is a 30 percent increase. In looking at the most recent history, from 2000 to 2008, the population in Jackson County

increased by 13,537 or 2.1 percent. From 1970 through 2008, Wyandotte County had a loss in population of 32,558, which is a -17.4 percent. There was subsequently a slight drop in population; however, in the most recent years, the population in Wyandotte has slightly increased. Under the baseline scenario, the projection for Wyandotte County is for an increase in population of 18,688. Under the adaptive scenario, the projection is for an increase in population of 56,269 or 35.6 percent.

With regard to the major changes between the historic trends and the baseline and adaptive scenarios, Johnson County has the most significant difference with 100,000 less in population than what is indicated by the historic trends. Platte County and Leavenworth County also have significant changes between the historic trends, the baseline scenario and the adaptive scenario.

In looking at a chart entitled, Redevelopment and Infill, the baseline scenario assumes that there will continue to be a negative 7 percent change in population in the urban core of the metropolitan area. The new growth would be occurring on the fringe. Mr. Rod clarified that the baseline scenario from 2000 to 2040 is not reflective of the historic trends. There are some differences. For the past four decades the vast majority of growth has been occurring on the fringe and not in the urban core. With the adaptive scenario, they are assuming that 40 percent of growth in the region will occur with infill or redevelopment in or along existing nodes as well as in built-up areas. In comparing the two scenarios from 2000 to 2040, there is a negative 7 percent of infill with the baseline scenario. With the adaptive scenario, there is an assumption that there would be 40 percent growth with redevelopment from 2000 to 2040. With the most recent history they have considered, it seems that they might have moved from the historic trend of a negative 7 percent to 0 percent of redevelopment and infill. To achieve the adaptive scenario of 40 percent infill by 2040, they would need to have substantial increases in redevelopment over a long period of time. If the City determines that the adaptive scenario is something worth moving towards, they might consider what percentage would be achievable given the measures that they find to be appropriate. It is a policy issue in determining what might be reasonable, appropriate and doable in Overland Park, Johnson County and the metropolitan area.

This leads to four questions they would like to discuss. The first question is how likely is either the baseline scenario or the adaptive scenario to be achieved or sustained over the next 30 years in Overland Park, Johnson County and the Kansas City metropolitan area.

Mayor Carl R. Gerlach asked how they created the baseline and adaptive scenarios. Mr. Lenk replied that the baseline scenario was created from a historical estimation of a set of models that looked at the probability that an area will develop, redevelop or decline. That data was then extrapolated forward for about 40 years to create the baseline scenario. Mayor Gerlach noted that Mr. Rod mentioned some differences between the baseline scenario and the historic trends that were extrapolated forward. Mr. Lenk replied that Mr. Rod took the historical data and calculated a simple trend and extended that out. Mr. Lenk explained that in developing the baseline scenario, he estimated the relationship between a parcel of land developing or not developing and factors like the proximity to employment, roads and whether the land is sewered. He used a model as opposed to carrying forward a trend. It is just a different way of looking at historical data.

Mr. Rod clarified that the data that was presented from 1970 to 2008 was obtained from the historic census information. The 2000 to 2008 data was census information. They were using the same base for the past years. The 2000 to 2040 data is based on the preliminary numbers they have been working with on their task force.

Mr. Lenk explained that they looked at county by county and they carried the trends forward for 40 years. They looked at the census data by county and carried that out to 2040. He started from 2000 and considered how they would grow in the future. One is a forecast and one is based on the past. His model is based on looking at the trends from 1990 to 2008. In looking at the same period, he is deriving a model that explains how these different factors are related to one another and then using the model to make the forecast.

Mr. Rod clarified that the numbers that indicate a baseline and adaptive scenario for 2040 are both out of the model. Mr. Lenk added that with the adaptive scenario, they considered what a sustainable region would look like. In part of the discussion with the Technical Forecast Committee, which is comprised of government planners around the region, they wanted to show an alternative, and they wanted the alternative to be significant rather than a mere modification. They wanted to look at something that was within the realm of reason with the majority of development in new areas but with a substantial difference in the way they do things. For the adaptive scenario, they looked at the target. They then began with the same model and began tweaking the probabilities of development to emphasize those factors he mentioned such as the corridors, the centers, and preserving and protecting vacant land.

Mayor Gerlach noted that Mr. Lenk inferred that only 22 percent of households have nuclear families and prefer to live in a suburban type of community. He asked if Mr. Lenk was suggesting that only families with children want to live in suburbs. Mr. Lenk replied that he was saying that there will be ten million moves in and out of the region over the next 30 to 40 years. Under the adaptive scenario, they are considering what it would look like if the net result is that 11 percent more people would chose to live along the redeveloping corridors than they have forecasted with the baseline scenario. There will be a lot of different kinds of people who want to live in suburban areas. The adaptive scenario indicates that 60 percent of growth is in new areas. However, people may want the new areas to be more pedestrian friendly. If people want the traditional suburban style, that is fine too.

Mayor Gerlach observed that it seems they are telling people where they are going to work and live with the policies that are needed for the adaptive scenario. The last policy regarded improving the quality of life, schools and public safety in the urban core. He asked how a transportation plan can dictate to policy making bodies that they would invest what it takes for quality public safety and schools. He asked if the plan would be destroyed if a group decides that they do not want to participate in that goal. Mr. Lenk replied that is the most difficult policy, which is why it is last. The weakness in the core hurts the entire metropolitan area. It hurts their ability to attract business and talent to the region. It is a regional problem. The question is if there are regional solutions. By itself, a transportation plan is not going to accomplish a quality of life in schools and public safety. The real question is if as a community they are willing to commit to making sure that every part of the region is healthy. To achieve that goal, it may require more cooperation across city and county lines. The Technical Forecast Committee is telling him that if they really want to achieve this level of redevelopment, it is going to take that kind of increased cooperation that

produces a region where all parts are healthy. He was asking the Overland Park Council if that was a reasonable goal for MARC to assume as they go forward in producing a transportation plan.

Mr. Fred Spears stated that he moved from Jackson County to Johnson County in the 1980s. He asked if they know where the people came from who represent the 316,431 people who moved to Johnson County between 1970 and 2008. Mr. Lenk replied that they do not know exactly where they came from, but many of them came from out of the region. Approximately 300,000 people move in and out of the region every year. He did not have the data to indicate what portion of the population has moved from county to county, but he could find that out. While a lot of people are moving from county to county, there are also several people who have moved into Johnson County from outside of the region. People move out of areas that they find to be unattractive, and in the past that has been the urban core locations. Mr. Spears asked if they have any projections of where the people might be coming from in the future. People are moving away from western Kansas because of a lack of opportunities. He assumed that many of them are coming to Johnson County for economic reasons. Mr. Lenk replied that they typically draw people from the farm belt, especially to the north of this area, and from Los Angeles. They lose people to the sun belt and to the Ozarks, especially when they get older. Mr. Spears replied that most of the people he knows who came from places like Los Angeles or San Francisco want a yard and a traditional four-bedroom house. Other people with children have left the inner city and they want to have suburban living. From his perspective, they don't have an interest in public transportation. They want to live in their communities.

Mr. Spears added that when he was in college, he took some planning classes where they learned about the donut impact, which indicated that people keep moving further away from the core, and the inner city collapses. He asked how would they change the societal norms and the cultural differences when people still want the four bedroom house and the two car garage. Mr. Lenk replied that they are not talking about everyone. They are talking about 11 percent of the population. Many people do move to the region because it is spacious and they want the relatively inexpensive big house. Other people move here and choose to live in the core, because they want a more urban style of living. The question is if there is enough flexibility to shift the trends and save themselves a large amount of funding for infrastructure. Can they exploit the interest in more urban living and the fear of rising energy and fuel prices and find a way to put people where it is more efficient for cities to serve them. The redevelopment does not always occur in the core. It needs to occur in existing areas. For example, 119th Street and Metcalf could be one of those existing areas, with the understanding that it will not be redeveloped any time soon. Mr. Spears asked if 11 percent is enough of a number to cause the demand for public transportation and public services to be consolidated to the point where it is viable. Mr. Lenk replied that if they can focus public transportation along key corridors, that would be enough of an increase to have public transportation be useful to more people than it is today.

Mr. Richard Collins indicated that he was looking at the Redevelopment and Infill chart. He asked for further clarification of the progressions that are indicated on the chart. Mr. Rod replied that the chart is showing examples of different scenarios from 2000 through 2040. The adaptive scenario assumes a 40 percent increase in redevelopment from 2010 to 2040. The baseline scenario is showing a -7 percent decrease in redevelopment between 2010 to 2040. The recent historic trend is possibly up to zero redevelopment through 2040. With the thousands of new housing

units that have been built in downtown Kansas City, Missouri, more people have moved there, and that may have moved the historic trend up to zero from a -7 percent. If they want to move towards the adaptive scenario, the question is what might be a reasonable amount to move towards that goal. If they want to have a 40 percent increase in redevelopment and infill from 2010 onward, they would have to make up ground from where they are currently during that 30-year period. If that does not seem to be reasonable, they should consider what might be reasonable whether it is a 10 percent increase in infill over that period of time, a 20 percent increase or a 30 percent increase. The intent of this chart is to provide some choices.

Mayor Gerlach clarified that the chart gives various examples to indicate different percentages of increased redevelopment to achieve certain goals from 2000 to 2040. Ten years have already passed by, so there is a higher slope on the chart to indicate a 40 percent increase in 30 years. Mr. Rod replied that most people would probably assume that a 40 percent increase in infill is not achievable in 30 years. The chart shows that if they want to average 40 percent over the 40-year period, they would have to achieve more, because they have already completed one quarter of the forecast period.

Mr. Dave Hill assumed that they were all interested in creating a more efficient infrastructure system and transportation system, and they wanted to save energy and be green. The presentation alluded to the fact that people make choices about where they want to live based on a low crime rate, the quality of education or the reputation for a good school district, and the quality of infrastructure and government. People consider that three-legged stool when they decide where they want to live. Studies by various chambers of commerce have validated this observation over and over again. The presenters asked the Councilmembers and Commissioners to consider if it is reasonable to assume that some of these redevelopment scenarios might occur. Mr. Hill was of the opinion that until or unless some of those systemic issues like crime rates and the quality of public education are addressed or change, the answer has to be no.

Mr. Lenk asked what is the possibility of those issues being addressed or changed. He asked if it is worth assuming that they might improve. Mr. Lenk asked what if the 40 percent was not accommodated at all in the core area of Kansas City, Missouri, but it was accommodated in areas such as Prairie Village and Raytown. Mr. Hill replied that it is a more realistic scenario to assume that the Metcalf corridor might be redeveloped before Paseo or Troost would be redeveloped. Mr. Lenk asked if 40 percent of growth in Overland Park could be for infill and redevelopment. Mr. Hill replied that he did not know.

In clarifying today's objective, Mr. Curt Skoog noted that MARC has been charged with developing a 40-year transportation plan under federal rules and regulations. The baseline scenario was based on how development has traditionally been accomplished. The committee was asking what are they willing to do to create a different target. The committee created the adaptive scenario by assuming that 40 percent of growth would be redevelopment and infill. He asked what kinds of things would they have to do as a community, without considering city boundaries, to make that happen. The other question was if that is a reasonable question. Overland Park has already taken a step towards the adaptive scenario with Vision Metcalf. He believed that MARC was looking for a discussion around the 40 percent goal and the policies they would be willing to adopt to work towards the adaptive scenario. With the Vision Metcalf plan,

they have already considered some of those policy issues and put them in place. Now the question is if they are willing as a community and a region to push the boundaries out even further.

Mr. Lenk stated that Vision Metcalf essentially served as a template for much of what they did. They essentially took Vision Metcalf and extended it region wide to consider what if the entire region was capable of doing what they are trying to do in Overland Park.

City Manager John Nachbar advised that Vision Metcalf assumes factoring 12 percent of future growth in Johnson County.

Mr. Skoog asked what percentage of growth they are capturing with MARC's example. Mr. Lenk replied that with the adaptive scenario, they are capturing 40 percent of growth over the entire region. Overall, the region is going to grow from 2000 to 2040 by about 700,000 people and they are assuming with this scenario that 277,000 of those people will move to existing areas. There is nothing magical about the year 2040. The direction from the board was to consider how far they could get over a 40-year period. The Technical Forecast Committee thought that those external factors that he had mentioned could account for as much 20 percent of infill growth. He was asking in addition to the external factors, what else could they do. People seem to want the adaptive scenario. He asked what could they do to accomplish what people want.

Mayor Gerlach replied that the big picture is that the transportation plan that MARC develops can make it easier or more difficult for communities, because federal funding is based on MARC's plan. Mr. Lenk replied that the transportation projects have to be included in the plan before they are eligible for federal funding. The forecast is only one part of why the projects get in the plan. However, they have all of those other policy criteria including safety or system performance reasons. They have created a scoring system, and the projects in Johnson County score relatively well.

Mr. Tom Gerend, Assistant Director of Transportation, MARC, stated that over the last 18 months they have been working with the public transportation policy committee and their long-range subcommittee in the development of the plan itself and underlying transportation components. As a part of that, they conducted regionalized project solicitation, which they started in August and continued through September. As a part of that project solicitation, they evaluated and scored projects. In this case, it is really a planning function. They were using the policy goals that Mr. Lenk reviewed to serve as a guide to form project score criteria. So the project evaluation was not necessarily based on the geographical location of the projects, but it was based on criteria that related back to the policy goals with things like system performance and systems condition, place making and accessibility. Those are the factors that have been used in evaluating transportation projects as a part of their plan. Ultimately, the forecast will be a tool to help them understand, from a transportation demand perspective, what investments are needed in the future to accommodate current demands and future demands.

Mayor Gerlach asked if MARC adopts the adaptive scenario as the plan and whatever policies that are necessary to implement that plan, will that criteria be used when the transportation projects are evaluated. The adaptive scenario is that 40 percent of the growth will be redevelopment and infill. He asked if they plan to use that information

as a part of the criteria for the federal funding dollars. Mr. Gerend replied that it is a complicated equation. There are a few functions that MARC serves within the transportation planning context. The development of the long-range transportation plan is not for allocating resources. It is simply identifying projects that they ultimately think are needed for the long term to support their system and that are reasonably affordable. That is the process they are going through with the planning and development process. Approximately every two years they program federal funds, and they have discretion to determine where those funds are allocated. In that process, they also have criteria to select the projects. After the plan is adopted, they will evaluate projects with the selection processes. One of the things they look at is consistency of the plan goals and objectives. The implication is that ultimately they would want to ensure that there is consistency among the programming processes and the selection processes to make sure that they are consistent with the goals that have been outlined.

Mr. Lenk added that since the 1990s and the adoption of some federal legislation, it has been clear that transportation is a tool to create great communities. It is up to them to define a great community. That is the discussion they are trying to have right now. They are considering what creates a great community and whether the adaptive scenario has a role in that, at least as a goal, if not as a forecast.

Mr. Nachbar asked if some communities in the region are considering limiting sewers in order to influence this outcome. Mr. Lenk replied that they are limiting sewers in the sense that they want to make sure that it makes fiscal sense. So they have talked about building sewers when there is a flow capacity trigger. Johnson County Waste-water has talked about that issue. They will have a plan for when they develop new sewers. When they reach a certain capacity, then they will talk about building a new facility. Mr. Nachbar replied that he thought that everyone should think about the implications of attempting to achieve 40 percent redevelopment. While that might be desirable to some individuals, they have to think about what it would actually take to make that happen when the market, up to this point, is going another way. If they as a region adopt this adaptive scenario, it is important that people be aware of the implications that are associated with the goal. If they adopt the adaptive scenario and they are failing with redevelopment at only 3 percent or 5 percent, would there be pressure for them as a region to come up with new methods to try and influence the outcome. It would seem that it would require a rather massive shift in development in this region in order to make that happen. The adaptive scenario will not occur naturally. It would either take some strong incentives or disincentives. It is important for the elected officials to be aware of that.

Mr. David White assumed that the statistics would prove that any growth that has occurred in Jackson County has been in the eastern area of that county, such as in Lee's Summit, and not in the core area. They have had negative growth in the core. If they are talking about putting 40 percent of growth in a redeveloped area, such as Raytown, that is fine. With a goal of redeveloping the core to get people to move back to the downtown area, they get back to the point that was mentioned by Mr. Hill. If they do not solve the issues associated with the schools and crime, the dollars are not going to be there for redevelopment, and the people are not going to want to move there. If they move there, they are going to move out again. From a policy standpoint, a significant subsidy by government will be required for redevelopment across the region. It seems that they are all to share in this burden, regardless of where redevelopment occurs. He was not excited about that type of policy. They have

always depended on a strong private reinvestment for redevelopment and not a huge public subsidy. That is totally different from the philosophy of some of their neighboring jurisdictions. When they are talking about the adaptive scenario, one of the variables is the different economic policies and different economic standings of the various communities in the region.

Mrs. Donna Owens noted that her question had to do with the implications of the adaptive scenario. They talked about using some of the plan goals and objectives for rating projects, which follows with funding. She asked what the ramifications are of goals they are setting. Mr. Lenk replied that if 40 percent redevelopment is a goal, they don't think it is a likely forecast. They would make a forecast somewhere in between zero and 40 percent. That forecast is run through their transportation models to estimate travel demands and see what projects might have a higher priority based on usage. This method has been used in the past as a first forecast of the development community. It is an easy and inexpensive forecast for them to use. They do not use the plan as their final forecast, but it is a starting place for them. They have these two scenarios, but they are not forecasts. They are trying to develop a final forecast. The question is if there are any policies that are necessary and doable, and, if so, what are they. A forecast would help them to calibrate how far and how fast they can achieve the plan.

Mayor Gerlach clarified that the policies that were mentioned include an increase in transit corridors, sewer policy triggers, redevelopment in targeted priority areas, providing density bonuses, impact fees, intra county tax sharing, no incentives for green field development and improvement in the quality of life, schools and public safety. Mr. Lenk added that this is the first time they are talking about policy in a public setting, and it is instructive for him. In future meetings, they will get to the point where they have a handout that can be filled out and given back to him.

Mr. Paul Lyons stated that he did not understand why the baseline scenario would be undesirable from a Johnson County and Overland Park perspective. He had a long way to go to understand this before he even had an opinion on the plan. He did not understand why they would set a goal with a certain percentage of redevelopment. His desire for Overland Park is to make it a desirable place for people to live. If that means more redevelopment, then that is fine. If it means other scenarios, that is also fine. He asked why an adaptive scenario is so important. Perhaps an adaptive scenario would be the outcome of some policies that they establish, but he did not know why they would choose policies to meet the adaptive scenario. Mr. Lenk replied that it depends on whether they believe that external forces are reshaping the market. If they do not believe that, then there is not the impetus for achieving the adaptive scenario. Many people do believe that external forces are reshaping markets, changing relative costs and making some things more in demand than they have been in the past. The adaptive scenario is an attempt to adapt to that change so their communities can be successful in the future.

Mr. Jim Hix observed that the challenge was to separate driving behavior to meet the desire of some policy makers versus responding to the desire of the public. Perhaps this discussion reflected a little of both positions. Obviously the elements that they mentioned do exist to some degree. When he looks at redevelopment on the residential side, he has yet to see any significant success stories that were not highly subsidized by the government. He asked if residential redevelopment is really desired or if people are just taking advantage of the cities' waiver of property taxes and the

other subsidies that are involved. It concerns him to set a goal so high that could be used as a base for their future transportation efforts without having more evidence that there are that many people who want to change their living style. He agreed with Mr. Lyons and Mr. Hill. Regardless of the transportation facilities that are available, if they do not have the three stool structure, people are going to want to leave. People who have children and who can economically afford to move will want to live in an area where there is a good educational system. All of the people are going to want to live in an area where there is no crime. He was concerned with talking about a dollars driven policy and if it was what people want or if it is what policy makers want.

Mr. Lenk replied that what they have right now is not natural. It is also a function of public policy. The public policy has been set to finance and subsidize the sewers for the new communities. They do that in large part to escape the social problems that have developed in the core. They have said that this is the natural way of doing things. He was asking if it is natural or if it is just what they are used to. He asked if there is a more logical and sustainable way to build a metropolitan area. He was of the opinion that there is a more logical way, and the adaptive scenario suggests a way that could be done. He agreed that there is a big gap between where they are right now and what would have to happen for the adaptive scenario to be possible. He was asking to what extent are they willing to fill that gap.

Mr. Dan Stock asked if the feedback that they give at this meeting is going to ultimately impact where public dollars are invested from a forecasting standpoint. Mr. Lenk replied that the feedback from this meeting and the other meetings they will be having will be presented to their board the first week of March. They will then take this feedback with a forecast to the Technical Forecast Committee. If the general consensus is that a 10 percent infill and redevelopment by 2040 is the best they can do, then that is the forecast. Mr. Stock replied that he was not sure they could even project 10 percent redevelopment. It would be necessary to have cooperation between interlocal governments across the state line. There is a level of distrust and some hesitation on the part of anyone to support that as a policy. He did not know what implications are involved with intra county tax sharing or what that means, so he could not respond to that policy. Regarding more incentives for green field development, he asked if that means that Wyandotte County would not have a levy if there were no incentives for green field development as a policy. If he was involved in the MARC planning process to determine where the dollars would go in the future, he would look at where they are today and where they came from to project forward. He would not come up with some kind of scenario that is based on what they would like to see happen, because there is a huge risk in adopting the adaptive policy. He did not know why they would make any kind of assumption, other than what is based on historical fact, in terms of where they are headed. He had no reason to make that assumption based on what he sees.

Mr. Lenk stated that although this may not be the case in Johnson County, in other parts of the region, the projected infrastructure cost for submitted projects are more than they can afford. They do not have the tax capacity to pay for them. So, they are going to have some constraints. That is, in part, because their tax capacity is not growing as fast as the rate at which the needs are growing. Mr. Stock replied that whoever designed the chart wants Kansas City to reestablish itself as the urban core at the expense of other surrounding communities. He was of the opinion that was not a realistic assumption. Mr. Lenk replied that this does not only involve Kansas City, Missouri. He asked if Overland Park could do the Vision Metcalf plan. He asked if

they could get the kind of redevelopment that they want along Metcalf. Mr. Stock replied that it is easier for them to respond to that question, because they have some control over what happens there. They have no control over what occurs in other jurisdictions. When they are asked what they think based on their ability to cooperate with the other interlocal governments, that is a difficult question. Another factor is that they all serve different terms, and this scenario covers 40 years. No one in this room can commit to future policy for future Councilmembers. Perhaps the Vision Metcalf is a stretch, but it seems viable because there are parts of it that they can pick and choose that will be developed as a result of having a plan. However, the adaptive scenario is probably unrealistic in the next 30 years.

Mr. Lenk replied that if there is a plan, it will probably spur them to action to achieve more of what they want than they would have achieved had they not had a plan. The general consensus he is hearing is that even if that is true, 40 percent redevelopment is a stretch. Regarding the policies they have presented, either they cannot comment on them or they are just not ever going to happen. If he was going to come back and ask them about Overland Park, he would ask the same kind of questions regarding the policies that are necessary to be put in place to make Vision Metcalf and other new redevelopment occur successfully over this 40-year period.

Mayor Gerlach agreed that this is an important meeting for the metropolitan area. He believed that MARC was listening and Mr. Lenk would relay the feedback that they have provided tonight. MARC understands that Overland Park is the second largest community in the entire metropolitan area in terms of the population. Within one mile of Metcalf and College, they have the same number of people that work as they do in the entire downtown Kansas City area. MARC knows those are important factors, and they are listening. What they do will dictate what happens to the City in the future.

Mr. Terry Goodman asked what is the single biggest impediment that keeps the adaptive scenario from occurring naturally. Mr. Lenk replied that if he was to look at this metropolitan area from above, he would assume that the most attractive spot would be the center, because they can get to most places from there more easily and quickly. In this country, they have basically destroyed the centers of most cities by putting all of the problems there with poor people, poor schools and high crime. Absent those conditions, it would seem that the virtues of centrality might be reasserted almost automatically.

At 7:27 p.m., Mayor Gerlach declared the meeting adjourned. Minutes transcribed by Pamela Blaszyk.

Richard Collins, Chair

Carl R. Gerlach, Mayor