



January 27, 2011 CVC Meeting Summary (Land Use and Transportation)

PART 1—LAND USE

PANEL DISCUSSION

A panel of experts was assembled to help inform the committee's discussion on the topic of Land Use. Participants included:

- Dean Palos, Director, Johnson County Planning Department
- John O'Neill, Director, Johnson County Wastewater
- Frank Lenk, Director of Research Services, Mid-America Regional Council (MARC)
- John Rod, Manager, Director, Community Planning & Services, Planning & Development Services, City of Overland Park

Each panelist was asked to respond to the following questions as they relate to their particular area of expertise:

- What is your department or agency's adopted vision for land use patterns in Johnson County in the next 10 to 20 years?
- How can Johnson County, its municipalities, and partner agencies more effectively coordinate land use, transportation, and infrastructure planning?

Speaker #1: Dean Palos, Director, Johnson County Planning Department

Handouts: Johnson County Rural Comprehensive Plan Brochure, 2007.

Dean provided an overview of Johnson County's Rural Comprehensive Plan and highlighted the following key points:

- Unincorporated areas contain a diverse range of uses—from horse farms to large lot single family residential
- County zoning applies to 44% of the county
- 5,500 square feet average new home size
- Rural Comprehensive Plan allows for densities up to 1 unit per 2 acres with sanitary sewer (Urban Fringe Policy Area); Limited to 1 dwelling unit per 10 acres in Rural Policy Areas
- Rural Comprehensive Plan's guiding principles support development where utilities are available, but encourage urban development in municipalities

- County's primary focus has been on defining how development should occur, not where development should occur
- Commercial development in the county is focused near the Air Center and in the SE portion of the county
- Johnson County will ultimately be urban - County's stance is to support agricultural development in unincorporated areas; but not to protect it
- Limited housing choices in unincorporated areas of the county by design
- Streamway parks are protected as part of larger network
- Aubrey/Stillwell- sewer close to being provided—JOCO approved
- US 69 being upgraded
- County is beginning a Corridor Plan for Aubrey
- County has been proactive in working with cities
- Areas where Johnson County is likely to see significant change:
 - BNSF Intermodal Facility—Gardner/Edgerton, 60,000 additional vehicle trips anticipated as a result
 - K-10 Corridor (Area Plan exists)
 - Sunflower Army munitions plant--- will be a new town - in clean up stages now, planned as a sustainable, "Community in the Park" (Area Plan exists)

Speaker #2: John O'Neill, Director, Johnson County Wastewater

Handouts: Johnson County Wastewater, Status of Proposed Districts and Study Areas, December 10, 2010 (Map); Johnson County Wastewater, Sewer Availability Projections, April 8, 2008 (Map)

John provided a brief overview of the county's policies regarding sewer expansion in unincorporated areas:

- County has traditionally been reactive based on demand; not predefined where sewers will be built – people come to us requesting sewers
- In order to seek expansion, 51% of the land owners in the area must approve; requires public hearing and BOCC approval
- Periodically, the county updates its Sewer Availability Predictions Map
 - Represents best guess by engineers about where demand will be and what the availability is in those locations
- In locations where requests are made and do not move forward due to lack of support, often end up with subdivisions built using septic systems – not good practice because septic tanks eventually fail and people then want sewers
- Johnson County Wastewater coordinates with other communities on a variety of projects:
 - Special projects
 - Schools
 - Etc.

Speaker #3: Frank Lenk, Director of Research Services, Mid-America Regional Council (MARC)

Handouts: PowerPoint (1/27/11)—Transportation Outlook 2040—How will we Grow?

Frank provided an overview of the land use questions that served as a foundation for MARC's Transportation Outlook 2040 plan:

- As a starting point, MARC assembled baseline and planned land use information from all municipalities
 - Based on what's planned the region's population is projected to reach 5.5 million at build out
- Similar challenges in all communities: changing demographics will require more diverse housing options than previously existed (older, smaller families)—less focus on single-family, detached homes
- Lot's of interest in mixed-use development as an alternative (e.g., Metcalf Corridor), but limited support for restricting outward growth.
- Result of the Transportation Outlook 2040 process has been local plans (e.g. Metcalf Corridor) that are more closely aligned with regional vision.

Speaker #4 John Rod, Manager, Director, Community Planning & Services, Planning & Development Services, City of Overland Park

Handout: PowerPoint —The Built Environment: Overland Park's Vision for the Future (January 27, 2011); Overland Park, Kansas, Future Development Plan, October 2010 (Large Format Map); available upon request

- City focusing on mixed use opportunities, more diverse housing
- Fringe growth will continue but with more focus on redevelopment

COMMITTEE QUESTIONS/COMMENTS—PART 1:

- Has job growth outpaced population growth in Johnson County?
 - As a percentage of overall growth, yes; in terms of actual numbers, no. Also, Johnson County is actually the least sprawling county in the region. (MARC)
- Much of discussion regarding sewers was related to expansion—is there any need for reinvestment in existing sewer infrastructure in Johnson County?
 - Yes, ongoing improvements are being made as needed. Approximately 20-30 million of the 60 million in capital improvements made annually are dedicated to improvements to existing infrastructure.
- Rural Comprehensive Plan map indicates that 199th Street is reserved for potential, future grade-separation—would there be at-grade access along this corridor if that were to occur?
 - Spacing would likely be between 125 and 150'.
- Should the county look at building its own sewage treatment plant?
 - There have been discussions about that.

PART 2—TRANSPORTATION

A panel of experts was assembled to help inform the committee's discussion on the topic of Transportation. Participants included:

- Alice Amrein, Director, Johnson County Transportation
- Kent Lage, Manager, Urban Services Division, Johnson County Public Works and Infrastructure
- KDOT, David Gurs
- Tom Gerend, Assistant Director of Transportation, Mid-America Regional Council (MARC)
- Doug Brown, Public Works Director, City of Overland Park
- Blake Schreck, Vice Chair, START Taskforce, Lenexa (Resource Panelist)

Each panelist was asked to respond to the following questions as they relate to their particular area of expertise:

- What is your department or agency's adopted vision for transportation in Johnson County in the next 10 to 20 years?
- How can Johnson County, its municipalities, and partner agencies more effectively coordinate transportation, land use, and infrastructure planning?

Speaker #1: Alice Amrein, Director, Johnson County Transportation

Handouts: Memorandum to Visioning Committee Members, January 27, 2011 re: Johnson County Transit

- Johnson County Transit (JCT) provides 3 key services: The JO, which provides fixed-route commuter express public transportation; Special Edition, which provides demand-response curb-to-curb transportation services; and SWIFT (Sheltered Industrial Fixed Transportation) service that provides home to work commute trips for JOCO Developmental Supports clients.
- Typically takes 5 years for a transit route to mature in terms of ridership
- Strategic Plan proposes more frequent service and connections; was prepared with lots of community input from stakeholders
- Metcalf Area was one where plan was adopted
- START Committee was proposed by former Chairman Surbaugh, who suggested an outside party should review the strategic plan and make recommendations to the BOCC
- 24 member task force was established—varied levels of expertise
- JCT beginning to work more closely with cities to align transit and land use

Speaker #2: Blake Schreck, Vice Chair, START Taskforce, Lenexa (Resource Panelist)

Handouts: Memorandum to Visioning Committee Members, January 27, 2011 re: Johnson County Transit—Strategic Transit Action Recommendation Taskforce Final Report, January 19, 2011.

- Not everyone on task force was aware of the JCT Strategic Plan; numerous informational meetings held to get the group up to speed

- Support for ideas, but recommendation to phase it in over a longer period of time
 - Look at a variety of funding options (e.g., mil levy, state funding, fees on vehicle tags, etc.)
- BOCC accepted committee's suggestions without funding recommendations
- Re-evaluate if things change, e.g., increased demand for services

Speaker #3: Kent Lage, Manager, Urban Services Division, Johnson County Public Works and Infrastructure

Handouts: PowerPoint —County Assistance Road System Program (CARS), January 27, 2011

Speaker #4: KDOT, David Gurs

Handouts: See attached excerpt from 5-County Regional Transportation Study (Phase 1); I-35 SW Johnson County Interchange Project Map.

- 5-County Study—a response to high impact developments (e.g., speedway, intermodal center) as a way to bring together other transportation studies and prioritize them as collective recommendations are too much to fund.
- Phase 1 of 5-County Study focused on vision/themes (see handout); see website link for full executive summary.
http://www.5countystudy.org/get_more_info/reports.aspx
- Phase II recently began—to be focused on prioritization for corridor improvements
- 3 JOCO projects in the works:
 - I-35/435/K-10—JOCO gateway
 - SW JOCO Interchange—between Gardner and Edgerton, to serve Intermodal Center (in design phase)
 - I-435/I-69—ongoing work
- K-7 to become controlled access over time
- US 56 Corridor Management Plan—recommends that the road remain rural, 2-lane, w/improvements (not 4-lane)
- KDOT considering a managed lane study (if funding permits) from I-35 to downtown KC; BNSF part of consideration, may look at truck only or toll only lanes
- Coordination opportunities
 - Need all communities to come to consensus about priorities
 - Need to be creative—can't fund all improvements needed within the current planning horizon
 - May need to consider other funding tools to fill the gap, e.g., Transportation Development Districts

Speaker #5: Tom Gerend, Assistant Director of Transportation, Mid-America Regional Council (MARC)

Handouts: PowerPoint —Greater Kansas City's Long Range Transportation Plan, Transportation Outlook 2040, Tom Gerend, 1/27/11; Kansas City Region Commits to More Sustainable Growth, Mid-America Regional Council

Speaker #6: Doug Brown, Public Works Director, City of Overland Park

Handouts: PowerPoint —Transportation: City of Overland Park - 2011 and Beyond

- Planning for roadways begins with the city’s planning department
- Multi-modal needs have become an increasing focus (development patterns/bikes/pedestrians)
 - Vision Metcalf—new concept since 2007
 - New transportation needs; must have transit
- BRT Alternatives Study –JOCO/OP/Mission/etc.
- Traffic control
- City has begun to may more attention to the curb appeal of the what they build—focused on form AND function.

QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS—PART 2:

- What would the benefits of the START Committee’s recommendations be? Sense of urgency? Impact on economic development?
 - Assumption is that transit would be a benefit
 - Has not been a huge deterrent to economic development not to have more transit
 - Don’t perceive transportation to be a problem—need to build on what we have
 - Light rail not realistic due to land use patterns (low intensity, dispersed)
 - Bus demand needs to be higher to warrant more service
- How does the maintenance of existing streets happen?
 - Funding is decreasing; In 2011 Overland Park is beginning a program focused on the reconstruction of neighborhood streets
- How is snow clearing to maintain access handled?
 - Limited programs for snow removal, but try to target problem areas
- Has POD technology been looked at as an option (similar to short rail technology in DT Las Vegas)? Any viability in Johnson County?
 - Always open to options, but will require investment to make it a reality
 - Was discussed in the Village West Area at a conceptual level
- How likely is toll financing? Could this be a trigger for transit as a way of changing behavior?
 - May be some corridors at the state level where this may occur—has been studied in some locations

- Have you seen shift of funding from roads to transit in other municipalities?
 - Generally a matter of funding structure
 - Many different sources of dedicated funding
 - JOCO is funded locally
 - Federal funds may be shifting more towards “flex dollars”—that may be used for all modes (bikes/peds/transit/roads)

- What does an efficient bus system look like? Will it ever be self-sustaining?
 - Most transit systems are not completely self-sustaining; average fare recovery for JCT is 50-60%
 - Appearance may be that ridership is low on some routes, but these routes are one-way, inbound trips that serve commuters. Therefore, they are full on the inbound leg and empty on the outbound leg
 - In 2008, when gas prices spiked, ridership on all routes was at capacity. Responded by adding buses.
 - JCT already operates as a privatized system (all assets are county-owned, but operated by private company)
 - Need to consider that roads are not expected to pay for themselves

COMMITTEE WORKSESSION—PARTS 1 & 2:

Land Use and Transportation—Charting our Vision

Questions to consider:

Is the continuation of the county’s current land use policies desirable in the long-term (e.g. encouraging urban growth within incorporated areas)? How will planned/growth in SW JoCo and in incorporated cities affect the county’s vision for the future?

How can Johnson Count, its municipalities, and partner agencies more effectively coordinate transportation, land use, and infrastructure planning in light of anticipated growth?

- Planning for future – what role should the government play in private sector?
- How can we shape vision for future (e.g. does transit have to pay for itself?)
- Need to consider the possibility that when demand for transit arrives -> system won’t be in place (ROW, etc, will then constrained) – other modes are more flexible
- Gas prices will continue to go up -> can’t continue to rely on single occupancy vehicles or electric vehicles -> need public transportation
- Grid is how you move in JoCo—transit needs to support this movement in the long run
- Aging population as much of an issue for transit as commuters – need to have access to transit through more than 1 corridor.

- Market aspect of development patterns needs to be considered (e.g., mixed-use not feasible today for retailers). Trying to retrofit a successful county into Boulder or Portland – results in increased costs and may make it not affordable to live here
- Are current policies still valid – not sure status quo will be right going forward (youth-> mid-age)
- Don't demonize what we've done (suburban development) -> we can't rethink that and it has helped make Johnson County a success
- Transformation -> transportation
 - What can we do better?
 - Funding sources are shrinking -> how to pay for it?
- Need to reinvest in existing areas
- Need to establish priorities to direct limited funding that is available where it will have the most impact
- New standards won't work in old areas
- Growth should pay for growth
- Maintaining existing infrastructure should be a priority (along with safety) not new "wish lists"
- Lots of transit benefits not being addressed
 - Quality of life;
 - Sense of community;
 - Younger adults;
 - Less impaired driving
 - Visibility of attractions from transit promote increased awareness and economic development
- Roads pay for capital; user pays for road operations
- Transit users don't pay for operations—70% subsidies
- However, need to consider that potential rider is decreasing burden on roads
- Choice of where you live should be part of discussion in supporting (existing) lifestyles with transit; (e.g., if you choose to live in on a large lot far from existing services, shouldn't expect that transit will be brought to you after the fact)
- Balance of old and new growth needed
- Shouldn't take a different stance on growth now than we did 20 years ago—pattern has helped make JoCo a success
- Growth has never paid for growth
- Growth in more remote locations should pay more for services
- What is our vision for growth in JoCo?
- Does the idea of rethinking how we build out communities hit home?
 - Metcalf -> driven by public; opv. Listened and trying to respond
 - Change is coming, but need to get ahead -> don't wait for demand
- Make it easier to do something different (e.g., mixed-use)
- Ties mixed-use development to trails as much as possible
- If could play SYMCITY with Johnson County, the following come to mind:
 - E-W connection important
 - Mixed use is possible but need to go big or go home (e.g., Zona Rosa has not been that successful)