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PUBLIC MEETINGS
MARCH 30 AND 31, 2016
Schedule

**Explore (Winter 2016)**
- Redevelopment scenarios
- Final Quiet Zone Study
- Advisory Committee
- Public meetings, online town hall and social media
- Planning commission

**Learn (Fall 2015)**
- Data gathering
- Ideal outcomes
- Advisory Committee
- Public meetings, online town hall and social media
- Draft Quiet Zone Study

**Define (Spring 2016)**
- Preferred scenario
- Advisory Committee
- Public meetings, online town hall and social media
- Planning commission

**Adopt (Summer 2016)**
- Initial and final draft plans
- Advisory Committee
- Public meetings, online town hall and social media
- Planning commission

We’re here!
Agenda

Community feedback
Strong Urban Centers
Anticipated Outcomes
Placemaking
Discussion
Next Steps
Community Feedback
Top Challenges

- Transportation options for transit riders, cyclists, and/or pedestrians
- Type, size and/or appearance of future development and redevelopment
- Missing infrastructure, such as utilities, for development
- The railroad
- Flooding and/or soils
- Steep slopes
Top Opportunities

- Park and recreational amenities
- Bike, transit, and pedestrian connections
- Gateways or entry points into the corridor
- Existing areas that could be redeveloped for businesses or other uses
- Vacant land
Emphasis

Focus areas

Development options

K-32 parkway

Truck traffic

Increasing housing densities

Investment in transportation
Potential Focus Areas

- Large parcels of ground
- Turner Diagonal area
- 65th Street area
- K-7 Interchange area
- Schiedt Lane area
- Downtown Bonner Springs and Edwardsville
Scheidt Lane Development Options

- Open space or agriculture
- Institutional uses
- Services or offices
- Industry
- Shopping
- Housing
Important Strategies for Strengthening Downtown Areas

- Add a transit hub or stop
- Slow traffic and make K-32 a narrower street
- Add downtown identification signage, banners, and/or art near K-32
- Make it easier for pedestrians to cross K-32
- Develop vacant or underutilized land
- Improve the variety of services, shops, and restaurants
K-7 Interchange Development Options

- Services
- Housing
- Shopping
- Other
Dev. Options for Large Parcels

- Industry
- Institutional uses
- Housing
- Services or offices
- Shopping
- Open space or agriculture
65th Street & Turner Diagonal Dev. Options

- Transit hub or stop
- Services or offices
- Green industry and job training
- Recreational open space
Investment in Transportation that improves transit and bike/ped

- Very important
- Somewhat important
- Not important
- Unsure
Increasing Housing Densities to Support Better Transit (bus and/or rail)

- Unsure
- Not important
- Somewhat important
- Very important
Creating Strong Urban Centers

Within an 8-mile, approximately 7,092-acre planning area
Short-Term Vision

TIMING
2015 - 2025

GOALS
Respond to realistic redevelopment opportunities and new development potential

Focus on downtowns

Provide transportation options

Create trails and greenways
Existing Land Use & Development
Future Land Use & Dev (Adopted)
Future Land Use & Dev. (2015 - 2025)
Future Land Use & Dev. (2015 - 2025)
Sample Street Sections - Parkway

Respond to corridor character

Urban/Prairie

Main Street/Prairie

Industrial/Prairie

12-foot lanes

Turn lanes and/or medians

Bike/ped off-street + on-street bike
Concepts for Activity Centers: Oak & K-32
Concepts for Activity Centers: Oak & K-32
Concepts for Activity Centers: Oak & K-32

Historic Intermodal Transit Facility (Bonner Springs)
- reestablish urban development form
- develop mixed-use
- relate to improved K-32 and river
- maximize on street parking
- 80+ on-site parking spaces
- 28,000 sq. feet of retail
- 50+ units of residential
  - Or, 40,000 sq. feet of office
  - Or, mix of office/residential

Transit Route
Concepts for Activity Centers: 4th & K-32
Concepts for Activity Centers: 4th & K-32
Concepts for Activity Centers: 4th & K-32

4th Street & K-32 Development Plan (Edwardsville)
- establish urban development form
- improve walkability
- new park space
- relate to improved k-32
- provide government center
- 54,000+ sq. ft of retail
- 40+ units of residential
- 290+ parking spaces

Church Remains

20,000 sq. ft. - government
22 units - residential

Grocery Store

9,800 sq. ft. - retail
10 units residential

Access Drive

Dollar General

Convenience Store
Remains

11,000 sq. ft. - retail
12 units residential

4,000 sq. ft. - retail

7,500 sq. ft. - retail

New Park Space
Concepts for Activity Centers: Grinter
Concepts for Activity Centers: Grinter

Prototype: Molly’s Landing Restaurant (Oklahoma)
Concepts for Activity Centers: Grinter

Grinter Place Development Plan
- maintain natural/rural character
- maintain historic site and structures
- create new retail, restaurant, recreation & entertainment venue
  - provide parking for new venue
- connect historic site and new venue by road and by trail
- use existing clearing and treed area for recreation and trail system
Multimodal Connections to Activity Centers
Option for On-Demand Transit Service (MetroFlex)

Increasing service area of demand response service to all three cities

Connecting to Village West and along Kansas Avenue

Increase service span to M-F
Bus stops on K-32, including downtown Bonner Springs, 4th Street, Grinter Museum, Kansas Avenue (employment), and Village West (Legends)

M-F service at one-hour (baseline) or 30-minute frequencies
Long-term Vision

TIMING
2026 and Beyond

GOALS
Build on “green” by preserving and increasing parks/open spaces

Plan for additional redevelopment, including conservation development options (residential and non-residential)

Promote and market recreational spaces, connections, development
Parks and Greenways
Future Land Use & Dev. (2026+)
Future Land Use & Dev. (2026+): A detailed map showing future land use and development plans for the K-32 Tri-City Multi-Modal Redevelopment Plan. The map includes various future land use categories such as Commercial, Public/Industrial, Office, Institutional, and Residential, each represented by different colors and symbols. The legend on the right provides a key to these categories, with annotations like "Future Land Use [11+ Years with Recommended Updates]." The map also includes other geographical markers such as roads, boundaries, and key landmarks for reference.
Anticipated Outcomes
Jobs-to-Housing Balance

(Assumption: X jobs per every 4 households; ideal is 0.75 - 1.5)

Resource: www.plan4sustainabletravel.org
Corridor Transit Densities
(2,328 needed for on-demand transit service)

Pop + Jobs / Sq. Mile

- 2026+
- By 2025
- Existing
Corridor Access to Alternative Modes of Transportation
(Parcels within 1/8 mile of a transit stop, bike route, or trail)

- Residential
- Employment
- Conservation

By 2025
2026+
Corridor Flood Protection
(Parcels within 100-year floodplain or 150-foot stream buffer)

- Residential
- Employment
- Conservation

- 2026+
- By 2025
Corridor Access to Nature
(Parcels within 1/8 mile of parks, open space, and trails)

- Residential
- Employment
- Conservation

- 2026+
- By 2025
Placemaking
Branding Concept | “Kaw River Parkway”

History
Agriculture
Industry
Downtowns
Kansas River
Recreation
Other

Beaverton, OR

Morris County, NJ

Augusta, GA


### 10+ Corridor Destinations

- Downtowns
- Tiblow Days
- Moon Marble
- Camp Naish
- Papa Bob’s Barbeque
- Edwardsville Days Festival
- Smokin’ in the Ville BBQ Comp.
- Grinter Museum
- Parks and open spaces
- “Kaw River Trails and Greenways”
- “Kaw River Green Industrial Park”

### 10+ Reasons to be There

- To shop
- To eat
- To learn
- To relax
- To exercise
- To experience nature
- To canoe, kayak
- ?????????
- ?????????

Source: Project for Public Spaces - http://www.pps.org/reference/the-power-of-10/
Discussion & Next Steps
Thoughts

• What are the **strongest aspects** of the phased development scenario (2015 – 2025 & 2026+)?

• What aspects **need to be improved**?

• What’s the most important thing to **see in the revised** improvement scenario?

• What **other questions, comments, or concerns** do you want to share?
Next Steps

• Mar. 30  Public Mtg. - KCK
• Mar. 31  Public Mtg. - Bonner Springs
• Apr. 9   Planning Commission Update
• Jun. 8   Advisory Committee Mtg.
• Jun. 29  Public Mtg. - KCK
• Jun. 30  Public Mtg. - Edwardsville
Thank You

PUBLIC MEETINGS
MARCH 30 AND 31, 2016
# Community Investment in Turner Diagonal

## High Level Construction Estimate

Prepared for TIGER Grant Application

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Construction Staking</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
<td>$125,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mobilization</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Removal of Existing Structures</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$1,750,000.00</td>
<td>$1,750,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Common Items Total** $2,625,000.00

## Grading and Drainage Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clearing and Grubbing</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
<td>$50,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Excavation</td>
<td>Cu. Yd.</td>
<td>338,000</td>
<td>$4.75</td>
<td>$1,605,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Common Excavation (Contractor Furnished)</td>
<td>Cu. Yd.</td>
<td>19,000</td>
<td>$25.00</td>
<td>$475,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Excavation</td>
<td>Cu. Yd.</td>
<td>21,758</td>
<td>$8.75</td>
<td>$189,380.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm Sewer or Cross Road Pipe (36&quot;)</td>
<td>Lin. Ft.</td>
<td>12,020</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>$2,404,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>End Section (36&quot;)</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>$1,750.00</td>
<td>$87,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fence (Chain link) (8')</td>
<td>Lin. Ft.</td>
<td>8576</td>
<td>$62.00</td>
<td>$531,712.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Riprap Stone (Light Stone)</td>
<td>Tons</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$30,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb and Gutter, 6&quot;</td>
<td>Lin. Ft.</td>
<td>22,542</td>
<td>$17.00</td>
<td>$383,214.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Construction (4&quot;) (AE)</td>
<td>Sq. Yd.</td>
<td>14,970</td>
<td>$42.50</td>
<td>$636,240.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalk Ramps</td>
<td>Each</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>$3,500.00</td>
<td>$56,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rock Excavation</td>
<td>Cu. Yd.</td>
<td>18,400</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
<td>$1,196,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Safety Barrier (Type II)</td>
<td>Lin. Ft.</td>
<td>1,825</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>$273,750.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Grading and Drainage Items Total** $8,401,247.28

## Concrete Surfacing Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete Pavement (9&quot;) (AE)</td>
<td>Sq. Yd.</td>
<td>26,615</td>
<td>$50.00</td>
<td>$1,330,731.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aggregate Base (AB-3) (6&quot;)</td>
<td>Sq. Yd.</td>
<td>34,548</td>
<td>$8.00</td>
<td>$276,387.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Concrete Surfacing Items Total** $1,607,118.76

## Paving Marking Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pavement Markings</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Pavement Markings Total** $75,000.00

## Signing & Delineation Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signing and Delineation Items</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Signing & Delineation Items Total** $500,000.00

## Traffic Control Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traffic Control</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Traffic Control Items Total** $750,000.00

## Permanent Seeding Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seeding</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Seeding Items Total** $200,000.00

## Temporary Erosion Control Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Erosion Control</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
<td>$750,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Seeding</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Temporary Seeding Items Total** $1,050,000.00

## Additional Project Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEM</th>
<th>UNIT</th>
<th>QUANTITY</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>COST</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lighting</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
<td>$350,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalization</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
<td>$300,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Relocations</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
<td>$200,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Temporary Construction Easements and Permitting</td>
<td>Lump Sum</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Additional Project Items Total** $925,000.00

**Project Cost** $16,133,366
**Contingency (30%)** $4,840,010
**PE (8%)** $1,677,870
**Construction Engineering (12%)** $2,516,805

**Subtotal Project Costs** $25,168,051

**Inflation Projection (3.5% Annually, 2018 Construction Year)** $1,792,594.43

**Total Project Cost** $26,960,645
**Turner Diagonal**

Area Development Potential - NE Quadrant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Land Area in NE Quadrant</th>
<th>210± ac / 9,147,600 sf</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potential Building Area in NE Quadrant</td>
<td>2,736,000 sq ft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Potential F.A.R. in NE Quadrant</td>
<td>FAR = 0.289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

April 15, 2016
THIS PAGE INTENTIONALLY LEFT BLANK
MEMORANDUM

TO: Doug Bach, County Administrator
FROM: Mike Grimm, Research Manager
SUBJECT: Unemployment Rates
DATE: April 21, 2016

The Kansas Department of Labor (KDOL) recently released Wyandotte County and Kansas City, KS unemployment data for March 2016. Monthly rates are shown for 2015 and 2016 for comparison purposes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Annual Average</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Unemployment Rate Memo Supplement**  
**Comparison of Wyandotte Co., Kansas City-KS, KC Metro Area, Kansas and National Unemployment Rates**

### 2016 Unemployment Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Kansas City, KS</th>
<th>Wyandotte Co.</th>
<th>KC Metro Area</th>
<th>Kansas</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.1</strong></td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td><strong>4.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### 2015 Unemployment Rates

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Month</th>
<th>Kansas City, KS</th>
<th>Wyandotte Co.</th>
<th>KC Metro Area</th>
<th>Kansas</th>
<th>National</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>January</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>February</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>March</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>April</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>June</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>July</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>August</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>September</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>October</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>November</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>December</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Annual Average</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>6.1</strong></td>
<td>Not Available</td>
<td><strong>4.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>5.3</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Community Survey Findings

Conducted for
The Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS

Presented by
ETC Institute

April 2016
A National Leader in Market Research for Local Governmental Organizations
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Purpose

• To gather objectively assess resident satisfaction with the delivery of city and county government services

• To gather input from resident to help set budget priorities for the Unified Government

• To objectively assess service performance and understand short and long term trends
Methodology

• Survey Description
  – A 6 page survey including 1 page of District specific questions

• Method of Administration
  – Conducted by mail, phone and the internet
  – Sample was stratified to ensure the completion of at least 300 surveys in each of the County’s 8 Districts

• Conducted late March/early April 2016

• Total number of completed surveys as of the time this report was prepared: 2,435

• More than 2,800 have now been completed, but the final results will not change much at this point in time

• Margin of error: +/- 2% at the 95% confidence level

• Distribution of sample compares well to Census estimates
Demographics

QD-2. What is your age? by percentage of respondents

- 35 to 44: 18%
- 45 to 54: 22%
- 55 to 64: 21%
- 65+: 17%
- 18 to 34: 21%
- Not provided: 1%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
QD-5. Are you or other members of your household of Hispanic or Latino ancestry?

by percentage of respondents

Yes 23%
No 77%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Demographics

QD-6. Which of the following best describes your race?

by percentage of respondents (multiple selections could be made)

- White: 64%
- African American/Black: 25%
- American Indian or Alaska Native: 1%
- Asian, Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islander: 2%
- Other: 8%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Demographics

Council District of Respondents
by percentage of respondents

- Council District 3: 13%
- Council District 2: 12%
- Council District 1: 12%
- Council District 4: 13%
- Council District 8: 13%
- Council District 5: 13%
- Council District 7: 13%
- Council District 6: 12%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Topic #1: Neighborhood and Community Services
Q1. Overall Satisfaction with Services in Neighborhood and Community

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding “don't know”)

- Fire services: 42% Very Satisfied, 43% Satisfied, 14% Neutral, 3% Dissatisfied
- Ambulance services: 41% Very Satisfied, 39% Satisfied, 17% Neutral, 3% Dissatisfied
- Trash collection system: 25% Very Satisfied, 47% Satisfied, 17% Neutral, 11% Dissatisfied
- Police services: 28% Very Satisfied, 43% Satisfied, 21% Neutral, 9% Dissatisfied
- Recycling: 13% Very Satisfied, 38% Satisfied, 29% Neutral, 20% Dissatisfied
- Parks & recreation facilities: 13% Very Satisfied, 36% Satisfied, 28% Neutral, 23% Dissatisfied
- Sewer utility system: 12% Very Satisfied, 36% Satisfied, 33% Neutral, 19% Dissatisfied
- Parks & recreation programs: 11% Very Satisfied, 30% Satisfied, 34% Neutral, 25% Dissatisfied
- Storm water runoff/management system: 10% Very Satisfied, 31% Satisfied, 34% Neutral, 25% Dissatisfied
- Public transportation: 10% Very Satisfied, 29% Satisfied, 38% Neutral, 23% Dissatisfied
- Municipal court: 10% Very Satisfied, 26% Satisfied, 46% Neutral, 19% Dissatisfied
- Code enforcement: 9% Very Satisfied, 25% Satisfied, 36% Neutral, 30% Dissatisfied
- Communication with the public: 8% Very Satisfied, 25% Satisfied, 37% Neutral, 31% Dissatisfied
- Planning & zoning: 9% Very Satisfied, 24% Satisfied, 47% Neutral, 20% Dissatisfied
- Maintenance of City streets: 7% Very Satisfied, 23% Satisfied, 29% Neutral, 42% Dissatisfied

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q1. Overall Satisfaction with Services in Neighborhood and Community


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding “don't know”)

1. Quality of City fire services
   - 2016: 85%
   - 2014: 85%
   - 2000: 81%

2. Quality of City police services
   - 2016: 71%
   - 2014: 66%
   - 2000: 63%

3. Quality of City’s parks & recreation facilities
   - 2016: 49%
   - 2014: 55%
   - 2000: 38%

4. Quality of City’s parks & recreation programs
   - 2016: 44%
   - 2014: 44%
   - 2000: 38%

5. City’s storm water runoff/management system
   - 2016: 46%
   - 2014: 41%
   - 2000: 34%

6. Quality of City Code Enforcement
   - 2016: 34%
   - 2014: 34%
   - 2000: 33%

7. Quality of communication with public
   - 2016: 40%
   - 2014: 33%
   - 2000: 29%

8. Quality of maintenance of City streets
   - 2016: 19%
   - 2014: 30%
   - 2000: 36%

Sources: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)

Since 2014, the most improved police services and the biggest decrease in communication.
Q2. Neighborhood Priorities That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Quality of maintenance of City streets: 53%
- Quality of City police services: 25%
- Quality of City’s parks & recreation facilities: 21%
- Quality of City Code Enforcement: 20%
- Quality of communication with public: 20%
- City’s storm water runoff/management system: 19%
- Quality of public transportation: 15%
- Quality of City’s parks & recreation programs: 15%
- Quality of City fire services: 11%
- Quality of City’s sewer utility: 11%
- Quality of recycling: 11%
- Quality of City Planning & Zoning: 10%
- Quality of trash collection system: 9%
- Quality of ambulance services: 8%
- Quality of Municipal Court: 6%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
## Priorities for Improving Neighborhood/Community Services by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overall City Priorities</th>
<th># of Districts ranked in top 5</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
<th>District 5</th>
<th>District 6</th>
<th>District 7</th>
<th>District 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1st</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>Maintenance of City streets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>Storm water runoff &amp; mngmnt system</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec facilities</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec facilities</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec facilities</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec facilities</td>
<td>City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Storm water runoff &amp; mngmnt system</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>City Code Enforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec facilities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Public transportation</td>
<td>City police services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec programs</td>
<td>City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Communication</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec programs</td>
<td>City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Storm water runoff &amp; mngmnt system</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec facilities</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Quality of Maintenance of City Streets

1st Priority

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District
Communication with the Public

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response

ETC INSTITUTE
Quality of Police Services

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District

3rd Priority
Quality of Parks and Recreation Facilities

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District

4th Priority
Quality of Code Enforcement

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District
# Importance-Satisfaction Rating

## Neighborhood/Community Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (I-S &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0.4201</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of communication with public</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.2102</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (I-S .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1719</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public transportation</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1400</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's parks &amp; recreation facilities</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1364</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City's storm water runoff/management system</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1336</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's parks &amp; recreation programs</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1225</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1061</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (I-S &lt; .10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City police services</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0856</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's sewer utility</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0764</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of recycling</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0748</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service received from City employees</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0665</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of trash collection system</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0359</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Municipal Court</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.0341</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ambulance services</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0226</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City fire services</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0206</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Greatest Opportunities for Improvement:

(I-S Rating Above 0.15)
2016 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey
Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

Neighborhood/Community Services
(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)

**Mean Importance**

- **Exceeded Expectations**
  - Lower importance/higher satisfaction
  - Fire services
  - Ambulance services
  - Trash collection system

- **Continued Emphasis**
  - Higher importance/higher satisfaction
  - Police services
  - Recycling

**Satisfaction Rating**

- **Less Important**
  - Lower importance/lower satisfaction
  - Sewer utility system
  - Storm water runoff/management system
  - Parks & recreation programs
  - Municipal court
  - Planning & zoning
  - Public transportation

- **Opportunities for Improvement**
  - Higher importance/low satisfaction
  - Parks & recreation facilities
  - Code enforcement
  - Communication with the public
  - Maintenance of City streets

Source: ETC Institute (2016)
Topic #2:
County Level Services
Q3. Satisfaction with County Services

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding “don’t know”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (1/2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Parks</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of County Sheriff’s Office</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Community Elections</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Election Office</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Treasurers Office</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of District Attorney’s Office</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of District Courts</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service received from County employees</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Public Health Department Services</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Adult Jail/Juvenile Detention Center</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of County Appraiser’s Office services</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Aging Services</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Senior transportation services</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q3. Satisfaction with County Services


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding “don’t know”)

- Quality of Parks: 54% (2016), 55% (2014)
- Quality of County Sheriff’s Office: 52% (2016), 50% (2014)
- Quality of Community Elections: 47% (2016), 50% (2014)
- Quality of Election Office: 46% (2016), 51% (2014)
- Quality of Treasurers Office: 42% (2016), 43% (2014)
- Quality of District Attorney’s Office: 42% (2016), 41% (2014)
- Quality of District Courts: 42% (2016), 43% (2014)
- Quality of Motor Vehicle Registration: 41% (2016), 45% (2014)
- Customer serviced received from County employees: 40% (2016), 47% (2014)
- Quality of County Appraiser’s Office services: 36% (2016), 36% (2014)
- Quality of Aging Services: 35% (2016), 34% (2014)
- Quality of services for developmental disabilities: 32% (2016), 33% (2014)

*Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)*
Q4. County Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Quality of Motor Vehicle Registration: 39%
- Quality of County parks: 24%
- Quality of services for developmental disabilities: 21%
- Quality of Area Agency on Aging Services: 20%
- Customer service provided by county employees: 20%
- Quality of senior transportation: 18%
- Quality of Public Health Department services: 17%
- Quality of County Appraiser’s Office services: 13%
- Quality of Treasurer’s Office: 11%
- Quality of Adult Jail/Juvenile Detention Center: 11%
- Quality of County Sheriff’s office: 9%
- Quality of community elections: 8%
- Quality of District Courts: 7%
- Quality of the Election Office: 6%
- Quality of The District Attorneys’ Office: 5%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
## Priorities for Improving County Services by District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Overall City Priorities</th>
<th># of Districts ranked in top 5</th>
<th>District 1</th>
<th>District 2</th>
<th>District 3</th>
<th>District 4</th>
<th>District 5</th>
<th>District 6</th>
<th>District 7</th>
<th>District 8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2nd</td>
<td>County Parks</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Senior Transportation</td>
<td>Public Health Services</td>
<td>County Parks</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>County Parks</td>
<td>County Parks</td>
<td>County Parks</td>
<td>County Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3rd</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Area Agency on Aging Services</td>
<td>County Parks</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>Public Health Services</td>
<td>Area Agency on Aging Services</td>
<td>Area Agency on Aging Services</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4th</td>
<td>Public Health Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Services for Developmental Disabilities</td>
<td>Area Agency on Aging Services</td>
<td>Services for Developmental Disabilities</td>
<td>County Parks</td>
<td>County Appraisors Office</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>Area Agency on Aging Services</td>
<td>Public Health Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5th</td>
<td>Area Agency on Aging Services</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Public Health Services</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>Public Health Services</td>
<td>Services for Developmental Disabilities</td>
<td>Customer Service</td>
<td>Services for Developmental Disabilities</td>
<td>Public Health Services</td>
<td>Area Agency on Aging Services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Motor Vehicle Registration

1\textsuperscript{st} Priority

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District

ETC INSTITUTE
Customer Service Provided by Unified Government Employees

3rd Priority

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response
Public Health Department Services

4th Priority

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District
Area Agency on Aging Services

5th Priority

2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District

Citizen Satisfaction
Mean rating on a 5-point scale

- 1.0-1.8 Very Dissatisfied
- 1.8-2.6 Dissatisfied
- 2.6-3.4 Neutral
- 3.4-4.2 Satisfied
- 4.2-5.0 Very Satisfied
- No Response
## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

### County Level Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (I-S &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Motor Vehicle Registration</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2620</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (I-S .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality services for developmental disabilities</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0.1683</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Customer service received from County employees</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1713</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Aging Services</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1699</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health Department Services</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1582</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior Transportation</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0.1478</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Parks</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1408</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of County Appraiser's Office services</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1037</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (I-S &lt; .10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult Jail/Juvenile Detention Center</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.0958</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Treasurers Office</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0818</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0574</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Community Elections</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0572</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of District Courts</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0480</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of Election Office</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0440</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of District Attorneys' Office</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0373</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement:**

(I-S Rating Above 0.15)
2016 Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County Community Survey
Importance-Satisfaction Assessment Matrix

County Level Services
(points on the graph show deviations from the mean importance and satisfaction ratings given by respondents to the survey)

mean importance

Exceeded Expectations
lower importance/higher satisfaction
- County Sheriff’s office
- The District Attorneys’ Office
- The Election Office
- Community elections
- District Courts
- Treasurer’s Office

Continued Emphasis
higher importance/higher satisfaction
- County parks

Satisfaction Rating

Less Important
lower importance/lower satisfaction
- Adult Jail/Juvenile Detention Center
- County Appraiser’s Office services

Opportunities for Improvement
higher importance/lower satisfaction
- Customer service
- Public Health Department services
- Area Agency on Aging Services
- Services for developmental disabilities
- Senior transportation

mean satisfaction

Lower Importance
higher importance/lower satisfaction

Higher Importance

Source: ETC Institute (2016)
Topic #3:
Overall Priorities
Q5. Overall Services That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years
by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Maintenance of City streets: 33%
- Motor Vehicle Registration: 20%
- Police services: 18%
- Code enforcement: 12%
- Parks & recreation facilities: 11%
- Area Agency on Aging Services: 10%
- Services for developmental disabilities: 10%
- Storm water runoff/management system: 9%
- County parks (Wyandotte County Park, Wyandotte Country Club): 9%
- Communication with the public: 8%
- Fire services: 8%
- Public transportation: 8%
- Public Health Department services: 7%
- Customer service provided by Unified Government em: 7%
- Senior transportation: 7%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Topic #4: Public Safety Ratings and Priorities
Satisfaction has increased in 5 of 6 areas since 2014.
Public Safety Services that Should Be Emphasized Most Over the Next Two Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- The City's overall efforts to prevent crime: 38%
- The visibility of police in neighborhoods: 37%
- Quality of animal control in your neighborhood: 31%
- The visibility of Code Enforcement in your neighborhood: 25%
- The visibility of police in neighborhood retail area: 25%
- How quickly police department personnel respond to: 19%
- The visibility of Building Inspection in your neighborhood: 15%
- Enforcement of traffic laws: 15%
- How quickly fire department responds to medical emergency: 8%
- How quickly fire department responded to fires: 7%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
### Importance-Satisfaction Rating

#### Public Safety

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (IS &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of animal control in City</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.2079</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City's overall efforts to prevent crime</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2250</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1720</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of police in neighborhoods</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.1646</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of police in retail areas</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.1228</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Visibility of Building Insepections</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1103</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (IS &lt;.10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police department personnel response to emergencies</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.0781</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcement of City traffic laws</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.0747</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire department response to medical emergency calls</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0149</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire department response to fires</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0125</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement:**

(I-S Rating Above 0.15)
Topic #5: Maintenance Ratings and Priorities
Satisfaction with Maintenance Services From 2000-2016

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding “don't know”)

- Snow removal on major City streets: 60% (2016), 60% (2014), 43% (2000)
- Maintenance of major City streets: 51% (2016), 41% (2014), 22% (2000)
- Overall cleanliness of streets & other public area: 34% (2016), 34% (2014), 32% (2000)

Satisfaction has decreased in 5 of 7 areas since 2014

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Maintenance Services that Should Be Emphasized Most Over the Next Two Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood: 42%
- Maintenance of major City streets: 31%
- Snow removal on neighborhood streets: 28%
- Maintenance of sidewalks in your neighborhood: 27%
- Overall cleanliness of streets & public areas: 25%
- Maintenance of stormwater drainage system: 19%
- Maintenance of curbs in your neighborhood: 16%
- Maintenance of alleys in your neighborhood: 15%
- Snow removal on major City streets: 12%
- Overall appearance of Downtown: 11%
- Maintenance of Downtown parking lots: 7%
- Maintenance of street signs/traffic signals: 7%
- Maintenance of City buildings: 6%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
## Importance-Satisfaction Rating
### Maintenance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (IS &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.2457</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of sidewalks</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.2088</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal on neighborhood streets</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1757</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall cleanliness of streets &amp; other public areas</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1624</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of major City streets</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1250</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of alleys</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>0.1243</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of stormwater drainage system</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.1226</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of curbs in your neighborhood</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1185</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (IS &lt;.10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appearance of Downtown</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.0679</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of Downtown parking lots</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.0489</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow removal on major City streets</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.0466</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of City buildings</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0337</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of street signs/traffic signals</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>53%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0313</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement:**

(I-S Rating Above 0.15)
Topic #6: Code Enforcement Ratings and Priorities
Satisfaction with the Enforcement of Codes and Ordinances
From 2000-2016

Satisfaction has increased/stayed the same in 3 of 4 areas since 2014

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q11. Codes and Ordinances That Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Enforcing clean-up of trash city-wide: 48%
- Enforcing clean-up of trash city-wide: 41%
- Enforcing clean-up of trash in your neighborhood: 40%
- Mowing & trimming in your neighborhood: 29%
- Maintenance of neighborhood residential property: 28%
- Enforcing removal of inoperable or junk cars: 23%
- Enforcing maintenance of business property: 16%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

### Codes and Ordinances

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (IS &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing the clean up of litter and debris city-wide</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.3547</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowing/Trimming on private and/or vacant property city-wide</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.3085</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing the clean up of litter and debris in neighborhood</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.2700</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mowing/trimming on private and/or vacant property in neighborhood</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2066</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of neighborhood residential property</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1832</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing removal of inoperable or junk cars</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1447</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enforcing maintenance of business property</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1064</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (IS &lt;.10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement:**
Topic #7:
Parks & Recreation Ratings and Priorities
Satisfaction has increased in 4 of 7 areas since 2014
Q13. Parks and Recreation Issues that Should Receive the Most Emphasis Over the Next 2 Years

by percentage of respondents who selected the item as one of their top three choices

- Number of walking & biking trails: 35%
- Maintenance of parks & equipment: 31%
- Youth recreation programs: 28%
- Swimming pool & spray parks: 26%
- The number of parks: 20%
- Programs for seniors: 19%
- Adult recreation programs: 19%
- Fees charged for recreation programs: 16%
- Number of outdoor athletic fields: 14%
- Ease of registering for programs: 7%
- Skate board parks: 6%
- Sunflower Hills Golf Course: 3%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
## Importance-Satisfaction Rating

### Parks and Recreation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category of Service</th>
<th>Most Important %</th>
<th>Most Important Rank</th>
<th>Satisfaction %</th>
<th>Satisfaction Rank</th>
<th>Importance-Satisfaction Rating</th>
<th>I-S Rating Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Very High Priority (IS &gt; .20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of walking &amp; biking trails</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.2380</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Priority (IS .10-.20)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth recreation programs</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0.1984</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swimming pool &amp; spray parks</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0.1955</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Programs for seniors</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0.1452</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance of parks &amp; equipment</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.1498</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult recreation programs</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0.1408</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fees that are charged for recreation programs</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0.1216</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of parks</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.1204</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Medium Priority (IS &lt; .10)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of outdoor athletic fields</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.0922</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ease of registering for programs</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0.0482</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skate board parks</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0.0432</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sunflower Hills Golf Course</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.0156</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Greatest Opportunities for Improvement:**

(I-S Rating Above 0.15)
Topic #8: Perceptions of the Community
Q16. How Respondents Feels About the Current Quality of Life in their Neighborhood

by percentage of respondents

- Getting better: 24%
- About the same: 47%
- Getting worse: 24%
- Never better: 4%
- Never worse: 2%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Q17. Satisfaction with Items that Influence Perceptions of Wyandotte County

by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 1 to 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding “don't know”)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Very Satisfied (5)</th>
<th>Satisfied (4)</th>
<th>Neutral (3)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (1/2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of life in the County</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County is planning/managing growth/development well</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your monthly trash service fee</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall image of Wyandotte County</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of City &amp; County services</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Your monthly sewer fee</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall feeling of safety in Wyandotte County</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall appearance of Wyandotte County</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall satisfaction considering taxes/fees paid</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>56%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Satisfaction with Items that Influence Perceptions of Kansas City, KS


by percentage of respondents who rated the item as a 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale (excluding "don't know")

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Overall quality of life in Kansas City</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall image of Kansas City</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)*
Topic #9:
Other Findings
How Residents Would Like to See Sales Tax Revenue From Village West Spent Beginning in 2017

By percentage of respondents

- Property Tax Relief: 50%
- Street Resurfacing: 38%
- Police Services: 33%
- Park Improvements: 25%
- Aging Services: 24%
- Demolitions of Residential/Commercial Properties: 23%
- Personal Property (Auto) Registration at Courthous: 21%
- Snow Removal Plowing & Treatment: 18%
- Mowing Vacant Lots: 14%
- Code Enforcement: 13%
- Fire Services: 13%
- Other: 11%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Percentage of Residents Who Have Needs for Various Services in Their Neighborhood

By percentage of respondents

- Grocery store: 67%
- Hardware store: 60%
- Clothing & home goods: 59%
- Urgent medical care facility: 58%
- Convenience/gas station: 57%
- Casual dining restaurant: 57%
- Drug store/pharmacy: 55%
- Health & fitness center: 55%
- Fast casual restaurant: 55%
- Fine dining restaurant: 52%
- Fast food restaurant: 45%
- Dry cleaners: 34%
- Children's day care: 29%
- Laundromat: 28%
- Senior day care: 27%

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
How Residents Would Like to See the Availability of Various Types of Businesses Change in Their Neighborhood

By percentage of respondents who had a need for the business

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Business Type</th>
<th>Increase (3)</th>
<th>Stay About the Same (2)</th>
<th>Decrease (1)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Senior day care</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health &amp; fitness center</td>
<td>81%</td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's day care</td>
<td>79%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fine dining restaurant</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>30%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast casual restaurant</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Casual dining restaurant</td>
<td>68%</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Urgent medical care facility</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clothing &amp; home goods</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grocery store</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dry cleaners</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laundromat</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>49%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardware store</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convenience/gas station</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fast food restaurant</td>
<td>39%</td>
<td>57%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drug store/pharmacy</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>62%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Support for an Amendment to the Current Dangerous Dog Ordinance to Include All Breeds

By percentage who responded YES by District

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Support for Allowing Residents to Have Female Chickens in Backyards Not Zoned for Agriculture

By percentage who responded YES by District

Source: ETC Institute DirectionFinder (2016 - Kansas City, KS/Wyandotte County)
Summary of Trends

- Since 2000, Overall Satisfaction Has Improved in Most Areas
- Since 2014, the Results Have Been Mixed.

**Notable Increases from 2014**
- Satisfaction with the overall quality of police services
- Satisfaction with the visibility of police in neighborhoods
- Satisfaction with police response time to emergencies
- Satisfaction with the number of walking and biking trails

**Notable Decreases from 2014**
- Satisfaction with overall quality of parks and recreation facilities
- Satisfaction with maintenance of major city streets
- Satisfaction with maintenance of street signs and traffic signals
- Satisfaction with the overall image of Kansas city
Summary of Priorities

- **Opportunities for Improving Neighborhood/Community Services**
  - Quality of maintenance of City streets
  - Quality of communication with the public
  - Quality of City Code Enforcement
  - Quality of public transit
  - Quality of City parks and recreation facilities

- **Opportunities for Improving County Services**
  - Quality of motor vehicle registration
  - Quality services for developmental disabilities
  - Customer service received from County employees
  - Quality aging services
  - Public health department services
Questions?

THANK YOU
Other City Service Maps
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2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District
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2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects mean rating for all respondents by Council District
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Quality of Sewer Utility System
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Quality of Parks and Recreation Programs
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Quality of Storm Water Run-off Management System
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Quality of Public Transportation
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2016 Unified Government Community Survey

Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District
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Q3 18 Quality of Services for Developmental Disabilities
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Q3 20 Quality of Senior Transportation
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Q3 21 Quality of District Courts
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Q3 22 Quality of Treasurer’s Office
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Q3 24 Quality of County Appraiser’s Office services
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Q3 28 Quality of Community Elections
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2016 Unified Government Community Survey
Shading reflects the mean rating for all respondents by Council District
Other Comparisons to Other Communities
Overall Satisfaction with Major Categories of City Services
Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS vs. Kansas City Metro vs. the U.S.

by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)

- Quality of City fire services
- Quality of ambulance services
- Quality of trash collection system
- Quality of City police services
- Quality of recycling
- Quality of City's parks & recreation facilities
- Quality of City's sewer utility
- City's storm water runoff/management system
- Quality of City's parks & recreation programs
- Quality of public transportation
- Quality of communication with public
- Quality of maintenance of City streets
- Quality of City Code Enforcement

Source: 2016 ETC Institute
### Overall Satisfaction With Major Categories of City Services in the Kansas City Area in 2016

By percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's parks &amp; recreation facilities</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's parks &amp; recreation programs</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>94%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City fire services</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of ambulance services</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>98%</td>
<td>80%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of trash collection system</td>
<td>73%</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>73%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City police services</td>
<td>61%</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>71%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of recycling</td>
<td>47%</td>
<td>95%</td>
<td>51%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of maintenance of City streets</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City's storm water runoff/management system</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>41%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City's sewer utility</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>48%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of communication with public</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>92%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of City Code Enforcement</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>80%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of public transportation</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>39%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: 2016 ETC Institute
Satisfaction with Items that Influence Perceptions of the City
Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS vs. Kansas City Metro vs. the U.S.

by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale
where 5 was “very satisfied” and 1 was “very dissatisfied” (excluding don’t knows)

Overall quality of life in Kansas City
- WyCO/KCK: 39%
- Kansas City Metro: 42%
- U.S. Avg (cities with 100,000+ residents): 74%

City is planning/managing growth/development well
- WyCO/KCK: 38%
- Kansas City Metro: 50%
- U.S. Avg (cities with 100,000+ residents): 42%

Overall image of Kansas City
- WyCO/KCK: 34%
- Kansas City Metro: 66%
- U.S. Avg (cities with 100,000+ residents): 68%

Overall feeling of safety in Kansas City
- WyCO/KCK: 29%
- Kansas City Metro: 77%
- U.S. Avg (cities with 100,000+ residents): 71%

Overall appearance of Kansas City
- WyCO/KCK: 29%
- Kansas City Metro: 66%
- U.S. Avg (cities with 100,000+ residents): 71%

Source: 2016 ETC Institute
Perceptions that Kansas City Area Residents Have of the City in Which They Live in 2016

by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)

Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS

- Overall quality of life in Kansas City: 19% (96% mean), 39%
- Overall image of Kansas City: 22% (93% mean), 34%
- Overall appearance of Kansas City: 22% (96% mean), 29%
- Overall feeling of safety in Kansas City: 29% (99% mean), 29%
- City is planning/managing growth/development well: 16% (93% mean), 38%

Source: 2016 ETC Institute
Overall Satisfaction with Public Safety
Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS vs. Kansas City Metro vs. the U.S.

by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale
where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)

- Fire department response to medical emergency call: WYCO/KCK 87%, KC Metro 81%, U.S. 87%
- Fire department response to fires: WYCO/KCK 86%, KC Metro 87%, U.S. 86%
- Police department personnel response to emergencies: WYCO/KCK 72%, KC Metro 70%, U.S. 70%
- Visibility of police in neighborhoods: WYCO/KCK 55%, KC Metro 55%, U.S. 55%
- Visibility of police in retail areas: WYCO/KCK 55%, KC Metro 55%, U.S. 55%
- Enforcement of City traffic laws: WYCO/KCK 49%, KC Metro 59%, U.S. 64%
- City's overall efforts to prevent crime: WYCO/KCK 40%, KC Metro 57%, U.S. 64%
- Quality of animal control in City: WYCO/KCK 34%, KC Metro 57%, U.S. 61%

Source: 2016 ETC Institute
Satisfaction with Various Public Safety Services Provided by Cities in the Kansas City Area in 2016

by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)

- Fire department response to medical emergency call: 74% (Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS)
- Fire department response to fires: 60% (Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS)
- Visibility of police in neighborhoods: 36% (Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS)
- Police department personnel response to emergency: 43% (Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS)
- City's overall efforts to prevent crime: 29% (Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS)
- Enforcement of City traffic laws: 46% (Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS)
- Visibility of police in retail areas: 38% (Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS)
- Quality of animal control in City: 32% (Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS)

Source: 2016 ETC Institute
Overall Satisfaction with Code Enforcement
Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS vs. Kansas City Metro vs. the U.S.

by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale
where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)

- Maintenance of neighborhood residential property:
  - WYCO/KCK: 33%
  - Kansas City Metro: 47%
  - U.S. Avg: 49%

- Enforcing maintenance of business property:
  - WYCO/KCK: 35%
  - Kansas City Metro: 49%
  - U.S. Avg: 57%

- Enforcing removal of inoperable or junk cars:
  - WYCO/KCK: 35%
  - Kansas City Metro: 48%
  - U.S. Avg: 57%

Source: 2016 ETC Institute
Satisfaction with the Enforcement of Codes and Ordinances by Cities in the Kansas City Area in 2016

by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)

- Enforcing maintenance of business property: 4% satisfaction, 86% dissatisfaction
  - Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS: 35% satisfaction, 65% dissatisfaction
- Maintenance of neighborhood residential property: 18% satisfaction, 81% dissatisfaction
  - Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS: 33% satisfaction, 67% dissatisfaction

Source: 2016 ETC Institute
Overall Satisfaction with City Maintenance
Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS vs. Kansas City Metro vs. the U.S.

by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale
where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)

- Snow removal on major City streets
  - WYCO/KCK: 59%
  - Kansas City Metro: 70%
  - U.S. Avg: 63%

- Maintenance of street signs/traffic signals
  - WYCO/KCK: 53%
  - Kansas City Metro: 78%
  - U.S. Avg: 70%

- Maintenance of major City streets
  - WYCO/KCK: 41%
  - Kansas City Metro: 70%
  - U.S. Avg: 57%

- Maintenance of City buildings
  - WYCO/KCK: 43%
  - Kansas City Metro: 70%
  - U.S. Avg: 75%

- Appearance of Downtown
  - WYCO/KCK: 40%
  - Kansas City Metro: 48%
  - U.S. Avg: 68%

- Maintenance of stormwater drainage system
  - WYCO/KCK: 36%
  - Kansas City Metro: 65%
  - U.S. Avg: 65%

- Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood
  - WYCO/KCK: 33%
  - Kansas City Metro: 56%
  - U.S. Avg: 55%

- Snow removal on neighborhood streets
  - WYCO/KCK: 38%
  - Kansas City Metro: 46%
  - U.S. Avg: 54%

- Overall cleanliness of streets & other public area
  - WYCO/KCK: 34%
  - Kansas City Metro: 42%
  - U.S. Avg: 60%

- Maintenance of sidewalks
  - WYCO/KCK: 22%
  - Kansas City Metro: 47%
  - U.S. Avg: 54%

Source: 2016 ETC Institute
Satisfaction with Maintenance Services Provided by Cities in the Kansas City Area in 2016

by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)

Overall cleanliness of streets & other public area
30% 99% 34%
Snow removal on major City streets
38% 93% 59%
Maintenance of major City streets
11% 91% 41%
Maintenance of City buildings
29% 97% 43%
Maintenance of street signs/traffic signals
43% 91% 53%
Snow removal on neighborhood streets
21% 90% 38%
Maintenance of streets in your neighborhood
22% 88% 33%
Maintenance of stormwater drainage system
36% 89% 36%
Maintenance of sidewalks
17% 89% 22%
Appearance of Downtown
19% 90% 40%

Source: 2016 ETC Institute
Overall Satisfaction with Parks and Recreation
Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS vs. Kansas City Metro vs. the U.S.

by percentage of respondents who rated the item 4 or 5 on a 5-point scale
where 5 was "very satisfied" and 1 was "very dissatisfied" (excluding don't knows)

- Number of parks
  - WYCO/KCK: 40%
  - Kansas City Metro: 72%
  - U.S. Avg: 77%

- Number of outdoor athletic fields
  - WYCO/KCK: 34%
  - Kansas City Metro: 68%
  - U.S. Avg: 68%

- Ease of registering for programs
  - WYCO/KCK: 28%
  - Kansas City Metro: 63%
  - U.S. Avg: 63%

- Number of walking & biking trails
  - WYCO/KCK: 32%
  - Kansas City Metro: 56%
  - U.S. Avg: 59%

- Youth recreation programs
  - WYCO/KCK: 30%
  - Kansas City Metro: 65%
  - U.S. Avg: 66%

- Swimming pool & spray parks
  - WYCO/KCK: 24%
  - Kansas City Metro: 59%
  - U.S. Avg: 59%

- Adult recreation programs
  - WYCO/KCK: 25%
  - Kansas City Metro: 54%
  - U.S. Avg: 53%

Source: 2016 ETC Institute
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Plan Purpose
The Unified Government/Kansas City-Wide Master Plan, the community’s Comprehensive Plan, identified the need for a true multi-modal transportation network that balances the needs of motorists, transit, pedestrians and cyclists. Today, many Wyandotte residents depend on walking and biking as their primary transportation mode. Unfortunately, in many parts of the County, there are not adequate sidewalk and trail facilities. Within older urban areas, existing sidewalk infrastructure is deteriorating or non existent. In many post World War II suburban neighborhoods, sidewalks do not exist because they were not required as part of the development review process at that time. Sidewalks are now required on at least one side of the street for new development, however, newer neighborhoods are often disconnected from surrounding destinations and amenities. Throughout the City, trails are limited to a few small locations, mostly within parks. Unfortunately, there are often no pedestrian accommodations to these parks from surrounding areas. Sidewalks, trails, and bicycle facilities are more than a transportation mode or recreational outlet. These facilities are an important part of a healthy and vibrant community. According to the 2012 County Health Ranking by the University of Wisconsin Population Health Institute, the Wyandotte County obesity rate is 38 percent, well above the state average of 30 percent and the national benchmark of 25 percent. Because of the lack of pedestrian and bicycle facilities, residents have few opportunities to safely walk, jog, run or ride their bikes. For these reasons, the Unified Government submitted and received a grant from the Health Care Foundation of Greater Kansas City to commission a sidewalk and trail master plan to address these needs.

Plan Goals
The Unified Government/Kansas City, Kansas Sidewalk and Trail Master Plan (Plan) provides a blueprint for the implementation of a sidewalk and trail network that meets the needs of residents, workers and visitors. As such, the Plan is intended to:

• improve the health and well-being of residents;
• provide a safe, convenient and attractive transportation alternative to the automobile;
• provide a sidewalk and trail network that meets the needs of all skill levels and physical abilities;
• connect major activity centers and destinations throughout the County; and
• connect to surrounding local and regional pedestrian and bicycle networks.
Plan Use
The Plan should be consulted by the Board of Commissioners, the Planning Commission, and Unified Government staff when reviewing development proposals, drafting future policies, and preparing upcoming capital improvements budgets. The Plan should also be used as a resource for residents, workers and visitors to find out about future pedestrian and bicycle connections.

Plan Process
The Plan's recommendations and priorities are the result of an inclusive public process that included eight public workshops held throughout the County and two surveys. Each workshop was designed to promote an open dialogue between the project team and participants. In addition to these workshops, the project team developed two surveys that were available electronically via the internet. The first survey asked participants about their priorities for the local network and destinations within the County, while the second survey focused on priorities for regional connections. A full summary of the public process and survey results is included in Chapter 4, Public Engagement.

Plan Organization
The Plan is organized into the following chapters:

- **Chapter 1 Introduction**: Plan purpose, goals, process and organization.
- **Chapter 2 Plan Coordination**: Summary of pertinent plans, studies and initiatives.
- **Chapter 3 Sidewalk Inventory and Assessment**: Methodology for the sidewalk and trail inventory and the results of the assessment of existing conditions.
- **Chapter 4: Public Engagement**: Summary of public workshop outcomes and survey results.
- **Chapter 5: Pedestrian Demand**: Priorities for pedestrian and bicycle facilities.
- **Chapter 6 Future Sidewalk Network and Priorities**: Future sidewalk network with priorities for connecting existing gaps where sidewalks do not exist as well as deteriorating sidewalks in need of repair or replacement.
- **Chapter 7 Future Trail and Bicycle Network and Priorities**: Future trail and bicycle network and associated standards and recommendations.
- **Chapter 8 Implementation**: Guide for Plan implementation including key actions and polices.
Overview
Planning does not occur in a vacuum and the Sidewalk and Trail Master Plan process is no exception. There are a number of past, present, and ongoing plans, projects, and initiatives intended to make Kansas City, Kansas a more pedestrian and bicycle friendly community. As part of this process, these planning efforts were carefully reviewed and evaluated within the present physical, environmental, and political context. In the case of past plans, assumptions were analyzed to see if changing conditions warranted refinements. For initiatives, recent policy changes were reviewed. For current and ongoing projects, specific improvements were noted and incorporated into the analysis of existing sidewalk and trail conditions. Part of this review process is intended to avoid duplication of effort and inconsistencies in policies and recommendations. However, to a greater extent, this review and coordination allows the Plan to build on the momentum of these efforts, and work synergistically toward common goals. The following is a list of summarized plans, projects, and initiatives that were consulted during the process:1

- Walk Friendly Communities Assessment and Report Card
- Unified Government/Kansas City, Kansas City-Wide Master Plan
- Johnson and Wyandotte County Bicycle Transportation Plan
- Southwest Boulevard/Merriam Lane Corridor Master Plan
- Parks and Boulevards Plan “Kessler Plan”
- MetroGreen Plan and MetroGreen Action Plan
- Safe Routes to Schools Program and Recent Projects

1Note: This is not an intended to be an exhaustive list of all projects that were considered during the Plan process. Many individual improvement/construction projects were used in the analysis and are too numerous to list within this document.
Walk Friendly Communities Assessment and Report Card

Walk Friendly Communities was created to encourage communities across the country to make supporting safer walking a high priority. The program recognizes communities that are working to improve walking conditions. The conditions include a range of issues related to walking including everything from safety to mobility. In early 2012, Walk Friendly Communities conducted an independent assessment of walkability in Kansas City, Kansas. Unfortunately, Walk Friendly Communities was not able to designate Kansas City, Kansas as a walk friendly community. However, through this assessment, constructive feedback was provided to improve walkability throughout the community. The graphic below provides a summary of the areas that Kansas City, Kansas is doing well, and the areas that need attention.

**Applicability**

The Walk Communities Report Card identifies specific areas that should be addressed to improve walkability in Kansas City, Kansas. This assessment was completed early in the Plan process and helped guide the development of the Plan recommendations, policies, and actions. As noted, this was an independent assessment, however, the need for a more walkable City was clearly articulated by the public during the Plan workshops and through feedback from surveys.
2008 City-Wide Master Plan

The City-Wide Master Plan, Unified Government/Kansas City, Kansas’s Comprehensive Plan, provided a vision for a connected system of parks, trails and opens space based on MetroGreen, as well as input from the public throughout the plan process. The Master Plan recommends a comprehensive greenway and trail system to connect all parks, schools, and other community cultural amenities.

Key Recommendations

• Implement the MetroGreen vision.
• Develop greenways and trails along naturally sensitive areas, such as streams, as part of the overall trail network
• Celebrate the City’s special cultural and historic resources through the development of the greenway system
• Acquire greenway connections as development occurs. Ensure that neighborhood-level connections are included as part of the platting process
• Provide information to developers and real estate investors, including homeowners, about the value added from proximity to open space and trails

Applicability

The Sidewalk and Trail Master Plan is part of the overall implementation of the City-Wide Master Plan which identified the need and the desire for a connected system of trails throughout the City. The City-Wide Master Plan provides the directive and the foundation for the development of the Sidewalk and Trail Plan’s recommendations.
1993 Johnson and Wyandotte County Bicycle Transportation Plan

This plan was a joint effort between Johnson and Wyandotte Counties to develop recommendations to ensure a safe and desirable environment for bicycling. The plan is intended to serve as a big picture guide for the development of more specific individual plans for future bicycle facilities. However, one of the most significant components of this plan is the initial groundwork for inter-jurisdictional planning and cooperation necessary for the development of the comprehensive regional bicycle network. The Bicycle Network identified in this plan includes 670 miles in Johnson County and 230 miles in Wyandotte County. Of the total 900 mile Bicycle Network, approximately 70 percent are on-road facilities.

Key Recommendations

• The Bicycle Network should provide regional linkages to the entire Kansas City metropolitan area.
• The Bicycle Network should incorporate, whenever possible, existing, committed and potential off-road bicycle corridors including MetroGreen.
• The Bicycle Network should provide allowances for bicycles to safely cross barriers, such as the Kansas River, I-435, I-635, railroads, streams and rivers.
• Local agencies should coordinate the proposed Bicycle Network with other planned transportation improvements.
• Streamway parks should accommodate a linear, off-road trail system.

Applicability

The 1993 Bicycle Transportation Plan served as a major catalyst for inter-jurisdictional cooperation and the development of many existing bicycle routes and facilities, especially within Johnson County. Through the present Sidewalk and Trail Master Plan process, the public has articulated the desire to connect to existing regional bicycle facilities outside of Wyandotte County, especially within Johnson County where these routes are well established. Within Wyandotte County, the 1993 Plan served as a starting point for bicycle route recommendations in Chapter 7.
Southwest Boulevard/Merriam Lane Corridor Master Plan

The Corridor Master Plan establishes long-range goals and objectives for development and stabilization of area neighborhoods and businesses along Southwest Boulevard and Merriam Lane between State Line Road and I-635/U.S. 69. The Corridor Master Plan was developed to help implement the City-Wide Master Plan and is intended as a companion document to the Rosedale Master Plan.

Key Recommendations

• Implement dedicated on-street bike lanes on both sides of Merriam Lane.
• Incorporate the Complete Streets policy with redevelopment and improve pedestrian and bicycle connections.
• Provide directional signage, lighting, landscaping and intersection bulb-outs to help pedestrians at cross walks.
• As identified in past plans, including MetroGreen, investigate the potential for a multi-use trail along the Turkey Creek corridor

Applicability

The Corridor Master Plan is important because it is one of the first plans in Wyandotte County to provide recommendations to implement the Complete Streets Policy, adopted in 2011, on a specific corridor. Complete Streets are designed to enable safe access for pedestrians, cyclists, motorists, and public transportation users of all ages and abilities to safely use a transportation corridor. In this case, new sidewalks and dedicated bike lanes along Southwest Boulevard and Merriam Lane will provide safe and convenient accommodations for pedestrians and cyclists. These recommendations are now in the process of moving from concept to reality with the construction of new sidewalks and dedicated bike lanes along the corridor. Construction of the eastern segment, Strasser Hardware to the Boulevard Drive-In, is under construction and is scheduled to be complete by early 2013. The central segment, Boulevard Drive-In to 20th Street, is scheduled for construction in 2014. Timing for the western segment is yet to be determined.
Between 1892 and 1893, George Kessler, a German-born landscape architect who briefly worked under Fredrick Law Olmstead, authored a plan for a system of interconnected parks and boulevards throughout Kansas City, Missouri in the spirit of the City Beautiful movement that was sweeping the nation at that time. This plan, commonly known as the “Kessler Plan” was formally adopted in 1893 by the city’s department of parks and boulevards and would be implemented over the next 100 years.

**Key Elements**

- Recommended an interconnected system of parks and boulevards.
- Considered topography, traffic patterns, demographics and emerging land use patterns.

**Applicability**

The ideas and concepts identified in the Kessler Plan were expanded over the years within Kansas City, Missouri as well as surrounding communities including Kansas City, Kansas. The map to the left shows a system of Parks and Boulevards for the Greater Kansas City metropolitan area in 1915. This early plan provided the foundation for the development of parks and boulevards in Kansas City, Kansas as well as regionally that would help lay the groundwork for later efforts including the MetroGreen Plan. The 1914 Plan identifies a number of greenway connections between major parks in Kansas City, Kansas. Unfortunately, most of these greenway connections do not exist today. However, the spirit and intent of this concept is carried forward in the trail recommendations in Chapter 7.

MetroGreen is an interconnected system of greenways and trails linking communities throughout the Kansas City metropolitan area. The 1,144-mile greenway plan covers Wyandotte, Leavenworth, and Johnson counties in Kansas and Cass, Clay, Jackson, and Platte counties in Missouri. The genesis of MetroGreen was the 1991 American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) annual meeting in Kansas City, Missouri, where the Community Assistance Team Project developed a vision for a regional trail network. From 1991 to 2001, the Prairie Gateway Chapter of ASLA, the society’s local chapter, refined this vision which would become the MetroGreen Plan. In 2001, the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) facilitated an effort to expand this vision. The 2002 MetroGreen Action Plan builds on George Kessler’s “Greenprint” and the 1991 ASLA Plan to provide recommendations for greenways, trails, and open space as well as environmental stewardship, urban growth management, and a future development strategy. To date, over 200 miles of the system has been built.

Key Recommendations

• Preserve and protect stream corridors.
• Green corridors for walking and biking to link destinations.
• Form an alternative transportation network of off-road non-motorized corridors.
• Provide venues and outlets for environmental education through outdoor classrooms.
• Protect and restore native habitats.
• Encourage public/private partnerships for implementation of future greenways.

Applicability

The MetroGreen Action Plan identified future greenway and trail corridors throughout the Kansas City metropolitan area, including Kansas City, Kansas. These corridors were used as a baseline for the development of the trail recommendations outlined in Chapter 7. Throughout the Plan process, the public identified connections to the regional trail network as a high priority for implementation. Many participants specifically cited the MetroGreen Plan by name.
Safe Routes to Schools

Safe Routes to Schools (SRTS) is a federally funded program of the U.S. Department of Transportation's Federal Highway Administration. It was established by Section 1404 of SAFETEA-LU, the Safe, Accountable, Flexible, Efficient Transportation Equity Act: A Legacy for Users Act. The funds provided by the program are administered by state departments of transportation. The funds are used to improve the ability of elementary and middle school students to safely walk and bike to school. As part of the Plan process, the following SRTS applications, plans, and projects were reviewed:

- Midland Trail Elementary School SRTS Application
- Junction Elementary School SRTS Application
- Douglas Elementary School SRTS Plan, Phase I Report
- TA Edison SRTS Application
- M.E. Pearson Elementary School SRTS Plan, Phase I Report
- Benjamin Banneker Elementary School SRTS Plan, Phase I Report
- Quindaroao Elementary School, SRTS Plan, Phase I Report
- Caruthers Elementary School, SRTS Plan, Phase I Report
- New Chelsea Elementary School, SRTS Plan, Phase I Report
- William Allen White Elementary School, SRTS Plan, Phase I Report
- White Church Elementary School, SRTS Plan, Phase I Report
- Stoney Point North Elementary School, SRTS Plan, Phase I Report

Applicability

Information from these SRTS applications, plans and projects were used to help inform the sidewalk inventory and analysis within these areas and to set priorities for future improvements. At the onset of the process, it was agreed that the SRTS improvement areas would be a logical starting point for future sidewalk priorities. This assumption was confirmed through the Plan process as the public identified schools as their top priority for local pedestrian and bicycle connections. Please refer to Chapter 4 for a summary of the public engagement process, Chapter 5 for the methodology for the pedestrian demand analysis, and Chapter 6 for the Future Sidewalk Network and priorities.
Introduction
In the fall of 2011, as part of the Plan process, the Unified Government commissioned a comprehensive sidewalk assessment. The purpose of this assessment was to develop a detailed sidewalk inventory and review of existing conditions. Interns from the University of Kansas and University of Missouri-Kansas City assisted with the data collection and analysis. After the field observations were completed, the project team and interns began to further analyze the data to seek a better understanding of which areas are in acceptable condition and which need attention.

Initial Review of Sidewalks
Prior to the field analysis, a cursory review of sidewalks was completed through a review of recent aerial photography. Through this process, areas were eliminated that did not have sidewalks. This process was completed using Geographic Information Systems (GIS) software designed to analyze, manage, store, and present all types of geographically referenced data. Areas that were not easily determined through the use of the aerial photos were identified to be examined during the field assessment.

Field Assessment
Upon completion of the initial review of the sidewalks, the project team began the detailed field assessment. To ensure accuracy and consistency, the project team conducted a trial run before starting field work. This trial run was completed on a four block area with a variety of sidewalk conditions to ensure an adequate cross section of evaluation. After the test run, the project team began the county-wide assessment. The assessment was conducted by using teams of two interns working together in the field. The teams entered the sidewalk data into a Global Positioning System (GPS) enabled laptop equipped with ArcPad software. ArcPad is a mobile version of GIS which allowed the project team and interns to create and modify sidewalk data in the field.
As illustrated in Figure 3.1 (left), each block segment was identified as yes, partial, or no. Block segments with a continuous sidewalk were noted as a yes. Blocks with intermittent segments of sidewalk coverage were noted as partial. Block segments without any sidewalks were noted as a no. Upon indicating the presence of a sidewalk, the width, green space, sidewalk type, and condition was noted. If the sidewalk needed a spot repair, it was noted in the data collection under additional comments and a corresponding photo was taken. The project team used a camera that was equipped with GPS to document where the spot repair photo was taken. This enabled the project team and interns to efficiently locate the area if further analysis was needed.
For the field condition assessment, a Sidewalk Assessment Rating Matrix, Figure 3.2 (right) was developed by the project team with input from City staff. This matrix was developed and included photo examples to ensure that there were minimal subjective decisions about sidewalk conditions and to provide uniform results from each team.

The Sidewalk Assessment Rating Matrix consists of a 5 to 1 scale for determining sidewalk conditions:

- **5.** A sidewalk with a rating of 5 was considered to be like new with no visible cracks or vertical displacement. This type of sidewalk was prevalent in newer neighborhoods, especially west of I-435.
- **4.** A sidewalk with a rating of 4 was considered in fair condition. Sidewalks with this rating had minor cracks, minor spalling, and no vertical displacement. The majority of the existing sidewalks in the county were rated a 4.
- **3.** Sidewalks with a rating of 3 contained moderate cracks, moderate spalling, and minor vertical displacement. This type of sidewalk was prevalent in many Post World War II neighborhoods between I-635 and I-435.
- **2.** Sidewalks with a rating of 2 contained wide cracks, major vertical displacement, major spalling, and overall deterioration. Often, sidewalks with this rating would be heavily covered with vegetation, missing pieces of concrete, or deteriorated into a narrow strip of sidewalk. This type of sidewalk was prevalent in older urban areas and neighborhoods east of I-635.
- **1.** Sidewalks with a rating of 1 were heavily deteriorated and almost non-existent. Any sidewalk that was indicated as a 1 in the field was also documented with a photo and corresponding GPS coordinate. These sidewalks were prevalent in the oldest parts of the County, particularly in the northeast, downtown and southeast neighborhoods.

![Figure 3.2 Sidewalk Assessment Matrix](image_url)

- **Like new, no surface cracks, no spalling**
- **Narrow cracks, no vertical displacement, minor spalling**
- **Moderate cracks, minor vertical displacement, moderate spalling**
- **Wide cracks, major vertical displacement, major spalling, deteriorated condition**
- **Heavily deteriorated, almost non-existent**
The photo on the top right illustrates an example of a sidewalk in need of spot repair. Many of these sidewalks were in fair condition overall, but had a specific portion that required attention. Sometimes vegetation from the adjacent property grew over the sidewalk making it inaccessible. Often, sidewalks located adjacent to a mature tree would be displaced because the roots had spread underneath the sidewalk. The tree’s roots can cause vertical displacement which may result in trip hazards, or in severe cases, limit accessibility.

Sidewalks were identified as concrete, asphalt or brick. The current Public Works standard for new sidewalks is concrete. A majority of sidewalks are concrete. A very small portion of sidewalks were asphalt. However, some sidewalks within the urban core and older neighborhoods are brick. Brick sidewalks contribute to the unique historic character and should be retained. In most cases, the brick sidewalk was noted to be in good condition, but had become overgrown with weeds or covered with debris as shown in the photo in the middle right. Bricks that are broken can be easily replaced. In areas that have become completely overgrown, the City could partner with neighborhood groups to reclaim these areas through coordinated clean-up and maintenance efforts.

Sidewalk width was noted along with the condition and type. A majority of sidewalks were at least five-feet wide, which is the current standard minimum width. Wider sidewalks are important because they allow pedestrians to walk comfortably side-by-side. In addition to width, green space between the back of curb and the sidewalk was also noted. Green space provides a buffer between pedestrian and vehicular traffic and improves aesthetics.

Information about sidewalk ramps was collected to help determine ease of accessibility. Ramps with truncated domes were noted. Truncated domes alert the visually impaired that they are approaching the street. An example of a truncated dome is shown in the photo on the lower right.

At the end of each day, the project team and interns saved the data within the mobile ArcPad unit and later transferred to the main database in the office to be reviewed and analyzed.
Figure 3.3 Sidewalk Assessment Example
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County-Wide and Policy Area Analysis Summary

The sidewalk field analysis was completed for the entire County in early December of 2011. A summary of this analysis is included on the following pages. The first set of tables, maps and exhibits describe county-wide sidewalk coverage, types and conditions. The second part of the analysis summarizes sidewalk coverage and conditions by the Plan Policy Areas established in the 2008 City-Wide Master Plan. It was recognized early on that development patterns, densities, neighborhood character, environmental conditions and infrastructure needs vary greatly throughout the County. For example, developed urban areas have different needs than rural areas.

At first glance, it appears that the County has very limited sidewalk coverage. However, coverage should be carefully analyzed within the context of the each area. For example, older urbanized areas tend to have more sidewalk coverage than rural areas. Additionally, local roads are only required to have a sidewalk on one side of the road. As noted in Figure 3.4 above, some segments were under construction at the time of the analysis and some streets only had partial segments with sidewalks. The partial segments were considered a sidewalk gap in the network.
Existing Sidewalks

The sidewalk field analysis was completed in early December of 2011. Approximately 1,801 miles of public sidewalks were inventoried during the field analysis. The exhibit below shows existing and partial sidewalks.

Figure 3.5
Existing Sidewalk Types
The exhibit below shows existing sidewalk types by category: concrete, brick and asphalt.

Figure 3.6
Existing Sidewalk Conditions

This exhibit shows existing sidewalk conditions on a scale of 5 to 1, with 5 the best condition (like new) and 1 the worst (almost non-existent). See page 13 and Figure 3.2, for a full description of each category. Detailed area maps are provided in Appendix A.

Figure 3.7
County-wide sidewalk conditions were rated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the best condition (like new) and 1 being the worst condition (almost non-existent). This rating scale is described in detail with photo examples in Figure 3.2 on page 13. The condition of the overall sidewalk network was found to be in generally fair to excellent condition with approximately 70 percent of sidewalks registering a 4 or 5.

61 percent of sidewalks are five-feet wide, which is the minimum width allowed under current Public Works standards. 10 percent of sidewalks are greater than five-feet. Only three percent of sidewalks are less than five-feet wide. Narrower sidewalks tend to be in the older urban areas east of I-635 that developed before specific standards were in place. The wider sidewalks tend to be in newer areas along major arterials such as the recently improved sections of State Avenue.

94 percent of sidewalks within the County are concrete. Only five percent are brick. Brick sidewalks were built in many older neighborhoods in the County, particularly east of I-635. Generally, most of the brick sidewalks are in fair condition but are in need of maintenance including clearing and trimming of plant overgrowth.

Most of the sidewalks in the County have some green space between the sidewalk and the back of curb. This green space provides a buffer between pedestrians and traffic in the adjacent street.

The average green space width is three to six-feet. It is ideal to have at least a four-foot green strip for a buffer which may include trees or shrubs.
Policy Area Sidewalk Analysis

The Policy Area Framework from the City-Wide Master Plan provides a guide for future land use as well as transportation and infrastructure investments based upon each individual area's existing and future needs.

Figure 3.8
Urban Revitalization Policy Area Analysis

The Urban Policy Area is comprised of downtown and older neighborhoods within the I-635 loop as well as areas south of I-70, including Rosedale, Armourdale, and Argentine. These areas are urban in character with smaller lots and older infrastructure.

Figure 3.9: Urban Revitalization Sidewalk Network

Compared to other policy areas, Urban Revitalization has the most sidewalk coverage of any area in the County. Most of the sidewalk coverage within these areas are within the I-635 loop and Armourdale. The Rosedale and Argentine neighborhoods to the south have a more sporadic sidewalk network. Some of these areas have significant topography constraints that make convenient and safe pedestrian and bicycle improvements challenging.

Table 3.6: Urban Revitalization Sidewalk Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>189.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eight percent of sidewalks within these areas are brick.

Table 3.7: Urban Revitalization Sidewalk Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Conditions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>106.2</td>
<td>11.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

County-wide sidewalk conditions were rated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the best condition (like new) and 1 being the worst condition (almost non-existent). This rating scale is described in detail with photo examples in Figure 3.2 on page 13. Because these areas have the oldest neighborhoods in the County, there are significant portions (approximately 12 percent) of sidewalks in need of repair or replacement (Conditions 1 or 2). However, despite their age, a majority of sidewalks are in fair condition.

Table 3.8: Urban Revitalization Sidewalk Width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Width</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3' or less</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4'</td>
<td>52.1</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td>126.5</td>
<td>21.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6'</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;6'</td>
<td>15.2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

The majority of sidewalks are five-feet wide, although these areas have a higher percentage of narrower sidewalks than other areas of the County.
Mixed-Use Policy Area Analysis

These areas are intended to accommodate a mix of business and residential uses within a cohesive development. One of the guiding principles of mixed-use areas is to provide enhanced pedestrian connections. The master plan recommends that these areas be connected to adjacent neighborhoods and surrounding areas through the construction of wide sidewalks and/or trails.

Figure 3.10: Mixed Use Sidewalk Network

According to the City-Wide Master Plan, mixed-use areas are intended to be among the most walkable areas of the County. Currently, most of this area does not have access to sidewalks. However, as development and redevelopment occurs, sidewalk improvements and/or trails need to be integrated within this area and connected to adjacent neighborhoods, schools, parks and activity centers.

Table 3.9: Mixed Use Sidewalk Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

99 percent of sidewalks within this area are concrete.

Table 3.10: Mixed-Use Sidewalk Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Conditions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

Sidewalk conditions were rated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the best condition (like new) and 1 being the worst condition (almost non-existent). This rating scale is described in detail with photo examples in Figure 3.2 on page 13. Approximately 58 percent of existing sidewalks within this area are in excellent condition (Condition 5) and 38 percent are in fair condition (Condition 4).

Table 3.11: Mixed Use Sidewalk Width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Width</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3’ or less</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4’</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5’</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6’</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;6’</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

79 percent of sidewalks within this area are five-feet wide. Ideally, mixed-use areas would have wider sidewalks to accommodate active retail street activities and better connections to future rapid transit modes.
Regional Entertainment Policy Area Analysis

This area is adjacent to I-70 and I-435 and supports large-scale regional entertainment uses. This area includes the Kansas Speedway, Livestrong Sporting Park, Community America Ballpark, the Legends Outlets and Schlitterbahn Waterpark. The City-Wide Master Plan recommends that this area be connected to adjacent neighborhoods and surrounding areas through wide sidewalks and/or trails.

Figure 3.11: Regional Entertainment Sidewalk Network

The City-Wide Master Plan states that this area should be “bicycle and pedestrian friendly,” and “connected to all areas of the City through new or enhanced trails.” Unfortunately, there are few sidewalks or trails within this area. Most existing sidewalks are designed for internal circulation with few safe or convenient pedestrian connections to surrounding neighborhoods.

Table 3.12: Regional Entertainment Sidewalk Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>2.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All sidewalks observed within this area are concrete.

Table 3.13: Regional Entertainment Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Conditions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.89</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td>1.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

Sidewalk conditions were rated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the best condition (like new) and 1 being the worst condition (almost non-existent). This rating scale is described in detail with photo examples in Figure 3.2 on page 13. Approximately 95 percent of existing sidewalks within this area are in excellent condition (Condition 5) which is not surprising since most of these sidewalks have been built within the past 15 years.

Table 3.14: Regional Entertainment Sidewalk Width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Width</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3' or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4'</td>
<td>0.40</td>
<td>0.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6'</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>0.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;6'</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>0.29</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

67 percent of sidewalks are five-feet wide while 28 percent are greater than five-feet. Wider sidewalks or a multi-purpose trail is desirable within this area.
Employment Revitalization Policy Area Analysis

These areas will support existing and future employment opportunities.

Table 3.12: Employment Revitalization Sidewalk Network

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Conditions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0.31</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.63</td>
<td>1.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

Sidewalk conditions were rated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the best condition (like new) and 1 being the worst condition (almost non-existent). This rating scale is described in detail with photo examples in Figure 3.2 on page 13. Approximately 72 percent of existing sidewalks within this area are in fair condition (Category 4) and 20 percent are in fair to deteriorating condition (Category 3). If Category 3 sidewalks are not properly maintained and/or repaired, they are likely to deteriorate to a Category 2 or 1 within the next 15 to 20 years and would require complete replacement.

Table 3.16: Employment Revitalization Sidewalk Width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Width</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3’ or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4’</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5’</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>1.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6’</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;6’</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

Outside of rural areas, this area has the lowest sidewalk coverage of any policy area. At first glance, this is understandable given the industrial nature of some of this area. However, during the Master Plan process, participants noted a desire to connect employment areas to adjacent neighborhoods through trails and greenways. The City-Wide Master Plan envisions transforming this area by attracting new “green” industries and business parks with enhanced amenities including recreational trails.

Table 3.15: Employment Revitalization Sidewalk Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>11.71</td>
<td>1.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

98 percent of sidewalks within this area are concrete.

58 percent of sidewalks within this area are five-feet wide with 33 percent greater than five-feet.
Neighborhood Conservation Policy Area Analysis

These areas are comprised of established neighborhoods, primarily in the southwest portion of the County, including the Turner and Shawnee Heights neighborhoods. These areas are diverse and have suburban and rural characteristics.

Figure 3.13: Neighborhood Conservation Sidewalk Network

Many of these neighborhoods were built between World War II and 1980. Unfortunately, many of these neighborhoods were built before sidewalks were required as part of the development review process. Fortunately, where sidewalks do exist, they are in fair condition (see Table 3.18 below). The City-Wide Master Plan recommends trail and sidewalks to connect neighborhoods to institutional uses (schools, community centers, churches, etc.) and parks.

Table 3.18: Neighborhood Conservation Sidewalk Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>48.76</td>
<td>4.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>0.20</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

99 percent of sidewalks within this area are concrete.

Table 3.19: Neighborhood Conservation Sidewalk Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Conditions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.28</td>
<td>0.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>38.67</td>
<td>3.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>5.78</td>
<td>0.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

Sidewalk conditions were rated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the best condition (like new) and 1 being the worst condition (almost non-existent). This rating scale is described in detail with photo examples in Figure 3.2 on page 13. Approximately 78 percent of existing sidewalks within this area are in fair condition (Category 4) and 12 percent are in fair to deteriorating condition (Category 3). If Category 3 sidewalks are not properly maintained and/or repaired, they are likely to deteriorate to a Category 2 or 1 within the next 15 to 20 years and would require complete replacement.

Table 3.20: Neighborhood Conservation Sidewalk Width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Width</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3’ or less</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4’</td>
<td>20.23</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5’</td>
<td>27.00</td>
<td>1.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6’</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;6’</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

55 percent of sidewalks within this area are five-feet wide while 44 percent are less than five-feet. As mentioned earlier, a majority of these neighborhoods developed before sidewalk standards were in place.
Rural Policy Area Analysis

For the purposes of this analysis, the Rural Development and Rural Conservation Policy Areas were combined. Both of these policy areas have significant environmental constraints such as steep slopes that limit the extension of infrastructure and the ability to provide a connected street grid. Therefore, these areas have basic services and limited access to urban infrastructure including sidewalks.

Figure 3.14: Rural Sidewalk Network

This area has almost no sidewalk coverage which is appropriate in most cases due to environmental constraints and extremely low population densities. In many cases, this area is comparable to unincorporated areas in surrounding counties with limited rural residential development. Most roads within this area have two vehicular lanes with no shoulder and open ditch drainage systems. However, even if sidewalks are not built within these areas, future pedestrian and bicycle connections could be provided through a system of trails along creeks/greenways or old rail corridors.

Table 3.21: Rural Sidewalk Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

All of the sidewalks within these areas are concrete.

Table 3.22: Rural Sidewalk Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Conditions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

Sidewalk conditions were rated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the best condition (like new) and 1 being the worst condition (almost non-existent). This rating scale is described in detail with photo examples in Figure 3.2 on page 13. The limited sidewalks that do exist within this area are all in fair condition (Category 4).

Table 3.23: Rural Sidewalk Width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Width</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3' or less</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4'</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5'</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;6'</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

73 percent of sidewalks within these areas are five-feet wide, while 27 percent are less than five feet.
Community Development Policy Area Analysis

These areas are comprised primarily of low-density suburban development in the western portion of the County. This area experienced significant growth in the early 2000’s with the development of the Kansas Speedway and Village West.

These areas are comprised primarily of low-density suburban development in the western portion of the County. This area experienced significant growth in the early 2000’s with the development of the Kansas Speedway and Village West.

Figure 3.15: Community Development Sidewalk Network

The newer neighborhoods within these areas have sidewalks on at least one side of the street as required by the current subdivision regulations. However, with the economic downturn beginning in 2008, residential construction has significantly slowed leaving scattered residential developments that are not connected to one another. Although some of these developments are close to Village West, there are few sidewalks connections to this area.

Outside of Wyandotte County Lake Park, there are no trails within this portion of the County. Through the Plan process, residents noted that trails and associated amenities would help this area remain competitive with similar emerging neighborhoods in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

Table 3.24: Community Development Sidewalk Type

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Type</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>35.11</td>
<td>12.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brick</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asphalt</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

99 percent of sidewalks within this area are concrete.

Table 3.25: Community Development Sidewalk Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Conditions</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>9.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>11.02</td>
<td>3.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>21.42</td>
<td>9.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

Sidewalk conditions were rated on a scale of 5 to 1 with 5 being the best condition (like new) and 1 being the worst condition (almost non-existent). This rating scale is described in detail with photo examples in Figure 3.2 on page 13. Approximately 61 percent of existing sidewalks within this areas are in excellent condition (Category 5).

Table 3.26: Community Development Sidewalk Width

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sidewalk Width</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>Partial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3’ or less</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4’</td>
<td>15.65</td>
<td>9.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5’</td>
<td>19.02</td>
<td>2.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6’</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;6’</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figures represented in miles.

54 percent of sidewalks within this area five-feet wide, while 44 percent are less than five feet.
Introduction
This Plan’s future sidewalk and trail network recommendations and priorities are a result of an inclusive hands-on public process that included multiple outlets and avenues to solicit issues, concerns, ideas, and feedback on preliminary and final concepts. This public process included two series of public workshops. Each workshop series included four public meetings held throughout the County. Public workshops were held at Donnelly College, Kansas City, Kansas Community College, Argentine Community Center and Cabella’s in Village West. In addition to the multiple locations, workshops were held during the day over the lunch hour as well as the evening to maximize opportunities for public input. Each workshop was designed to promote an open dialogue between participants, the project team and City staff. Input from the workshops was collected through comment cards and on flip charts. Input was also solicited through two electronic surveys which were provided to workshop participants and widely distributed through County e-mail lists. A link to the surveys was also posted on the Unified Government website.

Public Workshop Series #1
The first series of public workshops were held in the third week of March, 2012. During these workshops, the project team presented the results from the sidewalk analysis and solicited feedback on priorities for sidewalk and trail connections throughout the County. Participants were provided three dots to place on a County map to identify specific priority destinations. In addition to the map exercise, participants were asked to prioritize destinations by general type: educational facilities, transit corridors, parks, community resources, employment centers and entertainment/retail venues. These priorities were critical to the development of the Pedestrian Demand analysis in Chapter 5. This input and analysis provided the framework for prioritizing future sidewalk and trail improvements.

Public Workshop Series #2
The second series of public workshops were held in the fourth week of April, 2012. During these workshops, the project team presented a preliminary sidewalk and trail network and draft priorities based on an analysis of existing conditions as well as feedback received during the March workshops. Based upon this input received at these workshops, as well as the electronic surveys, the project team refined the early concepts and developed the final sidewalk and trail recommendations outlined in Chapters 6 and 7.
Survey #1

The first survey was designed to solicit public input concerning priority pedestrian destinations and to get an better understanding of local network needs. The survey was distributed to Public Workshop #1 attendees as well as a number of e-mail lists maintained by Unified Government staff. Participants were encouraged to forward the survey link to their friends, neighbors, and coworkers. In all, a total of 441 surveys were collected in the first round.

The first set of questions asked participants were they live and work. This provided the project team with an understanding of potential journey to work movements. On the maps to the left, the areas with the darkest shade of red have the highest concentration of responses, while the lightest shades have the least concentration of responses from a particular zip code. The highest concentration of respondents work in the eastern portion of the County. Conversely, the highest concentration of respondents live in the western portions of the County. This suggests the potential need for cross-county sidewalks, trails and bicycle routes to connect home to work destinations. During the public workshops, many participants suggested that if these facilities were available, that they would consider biking, and in the case of shorter trips, walking to destinations as an alternative to the automobile. These survey populations for home and work are fairly consistent with the general population. Approximately eight percent of respondents live outside of Wyandotte County while approximately 23 percent work outside of Wyandotte County. Most of these respondents live in adjacent Johnson and Jackson Counties. Many participants noted that it would be desirable to connect to neighboring counties with well-established trail and bicycle networks.
Question 3: Do you have access to sidewalks and/or trails in your neighborhood?

Just over 55 percent of respondents indicated that they did not have access to sidewalks or trails in their neighborhood. This percentage of sidewalk coverage is high compared to most areas of the County, especially outside of the older urban core.

Question 4: How important were the availability of sidewalks and/or trails to you when selecting your home and neighborhood?

73 percent of respondents indicated that the availability of sidewalks and trails were a very important or somewhat important in selecting their home and neighborhood. Many participants noted that the lack of sidewalks and trails made it harder to be competitive with similar developments in surrounding communities where such amenities are common.
Question 5: How important are safe and accessible SIDEWALKS?

Just under 80 percent of respondents indicated that safe and accessible sidewalks were very important while just under 16 percent indicated they were somewhat important. Only two percent of respondents indicated that safe and accessible sidewalks were not at all important.

Question 6: How important are safe and accessible TRAILS?

Just over 56 percent of respondents indicated that safe and accessible trails were very important while just over 31 percent indicated that they were somewhat important. Only three percent of respondents indicated that safe and accessible trails were not at all important. This indicates that trails are important to the public, however, they do not rate as high as sidewalks. This is likely because of the lack of safe and accessible sidewalks throughout the County.
Question 7: What do you think is the most important connection for sidewalks and trails in Wyandotte County? (Choose top three)

Question 8: Are you aware of the Unified Government’s Sidewalk Incentive Policy that provides matching funds for sidewalks?

Overall, the top three connections for sidewalks and trails in Wyandotte County are in order: educational facilities, followed closely by parks, with community resources (libraries, hospitals, etc.) third. This is consistent with the feedback received from the dot map and priority destinations exercises at the first series of public workshops. This input was a critical to the development of the Pedestrian Demand analysis described in Chapter 5. As a result of this input and analysis, priorities were established for the sidewalk network recommendations and priorities in Chapter 6.

The Unified Government currently has a Sidewalk Incentive Policy, which has recently been modified, where a match (approximately 50 percent of the average cost for sidewalk removal and replacement for one house, 60 percent for two to five adjacent houses, and 75 percent for more than five houses in a row) will be provided for property owners willing to participate in the cost for construction of new sidewalks. To date, few have participated in the program. This could be because many people are not aware of the program. According to the survey, only 27 percent of respondents were aware of the program.
Question 9: How important are sidewalk and trail improvements to you when compared with other infrastructure needs of the community?

As noted earlier, just under 80 percent of respondents indicated that safe and accessible sidewalks were very important while only two percent of respondents indicated that they not at all important. However, many participants noted that many areas had significant infrastructure needs including aging sanitary sewer lines and inadequate stormwater infrastructure. With this in mind, a question was developed to gauge the relative importance of sidewalks and trails compared to other infrastructure needs. As shown in the graph to the left, just over 86 percent of respondents indicated that sidewalk and trail improvements were very important or somewhat important when compared to other infrastructure needs. Just under three percent (similar to the percentages in Questions 5 and 6) felt that sidewalks and trails were not important at all when compared to other needs.

Question 10: Are there any specific areas that need consideration for sidewalks and trails?

235 responses were collected for this open ended question that asked for additional areas where sidewalks and trails were needed. The graphic to the left was developed to illustrate the specific names of parks, schools, neighborhoods, and activity centers that were most frequently identified. The largest text represents the most common responses.
Survey #2

While the first survey focused on priority destinations within the County, the second survey was designed to solicit input about preferences for regional connections outside of the County. The second survey also provided direction to the project team about individuals primary purpose for using sidewalks, trails, and bicycle facilities. This input provided insight into the purpose and need for pedestrian and bicycle improvements as well as a focus to the types of facilities that should be considered within the Plan. The survey was distributed to Public Workshop #1 and #2 attendees as well as a number of e-mail lists maintained by Unified Government staff. In all, a total of 576 surveys were collected in the second round.

Question 1: Public feedback during this project has included suggestions to connect to other metro-wide trail systems. Concerning these regional trail connections, how important are the following?

As noted above, a vast majority of participants indicated that links to existing parks in Wyandotte County are very important. Other preferences for linkages in order are: trails utilizing levees, followed closely by linkages to Johnson County, Downtown Kansas City, Missouri and the Northland Trails in Parkville and Riverside.
Question 2: If regional trail connections existed within Wyandotte County, what would be your PRIMARY purpose for using them?

Over 80 percent of respondents indicated that if regional trail connections existed, their primary purpose for using them would be for recreation. This is consistent with feedback gathered during the public workshops. The implication of this is to ensure that the design of the trail system and associated amenities include accommodations for a variety of uses.

Question 3: If regional trail connections existed within Wyandotte County, how would you use them? (select all that apply)

A majority of respondents indicated that their primary use of potential regional trail connections would be walking/hiking/strolling followed by biking. It is clear from the public workshop comments and survey responses that any future system needs to accommodate a variety of users with different needs.
Question 4: If regional trail connections existed within Wyandotte County, on average how far would you travel (one-way) on a given trip?

Currently, most existing trails within the County are relatively short connections within parks. In order to develop any trail system, it is important to understand preferences for distances. Just over 53 percent of respondents indicated that they would travel on average 1 to 5 miles on a one-way trip. Approximately 28 percent indicated that they would travel between 5 to 10 miles while just under 14 percent indicated that they would travel more than 10 miles. Only three percent indicated that they would travel less than 1 mile.

Question 5: If funding became available, how would you prioritize the following improvements? Note: There is no dedicated funding for sidewalks outside of the current Sidewalk Incentive Policy. However, the Plan will serve as a resource to pursue future state and federal grant programs and other revenue sources. (1=highest, 4=lowest)

The inventory and assessment detailed in Chapter 3 identified existing sidewalks and conditions throughout the County. The sidewalk assessment identified many needs including areas without sidewalks (network gaps), existing segments in good condition but in need of spot repair, as well segments in need of replacement due to crumbling/deteriorating concrete. According to survey responses, the highest priority is to fix minor spot repair of existing sidewalks. Regional trail connections were next, followed closely by repair of existing sidewalks to an acceptable condition.
Question 6: What does the “walkability” mean to you?  
420 responses were collected for this open-ended question that asked what “walkability” means to each individual. A sample of the responses are included in the bullets below:

- A city where I have the option to walk or drive for daily activities (i.e. commuting, eating, socializing).
- In two words: alternative accessibility. For too long urban design has focused on providing and building spaces for the automobile when we need to be focused on providing and building places for people.
- Streets that service the pedestrian foremost.
- Combination of on-street parking, street trees, wide sidewalks and parkways.
- Safety, separation from vehicles, total grade separation at intersections, and personal pedestrian safety underwritten by effective community policing.
- Paths that are safe, well-lit for night walking, well-maintained, and attractive.
- Being pedestrian friendly -- with lots of sidewalks and crosswalks -- not having to walk in the street.
- One can safely walk in areas away from traffic, with logical, direct routes to bus stops, schools, and businesses.
- In urban areas “walkability” means basic transportation. However most of Wyandotte County is suburban where walkability means recreation and exercise.
- At a bare minimum, having a sidewalk to walk on, which many of our streets do not.

Question 7: How important is walkability to you?

Just over 89 percent of respondents indicated that walkability was very important or somewhat important. Only 3 percent indicated that walkability was not important.
Question 8: How high a priority should walkability be for the Unified Government?

Just over 89 percent of respondents indicated that walkability should be a priority for the Unified Government. This is consistent with the percentages for Question 7 and has major implications for implementation of this Plan and future Unified Government policies and initiatives. A few years ago, the Unified Government took an initial policy step in adopting a Complete Streets Policy that ensures that pedestrians (among other modes) be given equal considerations with future transportation improvement projects.
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5. Pedestrian Demand

Analysis Process and Results
During the first public workshop series, the project team led the public through an exercise to identify priority pedestrian destinations. During the first exercise, participants were given three dots to place anywhere on the map for specific priority destinations. The consolidated dot map is shown below. In addition to the map exercise, participants were asked to prioritize generalized destinations (shown right). Each participant was given three priority tickets to be placed in a box for each destination type. All destinations were mapped in ArcGIS Model Builder with an 1/8-, 1/4- and 1/2-mile buffer. These are typical distances most individuals are willing to walk. Each destination type was weighted based on input from the public workshops to produce the Pedestrian Demand Map. The analysis workflow is on the following page and the Pedestrian Demand Map is on page 42.
Figure 5.1 Pedestrian Demand Analysis Workflow

Where is the most demand for sidewalks and trails in Wyandotte County?

Destination Buffers (1/8 Mile, 1/4 Mile, 1/2 Mile)

Educational Facilities (Schools, Colleges)

Parks

Community Resources (Libraries, Community Centers, Hospitals)

Transit Corridors (Bus Stops, Transit Centers)

Priority Multiplier (Public Feedback)

- Educational Facilities: 62.7%
- Transit Corridors: 41.1%
- Parks: 62.3%
- Community Resources: 44.1%
- Major Employment Centers: 16.4%
- Entertainment / Retail Venues: 22.0%

Pedestrian Demand Analysis

Sidewalk and Trail Master Plan
Pedestrian Demand

This map illustrates weighted priorities for pedestrian destinations based on input from public workshops and survey responses. The darkest red areas indicate the highest pedestrian demand. Sidewalk and trail improvements should be prioritized within these areas.

Figure 5.2
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Sidewalk Network Recommendations

The conclusion of the 2012 Walk Friendly Community Assessment and Report Card is that Kansas City, Kansas is not yet a walk friendly community. This conclusion was confirmed through the Sidewalk inventory and assessment as well as public input throughout the Plan process. This is due largely in part to the lack of sidewalks in significant portions of the County. Where sidewalks currently exist, there is a limited network with significant gaps between important destinations such as schools, parks and transit lines. Typically, sidewalks are constructed concurrently with development. Unfortunately, large segments of the County developed prior to sidewalk requirements. Today, sidewalks are required to be constructed on at least one side of a local street and both sides of an arterial street. Where sidewalks exist, many are in poor condition, especially in older parts of the County. Figure 6.1 on the following page provides a prioritized sidewalk network intended to address basic pedestrian needs including, but not limited to, connecting neighborhoods to schools, parks, transit lines, and other important local destinations. This map is intended to serve as a big-picture guide for the prioritization of future sidewalk improvements based on a high-level analysis, and public input throughout the Plan process. Specific routes and priorities may be modified based on changing conditions, further public input, and a more detailed engineering analysis. This Sidewalk Network, along with the Future Trail Network presented in Chapter 7, is intended to provide a long-range guide for a pedestrian and bicycle network that meets the needs of all users.

Fiscal Considerations

Sidewalk maintenance is a property owner’s financial responsibility. Currently, there is no dedicated funding for sidewalks outside of the recently modified Sidewalk Incentive Policy. However, even if there were a dedicated funding source, it would be cost prohibitive and likely unnecessary to build sidewalks in every portion of the County. As illustrated in the analysis by Policy Area in Chapter 3, different areas of the County have different needs. Some areas have high population densities and are in proximity to multiple priority destinations, while other areas are very rural with low population densities and few close activity centers. Therefore, this Plan does not recommend sidewalks everywhere in the County. This is not to say that sidewalks should not be built or repaired within segments not identified within this plan. Rather, these areas are a lower priority based on preferred pedestrian destinations and needs identified through the Plan process.
Future Sidewalk Network
The Future Sidewalk Network (see below) provides recommended improvements and priorities for sidewalks. Detailed area maps are provided in Appendix B.

Note: This map is intended to serve as a big-picture guide for the prioritization of future sidewalk improvements based on a high-level analysis, and public input throughout the Plan process. Specific routes and priorities may be modified based on changing conditions, further public input, and a more detailed engineering analysis.
Overview
Currently, there are few trail or bicycle facilities within the County. The few existing trails are located within existing parks including, but not limited to, Wyandotte County Lake Park, Wyandotte County Park, Jersey Creek Park and Kaw Point Park. Unfortunately, there are few safe and convenient pedestrian connections to these parks. Public workshop participants noted that they had to drive to these locations. In the case of Jersey Creek Park and Kaw Point Park, the gap in the trail network is relatively short. Meeting participants also noted that even though there are few trails within the County, there are numerous opportunities for connections to established trail and bicycle networks in adjacent counties. Examples of existing trail networks in adjacent jurisdictions include the extensive Johnson County, Kansas trail system, the Riverfront Heritage Trail in Kansas City, Missouri, and Northland trails in Riverside and Parkville, Missouri. Connections to these established trail networks could leverage a few miles of improvements into a true regional network and would help to further expand the MetroGreen system.

Planning Context
As detailed in Chapter 2, the Future Trail and Bicycle Network builds on a number of previous planning efforts, including, the Johnson and Wyandotte County Bicycle Plan, the MetroGreen Action Plan, the Southwest Boulevard/Merriam Lane Corridor Master Plan and the City-Wide Master Plan. These plans provide a vision and direction for the development of a comprehensive trail and bicycle network. Deviations, refinements, and new corridors were identified through the Plan process as a result of detailed input from the public workshops and surveys 1 and 2 described in Chapter 4. Other considerations included physical opportunities and constraints such as rivers, streamway corridors, topography, utility corridors, old road and rail rights-of-way, and levees described on the following pages.
**Physical Opportunities and Constraints**

Wyandotte County has significant natural and man-made opportunities and constraints that influenced the development of the Final Trail Network. Steep grades, rivers, and major creeks serve as natural barriers to safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle connections. Other physical barriers include highways and rail lines. However, if planned and coordinated properly, many of these barriers can become opportunities.

**Rivers**

The Missouri and Kansas Rivers serve as a significant barrier to future trail connections, especially to established trail networks in neighboring jurisdictions. Currently, there are few pedestrian or bicycle accommodations on existing bridges. Notable examples of bridges without such connections include the north and southbound K-7 bridges connecting to Johnson County, Kansas and the Platte Purchase and Fairfax Bridges connecting to Platte County, Missouri. As these bridges are improved or replaced in the future, the Unified Government should work with the Kansas and Missouri Departments of Transportation (KDOT and MoDOT) to ensure that pedestrian and bicycle accommodations are provided. In some cases, existing bridges can be retrofitted with pedestrian and bicycle facilities like the Heart of America Bridge (shown left), the Highway 9 crossing of the Missouri River between Downtown Kansas City, Missouri and North Kansas City, Missouri.

**Streamway Corridors**

As a best practice, streamway corridors should be protected to limit erosion of stream banks, provide a water storage area for floods, and preserve water quality by filtering sediment from runoff before it enters rivers and streams. The City-Wide Master Plan recommends the protection of undeveloped stream corridors and identifies their potential use for greenway trails. These greenway trails are also a significant component of the MetroGreen vision. While not ideal for most types of developments, streamway corridors provide an excellent opportunity for trails, parks and open space. These trails offer an attractive recreational outlet. They also provide a benefit to adjacent developments by providing an important amenity for local residents. Plan participants noted throughout the process that trails can be a selling point for future business owners, home buyers, and renters.
Streamway Corridors
Streamway corridors provide an excellent opportunity for trails.

Figure 7.1
Topography
Topography heavily influenced the physical development of Wyandotte County. The main topographic features within the county are the Kansas and Missouri River valleys and their tributaries. The uplands adjacent to these valleys are comprised of deeply dissected hills. The lowest level in Wyandotte County is about 740 feet above sea level at the junction of the Kansas and Missouri Rivers. The highest point is about 1,060 feet in the western part of the county. When considering cross-county trail connections, working with existing grade changes is essential.

Highways
The highway system serves as an important transportation artery for the County; however, it can serve as a significant barrier to cross-county trail connections. Safe crossings of these corridors involve physical separation (either under or over) from the highway. These networks can provide significant opportunities for trails if planned and coordinated properly. For example, K-7 on the western edge of the County is planned as a future limited access freeway. In coordination of these improvements, Wyandotte and Leavenworth Counties are working with KDOT to plan for future trails and bike routes on the parallel arterial road network. Additionally, KDOT is planning for future sidewalk and bike connections at I-70 and Riverview and I-70 and 118th Street. Any major highway improvements should consider future pedestrian and bicycle connections.

Arterial and Collector Roads
Trail opportunities for arterial roads include low-volume roads that are candidates for a “road-diet” where excess right-of-way could be used for a trail and/or bike lane. Additionally, safe integration of a trail on one side of the road should be considered for key north-south and east-west high-volume arterials such as 7th Street Trafficway and State Avenue. This strategy of identifying accommodations for trail connections will ensure a more balanced, complete street.

Rail Lines
Wyandotte County has a number of high-volume rail lines that serve as a major barrier to cross-county trail connections, especially within older industrial areas in the southeastern part of the County. These areas are comprised of large rail yards with significant activity. The Unified Government should continue to work with the railroads to ensure accommodations are provided for safe
Slope Analysis

The future trail corridors were heavily influenced by the County’s topography.
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pedestrian and bicycle crossings. In addition to the crossings, another opportunity includes a number of abandoned rail corridors that could serve as future trail connections, such as old streetcar corridors like the Kansas City Interurban line. The Unified Government should investigate the feasibility of using these abandoned corridors.

**Utility Corridors**

Similar to planning for road corridors, opportunities exist to take advantage of future planning for major sanitary sewer, water, natural gas, and power lines. These corridors could be candidates for trails if they make logical connections within the overall trail network. The Unified Government should work diligently with local service providers to consider utilizing a portion of future utility corridors, especially those underground, as an opportunity for future trails.

**Levees**

Levees are intended for flood protection and serve as physical barrier to the riverfront. However, levees have the potential to provide an excellent opportunity for walking and biking trails. Levees have successfully been used for trails throughout the country, including neighboring Riverside and Kansas City, Missouri. Levee trails can serve as an important regional transportation and recreational outlet and provide a visual and physical connection to the riverfront. Today, the riverfront is often taken for granted because it is not visible or accessible. Levee trails have the opportunity to raise overall awareness of the river and surrounding environment. Numerous regional trails plans, including MetroGreen and the Riverfront Heritage Trail, among others, have proposed a connected trail system along riverfront levees.

Levees are regulated by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and local levee districts. Most levee districts have posted these areas “no trespassing”. Although they have no direct authority or control over these levees, local communities and their residents contribute a significant amount of money for improvements and ongoing maintenance through tax dollars and/or special assessments. The Unified Government should consider a formal policy to request that the USACE and local levee districts provide trail access when local funding is requested or required for levee improvements. Public input advocating access to levees for trails is included in Appendix D.
Future Trail Network

The Future Trail Network, described below and illustrated in Figure 7.6 on page 57, is intended to serve as a long-term guide for a local and regional trails and bicycle routes to serve a variety of needs, ages, physical abilities, etc. This network was generated based upon a review and consideration of previous planning efforts, analysis of physical opportunities and constraints, as well as public input received through the public workshops and the two surveys. The Future Trail Network recommendations include three types of trails:

- Regional Trails
- Local Trails
- Greenway Trails

Design guidelines for all trail types are provided on the following page. Typical cross sections and descriptions for each trail type are provided on pages 54, 55 and 56.

Bike Routes

It is assumed that the majority of bike routes will be signed facilities where cyclists share a lane with vehicular traffic along designated routes. Legally, cyclists are allowed to share the road with vehicles on most routes, however, additional accommodations will be made for bicycles on designated bike routes through signage, shoulder improvements, relocation or re-configuration of utility grates, and other safety measures. Appropriate signage will be included on designated bike routes to alert motorists of the presence of bicycles. These could include metal signs placed on poles adjacent to the roadway or painted markings on the lane (as shown lower left). There may be opportunities in the future through road diets or other improvements to implement dedicated bike lanes within the roadway similar to Merriam Lane and Southwest Boulevard. However, each case will need to be thoroughly evaluated through detailed traffic and engineering studies to ensure that safe and efficient operations can be maintained for both the motorist and cyclist. For more information about these improvements, please refer to the Southwest Boulevard/Merriam Lane Corridor Master Plan.

Regional Sidewalk Connections

These sidewalks have the potential to supplement the regional trail network by providing additional cross-county connections and serving high-demand pedestrian destinations. For more detailed sidewalk recommendations and priorities, please refer to Chapter 6.
**Trail Design Guidelines**

The following guidelines apply for all recommended trails. Although there are several trail types, there are common minimum design standards necessary to ensure a safe and enjoyable experience for all users. These standards were developed based on input received through the Plan process and a review of the latest common practices, most notably the American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials (AASHTO) Guide for Planning, Design and Operation of Pedestrian Facilities, AASHTO Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, and KC-APWA standards.

1. For ease of maintenance, the preferred surface material for most regional and local trails is concrete. However, to accommodate different user needs and unique physical conditions, trails on unimproved levee roads, parks, greenways, or in other natural areas may utilize asphalt or “soft” surfaces such as limestone screenings, or other material approved by the County engineer.

2. Although the standard width is 10-feet, it is recognized that within the developed urban corridors and/or areas with significant physical and environmental constraints, narrower trail segments may be necessary. Within these areas, upon the recommendation of the County Engineer, a minimum of 8-feet may be accepted.

3. A three-foot minimum clear zone on each side of the trail is desirable. All vertical objects including signage, benches, etc. should be located outside of this zone.

4. Grades steeper than 8.33 percent (1:12 slope) should only be considered for very short segments; cross slopes should not exceed two percent.

5. Overhanging branches or obstructions should be higher than 10-feet.

6. For safety, large trees or tall shrubs should be at least 10-feet from the trail.

7. A buffer zone should be maintained to protect natural systems and ecologically sensitive areas.

8. Visual clutter should be limited in the green space between the road and sidewalk or trail.

9. Crossings on bridges should include a barrier and railing to separate traffic and the pedestrian or cyclist.

10. Trail heads provide places for rest, parking, water fountains, and maps of the trail system. Trail heads should be placed at the appropriate termini or junctions of a trail corridor and any place where a large concentration of users is anticipated. At a minimum, trail heads should include vehicular and bicycle parking as well as a system trail map with the specific location within the system. Other preferred features include but are not limited to benches, trash receptacles, lighting, appropriate cultural or historical interpretive signage, restrooms and drinking fountains. All facilities should be designed according to ADA accessibility guidelines.
Priorities

The following priorities for trails improvements are intended to be a general guide for future implementation of a county-wide network. It should be noted that a majority of trails will be built over time as development and re-development occurs, and ideally with a cost share by private development. However, there will be important trail connections that will not be financed by private development such as trails on bridges, levees and old rail corridors. These priorities are intended to guide the prioritization of local, state and federal funding. These general priorities were established based on input received at the public workshops as well as two surveys.

1. **Trail segments that provide a direct connection to existing schools and parks**
   - Kaw Point Connector
   - Wyandotte County Lake Park Connector
   - Trails that connect schools and parks in rural or environmentally constrained areas that do not have access to sidewalks

2. **Trail segments that provide a cross-county connection**
   - State Avenue Corridor
   - Parallel Parkway Corridor
   - North-South Greenway Corridors
   - K-32/Kansas River Corridor
   - Kansas and Missouri River Levees

3. **Trail segments that provide a direct connection to the regional trail network**
   - Trails in northern Johnson County, Kansas
   - Trails in Kansas City, Missouri, especially the Riverfront Heritage Trail
   - Trails in Riverside and Parkville, Missouri

More often than not, a majority of trail projects are implemented based on opportunities that cannot always be foreseen in a long-range plan. Therefore, the Unified Government and trail advocates should remain flexible and take advantage of opportunities as they arise to meet the goals and intent of this Plan.
Regional trails provide cross-county connections and linkages to regional trails outside of Wyandotte County. These trails are recommended to be at least 10-feet wide to accommodate pedestrians and less-experienced cyclists who do not feel comfortable riding in the street. More experienced cyclists are likely to ride in the street with vehicular traffic along designated bike routes.
Local trails provide connections to neighborhoods and local destinations. For the most part, these trails are adjacent to existing roads in developed areas with limited right-of-way. Like regional trails, a width of 10-feet is preferred to accommodate pedestrians and less experienced cyclists. In sections with limited right-of-way, 8-feet may be accepted. A green space buffer is preferred between the roadway and trail, however, where space is limited, a physical barrier or railing should be considered.
The primary setting for greenway trails is in undeveloped or sparsely populated areas; however, there are opportunities within urbanized areas as well. Greenway trails generally follow streams, providing a unique setting for trails and immersing the user in nature. In Wyandotte County, greenways provide a departure from the rigid grid pattern of streets and offer a more natural recreational setting. Care must be exercised to protect environmentally sensitive areas, yet, trails adjacent to these areas can provide educational opportunities and conservation.
Future Trail Network

The Future Trail Network (see below) is intended to serve as a guide for county-wide trails and bicycle routes. Detailed area maps are provided in Appendix C.
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8. Implementation

Overview
This Chapter provides a general guide and framework for Plan implementation. The Plan provides a long-term vision for a connected network of sidewalks, trails and bicycle routes. The public clearly articulated that safe and accessible sidewalks, trails and bicycle routes are important, even when compared to other pressing infrastructure needs. Due to limited funding options, implementation of this Plan will be a multi-step process that will occur over many years. This Chapter builds on the Plan recommendations outlined in Chapters 6 and 7 and provides key policies and action steps to implement the Plan goals developed through the extensive public engagement process. Additional policy direction was provided through recommendations outlined in the Walk Friendly Communities Assessment and Report Card. It is assumed that any policy change or action step will require direction, discussion and approval by the Planning Commission and the Board of Commissioners. Therefore, the actual approval, timing and implementation of any policy or action step identified within this Chapter is subject to change.

Implementation Matrix
The implementation matrix on the following pages outline recommended policy and actions. Key elements of this matrix include:

- A summary recommended policies and actions.
- Active partners responsible for initiation, oversight and monitoring.
- Anticipated time frames:
  - Short Term (1-5 Years)
  - Mid Term (5-10 Years)
  - Long Term (10+ Years)
  - Ongoing
**Sidewalk Network Actions and Policies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Responsible Entities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unified Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Use the GIS Sidewalk Inventory and update as necessary to monitor progress toward creating a connected sidewalk network to priority pedestrian destinations including schools, parks, transit lines, and other community resources.

2. Consider providing dedicated funding in the annual capital improvements budget to fund Priority 1 and 2 Sidewalk Gap improvements identified in Chapter 6. These funds would supplement other sources such as Safe Routes to Schools. One strategy could be to modify the Sidewalk Incentive Program to increase the Unified Government share for Priority 1 improvements.

3. Proactively work with local school districts to leverage this Plan to secure funding and resources through Safe Routes to Schools and other programs to address Priority 1 connections between schools and adjacent neighborhoods.

4. Consider updating the existing street standards to require construction of sidewalks on both sides of the street.

5. Work with volunteer groups and neighborhoods within the urban core to help proactively clean-up areas where existing brick sidewalks have become overgrown with grass, weeds, etc.
## Trail Network Actions and Polices

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Responsible Entities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unified Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Unified Government</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Short-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Adopt the Sidewalk and Trail Master Plan as an amendment to the City-Wide Master Plan with specific updates to the Parks, Open Space and Trails Framework, and Major Street Plan.

7. Amend the County’s land development regulations to require any development within 1/2-mile of a planned or existing trail to provide a direct connection at the owner/developer's expense. These trails will follow the design standards identified in Chapter 7.

8. Adopt a formalized policy that all infrastructure projects consider the need for safe and convenient pedestrian and bicycle access/accommodations. Proactively work with KDOT to ensure that this policy extends to state owned and maintained facilities.

9. The County should consider a formal policy to request trail access from the USACE and levee districts when local funding is used to help finance levee improvements.

10. Encourage developers through density bonuses and other incentives to dedicate an open space buffer and trail easement along identified streamway corridors.

11. Develop and adopt a trails program where local companies or groups can sponsor trail segments. This sponsorship may include monetary contributions, volunteer assistance, or in-kind contributions such as donation of products, materials, labor, etc. to help implement the Plan vision.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Trail Network Actions and Policies</th>
<th>Time Frame</th>
<th>Responsible Entities</th>
<th>Active Partners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Consider participating in the National Bicycle and Pedestrian Documentation Project to collect reliable and accurate bicycle and pedestrian traffic counts for planning future needs and setting priorities.</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>Unified Government</td>
<td>Private Developers/Property Owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Work with Downtown business groups and neighborhoods to develop local walking maps highlighting the trail network (completed to date), major destinations, activity centers, historic areas, parks, transit stops, etc.</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Unified Government</td>
<td>Private Developers/Property Owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>For major public and private projects, consider requiring a health impact assessment to determine the health benefits or negative impacts for the proposed project.</td>
<td>Long-Term</td>
<td>Unified Government</td>
<td>Private Developers/Property Owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Actively partner and/or coordinate with neighboring jurisdictions to implement the MetroGreen vision.</td>
<td>Ongoing</td>
<td>Unified Government</td>
<td>Private Developers/Property Owners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Actively support local pedestrian and bicycle advocacy groups such as Bike Walk KC through sponsorships, event participation and other resources to advance the Plan goals.</td>
<td>Mid-Term</td>
<td>Unified Government</td>
<td>Private Developers/Property Owners</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>