A Regional Greenway Initiative for Metropolitan Kansas City

<u>Metro Green</u>

±ſ

2001

MetroGreen

A Regional Greenway Initiative for Metropolitan Kansas City

2001





600 Broadway, 300 Rivergate Center Kansas City, Missouri 64105-1554 ph (816) 474-4240 www.marc.org



PATTI BANKS ASSOCIATES DEVELOPMENT PLANNING LANDSCAPE ARCHIVECTURE







contents

Table of Contents

Acknowledgments i **Executive Summary** ES-1 Introduction 1-1 Summary of Existing Greenway System 2-1 MetroGreen System Recommendations 3-1 **Implementation Program** 4-1 Appendices: A Summary of Public Input A-1 **B** Citizen Survey B-1 C Benefits of Greenways C-1 D Design Guidelines for MetroGreen D-1 E MetroGreen Finance Strategy E-1 F Operations, Maintenance and Management F-1 G Catalog of ArcView GIS Resource Database G-1



MetroGreen

Acknowledgments

The Mid-America Regional Council appreciates the financial contributions of the following foundations toward the preparation of the MetroGreen Action Plan.

Hall Family Foundation William T. Kemper Foundation Greater Kansas City Community Foundation, Grace Harris Philanthropic Fund

MARC appreciates the considerable in-kind support provided by area city and county governments with Geographic Information Systems (GIS) and other plan information, and personnel time to provide advice and feedback on the plan's development. In particular, we want to acknowledge the efforts of our Technical Advisory Committee:

Stephen Abbott, ASLA, Kansas City, MissouriParks and Recreation Vincent J. Bilardo, Jr., Kansas City, Missouri Brownfields Office Tim Colon, Economic Development Commission of Kansas City, MO Dale Crawford, ASLA, City of Olathe Parks Department Neil Davidson, Platte Land Trust Vanessa Eickhoff, Kansas City, Missouri Brownfields Office Tom Garland, City of Lee's Summit Parks and Recreation John Hartman, Clay County Parks and Recreation Karin Jacoby, P.E., Kansas City, MO Public Works Thomas Kimes, P.E., Kansas City, MO Public Works Randy Knight, Johnson County Parks and Recreation District Margie Maasen, Platte County Parks and Recreation Board William Maasen, Johnson County Parks and Recreation District Brian Nowotny, Platte County Parks and Recreation Foster Paulette, City of Lee's Summit Parks and Recreation Roscoe Righter, Blue Springs Parks and Recreation Laura Turnbull, ASLA, City of Lenexa Public Works, Prairie Gateway Chapter, American Society of Landscape Architects

Bruce Wilke, Jackson County Parks and Recreation



Mid America Regional Council Staff

MARC staff led the effort to secure funding, coordinate the planning process and partner with the project consultants to produce this Action Plan.

David Warm, Executive Director Marlene Nagel, Director, Community Development Jody Ladd Craig, Public Affairs Manager Barbara Hensley, Public Affairs Specialist Danny Rotert, Public Affairs Specialist Frank Lenk, Director of Research Services Scott Paszkiewicz, Environmental Planner Aaron Bartlett, Bicycle/Pedestrian Planner

Project Consultants

The consultants employed by MARC to assist in the preparation of this MetroGreen Action Plan would also like to extend their appreciation to the project funders, MARC staff and all those who volunteered their time in the preparation of this Action Plan.

Greenways Incorporated

Charles A. Flink, ASLA, President Don Stier, AASLA, Project Manager Dave Josephus, AASLA, Project Planner Jonathan Parsons, AASLA, Project Planner Bob Heuer, GIS Specialist Haley Blakeman, AASLA, Project Planner Marjorie Strauss Flink, Administrative Assistant Bob Searns, AICP, Consultant, Urban Edges Jeff Olson, AIA, Consultant, Trailblazer

Patti Banks Associates

Patti Banks, ASLA, Principal Steve Rhoades, ASLA, Project Planner John Mark Lambertson, Consultant, National Frontier Trails Center

ETC/Leisure Vision

Elaine Tatham, Ph.D, President Ronald Vine, Vice President

The Trust for Public Land Cynthia Whiteford, Regional Director Matt Zeiper, National Research Director Kim Hopper, Senior Associate, Marketing & Research

executive summary

Executive Summary

In 1991, the ASLA was invited to hold its annual meeting in Kansas City. The resulting Community Assistance Team Project produced by the society's local Prairie Gateway chapter was presented to the community and became a guide for metropolitan greenway development over the next 10 years. It became MetroGreen.

The Mid-America Regional Council served as steward and supporter of the MetroGreen vision during the past decade and local communities began to implement elements of the plan. With growing community interest in trails and increased concerns about stormwater and water quality, MARC launched an effort in 2001 to expand the 1991 vision plan.

As an expansion of the 1991 ASLA plan, MetroGreen promotes a comprehensive and extensive system of greenways, trails and open spaces. MetroGreen 2001 defines the critical relationship between environmental stewardship and urban growth management. The plan also articulates a future development strategy that will be based on the cooperative efforts of the seven counties and the municipal governments included within the plan.

MetroGreen proposes preservation and restoration of important natural streamways and environmental resources; auto-alternative travel for area residents commuting from home to work or school; it heightens awareness of recreation facilities throughout the region and improves access to them; it unifies the seven counties in the metropolis; and it connects economic, cultural and historic destinations throughout the region.

MetroGreen enlarges upon George Kessler's greenprint and the 1991 ASLA vision, adding connections leading from existing city boulevards, trails and greenways to trails, parks, and historic, cultural and recreational centers. The result will be a system of corridors and open space that will enhance the environment, offer alternative modes of travel and by connecting communities, promote their cohesive interaction.



Vision for the MetroGreen System

A Regional Greenprint

This MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative provides a greenprint for a metropolitan system joining urban and rural green corridors throughout the seven-county Kansas City region. The plan is designed to protect and improve water quality in the region for the next 100 years, and to protect and enhance the region's existing natural elements, and the quality of life area residents cherish.

- MetroGreen will preserve and protect stream corridors in the sevencounty Kansas City area by helping to use floodplain lands to absorb floodwaters, thus reducing economic loss. A clean water initiative, MetroGreen is designed to support the biological diversity of streams, rivers and lakes. The plan specifies waterways to be used for recreational purposes; offers watershed strategies for flood control and for protecting natural stream corridors; recommends local adoption of streamside buffer zones; and restores native habitats for indigenous plants and animals.
- MetroGreen will link destinations including home/school and home/ work. Green corridors available for walking and biking enhance other public health initiatives by broadening opportunities for area residents to lead healthy lifestyles. The orderly expansion of trail corridors will increase transport options and serve citizens' recreational needs.
- MetroGreen is designed to provide off-road corridors that are linked to form an alternative transportation network connecting the seven-county region. MetroGreen will promote non-motorized travel options and expand non-motorized routes.
- MetroGreen will make it possible for residents throughout the sevencounty region to experience the beauty of natural landscapes. The plan envisages outdoor classrooms to promote environmental education in the areas of urban geography, social studies and environmental management. In addition, MetroGreen proposes interpretive programs that celebrate cultural facilities located within its corridors. MARC will provide a web site that will offer area residents with updated information on MetroGreen's progress.
- In addition, MetroGreen will support ways to protect and restore native habitats for indigenous plants and animals.
- MetroGreen will encourage the development of public/private partnerships to make practical decisions concerning the construction and maintenance of future greenways. Among MetroGreen's primary goals is to identify specific economic strategies that will define the plan as a prime component of a healthy and vibrant regional economy. MetroGreen will identify partnership opportunities with private sector businesses, civic organizations, associations and individuals to spread the cost of implementing and managing greenways, and will concentrate on cost savings associated with greenway development.

MetroGreen's energetic, visionary greenprint will propel the Kansas City region into the vanguard of America's forward-looking, environmentally aware metropolitan areas.

After 10 years as the steward and primary supporter of the MetroGreen Vision, MARC obtained the services of a planning team to take the 1991 Vision to the next level of refinement. The planning team was comprised of Greenways Incorporated, Patti Banks Associates, ETC Institute/Leisure Vision, and the Trust for Public Land. The MetroGreen system defined in this plan has been developed from four primary sources of information: the ASLA MetroGreen Vision of 1991, the Geographic Information System (or GIS) resources of local governments, public involvement and input from municipal and county officials.

Community members and municipal and county officials provided input in three primary forms. Community involvement included:

- a series of public workshops held throughout the Kansas City region to educate community members about their local greenway systems (existing and planned) and the benefits of a regional greenway system as well as to receive their input regarding possible future greenway corridors;
- the technical expertise of the MetroGreen Technical Advisory Committee comprised of representatives from area municipal planning and parks and recreation departments, other local agencies, and non-profit organizations;
- and, the MetroGreen Civic Alliance that involved area civic leaders to gain the perspective and guidance from the private sector.

In addition to the personal involvement of citizens and staff from around the region, geographic information system (GIS) data files were collected from MARC and area communities. The GIS files were used to produce working maps of the region and a final digital map of the MetroGreen system that will be returned to the communities. Sharing the final MetroGreen system map will ensure the coordination of future greenway development in neighboring communities and that the maximum benefit of a regional system can be enjoyed by all.

As the MetroGreen system emerged, greater specificity was needed to support the comprehensive nature of the plan, thus ensuring that a buildable system was being planned. Efforts to broaden the Initiative included the development of MetroGreen Design Guidelines, a finance strategy to identify possible funding sources for the design and construction of the system, and a random sampling household survey of community members to understand the most important goals and gauge the support for the development of a regional greenway system. Throughout the process, the MARC Board of Directors was kept abreast of the activities and progress of MetroGreen.

The Master Planning Process

Recommendations

MetroGreen is a visionary, large-scale system of interconnected landscape corridors that will span more than 1,000 miles linking city to countryside, suburb to urban center, and regional residents to the landscapes they cherish. To achieve the vision articulated in 1991 by the ASLA Prairie Gateway Chapter, MetroGreen will become more than a system of trails and bike paths. MetroGreen will seek to conserve the unique native landscapes of the Kansas City region, and will help resolve the relationship between land development and land stewardship, defining a greenprint for the future.

The concept of MetroGreen is simple, link together corridors of land to the landscapes and destinations that people value. Where appropriate, build pathways that people can travel by foot, bicycle, rollerblade or on horse-back. And make the corridors wide enough so that they will help to protect water courses, preserve historic landscapes, and beautify area roadways.

Implementation of MetroGreen will be complex. Full build-out of the system envisioned in this Regional Greenway Initiative will require a coordinated effort by the local governments, private interests and residents of the seven-county region.

This plan responds to concerns that were expressed in the citizen survey conducted by MARC in 2001, and promotes a systematic, thorough and highly implementable set of strategies for shaping the future of the Kansas City region through the 21st Century. Once this is achieved, the work begun by George Kessler in 1892, and further articulated by the ASLA in 1991, will be fully evident to future residents of the Kansas City region in 2102.

Plan of Action

The MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative is a comprehensive, visionary plan that identifies potential greenway corridors throughout the Kansas City metropolitan area and proposes specific action steps to establish these greenways with a timeframe of three-to-five, five-tofifteen, and fifteen-to-twenty-five year increments. To realize the vision laid forth in this plan, the following steps will need to be completed for each greenway corridor: land protection, master planning, design development, construction, and maintenance.

Implementation Strategy

Implementing the region-wide concept of MetroGreen will take place at the county and municipal government level. This is not to suggest that local governments alone are to bear the entire burden of implementation. This plan envisions an active role for the Mid-America Regional Council and a partnership effort between the public and private sector to implement the MetroGreen vision.

Kansas City MetroGreen Plan

MetroGreen needs an organization that is dedicated to the vision, mission, goals and objectives of this Plan in order to be successful in the long run. The implementation of the MetroGreen plan will require one or more organizations with the ability to:

- Advocate, promote, and encourage development of MetroGreen.
- Engage and educate citizens as to benefits of MetroGreen.
- Assist in raising money for implementation.
- Help to organize volunteers to assist with implementation and management.
- Sponsor or co-sponsor MetroGreen events.
- Serve as champion for the MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative.
- Advise local governments on specific segments of the MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative.
- Facilitate cooperation among jurisdictions for implementation of MetroGreen.
- Promote use of uniform design guidelines for MetroGreen facilities.

The Mid-America Regional Council has taken responsibility for updating and refining the MetroGreen plan, building support among local government leaders and building community awareness. As a voluntary association of city and county governments and metropolitan planning organization, MARC views the MetroGreen planning function as an appropriate role for the agency. This role has been viewed as appropriate by member local governments and other MetroGreen stakeholders. In the near term, the Mid-America Regional Council will absorb the immediate planning and implementation efforts of MetroGreen under its existing organizational structure. This is viewed as a short-term solution to the issue of leadership.

The framework for a long-term organization structure includes the formation of a new organization called *MetroGreen, Incorporated.* It would be established as a non-profit, 501 (c)3 organization. Under the name MetroGreen, Inc., the organization would be governed by a Board of Directors and have its own administrative staff. Under this scenario, MetroGreen, Inc., could have the following divisions. One would be administrative and oriented toward implementation, the other, a "friends" group, would be oriented toward advocacy, promotion and fund raising.

MetroGreen, Inc. (Leadership Board)

- · Champion the MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative
- Advise local governments on the development of the MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative
- Facilitate cooperation among jurisdictions for implementation of MetroGreen
- Define and recommend sources of funding for MetroGreen
- Implement uniform design guidelines for MetroGreen facilities
- Coordinate efforts to create a unified MetroGreen system

Friends of MetroGreen

- Subset of MetroGreen, Inc.
- Membership organization
- Advocate, promote, and encourage development of MetroGreen
- Educate citizens as to the benefits of MetroGreen
- Assist MetroGreen in raising money for implementation
- Help to organize volunteers to assist with implementation and management
- Sponsor or co-sponsor MetroGreen events

Introduction

MetroGreen is a regional greenway system for the Kansas City metropolitan area. It is principally comprised of linear corridors of land found along streams, roadways and within abandoned rail corridors. The purpose of MetroGreen is to establish an interconnected system of trails that will link the seven-county metropolitan region. MetroGreen is a natural extension of the Kansas City area's trails heritage.

In 1991, the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) held its Annual Meeting in Kansas City. As is customary, the Society undertook a Community Assistance Team Project and presented the product as a gift to the host city. In 1991, that gift was the Vision of a Kansas City Metropolitan Greenway System, or MetroGreen.

The MetroGreen Vision has served admirably for 10-years as a guide for metropolitan greenway development. Many local communities have developed local plans and constructed trail segments consistent with this regional vision concept. However, it has become apparent that more details need to be articulated before a comprehensive system can come to be. This MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative is the handbook for completing a Kansas City metropolitan area greenway system.

Completion of MetroGreen will result in a more comprehensive metropolitan system of open space and trails that links with local systems to increase access to outdoor resources. The benefits of a fully-developed MetroGreen system include: preservation and restoration of important natural streamways and environmental resources, non-automotive options for people that commute to work and school, more recreation resources, a more unified metropolitan area, and greater access to Kansas City's economic, cultural, and historic destinations.

The Kansas City metropolitan area is not the first in the nation to consider the importance of developing a regional greenprint. In the late 1960's both Chicago and Denver began developing extensive greenspace projects that have flourished during the past 30 years. The Chicago Openlands Project has protected thousands of acres of land throughout the metropolitan area, and has been used to link together the famed Forest Pre-

Purpose of MetroGreen



Introduction

serves of the region. Denver began with a rather modest restoration and revitalization of the Cherry Creek corridor through the downtown area, and now boasts more than 200 miles of interconnected greenways, open space lands and parks.

Since 1997, the metropolitan region of Minneapolis and St. Paul has been working with the State of Minnesota Department of Natural Resources to develop Metro Green. This project is a collaborative, public/private effort to develop and manage a regional network of natural areas, parks and other open spaces interconnected by ecological corridors in the seven county metropolitan region. The southeastern region of Michigan (Detroit area) completed plans for an 8-county metro greenprint in 1998. The five-county metro region of Tulsa, Oklahoma prepared a trails and greenways plan in 1999.

The St. Louis region has also been working diligently to develop a bistate, metropolitan greenprint. Spurred by the community's bicentennial in 2004, the legislatures of Missouri and Illinois have granted authority to institute a local tax and create "regional park authorities" in the East St. Louis region of Illinois and the St. Louis region of Missouri. The goals of the programs are to protect open space, link green corridors together and develop an interconnected system of trails and parks.

History of Trails and Kansas City

Nearly two hundred years ago, the bluffs where Kansas City later rose witnessed the passing of the Lewis and Clark expedition on their epic voyage up the Missouri River. While encamped here at the confluence of the Kansas and Missouri Rivers, the members of the Corps of Discovery hunted, made repairs, and corporal punishment was first exercised on two of the men. On June 28, 1804, William Clark hinted in his journal of the great things that would develop at this site, describing present-day downtown Kansas City as "a butiful place for a fort, good landing place..."

After successfully completing their far-reaching explorations of the West, they again passed by here in September of 1806, where despite their eagerness to get home, Lewis and Clark took the time to climb the bluff and admire the commanding view. The historic, watery "trail" of their expedition was only the first of many trails to cross the Kansas City metropolitan area...and to change American History.

Lewis and Clark's accounts of the vast riches of the West spawned a flood of enterprising fur trappers who crisscrossed the Rocky Mountains in pursuit of both furs and freedom. Their extensive explorations also documented routes that would later be used by the major overland trails. These mountain men used the "trail" of the Missouri River as a superhighway to ship furs to markets all around the world. The fur trade also brought the first permanent settlement in Kansas City when the entrepreneurial Chouteau family of St. Louis established a trading post here in 1821. That same year a party of five men left Missouri on horseback and headed west to explore trade possibilities with various Indian tribes. Encountering a group of soldiers from Mexico, they were escorted to the small and remote city of Santa Fe. Hungry for new goods, the Mexicans quickly bought out the men's supplies, earning the Missourians huge profits. With their saddlebags full of silver, and encouraged by the New Mexican government to return, the men hurried home to Missouri with tales of their success.

The next year, more traders with pack animals, and later wagons heavily loaded with trade goods, carved a path across the prairies and down to Mexico. Even greater profits were reaped and the Santa Fe Trail was officially born.

While the original starting points were farther east in Missouri, by the 1830's Jackson County had established itself as the eastern terminus of the trail, with the new villages of Independence and Westport vying for the lucrative trade. Jackson County was ideally situated to serve in this role, being on America's western border with the "Indian Lands," now the State of Kansas, and bounded on the north by the major east-west transportation corridor of the Missouri River. Those two geographical features were responsible for pumping millions of dollars into the regional economy.

Overtime, the Santa Fe Trail left not only a major legacy for Kansas City and Missouri history but in American history as well. It provided a unique overland foreign trade route during an era when nearly all such commerce was conducted with ships from eastern seaboard cities. And it was also the trail used by American troops during the Mexican War in conquering and wrestling away from Mexico the entire American Southwest. Through that trail and action, we acquired what is today California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico, and parts of Colorado and Texas vastly increasing the size and wealth of the United States.

Besides routes of exploration and trade, the Kansas City area also has a rich history of emigration trails. In the spring of 1841, a number of families gathered their covered wagons together at a campground in present-day Johnson County, Kansas to embark on a risky and grueling 2,000-mile trek across the western wilderness. By successfully reaching California, they became the first Americans to migrate across the continent and settle permanently on the Pacific coast.

Pioneers following the trails out of this area to California were few in number compared to those headed to Oregon. That all changed with the discovery of gold in 1848 at the mill of Capt. John Sutter, a former Westport resident, which electrified the nation. Tens of thousands of gold seekers poured into the Kansas City area to outfit themselves for the trip to California, in hopes of making a quick fortune. Few were so lucky, and many returned home broke. In this area, the California Trail emigrants followed the same route already known as the "Road to Oregon." In the 1830's America's Pacific Northwest, then called the "Oregon Country," was claimed by both the American and British governments. However, the British actually had a physical presence there with outposts, and felt protected from the encroachment of those upstart young Americans because of the tremendous wall of protection afforded by the Rocky Mountains.

But by the early 1840's, a handful of Americans proved that thinking to be in error when they successfully crossed the continent and those rugged mountains, and entered the Oregon Country. With the promise of free, rich land, the initial trickle of American emigrants swelled into a mighty flood - all searching for better homes and brighter futures.

Once again, the migrations started from the Kansas City area, and were kicked off in earnest in the spring of 1843 when about 1,000 people left here for the Oregon Country. That initial colony was followed by wave after wave of American settlers, and England's hold on the region crumbled. As a result, the United States boundary with Canada was established much farther north than where it might have been and we acquired all of what is now Washington, Oregon, Idaho, and part of Montana.

Whether for exploration or trade, fast fortunes or settlement, the trails leading out of the Kansas City region forever changed the size, shape, and destiny of America. Use of these crude pioneer roads made possible America's acquisition, as well as the settlement and development, of the entire region west of the Rocky Mountains. Through the use of these trails, vast lands were obtained which have helped to pump America's economy for generations, through farming, ranching, mining precious minerals, fishing, shipping, and the timber and tourist industries, just to name a few.

The ripple effects continue. America's greatly increased economic clout in the twentieth century also brought increased political and military clout, taking us to new heights of world leadership. The trails across the American West played no small role in opening the door for this series of monumental developments - primitive pioneer trails, winding their way out of the Kansas City area. It is a legacy of towering dimensions.

Kessler and There is nothing novel about a linked system of parks, parkways, open spaces and greenways in Kansas City. The concept was introduced here 100 years ago when George Kessler, August Meyer, and William Rockhill Nelson convinced Kansas Citians that regional planning and civic design could improve their community. In the 1892-93 Plan proposed by Kessler and Meyer, an integrated network of parks and boulevards was laid out for the young city. The context in which this plan was created, the innova-

Kansas City

tive elements incorporated into the system, and the long-range effects of the plan are well worth considering here, for the spirit and excellence of the 1892-93 Plan provides a sound foundation for future regional plans and investments.

Just as many metropolitan areas are currently recognizing the benefits of greenway development, a handful of booming industrial cities of the latenineteenth century moved away from the planning of freestanding parks to the development of a park system. This broader approach to park planning allowed for significant conservation of natural features and recognized the fact that the distribution and location of a park system could be manipulated to increase real estate values and to guide development.

Kansas City was ripe for renewal and redirection in the 1890's. This gateway city straddled the prairie plains, and its centralized and strategic location at the great bend in the Missouri offered tremendous opportunities for growth. The frontier had passed through decades earlier and, in its wake capitalists and urban promoters were jockeying to put Kansas City in control of a vast hinterland. In appearance, however, it was nothing but a regional capital. Its bluffs were covered with shanties, its streets were narrow and clogged with mud, and it bore the austere, treeless, and disordered landscape of an aging frontier center of trade and transshipment.

George Kessler - a landscape architect who had studied civil engineering in his native Germany and who had also worked briefly in New York with Fredrick Law Olmstead and later for the Kansas City, Fort Scott and Gulf Railroad Company - arrived in Kansas City at a time when Nelson and others were leading a campaign for more public parks and connecting boulevards. It was the time of the City Beautiful Movement and civic design and planning on a grand scale were beginning to influence the form of the nation's larger cities. It was also in this context that Kessler submitted, and the Board of Parks and Recreation Commissioners approved, his parks and boulevard plan for the city.

The early park and boulevard system

The most interesting aspect of the 1892-93 Plan and the subsequent additions to it is that it brought together the design disciplines of architecture, planning, landscape architecture, and urban design. The plan was informed by these influences and the city was shaped by the plan. The result was an integrated network of parks, park structures, architecturally significant buildings, and fashionable boulevards that tied the entire city together and offered a unity of form and arrangement.

Initially conceived as a framework of boulevards that would connect West Terrace Park, Penn Valley Park, and North Terrace Park, the early system displayed a close alignment with the city's natural features. Boulevards followed ridges and natural waterways and frequently swept across or broke through the existing city grid. The parks in the system were situated in some of the most rugged and challenging terrain and those that occupied the bluffs overlooking the rivers offered stunning panoramic views unequaled elsewhere in the city.

This use and integration of the area's outstanding natural features contrasted with the formal elements that Kessler built into his parks and boulevards. In North Terrace Park a stately colonnade stood atop one of the bluffs where below, Cliff Drive hugged the wooded slope and passed under a canopy of trees. Along the Paseo, a series of fountains, pergolas, terraces, and sunken gardens was used to demarcate a chain of tiny parks that ran the nine-block course of the early boulevard. In other places, elegant bridges, reflecting pools, and formal walkways were used to identify parks and boulevards as components of the system.

The 1892-93 Plan still affects the way we see Kansas City, the way we move about, and the way the city continues to grow. The structural effects of the plan are simple - it reoriented Kansas City away from the riverfront and the original downtown. At the same time, as new boulevards and parks were added to the system, it pushed ahead of residential and commercial development and actually guided the city's growth. In older areas it functioned as a redevelopment tool and in all areas its extension always resulted in increased property values and often, in the creation of beautiful residential districts.

Kessler's system incorporated rational planning principles. His vision rested on traffic counts, analyses of population distribution, and studies of land values. At the same time that the system made good commercial sense, it also contributed to the preservation of the natural environment within the city and to the beautification of the city through formal design. Most importantly, however, the Kansas City Parks and Boulevard system stand as a model for the creation of connections, for environmental planning on a large scale, and for the linkage of the natural and built environments in an orderly and mutually beneficial way.

The following components comprised the unique plan,

- It outlined a connected system of parks and boulevards that serviced all parts of the expanding city.
- It joined old and new neighborhoods, enhanced communities and sustained property values.
- It contained not only larger parks and boulevards, but also local parks and playgrounds associated with schools, all evenly distributed throughout the city.
- It was forward looking in anticipating growth: in newer areas, land was acquired prior to development in order to provide a framework for urbanization.

- It was backward looking in acknowledging the need for urban renewal: in older areas, acquisitions were made with the intent to clean up blight, remove slums, reclaim disturbed landscapes, and protect major natural features.
- It was primarily oriented toward residential needs, with commercial traffic excluded from the boulevards.
- It was funded through a unique system of benefit districts that the city council was empowered to define, as well as through special assessments against the benefited real estate.
- It was legally adopted by charter amendment, authorizing the acquisition of park and boulevard property by "purchase, condemnation or otherwise" (e.g. by donation).

This astonishingly comprehensive proposal combined environmental protection; natural resource preservation; aesthetics; social ideas for building a stable, balanced, and wholesome community; solutions for transportation problems; and a fair and equitable cost distribution scheme. The plan's broad appeal and eminent good sense facilitated its comparatively rapid realization, even as other cities' plans languished.

The 1991 MetroGreen Vision identified a regional greenway system for the Kansas City area. The Vision proposed an interior, primarily urban, loop approximately 90 miles in length and a 140-mile outer loop through suburban areas. The system was envisioned as connecting the two loops with multiple spokes that followed stream courses and existing park lands. The existing urban natural systems and large greenspaces were identified as important features that needed to be incorporated into MetroGreen's development. The Vision also recognized rural greenspaces as providing significant amounts of open space that feature the region's natural environment. This included upland prairie, wooded slopes and draws, and streams. Land, currently and formerly, used for agricultural practices was also mentioned for its scenic value and environmental diversity.

In addition to the natural environment described in the document, an extensive examination of human influences on the region was also conducted. The Vision analyzed the development history, heritage and growth of the region. Discovery Centers were identified as important features to incorporate in the MetroGreen system. Discovery Centers were defined as important nodes that highlight the area's cultural treasures, parks and natural areas, as well as shopping, entertainment and sports venues. Discovery Centers were identified to ensure that economic and educational components were included in the development of the system.

Finally, the 1991 MetroGreen Vision called for the development of an adoptable MetroGreen Master Plan. The Vision specified a Master Plan that is flexible, provides more detailed greenway routes, and is available

1991 MetroGreen Vision

to all levels of government and departments that impact related issues such as flood control and transportation. This 2001 MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative is that plan.

Vision More than one hundred years ago, the Kansas City Board of Parks and Recreation Commissioners approved an innovative plan in 1893 by noted planner George Kessler to develop and link together a series of parks, boulevards and greenspaces that would serve Kansas Citians into the Twenty-First Century. In 1991, the American Society of Landscape Architects sponsored a Community Assistance Team to update the Kessler Plan and established a Vision for MetroGreen. This 2001 MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative uses the foundations of both the Kessler Plan and the ASLA MetroGreen Vision to define an implementation strategy for the next 100 years. The benefit of creating a comprehensive system of greenspace goes beyond leisure and aesthetics. MetroGreen will be an important element in the future economy and quality of the environment for the Kansas City metropolitan region for years to come. This greenspace system will offer a way to protect the natural green infrastructure of the region's landscape that is a necessity for maintaining the quality of life that residents have always enjoyed and will continue to desire for years to come. Simply put, the principal vision of MetroGreen is to develop an interconnected network of greenways and open space throughout the seven county metro region.

Goals and Objectives

Goal 1: Preserve and protect stream corridors throughout the metropolitan area

One of the primary goals of MetroGreen is to preserve, protect and restore floodplain lands as vital areas for the absorption of flood waters, thereby helping to reduce economic losses caused by flooding. Also, the MetroGreen system can be part of a clean water program, ensuring that streams, rivers and lakes will support biological diversity and human recreation.

Objectives

To accomplish this goal, the following objectives should be achieved:

- Encourage local communities to adopt ordinances that establish streamside buffers.
- Adopt policies and implement metro-wide programs that serve to maintain floodplains as open, undeveloped landscapes.
- Develop watershed-based strategies for controlling flooding and utilizing greenways as a mitigating landscape feature.
- Decrease non-point source pollution loads on streams, rivers and lakes by implementing Phase 2 of the National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) program.
- Develop a community-wide strategy for protecting undeveloped natural stream corridors.
- Develop a mitigation program to restore and reclaim stream corridors that have been adversely effected by poor land use practices.
- Increase public awareness of water quality issues and concerns.

- Develop and effectively implement proactive efforts to improve water quality involving private citizens through existing and expanded Adopt-A-Stream and storm drain stenciling programs.
- Increase public access to and public ownership of stream corridors.

Goal 2: Link people to outdoor resources close to where they live and work.

MetroGreen corridors should create a diversity of universally accessible landscapes that offer community residents an opportunity to maintain a fit and healthy lifestyle. Through the development of a recreation-based trails system, MetroGreen can also supplement other elements of the community's transportation program and encourage bicycle and pedestrian connections throughout the metropolitan region.

Objectives

To accomplish this goal, the following objectives should be achieved:

- The orderly expansion of the MetroGreen trails system throughout the region, as shown on an officially adopted MetroGreen Action Plan map should be supported as an important regional initiative. This will ensure that residents have access to a system of trails that can best serve the recreational needs of residents.
- Ensure that MetroGreen corridors are accessible to all persons, regardless of their ability. Utilize the most current national guidelines on outdoor accessibility to define the variety of trail environments and experiences that are available to residents.
- Integrate corporate health care programs into physical development strategies of the greenway system.
- Make greenways a destination for health and fitness activities.
- Provide overland connections as development occurs. Work with developers to ensure that important neighborhood-level connections are successfully developed as part of land development activities.

Goal 3: Link MetroGreen corridors to on-road bicycle and pedestrian facilities to create an interconnected alternative transportation network for non-motorized use. MetroGreen should be linked to the Mid-America Regional Council longrange transportation plan for on-road bicycle and pedestrian systems offering local residents non-motorized routes for travel to popular destinations such as work and school.

Objectives

To accomplish this goal, the following objectives should be achieved:

- Encourage all local communities to develop bicycle and pedestrian facility plans.
- Ensure that connections are made between the MetroGreen corridors and bicycle and pedestrian routes designated on MARC and local plans.

Goal 4: Provide opportunities for Kansas Citians to learn about the region's natural landscapes and celebrate their heritage through interpretive programs and cultural facilities located within MetroGreen corridors. MetroGreen corridors should offer local residents an opportunity to learn about the landscapes that are special to the Kansas City metropolitan region and promote the long-term involvement and participation of community residents in the planning, design, implementation and management of the regional greenway system.

Objectives

To accomplish this goal, the following objectives should be achieved:

- Encourage the establishment of outdoor classrooms to promote environmental education opportunities within greenways.
- Expand education curriculums of primary and secondary schools to include urban geography, social studies, and sciences related to environmental management.
- Develop a program of continuing education for elected officials, agency staff, developers and land designers/engineers to define technologies for managing urban and non-urban stream corridors.
- Establish an "adopt-a-greenway" program to include participation among local business, industry, residential and civic organizations.
- Develop an on-going communication with print, radio and television media. Establish a greenways publication to keep community residents informed of progress. Develop a web site to include updated information on the greenway program.
- Celebrate the area's special cultural and historic resources through the development of the greenway system.

Goal 5: Protect the native habitat of plants and animals throughout the Metro region.

MetroGreen corridors should be used to preserve and encourage biodiversity through the protection of important and distinctive habitat throughout the community.

Objectives

To accomplish this goal, the following objectives should be achieved:

- Protect and restore aquatic habitat as a primary component of the MetroGreen system.
- Establish streamside vegetative buffers to promote diverse habitat for aquatic and terrestrial species.
- Protect, restore and create wetlands in key riparian corridors to promote wildlife breeding grounds.

Goal 6: Implement the vision of a metropolitan greenspace system first envisioned by George Kessler in 1893, and as articulated in 1991 by the American Society of Landscape Architects.

The Kansas City Metropolitan region should execute an implementation strategy for MetroGreen that is based on public/private partnerships and community participation.

Objectives

To accomplish this goal, the following objectives should be achieved:

- Develop a public-private partnership effort that will further the efforts of MetroGreen development and maintenance goals for the future greenway system.
- Assign responsibilities for facility and land management to appropriate public and private sector organizations and agencies.
- Promote a management philosophy that encourages natural resource stewardship.
- Work with area communities to identify multiple actors as a dedicated source of funding for operation and management activities.
- Encourage local communities to support dedicated maintenance crews for greenway trails.

Goal 7: Make MetroGreen an integral part of a healthy and vibrant economy.

The Kansas City metropolitan region should continue to identify specific economic strategies that will enable MetroGreen to return financial benefits to the region.

Objectives

To accomplish this goal, the following objectives should be achieved:

- Identify partnership opportunities with public sector agencies that can serve to reduce the cost of implementing and managing greenways.
- Identify partnership opportunities with the private sector (businesses, civic organizations, associations and individuals) that can serve to reduce the cost of implementing and managing greenways.
- Provide information to developers and real estate investors, including homeowners, about the value added from proximity to open space and trails.

Summary of Existing Greenway System

Most cities and towns of the Midwest and the Great Plains were founded alongside rivers or near the great overland transport routes. In this sense, the setting that gave rise to Kansas City and its surrounding towns is not unusual. What makes this area extraordinary, however, is its geographical position in relation to the rest of the United States. Its central location near the confluence of two important rivers that drain the vast and open plains has made the Kansas City area a strategic and pivotal gateway from its very beginning.

The place that today we call the Kansas City metropolitan area occupies a large region that encircles the confluence of the Missouri River and its smaller tributary, the Kansas (or Kaw) River. Those who have lived here long enough think of the confluence area as split into three sections by these two rivers. The Missouri sweeps down from the Northwest and bends to the East leaving a vast piece of the region north of its course. The Kansas River flows in from the West-southwest and joins the Missouri at its eastward turn. This confluence creates the other two pieces - a smaller area to the West that falls between both rivers and remains entirely in Kansas, and a wide stretch of land that lies south of the Kansas and the Missouri Rivers and runs from Kansas into Missouri.

Dozens of tributary rivers, creeks and streams flow into these two muddy waterways and each of their channels cuts back into the woodland bluffs that edge the broad river flood plains. Many of these tributaries extend farther back from the rivers and drain the open, rolling prairie and treecovered and eroded hills that are scattered across the upland landscapes. Throughout this region of open upland and wooded stream courses, rich soils support a fairly thick and low vegetation cover that in turn serves as habitat for a broad range of wildlife.

The ecological relationships that bind the area's natural environment changed little until the last 200 years. Before that the confluence region served as territorial base to the Kansa, Osage and other peoples who hunted, foraged, and cultivated subsistence crops in the rich bottomlands. Intrusions by trappers and traders brought the market/resource demands of a global commercial economy and, at the same time, made the Kan-

Description of the Seven County Region

chapter 2



sas-Missouri confluence a strategic break point in the North American network of rivers and trails.

Anglo movements into the area increased in the first half of the nineteenth century and slowly, as trading posts were planted and way stations were built, the district surrounding the junction of the rivers became a general switch point for the east-west traffic, a gateway through which passed people and manufactured goods headed to the far West and Northern New Spain and in return passed the furs, gold, and harvested resources of the Louisiana Territory.

As the dominant transportation technology switched from steamship and overland wagon to railroad, the gateway status of the towns in the confluence region grew. Settlers poured into the Kansas City area, its commercial economy expanded and the hinterland that surrounded and supported the city evolved into one of the most productive farming regions in the world.

Today, more than 1.7 million people live in the cities and towns, suburbs and villages that fill the confluence area. Split by a state line and grouped into seven counties, five of which are well urbanized, the residents of the metropolitan area have all of the problems and pleasures of others who live in or near the great cities of North America. Many people commute daily to work in an older urban core. Others have remained in the center of the metropolitan area and are busy restoring and revitalizing the beautiful neighborhoods that are flourishing once again. Still others have settled the exurban fringes and have brought new life to many of the older country towns that declined as railroad traffic dwindled.

The Kansas City region bears a landscape transformed by 200 years of traffic and trade, of civilization and settlement. It still supports a rich variety of plants and animals that live off its streams and soils but the environment that once sustained the Kansa, Osage, and other native peoples must now serve the needs of a significantly larger and more demanding population. To make things work in the confluence area, we must carefully plan how we will inhabit, use, and sustain the region's resources in the years to come.

resources in the years to come. The 1,144 mile, seven-county MetroGreen system is an ambitious plan for our community. Yet, recent efforts suggest growing interest in realizing this vision. There is growing interest in greenways and trails by citizens, political leaders, and parks and public works officials. Many communities have completed extensive plans for greenway systems. Some communities have asked voters to approve dedicated taxes. Many cities and counties are seeking available federal and state grants to support trail construction. Currently, segments of 13 MetroGreen trails with over 85 miles exist in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

Trail systems are increasingly popular in private development. Developers have already begun designing new office park and neighborhood projects with greenways and trails as focal points.

Existing MetroGreen Segments

Berkley Park Esplanade



Greenway Description:

Terminal points:

Length:
Surface type:
Handicap accessible:
Pets permitted:
Dedicated parking:
Hours of operation:
For more information:

Currently, the trail is contained within R.L. Berkley Park, but it will be expanded soon. 0.5 mile Concrete Yes Yes Yes Sunrise to sunset Kansas City Parks & Recreation Dept. 4600 E. 63rd Street Kansas City, MO 64130 816-513-7500





The Berkley Park Esplanade is the northeastern-most point of the soonto-be-constructed Kansas City Riverfront Heritage Trail. Soon, direct connections will be made to the Kemper Arena and across the Kansas River to Wyandotte County. This urban trail is conveniently located near the vibrant and exciting Kansas City River Market Area. From Berkley Park, visitors enjoy commanding views of the Kansas City skyline and the Missouri River.





Greenway Description:

West terminus: East terminus: Length: Surface type: Handicap accessible: Pets permitted: Dedicated parking: Hours of operation: For more information:

Belleview Street Blue River 5.5 miles Concrete Yes Yes No Sunrise to sunset Kansas City Parks & Recreation Dept. 4600 E. 63rd Street Kansas City, MO 64130 816-513-7500

The Brush Creek Corridor is a premier cultural and recreational amenity. The corridor was designed to hold stormwater and reduce flooding damage while simultaneously providing an east-west pedestrian connection. The greenway passes through the Country Club Plaza (Kansas City's premier shopping district) as well as providing access to the Nelson-Atkins Museum of Art, Volker Park, Bruce R. Watkins Cultural Center and Brush Creek Park. The greenway has spurred considerable reinvestment in the corridor east of Troost. Plans are underway to extend the greenway west to State Line Road and east to the Blue River.



English Landing Park Trail





Greenway Description:

Terminal points:

Length: Surface type: Handicap accessible: Pets permitted: Dedicated parking: Hours of operation: For more information: Currently, the trail is contained within English Landing Park, but there are opportunities to expand the trail along the Missouri River. 3 miles Limestone screenings Yes Yes Yes Sunrise to sunset City of Parkville 1201 East Street Parkville, MO 816-741-7676

English Landing Park is located in Parkville along the banks of the Missouri River. It features one of the few trails along the Missouri River in the Kansas City region, and offers several recreational opportunities, which include playgrounds, a volleyball court, picnic shelters, a boat ramp, softball and soccer fields. The historic Waddell A-frame Bridge is located within the park. The Parkville City Market is located at the entrance to the park.





Indian Creek Trail



Greenway Description:

West terminus:

East terminus: Length: Surface type: Handicap accessible: Pets permitted: Dedicated parking: Hours of operation: 151st Street, west of Mur-Len Road Locust Street in KCMO 24 miles Asphalt/Concrete Yes Yes Yes Sunrise to sunset



The Indian Creek Trail Greenway passes through four metro cities: Leawood, Overland Park, Olathe, and Kansas City, Missouri. It connects with Tomahawk Creek Trail, Pinehurst Park, Foxhill South Park, the Corporate Woods Business Park, Stoll Park, the Overland Park Golf Course and Water Works Park in Olathe. It includes several amenities such as ball fields, shelters, playgrounds and tennis courts. It is close to several retail and commercial centers.

Jersey Creek Trail



Greenway Description:

West terminus: East terminus: Length: Surface type: Handicap accessible: Pets permitted: Dedicated parking: Hours of operation: For more information: 18th Street 5th Street 1.8 miles Asphalt No Yes No Sunrise to sunset Unified Government of Wyandotte County / Kansas City, Kansas Parks and Recreation Kansas City, KS 66109 913-596-7077





Jersey Creek Trail in Kansas City, Kansas, connects neighborhoods from 4th Street to 18th Street. This trail is mostly paved with one gravel section along an abandoned rail line. Benches and lookouts on the trail provide resting points along the creek. Heathwood Park located on the west end adds a playground and ball fields to the recreational aspects of the trail.



Leavenworth Landing Trail



Greenway Description:

West terminus: East terminus: Length: Surface type: Handicap accessible: Pets permitted: Dedicated parking: Hours of operation: For more information: North end of the park Three Mile Creek 1/2 mile Concrete Yes Yes Yes Sunrise to sunset Leavenworth Parks and Recreation 123 South Esplanade Leavenworth, KS 66048 913-651-2203

Leavenworth Landing Trail is located along the Missouri River next to the Historic Railroad Station, now the Leavenworth Community Center. The trail includes interpretive signs, sculptures, benches, a small dock, a trellis and picnic tables. The trail offers many outstanding views of the Missouri River and Three Mile Creek.



Little Blue Trace





Greenway Description:

North terminus: South terminus: Length: Surface type: Handicap accessible: Pets permitted: Dedicated parking: Hours of operation: For more information: Blue Mills Road I-70 11 miles Limestone screenings Yes Yes Sunrise to sunset Jackson County Parks and Recreation 22807 Woods Chapel Road Blue Springs, MO 64105 816-795-8200



The existing trail is located in the center of Jackson County along the Little Blue River. The trail is multipurpose. There are currently five access points: Blue Mills Rd., Ripley Junction, Bunshu Rd, M-78 Hwy, and R.D. Mize Rd. There is a picnic shelter at each access except R.D. Mize. A future access point is planned in the Hartman Heritage Center west of Little Blue Parkway. The city of Independence bicycle trail system connects at Little Blue Pkwy. There is a historical connection at Ripley Junction - the site of a Civil War skirmish.



Greenway Description:

- North terminus: South terminus: Length: Surface type: Handicap accessible: Pets permitted: Dedicated parking: Hours of operation: For more information:
- Longview Lake Dam South end of lake 6 miles Asphalt Yes Yes Sunrise to sunset Jackson County Parks and Recreation 22807 Woods Chapel Road Blue Springs, MO 64105 816-795-8200

The Longview Lake Trail runs along the western edge of Longview Lake from O'Donnell Park to Longview Shelter. The asphalt trail meanders through wooded areas and open prairie and connects the marina, swimming beach and several shelters.





2-11

Summary of Greenspace System

RENNER RD SANTA FE

-435





KANSAS RIVER

47TH ST

55TH ST

MID AMERICA

Greenway Description:

Mill Creek Trail

North terminus: South terminus: Length: Surface type: Handicap accessible: Pets permitted: Dedicated parking: Hours of operation: For more information:

Nelson Island / Kansas River Mill Creek Park / Olathe 17 miles Asphalt Yes Yes No Sunrise to sunset Johnson County Parks & **Recreation District** 7900 Renner Road Shawnee Mission KS, 66219 913-438-7275



The Mill Creek Biking and Hiking Trail is one of the longest greenways in the Kansas City metropolitan area. Trail users enjoy the streamside solitude, wildlife watching, and the gallery forest that features oaks, sycamores, and cottonwoods. A public phone is available at the Nelson Island terminus.

Contact the Johnson County Park & Recreation District for a more detailed map of the trail.



Tomahawk Creek Trail



Greenway Description:

North terminus: South terminus:

Length: Surface type: Handicap accessible: Pets permitted: Dedicated parking: Hours of operation: For more information: Mission Road & I-435 127th Street west of Nall Road 6 miles Asphalt Yes Yes Yes Sunrise to sunset City of Leawood Parks and Greenways 4800 Town Center Drive Leawood, KS 66211 913-339-6700

City of Overland Park Parks and Recreation 6300 West 87th Overland Park, KS 66212 913-327-6630



Stream

159TH ST

Tomahawk Creek Trail Greenway runs through both Leawood and Overland Park, Kansas. It connects Indian Creek Trail, Leawood Park, Tomahawk Park, Deer Creek Golf Course, Overland Park Community Park and St. Andrews Golf Course. Future plans provide connections to Black Bob Park and Heritage Park Golf Course. Shelters and picnicking facilities are located along the trail. A bridle path is also located along some portions of the trail.

HERITAGE PARE GOLF COURSE

Trolley Track Trail





Greenway Description:

North terminus: South terminus: Length: Surface type: Handicap accessible: Pets permitted: Dedicated parking: Hours of operation: For more information: Volker Boulevard 85th Street 6 miles Limestone screenings Yes Yes No Sunrise to sunset Kansas City Area Transportation Authority 1200 E. 18th Street Kansas City, MO 64108 816-346-0200

The Trolley Track Trail is, as the name implies, routed along a former trolley rail line. The trail was constructed in 1997 and is very popular with the residents in this urban/suburban corridor. Soon the trail will be extended east to Prospect Avenue. The Trolley Track Trail provides access to: Brookside, Waldo, the Country Club Plaza, Brookside Park and UMKC.



Relation to Existing Local Systems and Plans

MetroGreen provides a regional framework for green corridors connecting communities throughout the metro area. MetroGreen identifies those segments of local plans that support longer-range regional trips and link users to important regional destinations. Currently, numerous local municipalities have bike and pedestrian trails (with plans for more!). Some of these facilities, however, were not designed to connect to neighboring plans, because their primary focus is to support shortrange trips - not regional trips.

The strength of a regional system is its ability to support short-range trips as well as long-distance use, and connect local greenway systems, other modes of transportation and regional destinations. The success of a regional system will be evident by the cooperation and coordination of transportation officials, planners, and developers throughout the Kansas City region.

By serving as a regional bicycle and pedestrian system, MetroGreen will:

- Be publicly accessible;
- Provide links between communities;
- Develop the identity of a connected Kansas City region;
- Provide connections to regional destinations such as parks, lakes, rivers, cultural, historic, and economic centers;
- Support existing, planned, or proposed local bicycle and pedestrian systems;
- · Identify major travel corridors;
- · Accommodate different modes of travel.

The previous pages present information specific to each of the existing MetroGreen segments. These successful trails are precursors of the more comprehensive MetroGreen system. The information presented is intended to help area residents locate and enjoy these outstanding facilities.

The focus of the Kansas City MetroGreen effort is to produce an umbrella system that unifies and enhances plans from area communities. It is anticipated that many of the existing and future local systems will link to the MetroGreen System, thus leveraging the investment in local facilities and providing area residents with greater transportation and recreation options.

Typically, local systems are designed to serve local populations and, when combined, local systems improve access to resources throughout the region.
Local systems are designed to:

- Accommodate travel within a jurisdiction or neighborhood;
- Provide community connections to schools, churches, parks, and civic centers;
- Feed into regional systems for access to longer distance destinations.

By developing MetroGreen, the Kansas City area will have a comprehensive greenway system. Local trail systems will benefit by providing local residents access to key destinations around Kansas City.

chapter 3

MetroGreen System Recommendations

The development of a greenway system on the scale of the MetroGreen system is a sizable task. Connecting seven diverse, metropolitan counties and producing an implementation plan for a unified structure was, without a doubt, challenging. It was a given that the process would have to be participatory and inclusive. The MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative has been developed from four primary sources of information: the MetroGreen Vision of 1991, the Geographic Information System (or GIS) resources of area municipalities and planning bodies, direct public involvement, and input from municipal staff and officials.

The MetroGreen Vision of 1991

The impetus of the MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative was the MetroGreen Vision produced by the Prairie Gateway chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA). Not only did the 1991 Vision serve as a guide for regional trail development over the past ten years, but it identified key principles for developing a greenway system in the region. The MetroGreen Vision articulated the historical basis for a greenway plan, listed important cultural resources and broadly identified corridors for greenways.

Geographic Information System Resources

The maps presented in this document have been produced through the use of GIS. GIS applications are tools used to analyze spatial data and allow detailed geographic analysis. The strength of GIS applications is their ability to overlay separate layers of data and reveal patterns of interrelated landscape components. Once spatial relationships are determined and patterns are revealed, plans can be formed and implemented to preserve, create, correct or reverse the processes responsible for a given situation. For MetroGreen, GIS has been used to document existing greenway facilities, parks, municipal boundaries, roads and streams. By layering these features on top of one another and assembling the seven counties together, potential greenway corridors began to emerge and critical connection points could be identified.



Methodology/ Criteria The ability to share information is a strength of using GIS for the layout of the MetroGreen system. A number of local governments in the study area have GIS capabilities, however, the level of usage varies. The benefit of producing the MetroGreen map in GIS is that the information can easily be reproduced, shared, incorporated immediately, or held until GIS usage is more prominent in local planning strategies. The result will be a coordinated effort among communities, because with a MetroGreen GIS file greenway planners and designers will be able to plan and connect future greenway facilities.

Public Involvement

The effort to produce a MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative included meetings with local officials, a charette with the Prairie Gateway Chapter of ASLA, and three series of public workshops. The public workshops were held in various parts of the metropolitan area. In April, the meetings were held in Lee's Summit, Missouri; Kansas City, Missouri (north of the river); and Mission, Kansas. In June, the meetings were held in Gladstone, Missouri; Kansas City, Missouri; and Merriam, Kansas. The final public workshop was held in October at the MARC office building in downtown Kansas City, Missouri. These meetings were conducted to receive public input for the development of the MetroGreen system and to build public enthusiasm for its construction. For a summary of the public workshops, please see Appendix A. All of the input received at the workshops was used to produce a MetroGreen plan that guides local governments in the development of a connected greenway system.

Additional public participation was solicited from area civic leaders. Their guidance and input in the construction of this plan was valuable. While the public workshops allowed participants to focus on routing decisions and the corridors of MetroGreen development, the Civic Alliance worked on the strategies to implement the MetroGreen system. Particular issues that they focused on included financing, the need for continued public involvement, media exposure and public relations.

Local Official Involvement

Many public officials were engaged in this planning process. Discussions were held with representatives from each participating county. Meeting attendees included park and recreation officials, planners, landscape architects and elected officials. Insight was gained on existing local system plans and facilities. Local officials were also on-hand to answer questions (specific to their local plans) at the public workshops.

Additional local official involvement was received through an Advisory Technical Committee. This group represented counties, municipalities, land trusts and other governmental agencies throughout the metropolitan area. Bi-monthly meetings were held to review planning progress and make system suggestions.

Corridors and Facilities

MetroGreen will be physically comprised of three types of corridors throughout its 1144 mile length: a) stream and river corridors, b) roadway corridors and c) abandoned rail corridors (a map of the MetroGreen system is shown on the following page). Within these corridors, a variety of facilities can and should be constructed, including trails, signage systems, and places where people can gather, sit and relax. The design of these facilities is further articulated by a detailed set of MetroGreen Design Guidelines featured in Appendix D.

Stream and River Corridors

The dominant corridor type found within the MetroGreen system is located adjacent to streams and rivers throughout the region. Stream and river corridors will comprise 57 percent (648 miles) of the entire MetroGreen system. These corridors will serve multiple functions, including the conservation of riparian (stream-related) habitat, stabilization of streambanks, preservation of historic landscapes, protection of water quality, and the provision of suitable land for trail development.

Roadway Corridors

Another dominant corridor type will be designated roadways throughout the region. These corridors will comprise 30 percent (344 miles) of MetroGreen. The principal function of these corridors will be related to transportation and recreation. However, other attributes are possible including scenic and historic preservation and water quality protection. Many of these corridors have the potential to be enhanced through landscape plantings to become aesthetic assets for the region.

Abandoned Rail Corridors

The final corridor type is abandoned railroad corridors. These comprise 13 percent (152 miles) of the MetroGreen system. These are very important corridors for the future of the region. With the existing right-of-ways intact, they are valued linear corridors that provide continuous access across parts of the region that lack other corridor types. Their flat to gentle grades make them ideal for future trails. Historically and economically, rails-to-trails are a proven success throughout Missouri and Kansas. One of the most promising future projects is the extension of the KATY Trail into the heart of Kansas City. This would complete a cross-state trail through Missouri and link the Kansas City region to St. Louis.

Five Types of Trails

The MetroGreen will provide a full range of trail types to meet the needs of users. There are five different types of trails that will be found within the system. MetroGreen corridors may contain more than one type of trail. The selection of a trail type is not currently defined for MetroGreen corridors and will normally be determined after further evaluation of the physical and future use characteristics for each corridor. The five trail types are defined and described below. More information on MetroGreen Design Guidelines can be found in Appendix D. Description of MetroGreen System



Type 1: No Facility Development

For corridors that are environmentally sensitive and contain steep slopes, wetlands, or rare habitat, a no-facility development type is recommended under MetroGreen. It is anticipated that many corridors defined for water quality, habitat protection, and floodplain management purposes would also fit under this category. Typically, these corridors would remain in a natural undeveloped condition.

Type 2: Limited Development, Low-Impact Uses

The second type of trail would be found within corridors that are environmentally sensitive but can also support limited trail development. These corridors would support bare earth, wood chip, or boardwalk trails. Typically, uses would be limited to pedestrian only.

Type 3: Multi-Use Unpaved Trail Development

This designation would apply to corridors that are capable of supporting a broader range of uses. Trail development, if it occurs along a stream, would be located outside of the floodway. A variety of surface materials could be used, but crushed gravel is viewed as the most likely. These trails can be used by pedestrians, cyclists, equestrians and persons with disabilities.

Type 4: Multi-Use Paved Trail Development

Multi-use paved trails may become one of the most common types of offroad trails in the entire MetroGreen system. These trails will support the greatest diversity of users, and can be used year round. They will be more expensive than other types to construct, but their benefit will serve the needs of most users. These trails can be constructed within floodprone landscapes as well as upland corridors.

Type 5: Bike & Pedestrian Facilities in Rights-of-Way

Type 5 trails are generally located within the rights-of-way of roadways throughout the metropolitan area. One of the primary purposes for this trail type is to serve as a connector to the off-road network of MetroGreen. Sidewalks, bike routes, bike lanes and wide multi-purpose side paths are envisioned as the constructed facilities.

The following pages highlight each of the participating seven counties. A brief description is given of the MetroGreen system within each county and a corresponding map is displayed. The trails and linkages shown were selected based on their potential to accommodate bicycle and pedestrian facilities, as well as their location as part of the overall trail system. The proposed system, of 1144 miles, provides access to many of the metro area's schools, parks, neighborhoods, retail and employment areas, as well as accomplishing the overall goal of linking metropolitan communities together.

It is the goal of this plan to provide a trail within two-miles of 90 percent of the area's residential population. A distance of two-miles was chosen because it is the limit to which most people are willing to bicycle to a

Proposed MetroGreen Segments

destination. Comparatively, one half-mile is the limit to which most people are willing to walk to a destination. The MetroGreen System, as described in this document, serves over 95 percent of the population within twomiles of their home and 53 percent within a half-mile of their residence.

Proposed Trails

MetroGreen trails will be aligned along roadways with ample rights-of-way that can accommodate a bicycle/pedestrian trail, along the edges of streams, or within existing utility or railroad rights-of-way. The trail corridors identified in this plan comprise a regional trail system and should accommodate bicycles, in-line skaters, joggers and pedestrians. Additional trails such as nature trails or trails with alternative surfaces for horseback riding, jogging, or mountain biking, are considered secondary to the overall trail plans. In addition, local trails providing connections to the regional system or serving a particular destination or population will also be identified within individual community trail plans. Priority references are tied to the definitions of MetroGreen Segment Priority classifications as described in Chapter Four: Implementation Program. All mileage figures are approximate.

Johnson County

Johnson County has been aggressive in its trail building efforts and has nearly 50 miles of trails already in use. The Mill Creek greenway is considered a great success not only as an impressive recreation amenity but also for its ability to hold stormwaters and reduce flooding. As a part of the MetroGreen plan, the Mill Creek Trail will be connected to the Indian Creek Trail, thus creating over 30 miles of continuous trail facilities that connect the Kansas River to the state line via the middle of Johnson County.

- Jo01 This 3.09-mile segment runs from Turkey Creek atthe Wyandotte County line south and west to Johnson Drive. It parallels I-35 and provides an inter-county connection to Wy 05. When complete this section will serve as an extension north to the already existing segment Jo03. It is a Priority 2 trail.
- **Jo02** This trail runs from the Wyandotte County line to I-35 south and east on on Switzer Road. It measures 1.21 miles and is Priority 3. It will provide an inter-county connection to Wy09.
- **Jo03** This is an exsisting 2.39-mile trail that parallels I-35 along Turkey Creek, from Johnson Drive south to 75th Street.
- Jo04 This Priority 2 trail runs along Turkey Creek, from 75th Street south to 87th Street, parallel to I-35. It is 2.02 miles in length. When complete this section will serve as a southward extension of the existing trail segment Jo03.
- Jo05 This segment begins at Anderson Park and parallels Shawnee Mission Parkway east to the Missouri State Line. Here it will connect to Jackson County's Ja02, the Brush Creek Corridor. It is a Priority 3 segment of 4.93 miles.

Johnson County

MetroGreen Corridors



- Jo06 This segment travels along Tomahawk Road from Somerset north and east to Shawnee Mission Parkway where it connects to Jo05.
 A small on-road segment of this trail (1.65 miles) already exists, and the remaining 4.4 miles are Priority 3.
- Jo07 This is the Indian Creek Trail, one of the premier trails in the metropolitan area. It is 25.2 miles long travelling along Indian Creek west and south from the State Line to Olathe. This segment is substantially complete; however, two Priority 1 extensions (2.75 miles) go to Jo12 and to the existing Tomahawk Creek Trail, Jo14.
- Jo08 This is the Tomahawk Creek Trail. It runs south and west from the Indian Creek Trail (Jo07). This trail will be extended further along Tomahawk Creek, past St. Andrews Gof Course, and on to Heritage Park. The extensions are Priority 1 and 2, respectively, and total 16.66 miles
- Jo09 This trail will serve as another interstate connection at Ja06. Jo09 follows the Blue River south and west from the State Line to the Overland Park Arboretum. It is a Priority 1 and 2 trail extending 5.94 miles.
- Jo10 This Priority 3 trail will be a 5.51 mile westward extension of Jo09 along Coffee Creek from Blue River to Heritage Park.
- **Jo11** This segment will be a 5.6 mile southward extension of Jo09 along Camp Branch Creek. It is a Priority 3.
- Jo12 This trail is a further extension (6.35 miles) of Jo10 westward along Coffee Creek from Heritage Park to and along 175th Street. It is a Priority 3 trail.
- Jo13 This Priority 3 trail will begin at the Overland Park Arboretum and extends Jo09 7.27 miles westward, briefly along the Blue River but primarily follows Wolf Creek. The trail will turn slightly northward before it intersects with Jo18 at 175th Street.
- Jo14 Mill Creek Trail. Another premier trail in the metropolitan area. This 15.8-mile trail is one of the the longest existing segments of MetroGreen. It begins at Nelson Island on the south bank of the Kaw River and travels south along Mill Creek to Mill Creek Park. A two-mile addition to this trail is Priority 1.
- Jo15 This trail extends west from I-35 (Jo03) to the Mill Creek Trail (Jo14). A portion of this 6.21 mile trail already exists along Midland Drive. Remaining portions are Priority 2 and 3.
- Jo16 The Prairie Star Trail will serve as a 7.55 mile east-west connector between Mill Creek Trail (Jo14) and Cedar Creek (Jo23). The first portion of this trail (Priority 1) to be constructed will be west from I-35 to Kansas 7 Highway. The remaining portion is Priority 3.
- Jo17 This 16.7-mile trail will serve as an east-west connector and as a loop trail. The trail departs from Cedar Creek heading east along Little Cedar Creek. It then forks and follows both the north and south forks of Little Cedar Creek. The north fork will connect to Mill Creek Trail (Jo14) south of 95th Street, and the south fork will pass through Ernie Miller Park before connecting to the southern terminus of Mill Creek Trail. Currently 1.6 miles exist.

- Jo18 This is a 6.12 mile linkage trail. The routing connects Coffee Creek (Jo12) southwest to Wolf Creek (Jo13) and northwest to Cedar Creek (Jo24). The trail will utilize the streambanks of the upper stretch of Cedar Creek and much of 175th Street. This trail is a Priority 3.
- Jo19 A 4.2 mile, Priority 3 trail segment that will connect Jo18 to Little Bull Creek (Jo20) via the Bain Creek corridor.
- **Jo20** This is a Priority 3 trail that will connect Gardner to the Miami County line. It follows Little Bull Creek and runs 6.56 miles.
- Jo21 This trail follows the Kaw River for 7.26 miles from the Mill Creek Trail (Jo14) northern terminus to the Shawnee Riverfront. It is a Priority 2 trail.
- Jo22 This segment extends Jo21 westward along the Kaw River for 3.92 miles to the Cedar Creek northern terminus (Jo23). It is a Priority 2 trail.
- Jo23 A Priority 2 trail that follows the Cedar Creek corridor from the Kaw River (Jo22) south 15.36 miles to Olathe Lake where it meets Jo24. The trail includes a west fork that connects to the Prairie Center.
- Jo24 This 5.73 mile Priority 1 and Priority 2 trail continues south along Cedar Creek (Jo23) before paralleling a rail line to Gardner. Here the trail intersects with Jo20 and Jo27.
- Jo25 A Priority 2 trail that provides an east-west connection between Cedar Creek (Jo23) and Kill Creek (Jo26). The trail follows the Kaw River and extends Jo22 westward linking it to the eastern terminus of Jo28. It is 4.08 miles long.
- Jo26 This trail extends from the Jo25 and Jo28 trails in DeSoto southward along the Kill Creek corridor to Kill Creek Park. It is 7.9 miles long. The trail is Priority 1 and Priority 2.
- Jo27 This trail connects the Town of Gardner with Kill Creek Park via the Kill Creek corridor. It is a 10.97 mile, Priority 2 trail that links Jo26 with Jo24 and Jo20.
- **Jo28** Priority 3, 11.54 mile trail that runs along the Kaw River west from Kill Creek (Jo26) to the Douglas County line.
- Jo29 This segment is a Priority 3 trail that runs north-south along Spoon Creek, from Kill Creek Park (Jo26) to 135th Street. It is 4.61 miles long.
- Jo30 This on-road trail runs west from Olathe Lake (Jo23) to the Douglas County line as it crosses Jo27 and Jo32. It is a 14.13 mile Priority 3 trail.
- Jo31 This trail continues up Spoon Creek (Jo29), south from 135th Street and crosses overland before running the length of Big Bull Creek. It terminates at the Miami County line. The trail is 12.33 miles long and is a Priority 3.
- Jo32 This Priority 3 trail runs north-south parallel to the County's western boundary along Captain Creek. It terminates at both ends where it crosses into Douglas County. It is 8.2 miles long.

Leavenworth County

The city of Leavenworth has already begun developing plans to extend the Leavenworth Landing Park Trail along Three Mile Creek in the City of Leavenworth. MetroGreen goals for Leavenworth County include adapting out-of-use rail lines to serve as bike and pedestrian trails, on-road bike facilities, and streamside greenways to preserve wildlife habitat, manage stormwater and protect water quality.

Two highways offer opportunities as scenic byways - U.S. 73 to Atchison and K-5, allowing the preservation of picturesque landscapes in the region.

- Lv01 This trail follows U.S. Highway 73 north and west from the Missouri River, out of the City of Leavenworth, to the headwaters of Stranger Creek (Lv06). The trail is 10.94 miles long and is a Priority 2.
- Lv02 This trail runs south (mostly along Highway 5) from U.S. Highway 73 (Lv01), through Leavenworth and Lansing and down to the Wyandotte County line where it connects with Wy10. The trail is 7.27 miles long and is a Priority 3.
- Lv03 A Priority 3 trail that follows the railroad corridor from Lansing (Lv02) south to the Wyandotte County line where it connects with Wy15. The trail is 24.16 miles long.
- **Lv04** This segment follows the State Street corridor east from Lv03 to Tonganoxie. It is 8.92 miles long and a Priority 3.
- **Lv05** This is a proposed riverfront trail along the Kaw River. It runs east from Linwood to DeSoto. It is 4.20 miles long and is a Priority 3.
- Lv06 This is the longest proposed segment in the MetroGreen Master Plan. It is 47.86 miles long as it winds its way north-to-south down Stranger Creek for the entire length of Leavenworth County until it terminates at the Linwood Wetlands. It is a Priority 3 trail.
- Lv07 This includes the existing 0.51-mile Leavenworth Landing Park trail and the Priority 1, 0.80-mile extension of the trail along Three Mile Creek.



Wyandotte County

Plans are already underway for the construction of the Kansas City Riverfront Heritage Trail that will connect Kansas City, Kansas, to Kansas City, Missouri. Eventually, MetroGreen facilities will extend west from the confluence of the Kansas and Missouri rivers to popular facilities such as Wyandotte County Lake, the new Kansas Speedway, and Sandstone Amphitheater. Opportunities to build trails along the Kansas and Missouri rivers will allow the enjoyment of these natural resources and improved levee maintenance operations.

MetroGreen corridors planned for Wyandotte County include stream preservation and restoration efforts along Turkey Creek, Little Turkey Creek and Marshall Creek. These segments will allow for stormwater management, and habitat and riparian area protection.

- Wy01 The trail departs from the Riverfront Heritage Trail and follows the Missouri River levee along the south bank where it connects with Wy06 at I-635. This is a Priority 3, 6.7 mile trail.
- Wy02 This segment includes the existing Jersey Creek trail and extends east to the Riverfront Heritage Trail and west to Klamm Park. The existing portion and the Priority 3 extensions total 2.61 miles.
- Wy03 A Priority 2, 2.31 mile trail that begins at the Lewis and Clark Bridge and follows the west bank of the Kansas River south. The trail parallels the east bank Riverfront Heritage Trail.
- Wy04 This trail will begin at the end of the Riverfront Heritage Trail and continue along the south bank of the Kansas River for 8.89 miles. It is a Priority 3.
- Wy05 This 3.55 mile trail has Priority 1, 2 and 3 segments throughout its length. The greenway will follow Turkey Creek from the Johnson County Line to the Kansas River.
- Wy06 Another levee trail, this segment connects to Wy01 at I-635 and continues 8.66 miles along the south bank of the Missouri River. It is a Priority 3 trail.
- Wy07 This segment is a primary east/west connector for Wyandotte County. The trail will parallel Georgia Street from Klamm Park to Wyandotte Creek. A Priority 3 trail, it is approximately 9.16 miles long.
- Wy08 This trail travels 6.2 miles from Jersey Creek Park to the Kansas River. It follows Parallel Parkway for much of its length. It is a Priority 3.
- **Wy09** A Priority 3, 3.47 mile connection from the Johnson County Line, north along the 55th Street corridor, to the Kansas River.
- **Wy10** This trail has an existing segment as a part of Wyandotte Lake that will be extended to the Leavenworth County Line. The extension is Priority 2 and the overall length is 3.49 miles.
- Wy11 This greenway will provide significant benefits for wildlife along Marshall Creek. The corridor connects Wyandotte Lake and Wyandotte County Park. It is a Priority 2, 9.49 miles long.

Wyandotte County MetroGreen Corridors



- Wy12 A significant north / south connector that will travel south from the Kansas Speedway to Kansas Avenue. It is a 3.55 mile, Priority 2 trail.
- **Wy13** A Priority 3, 8.13 mile levee trail that follows the north bank of the Kansas River from 55th Street to Edwardsville.
- Wy14 A relatively short trail at 2.67 miles, it travels north from the intersection of I-435 and the Kansas River to Kansas Avenue. It is a Priority 3.
- Wy15 This segment is the westward continuation of Wy13 from Edwardsville to the Leavenworth County Line. It is a Priority 3 and 4.98 miles long.
- Wy16 This greenway along Little Turkey Creek is 3.07 miles and is intended to have an impact on water quality and floodwater storage. It is a Priority 2.

Clay County will soon host one of the area's newest public equestrian trail facilities near Smithville Lake. The MetroGreen system in Clay County will connect recreation amenities such as Smithville Lake to historic Excelsior Springs and the Missouri River. Existing local facilities, such as those in Liberty, will be able to connect with trails around Clay County and throughout the Kansas City region.

- **Cl01** This Priority 2 trail is 17.33 miles that features Smithville Lake. The trail encompasses the lake and will offer many scenic views.
- CI02 The trail will extend eastward from the Platte County Line to Watkins Mill State Park. The trail passes near the Jesse James Farm and the Claybrook House off of Highway 164. it consists of two segments: 7.43 miles are Priority 2, and 12.21 miles are Priority 3.
- CI03 A Priority 3, 16.76 mile long trail that traverses south from Watkins Mill State Park to H Highway via Old Quarry Road. This segment connects Cl02 and Cl04.
- CI04 Another Priority 3 trail. This segment is 5.92 miles and terminates at its northeastern end in Excelsior Springs. The southern end of the trail connects to CI12.
- **Cl05** A Priority 3, 9.72 mile trail that travels along Shoal Creek from Hodge Park to Kearney.
- **CI06** This trail connects to the Smithville Lake Equestrian Trail and ends at Camp Branch Bridge. The trail passes along the south shore of Smithville Lake. The trail is 3.54 miles and a Priority 3.
- CI07 This trail will be an alternative to Cl02. The trail extends from the west end of Smithville Lake to Kearney via Clear Creek. It is a Priority 3 and is 5.88 miles.
- CI08 This Priority 3 trail passes through the middle of Clay County from north-to-south along an old railroad corridor. The trail will be 10.11 miles and connect the towns of Liberty and Kearney.
- **Cl09** Another Priority 3 trail. It is 6.63 miles long travelling south from Hodge Park, past Cl11, and turns north to Brooklyn Avenue.
- CI10 This segment is a southward extension from CI08 to the Missouri River. This Priority 3 trail is 9.6 miles long.
- CI11 A Priority 3 trail of 4.41 miles. This segment travels along the Searcy Creek Parkway from Maplewoods Parkway to Highway 210. Trails beside the Parkway features woodlands and the Searcy Creek corridor.
- Cl12 A part of the Centennial Parkway. This 7- mile segment is a Priority 2 and connects Platte County to Jackson County.
- CI13 The westernmost segment of Clay County's Missouri River levee trail. It is a Priority 3. The segment is 10.66 miles between North Kansas City and I-435.
- CI14 This segment connects CI13 to CI17, along the Missouri River. It is a Priority 3 trail and runs 13.11 miles between I-435 and Missouri City.
- CI15 A 6.87 mile, Priority 3 trail, CI15 connects the Jerry L. Litton Visitors Center at Smithville Lake to the Shoal Creek Parkway (CI09).

Clay County

- CI16 This Priority 3 trail passes through Clay County agricultural lands. It is 5.83 miles long stretching along Mt. Olivet Road between Smithville Lake and Highway 291.
- CI17 This is the easternmost segment along the Missouri River in Clay County. It connects to CI14 at Missouri City and extends eastward to the Ray County Line. It is a Priority 3 trail, 7.34 miles in length.
- **Cl18** This segment extends Cl16 southward from Highway 291 to Hodge Park along Reinking Road. It is 2.74 miles long and a Priority 3.
- **Cl22** This Priority 3 trail passes the Cooley Lake Wildlife Management Area before reaching the Ray County Line. The total length is 4.24 miles with .64 miles being off-road and 3.6 on-road.
- CI23 A Priority 3, 2.68 mile trail that connects CI22 to the Missouri River (CI17). It passes through the Cooley Lake Wildlife Management Area.
- **CI24** A Priority 1, this 14.07-mile segment follows Vivion Road from Riverside to Liberty.

* CI19, CI20 and CI21 were skipped in order to correspond to the Northland Trail Plan segment numbering.

Clay County MetroGreen Corridors



Cass County MetroGreen will make use of abandoned rail lines by creating trails that connect the towns of Belton, Peculiar, Harrisonville, and Pleasant Hill. Perhaps, the greatest benefit to developing greenways in Cass County will be connecting to the nationally recognized KATY Trail. Someday Kansas Citians will have a continuous trail across Missouri that connects them to St. Louis and many towns along the way.

- **Ca01** This Priority 2 trail of 10.1 miles will be an extension of the popular KATY Trail that stretches across the State of Missouri. This segment will follow the Rock-Island railroad corridor northwest from the county line to Pleasant Hill.
- **Ca02** Is an extension of Ca01. The trail is Priority 2 and continues the KATY Trail 5.58 miles to Pleasant Hill.
- **Ca03** This Priority 2 rail-trail of 10.42 miles will serve as a pedestrian and bicycle connection for Cass County between Harrisonville and Peculiar (Ca05).
- Ca04– This Priority 3 segment will stretch 11.16 miles between Harrisonville and Pleasant Hill.
- Ca05– This Priority 1 rail-trail spans 8.29 miles and connects Peculiar (Ca03) to Belton.
- **Ca06** A Priority 2, this 15-mile rail-trail will proceed eastward from Harrisonville to the Johnson County (MO) Line where it will connect with Ca01.

Cass County MetroGreen Corridors



Legend * Break Points



Jackson County

Among top priorities in Jackson County is the Riverfront Heritage Trail, an 11-mile MetroGreen segment connecting the Berkley Esplanade to Kansas City, Kansas. The Brush Creek greenway through the Country Club Plaza will be expanded west to the state line and east to the Blue River. The Trolley Track Trail along Brookside Boulevard is one of the most heavily used trails in the Kansas City area. Trails along the Blue River and the Little Blue River are already in use and will be extended. Citizen groups are doing exciting work to see that a trail is built to preserve the historic alignment of the Santa Fe Trail in south Kansas City.

- Ja01 This segment represents the Riverfront Heritage Trail project. It is a Priority 1, 9.8-mile trail that extends westward from R. L. Berkley Park to Kemper Arena.
- Ja02 The Brush Creek corridor already has an extensive portion in existence. It will be extended west 0.76 miles to the Johnson County line and east to the Blue River. The extensions are a Priority 1 and the overall length is 3.82 miles.
- Ja03 The Trolley Track Trail is one of Kansas City's most popular greenways. It connects to Ja02 and progresses southward along Brookside Boulevard. Extending this trail to the Blue River trail is a Priority 3. The total length is 7.28 miles.
- Ja04 The Blue River trail is an extensive segment of MetroGreen (14.29 miles). Portions of this trail already exist while other parts are Priority 1 and Priority 2. The trail is envisioned as connecting Swope Park to the Missouri River.
- Ja05 This 6.35-mile trail extends the Indian Creek Trail from the Kansas state line to Swope Park where it will intersect Ja04. The western portion of this trail already exists. The eastern portion is a Priority 1.
- Ja06 This southern portion of the 4.7-mile Blue River greenway is a Priority 2. The corridor is in public ownership from the Kansas state line to the northeast. A new 2.4-mile segment will connect to the existing 2.28-mile segment that runs to the state line.
- Ja07 This Priority 3 levee trail, this segment stretches along the south bank of the Missouri River from R. L. Berkley Park to Sugar Creek. It is 6.98 miles long.
- Ja08 This segment is a connecting piece that runs 7.22 miles from the I-435 bridge to the Blue River (Ja04). It is a Priority 2 and 3.
- Ja09 This greenway is planned as part of the Centennial Parkway. It will proceed 26 miles southward along Paseo Boulevard from the Missouri River to Blue River Road. It is a Priority 1 and 2.
- Ja10 This segment is a Priority 3 trail that connects downtown Kansas City, Missouri, to the Little Blue River 21.87 miles to the east. It will travel along 12th Street and Truman Road.
- Ja11 This greenway will follow along the 40 Highway corridor from the Blue River to the Little Blue River. It is a Priority 1 and 8.89 miles long.
- Ja12 This trail will potentially use the Rock Island railroad corridor as a link between Ja04 and Ja17. It is an 11.75 mile, Priority 3 project.

Jackson County

MetroGreen Corridors

0

1

2 Miles



- Ja13 A Priority 2, this 7.22-mile facility is envisioned as connecting the Rock Island railroad corridor (Ja18) to the Blue River (Ja04). It follows the 87th Street corridor.
- Ja14 This trail is part of the Longview Lake recreational area. It starts at the Longview Lake Dam and proceeds southward along the western shore of the lake. It will eventually extend to the Cass County Line for a total length of 10.36 miles. Most of this trail already exists, however a small portion at the southern end is a Priority 3.
- Ja15 A Priority 3 levee trail, this facility will eventually extend along the south bank of the Missouri River from Sugar Creek (Ja07) to the Lafayette County Line. The distance is approximately 26.15 miles.
- Ja16 This is an ambitious, community led endeavor to preserve the historic origins of the Oregon Trail, California Trail and Sante Fe Trail. The greenway is a Priority 1 and Priority 2. It stretches 23.72 miles from Sugar Creek to the Kansas State Line.
- Ja17 This 26-mile long corridor is a Priority 1 and Priority 2. Portions of the Little Blue Trace already exist along the corridor. Eventually, this greenway will connect the Missouri River (Ja15) to the Rock Island railroad corridor (Ja18).
- Ja18 This is a 9.16 mile, Priority 3 segment of the Rock Island railroad corridor. It connects the James A. Reed Wildlife Area to the Little Blue River.
- Ja19 A Priority 2 segment, this corridor will span 19.72 miles as it meets the KATY Trail (Ca02) at the Cass County Line and passes Lake Jacomo as it connects to Ja17 along the Little Blue River.
- Ja20 This Priority 3 trail travels 11.29 miles southeast from the Little Blue River to Sni-A-Bar.
- Ja21 This 11.18-mile segment, is a Priority 3 that begins at Blue Branch and terminates at the Johnson County (MO) Line.
- Ja22 The trail along the Frisco Corridor is a northward extension of Ca03. This Priority 3 segment is 8.21 miles long.
- Ja23 The Rock Creek corridor is a Priority 1 and 3. It begins at Truman Road (Ja10) and proceeds eastward allong Rock Creek to the Little Blue Trace (Ja17). The segment is 20.54 miles long.

Platte County will build upon the success of Parkville's English Landing Park trail. First steps include extending this trail northwest and southeast along the banks of the Missouri River, turning north along Brush Creek (to the west) and Line Creek (to the east) before completing an approximately 25-mile loop (along Highway 45). The completion of the Bluff Road trail near Weston will offer scenic hiking and biking opportunities for residents and visitors.

- **PI01** This is a Priority 3 trail that travels 14.90 miles along the Platte River from the Buchanan County Line to the Little Platte River.
- PI02 An east / west connector, this Priority 2 segment follows the Little Platte River for 10.81 miles between the Clay County Line and the Platte River (PI01 / PI09).
- PI03 A Priority 3 trail, this segment is 10.07 miles in length as it borders Second Creek between Tiffany Springs Parkway and the Clay County Line.
- **PI04** This segment connects Tiffany Springs Park and the Line Creek Parkway. It stretches 6.63 miles and is a Priority 1.
- PI05 From PI04, this Priority 1 segment turns south for 5.77 miles along the Line Creek Parkway before connecting to CI12 at the Clay County Line.
- PI06 This segment continues south from the Line Creek Parkway (PI05) along Line Creek to the Missouri River (PI07). It is a Priority 1 and 3.8 miles long.
- PI07 Another Priority 1 trail, this segment follows the north bank of the Missouri River for 5.58 miles from the Clay County Line to Parkville.
- **PI08** This Priority 1 trail is a 5.62 mile extension of PI07 from Parkville to Parma Park where it meets PI13.
- **PI09** This Priority 2 segment along the Platte River, connects Platte City to the Little Platte River over a distance of 6.61 miles.
- **PI10** This is a major east / west corridor. It is a Priority 1 and Priority 2 facility that stretches 8.23 miles along 45 Highway.
- PI11 This Priority 3 segment follows the final 14 miles of the Platte River from Platte City to the Missouri River.
- PI12 This segment parallels I-435 for much of its 6.54 mile length along Brush Creek. It is a Priority 1 and Priority 2 trail that connects Tiffany Springs Park to the Missouri River.
- PI13 This segment travels along the east bank of the Missouri River from Parma Park (PI08) to the Platte River (PI11). It is 7.9 miles in length and a Priority 3.
- PI14 Another Priority 3, this segment extends PI13, 6.22 miles from the Platte River to M92 / U.S. 73, just across the Missouri River from Leavenworth, Kansas.
- PI15 This Priority 2 segment continues PI14 from M92 / U.S. 73 for 3.95 miles along the Missouri River to Beverly.
- **PI16** This is a Priority 1, 5.96-mile segment. It travels along Bluff Road from Beverly through Weston and ends at M45 (PI17).
- **PI17** This Priority 3 segment is 12.18 miles long from the north end of PI16 to Lewis and Clark Park.

Platte County

Platte County

MetroGreen Corridors



Implementation Program

The implementation of a greenway system as large and complex as MetroGreen cannot be accomplished at one time. It will take many years to build the MetroGreen system, giving full consideration to the way each part of the system is designed, surveying the miles and developing adequate funding. This master plan will serve as an organizing framework and to ensure that connectivity is maintained between the many jurisdictions. For this reason, as the plan was being developed, priorities were identified for all MetroGreen segments.

The segments of the MetroGreen system have been defined by four distinct phases. They are as follows:

- Existing segments are already built. Today approximately 85 miles are on the ground and being used by residents in the Kansas City metropolitan area.
- Priority 1 segments will be the first trails added to the system. Their identification as Priority 1 indicates that there is local commitment for the project and some funding has been identified to begin land acquisition, design and/or construction. Designating these segments as Priority 1 is intended to encourage the trail developers/planners to continue raising funds, heighten public awareness of these active projects and show support for the completion of trails that will contribute to MetroGreen. It is expected that Priority 1 segments will be constructed over the next three-to-five years. Approximately, 141 miles of the MetroGreen system have been designated as Priority 1.
- Priority 2 segments are not yet funded. However, completing these segments has been determined to be a high priority based on public comment and input from government officials. It is expected that Priority 2 segments will be constructed over the next five-to-15 years. Approximately, 316 miles of the MetroGreen system have been designated as Priority 2.

Setting Priorities for MetroGreen

chapter 4



Priority 3 - segments are needed to complete the system. They
represent the long-term strategy. It is expected that Priority 3
segments will be constructed over the next 15-25 years.
Approximately, 602 miles of the MetroGreen system have been
designated as Priority 3.

Roles and Responsibilities for a MetroGreen Organization

The Mid-America Regional Council has taken responsibility for updating and refining the MetroGreen plan, building support among local government leaders and building community awareness. As a voluntary association of city and county governments and metropolitan planning organization, MARC views the MetroGreen planning function as an appropriate role for the agency. This role has been viewed as appropriate by member local governments and other MetroGreen stakeholders.

The implementation of the MetroGreen plan will require one or more organizations with the ability to:

- Advocate, promote, and encourage development of MetroGreen.
- Engage and educate citizens as to benefits of MetroGreen.
- Assist in raising money for implementation.
- Help to organize volunteers to assist with implementation and management.
- Sponsor or co-sponsor MetroGreen events.
- Serve as champion for the MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative.
- Advise local governments on specific segments of the MetroGreen plan.
- Facilitate cooperation among jurisdictions for implementation of MetroGreen.
- Promote use of uniform design guidelines for MetroGreen facilities.

Governance Overview

The following text provides an overview of the different forms of governance considered. It was important to select an organization style that will effectively champion the MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative. Included here are a review of typical organizational models for greenway governance and an overview of other regional greenway and open space organizations from throughout the United States. Following these summaries is the consultant's recommendation for establishing an organizational structure for MetroGreen.

Typically, greenway governance involves designating or creating an organization or agency that will be responsible for implementation of a community-wide or region-wide greenway system. Often what is needed is an organization or agency that serves as "champion," coordinator or facilitator of the community greenway program. The challenge in selecting or designating such a champion is to determine the organization or agency that can best satisfy fiscal, operational and management objectives associated with the greenway program in the Kansas City region.

A Review of Organizational Models

Several types of organizational structures are currently operating throughout the United States governing various greenway initiatives. Listed below are examples of some of the most successful models by type.

The Single Agency Model

The Single Agency Greenway Organization is developed around the leadership of a local, regional or state government agency. Oftentimes this will be a parks and recreation or planning department whose interests and operating mission are naturally aligned with the goals for greenways. The Raleigh, NC, Capital Area Greenway Program is an example of a single agency greenway model with the Parks and Recreation Department as lead agency.

The Multi-Agency Model

The Multi-Agency Model offers the same organizational foundation as the Single Agency Model, however, in this example, two or more agencies have decided to pool their talent and divide the responsibilities in order to resolve the complex issues for greenway implementation. Charlotte-Mecklenburg County, NC Greenway Program is an example of a dual agency program with Parks and Recreation as lead and County Stormwater Services, Charlotte-Mecklenburg Utilities and other agencies in supporting roles.

The Public-Private Model

There are two public-private partnership models for greenways. The first is a strong-side public sector, which in essence means that local government partners support the bulk of its efforts. The private sector may support this partnership through fund-raising, promotion and programming. The Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission is a good example of a regional public-private greenway organization.

The Private-Public Model

Under this scenario, the private sector is the strong side, which means that private organizations shoulder more of the burden for planning, design, implementation and management of greenways. Public sector partners are asked to support the greenway effort in the areas of management, promotion, and programming. The Saint Paul Riverfront Corporation is an example of a private sector organization developed with the support of public sector leadership. Chicago Openlands is a very good example of a private-public greenway organization. The Southeast Michigan Greenways Initiative led by the Community Foundation for Southeastern Michigan is another example of a private sector leadership with public sector partners.

The Private Sector Model

The Private Sector Model places the establishment and operations of the greenway program totally within the realm of private organizations, without any direct influence from local, regional or state governments. The private sector completes all work on greenways through its own means. The South Suburban Park Foundation of Denver, Colorado is a good example of a private sector organization that is exerting leadership in greenway development. Additionally, the Peninsula Open Space Trust in San Francisco is a private sector organization that is protecting land and implementing a variety of greenway objectives in the Bay Area region.

Examples of Other Organizations

Chicago Openlands Project, Chicago, Illinois

Since 1963, the Chicago Openlands Project has been working diligently to protect open space in the Chicago metropolitan area. To date the organization has preserved more than 21,000 acres of land that are now enjoyed by local residents as parks, forest preserves, bicycle trails, urban gardens and places to observe nature. Chicago Openlands was created by corporate executives who were concerned with the pace of rapid urbanization in the early 1960's. As a private-sector-led land conservancy organization, the original goals were simple - take steps necessary to protect and preserve the unique natural resources of northeastern Illinois to ensure the quality of life for future generations. Chicago Openlands has always been concerned with the important interrelationship between natural resources and community expansion.

The organization is structured as a private, nonprofit advisory group - the guiding philosophy could be summed up as "no power is all power." As an advisor, the group is free from political influence and is able to carry out its mission and objectives. Currently, the organization crafts policy and programs which are then implemented through a variety of partnerships both public and private. The 260 municipalities of the Chicago metropolitan area are the primary implementors of the Openlands strategies. Additionally, Openlands contracts work to local governments and private sector organizations to help it achieve results. This has enabled Openlands to remain a modest organization with an essential, highly trained and educated staff.

The primary strategy of Openlands since the late 1980's has been to implement a 1,600-mile multi-objective greenway system. The Northeastern Illinois Regional Greenway Plan was created through a partnership between the Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission (NIPC) and Openlands in September 1992 as the guiding document for this ambitious system. The plan physically defines on-road and off-road corridors throughout the metro area as linkages to the already well-established Forest Preserves. Local and regional parks, parkways, canals and historic trails are all essential elements of the greenway strategy. The heart of the plan lies in the designation of 900 miles of streamways as multipurpose greenway corridors.

One of the functions of Openlands is the acquisition of property that is located within the proposed greenway system. CorLands, a real estate affiliate of Openlands, is the agent for this acquisition. Since 1988, CorLands has acquired 4,500 acres. CorLands uses a variety of landacquisition strategies to preserve and protect vital open space within the metro area.

Peninsula Open Space Trust, San Francisco, California

The Peninsula Open Space Trust (POST) is a nonprofit land trust dedicated to preserving the beauty, character and diversity of the San Francisco Peninsula. Since its founding, POST has protected more than 40,000 acres of San Francisco Peninsula Open Space. POST partners with many organizations in the Bay Area to protect land, principal among them the Mid-Peninsula Regional Open Space District. The district was established in 1972 to create a regional greenbelt of open-space lands linking district preserves with other parklands. The district also participates in cooperative efforts such as the Bay Trail, Ridge Trail and Skylineto-the-Sea Trail. The district encompasses 16 cities and three counties.

POST works to buy and preserve land. POST utilizes a combination of public and private funds to support its activities. POST sells land to local, state and federal government agencies for management purposes as public monies become available for the transactions. One of POST's recent campaigns was to raise \$33.5 million in private-sector funds to protect more than 12,500 acres of land in the Bay Area.

POST is governed by a 15-member board of directors. Directors come from some of the most influential private sector and philanthropic organizations in the Bay Area. A 34-member Advisory Council that is comprised of private-sector representatives supports the board in its work. POST employs a four-person staff consisting of a president, two vice-presidents and one Director of Stewardship.

A seven-member board of directors that is determined by seven geographic wards governs the Mid-Peninsula Open Space District. Each member serves a four-year term and is chosen through district elections. Sixty employees, the majority of whom are responsible for resource management, staff the district. They patrol and maintain a 250-mile network of trails. The district is funded from an annual property tax of 1.7 cents per \$100 value. This generates an annual fund of \$10 million. Other revenue is derived from federal and state grants, interest and rental income and donations or gifts.

The Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission, Roanoke, Virginia The Roanoke Valley Greenway Commission is a government-appointed advisory board that serves to advocate the development of a regional greenway system. Established by an intergovernmental agreement on April 19, 1997, the commission represents the interests of citizens from the four valley governmental units.

The purpose of the commission is to advise the four governments on greenway opportunities and citizen interests in greenways, facilitate cooperation among jurisdictions in greenway planning and development,

recommend sources of funding for greenway construction, develop uniform standards for greenway design and construction, pursue public/ private partnerships, and coordinate efforts to create a valley-wide greenway system.

A non-profit corporation known as Pathfinders for Greenways aids the commission in carrying out its duties. Pathfinders' purpose is to promote and encourage development of a greenway network, educate citizens and officials on the benefits of greenways, raise and receive gifts, donations and grants for greenways, organize volunteers to assist with greenway development and sponsor greenway promotional events.

The commission consists of 13 appointed members. Twelve members come from four local governments. Roanoke City, Roanoke County, the Town of Salem and the Town of Vinton are each allotted three appointees. The Metropolitan Planning Organization appoints one member. Ten exofficio members come from planning, parks and recreation and other local, state and federal agencies, and from two non-profit organizations.

The South Suburban Park Foundation, Denver, Colorado

The South Suburban Park Foundation, Inc. was formed in 1979 with the mission of enriching the environment and improving open space and recreational opportunities for residents of the south suburban communities of metropolitan Denver. A private sector, nonprofit organization, South Suburban Park Foundation (SSPF) is an advocacy group that has served as master planner and builder of several significant greenway projects, including the award-winning Arapahoe Greenway and 10,000 Trees, a stream bank revitalization and reforestation project.

The intent of SSPF is to leave a legacy of greenways, trails and open space in the south Denver metro area. The trustees and supporters are committed to realizing this objective through partnerships between the foundation and private citizens, government agencies, corporations or philanthropic institutions. The Foundation offers a means for these individuals and groups to contribute funds, goods or volunteer efforts toward shared community objectives. The foundation has received numerous awards for its outstanding work.

The South Suburban Park Foundation is a membership organization that accepts and encourages grants, donations and contributions from public and private sources. The Foundation is a tax-exempt, not-for-profit corporation. SSPF is structured with an 11-member Board of Directors, and has employed through contracts an Executive Director and technical consultants during its 17-year history. The organization partners with local government agencies to plan and implement most of its projects. It also partners with other private-sector groups, including corporations, to implement activities.

Saint Paul Riverfront Corporation, St. Paul, Minnesota

The Saint Paul Riverfront Corporation has been empowered by the community of St. Paul to serve as the lead organization for the implementation of the Saint Paul on the Mississippi Development Framework. The Riverfront Corporation has recently expanded in order to fulfill this role and has committed itself to a multi-year effort to make the vision real.

The Riverfront Corporation achieves this mission through the Saint Paul on the Mississippi Design Center, public outreach and fund-raising. As part of its Design Center function, the Riverfront Corporation works to enhance the quality of life in St. Paul through high-quality urban design based on the principles and the goals of the Development Framework. Through its fund-raising efforts, the Riverfront Corporation works to align public and private resources that often accelerate the completion of projects that contribute to the overall vision. The Riverfront Corporation maintains an aggressive public-outreach program to educate, inspire and inform the community. Its goal is to form the partnerships that are necessary to realize the vision of a system of interconnected urban villages nestled in the lush green of a reforested river valley.

One result of this partnership between the Riverfront Corporation and the community is the Renaissance Project - a system of parks, trails and open spaces that will create connections from the downtown core to the Mississippi River and surrounding neighborhoods. The Renaissance Project is a strategy to implement the Development Framework that will build on current projects as well as create new ones. It will result in 92 acres of new or improved parks, five miles of new trails, eight miles of improved streetscapes, thousands of new trees and plants and other strategic investments.

The Riverfront Corporation is a private, nonprofit organization that is governed by a Board of Directors and a Finance Committee. Representatives from the Board of Directors and the Finance Committee are nominated by an internal committee that maintains balanced representation in the diverse community the Corporation serves. There are 30 directors, a seven-person Executive Committee, an Executive Director and six specialized staff members.

The Southeastern Michigan GreenWays Initiative, Michigan

The Southeastern Michigan GreenWays Initiative is a five-year program of the Community Foundation for Southeastern Michigan. The fundamental goal of the Initiative is to demonstrate the importance and benefits of building a greenway system within a seven-county region. This program is a comprehensive effort aimed at expanding and enhancing the region's natural landscape. The program is oriented toward linking communities, leveraging vision, resources and people, and collaborating to promote and protect public health and well-being of Southeastern Michigan residents.

The GreenWays Initiative was developed through a partnership of 70 organizations, agencies and community leaders. The Foundation's five-year program focuses on public outreach and education, capacity building programs in the form of technical assistance and funding through philan-thropic grants.

The Community Foundation for Southeastern Michigan was established in 1984 and is a permanent community endowment built by gifts from individuals and organizations. The foundation works to improve the quality of life for residents in Southeast Michigan by supporting a wide variety of activities. A 50-member board of directors, comprised of community leaders, governs the foundation. The GreenWays Initiative has been supported by the Kresqe Foundation, the MacGregor Fund, The Carls Foundation, the John S. and James L. Knight Foundation, the Matilda R. Wilson Fund, the Whitney Fund, The Americana Foundation and the Frey Foundation.

Recommendation

Historically, one of the most important elements missing from the MetroGreen concept was lack of leadership to carry out the vision, goals and objectives established in 1991. Most successful regional efforts of this type have succeeded in part due to the establishment of a leadership group.

For example, Chicago's 1,000 mile regional greenway system has been guided by the OpenLands Project since 1969, Denver has been supported in its regional efforts by the South Suburban Park Foundation, Minneapolis has established a Metro Greenprint for its regional system and St. Louis used its 2004 planning initiative to create two regional park authorities in both Illinois and Missouri. MetroGreen needs an organization that is dedicated to the vision, mission, goals and objectives of this Plan in order to be successful in the long run.

Currently, there is no leadership organization, other than the Mid-America Regional Council, that is capable of championing the vision for MetroGreen. There are no organizations in the Kansas City metro region that plan for and support regional natural resource issues other than MARC. In the near term, the Mid-America Regional Council will absorb the immediate planning and implementation efforts of MetroGreen under its existing organizational structure. This is viewed as a short-term solution to the issue of leadership. MARC will work with partners throughout the metro region to define a long-term organizational structure for MetroGreen. The following defines one possible model for how this organization could be established, staffed and funded.

Organizational Framework

Based on similar organizations that are in place and active in other parts of the United States, it is recommended that a new organization would be established, called *MetroGreen, Incorporated*. It would be established as

a non-profit, 501 (c)3 organization. Under the name MetroGreen, Inc., the organization would be governed by a Board of Directors and have its own administrative staff. The chart on the next page defines the structure of the organization.

Under this scenario, MetroGreen, Inc. could have the following divisions. One would be administrative and oriented toward implementation, the other, a "friends" group, would be oriented toward advocacy, promotion and fund raising.

MetroGreen, Inc. (Leadership Board)

- Champion the MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative
- Advise local governments on development of MetroGreen plan
- Facilitate cooperation among jurisdictions for implementation of MetroGreen
- · Define and recommend sources of funding for MetroGreen
- Implement uniform design guidelines for MetroGreen facilities
- · Coordinate efforts to create a unified MetroGreen system

Friends of MetroGreen

- Subset of MetroGreen, Inc.
- Membership organization
- · Advocate, promote, encourage development of MetroGreen
- · Educate citizens as to benefits of MetroGreen
- · Assist MetroGreen in raising money for implementation
- Help to organize volunteers to assist with implementation and management
- Sponsor or co-sponsor MetroGreen events

Organizational Structure

MetroGreen, Inc. could have a board of directors comprised of representatives from each of the seven counties and one representative from MARC. Representatives would come from both the public and private sectors. Nominations would be based on the person's knowledge or experience, ability to serve and interest in the activities of MetroGreen. Assuming two members per county, the 15-member board should be appointed by each governing body and would have staggered terms. A chair and vice-chair would be elected from within the organization. Standing committees would also be established and would focus on Finance and Fund Raising, Planning and Project Development, and Promotion and Marketing.

Ideally, and based on a review of other model organizations around the nation, MetroGreen, Inc., would have a minimum of three staff: an executive director, an assistant director for development and a administrative assistant. Funding for staff would initially come from grants from philan-thropic organizations and some public support from local and/or state governments.

MetroGreen Organizational Chart



Friends of MetroGreen would be a subset of MetroGreen Inc. and would be staffed by MetroGreen Inc. staff. The Friends subgroup would be governed by a subcommittee of the board.

Duties and Activities

The principal activities and duties of MetroGreen, Inc. would be to champion the full development of this plan. To accomplish this, MetroGreen, Inc. would need to assist local communities in completing the individual work plans outlined in the systems section of this plan. In some cases, this may result in MetroGreen, Inc. assisting local governments in raising funds, coordinating efforts between local governments or with other public or private sector groups, or assisting with development activities where appropriate. MetroGreen, Inc. could publish an annual report that provides the community with an update of its progress. MetroGreen, Inc. should launch and maintain a web site that provides up-to-date information about the MetroGreen system, as well as a library of completed projects.

The activities and duties of Friends of MetroGreen would be principally oriented toward communication, event programming and outreach/ education. Friends should, at a minimum, host an annual meeting of its membership and this event should be held at a MetroGreen facility/ project. MetroGreen, Inc., staff would publish a newsletter and distribute this to the membership. Friends should sponsor events and programs such as a speaker's bureau, education, outreach and technical programs for landowners, businesses and educators. Friends should also help fund raise for MetroGreen facility development.

Funding

MetroGreen Incorporated will need some initial seed money for start-up. It will also need to generate long-term financial support for its future operations. The consultant recommends that a one-time initial funding formula be created to establish MetroGreen Incorporated. Each county, major cities, MARC, and private-sector organizations, would contribute to create an initial budget to employ staff and launch the programs of MetroGreen.

During its first year, the staff of MetroGreen would be asked to raise additional funds to support the annual operating budget of MetroGreen Inc.

A Regional System

Implementing the region-wide concept of MetroGreen will take place at the county and municipal government level. This is not to suggest that local governments alone are to bear the entire burden of implementation. This plan envisions an active role for the Mid America Regional Council and a partnership effort between the public and private sector to implement the MetroGreen vision.

Next Steps
MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative Checklist

The following actions and activities should be completed by all county and municipal governments within the seven county region of Kansas City in support of the implementation of MetroGreen.

Policy Development

- Take action in support of the MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative.
- Designate a lead agency/department to work with the Mid-America Regional Council and the newly established MetroGreen, Inc., to implement the Regional Greenway Initiative.
- For Leavenworth and Cass counties, consider establishment of a county parks and recreation department, with initial focus on streamway/trail development.
- Integrate the MetroGreen plan and any local trails/greenways plans into the community's parks and open space, land use and transportation plans.
- Adopt a stream buffer ordinance that protects stream corridors.
- Adopt a park/open space dedication requirement to support the acquisition of land and development of MetroGreen and a local trail system.
- Incorporate MetroGreen objectives into the development of the community's stormwater program, including consideration of how adoption of local stormwater utility fees could assist in implementing MetroGreen.

Planning

- Develop a local trails/greenways plan, or if one exists, ensure that it is consistent with MetroGreen.
- Conduct a Natural Resources Inventory as part of the comprehensive or land use planning process to identify important resources to protect and preserve and to determine appropriate stream setback provisions.
- Identify land ownership for each MetroGreen segment within each community, and determine how acquisition or access will be accomplished.
- · Determine the facility type for each MetroGreen segment.
- Identify partners from the public and private sectors that can help implement MetroGreen segments.
- Continue to assist MARC in building a regional GIS inventory of natural resources including open space, parks and trails.
- Evaluate the potential for area highways, including K-5 and US 73, to be designated as state or federal scenic byways.

Programming

- Refine priorities for MetroGreen facility construction.
- Identify and program local funding sources for the highest priority MetroGreen segments and seek grants and other funds to supplement local resources.

- Evaluate how new funding sources could support the development of MetroGreen trail segments. In particular, Clay County should determine how the recently enacted use tax could support implementation of MetroGreen and the Northland Trails Vision Plan; and Jackson County should seek federal and/or state grant funds to complete the trail system along the Little Blue River and along the Blue River from the state line to Swope Park.
- Build public awareness and support for greenways and trails, and promote system use.
- Support efforts to establish MetroGreen, Inc., and as appropriate, work with local citizen groups.

Operation/Maintenance

- Adopt the MetroGreen design guidelines for MetroGreen and local system greenways and trails.
- Adopt the MetroGreen logo into the county or city's signage for its trail system, using one of the proposed design concepts.
- Determine how and by whom each segment of MetroGreen will be operated and maintained.
- Develop maintenance standards for MetroGreen and local trails.

For the Mid-America Regional Council

Policy Development

- Adopt the MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative as a regional framework for a metropolitan system of trails and greenways in the Kansas City area.
- Encourage local communities to respond to the MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative checklist.
- Provide local communities with model stream buffer ordinances and encourage their adoption.
- Encourage local communities to adopt a park/open space dedication requirement to support the acquisition of land and development of MetroGreen and a local trail system.
- Work with local communities and MetroGreen, Inc., to promote discussion of new public funding sources to support the development and on-going maintenance of the regional greenway/trail system.

Planning

- Further enhance the regional Geographic Information System (GIS) with local trails data and natural resources inventories.
- Continue to refine the MetroGreen plan by evaluating trail and greenway segments and identifying potential partners and funding sources.
- Encourage local communities to develop local trail and greenway plans consistent with MetroGreen.
- Evaluate state highways and other transportation corridors in the metro area for designation as state or federal scenic byways.
- Continue to work with the Missouri Department of Natural Resources to connect the KATY Trail to the Kansas City region.

• Encourage the US Army Corps of Engineers and area levee districts to explore public access and trail opportunities along Missouri and Kansas River levees.

Programming

- Work with local communities and other possible project sponsors to refine priorities for MetroGreen facility construction.
- Pursue federal, state and private grants and resources to assist local communities in implementing MetroGreen.
- Provide technical assistance and other support to local communities to advance high priority MetroGreen corridors for trail development.
- Build public awareness and support for greenways and trails, and promote system use.
- Establish MetroGreen, Inc. to build citizen support throughout the metro area.

Operation/Maintenance

- Promote the adoption of the MetroGreen design guidelines and MetroGreen logo into county or city signage.
- Encourage use of native vegetation along trails and stream corridors.

Summary of Public Input

Approximately, 80-to-100 residents participated in the first round of MetroGreen public workshops. Three drop-in format meetings were held on the evenings of April 24, 25, and 26. The workshops were located at the Missouri Department of Transportation office in Lee's Summit, St. Luke's Northland Hospital off Barry Road, and the Sylvester Powell Community Center in Mission. Three more meetings were held in June on the 25th, 26th, and 27th. These workshops were held at the Gladstone Community Building in Central Park, the Brush Creek Community Center, and the Merriam Community Center. Approximately, 50-to-70 people attended these workshops. A final public meeting was held on October 24th in downtown Kansas City.

Participants viewed a short video that explains the concept of greenways, the different forms greenways take, and the many functions that they perform. Also, available for public viewing were displays produced by area agencies, highlighting local and regional trails systems, proposed and existing. Visitors were encouraged to look at, write comments, and sketch ideas on regional and county maps that were produced especially for the workshops. Workshop attendees located areas that they felt needed bicycle and/or pedestrian connections. Digital photographs of the maps and comments are printed on the following pages.

A comment form was also made available to participants. Results from these forms are displayed following the workshop maps. Comments from the workshops were incorporated into subsequent drafts of the MetroGreen Map that shows potential greenway locations. In addition, MARC staff, Greenways Incorporated, Patti Banks Associates, and local representatives attended the workshops to answer questions and solicit responses.

Summary of Public Workshops



Presentation of Working Maps

The following maps contain the notes and graphic illustrations received at the public meetings. The maps were printed on 36-inch by 48-inch sheets of paper. The process of reducing the maps to fit on an 8-1/2 by 11 sheet limits graphic clarity; therefore, comments from each map are listed on the corresponding pages.

Jackson County - April 24, 2001

- Money TEA 21 CMAQ, Recreation trails, Enhancements; Corps; EPA; FEMA Project impact; 3/8 cent sales tax - Lee's Summit Parks; Little Blue Sewer District levy; Jackson County Stormwater - regional approach; Independence water company - contract; Local landmark parks funding; Private donations - foundations; DNR - nature, stormwater, 301 water quality; MDC - natural areas, wetlands, streambank trust fund, fee-in-lieu.
- Bike Ped (Heart of America Bridge).
- New bridge will be accessible (MO River).
- New river bridge southbound will be accessible (MO River) at Sugar Creek.
- Historic sites (planned bike facility).
- Existing park in Sugar Creek is Jackson Co. and MDC land.
- Jackson Co. owns land corridor (Little Blue River).
- Fort Osage Park. Where is it? Historic reenactment site.
- Protected wetland (MO River).
- Add Santa Fe Trail.
- Many park boundary corrections were made. Some of the errors were due to GIS information while others were due to GIS files overlapping the parks layer.
- 8-foot wide gravel trail along Little Blue River.
- Existing Longview bike trail 8' wide.
- Jackson County owns land corridor along this stream (Little Blue River).
- Lake Jacomo 5HP limit.
- Longview Lake flood control & recreation.
- Link to KATY Trail (Belton, MO).
- Frisco Corridor to Clinton, MO.
- 150th St. corridor (Grandview to Greenwood).
- · Lonview Lake to MO River corridor segment.
- Add Lee's Summit Trails and Greenway System.
- Rock Island corridor to Pleasant Hill/Windsor (Ameren U.E.) possible light rail corridor rail w/trail (new MG corridor).
- The following items were labeled: Sni-A-Bar River, Blue and Gray Park, Powell Gardens, Blue Springs Lake, Cement City Rd (beside MO River), Stadium Sports Complex, Brush Creek, Sewer Treatment Plant (between Blue Valley and Atherton Sibley).
- Connections noted: Johnson County, Indian Creek and Brush Creek to Blue River to Missouri River. Missouri River levee trail, Little Blue River corridor. Connect the stadium complex to KATY Trail via Rock Island RR corridor. Blue Branch Creek from county line west to Little Blue River.



Clay and Platte Counties - April 25, 2001

- Instructions: Please indicate where you would like to see trails and greenways located. Draw on me.
- Get Vivion Road plan.
- Get GIS file of KCMO Major Street Plan (Bob Hurst City Planning and Development).
- Old inter-urban rail corridor. AA Hwy to 108 Hwy.
- North KC to Airport Heart of America Bridge, along river to Parkville, 9 Hwy/Union Chapel Rd, Barry Rd, Tiffany Springs, 104 St, TWA facility.
- Better corridor than 92/10.
- Old rail line, talk to Aaron Schmidt.
- Platte County P+2.
- Interurban right-of-way from Liberty to Excelsior is mostly intact.
- Excelsior Springs historic destination.
- Pharis Farm is shown in the wrong location and may be public land soon.
- Rail corridor from Liberty to Kearney is used once a week might be shared with MetroGreen.
- Old Armour Road, 3 miles, inactive roadway from Chouteau Bridge (E) to Walker Rd (W).
- Connection corridor * Line Creek / Riverside / Parkville very important!
- Greenway trails on Missouri River levees on Corps of Engineer, entire Platte County.
- Routes highlighted include: along the Missouri River, Platte River, Little Platte River, Brush Creek, Second Creek, and Line Creek. Connections to Liberty, Kearney, Excelsior Springs, North Kansas City, and Smithville.
- Items labeled: Platte River, Little Platte River, Jesse James Farm, Second Creek, Brush Creek, Line Creek, Searcy Creek, Midwest Baptist Seminary, Greenhills wildlife area, English Landing Park, Park at old Argosy Casino, Parma Park, Tiffany Springs Park, New (Marshall C.A.) Conservation Dept. Area, Little Bean Marsh Conservation Area, and a boat ramp near Weston.



Summary of Public Input

Johnson County - April 26, 2001

- Add South Community Park and Lone Elm Campground off US 169 to the map.
- Link Lake Olathe to Cedar Lake, with a spur to the South Community Park and Lone Elm Campground, to Heritage Park, down Coffee Creek and down Blue River to KATY Trail - Important Link.
- A Johnson County Central Park should be created where all of the greenways converge near the Prairie Center, Lake Olathe, Oregon Trail Park, Pine and Elm Park, West Santa Fe Park, Prairie Center Park and Ernie Miller Park.
- Make a connection from greenway intersection with 135th Street around the Sunflower Munitions Plant to the south and around the west side to connect with Douglas County.
- Greenway corridors up Indian Creek to the County Central Park and up Tomahawk Creek to St. Andrews Golf Course.
- Bike lanes or other as road accommodates along 143 Street.
- There needs to be a connection near Quivira Road north of 435 to Indian Creek.
- Trailhead location at 95th Street and Mill Creek.
- Add Prairie Star Parkway trail is planned along the street.
- 10 acre ISTEA park on Monticello.
- 30 acre park south of the Wild Bill Hickcock Park.
- Connect Shawnee Riverfront Park to Mill Creek.
- Connection and safety bridge needed near I-435 at Wyandotte County border.
- Add Blackfish Greenway to the map.
- Roeland Park Community Center will be connected via greenway extension to 75th Street.
- Retrofit Mission Road.
- Contact Neil Holman, director at Shawnee Parks.
- Road cyclists on an unidentified road between 135th and 143rd in Olathe.
- Label Wolfe Creek.
- Connect DeSoto to Gardner to Spring Hill via Kill Creek.



Wyandotte County - April 26, 2001

- Need legal bike access on river bridge at I-435 (next bridge is Hwy 92 at Leavenworth or in downtown KC).
- Only bike access (E on 47th to connect to Mill Creek JOCO system) is at K-7 Hwy.
- On-road trail suggested along Georgia Street.
- Cross Kansas River (Heritage Trail).
- Connection to MO (Turkey Creek).
- Possible transit hub (Turkey Creek).
- JOCO connect (need striping and signs) 18th Street.
- Bridge for peds and bike at I-435 Johnson/Wyandotte County line, Kaw River.
- Go to Mill Creek (from Lake Quivira).
- Remove 1991 Vision route east of 435.
- Show routes along 110th, railroad corridor along the Kansas River, levees along the Missouri River, Parallel Parkway, 55th Street, and connect Wyandotte County Lake to Leavenworth County.
- Items labeled: MO River, Race Track, Woodlands, Wyandotte City Park, Sunflower Hills, Sandstone Amphitheatre/Agricultural Hall of Fame, Parallel Parkway, Heritage Trail, Roe Lane, Wyandotte County Lake.



Regional Map - Used April 24, 25, and 26, 2001

- Create a metro-wide "Share the Road" signage program and start today.
- Wyandotte County (JCBC Weston Ride) to Weston and Atchinson.
- Connections needed between Wyandotte County and Johnson County especially north of the river.
- Pocket Park Transit Center near Kansas University Medical Center.
- Link from Johnson County 51st and Lowell to KCK near Turkey Creek.
- Connect J.A. Reed W.P. to Pleasant Hill to Windsor.
- Incorporate trail design into planned corporate improvements (John Groddhouse) on Turkey Creek.
- Note existing and proposed 4' sidewalks drawn in orange on the map around Raymore.
- Possible rail from Raymore to Harrisonville.
- Priority 1 trail from south of Raymore to countyline.
- Harrisonville / Pleasant Hill connection via rail line.



Comment Map - Kansas City Metro Region

Platte and Clay Counties - June 25, 2001

- Add a 10' bike lane along Hwy 45 from I-435 and extend to Line Creek priority one.
- Add a priority 1 trail from Riverside-Young Park to English Landing Park.
- Add Cooley Lake to the southeast corner of the map.
- Make a connection from Missouri River to Excelsior Springs.
- Add Clay County priorities to map (noted in green) C-23, C-22, C-4, C-3, C-2, C-1, C-15, C-16, C-18, C-9, C-11.
- Note Lewis and Clark State park in the northwest corner of the map.
- Show existing English Landing Park along Segment 19.
- Tiffany Springs Parkway and Centennial Parkway trail drawn to Shoal Creek and down Maplewoods Parkway.
- Add a priority 1 segment from Segment 23 to Segment 30 along M-45.
- Bluff Road historic and cultural point. Beverly Old 92 and JNC 45 northwest to Weston along Bluff. Then Bluff Road northwest to Highway 45. The old depot in Weston will be redone as a trailhead. Some funding may be available through the depot project. The view from Weston Bend S.P. to Kansas is one of the best representations of how the area appeared prior to development - (i.e. Lewis and Clark). The Lewis and Clark committee is requesting grant funds for trail and info kiosks.
- No rail corridor with Clay County. North off Hwy 33 rail has been reverted Boggess, Fulkerson, and James Park.



MetroGreen Draft Map - Clay and Platte Counties

Jackson County - June 26, 2001

- Remove local trail segments (not part of the Regional System) indicated around Segment #15 (Kansas City River Heritage Trail).
- Convert old rail bridge to pedestrian bridge around Segment #15.
- Add an on road priority 1 trail to the Zoo on the Missouri side.
- There are no plans to extend the Trolley Track Trail to I-435.
- Red Bridge Road on-road trail shown.
- Move Segment 2 (Trolley Track Trail) of existing greenway from map from Paseo over to Brookside Blvd.
- Brush Creek Trail runs from Roanoke to Troost / Paseo area.
- Add Casino Trail near Segment #12.
- Station Casino labeled.
- Paseo Parkway delineated.

MetroGreen Draft Map - Jackson County



Johnson County - June 27, 2001

- Connect 63 to trailhead at Turkey Creek.
- Line to connect to 65 or south or to Mill Creek.
- Cedar Creek through Ernie Miller Park to end of Mill Creek Park.



MetroGreen Draft Map - Johnson County

Wyandotte County - June 27, 2001

- Existing right-of-way mentioned in regards to the abandon 1857 Missouri Bluff Road along the Kaw River.
- Remove parts of Segment 15 and adjacent priority 2 trails indicated on the map.
- Segment 67 should follow old trolley line to Leavenworth County.



Summary of Public Input

ASLA Meeting - June 22, 2001

- Add trail segment "A" to the map from Tiffany Springs Parkway to Shoal Creek Parkway.
- Double check Katy alignment I think that the 74 segment is the wrong rail line.
- Cliff Drive Resource/trail on Gladstone or Benton. Contact Vince Bilardo or Karin Jacoby.
- Change U.S. Highway 40 to the actual alignment that is indicated on the map.
- Possible Douglas County connections:
 - Kansas River
 - K-10 Wak-A-Rusa Trail
 - Santa Fe Trail U.S. 56
- MoDOT Bridge Projects that accommodate bike facilities. Possible 350 connection as alternate for rail corridor (#9).
- Shawnee Mission Parkway New bridge at Mission Mall can accommodate a fleet of bikes.
- Bike lanes are currently on portions of Midland and are planned for new phases.
- Blue River Greenway Project Korin Jacoby Kansas City, MO Special Projects.
- Existing Longview Lake Trail noted.
- Bridge at I-435 and I-350.
- Mill Creek extension is funded by \$850 K TEA-21.
- Spur connection needed from Segment 47 to the Johnson County Prairie Center.
- Extend Segment #72 (Stranger Creek) to provide access for crossing K-7 bridge.
- No access for crossing river at K-62 (I-435 Johnson/Wyandotte Counties).
- On-road trails exist at Somerset and Tomahawk.
- Move trail to Brookside along Segment 2.
- Extend 135th on-road into Douglas County.

MetroGreen Draft Map - ASLA Meeting



Regional Map - Used June 22, 25, 26, and 27, 2001

- Foster and Tom about J.A. Reed W.P. Route.
- Possible bike lanes along County Line Road between Jackson and Cass Counties.
- Feature Native American History:
 - River Routes
 - Berkley Park no native American history
 - Indian Mound at Kessler park
 - Hopewell Indian at Line Creek
 - Cohokia Mounds in East St. Louis
- Add Three Trail / Trailside Travelers corridor from Segment 12 to Grandview Triangle.
- Segment 34 not developed.
- Centennial Parkway delineated.
- Connect Cass County 75 to Longview Lake.



MetroGreen Draft Map - Kansas City Metro Region

Informal Survey Process and Results

The following charts represent the results from the MetroGreen Public Comment Form distributed at the April and June public workshops. The form was also posted on the MARC website (www.marc.org). A total of 58 forms were returned. Comments that correspond to "other" are listed below the charts.



How do you envision using MetroGreen facilities?

Comments:

- Start making bike routes now.
- · Link cities, major parks/points of interest, cross the Rivers!
- If it 'twer to be done, 'tis best it were done quickly.
- Big picture cities and developments should connect.
- The plan should be overlayed with major street plan of Kansas City, MO as it can have a great impact on planning the system.
- · Gosh hard to argue that none of the above are important.
- To provide open natural green space that is accessible and close distance to high population areas.
- Inter-linked recreation & transportation bicycle/ped system. Both sides of state line.
- Link is an important word. It should be applied to unify the greater metropolitan area.

- Provide habitat for birds.
- Regional cooperation.
- Probably all of the above plus connect to street network.
- Promote companion on-road cycling initiative MetroBike.
- Provide a living breathing green lung with enough capacity to counter balance the amount of pollution from our cars and industry and get federal "enery crisis" funding for it.
- Trails for horse riding.
- Natural history especially. Connect to Natural Lands (Remnant natural communities) see www.kcwildlands.org.



Who should champion the development of MetroGreen?

Comments:

- They (MARC) are well-positioned to provide inter-jurisdictional coordination needed to make the connections.
- Visit Minnesota and see how it's done there...Twin City Apple Valley.

What should be accomplished by MetroGreen?



Comments:

- Boating and picnic areas like Parkville.
- Recreation.
- To enjoy a quiet natural area with trees and animals.
- Bikes as alternative form of transportation. We have to drive cars too much in KC Metro. Also need: good public transportation...street cars
 light rail, etc. We had that once here, back in the 40's - 50's.
- Variety of reasons, recreation as well as transportation.
- Birding.
- · Enjoy nature.

Do you support using public funds for the development of MetroGreen facilities?



Comments:

• No comments were received for this question.



What type of funding mechanism would you support for MetroGreen?

Comments:

• No comments were received for this question.

Newsletters were prepared for the promotion of MetroGreen public workshops, to build enthusiasm for the MetroGreen planning process and to keep interested citizens informed of the MetroGreen planning progress. The newsletters were printed for direct mailing, display at regional destinations (such as community libraries and park and recreation department offices), placement at retail locations with a personal interest in the plan (bicycle shops), and posted to the MARC website (www.marc.org). The following pages contain copies of the newsletters produced. Copies of Newsletters

A Kansas City Metropolitan Greenway System

1

April 2001

	Workshops to be as City MetroGree	a construction of the second
Drop	by anytime between 4:00 and 8:0	00 p.m.
Tuesday, April 24 Open House 4:00 — 8:00pm	Wednesday, April 25 Open House 4:00 — 8:00pm	Thursday, April 26 Open House 4:00 — 8:00pm
Mo. Dept. of Transportation, Room 136 600 N.E. Colbern Road Lee's Summit, MO	St. Luke's Northland Hospital, Barry Medical Park Conference Center 5844 NW Barry Road Kansas City, Missouri	Sylvester Powell Community Center 6200 Martway Mission, Kansas

Regional Greenway Plan Underway

The Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) and Greenways, Incorporated, in association with the Trust for Public Land, Patti Banks Associates and ETC Institute, have begun work on an action plan for developing a comprehensive greenway system throughout the Kansas City metropolitan area. This plan will build upon the existing work in numerous metro Kansas City communities. The result will be a regional system that connects and unites existing and proposed greenways to produce a MetroGreen system that benefits the entire metropolitan area.

This MetroGreen Plan builds upon local greenway plans in the region, and is the next step in a project launched in 1991 by the Prairie Gateway Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects. The ASLA produced the first MetroGreen vision as a gift to the metro area. The 2001 plan will identify a regional system that connects the region's assets and outlines a specific and achievable plan with financing options. This project will support our community's efforts to achieve one of the 10 Giant Steps identified as part of the KC150 Sescquicen-tennial Celebration.

A series of meetings will take place this spring to gather input from government officials, developers, neighborhoods, environmentalists, historians, and other interested groups. Public education and partnership building are essential components of this planning process and will continue with public workshops to be held in the summer. The final plan will be released in late fall of 2001.

What is a Greenway?

A greenway is:

- A way of connecting people and places along natural or human-made corridors;
- A linear landscape that protects the natural, historic and social character of an area;
- An area for people to play, walk, bicycle, socialize and relax.

Team to Complete Plan

Local and national agencies are working together on the MetroGreen plan:

Greenways Incorporated is a North Carolina-based firm that specializes in the planning, design, development and management of greenways. This nationally-recognized firm has provided services to more than 100 communities in 27 states across the country.

The Trust for Public Land (TPL) is a national non-profit organization dedicated to conserving land for people. This organization will identify local, state, and federal funding opportunities and land acquisition strategies for greenway design and implementation.

Patti Banks Associates is a Kansas Citybased landscape architecture firm specializing in trails master planning and implementation. Their success is a result of community consensus building, that produces desirable results for clients and their constituents.

ETC Institute is an Olathe-based research organization that specializes in feasibility studies and statistically valid public opinion surveys. This organization will conduct a public opinion poll to determine appropriate action steps for the MetroGreen Plan.

Mid-America Regional Council is the metropolitan planning organization for the eight-county, bi-state metropolitan area.

This Action Plan Made Possible by...

The Mid-America Regional Council would like to thank the Hall Family Foundation for their generous contributions that are funding the MetroGreen Action Plan.



(Above) Walkers and bicyclists enjoy the health and recreational benefits of a greenway.

A Word About Property Rights

The MetroGreen Plan will in no way infringe upon the rights of property owners. The plan will stress the voluntary participation of landowners, appropriate compensation for property (or an interest in property) when there is a willing seller, and appropriate management strategies for public lands. The plan will also help inform landowners about the benefits of preserving open space, including income tax benefits and increased property values.



Greenways can serve as exercise facilities as well as preserve scenic green space.

For more information please contact:

Mid-America Regional Council 600 Broadway, Suite 300 Kansas City, MO 64105 816/474-4240 www.marc.org

April 2001

Summary of Public Input

How Will Greenways Improve Metro K.C.?

Kansas City Metro Area Greenways will benefit everyone who lives, works, learns and plays in the metropolitan region by:

• Providing Safe Opportunities for Outdoor Recreation — Public open space is limited today, with fences and safety concerns acting as physical and psychological barriers to accessing points of interest in the area. A greenway will improve close-to-home recreation opportunities.

• Enhancing Property Values — Greenways have been proven to increase the value of adjacent lands because residents place a premium on living and working near parks, greenways and natural areas.

• **Improving Quality of Life** — The preservation of naturally and historically significant landscapes will improve quality of life for residents, attract visitors, and encourage businesses to locate in the Kansas City area.

• Attracting Tourists and Businesses — By celebrating the cultural diversity of neighborhoods throughout the metropolitan area and encouraging sustainable redevelopment, greenways will attract visitors and benefit tourism-based businesses in the area.

• Improving Access to Local Points of Interest — Greenways will create opportunities for people to travel, on foot and by bicycle, on paths that enable area residents to reconnect with cultural and ecological assets.

• Stormwater and Water Quality — Greenways improve water quality by filtering surface pollutants before they reach rivers and streams, and by serving as floodwater storage areas when streams overflow their banks.

Did You Know?...

• The many benefits of open space include: improving water quality, providing opportunities for outdoor recreation, reducing flood losses, enhancing property values, improving the quality of life, and protecting wildlife.

• As little as 30 minutes a day of moderate-intensity exercise (such as bicycling, walking, or in-line skating) can significantly improve a person's mental and physical health and prevent certain diseases.

• Greenways are viewed as amenities by residential, commercial and office park developers who are realizing higher rental values and profits.

• The state of Missouri spent \$6 million to create the 200-mile KATY Trail, which generated travel and tourism expenditures of over \$6 million in its first full year of operation alone.

• Urban and rural species of plants and wildlife use greenways as migratory corridors.

• Greenways can reduce traffic congestion by serving as alternative transportation corridors.

• Greenways along streams filter stormwater run-off to improve water quality and provide greater capacity for storing floodwater.

PLEASE SHARE THIS NEWSLETTER!

Page 3

April 2001

Future of Metropolitan Greenways to be Discussed at Three Regional Workshops

What should the Kansas City metropolitan area look like in ten years? Twenty years? To what areas or destinations would you like to be able to walk? What types of improvements should be made to the metropolitan "green infrastructure?"

Greenways Incorporated will ask local residents to answer these and other questions at public workshops April 24th, 25th, and 26th. Results from these workshops will be used to build upon the various community greenway plans throughout the Kansas City metropolitan area. regarding:
The opportunities and constraints for greenways in the metro region.

Residents are encouraged to bring comments

- Passive outdoor recreation needs.
- Greenway needs that address quality of life issues.
- · Wildlife populations and habitat.
- Historical or culturally important community sites.
- Important ecological communities and natural features.



Greenways, Inc. has already been hard at work, gathering base information toward developing a vision and goals for Kansas City greenways. A framework for action will be based on these goals.

Residents are urged to stop by the workshops and learn about the Kansas City MetroGreen Plan. Participants will be asked for input regarding the greenway needs and priorities of the Kansas City metropolitan area so as to develop a community vision, goals and objectives for this project.

The map (at right) shows the schematic concept produced as a part of the 1991 MetroGreen Plan.

April 2001
Kansas City MetroGreen News

A Kansas City Metropolitan Greenway System



Development of Kansas City Greenway Plan Underway

A series of public workshops is planned for this June (see specific dates above) to continue the development of a metropolitan area greenway system — MetroGreen. Mid-America Regional Council (MARC), the metropolitan planning organization and association of city and county governments, is working with a team of experts led by

connects existing facilities and incorporates existing local plans. The MetroGreen Plan builds upon a plan produced in 1991 by the Prairie Gateway Chapter of the American Society of Landscape Architects.

Public education and partnership-building are essential components of this planning process.

Greenways, Inc. The team also includes the Trust for Public Land, Patti Banks Associates, and ETC Institute. MARC is in the process of crafting a community MetroGreen vision. Receiving input from interested citizens is critical to successfully producing a MetroGreen plan that the metropolitan community supports.

The MetroGreen Plan will identify a regional system of trails and greenways that



Participants in Lee's Summit

This round of workshops is the second of three sets of public working sessions designed to gather input from neighborhood residents, government officials, environmentalists, developers, historians, and other interested groups. These workshops will display the feedback received during the first round of meetings with the hopes that new community input will build upon previous workshops. The final plan will be released in late fall of 2001.

June 2001

First Round of MetroGreen Workshops a Success

T he first round of MetroGreen workshops were well-attended and productive. Almost 100 people stopped by to contribute to the project their knowledge of the region and to learn more about existing area trails and municipal greenway plans. Area television stations and *The Kansas City Star* sent reporters to learn more about the MetroGreen project and to talk to local citizens about their needs and desires for a regional greenway system.

At the workshops, participants were encouraged to make notations and draw potential trail routes directly on county maps and a map of the metropolitan region. Comment forms were also available for people to leave written comments and answer

What is a Greenway?

A Greenway is:

- A way of connecting people and places along natural or human-made corridors;
- A linear landscape that protects the natural, historic and social character of an area;
- An area for people to play, walk, bicycle, socialize and relax.



Greenways serve as recreational amenities. June 2001



Greenways help preserve historical resources.

questions about how they might use a MetroGreen trail system. Additionally, area municipalities had their greenway maps on display. Residents can register their ideas online at MARC's website at www.marc.org/ Community/metrogreensurvey.htm

Over 70 possible segments of a MetroGreen system were proposed and nearly ten trails already in use were identified (see pages 2 and 3 for a list of proposed corridor segments and a corresponding map). As this project continues, more needed connections will be identified and the comprehensive MetroGreen system will continue to take shape.

For more information please contact:

Mid-America Regional Council 600 Broadway, Suite 300 Kansas City, MO 64105 816/474-4240 www.marc.org

PLEASE SHARE THIS NEWSLETTER!

Page 4

Kansas City MetroGreen News



Kansas City MetroGreen Plan
92-9



Summary of Public Input

Kansas City MetroGreen News

A Kansas City Metropolitan Greenway System

August 2001

Second round of public workshops completed

Meetings with a broad range of stakeholders were held in May, June and July to further refine the MetroGreen Action Plan. MetroGreen is a regional system of 1,000 miles of green corridors and trails linking Johnson, Leavenworth, Wyandotte, Cass, Clay, Jackson, and Platte counties in the Kansas City area. The action plan will identify the regional system and assign priorities to every segment for implementation. Design standards, funding strategies and governance recommendations for a regional citizens alliance will be included in the plan.

Local government parks, public works and planning professionals offered advice on the MetroGreen system design and identification of priority corridors. A May meeting with local officials from the US Army Corps of Engineers and area levee districts focused on opportunities to add trails and public access along the Missouri and Kansas rivers.

A series of public workshops were held in late June in Gladstone, Merriam and Kansas City, Missouri, to share information and obtain additional input from area residents. Informal discussions with business and civic leaders in June provided valuable insights for the funding and governance aspects of the action plan. A presentation on the economic value that trails and greenways offer to private development was made to the Kansas City District Council of the Urban Land Institute on June 27.

A public survey will be distributed in late August to help MARC and its consultants better understand public attitudes on MetroGreen. A final round of public meetings will be held in October, and the completed plan will be available by early December.

What is a Greenway?

A greenway is:

- A way of connecting people and places along natural or human-made corridors;
- A linear landscape that protects the natural, historic and social character of an area;
- An area for people to play, walk, bicycle, socialize and relax.

The Hall Family Foundation and the William T. Kemper Foundation have provided funding to support the plan.

To view the most current version of the draft plan and list of corridors online, go to MARC's web site at www.marc.org/metrotrails.htm.



Community members have given comments as part of informal surveys as well as writing and drawing on maps at the MetroGreen public workshops.

www.marc.org/metrotrails.htm

Kansas City MetroGreen News



Members of the Prairie Gateway chapter of the ASLA review MetroGreen maps at Fitz's Restaurant in Union Station.

ASLA Prairie Gateway Chapter continues work on MetroGreen

In 1991, the American Society of Landscape Architects (ASLA) held its Annual Meeting in Kansas City. As is customary, the local chapter presented a gift to the host city: the Vision of a Kansas City Metropolitan Greenway System, or MetroGreen.

In June, the Prairie Gateway chapter of ASLA gathered at Fitz's Restaurant to give input and review the progress of the 2001 Action Plan. Attendees were glad to see that current work is building on their early efforts and that the 1991 Vision was being updated with a specific action plan. The June 22 charrette gave chapter members an opportunity to delineate trail routes, identify possible access points, and highlight key connections to regional amenities.

For more information please contact:

Mid-America Regional Council 600 Broadway, Suite 300 Kansas City, MO 64105 816/474-4240 www.marc.org

MetroGreen will benefit Kansas City region

The development of MetroGreen will bring many benefits to residents in the Kansas City area. MetroGreen will be a comprehensive metropolitan trail system that links together local trail systems to increase the travel options of walkers, joggers and cyclists.

The benefits of a fully-developed MetroGreen system include: preservation or restoration of important green corridors for stormwater management and water quality protection; non-automotive options for people that commute to work and school; more recreation resources; a more unified metropolitan area; and greater access to Kansas City's economic, cultural and historic destinations.

How long will it take?

The current draft of the regional system includes 1,030 miles of planned greenways and trails, much of it along streams throughout the seven-county area. Some of the trail segments are along highways offering bicyclists scenic routes to reach other trails for various destinations. A few segments make use of old railroad corridors.

Approximately 70 miles of the system exists today and another 75 miles is planned by local communities to be open for public use within the next five years. Over 300 miles could be added to the regional system within five to 15 years and the remaining segments would be available to the public 15 to 25 years into the future.

PLEASE SHARE THIS NEWSLETTER!

appendix B

Citizen Survey

Overview of the Methodology

The Mid-America Regional Council conducted a random sample household mail/phone survey in the seven counties of the metropolitan Kansas City community as part of the overall planning process for MetroGreen.

The survey was administered by ETC Institute. ETC Institute worked in close association with officials from the Mid-America Regional Council and Greenways, Incorporated on the design of the survey document. This work allowed the survey to be tailored to issues of strategic importance in understanding the most important goals, benefits, potential usage, and support for development of a regional system of greenways and trails throughout the Kansas City metropolitan region.

A total of 1247 surveys were completed in the seven counties, with a minimum of 100 surveys being completed in each of the counties. 47% of the total surveys were completed by males and 53% by females. Results from the entire sampling of 1247 households have a 95% level of confidence with a precision of at least +-2.8%.

This appendix contains 1) an executive summary of highlights of the survey respondents; 2) charts and graphs of respondents' answers; 3) cross tabular analysis for survey findings by County of respondent, gender, and current usage/non-usage of off-road trails; and 4) a copy of the survey instrument.

Highlights of the Survey Responses:

Preserving water quality and safety from crime in neighborhoods are the most important issues to survey respondents out of 14 potential choices. In ALL seven counties, preserving water quality was the number one most important issue. 30% of respondents picked it as their number one most important issue and 52% picked it as one of their three most important issues. Safety from crime in neighborhoods was the second most important issue in ALL seven counties.



Summary of Results

More than 80% of respondents are either very supportive (57%) or somewhat supportive (27%) of using the 1,000 mile MetroGreen system for projects such as walking and biking trails, creating transportation linkages between neighborhoods, and habitats for animals, when they were informed that three-quarters of MetroGreen was in a floodplain which could not be used for permanent developments. In ALL seven counties at least 69% of household respondents were very supportive or somewhat supportive of using MetroGreen for these projects.

Protecting water quality by establishing buffers along rivers and streams is the overwhelming most important goal for MetroGreen to accomplish. Out of 10 potential goals, fully 47% of survey respondents indicated protecting water quality as their number one most important goal and 69% indicated it was one of their three most important goals. Protecting water quality by establishing buffers along rivers and streams was the number one most important goal in ALL seven counties.

Other important goals (based on a sum of respondents' top three choices) included: provide habitats for wildlife, birds, and plant life (46%); provide outdoor park space for passive activities such as picnicking and other leisure activities (25%); increase property values of homes and businesses along trails and greenways (24%); provide education programs related to nature and the environment (23%); and provide recreational usages for flood plain areas that cannot be developed (22%).

69% of respondents indicated that understanding how greenways can be used to help protect water quality and protect against flooding would either greatly increase (36%) or somewhat increase (33%) their support for the development of MetroGreen. In ALL seven counties at least 67% of respondents indicated this knowledge would increase their support. 34% of respondents indicated that they currently use offroad trails, with 66% indicating they don't use such trails. Current usage is highest in Johnson County (53%). Males (35%) and females (32%) have very similar current usage of trails.

78% of respondents indicated they would like to see more places to walk and bike in their communities. In ALL seven counties at least 68% of respondents would like to see more places to walk and bike in their communities. More than 80% of survey respondents indicated they would use a trails system at least once per month if it had the amenities they wanted, with 36% indicating they would use it at least once a week. Clay County had the highest once a week potential usage (44%).

40% of respondents selected bi-state sales tax as one of their top three choices to support from a list of nine (9) potential tax-based funding sources to help fund purchasing, restoring, and maintaining areas for trails and greenways in their communities. Based on their top three

choices, the next most supported tax sources were: county sales tax for parks and trails (37%); city sales tax for parks and trails (27%); county sales tax for stormwater (23%); county property tax for parks and trails (21%) and city sales tax for stormwater (19%).

62% of respondents selected gifts from private foundations as one of their top two choices to support from a listing of five (5) non-tax revenue sources to help fund purchasing, restoring, and maintaining areas for trails and greenways. Based on a sum of their top two choices, the next most supported non-tax sources were federal/state grants (48%) and donations from developers (45%).

At least 59% of respondents indicated that ALL of the public, nonprofit and private organizations indicated in the survey should be involved in the process to purchase, restore and maintain natural areas in their community, showing support for a partnering approach to such decision-making.

When respondents were asked the two ways they would most support organizations working to develop MetroGreen; 42% indicated a partnership of the State of Kansas and State of Missouri; 41% a partnership of public agencies (cities, counties, and state governments) and private businesses; and 39% a partnership of public agencies (cities, counties, and state governments).

79% of respondents indicated that compared to other community issues, developing new trails should be a very high (10%), high (31%), or medium (38%) priority. In ALL seven (7) counties at least 64% of respondents indicated it should be a medium priority or higher.





















Q7. Importance of Specific Goals That Could Be Accomplished by Metro Green

Protect water quality with buffers		74%		20%	3%
Habitats for wildlife, birds & plant life	569	/6	35%	6	%3%
Outdoor park space for passive activities	47%		43%	8	%%
Educational programs	42%	4	4%	119	63%
Recreational usages for floor plain areas	42%	42	2%	11%	5%
Promote personal fitness and health	40%	44	%	13%	3%
Alternative transportation routes	35%	42%		17%	6%
Reveal & interpret unique history of KC region	27%	48%		19%	6%
Increase property value	35%	38%		22%	5%
Travel linkages between neighborhoods	21%	49%	2	3%	7%
rail network along the Missouri & Kansas River	22%	46%	2	6%	6%
09	6 20%	40% 60%	% 80	1%	1009
Very Important Somewhat	Important	Not Important	Don't k	now	

Kansas City MetroGreen Plan





B-9



















Q13. Support for Possible Funding Mechanisms for Purchasing, Restoring, and Maintaining Areas for Trails and Greenways in Respondent's Community













B-16









B-18









Kansas City MetroGreen Plan











N=1247			Q20 C	county you	live in			Q2 Respond		Q10 A currently any off 1	using	Total
			Leave-		Johnso-		wyando-					
	Cass	Clay	nworth	Jackson	n KS	Platte	tte	male	female	yes	no	
<u>Q1 # of </u>	people in ho	ousehold										
1	15%	14%	20%	25%	20%	19%	20%	18%	22%	14%	23%	20%
2	42%	43%	34%	44%	33%	42%	42%	44%	36%	36%	41%	40%
3	19%	23%	17%	16%	19%	15%	17%	17%	19%	21%	16%	18%
4	20%	16%	20%	10%	20%	18%	14%	17%	16%	22%	14%	16%
5+	3%	5%	9%	5%	7%	5%	6%	5%	7%	6%	6%	6%

N=1247			O20 C	ounty you	live in			Q2 Respond	25 lents sex	Q10 A currently any off 1	using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q3a Preserving wa	ter quality											
very important	92%	89%	83%	90%	92%	88%	92%	87%	92%	91%	89%	90%
somewhat	8%	9%	12%	9%	7%	11%	6%	10%	7%	8%	9%	8%
not sure	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%
not important	0%	1%	4%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%

N=1247

			Q20 C	ounty you	live in				25 lents sex	currently any off	y using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q3b Reduce impac	ts of flood	ing										
very important	53%	50%	60%	60%	52%	54%	73%	47%	67%	54%	59%	57%
somewhat	42%	41%	31%	31%	38%	40%	22%	41%	29%	39%	32%	34%
not sure	2%	6%	4%	5%	5%	1%	3%	6%	3%	3%	5%	5%
not important	3%	3%	5%	4%	5%	5%	2%	7%	1%	3%	4%	4%

Q10 Are

N=1247			020.0	ounty you	live in				25 dents sex	Q10 A currently any off	y using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q3c Improving hea	alth/fitness-	residents										
very important	48%	38%	47%	48%	45%	60%	60%	43%	54%	52%	47%	48%
somewhat	34%	49%	35%	35%	40%	30%	31%	38%	36%	40%	36%	37%
not sure	13%	8%	6%	11%	7%	4%	5%	11%	5%	5%	9%	8%
not important	6%	6%	11%	7%	7%	6%	5%	8%	5%	3%	9%	7%

N=1247

N=1247			Q20 C		Q2 Respond	25 lents sex	Q10 A currently any off r	using	Total			
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q3d Bi-state coope	eration											
very important	50%	45%	38%	45%	38%	47%	52%	40%	47%	42%	44%	44%
somewhat	32%	32%	45%	34%	37%	39%	25%	35%	34%	39%	32%	34%
not sure	11%	16%	10%	13%	15%	8%	15%	13%	14%	12%	15%	14%
not important	7%	7%	7%	8%	10%	7%	8%	11%	5%	7%	9%	8%

N=1247								Q	25	Q10 currently		
			Q20 C	ounty you	live in			Respond	lents sex	any off	rd trail	Total
			Leave-		Johnso-		wyando-					
	Cass	Clay	nworth	Jackson	n KS	Platte	tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q3e Safety from c	rime in neig	ghborhood	1									
very important	87%	84%	83%	90%	86%	83%	93%	83%	91%	86%	88%	87%
somewhat	11%	14%	12%	8%	12%	15%	5%	14%	7%	13%	9%	11%
not sure	2%	1%	3%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%
not important	0%	1%	2%	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	1%	2%	1%

N=1247

			Q20 C	ounty you	live in			-	25 lents sex	currently any off	e	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q3f Quality of life	e-children/fa	amilies										
very important	82%	77%	83%	82%	79%	79%	89%	73%	89%	84%	80%	81%
somewhat	16%	20%	9%	13%	18%	18%	8%	22%	8%	14%	16%	15%
not sure	2%	2%	4%	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	1%	3%	2%
not important	0%	1%	4%	2%	1%	1%	1%	2%	1%	0%	2%	1%

Q10 Are

N=1247			0200	County you	live in			-	25 lents sex	Q10 currently any off	y using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q3g Quality of edu	ucation K-1	2										
very important	90%	87%	82%	88%	85%	82%	90%	81%	92%	89%	85%	87%
somewhat	7%	10%	10%	7%	11%	16%	7%	13%	6%	6%	11%	9%
not sure	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	0%	1%	4%	1%	3%	2%	2%
not important	0%	1%	5%	1%	2%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%

N=1247

N=1247			Q20 C	county you	live in			-	25 lents sex	Q10 A currently any off f	y using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q3h Economic we	ll being of 1	residents										
very important	58%	57%	56%	66%	54%	62%	79%	55%	67%	60%	62%	62%
somewhat	36%	35%	33%	29%	38%	30%	17%	34%	29%	34%	30%	32%
not sure	4%	7%	7%	4%	7%	6%	2%	8%	3%	5%	5%	4%
not important	2%	1%	4%	1%	1%	2%	2%	3%	1%	0%	2%	2%

N=1247			000 0		1			-	25	Q10 A currently	y using	T (1
-	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	ounty you Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	Respond male	female	any off 1 yes	no	Total
Q3i Property values	S											
very important	61%	51%	58%	63%	55%	60%	73%	55%	65%	57%	61%	60%
somewhat	36%	41%	31%	31%	38%	37%	19%	37%	30%	37%	32%	33%
not sure	3%	6%	7%	4%	5%	2%	4%	5%	4%	5%	4%	5%
not important	0%	2%	4%	2%	2%	1%	4%	3%	2%	1%	3%	2%

N=1247

			Q20 C	ounty you	live in			-	25 lents sex	currently any off 1	U	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q3j Linking neigh	borhoods to	ogether										
very important	29%	20%	26%	31%	25%	27%	44%	23%	35%	30%	28%	29%
somewhat	44%	49%	42%	44%	46%	50%	36%	45%	44%	46%	44%	44%
not sure	8%	18%	17%	14%	18%	15%	12%	18%	12%	14%	15%	15%
not important	20%	13%	14%	12%	11%	9%	8%	15%	9%	10%	13%	12%

Q10 Are

N=1247 Q20 County you live in									Q25 Respondents sex		Q10 Are currently using any off rd trail	
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	Total
Q3k Acquiring/pro	otecting nati	ural areas										
very important	55%	53%	46%	57%	51%	55%	64%	46%	63%	64%	50%	55%
somewhat	31%	34%	36%	31%	38%	35%	26%	38%	30%	31%	35%	33%
not sure	6%	6%	8%	8%	5%	6%	6%	8%	5%	2%	8%	7%
not important	8%	7%	9%	4%	6%	4%	4%	9%	2%	3%	7%	5%

N=1247

N=1247	Q20 County you live in								Q25 Respondents sex		Q10 Are currently using any off rd trail	
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q31 Being a world class city												
very important	34%	28%	23%	36%	28%	30%	45%	27%	37%	31%	33%	32%
somewhat	36%	41%	33%	38%	43%	40%	34%	38%	39%	41%	38%	39%
not sure	13%	13%	16%	12%	12%	10%	9%	13%	11%	12%	12%	12%
not important	18%	18%	27%	14%	17%	20%	13%	22%	13%	16%	17%	17%
N=1247								Q	25	Q10 currently		
--------------------------------------	--------------------	-------------------	------------	-----------	---------	--------	---------	---------	-----------	---------------	----------	-------
			Q20 C	ounty you	live in			Respond	lents sex	any off a	rd trail	Total
			Leave-		Johnso-		wyando-					
	Cass	Clay	nworth	Jackson	n KS	Platte	tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q3m Quality of loo very important	cal governn 59%	nent servi 57%	ces 56%	66%	54%	56%	80%	57%	66%	58%	63%	61%
somewhat	34%	39%	34%	27%	39%	40%	16%	36%	29%	36%	30%	32%
not sure	4%	5%	7%	5%	6%	1%	2%	5%	4%	4%	5%	5%
not important	3%	0%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%

N=1247

N=1247			Q20 C	county you	live in			-	25 lents sex	Q10 A currently any off 1	using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q3n Linking neigh	borhood-co	ommunity	facil									
very important	35%	32%	40%	39%	28%	37%	56%	30%	43%	37%	37%	37%
somewhat	48%	48%	38%	40%	54%	43%	29%	47%	42%	48%	42%	44%
not sure	9%	11%	15%	14%	10%	14%	8%	12%	10%	10%	12%	11%
not important	9%	9%	7%	8%	8%	7%	6%	11%	5%	5%	9%	8%

N=1247									25 ondents	Q10 currently	y using	
			-	ounty you				S	ex	any off	rd trail	Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q4 Most important												
A=water quality	35%	28%	33%	28%	28%	32%	34%	30%	30%	28%	31%	30%
B=reduce flooding	0%	2%	3%	2%	3%	5%	6%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%
C=health/fitness	1%	3%	4%	3%	4%	1%	2%	4%	2%	5%	2%	3%
D=Bi-state coop	1%	2%	1%	1%	4%	2%	2%	3%	1%	2%	2%	2%
E=safety-crime	26%	20%	22%	20%	21%	16%	22%	20%	21%	20%	22%	21%
F=quality of life	16%	12%	12%	12%	14%	5%	10%	13%	12%	14%	11%	12%
G=education K-12	16%	18%	16%	19%	12%	15%	14%	15%	16%	13%	17%	16%
H=economic well-being	2%	3%	1%	3%	3%	11%	1%	3%	3%	4%	3%	3%
I=property values	1%	1%	0%	3%	3%	3%	2%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%
J=link neighborhd	0%	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%
K=natural areas	2%	5%	0%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	2%	4%	2%	3%
L=world class city	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%	0%	1%	0%	0%
M=local govt svcs	0%	2%	0%	2%	2%	1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	1%
N=link neigh/comm	0%	0%	0%	0%	1%	3%	1%	1%	1%	0%	1%	1%
Z=NONE SELECTED	1%	4%	7%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%

N=1247									25 ondents	Q10 currently	y using	
			-	ounty you				S	ex	any off	rd trail	Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female	yes 1	no 2	
Q4 2nd most												
A=water quality	11%	14%	10%	9%	15%	16%	6%	13%	11%	13%	11%	12%
B=reduce flooding	8%	9%	17%	7%	5%	7%	12%	9%	8%	6%	9%	8%
C=health/fitness	9%	5%	5%	4%	4%	4%	7%	4%	6%	5%	5%	5%
D=Bi-state coop	2%	1%	2%	4%	2%	1%	0%	3%	1%	2%	2%	2%
E=safety-crime	15%	20%	18%	24%	22%	11%	19%	19%	21%	19%	21%	20%
F=quality of life	15%	10%	11%	11%	11%	14%	13%	12%	12%	13%	11%	12%
G=education K-12	20%	16%	22%	18%	19%	24%	17%	18%	20%	19%	19%	19%
H=economic well-being	6%	3%	2%	5%	5%	3%	8%	6%	4%	6%	4%	5%
I=property values	5%	5%	2%	6%	4%	4%	6%	5%	5%	3%	6%	5%
J=link neighborhd	3%	1%	0%	1%	2%	3%	2%	2%	1%	1%	2%	2%
K=natural areas	4%	5%	0%	3%	6%	9%	3%	5%	4%	7%	3%	4%
L=world class city	0%	0%	0%	0%	2%	0%	0%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%
M=local govt svcs	2%	5%	4%	3%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%
N=link neigh/comm	0%	1%	0%	1%	1%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	0%
Z=NONE SELECTED	1%	5%	7%	4%	2%	3%	4%	3%	4%	3%	4%	3%

1047 ъ.

N=1247									25 ondents	Q10 currently		
			-	ounty you				-	ex	any off		Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q4 3rd most												
A=water quality	14%	11%	8%	12%	10%	5%	10%	10%	11%	8%	12%	10%
B=reduce flooding	3%	4%	5%	4%	7%	1%	3%	5%	4%	5%	4%	4%
C=health/fitness	7%	7%	7%	7%	6%	9%	8%	6%	7%	8%	6%	7%
D=Bi-state coop	5%	1%	2%	2%	3%	3%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%
E=safety-crime	16%	14%	19%	10%	13%	14%	14%	13%	14%	13%	14%	14%
F=quality of life	11%	13%	10%	12%	11%	13%	9%	9%	14%	11%	12%	11%
G=education K-12	15%	16%	14%	15%	15%	18%	12%	16%	14%	15%	14%	15%
H=economic well-being	4%	4%	3%	6%	6%	12%	8%	6%	6%	6%	6%	6%
I=property values	7%	5%	11%	8%	7%	5%	8%	8%	7%	6%	8%	7%
J=link neighborhd	1%	0%	0%	1%	2%	0%	3%	1%	1%	2%	1%	1%
K=natural areas	5%	7%	6%	7%	8%	9%	4%	6%	8%	10%	5%	7%
L=world class city	0%	1%	1%	1%	2%	3%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	1%
M=local govt svcs	6%	8%	6%	8%	5%	5%	9%	8%	6%	5%	7%	7%
N=link neigh/comm	3%	5%	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Z=NONE SELECTED	4%	5%	7%	6%	4%	4%	5%	4%	5%	4%	5%	5%

question 4 top three issues considered to be most important

N=1247								-	25 ondents	Q10 currently		
			Q20 Co	ounty you				-	ex	any off		Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q4 Sum of top 3 choices												
A=water quality	59%	53%	51%	49%	54%	53%	49%	53%	51%	49%	53%	52%
B=reduce flooding	11%	14%	25%	13%	15%	13%	20%	16%	15%	14%	16%	15%
C=health/fitness	17%	15%	16%	14%	13%	14%	17%	14%	15%	18%	13%	15%
D=Bi-state coop	8%	4%	5%	6%	8%	6%	5%	8%	5%	6%	6%	6%
E=safety-crime	56%	55%	59%	54%	57%	40%	55%	52%	57%	52%	56%	55%
F=quality of life	42%	35%	33%	35%	37%	31%	32%	33%	37%	38%	34%	35%
G=education K-12	50%	49%	52%	52%	45%	56%	43%	48%	50%	48%	50%	49%
H=economic well-being	12%	10%	6%	14%	13%	25%	17%	15%	13%	16%	13%	14%
I=property values	13%	11%	13%	17%	14%	12%	17%	15%	13%	11%	16%	14%
J=link neighborhd	4%	1%	1%	3%	5%	3%	5%	4%	3%	5%	3%	4%
K=natural areas	11%	17%	6%	12%	17%	21%	10%	13%	14%	20%	10%	14%
L=world class city	0%	1%	1%	1%	4%	4%	1%	3%	2%	4%	1%	2%
M=local govt svcs	8%	15%	10%	13%	8%	9%	14%	13%	10%	7%	13%	11%
N=link neigh/comm	3%	5%	1%	2%	2%	4%	4%	3%	3%	2%	3%	3%
Z=NONE SELECTED	1%	4%	7%	3%	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	3%	3%

N=1247			Q20 C	County you	live in			-	25 Jents sex	Q10 currently any off	using	Total
			Leave-		Johnso-		wyando-					
	Cass	Clay	nworth	Jackson	n KS	Platte	tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q5 Aware of Metr	o Green											
yes	20%	38%	23%	32%	37%	42%	18%	34%	30%	40%	27%	32%
no	80%	62%	77%	68%	63%	58%	82%	66%	70%	60%	73%	68%

N=1247			Q20 C	ounty you	livein			-	25 lents sex	Q10 currently any off	v using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q6 Support greenwa	ay system f	or walk/b	ike									
very supportive	61%	59%	52%	52%	65%	56%	53%	57%	58%	81%	46%	57%
somewhat	26%	25%	17%	35%	24%	29%	30%	27%	28%	15%	33%	27%
not sure	10%	9%	19%	9%	8%	11%	13%	10%	11%	3%	14%	11%
not supportive	3%	7%	12%	4%	3%	4%	4%	6%	3%	1%	7%	5%

question 7 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	county you	live in			-	25 dents sex	Q10 currently any off	using	
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jackson 4	Johnso- n KS 5	Platte 6	wyando- tte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q7a Build trail netwo	ork along M	lo/Ks rivr										
1=very important	16%	22%	25%	25%	21%	32%	23%	25%	22%	38%	16%	
2=somewhat	48%	48%	43%	48%	51%	45%	52%	45%	53%	50%	48%	
3=not important	36%	30%	31%	27%	27%	22%	25%	30%	25%	11%	36%	

question 7 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	County you	live in			-	25 lents sex	Q10 currently any off	y using	
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jackson 4	Johnso- n KS 5	Platte 6	wyando- tte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q7b Protect water qu	ality											
1=very important	79%	72%	68%	83%	72%	78%	81%	72%	81%	81%	74%	
2=somewhat	18%	23%	28%	16%	24%	19%	15%	24%	17%	17%	22%	
3=not important	3%	4%	4%	1%	3%	3%	5%	4%	2%	1%	4%	

question 7 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	county you	live in			-	25 lents sex	Q10 A currently any off 1	using
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jackson 4	Johnso- n KS 5	Platte 6	wyando- tte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2
Q7c Provide travel li	nkages btwi	n neighb									
1=very important	17%	19%	15%	27%	19%	27%	32%	19%	26%	28%	20%
2=somewhat	58%	55%	51%	49%	56%	55%	48%	49%	57%	56%	52%
3=not important	25%	26%	34%	24%	25%	18%	19%	32%	17%	16%	29%

question 7 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	county you	livein			-	25 lents sex	Q10 A currently any off 1	using	
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jackson 4	Johnso- n KS 5	Platte 6	wyando- tte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q7d Increase property	y value of h	ome/bus										
1=very important	38%	31%	27%	43%	29%	41%	53%	35%	39%	37%	37%	
2=somewhat	45%	42%	46%	37%	45%	39%	27%	38%	43%	42%	39%	
3=not important	16%	26%	26%	20%	26%	20%	20%	27%	18%	20%	24%	

φ

question 7 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	county you	live in			-	25 lents sex	Q10 currently any off	using	
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jackson 4	Johnso- n KS 5	Platte 6	wyando- tte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q7e Reveal/interpret	history of F	KC										
1=very important	25%	30%	22%	32%	23%	31%	37%	23%	33%	31%	28%	
2=somewhat	57%	50%	55%	49%	53%	49%	49%	51%	51%	52%	51%	
3=not important	18%	20%	22%	19%	24%	19%	14%	25%	15%	18%	21%	

question 7 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	ounty you	livein			-	25 Jents sex	Q10 currently any off	/ using	
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jackson 4	Johnso- n KS 5	Platte 6	wyando- tte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q7f Provide habitats-	wildlife bir	d plant										
1=very important	60%	56%	55%	60%	53%	61%	66%	52%	63%	64%	55%	
2=somewhat	34%	35%	37%	35%	42%	36%	28%	39%	33%	32%	38%	
3=not important	6%	9%	8%	5%	5%	3%	6%	8%	4%	3%	7%	

question 7 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	county you	live in			-	25 dents sex	Q10 A currently any off 1	using	
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jackson 4	Johnso- n KS 5	Platte 6	wyando- tte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q7g Outdoor park sp	ace passive	activity										
1=very important	46%	42%	43%	45%	53%	49%	54%	44%	52%	57%	44%	
2=somewhat	42%	51%	38%	48%	43%	40%	38%	47%	41%	40%	46%	
3=not important	13%	7%	18%	7%	5%	10%	7%	9%	7%	3%	11%	

question 7 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	county you	livein			-	25 lents sex	Q10 A currently any off 1	using	
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jackson 4	Johnso- n KS 5	Platte 6	wyando- tte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q7h Promote persona	l fitness/he	alth										
1=very important	41%	43%	33%	43%	37%	48%	52%	37%	47%	49%	38%	
2=somewhat	43%	44%	51%	44%	50%	41%	37%	46%	44%	44%	45%	
3=not important	16%	14%	16%	13%	12%	11%	11%	17%	10%	6%	17%	

question 7 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	County you	livein				25 lents sex	Q10 A currently any off 1	using
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jackson 4	Johnso- n KS 5	Platte 6	wyando- tte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2
Q7i Education progra	ams-nature	& enviror	1								
1=very important	50%	43%	38%	46%	36%	46%	54%	37%	49%	46%	42%
2=somewhat	40%	44%	44%	45%	52%	44%	37%	48%	42%	46%	45%
3=not important	11%	14%	18%	9%	13%	9%	9%	14%	8%	8%	13%

question 7 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	county you	live in			Q	25 lents sex	Q10 A currently any off a	using	
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jackson 4	Johnso- n KS 5	Platte 6	wyando- tte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q7j Alternative transp	ortation ro	utes										
1=very important	30%	34%	26%	43%	29%	40%	56%	31%	42%	41%	35%	
2=somewhat	58%	41%	51%	43%	50%	43%	34%	46%	45%	45%	46%	
3=not important	12%	25%	24%	14%	21%	18%	10%	23%	12%	14%	19%	

question 7 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247

N=1247			Q20 C	ounty you	livein			-	25 lents sex	Q10 currently any off	y using
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jackson 4	Johnso- n KS 5	Platte 6	wyando- tte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2
Q7k Recreational usa	age flood pla	ain areas									
1=very important	46%	37%	32%	47%	43%	45%	52%	39%	49%	56%	38%
2=somewhat	40%	47%	46%	43%	49%	45%	39%	47%	43%	39%	48%
3=not important	14%	15%	22%	10%	8%	9%	9%	14%	9%	5%	14%

N=1247								Respo	25 ndents	Q10 currently	using	
				ounty you				S	ex	any off	rd trail	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jacks-	Johns- on KS	Platte	wyan- dotte	male	female	Nos		
	1	2	3	on 4	5 5	6	7	1	2	yes 1	no 2	
Q8 1st goal												
A=trail network	5%	7%	10%	7%	4%	13%	8%	8%	6%	9%	6%	7%
B=water quality	56%	43%	53%	46%	45%	46%	48%	47%	47%	42%	50%	47%
C=travel linkage	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%	1%	5%	2%	2%	1%	3%	2%
D=property values	6%	7%	6%	9%	9%	8%	6%	8%	8%	7%	8%	8%
E=history of KC	2%	5%	1%	3%	5%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%	4%	3%
F=wildlife habitat	15%	11%	11%	9%	9%	10%	10%	9%	11%	12%	9%	10%
G=outdr park space	2%	9%	4%	3%	4%	4%	6%	5%	4%	5%	4%	5%
H=personal fitness	6%	3%	4%	2%	5%	0%	2%	4%	3%	5%	2%	3%
I=education prgms	2%	5%	2%	4%	3%	5%	1%	3%	4%	3%	4%	3%
J=transportation	0%	1%	0%	3%	2%	4%	3%	2%	2%	3%	2%	2%
K=rec usage-flood	1%	3%	1%	6%	7%	3%	3%	5%	4%	7%	4%	5%

N=1247			O20 Co	ounty you	ı live in			Respo	25 ondents ex	Q10 currently any off	using	Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female	yes	no 2	
Q8 2nd goal												
A=trail network	5%	3%	8%	4%	4%	4%	1%	6%	2%	7%	2%	4%
B=water quality	13%	18%	12%	14%	16%	13%	16%	15%	15%	18%	13%	15%
C=travel linkage	4%	3%	3%	4%	4%	6%	5%	4%	4%	4%	4%	4%
D=property values	12%	7%	13%	11%	8%	17%	14%	11%	11%	9%	11%	11%
E=histor of KC	5%	3%	7%	6%	3%	4%	5%	4%	5%	3%	5%	5%
F=wildlife habitat	22%	24%	21%	22%	23%	25%	18%	22%	23%	21%	23%	22%
G=outdr park space	9%	11%	9%	6%	13%	10%	9%	10%	9%	9%	10%	9%
H=personal fitness	7%	11%	8%	9%	7%	5%	9%	6%	9%	10%	7%	8%
I=eduacation prgms	10%	7%	9%	8%	7%	7%	5%	8%	7%	6%	8%	7%
J=transportation	4%	5%	0%	7%	7%	4%	5%	5%	6%	4%	6%	5%
K=rec usage	6%	3%	4%	4%	6%	1%	6%	5%	4%	5%	5%	5%

N=1247								-	25 ndents	Q10 currently	using	
			<u> </u>	ounty you				S	ex	any off	rd trail	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jacks- on	Johns- on KS	Platte	wyan- dotte	male	female	yes	no	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	1	2	
Q8 3rd goal												
A=trail network	0%	5%	4%	5%	5%	2%	1%	4%	3%	5%	3%	4%
B=water quality	7%	7%	9%	7%	8%	8%	3%	6%	8%	7%	7%	7%
C=travel linkage	1%	2%	2%	3%	2%	5%	6%	3%	3%	3%	3%	3%
D=property values	7%	5%	5%	4%	5%	3%	10%	6%	4%	6%	5%	5%
E=histor of KC	3%	5%	6%	4%	4%	5%	3%	5%	4%	5%	4%	4%
F=wildlife habitat	17%	15%	12%	15%	14%	15%	10%	14%	14%	16%	13%	14%
G=outdr park space	8%	9%	13%	12%	13%	9%	12%	11%	12%	12%	11%	11%
H=personal fitness	9%	12%	7%	9%	10%	12%	10%	11%	10%	11%	10%	10%
I=eduacation prgms	17%	13%	11%	11%	11%	14%	14%	11%	14%	12%	13%	13%
J=transportation	11%	7%	7%	8%	5%	9%	17%	8%	9%	7%	9%	8%
K=rec usage	17%	13%	12%	12%	16%	12%	6%	13%	13%	13%	13%	13%

question 8 top three goals most important

N=1247								-	25 ondents	Q10 currently		
			Q20 C	ounty you	ı live in			S	ex	any off	rd trail	Total
			Leave-	Jacks-	Johns-		wyan-					
	Cass	Clay	nworth	on	on KS	Platte	dotte	male	female	yes	no	
	I	2	3	4	5	6	7	1	2	1	2	
Q8 Sum of top 3 choices												
A=trail network	10%	14%	22%	16%	12%	19%	10%	18%	11%	21%	11%	14%
B=water quality	76%	67%	74%	67%	69%	67%	66%	68%	70%	67%	70%	69%
C=travel linkage	7%	7%	8%	8%	8%	12%	17%	9%	9%	9%	9%	9%
D=property values	25%	18%	24%	24%	21%	27%	30%	25%	23%	22%	24%	24%
E=history of KC	10%	13%	14%	13%	12%	12%	12%	12%	12%	11%	13%	12%
F=wildlife habitat	53%	51%	44%	47%	46%	50%	37%	45%	47%	49%	45%	46%
G=outdr park space	19%	28%	26%	21%	30%	23%	26%	25%	26%	27%	25%	25%
H=personal fitness	22%	25%	19%	20%	22%	17%	21%	21%	21%	26%	19%	21%
I=education prgms	29%	26%	22%	24%	21%	25%	20%	22%	25%	21%	24%	23%
J=transportation	15%	13%	7%	17%	14%	17%	25%	14%	17%	14%	17%	16%
K=rec usage-flood	24%	18%	17%	23%	29%	16%	15%	23%	21%	24%	21%	22%

N=1247							Q2		Q10 A currently	using
		-	ounty you			<u> </u>	Respond	ents sex	any off r	d trail
Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no
Q9 Knowledge greenway help pro	stect wat	ter								
greatly increase 39%	34%	29%	39%	37%	35%	39%	35%	38%	49%	30%
somewhat 33%	35%	40%	28%	38%	32%	31%	33%	34%	32%	34%
no change 25%	23%	22%	26%	21%	27%	19%	27%	20%	16%	27%
decreases 1%	1%	1%	1%	0%	2%	0%	1%	1%	0%	1%
don't know 3%	7%	8%	7%	4%	5%	11%	5%	8%	2%	8%
N=1247		0.00		1				25	Q10 A currently	y using
N=1247		-	County you			wyando-	Q Respond			y using
	Clay	Q20 C Leave- nworth	County you Jackson	live in Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte			currently	y using
	•	Leave-		Johnso-	Platte	•	Respond	lents sex	currently any off	y using rd trail
Cass	•	Leave-		Johnso-	Platte 31%	•	Respond	lents sex	currently any off	y using rd trail

N=1247			020.0	County you	live in			-	25 Jonta aay	Q10 currently	y using
			Leave-	County you	Johnso-		wyando-	Respond	lents sex	any off	
	Cass	Clay	nworth	Jackson	n KS	Platte	tte	male	female	yes	no
Q11 Like to see m	ore places to	walk/bik	e								
yes	80%	79%	68%	77%	79%	78%	78%	76%	79%	94%	69%
no	20%	21%	32%	23%	21%	22%	22%	24%	21%	6%	31%
N=1247			-	County you				Q2 Respond		Q10 acurrently any off r	using
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no
Q12 How often wo	uld use trail	system									
once a week	28%	44%	27%	32%	40%	40%	39%	36%	37%	57%	26%
few times a mo	25%	18%	21%	24%	24%	19%	29%	21%	26%	28%	21%
monthly	11%	9%	14%	11%	10%	10%	7%	9%	11%	8%	11%
once a month	15%	14%	10%	16%	14%	11%	12%	17%	11%	5%	18%
never	21%	15%	27%	17%	11%	20%	14%	17%	15%	1%	24%
don't know	0%	1%	1%	1%	0%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	1%

question 13 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	ounty you	ı live in			Respo	25 ondents ex	Q10 currently any off	using	Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q13a City sales tax fo	r parks/tra	ils										
1=very supportive	15%	21%	18%	21%	18%	14%	23%	19%	19%	27%	15%	19%
2=somewhat	49%	35%	36%	45%	42%	42%	46%	38%	47%	44%	42%	43%
3=not supportive	36%	44%	46%	34%	39%	44%	31%	43%	33%	30%	43%	38%

question 13 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	ounty you	ı live in			Respo	25 ondents ex	Q10 currently any off	using	Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q13b County sales tax	for parks	/trails										
1=very supportive	14%	21%	17%	25%	25%	20%	25%	22%	23%	34%	16%	23%
2=somewhat	50%	41%	42%	46%	46%	44%	47%	42%	49%	48%	44%	45%
3=not supportive	36%	37%	41%	29%	29%	36%	28%	35%	28%	18%	39%	32%

question 13 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	ounty you	ı live in			Respo	25 ondents ex	Q10 currently any off	using	Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q13c City sales tax for	r stormwa	ter										
1=very supportive	15%	15%	18%	22%	18%	15%	27%	17%	21%	21%	18%	19%
2=somewhat	54%	40%	42%	40%	41%	41%	47%	39%	46%	45%	41%	43%
3=not supportive	31%	45%	40%	38%	42%	44%	26%	44%	33%	33%	41%	38%

question 13 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	ounty you	ı live in			Respo	25 ondents ex	Q10 currently any off	using	Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q13d County sales tax	for storm	water										
1=very supportive	15%	18%	12%	17%	23%	15%	25%	18%	20%	24%	17%	19%
2=somewhat	48%	38%	48%	50%	45%	43%	44%	42%	49%	51%	43%	46%
3=not supportive	38%	44%	40%	33%	32%	43%	31%	40%	31%	26%	41%	35%

question 13 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	ounty you	ı live in			Respo	25 ondents ex	Q10 currently any off	using	Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q13e City property ta	x for parks	s/trails										
1=very supportive	15%	18%	18%	19%	15%	13%	17%	15%	18%	20%	15%	16%
2=somewhat	31%	25%	30%	30%	37%	34%	42%	31%	35%	36%	32%	34%
3=not supportive	55%	58%	51%	52%	48%	53%	41%	54%	47%	45%	54%	50%

question 13 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	ounty you	ı live in			Respo	25 ondents ex	Q10 currently any off	using	Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q13f County property	tax for pa	rks/trail										
1=very supportive	11%	17%	14%	19%	21%	17%	17%	16%	20%	24%	14%	18%
2=somewhat	31%	30%	32%	34%	39%	44%	44%	35%	38%	40%	35%	37%
3=not supportive	58%	53%	54%	46%	40%	39%	39%	49%	42%	36%	51%	45%

N=1247			020 C	ounty you	ı live in			Respo	25 ondents ex	Q10 currently any off	y using	Total
	Cass	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male	female 2	yes 1	no 2	<u> </u>
Q13g City property ta	ax for storn	<u>nwater</u>										
1=very supportive	9%	11%	12%	16%	15%	15%	20%	14%	15%	15%	14%	15%
2=somewhat	35%	34%	35%	35%	38%	30%	37%	33%	39%	39%	34%	35%
3=not supportive	55%	55%	53%	49%	47%	55%	44%	53%	46%	46%	52%	50%

question 13 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	ounty you	ı live in			Respo	25 ondents ex	Q10 currently any off	/ using	Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q13h County property	v tax for sto	ormwater	r									
1=very supportive	9%	12%	11%	15%	19%	16%	17%	14%	17%	21%	12%	15%
2=somewhat	32%	37%	35%	39%	41%	36%	37%	36%	40%	41%	36%	38%
3=not supportive	59%	51%	54%	47%	40%	48%	46%	50%	43%	39%	51%	47%

question 13 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	ounty you	ı live in			Respo	25 ondents ex	Q10 currently any off	v using	Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q13i Bi State sales tax	X											
1=very supportive	22%	30%	16%	35%	29%	28%	33%	28%	31%	38%	25%	29%
2=somewhat	42%	32%	46%	35%	30%	44%	42%	33%	40%	35%	37%	37%
3=not supportive	36%	38%	39%	30%	41%	28%	25%	39%	29%	27%	38%	34%

N-1247

N=1247			Q20 C	ounty you	live in			-	25 lents sex	Q10 acurrently any off	using	
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q14 Most support												
city sales-P&R	16%	16%	9%	15%	13%	13%	20%	14%	15%	16%	14%	
County sales-P&R	14%	16%	13%	12%	18%	14%	13%	14%	15%	21%	12%	
city sales storm	12%	5%	9%	7%	5%	4%	10%	6%	8%	3%	9%	
Cnty sales storm	6%	2%	4%	2%	5%	1%	5%	4%	4%	3%	4%	
City prop p&r	4%	3%	4%	3%	4%	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	3%	
Cnty prop p&r	2%	3%	5%	3%	6%	9%	2%	3%	5%	5%	4%	
city prop-storm	1%	1%	1%	1%	3%	4%	3%	3%	1%	1%	2%	
Cnty prop-storm	2%	1%	0%	1%	3%	2%	1%	2%	1%	2%	1%	
Bistate sales	19%	24%	16%	28%	22%	26%	24%	24%	23%	27%	22%	
NONE SELECTED	25%	29%	39%	29%	22%	25%	20%	26%	26%	18%	30%	

N=1247			020 0	ounty you	live in			-	25 Jonts soy	Q10 currently	using
			Leave-	ounty you	Johnso-		wyando-	Respond	lents sex	any off	
	Cass	Clay	nworth	Jackson	n KS	Platte	tte	male	female	yes	no
Q14 2nd support											
city sales-P&R	6%	9%	3%	9%	7%	16%	6%	8%	8%	12%	6%
County sales-P&R	17%	14%	13%	14%	16%	18%	17%	16%	15%	20%	13%
city sales storm	4%	5%	5%	5%	7%	5%	6%	5%	6%	6%	5%
Cnty sales storm	17%	13%	11%	10%	15%	7%	11%	11%	13%	10%	13%
City prop p&r	9%	5%	11%	8%	6%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%	7%
Cnty prop p&r	10%	9%	5%	10%	9%	8%	5%	10%	7%	12%	7%
city prop-storm	2%	3%	3%	2%	3%	2%	7%	3%	3%	2%	3%
Cnty prop-storm	4%	3%	3%	5%	7%	3%	3%	5%	4%	6%	4%
Bistate sales	6%	5%	4%	4%	3%	5%	8%	4%	5%	4%	5%
NONE SELECTED	26%	36%	42%	34%	28%	30%	28%	31%	32%	21%	37%

N=1247			O20 C	ounty you	live in			-	25 lents sex	Q10 currently any off	using
	Cass	Clay	Leave-	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no
Q14 3rd support											
city sales-P&R	6%	6%	3%	3%	6%	4%	6%	5%	4%	6%	4%
County sales-P&R	7%	9%	3%	9%	6%	12%	4%	7%	7%	8%	6%
city sales storm	13%	5%	4%	7%	6%	6%	8%	6%	8%	9%	6%
Cnty sales storm	4%	5%	8%	7%	9%	6%	10%	8%	7%	9%	6%
City prop p&r	7%	5%	3%	4%	7%	2%	5%	5%	5%	6%	5%
Cnty prop p&r	6%	9%	5%	7%	10%	12%	10%	9%	9%	12%	7%
city prop-storm	4%	6%	9%	6%	6%	3%	6%	6%	6%	5%	7%
Cnty prop-storm	7%	3%	7%	5%	9%	9%	6%	7%	6%	6%	7%
Bistate sales	15%	12%	12%	12%	10%	11%	14%	12%	12%	13%	12%
NONE SELECTED	32%	40%	46%	39%	32%	36%	31%	36%	36%	27%	40%

question 14 top three funding sources

N=1247			020 C	ounty you	ı live in			Respo	25 ndents ex	Q10 currently any off	using	Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q14 Sum of top 3 choices												
A=city sales-P&R	28%	30%	15%	27%	26%	32%	32%	27%	28%	33%	24%	27%
B=County sales-P&R	38%	40%	29%	35%	40%	43%	34%	38%	37%	49%	31%	37%
C=city sales storm	29%	15%	18%	20%	17%	15%	25%	17%	21%	19%	20%	19%
D=Cnty sales storm	27%	19%	23%	19%	28%	14%	25%	22%	23%	22%	23%	23%
E=City prop p&r	20%	13%	18%	15%	16%	12%	15%	16%	15%	17%	15%	16%
F=Cnty prop p&r	18%	20%	15%	20%	25%	28%	17%	22%	20%	29%	17%	21%
G=city prop-storm	7%	10%	13%	10%	12%	9%	15%	12%	10%	8%	12%	11%
H=Cnty prop-storm	13%	7%	10%	10%	19%	14%	10%	13%	12%	14%	12%	13%
I=Bistate sales	40%	40%	32%	43%	35%	42%	46%	40%	39%	43%	38%	40%
Z=NONE SELECTED	25%	29%	39%	29%	22%	25%	20%	26%	26%	18%	30%	26%

question 15 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	County you	live in			Q		Q10 A currently any off 1	using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
	Cuss	Ciuj	nworun	Juckboll		Thutte		Intuite	Telliute		110	
Q15a Gifts from pr	ivate found	ations										
very supportive	84%	83%	77%	86%	82%	87%	79%	82%	84%	89%	79%	83%
somewhat	11%	11%	18%	13%	16%	12%	19%	16%	13%	11%	17%	14%
not supportive	5%	6%	5%	1%	1%	1%	3%	2%	3%	0%	4%	3%

question 15 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	County you	livein			Q2 Respond		Q10 A currently any off 1	using	Total
			Leave-		Johnso-		wyando-					
	Cass	Clay	nworth	Jackson	n KS	Platte	tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q15b Federal/State	grants											
very supportive	72%	72%	70%	78%	71%	78%	74%	70%	78%	80%	70%	74%
somewhat	20%	17%	17%	14%	22%	19%	19%	20%	17%	16%	20%	18%
not supportive	8%	10%	13%	8%	7%	3%	7%	10%	6%	4%	10%	8%

question 15 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	county you	livein			Q2 Respond		Q10 A currently any off 1	using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q15c User fees												
very supportive	26%	25%	34%	29%	22%	32%	32%	28%	27%	22%	30%	27%
somewhat	44%	36%	32%	35%	32%	39%	31%	36%	34%	31%	37%	35%
not supportive	30%	39%	33%	36%	46%	29%	36%	36%	39%	46%	33%	38%

question 15 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	ounty you	live in			-	25 lents sex	Q10 A currently any off 1	using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q15d Adopt a trail	volunteer p	orograms										
very supportive	66%	65%	63%	67%	62%	61%	67%	61%	68%	73%	60%	65%
somewhat	29%	27%	32%	25%	33%	33%	27%	32%	26%	24%	32%	29%
not supportive	4%	8%	5%	8%	5%	6%	6%	7%	6%	3%	8%	6%

question 15 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			0200	ounty you	livein			Q2 Respond		Q10 A currently any off r	using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	10111
Q15e Donations from	n develope	ers										
very supportive	80%	77%	71%	79%	80%	79%	72%	75%	80%	83%	75%	78%
somewhat	16%	14%	21%	16%	16%	15%	23%	18%	15%	12%	19%	16%
not supportive	4%	10%	8%	5%	4%	6%	5%	6%	5%	5%	6%	6%
N=1247			0	20 County	you live in				Q25 idents sex	Q10 currently any off	y using	
	Ca	ss Cl	Lea ay nwo	ve-	Johnso	- Platte	wyando- tte	· _ ·	female	yes	no	
Q16 Most support												
gifts foundations	4	7%	38% 4	-1% 38	3% 42%	6 389	6 45%	40%	42%	41%	40%	
federal/state grants	2	23% 2	24% 2	26% 23	3% 23%	6 239	% 26%	26%	22%	26%	23%	
user fees		6%	5%	7% 4	% 5%	6 79	6 5%	6%	5%	4%	6%	
adopt a trail		6%	11%	3% 8	s% 7%	6 49	6 2%	5%	8%	6%	6%	
developer donation	1	5%	14% 1	0% 19	0% 18%	6 239	% 18%	18%	16%	19%	17%	
NONE SELECTED		4%	9% 1	3%	9% 5%	6%	6 5%	6%	8%	4%	8%	

N=1247			Q20 C	County you	live in				25 lents sex	Q10 currently any off	using
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no
Q16 2nd most											
gifts	18%	25%	13%	23%	22%	23%	19%	23%	19%	23%	20%
federal/state	27%	20%	26%	21%	25%	30%	26%	23%	25%	26%	23%
user fees	5%	7%	7%	7%	4%	6%	6%	7%	5%	5%	6%
adopt a trail	17%	7%	15%	12%	14%	11%	16%	12%	14%	16%	11%
donations	30%	31%	24%	29%	29%	24%	27%	29%	28%	26%	29%
NONE SELECTED	4%	9%	15%	9%	6%	7%	6%	6%	9%	4%	10%

question 16 top two funding sources

N=1247								-	25 ondents	Q10 currently	/ using	
			Q20 C	ounty you				S	ex	any off	rd trail	Total
			Leave-	Jacks-	Johns-		wyan-					
	Cass	Clay	nworth	on	on KS	Platte	dotte	male	female	yes	no	
		2	3	4	5	6	7		2		2	
Q16 Sum of top 2 choices												
A=gifts foundations	64%	63%	54%	60%	64%	61%	63%	63%	61%	65%	60%	62%
B=federal/state grants	50%	45%	52%	44%	48%	53%	52%	49%	47%	52%	46%	48%
C=user fees	11%	12%	14%	11%	10%	13%	11%	12%	10%	8%	12%	11%
D=adopt a trail	23%	18%	18%	20%	21%	15%	18%	17%	21%	22%	18%	19%
E=developer donation	45%	45%	34%	48%	47%	46%	45%	48%	44%	45%	46%	45%
Z=NONE SELECTED	4%	9%	13%	9%	5%	6%	5%	6%	8%	4%	8%	7%

question 17 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	County you	live in				25 lents sex	Q10 A currently any off r	using	Total
-	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q17a Your city												
yes	53%	62%	54%	66%	73%	65%	63%	63%	67%	72%	61%	65%
no	34%	24%	29%	17%	15%	24%	21%	24%	17%	15%	24%	21%
don't know	13%	14%	17%	17%	12%	12%	15%	12%	16%	13%	15%	14%

question 17 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	County you	live in			-	25 lents sex	Q10 currently any off	using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q17b Your co	unty											
yes	65%	71%	57%	71%	77%	78%	68%	72%	71%	79%	67%	71%
no	25%	17%	26%	13%	13%	14%	17%	18%	14%	11%	19%	16%
don't know	10%	12%	17%	16%	10%	8%	16%	10%	14%	10%	14%	13%

question 17 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247			Q20 C	County you	live in			-	25 dents sex	Q10 A currently any off r	using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q17c State of M	lissouri											
yes	69%	66%	59%	69%	52%	75%	56%	60%	65%	65%	61%	62%
no	19%	21%	26%	14%	31%	14%	19%	24%	19%	21%	21%	21%
don't know	12%	13%	15%	18%	17%	12%	25%	16%	17%	14%	18%	17%

question 17 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247 Q20 County you live in									25 lents sex	Q10 Are currently using any off rd trail		Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q17d State of k	Kansas											
yes	50%	49%	70%	53%	67%	56%	76%	57%	64%	68%	57%	60%
no	31%	26%	21%	22%	21%	25%	14%	26%	18%	18%	24%	22%
don't know	20%	24%	9%	25%	13%	20%	10%	17%	18%	14%	20%	18%

. Р

question 17 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247 Q20 County you live in									25 lents sex	Q10 Are currently using any off rd trail		Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q17e Non prof	it organizat	ion										
yes	63%	54%	52%	56%	64%	62%	62%	61%	59%	64%	57%	59%
no	20%	26%	24%	19%	19%	20%	23%	23%	19%	18%	23%	21%
don't know	17%	20%	24%	25%	16%	19%	15%	16%	22%	18%	21%	20%

question 17 don't knows recoded to blanks

N=1247 Q20 County you live in									25 lents sex	Q10 Are currently using any off rd trail		Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q17f Private fo	oundations											
yes	67%	58%	60%	66%	65%	66%	66%	64%	65%	65%	64%	64%
no	17%	21%	18%	15%	18%	15%	20%	21%	13%	16%	18%	17%
don't know	16%	21%	22%	20%	18%	20%	14%	15%	22%	19%	18%	19%

question 18 top two ways public, nonprofit and private organizations work to <u>develop Metro Green</u>

N=1247			O20 C	ounty you	ı live in	Respo	25 ondents ex	Q10 Are currently using any off rd trail		Total		
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2	
Q18 Most support Metro C	Green											
1=public agency part	35%	41%	28%	40%	44%	36%	37%	41%	37%	51%	33%	39%
2=work separately	9%	13%	10%	10%	14%	14%	14%	12%	13%	10%	13%	12%
3=Ks/Mo partners	53%	46%	44%	44%	36%	35%	45%	40%	45%	39%	44%	42%
4=business & nonprofit	27%	21%	30%	31%	29%	23%	30%	27%	29%	22%	31%	28%
5=publc agencies	41%	41%	40%	38%	46%	49%	34%	41%	41%	49%	37%	41%
6=priv bus/landowners	21%	17%	21%	14%	12%	16%	17%	18%	13%	10%	18%	15%
7=other	3%	4%	9%	2%	4%	3%	3%	4%	3%	4%	3%	4%
0=none selected	1%	2%	4%	5%	4%	7%	6%	3%	5%	3%	5%	4%
N=1247								Q	25	Q10 currently	using	
-------------------	-------------	-----------	-----------------------	--------------	----------------------	-------------	---------------------	-----------	-----------	---------------	----------	-------
			Q20 C	County you	live in			Respond	lents sex	any off	rd trail	Total
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jackson 4	Johnso- n KS 5	Platte 6	wyando- tte 7	male 1	female	yes 1	no 2	
Q19 Priority deve	eloping new	trails										
1=very high	9%	11%	9%	8%	10%	13%	9%	10%	9%	16%	6%	10%
2=high	33%	27%	19%	35%	32%	26%	31%	30%	32%	39%	26%	31%
3=medium	36%	39%	36%	37%	40%	42%	37%	34%	42%	35%	40%	38%
4=low	19%	18%	26%	15%	14%	17%	13%	23%	10%	7%	21%	16%
9=don't know	4%	5%	10%	4%	4%	3%	10%	3%	7%	2%	7%	5%

question 19a two benefits need more information to make new trails higher priority

N=724			Q20 C	ounty you	ı live in			Respo	25 indents ex	Q10 currently any off	y using
	Cass 1	Clay 2	Leave- nworth 3	Jacks- on 4	Johns- on KS 5	Platte 6	wyan- dotte 7	male 1	female 2	yes 1	no 2
Q19a Benefit new trails can p	orovide										
1=altern transp	22%	15%	7%	21%	24%	18%	31%	19%	22%	23%	20%
2=flood plain use	34%	38%	29%	35%	32%	31%	27%	33%	32%	31%	33%
3=incr prop value	20%	14%	17%	23%	22%	15%	24%	20%	21%	22%	20%
4=better bike-walk routes	12%	19%	20%	23%	19%	16%	12%	18%	18%	25%	16%
5=preserve hist sites	14%	13%	17%	11%	11%	18%	8%	11%	13%	12%	12%
6=water quality	53%	46%	44%	50%	52%	42%	37%	47%	48%	50%	46%
7=wildlife habitat	25%	23%	20%	15%	22%	27%	20%	19%	23%	18%	22%
8=other	5%	5%	16%	4%	6%	6%	11%	8%	6%	9%	7%
0=none selected	5%	10%	9%	6%	4%	8%	10%	8%	5%	3%	8%

N=1247								-	25	Q10 currently	y using
			Q20 C	ounty you	live in			Respond	dents sex	any off	rd trail
	G		Leave-	T 1	Johnso-		wyando-	,	C 1		
	Cass	Clay	nworth	Jackson	n KS	Platte	tte	male	female	yes	no
Q22 # of years live i	n your coun	ty									
5 yrs or less	24%	20%	27%	13%	20%	24%	16%	20%	18%	20%	19%
6-10 years	16%	19%	11%	12%	15%	17%	5%	14%	13%	17%	11%
11-15 years	14%	9%	11%	10%	16%	11%	10%	10%	14%	14%	11%
16-10 years	13%	7%	11%	7%	12%	12%	9%	10%	9%	11%	9%
21-30 years	19%	15%	15%	15%	15%	16%	12%	15%	15%	14%	16%
31 years or more	15%	30%	24%	43%	21%	22%	47%	31%	31%	24%	34%

N=1247			020 0	County you	live in				25 lents sex	Q10 A currently any off	using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q23 What county	primary w	ork locati	on									
not employed	22%	24%	15%	21%	15%	16%	25%	18%	21%	9%	25%	20%
Cass	24%	0%	0%	1%	0%	0%	0%	2%	2%	2%	2%	2%
Clay	1%	33%	0%	1%	1%	11%	1%	5%	6%	7%	5%	6%
Leavenworth	0%	0%	54%	0%	1%	1%	1%	6%	4%	5%	5%	5%
Jackson	30%	20%	5%	56%	19%	16%	14%	28%	26%	33%	24%	27%
Johnson KS	12%	4%	11%	9%	53%	5%	21%	21%	22%	30%	18%	22%
Platte	0%	7%	1%	0%	1%	39%	2%	5%	5%	3%	5%	5%
Wyandotte	2%	3%	4%	3%	4%	4%	31%	7%	7%	6%	7%	7%
other	9%	9%	10%	7%	6%	9%	6%	8%	6%	6%	8%	7%

N=1247			020 0	ounty you	live in				25 lents sex	Q10 currently any off	using	Total
	Cass	Clay	Leave- nworth	Jackson	Johnso- n KS	Platte	wyando- tte	male	female	yes	no	
Q24 Responden	ts age											
under 25	5%	5%	4%	4%	4%	5%	7%	3%	6%	4%	5%	5%
25-34	7%	20%	14%	17%	17%	13%	16%	15%	17%	19%	14%	16%
35-44	21%	17%	23%	22%	24%	21%	16%	20%	22%	26%	19%	21%
45-54	27%	19%	22%	16%	25%	28%	18%	22%	21%	26%	20%	22%
55-64	19%	15%	19%	15%	13%	14%	18%	18%	13%	14%	16%	16%
65-74	11%	14%	7%	13%	10%	14%	14%	12%	12%	7%	15%	12%
75+	9%	9%	10%	12%	6%	6%	10%	9%	9%	3%	11%	9%

Citizen Survey

Document Survey

300 Rivergate Center 600 Broadway Kansas City, Missouri 64105-1554

816/474-4240 816/421-7758 FAX www.marc.org



September 2001

Dear Cass, Clay, Jackson, Johnson, Leavenworth, Platte and Wyandotte County Residents:

We need your input as we study the on-going development of a multi-purpose greenway trail system that runs through the seven counties. The metropolitan Kansas City area contains approximately 1,000 miles of greenway corridors that can be used for protecting water quality, preventing flooding problems, providing walking and biking trails, protecting plant and animal habitat and other purposes.

county area. We are working with ETC Institute (a professional survey consultant) in Olathe, Kansas to conduct the random survey. As part of our planning process, you are asked to participate in our random citizen survey of residents in the seven

confidential and results will be presented only in summary format. understanding of the preferences of residents within the seven counties. All individual responses will be in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. Your participation is very important, so please take the time to give your opinions and return the completed survey in the enclosed postage-paid envelope. The responses will provide the Steering Committee with a better

Thanks for taking the time to participate in the survey and for helping the community decide the important features for a coordinated planning of trails within the seven counties. Please call Marlene Nagel (Mid America Regional Council at 816-474-4240) if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Ameletis Subauge

Johnson County, KS Commissioner Mid-America Regional Council Board of Directors Annabeth Surbaugh, Chair



Johnson County, KS Annabeth Surbaugh Ist Vice Chair Dr. Charles A. Eddy Councilman Kansas City, MO

nissioner

2nd Vice Chair Carol Marinovich Mayor/CEO Unified Government of Wyandotte County/ Kansas City, KS

PRINTED ON 30% POST CONSUMER RECYCLED PAPER

Presiding Commit Cass County, MO Gene A. Molendorp missioner Secretary Merle Walker Councilman North Kansas City, MO

Executive Director David A. Warm

The Kansas City seven county area (Cass, Clay, Jackson, Platte, Leavenworth, Johnson (KS) and Wyandotte) is planning for the development of a multi-purpose greenway trail system that connects all seven counties in the metropolitan area. <u>This survey will take about 10-15 minutes to complete</u>. When you are finished, please return your survey in the enclosed postage-paid, return-reply envelope. <u>We greatly appreciate your time.</u>

1.	Counting yourself, ho	w many people live in	your household?	
2.	How many persons in	your household (cou	nting yourself) are:	
	Under 5 years	15 - 19 years	35 - 44 years	65+ years
	5 - 9 years	20 - 24 years	45 - 54 years	
	10 - 14 years	25 - 34 years	55 - 64 years	

3. Some issues that Metropolitan Kansas City communities are discussing are shown below. Please indicate the importance of each issue.

inc		Very Important	Somewhat Important	Not <u>Sure</u>	Not Important
A)	Preserving water quality				4
B)	Reduce impacts of flooding				4
C)	Improving health and fitness for area residents				
D)	Bi-state cooperation	1	2	3	4
E)	Safety from crime in neighborhoods	t			4
F)	Quality of life for children and famil	ies1			4
G)	Quality of education K-12				4
H)	Economic well-being of area residen	ts1			4
I)	Property values				
J)	Linking neighborhoods together				4
K)	Acquiring and protecting natural are	as1			4
L	Being a world class city	1			4
M)	Quality of local government services	s 1			4
N)	Linking neighborhoods to communit Facilities	ty			

 Select the three issues that you consider to be the most important by writing the letter(s) from question 3 above to indicate your choices.

Most	2 nd most
important	important

3rd most important

- 5. Are you aware that area communities are working together to plan a regional system of 1,000 miles of greenway corridors called "Metro Green" to protect water quality, for walking and biking trails, to protect plant and animal habitat, and other purposes?
 - ___(1) Yes
 - _(2) No

Citizen Survey

Page 2

- 6. Three-fourths of the Metro Green greenway system is in flood plain areas, which cannot be used for permanent developments such as housing, shops, or office and industrial developments. Knowing this, how supportive are you of using this 1,000 mile greenway system for projects such as walking and biking trails, creating transportation linkages between neighborhoods, and habitats for animals?
 - (1) Very supportive
 - (2) Somewhat supportive
 - (3) Not sure
 - (4) Not supportive
- 7. Some specific goals that could be accomplished by Metro Green are listed below. For each goal below, please indicate whether you think the goal is very important, somewhat important, or not important to members of your household by circling the corresponding number.

	Very	Somewhat		Don't
	Important	Important	Important	Know
A) Build a trail network along the Missouri and Kansas River	1		3	9
B) Protect water quality by establishing buffers along streams and rive	ers 1			9
C) Provide travel linkages between neighborhoods D) Increase property values of homes and businesses		2	3	9
along trails and greenways	1	2	3	9
E) Reveal and interpret the unique history of the Kansas City region				9
F) Provide habitats for wildlife, birds and plant life				9
G) Provide outdoor park space for passive activities, such as picnickin				
and other leisure activities.	-			9
H) Promote personal fitness and health				9
 Provide education programs related to nature and the environment. 				
J) Provide alternative transportation routes				
(K) Provide recreational usages for flood plain areas that cannot be dev				
				in the
letters below for your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choice using the letters from				in the
				in the
 letters below for your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choice using the letters from ^{1st} ^{2nd} ^{2nd} ^{3rd} ^{3rd} ^{3rd} ^{3rd} st st	m the list in q otect against Green?	flooding.	above.]	
 letters below for your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choice using the letters from ^{1st} ^{2nd} nd ^{3rd} ^{3rd} ^{3rd} ^{3rd} (1) Greatly increases my support (4) Decree (4) Decree	m the list in q otect against o Green? cases my supp	flooding.	above.]	
 letters below for your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choice using the letters from ^{1st} ^{2nd} nd ^{3rd} Greenways can be used to help protect water quality and prokenowledge impact your support for the development of Metro <u>(1)</u> Greatly increases my support <u>(4)</u> Decree <u>(2)</u> Somewhat increases my support <u>(5)</u> Don't <u>(5)</u> Don't 	m the list in q otect against o Green? cases my supp	flooding.	above.]	
 letters below for your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choice using the letters from ^{1st} ^{2nd} nd ^{3rd} Greenways can be used to help protect water quality and prokenowledge impact your support for the development of Metro (1) Greatly increases my support (4) Decree 	m the list in q otect against o Green? cases my supp	flooding.	above.]	
 letters below for your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choice using the letters from 1st 2nd 3rd 9. Greenways can be used to help protect water quality and proknowledge impact your support for the development of Metro (1) Greatly increases my support (4) Decre (2) Somewhat increases my support (5) Don't (3) No change 10. Are you or other members of your household currently usin	n the list in q otect against Green? ases my supp know	flooding.	above.]	
 letters below for your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choice using the letters from 1st 2nd 3rd 9. Greenways can be used to help protect water quality and proknowledge impact your support for the development of Metros (1) Greatly increases my support (4) Decret (2) Somewhat increases my support (5) Don't (3) No change 	n the list in q otect against Green? ases my supp know	flooding.	above.]	
 letters below for your 1st, 2nd, and 3rd choice using the letters from 1st 2nd 3rd 9. Greenways can be used to help protect water quality and proknowledge impact your support for the development of Metro (1) Greatly increases my support (4) Decre (2) Somewhat increases my support (5) Don't (3) No change 10. Are you or other members of your household currently usin	m the list in q otect against Green? ases my supp know g any off-roa	flooding. ort of trails?	above.]	

12. How often would you or members of your family use a trails system if it had the amenities you wanted?

- (1) at least once a week
- (4) less than once a month
- (2) a few times a month(3) monthly
- ___ (5) never

13. How supportive are you for each of the following possible funding mechanisms for purchasing, restoring and maintaining areas for trails and greenways in your community?

	Very Supportiv	somewhat <u>Supportive</u>	Not <u>Supportive</u>	Don't <u>Know</u>
(A)	City sales tax for parks and trails 1			9
(B)	County sales tax for parks and trails 1			
(C)	City sales tax for stormwater 1			
(D)	County sales tax for stormwater 1			9
(E)	City property tax for parks and trails 1			9
(F)	County property tax for parks and trails 1			
(G)	City property tax for stormwater 1			9
(H)	County property tax for stormwater 1			
(I)	Bi-State Sales tax 1			

14. Which THREE of the above funding sources would you most support using to help fund new trails in your area? [Write in the letters for your top three choices below using the letters from the list in question #13]

Most	2 nd Most	3 rd Most
Support	Support	Support

15. How supportive are you for using the following Non-Tax funding sources to assist in purchasing, restoring and maintaining areas for trails and greenways in your community?

(A)	Gifts from private foundations	Very Supportive	Somewhat Supportive 2	Not Supportive 3	Don't <u>Know</u> 9
(B)	Federal/State grants				
(C)	User fees				9
(D)	Adopt a trail volunteer programs				9
(E)	Donations from developers				9

16. Which TWO of the above funding sources would you most support using to help fund new trails in your area? [Write in the letters for your top two choices below using the letters from the list in question #15]

Most	
Support	

2nd Most Support

Page 4

17. Who should be involved in the process to purchase, restore and maintain natural areas in your community?

	Yes	No	Don't <u>Know</u>
(A) Your city			
(B) Your county			
(C) State of Missouri			
(D) State of Kansas			
(E) Non-Profit Organizations	I		
(F) Private Foundations			3

18. Metro Green will be composed of greenways in each of the seven counties in the Kansas City metropolitan area. Knowing this, from the following list please check the TWO ways you would MOST SUPPORT public, non-profit, and private organizations working to develop Metro Green? (1) A partnership of public agencies (cities, counties, and state governments)

- (2) Each county and city working separately in their communities
- (3) A partnership of the State of Kansas and State of Missouri

(4) A partnership of private businesses and non-profit foundations

(5) A partnership of public agencies (cities, counties, and state governments) and private businesses

(6) A partnership of private businesses and landowners

(7) Other (please describe)

- 19. Compared to other community issues, what priority should your community place on developing new trails?
 - (1) Very high
 - ___(2) High
 - (3) Medium priority (please answer Question 19a)
 - (4) Low priority (please answer Question 19a)
 - (9) Don't Know (please answer Question 19a)
 - 19a. Following are some potential benefits that new trails can provide to your community. Please check the TWO benefits that you would need to have <u>more information</u> on to make new trails a higher priority for you and members of your household.

Page 5

- (1) Providing alternative transportation routes to community destinations
- (2) Providing good use for flood plain areas that cannot be developed
- (3) Increasing property values of homes near new trails

(4) Providing better bicycle, walking, and running routes

(5) Increasing access to and helping to preserve historical areas

(6) Protecting water quality by creating buffers along streams and rivers

(7) Providing habitats for birds and wildlife

(8) Other _____

20.	In which county do you live?			
	(1) Cass		(5) Johnson, Kansas	
	(2) Clay		(6) Platte	
	(3) Leavenworth	-	(7) Wyandotte	
	(4) Jackson	-		
21.	What city do you live in?			
100			-	
22.	How many years have you lived i	vour county?		
	(1) 5 years or less (3)11 to 15 years		(5) 21 45 20	
	(2) 6 to 10 years	_(4)16 to 20 years	(5) 21 to 30 years	
	(2) 0 to 10 years	_(4)10 to 20 years	(6) 31 years or more	
22	To address accurates to strong and strong and			
23.	In what county is your primary w	ork location?	10.0.1	
	(0) Not employed	-	_(4) Jackson	
	(1) Cass		_(5) Johnson, Kansas	
	(2) Clay	-	(6) Platte	
	(3) Leavenworth	_	(7) Wyandotte	
			_(8) Other:	
24.	Which of the following describes	your age?		
	(1) Under 25		(5) 55 to 64	
	(2) 25 to 34		(6) 65 to 74	
	(3) 35 to 44		(7) 75+	
	(4) 45 to 54			
25.	Your sex:(1) Male		(2) Female	
26.	Would you like to be added to our mailing list to receive further information on Metro Green?			
	(1) Yes	(2) No		
	If yes, please provide your name, address and telephone number			
		10.0. Mar 14. 118		
	Name:			
	Street Address:			
	City:Sta	te:Zi	p Code:	
	Telephone:			
	This concludes	the survey; Than	k you for your time.	
	Please Return Your Completed Survey in the Enclosed Envelope Addressed to:			
	ETC Institute, 72	25 W. Frontier Cit	rcle, Olathe, KS 66061	
			Page 6	

Benefits of Greenways

A multi-objective greenway system for the Kansas City metropolitan area can address and resolve many community issues that affect the future environmental and economic health of the area. Greenways have been implemented by other communities to provide recreation and alternative transportation, control flooding, improve water quality, protect wetlands, conserve habitat for wildlife, and buffer adjacent land uses. Greenways typically incorporate varying types and intensities of human use, including trails for recreation and alternative transportation, and passive and active park facilities, including open play fields. Greenways have also been shown to increase the value of adjacent private properties as an amenity to residential and commercial developments. These and other benefits of a MetroGreen greenway network are described in the following pages.

Water Quality and Water Quantity Benefits

Greenways often preserve wooded open spaces along creeks and streams which absorb flood waters and filter pollutants from stormwater. Flooding has historically been a significant problem in many parts of the Kansas City area. In some areas, buildings and other land uses have encroached into flood prone areas. By designating floodplains as greenways, the encroachments can be better managed, and in some cases, replaced with linear open space that serves as an amenity to local residents and businesses whose property lies adjacent to the greenway.

As a flood control measure, greenway corridors serve as a primary storage zone during periods of heavy rainfall. The protected floodplain can also be used during non-flood periods for other activities, including recreation and alternative transportation. In conjunction with existing stormwater management policies and programs implemented in the region, greenway lands can be established as development occurs.

Greenway corridors also serve to improve the surface water quality of local rivers and creeks. The floodplain forests and wetlands contained within greenway corridors filter pollutants from stormwater. These pollutants are not removed if stormwater is collected in pipes and discharged directly into local streams and rivers. Improving surface water quality in streams not only benefits local residents but also numerous forms of wildlife that depend on streams for their habitat.



Greenways Solve Community Issues that Affect the Future





Plant and Animal Habitat Benefits

MetroGreen corridors can serve as viable habitat for many species of plants and wildlife. Greenway corridors provide essential food sources and, most importantly, access to water that is required by all wildlife. Additionally, greenway corridors in the area could become primary migratory corridors for terrestrial wildlife, serving to help maintain the integrity of many plant and animal gene pools. Some wildlife biologists have extolled greenways as future "gene-ways" and determined that migration routes are essential to maintaining healthy wildlife populations. Greenways can also serve as "gene-ways" for plant species, which migrate with changes in climate and habitat. These "gene-ways" often follow river and stream corridors that have long served as transportation routes for animals and humans. Programs can be established to not only protect the valuable existing forested and wetland areas, but also to reclaim and restore streams to support higher quality habitat.

Transportation Benefits

In past years, most American communities have grown in a sprawling, suburban form as a result of dependence upon the automobile as the sole means of transportation. Americans have abandoned some traditional forms of transportation (such as passenger train service), and have been slow to improve other forms of transportation (bicycle and pedestrian networks, bus systems, local train service). In order to improve mobility for certain population segments and to provide relief from congested streets and highways in the metro area, future transportation planning and development should be concentrated on providing a choice in mode of travel to local residents. These mode choices should offer the same benefits and appeal currently offered by the automobile: efficiency, safety, comfort, reliability and flexibility.

MetroGreen corridors can serve as extensions of the road network, offering realistic and viable connections between origins and destinations such as work, schools, libraries, parks, shopping areas, and tourist attractions. Greenway-based bikeways and walkways are most effective for certain travel distances. National surveys by the Federal Highway Administration have shown that most Americans are willing to walk an average of one-half miles or bike two miles to a destination. It is easily conceivable that destinations can be linked to multiple origins throughout the Kansas City area with a combination of off-road trails and on-road bicycle and pedestrian facilities.

Air Quality Benefits

Greenways as alternative transportation corridors could serve to reduce traffic congestion, helping to improve local air quality. Since the majority of automobile trips are less than two miles in length, offering viable, alternative transportation choices through greenways would encourage people to bicycle and walk more often, especially on short trips, thereby reducing traffic congestion and automobile emissions.





Economic Benefits

MetroGreen offers numerous economic benefits, including higher real property values, increased tourism and recreation related revenues, and cost savings for public services. Greenways have been shown to raise the value of immediately adjacent properties by as much as 5 to 20 percent. For example, in a new development in Raleigh, North Carolina, new lots situated on greenways were priced \$5,000 higher than comparable lots off the greenway. Many home buyers and corporations are looking for real estate that provides direct access to public and private greenway systems. Greenways are viewed as amenities by residential, commercial and office park developers who, in turn, are realizing higher rental values and profits. Additionally, greenways can also save local tax dollars by utilizing resource-based strategies for managing community stormwater and hazard mitigation, thus placing into productive use landscapes that would not normally be developable in a conventional manner.

Greenways can enhance the role that tourism plays in the economy. Tourism is currently ranked as the number one economic force in the world. In several states, regional areas, and localities throughout the nation, greenways have been specifically created to capture the tourism potential of a regional landscape or cultural destination. The State of Missouri, for example, spent \$6 million to create the 200-mile KATY Trail, which, in its first full-year of operation, generated travel and tourism expenditures of more than \$6 million.

Health and Recreation Benefits

Greenways encourage more people to walk or bike to short distance destinations, which improves the health of residents. Studies have shown that as little as 30 minutes a day of moderate-intensity exercise (such as bicycling, walking, in-line skating or cross-country skiing) can significantly improve a person's mental and physical health and prevent certain diseases. Providing opportunities for participation in these outdoor activities, close to where people live and work, is an important component of promoting healthy lifestyles for area residents.

In 1987, the President's Commission on Americans Outdoors released a report that profiled the modern pursuit of leisure and defined the current quality of life for many Americans. Limited access to outdoor resources was cited as a growing problem throughout the nation. The Commission recommended that a national system of greenways could provide all Americans with access to linear open space resources.

The MetroGreen system will be developed to complement the community's existing parks and open space systems. MetroGreen will be developed to serve as a primary recreation and fitness resource. Additionally, greenways can help meet the passive recreation needs for the growing population of older residents.









Cultural Benefits

Greenways can enhance the culture and protect historic resources in the metro area. Successful greenway projects across the United States have served as new "main streets," where neighbors meet, children play, and community groups gather to celebrate. For cities and towns large and small, greenways have become a cultural asset and focal point for community activities. Some communities sponsor "greenway days" to celebrate the outdoors and local traditions. Various walking and running events are also held on greenways to support charity events or extend traditional sporting events. Many civic groups adopt segments of greenways for clean-up, litter removal and environmental awareness programs. Some greenways, like San Antonio's Riverwalk, are the focal point not only for community activities, but also for economic development.

A major objective of the 1991 Vision was to connect the area's rich and diverse historic resources represented by numerous National Register of Historic Places, locally significant sites and historic districts. The interpretation of historic and archeological sites along greenways can serve to increase the awareness and appreciation of the area's rich history. Greenways can also be a vehicle to provide controlled public access to important cultural sites in a manner that promotes preservation and enhances interpretive opportunities.

Security and Safety Benefits

Many Americans are concerned with crime. Some of the most successful deterrents to criminal activity have involved increased neighborhood awareness by citizens and participation in community watch programs. Greenways have proven to be an effective tool to encourage local residents to participate in neighborhood watch programs. Some greenways have even been developed as part of efforts to deter criminal activity in a neighborhood. Crime statistics and reports from law enforcement officials have shown that parks and greenways are typically land uses with the lowest incidence of reported criminal activity.



As a recreation resource, alternative transportation corridor, or area where fitness activities take place, most greenways provide a much safer and more user-friendly resource than other linear corridors, such as local roads. Greenways typically attract local residents, who use the facility frequently, creating an environment that is virtually self-policing. Additionally, greenways-whether publicly or privately owned-are dedicated for multiple use and are normally designed to meet federal, state and local standards for public safety and use.

appendix D

Design Guidelines for MetroGreen

The goal of the MetroGreen Design Guidelines is to achieve a regional system that offers consistent placement, style and quality of trail segments over time and throughout the metro area. The consistent use of these guidelines will ensure that the system is recognizable by the public, is safe and accessible to all population segments, and meets multiple system objectives. Use of these guidelines by implementing agencies will ensure that MetroGreen achieves its intended objectives to protect riparian corridors and floodplains, enhance water quality, provide transportation alternatives and preserve wildlife habitats and biodiversity.

Achieving Conservation and Other Community Objectives

Many of the MetroGreen segments are along stream corridors. The susceptibility of these areas to flooding has led area jurisdictions to limit development and provide important open space and recreational opportunities. The checklist in this chapter offers possible objectives for consideration by local officials to protect these stream corridors and the resources found within and along them.

Conservation and Other Community Objectives for Stream Corridor Protection

Resource Conservation

- Protect surface and subsurface water resources
- · Protect critical or threatened habitats and biodiversity
- · Protect natural drainage ways and their associated floodplains
- · Protect lands of cultural or historic importance
- Protect sites for active or passive recreation
- Protect the region's unique or significant natural features
- · Protect prime farmlands and forest lands
- · Protect areas that shape community design and character
- Protect steep slopes



Introduction



Tomahawk Creek Trail - Segment Jo08

Access and Connectivity

- · Provide public access to the water's edge
- Connect open space parcels through corridors of greenways

The MetroGreen Regional Greenway Initiative recommends that all communities in the Kansas City region consider the adoption of a stream setback ordinance to protect riparian areas, habitat and water quality, minimize stream bank erosion, and reduce flooding threats.

Stream buffers may be supported by a natural resource and stream assessment, which assists in balancing growth and development goals with environmental protection. The stream assets are prioritized through a process involving on-site evaluations of bank stability, vegetative cover, wildlife habitat, water quality and other factors. Enhanced setbacks are required in those areas most at-risk or most desirable to save. The setback width varies with the quality of the resource, the existence of steep slopes and the extent of wetland or floodplain.

In general, a minimum corridor width of up to 100 feet on each side of the stream bank or the 100-year regulated floodplain, whichever is greater, should be preserved along each stream corridor. The protected area includes three distinct zones: the streamside zone, the managed zone and the upland zone. Several communities in the region, including Lenexa and Overland Park, are conducting stream assessments and considering setback ordinances.

Streamside Zone

The streamside zone protects the physical integrity of existing aquatic and riparian ecosystems. Native vegetation should be preserved or restored, and existing forest canopy should remain undisturbed. Regulations for this zone should be very restrictive toward development. Permitted uses in the streamside zone may include flood control and bank stabilization. Other land uses that disturb existing native vegetation and ecosystem functions are prohibited except under very limited circumstances when no practical alternative exists. Mitigation efforts should be undertaken to restore the native ecology of this zone. Unpaved and unimproved footpaths and/or boardwalk trails could be constructed in this zone.

In some urban settings, it may be necessary to develop a hard surfaced trail because of limited public right-of-way. Such development should occur only in conjunction with ecosystem improvements, such as water quality features, soil bioengineering and other best management practices. Development of this type of trail



Indian Creek Trail - Segment Jo07

Design Guidelines for MetroGreen

may also occur in conjunction with new utility installation. Infrastructure such as sanitary sewers, storm drains and bridges often impact the streamside zone. Careful design and construction of those utilities and structures can minimize their impact.

Managed Zone

The managed zone lies between upland development and the streamside zone. The land use in this zone should be restricted to passive recreation activities, stormwater best management practices and multi-use trails. The vegetation should consist of native vegetation such as a managed forest, or a mixture of trees, perennial grasses and forbs. The majority of greenway facility development should occur in this zone, including asphalt or concrete surfaced trails or facilities such as signage, bench seating and security systems.

Upland Zone

Development is also limited in the upland zone, although activity is less restrictive than the streamside or managed zones. The land within this zone acts as a filter for runoff from adjacent property. A forest canopy or other native vegetation is encouraged within this zone, and impervious surfaces should be kept to less than 5 percent of the area.

Trailside Travellers - Segment Ja16







Trail Types Type 1: No Facility Development General Considerations

These corridors contain environmentally sensitive areas, steep slopes, wetlands or other constraints that make trail facilities undesirable or impossible. These areas may be further described as those that contain significant natural resources or remnant landscapes, and those that are unsuitable for development but have or offer natural resource assets or potential.

Environmental Considerations

The corridor will remain primarily in a natural state, as human access would be extremely limited. Some functions for these corridors include floodplain management, water quality protection and conservation of important habitat for wildlife and plants. Preserving connections among wildlife habitat areas is also an important function of such corridors.

Trail Users

Hikers could use wildlife trails to explore creeks and other natural features. Very low volume of use is expected. Bicycle use should be restricted in most cases.

Trailhead and Amenities

No support facilities or amenities are recommended.

Trail Signage

No signage is recommended.

Trail Surface

Natural setting (no trail).

Trail Construction

In these areas, actual trail development would be avoided.

Example

Stranger Creek in Leavenworth County, Kansas, Segment Lv06 of the MetroGreen System - See system map.



Type 1: No Facility

Type 2: Limited Development, Low-impact uses General Considerations

These trails are best suited to corridors containing environmentally sensitive features that limit the extent of facility development. Corridor widths of 200 feet or more are preferred, with 100 feet considered the minimum. Sites ideal for these paths, often very narrow, sometimes follow strenuous routes and may limit access to all but the most mobile users.

Environmental Considerations

Corridors need to remain in a natural state, and preservation of natural environments is a priority.

Trail Users

Hikers, joggers and perhaps cross-country skiers. This trail type is not intended for cyclists or other wheeled users. Generally a very low volume of users is expected.

Trailhead and Amenities

The need for trail head facilities and other amenities should be limited to major entry points and intersections with trail types 3, 4 and 5.

Trail Signage

The need for signage is limited to minor entry signs, guidance and possibly some interpretive signs.

Trail Surface

Wood chip, crushed gravel or earth.

Trail Construction

The trail corridor must be able to support construction access, some earthwork and the use of moderately heavy equipment. Construction and maintenance are easiest when the trail can be built at grades below 10% and cross slopes at a maximum of 2%. Where feasible, sections near trailheads should be barrier free to physically challenged users. Boardwalks may be necessary to cross wetlands in these areas.

Example

Smithville Lake 1 in Clay County, Missouri, Segment Cl01 of the MetroGreen System - See system map.



Type 2: Limited Development

Type 3: Multi-Use, Unpaved Trail Development General Considerations

These trails are in greenway corridors and are located outside of areas that experience frequent flooding such as in the Managed Zone. While less expensive to install, unpaved trails typically require more frequent repairs. Careful consideration should be given to the amount of traffic the specific segment will generate since these surfaces tend to deteriorate with excessive use. This trail type may be an acceptable first phase for a trail to be paved in the future.

Environmental Consideration

Fine aggregate surface trails (10 ft. minimum width) are appropriate for corridors outside the floodplain where anticipated use or the adjacent landscape dictates a more natural trail.

Trail Users

These trails are restricted to pedestrians, bicycles and equestrians. Equestrian users require a separate trail so that horses do not damage the trail surface. Wheelchair users and persons with strollers can use unpaved trails if they are designed to ADA standards and surfaced with compacted crushed stone or other firm surface. Low to moderate volume of users is expected.

Trailhead and Amenities

In urbanized areas, the trailheads should be smaller in size and more frequent, and in less urbanized areas, they may be larger and less frequent. Benches, picnic tables and trash receptacles are common amenities for this type of facility.

Trail Signage

Signage is appropriate and should be located at trailheads and as necessary for guidance, warnings and regulations.

Trail Surface

Crushed stone and wood chip or grass for equestrian use.

Trail Construction

The site should be able to withstand more construction activity without causing environmental damage to the corridor. It is likely that heavier construction equipment will need to access the site.

Example

Little Blue Trace in Jackson County, Missouri, Segment Ja20 of the MetroGreen System - See system map.



Type 3: Multi-Use, Unpaved Trail

Type 4: Multi-Use Paved Trail Development

General Considerations

This designation applies to corridors that do not contain environmentally sensitive features, where high use is anticipated and will likely be used as a transportation route. Typically this trail type is used in more urban areas. In some cases, this trail type may also be suited to areas that flood frequently.

Environmental Considerations

The multi-use paved trail is appropriate for a variety of locations including streamside, floodway, floodplain and upland conditions. However, it is best suited to the upland zone. It should not be used in environmentally sensitive areas due to the disruption caused by construction and a high number of users. This facility type is recommended for the majority of trails in the MetroGreen system.

Trail Users

Several user groups can enjoy the paved trails, including bicyclists, joggers, wheelchair users and rollerbladers. Moderate to very high use is expected.

Trailhead and Amenities

These trails ordinarily warrant trailheads and a full range of amenities by virtue of the expected user volume. Suitable locations for trailheads and major access points should be identified early in the planning process. Amenities may include portable toilets or restrooms, shelters, lights, drinking fountains, and auto and bicycle parking.

Trail Signage

The need for guidance, warning and regulatory signs will increase, especially in more urbanized locations.

Trail Surface

Asphalt or concrete. Concrete is best for areas that experience periodic flooding.

Trail Construction

Corridors most suited to this trail type must be able to accommodate heavy construction equipment, more significant site disruption, frequent maintenance, vehicle access and emergency equipment. The minimum construction zone is typically 25' wide.

Example

Gary L. Haller Trail within Mill Creek Streamway Park, Johnson County, Kansas, Segment Jo14 of the MetroGreen System - See system map



Type 4: Multi-Use Paved Trail

Type 5: Bicycle and Pedestrian Facilities within the Right of Way

General Considerations

These corridors serve to connect off-road trail systems and major regional destinations. These facilities may include both sidewalks for pedestrians and bikeways for cyclists. Major facility categories in this trail type include sidewalks, bike routes, bike lanes, widened multi-use sidewalks and wide outside vehicular lanes.

Environmental Considerations

These trails often serve an important environmental function as alternative transportation routes.

Trail Users

Depending on the specific facility, this trail type serves pedestrians, cyclists, rollerbladers, etc. Moderate to high use is expected. A 1994 report by the Federal Highway Administration, "Selecting Roadway Design Treatments to Accommodate Bicycles" used the general categories of bicycle user types (A, B and C) to assist transportation planners and engineers in determining the impact of different facility types and roadway conditions on bicycles:

Type A - These are advanced or experienced cyclists who use their bicycles as they would a motor vehicle. They want direct access to their destination without any delay. This type of cyclist is usually comfortable riding with motor vehicle traffic, but they need sufficient operation space on the traveled way or shoulder to eliminate the need for them or a passing motor vehicle to shift position.

Type B - These are basic or less confident adult cyclists that may also use their bicycles for transportation purposes. They are usually trying to get to the store or to visit friends, but they are less comfortable riding with motor vehicle traffic and avoid roads with fast busy motor vehicle traffic unless they have an ample amount of operation space. They are more comfortable riding on a neighborhood street, shared use path or a designated facility such as a bike lane or wide curb lane.

Type C - This type includes children that may be riding on their own or with parents. They do not travel as fast as an adult cyclist, but still require access to key destinations in their community, such as schools, convenience stores and recreational facilities. Neighborhood streets with low motor vehicle speeds, well-defined bike lanes or shared use paths best accommodate children without encouraging them to ride in the travel lane of busy roadways.



Type 5: General Section



Bicycle User Types

Trailhead and Amenities

The need for trailheads and amenities is minimal as this type connects with existing major destinations which may already have facilities. Benches, lighting and street trees may be added to encourage sidewalk use.

Trail Signage

On-road bikeways include signed shared roadways (signed bike routes) and bicycle lanes. Bicycle routes are designated shared roadways (clearly marked according to MUTCD sign standards) as preferred routes for bicycles. The bicycle lane needs to have striping, signing and pavement markings for the exclusive use of bicyclists.

Trail Surface

Concrete or asphalt.

Trail Construction

Sites must be totally accessible for heavy construction, since they are most often built with the roadway or retrofit to an existing road.

Example

Shoal Creek Parkway in Kansas City, Missouri, Segment Cl11 of the MetroGreen System- See system map.

Site Specific Trail Guidelines

The following information provides more detail on specific trail design considerations for all trail types. It is not unusual that a single trail corridor may include more than one trail type and the planner may encounter a variety of design issues on any segment. Planning and construction details for various, common trail features are shown. The design details are based on time-tested techniques of successful trail segments in the Kansas City area as well as others from systems throughout the country.

National Guidelines Purpose

There are a number of sources on the national and regional level that provide guidance for trail design. These should be reviewed in the preliminary planning stages for any segment.

Guidelines

- Accessibility Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas, Draft Report 2001, Access Board of Americans with Disabilities Act, Accessibility Guidelines, www.access-board.gov.
- Guide for the Development of Bicycle Facilities, 1999, AASHTO (American Association of State Highway and Transportation Officials).
- Manual for Uniform Traffic Control Devices, Part 9 Traffic Control for Bicycle Facilities, 2000, the Federal Highway Administration, U.S. Department of Transportation manual for unified national standards for signs, signals, markings on all streets and highways open to public travel.
- Innovative Bicycle Treatments, 2001 Draft report, Institute of Traffic Engineers
- Selecting Roadway Design Treatments to Accommodate Bicycles, 1994, Federal Highway Administration.
- MARC Bicycle Element, Long-Range Transportation Plan -Local Facility Design Guidance, Proposed 2002.

Trails in the Floodplain

Purpose

Floodplains provide important open space, recreation and greenway functions. Since they are generally protected from development, they provide ideal locations for trails. Nonetheless, locating trails in floodplains requires special planning, design and maintenance. Improper trail location or construction within a floodplain may result in erosion or sedimentation that can seriously degrade water quality.

Where to Use

Trail types 2, 3 and 4 are suitable. Unpaved trails could be vulnerable to damage in a floodable area.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Whenever possible avoid construction of trails in sensitive natural areas such as wetlands. Locate trails on the edge of or adjacent to these areas. Utilize areas that have already been disturbed and have the potential to be restored during construction.
- Maintain specific sites for equipment and supplies and clearly define a limit of disturbed grade.
- Above grade fill should not be added to a floodplain. If gravel, concrete, or asphalt is necessary for construction, remove an equal amount of floodplain material to maintain an unimpeded floodway.
- A floodplain or wetland location may require permits from the state and federal government. Be sure to check permitting requirements prior to design.
- Locate trails in areas least sensitive to erosion and use drainage controls on slopes. When surface runoff is low, direct it across the trail surface.
- When surface runoff is high, use a crowned tread with a ditch on the uphill side to lead water to grade dips or culverts.
- Use conservative tree protection strategies during construction. Place fencing around sensitive areas and trees to be protected. Fencing should be placed at a distance from the trunk equal to 2.5 times the height of the tree.

Stream Corridors



Floodplain Trail



Floodway Trail

Floodway Trail

Purpose

Due to topography or other constraints trails may be located along stream corridors within the designated floodway.

Where to Use

Trail types 2, 3 and 4 are suitable. Unpaved trails could be vulnerable to damage in a flood prone area.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Position multi-use trails within the floodway but not directly adjacent to the stream. Floodwaters often change the stream channel and locating the trail further away allows for this natural realignment without jeopardizing the investment in the trail.
- Where possible, existing vegetation between the stream and the trail should remain intact.
- High-use trails in the floodway should be paved surfaces of either asphalt or concrete. Use asphalt where water velocities are slow and concrete where flows are fast and strong.
- Multi-use trails should be a minimum of 10' wide. Smaller foot paths coming off the main trail can be used to access more sensitive areas.
- Trails should be designed and implemented with care, accessing but not harming sites of environmental significance.
- Remember that all elements of the trails including the trailheads, railings, benches and trash receptacles will be periodically flooded.

Streambank/Creekside Trail

Purpose

This trail type is particularly well suited to urban areas. Creekside trails access some of the most interesting geography in the region. Creekside areas are also often the most fragile zones within which construction occurs. Streambank trails should be limited to those areas of significant scenic interest or at points along a trail that are located within the floodplain or floodway.

Where to Use

UPLAND ZONE

Trail types 2, 3 and 4 suitable.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Creekside trails should be a minimum of 10' wide.
- All amenities must withstand inundation during periods of high flow.
- Facilities should be carefully designed so as not to obstruct flow during high water.
- Creekside trails must be designed and installed in a way that minimizes their effect on the overall working of the stream system.



- These trails should be hard surfaced, usually concrete, to withstand high-velocity stream flows.
- Retaining walls or other structural elements may be required to stabilize slopes and protect the trail from erosion and flood damage.

Wetlands/Boardwalks

Purpose

Wetlands are often the most interesting areas in a trail corridor and the most fragile. Access to these areas must be handled carefully. Boardwalks can be used to cross wetlands with minimal disturbance. Because the cost of boardwalks is high, strategically locate them to highlight areas of major interest.

Where to Use

Trail types 2, 3 and 4 suitable.

- Any construction in classified wetlands requires a Section 404 Permit from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Do not proceed with the project without appropriate plans and permits.
- Boardwalk supports should be either helical screw anchors or ground level sleepers. Screw anchors provide the best support, have a considerably longer life span and cause less disruption during construction. In highly sensitive areas, the materials and equipment can be hand carried into the site resulting in little or no harm to the resource.
- Design of the boardwalk should compliment the site. Work to hide foundations and supports, use lighter railings and suitable site furnishings.
- Boardwalk planking should be either non-toxic treated lumber or recycled plastic. Plastic can have a longer life span al though it is slippery when wet, and therefore, should not be used on sloping sections.
- Boardwalk connecting hardware should be galvanized. Use decking screws to fasten decking to aid in future maintenance operations.
- Where feasible, provide viewing decks or widened sections of boardwalk to accentuate key features. Varying the level of the viewing deck can enhance the experience for the user but may interfere with accessibility.
- Build benches, railings and interpretive signs into the design of the boardwalk.
- If it is absolutely necessary to locate the trail in wetland areas, use boardwalks that offer minimal obstruction to the path of flood flows and minimal disturbance to wetland areas.



Boardwalk

Facilities in R.O.W. Sidewalks

Purpose

Sidewalks can encourage walking and also improve the safety of pedestrians. Sidewalks should be of sufficient width to accommodate the expected level of traffic based on adjacent land uses.



Type 5: Sidewalk

Where to Use

Sidewalks should be provided along all public streets. It is preferable to have them on both sides of the street.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Sidewalk widths should be a minimum of 5 feet, large enough for two adults to walk side by side. In commercial areas, sidewalks may be as wide as 12 feet depending on the amount of traffic on the adjoining street. It is desirable to protect the pedestrian from traffic to the extent possible through physical separation of the sidewalk from the curb. Installing landscaping between the curb and the sidewalk is a technique that works well where space allows and one that improves the pedestrian experience.
- On-street, parallel parking and bike lanes can also increase pedestrian safety.
- Street trees are essential to a high quality pedestrian environment, providing shade and a sense of enclosure to the sidewalk.

Widened, Multi-Use Sidewalks Purpose

Widened, multi-use sidewalks allow bicyclists and pedestrians to share an off-road facility.

Where to Use

Use this solution to provide bikeway continuity along high-speed or heavily traveled roadways. Widened, multi-use sidewalks are also useful in places where there is inadequate roadway width for bicyclists and where the corridor is uninterrupted by driveways and intersections for long distances.

- These are typically not recommended unless the parallel roadway is not safe for bicycle travel.
- They should be a minimum of 10 feet wide.
- There must be a minimum of 18-20 feet of available right-of-way, with a 7 ft. min., 12 ft. preferred buffer between the path and the roadway. If separation must be less than 5', a physical barrier should be provided per AASHTO Standards.



Type 5: Multi-Use Sidewalk

- ____ D-15
- Design Guidelines for MetroGreen

There should be fewer than 12 residential driveways, six commercial drives/minor streets, or three major street intersections per mile; commercial or other areas with heavy vehicular turning movements are particularly dangerous.

- Remove obstructions from sight triangles at all intersecting streets and driveways.
- Provide appropriate curb cuts and transition areas so that bicyclists may access the path from both the parallel and intersecting streets.
- Modify signal timing to permit bicyclists to move through an intersection without being hit by turning traffic.
- Locate signal activation buttons appropriately for bicyclists and pedestrians to conveniently activate signal at signalized intersection.
- AASHTO specifically warns against this type of facility. However, it may be the only solution in some circumstances. If necessary, they should be used on a limited basis.

Bike Routes

Purpose

To allow motorists and bicyclists to share the roadway by using widened curb lanes and paved shoulders. Widening roadways provides additional operating room for bicyclists and offers several benefits to motorists, including better accommodating trucks, buses and other wide vehicles and assisting turning vehicles. Paved shoulders have advantages for both the cyclist, vehicular traffic and pavement management.

Where to Use

Wide curb lanes are used on roads that can either be widened with new construction or re-striped to provide a wider lane at the curb. Wide curb lanes best accommodate advanced cyclists who are more comfortable operating in the flow of traffic. Paved shoulders are most often used in rural areas, however, they are gaining popularity in the metropolitan area as well.

- Wide curb lanes should be a minimum of 14 feet wide; 13 feet wide lanes may be used where the existing roadway and ROW section is inadequate for a wider shared lane.
- The wide curb lane is always the outside, right-hand lane and is constructed with the same pavement section as the roadway.
- Wide curb lanes can be signed as ""Share the Road"" or, in some cases, not signed at all.
- Paved shoulders should be a minimum of four feet in width and wider on streets with high volumes of traffic.
- Ensure smooth pavement and bicycle friendly storm drain grates and do not use rumble strips.





Type 5: Paved Shoulders

- Incorporate a maintenance program that keeps the shoulder free of debris and potholes.
- Paved shoulders should have the same pavement thickness and sub-base as the adjacent roadway.
- The Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices specifies standard signage for these facilities.



Purpose

To dedicate a specific segment of the roadway to bicycle usage.

Where to Use

Bicycle lanes are appropriate for any classification of roadway, although they are rarely used on low volume residential streets.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Bicycle lanes are always located on both sides of the road (except where they are constructed on one-way streets) and direct bicycle traffic in the same direction as motor traffic.
- Bike lanes should be a minimum of 4 feet wide, exclusive of the gutter when the road is curbed. They should be 5 feet wide when adjacent to parallel parking.
- The Manual of Uniform Traffic Control Devices specifies standard signage for bicycle lanes.

Trails in Other Trails on Levees Locations

Levees are placed along river corridors to prevent flooding and for the protection of property. They can provide vital links in greenway development in both urban and rural areas. Trails along levees can connect people to the environments of riparian corridors.

Where to use

Trails on levees should be used along major river corridors for the benefit of the public wherever possible and are an important recreational component for the metro area. They can provide linkage through heavily developed areas serving as safe alternative transportation routes.

- Work with the authority governing the levee construction and maintenance early in the process.
- Use design treatments and construction methods that minimize disruption to the river corridor.
- Soft surface trails (types 1, 2 and 3) are preferred on top of levees to allow the levee to move.
- Trail amenities should be designed with pad foundations, impervious clay footings and riprap reinforcement around all foundations so as not to disturb the integrity of the levee.



Type 5: Bike Lanes



New Orleans District U.S. Army Corp of Engineers

- Allow for clearance of all maintenance vehicles. Trails may be used as the maintenance road for the levee.
- Coordinate signage and access in areas where adjacent developments routinely access the levee.

Points of Contact for Corps of Engineers with Trails on Levees

Trails have been successfully introduced along a number of levees in other communities, including Minneapolis, New Orleans, Louisville, Hannibal and Jacksonville.

- Louisville District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Louisville District, P. O. Box 59, Louisville, KY, 40201-0059, phone (502) 315-6768, www.lrl.usace.army.mil
- St. Paul District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, (651) 290-5200, 190 Fifth Street East, St. Paul, MN, 55101-1638, www.mvp.usace.army.mil
- Jacksonville District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, P.O. Box 4970, 400 West Bay Street, Jacksonville, FL 32232-0019, (904) 232-2568 or 1-800-291-9405, www.saj.usace.army.mil
- New Orleans District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, P.O. Box 60267, New Orleans, LA 70160-0267, (504) 862-2201, www.mvn.usace.army.mil
- St. Louis District, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, 1222 Spruce Street, St. Louis, MO 63103-2833, (314) 331-8000, www.mvs.usace.army.mil

Trails along Utility and Railroad Corridors **Purpose**

To allow trail connections using utility easements and/or railroad corridors through partnerships with the local and regional rail and/ or utility companies.

Where to use

May be used in corridors with below ground utilities, overhead lines and rail corridors.

- Involve the utility and/or railroad company early in the planning process.
- Avoid crossing the utility and/or rail lines as much as possible, by routing trail alignment to the side.
- Avoid locating the trail where access covers to underground utilities will be within the trail surface and side shoulder area.
- Sign and fence areas where public access should be prohibited.
- Post necessary signage along the route in accordance with MUTCD.



St. Paul District U.S. Army Corp of Engineers



Access Control Trolley Track Trail - Ja03

- Underground corridors are visually more appealing, but have more restrictions for crossing or paralleling lines. Each utility agency will have separate requirements for depth of cover over the line and other specific details.
- Overhead utility companies prefer greenways with open access as opposed to those with fences and landscaping.
- For additional information, refer to the Rails-to-Trails Conservancy website at www.railstotrails.org.

Crossings At Grade – Intersections

Purpose

To allow trail users to safely and conveniently cross the street network.

Where to use

Where the trail system requires the user to cross the roadway. Type 5 trails normally cross at the intersections. Type 2, 3 and 4 trails cross at intersections when mid-block crossings are undesirable.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Crossing should be clearly marked, obvious and barrier-free.
- Post the appropriate signage for both the motorist and trail user.
- Make the crossing highly visible to allow the users to see and be seen by approaching traffic.
- Make the waiting times short for trail users and allow adequate time for all users to cross (important in signal timing).
- Limit conflict points with traffic and reduce the distance crossing the street with curb extensions or refuge islands where possible.
- Design each crossing as an individual situation taking into account traffic volumes, street widths and trail volumes. These will vary from location to location.
- Intersections and approaches should be at a relatively flat grade.
- Provide a pedestrian activated signal crossing where there are heavy traffic volumes at a convenient location for pedestrians and bicyclists. Bicyclists should be required to dismount and walk their bike to reach activation button, preferably on the right side of the trail.

At Grade - Mid-block Purpose

Mid-block crossings provide an opportunity to cross a roadway where there are no intersections nearby.



Intersection Crossing



Intersection Crossing - Refuge

D-18

Where to use

Mid-block crossings should be used where long sight lines are possible and the volume of traffic on the roadway is lower. Trail types 2, 3 and 4 are best suited to mid-block crossings.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Crossing should be clearly marked with pavement markings, obvious to both motorist and trail user, and should be barrier free.
- Crossing should be highly visible to allow the users to see and be seen by approaching traffic.
- Median refuge island can be used where traffic volumes are higher and street widths are greater. Passageways should be at grade through the island and the same width as the trail. Minimum island width should be 6' to provide adequate refuge. Minimum island length should be 26' for sufficient visibility.
- Landscaping should not compromise the visibility of the crossing. Keep the shrub height below 18 inches and tree branching above 14'.
- Diagonal or turn medians should be considered when designing a refuge island on streets with heavy traffic volumes and high speeds. These medians physically turn the user to face on-coming traffic and help minimize conflicts.
- Vertical speed tables can be used to slow traffic and give a greater prominence to the trail user. They must be carefully designed to allow a reduction of speed for the motorist but not impede the movement of emergency vehicles.
- Design each crossing as an individual situation as traffic volumes, street widths and trail volumes will vary from location to location.
- Crossings should be at a relatively flat grade and should be designed to consider physically challenged users.
- Provide a pedestrian-activated signal crossing and post the appropriate signage for both the motorist and trail user depending on the specific engineering requirements.
- Align trail as it approaches the street so that the user faces oncoming traffic to improve visibility.

Grade Separated - Pedestrian Bridge

Purpose

To cross a roadway while eliminating pedestrian/automobile conflicts. A bridge is safer than at-grade crossings.

Where to use

At busy roadways and highways when an at-grade crossing is not feasible. Suitable for type 2, 3, 4 and 5 trails.



Curb Extensions



Midblock Crossing - Offset



Midblock Crossing



Perpendicular Street Crossing



Pedestrian Bridge

Guidelines/Considerations

- Railings should be a minimum of 54" in height and provide rub rails at handlebar heights.
- Lighting should be evenly distributed and focused on the pathway, shining down rather than out.
- Openings or gaps in the decking material should be perpendicular to the path of travel.
- Slopes to the approaches should not exceed 5 percent.
- Align bridge along the path and avoid sharp turns and bends at the ends of the bridge.
- Bridges on hard surface paths should carry a minimum five-ton live load.
- Provide expansive infill material at all expansion joints and gaps.
- Bridges should be widened two to three feet to allow adequate clearance to the vertical sides.

Grade Separated – Underpass Purpose

To cross a roadway while eliminating pedestrian/automobile conflicts. An underpass is safer than an at-grade crossing.

Where to use

On busy roadways and highways when an at-grade crossing is not feasible. Suitable for type 2, 3, 4 and 5 trails.

- Underpass can be concrete box culvert or metal pipe.
- Adequate sight lines to the entrance of an underpass are critical for user safety. The minimum unobstructed view should be 140' to the entrance.
- The minimum vertical clearance should be 10'. A 14' minimum vertical clearance is required for equestrian use.
- Culvert-type underpasses should have a 14' minimum width.
- Locate lights no more than 30' from entrances and throughout the underpass and leave on 24 hours a day.
- Walls and ceiling of a box culvert should be painted with white epoxy paint to increase light levels in the tunnel.
- Protection from road debris, snow removed from the road and flying debris from the road overhead need to be
- accommodated in the design, protecting the underpass user.The underpass should be appropriately drained and free of
- The underpass should be appropriately drained and free of areas that flood.
- Provide regular and consistent maintenance and inspection of paths, lighting, and underpass structure.

Railroad Crossings

Purpose

To provide for the safety of trail users at the intersections of railroad tracks and multi-use trails.

Where to use

At points where trails cross railroad tracks. Suitable for type 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Have the trail cross at a right angle to the track. Non-right angle crossings increase chance of wheels or feet getting caught in rails.
- Approaches to the track and areas in between the tracks should be elevated, level with the top of the rail.
- Provide a paved surface for the approaches to the tracks. There should be a five feet area on each side of the track that is flat, free of obstacles, and has a firm and stable surface. Compressible flangeway fillers can be used to allow for a safer way to cross tracks for wheeled users.
- Where multi-use paths follow roadways, which cross the tracks at an angle of less than 60 degrees, consider providing bulb-outs in the bicycle lane or path to allow the trail to cross at a right angle to the tracks.
- Warning signs should be installed in accordance to the MUTCD standards and additional pavement markings should be used to direct users to the best angle at which to cross the tracks.
- Crossing signal arms or other methods to stop trail traffic can also be used along multi-use paths to alert trail users of an on coming train.



Trail Underpass



Leavenworth Landing Park -Segment Lv07



Railroad Crossing


Leavenworth Landing Park -Segment Lv07



Stream Ford

Streams: Stream Fords Purpose

To provide crossings at streams for trail users. The goal in creating a ford is to slow the flow of the water. Shallow stream fords provide solid footing at a consistent depth from one bank to the other.

Where to use

Stream fords should be located on trail types 1 and 2 away from bends and curves of the stream as much as possible. Fords are ideal in areas where there is moderate to low water flow. They should not be designed in streams that experience normal high flows.

Guidelines/Considerations

- A ford for hikers should not be more than 16" to 24" in depth during the majority of the rainy season.
- A ford for equestrian uses should not be more than 39" in depth.
- Fords are best located in the wider, shallower portions of the stream. The approaches on each side should climb to the high water line and not exceed 15 percent in grade.
- The tread in fords should be made of medium sized gravel. When leveled out it provides for solid footing and disburses the flow of water over a greater area preventing the gravel from being washed away.
- The flow of water can be slowed by locating several stones downstream of the trail to create a small dam.
- Stepping-stone rocks (130 lb. min.) can be imbedded on the upstream side of the trail tread to slow the water and even it out as it enters the ford. Do not place the rocks too close to the trail to avoid creating a scouring effect to the trail tread.
- Stream fords are constructed to have minimum maintenance costs (barring major flood events) and to provide a relatively low challenge for users.
- Natural bedrock shelves in the creek bed may offer excellent stream fords if appropriately located.

Mill Creek Streamway -Segment Jo14

Low-Water Crossings Purpose

Provide crossings at streams for trail users. These are designed and engineered to be topped in flood events and allow debris to pass over them.

Where to use

Low-water crossings are commonly used on multi-use paved and unpaved trail types (types 3 and 4). In some cases, there may already be low-water crossings in existing stream corridors, which can be upgraded with minimal regulatory agency review.

Guidelines/Considerations

- These crossing are typically the same width as the trail. Low stream flows should be accommodated through the crossing, usually through a series of pipes.
- The size and number of pipes would depend on the size of the stream.
- Approaches to the low water crossing should be concrete and extend a minimum of 10' into the creek bank to ensure stability in high flows.
- Provide a concrete footer for the crossing that extends three feet below the creek bottom or to rock whichever is less.
- Avoid steep slopes approaching the low-water crossing to the extent possible. This should be accomplished by proper site selection rather than disruptive grading operations.
- Avoid placing crossings at the bends of the creek.
- Cross at right angles.
- Top of crossings should be less than 30" above the creek to avoid guardrail requirements thus minimizing high flow obstructions.
- "High water" cautionary signs should be placed at low-water crossings.

Foot Logs

Purpose

Provide crossings at small streams for trail users.

Where to use

Foot logs can be used along the limited development type corridors where fords would be washed away in periods of high runoff. They are not ADA accessible and should be limited in use. Suitable for trail type 2.

- They should consist of a log, notched sills and bulkheads. The foot log should be level, well anchored and not touch the ground.
- The walkable surface of the log should be hewn and provide for a minimum walking width of 10". Provide railings 42" high.
- Locate foot log bridges upstream or far downstream of the fords.



South Cates Branch Trail -Liberty, MO



Single Log Bridge



Prefabricated Bridge

Other Bridges

Purpose

Use bridges to cross streams with higher flows or where the trail user volume is high.

Where to use

Most suitable for trail types 3, 4 and 5.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Avoid placing steep grades at approaches to bridges as they may create conflict with different types of users entering and leaving the structure.
- Bridge width should be 2 feet to 3 feet wider than the trail.
- Design bridges that fit the specific requirements of the site as determined by an engineer, landscape architect or a manufacturer.
- Provide bicycle friendly railings.
- All bridge structures need to be inspected by a qualified bridge inspector at least every four years.
- Bridges should not adversely impact the flow of high water.

Special Users Providing Accessibility for the Physically Challenged

To provide people with disabilities access to a wide range of transportation and recreational experiences provided by trails.

Where to use

At every aspect of the trail experience including the trailhead, corridor, amenities and facilities.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Follow guidelines and design standards set in the "Accessibility Guidelines for Outdoor Developed Areas" (U.S. Access Board, 1999b).
- Follow ADA Accessibility Guidelines (ADAAG) Sections 1-9 for design standards for trail amenities and facilities (e.g., drinking fountains, restrooms, parking areas).
- Strive for maximum accessibility. In situations where it is not possible to fully comply, designers are encouraged to comply to the greatest extent possible.
- Provide accurate signage with objective information (e.g., grade, cross slope, surface, width, obstacles) for actual, on- trail conditions.
- Signage should have limited text and graphics and be easily understood by all users.
- Use the Universal Trail Assessment Process (UTAP) as an inventory tool to record trail accessibility and maintenance.
- Make pathways leading to and access points along trails accessible.

- Minimize or eliminate vertical changes between two adjacent surfaces. If vertical changes are unavoidable, small changes up to 0.25 in. may remain vertical without edge treatment.
- Vertical changes between 0.25 in. and 0.5 in. should have a beveled surface with a maximum slope of 50 percent. Changes greater than 0.5 in. should be ramped or eliminated.
- Constructed openings (grates, storm drains, spaces between planks on boardwalks) should not be within the trail surface. If present, they should not allow passage of a 0.5 in. diameter sphere.
- Elongated openings should be placed perpendicular or diagonal to the dominant direction of travel.
- Running grades should not exceed 5 percent and the most gradual slope possible should be used at all times.
- If steeper grades exist, total running grade exceeding 8.33 percent should be less than 30 percent of the total trail length.
- Maximum grade segment should be designed with the following recommendations:

8.3% for a maximum of 200 ft.10% for a maximum of 30 ft.12.5% for a maximum of 10 ft.

- Lengths of steep grades should be minimized and free of other access barriers.
- Near the top and bottom of maximum grade segments, grade should transition to less than 5 percent.
- Rest intervals (smaller than rest areas) should be provided within 25 ft. of the top and bottom of maximum grade segments.
- The frequency of rest areas should be dependent upon terrain and trail use.
- · Cross slopes should be a maximum of 3 percent.
- Trail surfaces should be firm, stable and slip resistant.

Equestrian Trails

Purpose

Equestrian trails provide for horseback riding opportunities along multi-use trail corridors on separated paths within greenways.

Where to use

Along corridors that have adequate distance and size to allow for the integration of equestrians with other users or where equestrians are the sole users.

Guidelines/Considerations

• Plan trail routes with a desirable range of grades up to 10 percent. Do not exceed a maximum sustained grade of 15 percent. Avoid areas with grades steeper than 20 percent over a maximum distance of 100 feet.



Equestrian Trail Section



New Orleans District U.S. Army Corp of Engineers

- Provide access to drinking water for users and horses every 10 miles.
- Design trails for the safety of both the rider and the horse.
- Allow adequate sight lines along the trail especially along multi-use paths.
- Plan trail for day-use riding. Integrate day-use loops on long distance linear trails where appropriate.
- Day-use trails range from 3 to 10 miles depending upon the terrain and user ability. Long distance trails may cover more than 10 miles.
- Design widths to accommodate a steady flow of two-way horse traffic during peak periods of use.
- Locate trails in areas of stable, well-drained soils.
- Avoid areas that are wet or frequently flooded as horse traffic could damage them. If wet areas must be crossed use bridges, boardwalks or fords.
- Prohibit access to sensitive areas.
- Provide additional width to trail in steeply sloping areas. On steep side slopes place rocks or logs along the outer edge to prevent sloughing of trail edge.
- Design long climbing turns instead of switchbacks. If switchbacks are used, design the curve radius to a maximum of 10 feet. Grades of 10 percent to 15 percent leading to and from the curve will discourage shortcutting. Also use rocks and logs as barriers for a distance of 10 to 30 feet back from the turning point.
- Keep grass trails free of small stumps, rock debris, branches and woody plant growth.
- Provide frequent tethering places at trailheads and along the trail.
- Educate users and employ regulation to discourage grazing along trails and at trailheads.
- Design bridges to support the maximum number of loaded horses that may occupy it at one time. Provide secure footing across bridge tread.
- Use stream fords rather than bridges, especially in shared use conditions, if water velocity and depth permit. Stream fords should be used as much as possible and constructed with a wide stable base.
- Where soils may become unstable, use additional material such as crusher fines or wood shreds to help stabilize trail tread.
- Provide for additional space and staging areas at trailheads that will accommodate equestrian uses including trailer parking, horse tie off areas and grove gathering spaces.
- Post signage for both equestrian riders and multi-use path users that alerts them to the risk of spooking or alarming horses, which can become an unsafe condition along public use corridors.

Sight Distance on Trails Where to use

Any place where a user may come into conflict with another user, traffic, or other possible hazards. Trail types 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Guidelines

- Use 20 mph figures when designing a multi-use path. Use signs for exceptions. Where these sight line guidelines cannot be followed, trail signs must warn users of a curve ahead. A "slow" sign may also be needed for particularly blind curves.
- To help prevent accidents with high-speed users, design the longest possible sight lines into hard surface trails (at least 200 feet).
- Avoid sharp curves on grades.

Trail Grades

Where to use

Applies to trail types 2, 3, 4 and 5.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Grades up to 5 percent can be used on standard trail sections (intersections should have grades below 3 percent).
- Grades over 5 percent can be used for limited lengths of trail (see table).
- 8 percent grade is a practical maximum, every effort must be made to avoid grades above 8 percent.
- Grades above 5 percent are not considered ADA accessible.
- Avoid steep grades on sharp curves. Where a trail must curve on a grade, provide long sight lines and a transition zone at the top and bottom of the grade.
- Sign steep grades at the top of grades of 7 percent or more, where the length of the grade is 100' or more (or where the end of the grade is not visible), signs must warn users of the steep downgrade ahead.
- Provide a transition zone at the top and bottom of the grade.

Trail Surface Types: Concrete

Where to Use

Preferred material for use on sidewalks, on pathways separated from the road, and in low areas with high velocity flows crossing the trail. Trail types 4 and 5.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Minimum thickness is four inches and as specified by local governing authorities.
- Additional sub-base material may be need in certain areas depending upon soil conditions.
- Relatively easy to maintain and repair, but replacement cost is higher.

Construction Applications

<u>Grade</u>	<u>Limit on length</u>
5 - 6%	up to 800'
7%	up to 400'
8%	up to 300'
9%	up to 200'
10%	up to 100'
11+%	50' - not recommended

Trail Surface Types: Asphalt Where to Use

Preferred material for use on any type 4 and 5 facility.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Minimum thickness of 4 inches as specified by local governing authorities.
- Use a four inch-six inch compactible crushed stone sub-base, if soil conditions warrant.
- Provides a more flexible surface than concrete.
- Requires annual inspection and sealing of cracks for longer life.
- Overlaying every eight to10 years should be planned.

Trail Surface Types: Crushed Stone

Where to Use

Suitable for trail types 2 and 3.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Two inches of 1/4 minus compacted aggregate over four inches of 3/4 inch minus compacted aggregate.
- Geotextile fabric is recommended below the aggregate to limit weed growth and migration of aggregate into soil.
- Compact material to create firm, smooth walking surface.
- Will require continuous ongoing maintenance to provide an ADA compliant walking surface.

Trail Surface Types: Wood Mulch Where to Use

Suitable for trail types 2 and 3

Guidelines/Considerations

- Four inches of wood mulch on compacted sub-grade.
- Geotextile fabric beneath the mulch is recommended to limit weed growth.
- Compact material to create firm, smooth walking surface.
- Relatively easy to install, but will require continuous ongoing maintenance.

Steep Slopes

Purpose

When designing hillside trails, which will traverse steeply sloping areas, it is important to consider construction methods to help prevent future erosion along the trail.

Where to use

Where steep side slopes occur.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Use full-bench construction for side slopes >50 percent.
- Use 3/4 bench construction for side slopes 30-50 percent.
- Use a balanced bench construction for side slopes 10-30 percent.
- Do not use fill for the trail bed on slopes >30 percent.
- Make sure the cross slope of the trail does not exceed 2 percent and that surface is clear of obstructions that could prevent water from freely draining across the tread.
- Maximum slopes of cuts and fill near trail will depend on the soils and geology. Adjacent slopes should be designed to prevent debris from falling onto the surface of the trail and to prevent washouts from below.
- Small retaining or crib walls can be used to stabilize slopes on each side of the trail.
- Refer to Amenities Section for information on railings at steep drop-offs.
- Proper construction of fill slopes below the trailway is critical to avoiding slope failure.
- When possible, a more natural solution using erosion blankets and native vegetation should be used on back slopes and fill slopes.

Drainage

Purpose

To prevent failure of the trail tread by removing water from its surface using a cross slope, or side swales and culverts.

Where to use

Where existing cross slope drainage patterns or man-made drainage patterns cross trail surfaces. All trail types.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Cross slope is best used over asphalt and concrete trails.
- For proper drainage, trail tread must have 1/4" pitch/foot of hard surface.
- When pitch is toward the downhill side of the tread, be sure path edge is clear of obstructions.
- When pitch is toward uphill side of tread, a collection swale and culverts may be needed.
- Interceptor swales should be used on trails with adjacent slopes greater than 10 percent, or where water may drain onto tread from uphill.
- Water bars can be used to stabilize earth, mulch and some aggregate trails in sloped areas. Use proper construction and maintenance methods to prevent them from becoming a hazard.



Trail Slope Sections







Trail with Culvert Section



Access Control with Metal Bollard



Trail on Slope -Retaining Wall on High Side



Trail on Slope - Retaining Wall on Low Side with Railings

Access Control

Purpose

To prohibit unauthorized motorized vehicles from entering the trail system from adjacent roadways.

Where to use

At trailheads and at intersections with roadways. Trail types 3, 4 and certain situations in Type 5.

Guidelines/Considerations

Single Trail

- Posts or bollards in the center and at each edge of the trail.
- A minimum five-foot spacing recommended.
- Posts should be well-marked and visible to trail users, both day and night. Posts should be at least three feet high. Use reflective coatings, signage and appropriate pavement markings, such as four inch yellow stripe around the post as specified by MUTCD.
- Use a collapsible or removable bollard in the center of the trail to allow access by emergency and maintenance vehicles.

Split Trail

- Split entryway into two 5-foot paths separated by low landscaping to restrict entry of motor vehicles.
- This may be appropriate where heavy trail use may limit a bicyclist's view of the center bollard.

Retaining Walls Purpose

To prevent erosion of banks onto or underneath the trail surface.

Where to use

Locate retaining walls to prevent significant cut or fill of hillsides either above or below the trail. Trail types 2, 3, 4 and 5.

- Using vegetation to stabilize slopes is the preferred method of containing slopes from erosion.
- Allow for a wider shoulder between the wall and the trail.
- Provide the necessary railings along the trail on the downside of the slope where retaining walls are used.
- Possible materials to use: stone, landscape timbers, concrete, interlocking concrete blocks, pre-made concrete wall systems.

Railings

Purpose

Provides trail user safety and comfort by providing a barrier from vertical hazards such as steep side slopes.

Where to use

Use in areas where the trail is adjacent to ditches or steep slopes greater than 3:1 with a drop of over 30".

Guidelines/Considerations

- Pedestrian guardrails should be 42" high. Railings for bicyclists should be 54" high. For general multi-use trails, a 54" railing with a maximum four-inch opening is preferred.
- Begin the railing eight feet (min.) prior to the vertical hazard and extend eight feet (min.) beyond the hazard.
- Where grade exceeds 3:1 within six feet of the trail edge, provide a railing.
- Provide a flanged end to the railings to prevent trail users from colliding with the end of the railing.
- The trail shoulder should be a minimum of three feet from the edge of trail to the railing.
- Provide smooth rub rails at handlebar height for bicyclists. Handlebar height is generally 36"- 42" on an average size bicycle.

Clearing Vegetation for Trail Construction **Purpose**

To clear vegetation from trail construction corridors.

Where to use

The amount of vegetative clearing needed will vary with different locations and trail types. Trail types 1 and 2 will require minimal clearing while types 3 and 4 will require significantly more.

- Clearing and grubbing consists of tree, shrub and stump removal.
- The minimum width for clearing and grubbing of a 10-foot wide trail is 14 foot.
- Selective thinning includes removal of under brush and limbs to create open pockets within the forest canopy.
- Selective thinning for adequate visual clearances at intersections and sharp curves may be necessary.
- Selective clearing does not include removal of the forest canopy.
- Vegetative clearing should be consistent with local stream buffer ordinances.



Railing



Vegetative Clearing Section



Tread Creep - Stabilization Section

Stabilizing Tread Creep

Purpose

To prevent the lower edge of the trail surface from eroding due to heavy use or subsurface conditions.

Where to use

Trail types 2, 3 and 4.

Guidelines/Considerations

- One method of preventing trail creep is to place guide structures along the edge to prevent trail users from walking on the outer edge.
- Guide structures should be placed close to the downhill edge of the trail.
- Guide structures can be made of trees, log ends, rocks and stumps.
- Guide structures should not be more than one foot in height and should have at least one-third of the object buried into the ground.

Preventing Sloughing (Erosion)

Purpose

To prevent soil, rock and debris from moving downhill and onto the trail tread, which could narrow the trail width and push users to the outside edge, creating trail creep.

Where to use

Trail types 2, 3 and 4.

- Removing slough needs to be done on a regular basis and should be incorporated into routine maintenance.
- Use erosion control measures to prevent sloughing of debris onto trail surface.
- Prevent berming of debris along the outside edges of the trail surface, as it will not allow water to adequately drain across the trail surface.

Stabilizing Slopes

Purpose

To maintain slopes along trails, prevent erosion and ultimately extend the functional life of the trail.

Where to use

Streambanks and streambeds found along trail types 2, 3 and 4.

Guidelines

- Soil bioengineering and other methods provide natural means of stabilization and enhancing habitat. Consider ecological conditions such as soil moisture, soil fertility, temperature and sunlight.
- Installation techniques for live material include: plugging/ transplanting, branch layering, live fascines and brush mattresses.
- Possible materials for use include grasses, forbs, shrubs, trees, vines, root wads, coir fiber rolls, crib walls, rock and stone.



Slope Stabilization Using Facines

Trail Signage



One objective of the MetroGreen Design Guidelines is to achieve a comprehensive and uniform level of trail signing across the seven-county metropolitan area. It is intended to help enhance the safety of trails users, improve the connection among communities in the system and promote the concept of MetroGreen.

Signs are important trail components that are often overlooked in the design process. Signs help regulate the flow of traffic, alert users about trail characteristics and potential hazards, and provide information necessary to the enjoyment of the recreational opportunity. Since MetroGreen is a regional system, serving people from outside the community, signs can be essential to a pleasant trail experience.



MetroGreen Logo

System identification is also important to provide continuity and recognition of MetroGreen throughout the metropolitan area. In many cases individual jurisdictions will also want to identify segments as their own. In these cases, a joint signing scheme is suggested so that both purposes are served on the fewest poles possible. Some cities in the MetroGreen area have already developed joint signage standards. These serve as a guide to future solutions.

This section includes general signage considerations, guidelines on incorporating the MetroGreen logo into new and existing signs, as well as guidelines for various types of signs.

General Design of Signs

Properly designed signs help unify and create a sense of identity for the trail corridor. When designing a system of signs, it is important to consider the design fundamentals, including balance, unity, proportion and size. Information, graphics and symbols should be simple and easily understood. Needs of mobility, visually, hearing or learning impaired should be considered. Also consider that many trail signs will have to be read and understood easily by users in motion.

Organize the signs so they are read from left to right and top to				
bottom. Allow plenty of blank space along margins to highlight and				
reinforce the information on the sign. Graphics and appropriate				
letter sizes aid in guiding the eye through the sign. Colors used in				
signage provide depth and organization. Contrasting colors are				
recommended to command the trail users' attention.				

It is best to communicate through a universal set of symbols and graphics. Such graphics can be easily understood by young trail users as well as non-reading visitors, foreign language speakers and learning-impaired trail users. There are many standardized sign graphics and symbols available to use in the design of signs. The Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), 2000,

	Viewing	
Letter Sizes	Distance	
1/2	4	
5/8	6	
2 1/2	30	
3	40	
3 1/2	50	
4	60	
4 1/2	70	
5	80	
6	90	

Part 9 provides a standard set of graphics for bicycle facilities. The National Park Service uses a standard font which is available online at www.avenza.com/freezone/freezone.goodies.html, providing camera-ready artwork for universal park symbols and pictograms.

Many communities like to include their logos and graphics on signs. MetroGreen has also developed a standard logo for the designation of corridors along the system. Communities are encouraged to include this logo on all signage in the MetroGreen system. A camera-ready copy of the logo may be obtained by contacting the Mid-America Regional Council. Examples of how to integrate the MetroGreen logo into signage will follow in this section.

The proportion, style and size of lettering used on signs is as important as the colors and graphics. Selecting the appropriate font style aids with the overall readability and character of the sign system. Serif and Sans Serif font types are the best for readability. Script fonts tend to blend together and are harder to read. It is best to use a standard font with variations such as italics, boldness and size for emphasis. A hierarchy of letter sizes can help communicate how a sign should be read. Letter sizes should be based upon readability at the desired viewing distance.

The location of signs along trails is as important as their specific design. Generally, signs should be placed along the right-hand side of the trail, similar to the way signs are placed along road-ways. MUTCD provides specific guidelines for locating signage along a bicycle facility. Trail traffic occurs in both directions and signs must be appropriate for each direction. For instance, some informational signage may only occur on one side of the trail. Avoid creating conflicts with physical objects, obstructing views or placing too many signs in one area. When placing more than one sign on a post, locate the most important sign on top. Avoid mounting more than two signs per post.

Incorporating the MetroGreen Logo into Existing Signs

Purpose

To designate existing local trails, which may already have a signage system, as MetroGreen segments connected to the regional system.

Where to use

Retrofit existing signs along MetroGreen segments.

Guidelines/Considerations

• Minimum size for the MetroGreen logo shall be 2" x 2" and should be consistent in design with the MARC version.



Incorporating MetroGreen Logo Indian Creek Trail - Segment Jo07

- On small entry signs locate the MetroGreen sign below the existing sign, using 6" letters, Helvetica font and the MetroGreen logo.
- On pole mounted sign or MUTCD guidance signs locate a 3" x 6" MetroGreen sign below the existing sign.
- Conform to local signing standards where applicable.

These signs may take on many forms and types. They can be simple guidance signs directing trail users, entry signs at trailheads, trail identification signs with guidance, trail signs with maps, interpretive signs and other local signs. Within these signs a trail-specific logo can be used to highlight the uniqueness of a trail and its landscape. The repetition of an interesting logo at access points can create a positive image of the trail and provide the sense of a unified trail system. It is recommended to use the MetroGreen logo in the design of these signs.



Guidance signs provide trail information to the user. These signs can be directional, informational and can designate routes. These signs may point out areas of interest and support facilities. Informational signs include mileage markers. Location signs orient a user within a larger area, such as a park or trail system. Route signs mark bicycle routes along roadways. Other guidance signs may be temporary and offer public information regarding events, construction and other short-term conditions. Temporary signs are secondary to permanent warning and regulation signs, but they should still be easily visible.

Where to use

Guidance signs are used to mark routes and direct trail users. These would be used in trail types 2, 3, 4 and 5.

- Inform trail users of change of direction, distance and destination.
- Repeat at regular intervals, as access points along the route may vary.
- Typically when using the MUTCD standards, guide signs are green when providing directional guidance, brown for recreational or cultural interest and orange for construction areas.
- National standards and symbols are available for these signs, refer to the MUTCD 2000 manual, Part 9, for requirements.



```
Guidance Sign
```

Entry Signs

Purpose

Entry signs designate access points to the trail system and create a unified system identity. For communities which do not have standard entry signs, some guidelines are provided to aid in the development of a local style. The accompanying graphic represents a sample of how communities can incorporate graphics into entry signs.

Where to use

Located at the trailheads, at major intersections or access points along the trail.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Use a 8" x 8" MetroGreen logo.
- Local trail name should be 4[°] to 6" in height, Helvetica font and located in the center of the panel.
- Locate the participating agency logo and name near the bottom of the sign, use 2"- 3" height letters, Helvetica font and center in the middle of the panel.
- Use contrasting colors, such as dark green background with white lettering.
- Keep graphics simple.
- Where logo colors conflict with background allow for a 1/4" white border around the logo.

Wayfinding Signs

Purpose

Directional signage helps trail users plan and find features along the trail. It should include the name of the destination, the distance to the destination and an arrow indicating the direction to the destination.

Where to use

Located at crossings of minor roadways and at other junctions of the trail system.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Place far enough away from the trail to not interfere with the trail users.
- Trail identification panels should be 24" x 18" aluminum sign with dark green background and white font color.
- Lettering should be 2-3" height letters, Helvetica font located in the center on the sign panel.
- Directional signs should be 6" x 24" with text height of 1 " and Helvetica font.







Directional Sign

- Use a 4" x 4" pressure treated wood post or 2" x 2" painted or galvanized steel post and galvanized bolts to attach sign.
- Use a 4" x 4" MetroGreen logo.

Trail Map Signs

Purpose

Map signs help trail user orient themselves and plan routes.

Where to use

Locate at trailheads and at major trail crossings and intersections.

Guidelines/Considerations

- They should be placed far enough away from the trail to not interfere with the trail users
- Mount on a 4" x 4" pressure-treated wood post or 2" x 2" painted or galvanized steel post and galvanized bolts to attach sign.
- Sign should be 12" x 18" and with text height of 3/4" and Helvetica Font.
- Background color should be dark green with white lettering.
- Maps should indicate local trail route.
- Use a 2" x 2" MetroGreen logo.
- Local trail name should be centered and below the map.
- Participating agency logo and text should be located at the bottom of the sign.

Regional Maps

Purpose

Helps trail users orient themselves and identifies the trail as part of the regional system.

Where to use

Locate at trailheads.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Place in the kiosk at trailheads. (See amenities section for kiosk guidelines.)
- Regional maps can be obtained from Mid-America Regional Council (www.marc.org).





Kansas City MetroGreen Plan

Local Sign

Interpretive Signs

Purpose

Interpretive signs serve an informational purpose, allowing the user to learn about historic sites, events and areas of ecological significance. These signs make a trail experience unique.

Where to use

Points of interest could include locations of important political events, historic architecture, local history and culture, native or special flora and fauna, scenic views and unusual geological features.

Guidelines/Considerations

- They should be placed far enough away from the trail to not interfere with trail users.
- · Install signs in locations that are accessible to all.
- Install sign at viewing height of visitors including wheelchairs (30"-34" from the bottom of the panel to the finish grade).
- Keep typeface legible and as readable as possible.
- Select colors which prevent eye strain and glare and allow excellent readability (white should not be used as a background color).
- Organize the board for quick scanning.
- Use interesting shapes and colors in the sign.
- Keep text at a minimum and use interesting titles and graphics to tell the story.
- Limit the number of signs to maintain user interest.
- Place in areas which do not obstruct views or points of interest described on the signs.
- Place signs earlier in the trail experience on long trail routes.
- Material used in interpretive signs could include: wood signs, fiberglass embedment, metal, metal-micro imaging, porcelain enamel, lexan-aluminum laminate, medium density overlay.

Regulatory Signs

Purpose

Regulatory signs are used to notify the trail users of the laws, regulations and rules governing the trail. These laws will vary depending upon the location of the specific trail segments and the ownership of the corridor. Some common regulatory signs include: stop, yield, speed limit, bicycle lane designation and exclusion.

Where to use

Regulatory signs provide traffic control and are most often used with type 5, bicycle pedestrian facilities within the right-of-way or type 3 and 4 multi-use paths. They are usually erected where the specific regulation applies and should be highly visible near trailheads and access points.



Regulatory Signage



Interpretive Signage Trailside Travelers - Segment Ja16

Design Guidelines for MetroGreen

Guidelines/Considerations

- Red, black and white are typical colors used in regulatory signs.
- National standards and symbols should be used for these signs. Refer to the MUTCD 2000 manual, Part 9 for specific requirements.
- Limit the number of regulatory signs along the trail selecting only those that are necessary.
- Regulatory signs should be placed on a 4" x 4" wood post or 2" x 2" painted or galvanized steel post.



Warning Signage

Warning Signs Purpose

Warning signs point out existing or potential hazards or changes in facility condition that a user may encounter. Like regulatory signs, warning signs should be highly visible so that the trail user is informed of the upcoming hazard or condition.

Where to use

They are typically used near intersections and sharp curves or to indicate steep slopes, changes in surface condition and high water areas and to denote a change in facility design or condition.

Guidelines/Considerations

- A yellow background is the color used in warning signs with black letters or symbols.
- National standards and symbols should be used for these signs. Refer to the MUTCD 2000 manual for requirements.
- Remove or mitigate hazard areas along a trail which will eliminate the need for warning signs.

Pavement Markings

Purpose

Pavement markings help alert trail users to potential conflicts and convey regulatory and warning messages to trail users and motorists at intersections or crossings.

Where to use

Where there are potential conflicts with trail users and motorists, to separate uses and to designate oncoming hazards or conflicts.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Use a painted 4"-wide yellow center stripe to separate opposite directions of travel in cases where there is a heavy volume of traffic; vertical and horizontal curve sight distances are restricted; and on unlighted paths where nighttime use is anticipated.
- Use skid- or slip-resistant material in the paint when marking trails.

- Use edge lines along areas where nighttime traffic is expected and in areas where visually impaired users would have a hard time determining the outer edge of the trail.
- Indicate oncoming obstruction of the trail by pavement markings.
- National standards and symbols should be used for these signs, refer to the MUTCD 2000 manual, Part 9 for specific requirements.

Trail Amenities and support facilities are an integral part of a successful trail system. Amenities and support facilities provide:

- Areas for trail users to stop and relax
- Safety zones
- Areas for group activities
- Staging for day trips
- Information about trail experiences
- Maps of the trail system

The types of amenities and facilities and their placement along the trail depend on several different factors: the setting and proposed uses of the trail, the trail's intensity of use, the level of maintenance the facilities will require, budgetary constraints and the utility requirements of the facilities. The table below shows amenities to consider for each trail type.

, M Ś

	No Facility Development	Limied development	Unbared Use l'ail M	Laved Loo Tail M	Winin Right OF Way
Trail Type	Type 1	Type 2	Type 3	Type 4	Type 5
Trailheads		٠	۲	•	
Kiosk		٠	•	٠	
Vehicular parking			۲	۲	
Restrooms				۲	
Drinking Fountain			۲	۲	
Trash Receptacles			۲	۲	
Benches				۲	
Shelters			۲	۲	
Picnic Areas			۲	۲	
Phones			۲	۲	۲
Lighting					
Bike Parking			۲	۲	
Landscaping			۲	۲	۲
Fences			۲		



Large Trailhead - KATY Trail

Trailheads Purpose

The trailhead will be the first point of contact for trail users to the regional trail system and it is the gateway to a successful trail system. These places are as varied in style and layout as the character of the places they serve. Trailheads may be as simple as a few parking spaces and a trail sign or as elaborate as sizable parking areas, equestrian staging areas, drinking fountains, restroom facilities and shelters. Regardless of their size, trailheads should be simple, inviting and kept clean. Their main purpose is to provide for the transfer from motorized vehicles to non-motorized trail travel.

Where to use

Trailheads should be located near primary roadways or within existing parks where access to the greenway corridor is possible.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Since a trailhead is a high-activity area, it should be located away from sensitive, natural areas.
- Major trailheads should include parking areas for more than 10 vehicles and/or trailers, and could include such amenities as kiosks, regional maps, picnic areas, shelters, landscaping, restrooms, phones, air for bicycles and drinking fountains.
- Minor trailheads should include parking for less than 10 vehicles and include such amenities as trash receptacles, small kiosks and trail map signs.

Kiosks

Purpose

Kiosks are places for visitors to orient themselves, learn of site opportunities, read the rules and regulations of the site, and find the hours of operation.

Where to use

Kiosks should be located at trailheads and entry points to the trail system.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Place rules in a convenient location at entrances, trailheads or around restrooms where visitors will have time to read them.
- Use provocative and attractive text and graphics; be positive and give reasons for the rules.
- Kiosk design should be coordinated with the character of the site and style of the area.
- Keep the style of the kiosk simple and readily identifiable by trail users as an information contact station.
- Bulletin boards, regional trail maps, rules and regulations and accessibility advisories should be designed as part of the kiosk.
- When locating kiosks next to parking facilities, set the units back far enough from traffic and protect the support posts with appropriately sized bollards.

Vehicular Parking

Purpose

To provide a place to leave cars while using a trail.

Where to use

Provide vehicular parking at major access points such as trailheads or within parks.



Small Trailhead Mill Creek Streamway - Segment Jo14



Large Kiosk - KATY Trail



Restroom Facilities - KATY Trail

Guidelines/Considerations

- Parking lot should have clearly marked spaces and a safe entrance and exit coordinated with traffic flows from adjacent roadways.
- All parking areas at trailheads should be ADA accessible.
- All equestrian trails should have additional room for trailers and staging.
- Parking lot should be paved if it is expected to have year-round use.
- · Provide adequate drainage of parking areas.
- Unpaved or gravel parking areas may include one or two paved accessible spaces.

Restrooms

Purpose

To provide adequate sanitary facilities for users' convenience.

Where to use

Full-service restrooms must be located near existing utilities and in areas that are easily accessible to service personnel.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Restrooms must comply with local ordinance codes and accessibility standards.
- Facility should be lockable and secured at night or in the off-season.
- The number of stalls within a facility will vary according to the level of trail use.
- When designing a facility consider characteristics of site, the level of trail use and the level of maintenance and security that can be provided.

Drinking Fountains

Purpose

To provide a more enjoyable experience and to protect the health of trail users.

Where to use

Locate near restrooms but at least five feet off circulation pathways. Drinking fountains may also be located at rest areas, parks or other points along the trail.

- Cast iron and pre-cast concrete are recommended materials for drinking fountains.
- Standard and accessible height bowls should be installed to accommodate all trail users.
- Drinking fountain should be placed on a well-drained surface.
- Include hose bib connections for maintenance purposes.

Trash Receptacles Purpose

Provide for proper maintenance and appearance of the trail.

Where to use

Locate trash receptacles at each trail entrance and each seating area. Placement of other receptacles will depend upon the location of concessions, facilities and areas of group activities.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Receptacles should be selected using the following criteria: expected trash amount, maintenance program requirements, types of trail users and durability.
- Receptacles need to be accessible to maintenance personnel and trail users.
- Receptacles should be set back a minimum of three feet from the edge of the trail.

Benches

Purpose

Allow trail users the opportunity to rest along the trail and relax and enjoy special points.

Where to use

Areas that provide interesting views, shade or shelter from seasonal winds. Also consider locating benches at certain intervals along the trail and at the tops of steep slopes.

- Benches and other site furniture should be located a minimum of five feet from the edge of circulation paths.
- Drainage should slope away from the bench and trail.
- Wheelchair access should be provided alongside benches with firm surface to match trail.
- Locate a minimum of two feet from trash receptacles, light poles and sign posts.
- Locate a minimum of four feet from restrooms, phone booths and drinking fountains.
- Benches may come in a variety of materials including wood, painted metal, concrete, split-faced logs or flat-topped boulders.
- Benches should be securely anchored to the ground.



Bench located along trail

Shelters

Purpose

Shelters provide users a safe haven from weather elements such as sun, rain, snow and wind, and also provide a location for group activities.

Where to use

Near the trail and other amenities such as pay phones, vehicular parking, drinking fountains and restrooms.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Locate shelter near the trail and provide a connecting trail to the shelter.
- Shelters should not interfere with circulation along the trail.
- Factors that may determine the placement of shelter: location of existing and proposed utilities, existing and proposed plant material, and other natural or man-made obstructions.
- The roof should provide for adequate drainage and prevent the buildup of snow. Extend slab three feet beyond roof line to minimize erosion.
- In locations where wind is a frequent problem consider wind screens such as clear Lexan walls or windbreak plantings.

Picnic Areas

Purpose

Provide areas for trail users to congregate for large and small group functions or to just sit and relax.

Where to use

Picnic areas should be placed in locations that provide for the comfort and enjoyment of trail users.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Picnic tables may be constructed of wood, metal, concrete or recycled plastic.
- Picnic areas should be set far enough back from the trail to avoid interfering with circulation along the trail.
- Wheelchair access should be possible at some picnic tables.
- Wheelchair-accessible tables should be connected to the trail by a firm surface path.

Phones

Purpose

Provides a means of contacting emergency personnel while using trail facilities and for convenience of users.

Where to use

At major intersections, trailheads, entrances/exits of tunnels and other areas of potential conflict along the trail. A calling system is especially important in remote areas.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Site-specific design should be considered when locating phones. Many urban areas have plenty of opportunities to use phones while more rural areas offer limited access to phones.
- Where feasible, locate phones at a minimum interval of every 1/2 mile. Some cases may dictate a closer interval of 1/4 mile.
- When locating emergency phones provide reference information on the location, such as mile markers.

Lighting

Purpose

Allows trail to be used in the nighttime and provide safety for trail users.

Where to use

Place lighting in potential conflict areas such as tunnels and consider lighting along highly used trail systems in urban areas.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Locate lighting at entrances and exits of bridges, street crossings and tunnels.
- Design the lighting levels appropriate to each situation.
- Avoid light fixtures at eye level which could impair visibility.
- Only use along a trail if night usage is desired, if it is acceptable to neighboring land uses, and the area is not a wildlife area.

Bike Parking

Purpose

Provides a safe place to secure bicycles for an extended period of time and encourages use of bicycles as a transportation mode.

Where to use

Locate bike racks or parking areas in places that allow for visual supervision, contain lighting and where convenient for commuters, shoppers and tourists.

Guidelines/Considerations

• When selecting types of bike racks consider their locations, how bicycles can be secured and the dimensions of the bicycles to be used on the trail. Racks should secure bikes by the frame.



Lighting -Leavenworth Landing Park -Segment Lv07



• Bicycle lockers or parking areas should be used where public transit systems cross or stop near trail facilities.



Landscaping -Mill Creek Streamway - Segment Jo14

Landscaping

Purpose

Landscaping enhances the aesthetic appearance of the trail and provides a sense of security for the trail users.

Where to use

Landscaping should be used along trail corridors type 3, 4 and 5.

Guidelines/Considerations

- Locate plant material out of the clear zone on each side of the trail.
- Use landscaping to frame views to special features along a trail.
- Place landscaping around areas that will protect trail users from the elements such as places with lots of sun or very windy areas.
- Use landscaping to screen undesired views.
- Consider use of native vegetation.

Fences

Purpose

Fences enhance and improve the quality of a trail and are used to control circulation or to protect sensitive areas.

Where to use

Fences should be used to control access to sensitive areas, cueing spaces in parking lots and to restrict circulation to hazard-ous areas.

- Fences used to control circulation should be designed to control movement and to attract the trail users' attention.
- Design of the fence should fit the context of the trail.
- A simple one-rail spilt rail can be used at intersections of high traffic areas to remind users to stay on the trail and prevent damage to the off-trail surface. This fence type is more for circulation than for safety.
- Use a two-rail fence system to prevent serious short-cutting areas and in areas where comfort level and circulation are a priority.
- When fencing hazardous areas, the size of the fence should be proportional to the amount of the hazard. Extremely hazardous areas may require a chain link fence.
- When fencing a drop off of more than 30" refer to the railings section of this document.

appendix E

MetroGreen Finance Strategy



Executive Summary

The Mid-America Regional Council is providing coordination and planning services on behalf of local communities throughout the Kansas City metro area to create MetroGreen - a vast network of trails and greenways that will connect neighborhoods and unite communities. These green corridors serve to meet an increasing public demand for recreational opportunities, preserve important natural resources, link growing communities, and respond to the pressures of new growth and development. In communities large and small, public officials, residents, and developers alike are recognizing the benefits that trails and greenways provide to the health, environment, and quality of life of the region.

Counties and municipalities in the metro area are currently using a variety of techniques to finance trail and greenway projects. These range in size and scope from the request of a land gift by a developer to the passage of a voter-approved parks/trails sales tax measure. This report is designed to explore the range of financing options available, illustrating successful approaches within the region and outlining potential new opportunities. (The MetroGreen region includes the following counties: Johnson County, KS; Leavenworth County, KS; Unified Government of Wyandotte/Kansas City, KS; Jackson County, MO; Clay County, MO; Platte County, MO; Cass County, MO).

Achieving the vision of MetroGreen may take one of several approaches, ranging from a wholesale regional funding initiative -such as St. Louis' Confluence Greenway, a regional effort in Missouri and Illinois- to a series of independent (yet, ideally interconnecting) local efforts reflecting the goals, financing capacity and political landscape of that county or municipality.

Local governments have a wide range of funding sources to consider and can look to other funding partners, such as state and federal programs. Local governments may also emulate the successful efforts of several other metro area governments that have combined funding sources into a so-called "funding quilt." For example, the city of Lee's Summit relies on

Creating a Funding Quilt several sources to fund its comprehensive greenway plan. Voters have approved a dedicated parks/trails sales tax, federal and state grant money has been secured, and park planners work closely with developers to encourage donations of parks land, trails, and green spaces.

In another instance, the city of Lenexa uses a variety of funding sources to implement its "Rain into Recreation" program. These include a 1/8-cent sales tax for stormwater/recreation improvements, a stormwater utility charge on residential, commercial, and industrial land users, and a capital fee on new development. These funds are supplemented with revenue from existing sources such as the county Storm Water Management Program.

The largest funding source for MetroGreen will be individual local governments' tax revenues. State and federal funds (as well as private sources) can serve as incentives, or as supplements, but relying upon them as primary funding sources will limit the ability to achieve the vision of MetroGreen.

Overview of Key Financing Options

The financing options utilized by a community will depend on a variety of factors, such as taxing capacity, budgetary resources, voter preferences, and political will of the governing body within a jurisdiction. From the top down, funding for trails and greenways can come from federal and state grants, the creation of regional special districts, county and municipal taxing/borrowing options, and local non-taxing sources such as impact fees, stormwater utilities, and negotiated donations by landowners.

The ability of local governments to establish dedicated funding sources for trails and greenways (and more generally parks and land conservation) depends upon state enabling authority. Both Kansas and Missouri have given local governments a broad and varied range of options to fund trails and greenways such as taxes, borrowing, impact fees, etc.

These funding options, explored below, have varying degrees of difficulty to implement and yield significantly different sums of money. For instance, sales tax measures are fairly popular and can generate considerable funds. They do, however, require voter approval and are limited by a jurisdiction's taxing capacity. Alternatively, some local planners are successfully encouraging developers to donate land during the planning process - an approach with a simpler implementation process, yet one that will likely yield fewer conservation resources. Whatever approach is chosen, it is important that a community carefully assess its options and design a program that reflects local needs, maximizes local resources, and leverages outside funding.

Federal & State Sources

At the federal level, local communities in Missouri and Kansas are taking advantage of increased grant dollars from programs such as the US Department of Interior's Land and Water Conservation Fund and the US Department of Transportation's TEA-21 Program. Within the TEA-21 program, Transportation Enhancements, Congestion Mitigation Air Quality, and the Recreational Trails Programs support bicycle and multiuse trail development. The US Environmental Protection Agency's Section 319 Nonpoint Source Pollution Program includes stream preservation as an eligible activity. These federal sources typically require a local funding commitment and are competitively awarded. Since these resources are not sufficient to fully fund local trails projects, it is recommended that federal grants be used to supplement a locally funded trails program.

Both Kansas and Missouri have state programs that provide matching grants to local governments for land conservation, including trails and greenways. Missouri has a dedicated funding source - a portion of the sales tax - while Kansas does not. However, both Missouri's Landmark Local Parks Program and Kansas' Local Government/Outdoor Recreation Grant Program are subject to annual legislative appropriation. In the current fiscal year, no state appropriations were made to these programs in either state. Missouri's Department of Conservation has a statewide sales tax, which provides for the acquisition of natural lands throughout the state. While not specifically intended for greenways and trails, this statewide fund could be a resource in limited circumstances.

Local Options: Sales Tax

Dedicated sales taxes can generate considerable sums of money for conservation/trails. For example, Platte County's 1/2-cent sales tax is expected to generate about \$60 million over 10 years, about \$9 million of which will be used to fund the county's portion of the proposed Northland trails system. In the city of Olathe, voters approved a 1/8-cent sales tax in November 1999. Portions of the revenues are being used to fund trails and greenways and to leverage federal TEA-21 funds. The sales tax is a common source of county and municipal funds in the metro region, including such projects as parks, recreation, trails stormwater and other related capital improvements. Objections to the sales tax generally revolve around the regressive nature of the tax.

Local Options: Property Tax

In general, property taxes can provide a steady source of revenue while broadly distributing the tax burden. However, there is stiff competition for these funds for other public purposes and a high level of concern among taxpayers about high rates. In Johnson County, residents have supported several major park and trail funding measures in recent years, including a 1986 1/2-mill tax levy that established the Streamways Parks System, a countywide network of trails and parks along eight major streams. A major consideration in the decision to use property taxes for greenways and trails could be the relationship between green space and increased property values.

Local Options: Borrowing

Borrowing funds can provide a community with substantial revenue upfront to purchase land when it is available, while spreading costs into the future to be borne by current and future beneficiaries. On the downside, financing charges are accrued and voter approval is required in many cases (a super-majority is required in Missouri). In Leawood, voters passed a \$12.5 million general obligation bond - the largest bond in the city's history - to add parkland and improve existing parks. The implementation process and voter approval requirements for property tax levies and general obligation bonds vary in Missouri and Kansas

Local Options: Impact Fees/Developer Dedications

Many area communities have park and open space dedication requirements for new residential development. In the city of Kearney, developers are required to dedicate open space or parklands upon which trails can be developed or donate money in lieu of land in the amount of \$150 per new home. In addition, the city is incorporating sidewalk trails into its road widening projects, which will be connected to the main trail networks and neighborhood schools.

Local Options: Stormwater Utility Fees

Stormwater utility fees are helping the city of Lenexa fund its "Rain-into-Recreation" program, a series of natural park-like detention basins connected by greenways and trails. These fees and the innovative, multifunding approach being used by Lenexa could become a regional model.

Regional Options

The potential for a regional financing program includes such options as a modification of the bi-state tax (the current enabling legislation is limited to cultural and sports facilities and activities), and regional recreation and transportation districts in Missouri.

Private - Corporate & Philanthropic

Grant funds from existing foundations are typically only available when a nonprofit partner is involved. In fact, some foundations have policies against awarding grants directly to governmental agencies. Foundations can, however, be structured to play an important role in the land conservation process, raising money from individual and corporate donors, large grant-aiding foundations, and state and federal grant programs. These foundations are created with the mission of supporting the governmental entity's conservation program by providing financial and other support. Corporate funds can also provide local matches for grants and corporations can play leadership roles in efforts to create local public sources. An analysis of election trends is helpful in understanding voting behavior and levels of public support for fiscal measures within a community and a region. This information can help guide local financing decisions in addition to public opinion polls designed to test support for a trails measure. An election analysis involves a review of all fiscal and environmental measures at the state, county, municipal, and special district levels over a period of roughly five years. Examining how these measures have fared and at which elections (special, primary, general, mail ballot) can help local decision-makers assess next steps.

In the Kansas City metro area, voters have shown a strong willingness to support public financing measures, including taxing and borrowing for parks, trails, and greenways. Support varies among jurisdictions and spending measures, as outlined in the report, but public support is generally strong and many communities have approved land conservation finance measures in recent years. In Johnson County alone, voters have supported several major park and trail funding measures in recent years: a countywide 1/2 mill tax levy in 1986 to fund the Streamways Parks System, a countywide \$6 million general obligation bond in 1998 to acquire land for Big Bull Creek Regional Park, and a 1/8-cent parks sales tax in the city of Olathe in 1999.

A review of the experiences of local communities in the Kansas City metropolitan area finds that public involvement in developing a clear plan for the use of new public resources is important to gaining necessary public support. Careful consideration should be given to the implementation of financing techniques that require voter approval and those that do not. To implement most voter-approved taxing/borrowing options, a three-step approach is recommended: feasibility research, public opinion polling, and measure design. First, research is conducted into a jurisdiction's financing capacity and the potential revenues that could be raised via different options. This type of research is provided at the county level in this report. This research will help inform local leaders about the funding options available, how much revenue these options would raise, and what the impact might be on residents.

To assess voter preferences, their willingness to fund trails and greenways (in relation to other public needs) and how much they are willing to spend, scientific public opinion polling should be conducted. Polling will help determine the type and size of a financing measure and the local conservation priorities of the public. Should the result of the research and polling indicate a favorable response, a ballot measure is carefully designed to reflect public priorities and a community's conservation needs. Considering Election Trends

Next Steps

Demographic, Economic & Political Overview

"The dominant population trend around Kansas City continues to be one of rapid suburban growth," reported the <u>Kansas City Star</u> in its coverage of newly released U.S. Census figures. "Five of the nine outlying counties in the bi-state area grew by at least 20 percent."¹ The 7-county bi-state region included in the MetroGreen plan grew 12.3 percent to 1,672,418 a lower rate than the national average, but higher than either Missouri or Kansas. Population on the Missouri side of the state line grew almost as much as on the Kansas side in the 1990s - a big change from the '70s and '80s when Kansas counties grew much faster. In Missouri, Cass and Platte counties grew at a faster rate than Johnson County, Kansas.

Rising property values and lower crime rates did not produce the anticipated population turnaround in the urban core. Although reinvestment in older neighborhoods has been stronger during the last decade, most of the region's growth has been in new suburban areas, creating the need for new infrastructure. Residents are clearly willing to trade longer commute times for a new home in the suburbs and as a result the landscape is rapidly changing - wider roads, new commercial districts and housing developments, and loss of open space.

The three fastest growing cities in the metropolitan area with populations greater than 20,000 over the past decade are Lee's Summit, Missouri, Olathe, Kansas, and Leawood, Kansas.² (Olathe added almost 30,000 residents and grew by 46.5 percent in the last decade.) First ring suburbs, including Prairie Village, Raytown, Grandview, Merriam, and Roeland Park lost population. The largest cities in the metropolitan area continue to be Kansas City, Missouri; Kansas City, Kansas (Unified Government of Wyandotte County); Independence, Missouri; and Overland Park, Kansas.

Within the city of Kansas City, Missouri, the population shifts have occurred north of the Missouri River. Kansas City in Clay and Platte counties is growing significantly faster than census experts expected (118,635 residents). The city south of the river lost nearly 18,500 people (322,910). With this shift in population and political influence, greater attention is expected to be given to basic services, stormwater management, and preservation of open space.

Population Growth & Median Income: MetroGreen Counties

County	Population 2000	Percentage Change, 1990 to 2000	Median Household Income (1997 model- based estimate)
Platte Co., MO	73,781	27.50%	\$52, 960
Clay Co., MO	184,006	19.90%	\$46,602
Cass Co., MO	82,092	28.70%	\$43,100
Jackson Co., MO	654,880	3.40%	\$37,732
Wyandotte Co., KS	157,882	-2.60%	\$30,056
Johnson Co., KS	451,086	27.10%	\$59,870
Leavenworth Co., KS	68,691	6.70%	\$44,046

Source: U.S. Census Bureau.

The Kansas City area economy experienced relatively flat growth in the last quarter of 2000 and the first quarter of 2001, generally following the U.S. and state economies. Earlier predictions showed a modest rebound, both nationally and regionally, by the end of 2001. The economic forecast prepared by MARC for the Greater Kansas City Chamber of Commerce predicted that Kansas City's gross regional product would grow 2.2 percent for the year, which follows zero growth in the first quarter of 2001. There will also be 14,200 fewer jobs than originally predicted. Still, overall unemployment rates remain low and researchers predicted that the economy would return to long-term growth trend rates in 2002.³ This forecast has been revised, given the events of September 11, and it is expected that the nation and the region will not experience growth in the GDP or jobs until mid-year 2002.

The softening economy has impacted state and local government budgets. Both states have announced budget cutbacks in programs and services. Local governments are impacted by both the lower state revenues and by slower local tax collections.

Missouri

Cass, Clay, Jackson, and Platte are first-class counties. Platte, Clay, and Cass Counties have three-member county commissions (a presiding commissioner and two associate commissioners.) Jackson County operates under a Constitutional Home Rule Charter that provides for an elected executive and a nine-member legislative body.⁴ Municipalities on the Missouri side of the metro area range from large cities like Kansas City and Independence with Constitutional Charters, to third, and fourth class cities and villages. Kansas City, Missouri has 13 council members, including the mayor. (More on the classification of cities in the following chapter).

Kansas

Leavenworth County is governed by an elected three-member commission. Johnson County functions under a Commission-Administrator form of government. Five commissioners, who are elected to staggered four-year terms, appoint a county administrator. (A recent charter election will result in an elected commission chairman in 2002).

The Region's Economy

Political Overview

The governing body of the Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas consists of a 10-member Commission and a Mayor/ Chief Executive Officer. Eight commission positions are elected within a geographic district. The mayor runs countywide for the primary and the general elections. The mayor appoints the county administrator with approval of the commission.⁵

Cities in Kansas are first, second, or third class, depending on population size. (More on the classification of cities in the following section.)

Public Financing Options

Park & Greenways Funding Options at the Regional, County & Municipal Level

Given the ambitious goals of the MetroGreen plan (i.e. creating a vast, connecting trail system throughout the Kansas City metro region), a combination of funding sources - local, state, federal, and private - will be required for implementation. With extensive competition for state and federal funds, it is also assumed that the primary responsibility for funding any type of conservation program will rest with local governments. State and federal money will probably serve as incentives or supplements. This section outlines potential sources available from all levels of government to help fund a system of trails throughout the Kansas City metro region.

Federal & State Conservation Funding Summary Expanded federal conservation funds are available through Conservation and Reinvestment Act (CARA), which will provide \$12 billion over six years beginning in FY 2002. While funding for each category under CARA is still subject to annual appropriations, minimum levels have been guaranteed. In addition, federal land conservation funds are available through programs within the Federal Transportation Act, Farmland Protection Act, Wetlands Reserve Program, Army Corps of Engineers funds, and E.P.A. Non-point Source Pollution Grants.⁶

Some states rely on a single revenue stream, while others use a combination of dedicated revenue sources. Incentives for local action in the form of grants and low-interest loans are often offered. In addition, some states provide income or other tax credits to private landowners who donate land or easements to public or private, nonprofit entities for conservation purposes. Tax incentive programs offer a strong supplement to other open space funding programs by encouraging private, voluntary land conservation. State revenue stream examples include:

General obligation bonds: Sales tax: Lottery income: Transfer tax or deed recording fees: General fund appropriations: California, Rhode Island Missouri, New Jersey Colorado, Minnesota Florida, Massachusetts Washington, Arizona Other common state revenue sources include license plate revenues, hunting and fishing license fees, hotel/motel tax, cigarette tax, state income tax, and oil and gas revenue.

Missouri has a dedicated sales tax that funds conservation programs and natural resource protection. A dedicated 1/10 of 1 percent sales tax is divided between the State Parks and Soil Conservation Divisions of the Department of Natural Resources. Some funds are available for land protection at the local level. This year, however, its Landmark Local Parks Program was not funded due to a budget shortfall. Likewise, Kansas has funded local trails through its Local Government/Outdoor Recreation Grant Program, however, no funds were appropriated in the current fiscal year. These and other state programs that could potentially fund trail/ greenway projects are outlined later in this chapter.

Through state enabling legislation, local governments can help fund park, trail, and stormwater management projects themselves. Common local financing options in Kansas and Missouri are as follows:

- property tax
- local option sales tax
- general obligation bonds
- special assessment district fees
- stormwater fees
- impact fees/developer dedications

Information about these options was obtained from existing local plans (e.g., Northland Trails Vision Plan, county park master plans, etc.), governmental entities such as the Missouri and Kansas Association of Counties and the state Departments of Revenue, and local press coverage.

While general obligation bonds are emphasized in this report, other borrowing techniques exist. Lease purchase contracts, for instance, can be used when a decision has been made to buy a property but upfront funds are unavailable. Under such an arrangement, acquisition can be paid for in periodic payments, or installments, that include principal, interest, and associated costs. The contract can grant possession or use for a specified or indeterminate period. Lease/purchase contracts do not necessarily bind a future government to a purchase. They are similar to a bond but do not impact debt limit. They are also more expensive.⁷

Additionally, certificates of participation (COPS) are also becoming increasingly important tools for local governments to protect open space. Although they are typically used to finance sizable purchases of equipment, they are also being applied creatively in open space financing to provide upfront cash, usually without a referendum and without affecting the debt ceiling. Johnson County has been at the forefront of Local Financing Option Summary
their use as a land protection technique in the Midwest. Finally, a securitized installment sale allows government to borrow, in effect, from the landowners.

Other states allow for additional financing options, although most are less common. Some of these options are summarized in the "Common Conservation Financing Options" table. Transfer taxes have been able to generate considerate funds for conservation, particularly in fast-growing communities. They can be difficult to pass, however, in the face of strong opposition from real estate and construction interests.

Land Acquisition Methods

Communities often employ a combination of conservation methods to protect land. Some things to consider: the intensity of land management; public access requirements or advantages; interests the owners is willing to sell; relevant administrative or management issues; and available funds. A review of some common methods follows:

- Fee-simple acquisition: provides the most permanent protection of land; typically raises the value of nearby property and increasing tax rolls; often too costly to protect all land.
- Conservation easement: more restrictive and more permanent than regulations; landowners decide to protect their land and may benefit from tax incentives; cheaper than acquisition; land is kept on the tax rolls; leaves land in private ownership, often denying public access.
- Leasing (short or long-term): government pays a lower cost for land but has limited and temporary control.

Johnson County used a variety of methods to fund its Mill Creek Streamway Park project. Through coordination and planning with local municipalities and agencies, developers and individual landowners were informed of benefits and encouraged to donate flood plain lands. Grants of right-of-way and conservation easements were used to acquire access through certain properties along the corridor where land use is compatible with park facilities. The District "foresees these easements as a viable alternative for property owners wishing to participate but desiring to maintain ownership." License agreements, joint-use agreements, and lease agreements are other methods the District can employ to secure property for trail users. Finally, the District reserves the most expensive form of acquisition - outright fee simple title purchase - only when absolutely necessary.⁸

National Trail & Greenway Funding Examples A variety of financing tool and techniques are used to fund trails and greenways across the United States. A summary of several successful programs and their funding sources follows.

Los Angeles River Greenway

Goal: 51-mile bikeway from San Fernando Valley to Long Beach

- Los Angeles County Proposition A, November 1996, \$319 million
- City of Los Angeles measure
- California State Proposition 12, \$89 million of \$2.b billion state parks bond allocated to Los Angeles River

Chattahoochee Riverway, Georgia

Goal: 180-mile statewide corridor at a cost of \$100 million

- \$25 million in federal funds for Chattahoochee National Recreation Area
- Georgia River Care 2000 and Greenspace programs
- Woodruff Foundation lead philanthropist at \$25 million
- Local governments: Gwinnett County, Atlanta, City of Duluth

Confluence Greenway - St. Louis Area (Missouri and Illinois)

Goal: 40-mile regional trail system

Proposition 2 in November 2 created two regional park districts created in each state (approved in four counties and St. Louis).
 \$23.8 million annually from dedicated sales tax (1/10-cent over 20 years)

Greenways Initiative - Southeast Michigan

Goal: 110-mile network; raise \$75 million over five years

- TEA-21 Enhancement Funds (\$22 million a year statewide)
- Michigan Natural Resources Trust Fund (\$24 million a year statewide)
- Community Foundation for Southeast Michigan grant for \$24
 million over five years and Kresge Foundation grant for \$10 million

Common Conservation Financing Sources

Method	Definition	Pros	Cons
Property tax	Tax on real property paid for by commercial and residential property owners	 steady source of revenue relatively easily administered 	 competition for other public purposes overall concern among taxpayers about high rates
		 tax burden fairly broadly distributed small increases create substantial funding 	
		 popular with voters when restricted to parks and open space 	
Sales & use tax	Tax on the sales of goods or services	· relatively easily administered	· revenues can drop when the economy slows
		 · low reporting costs · can generate large sums – even at small tax levels. · can also tap into tourism profits generated by open space amenities. 	· tax is considered regressive
Real estate	Tax on the sale of property,	· funds can be substantial	· difficult to pass
transfer tax	paid by either the buyer or the seller	\cdot nexus between taxing new development and protecting remaining open space	· unpredictable revenue stream
Impact fee	One-time fee paid by developer to off-set costs of infrastructure caused by new development	 nexus between taxing new development and protecting remaining open space 	 park and open space projects must be directly linked to new development makes housing less affordable Negotiating effectively with developers matake expertise and experience not found in some communities
Special assessment district	Special tax district for area that benefits from an open space project	 users finance acquisition and management predictable revenue stream accountability in government spending sense of ownership of and responsibility for area services and parks 	· timely and costly to implement
Business improvement	Special tax district that assesses business owners	· same as special assessment district	· can only address park needs of a limited area
district	for special services.		· inequitable park financing mechanism, not likely to be found in poorer neighborhoods
General obligation bond	Loan taken out by a city or county against the value of the taxable property	 allows for immediate purchase of open space, locking in land at current prices distributes the cost of acquisition 	• extra interest costs of borrowing
Revenue bond	Loan paid from proceeds of a tax levied for the use of a specific public project, or with proceeds of fees charged to those who use the financed facility	inot constrained by debt ceilings of G.O. bonds	 can require 2/3 voter approval more expensive than G.O. bonds
		· voter approval rarely required	

E-12

There are a number of federal programs that provide funds for state/local land and water conservation, trails, recreational programs, and stormwater and flood control. Most require a state/local match. Eligibility varies depending on the nature of the local project. The federal programs highlighted here primarily provide funds to local governments (through the states) or to landowners

Land and Water Conservation Fund

Created in 1965, the Land and Water Conservation Fund is the largest source of federal money for park, wildlife, and open space land acquisition. The program's funding comes primarily from offshore oil and gas drilling receipts, with an authorized expenditure of \$900 million each year. Under this program, a portion of the money is intended to go to federal land purchases and a portion to the states as matching grants for local park projects.

With the exception of a one-time increase in LWCF appropriations to the fully authorized level of \$900 million in fiscal year 1998, Congress generally has appropriated only a fraction of the amount authorized. In addition, between 1995 and 1998, no funds were provided for the state-and-local grant portion of the program, which provides up to 50 percent of the cost of a project, with the balance of the funds paid by states or municipalities.

In October 2000, federal funding for land conservation received a significant boost when President Clinton signed the FY 2001 Interior Appropriations Bill. This bill included \$450 million for federal LWCF, \$90 million for state and local grants, and \$30 million for the Urban Parks and Recreation Restoration program. Perhaps most importantly, it included an ongoing funding guarantee of \$12 billion during the next five years.

LWCF funds are apportioned by formula to all 50 states, the District of Columbia and territories. The grants submitted by states and localities are "approved" (rubber-stamped) by the National Park Service. Cities, counties, state agencies, and school districts are eligible for LWCF fund monies. These funds can be used for outdoor recreation projects, including acquisition, renovation, and development. Projects require a 50 percent match. In Missouri in 2001, grants were offered to applicants that previously submitted applications to the Landmark Local Parks program but were not funded. Projects that received funding included Clay County's Claybrook Plantation Renovation (\$144,000) and the City of Independence's Santa Fe Park Tennis Complex (\$144,000).

In fiscal year 2001, Congress approved stateside grant funding at \$90 million, which through formula apportionment provided Missouri with \$2.635 million and Kansas with \$1.772 million. In the current fiscal year, the stateside amount has been increased to \$140 million nationwide, which will provide states with increased apportionments (at press time state-by-state apportionments had not yet been determined.)

Part One: Federal Funding Sources

TEA-21 Program

The Intermodal Surface Transportation Efficiency Act (also known as ISTEA, or "ice tea") provided an important source of federal funds - transportation enhancements - for various park and recreation projects. Between 1991 and 1997, \$2.6 billion went to enhancement projects such as bicycle and pedestrian facilities and the conversion of abandoned rail corridors into greenways and multiuse trails.

In 1998, Congress reauthorized ISTEA and renamed it TEA-21 - the Transportation Efficiency Act for the 21st Century. Under this six-year extension, the transportation enhancements program received an important vote of confidence in the form of a 40 percent increase in funding, averaging about \$630 million per year. A second funding category, Congestion Mitigation Air Quality, is targeted to communities with air quality problems and is designed to fund transportation projects that improve air quality. With the passage of TEA-21, the Kansas City region became eligible for CMAQ funds for the first time, and MARC has defined an application process that allocates a portion of the annual funding for bicycle and/or pedestrian projects. In addition to the CMAQ funds, MARC also makes funding decisions for Missouri Transportation Enhancement funds for the Kansas City metro area.

The third funding category, the Recreational Trails Program, provides funds to the states to develop and maintain recreational trails and trailrelated facilities for both nonmotorized and motorized recreational trail uses. Examples of trail uses include hiking, biking, in-line skating, equestrian use, cross-country skiing, all-terrain vehicle riding, snowmobiling, etc.

Each state administers its own program, typically through a state resource or parks agency, and develops its own procedures to solicit and select local projects for funding. Each state also has a State Recreational Trail Advisory Committee to assist with the program. In some states, the committee selects the projects, while in others the committee is advisory only.⁹

Funding of \$50 million was allocated annually from 2000 through 2003 for the Recreational Trails Program. In fiscal year 2001, Kansas received \$2,844,448 and Missouri received \$3,736,903. Funds may be used for maintenance and restoration of existing trails, construction of new trails, acquisition of easements or property for trails, etc. Project amounts vary by states, but most range in value from \$2,000 to \$50,000. Typically, payment for the project is reimbursed to the local government.

Urban Park and Recreation Recovery Program (UPARR)

Enacted in 1978, UPARR is an urban complement to the Land and Water Conservation Fund. UPARR's purpose is to provide direct federal assistance to urban localities for the rehabilitation of recreational facilities while encouraging the continuing operation and maintenance of recreational programs.

North American Wetlands Conservation Act Grants (NAWCA)

NAWCA provides funding for the North American Waterfowl Management Plan, an international program to protect the continent's wetlands and increase migratory bird populations. NAWCA authorizes up to \$30 million annually in small grants (up to \$50,000) and standard grants (up to \$1 million) for the funding of wetlands conservation projects. Habitat acquired or restored with small grant funds can be owned or managed by any federal, state, or nonprofit organization involved in land management. Some grants require a 1:1 match, others a 2:1 match. NAWCA is administered by the US Fish and Wildlife Service.

Pittman-Robertson Act

The Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, popularly known as the Pittman-Robertson Act, provides funding for the selection, restoration, rehabilitation, and improvement of wildlife habitat, wildlife management research, and the distribution of information produced by the projects. Funds from an 11 percent excise tax on sporting arms and ammunition are appropriated to the Secretary of the Interior and apportioned to states on a formula basis for paying up to 75 percent of the cost approved projects. The program is a cost-reimbursement program in which the state applies for reimbursement through Federal Aid for up to 75 percent of the project expenses. The state must provide at least 25 percent of the project costs from non-federal sources.¹⁰

Farmland Protection Program

The federal Farmland Protection Program (FPP) was created in the 1996 Farm Bill to provide federal matching funds for state and local farmland protection efforts. It was allocated start-up funding of \$35 million in 1996 and another \$17.5 million in 2001. Additional funds for this program are being considered by Congress through a reauthorization of Farm Bill programs, but funding levels are yet to be determined. To be eligible for funding, a state, county or local jurisdiction must have a complementary program of funding for the purchase of conservation easements, and grants are awarded competitively through the USDA's Natural Resources Conservation Service (NRCS).

Wetlands Reserve Program

Congress authorized and amended the Wetlands Reserve Program (WRP) under the Farm Bill in 1996 as a means of addressing the loss of wetlands nationwide. The program is administered through the Department of Agriculture's Natural Resources Conservation Service. This program offers landowners three options: permanent easements, 30year easements, and restoration cost-share agreements of a minimum 10-year duration. In order for a property to be eligible for a WRP grant, the landowner must have owned the land for at least one year (unless the land was inherited or the landowner can prove the land was not purchased for enrollment into the program), and the land must be restorable and suitable for wildlife benefits. The landowner continues to control access to the land and may lease the land for recreational activities.

The amount of funding available in a given fiscal year depends on the amount of acres Congress permits to be enrolled in the program. The funding level is dependent on the value of the land. A per acre value is assigned in each state. To date, appropriations have supported the enrollment of 774,076 acres within the Wetlands Reserve Program. This program is administered through the Natural Resources Conservation Service.

Clean Water Act (Section 319)

The Clean Water Act (Section 319) funds the national and state Nonpoint Source Pollution (NPS) programs. Each year, the U.S. spends \$100 million through section 319 to restore and protect areas damaged by nonpoint source pollution. In order to qualify, each state needs to put together a Unified Watershed Assessment (UWA) that prioritizes, through nine key elements, watersheds in need of restoration. In FY 2000, states that have effectively implemented all nine key elements will be awarded by grant with additional funding above and beyond the base level funding of \$100 million. Both Missouri and Kansas offer annual grants to local governments and organizations for watershed protection activities through a competitive program.

Safe Drinking Water Act and Other Programs

There is authorization for states to use some of their Safe Drinking Water Act Revolving Fund monies (up to 15 percent) for land acquisition. This is voluntary, however, and most states don't do this.

Part Two: State Funding Sources -Missouri

Voters in Missouri have demonstrated strong support for statewide funding of parks, conservation, and natural resource protection. In1976, voters approved a permanent 1/8 of 1 percent tax to fund the Department of Conservation, which protects the state's fish, forest, and wildlife resources. The Department of Natural Resources (DNR) also received sales tax funds. A 1/10 of 1 percent sales tax is divided between the state parks and state soil conservation division of the DNR. This tax has a sunset clause but has been extended by voters. Using these funds, DNR provides financial assistance for natural resources/land protection through a variety of programs. Grants, loans, and tax credits are available to local governments, non-profit organizations, individuals, and companies. The DNR has a state parks program, and included in that is the Missouri Katy Trail, a hiking/biking trail from St. Louis to Clinton. MARC is working to extend the trail into the Kansas City area.

Landmark Local Parks Program

Then-Governor Mel Carnahan initiated the five-year Landmark Local Parks program in 1996 to respond to local and county parks and recreation needs. The program is funded by annual appropriations by the state legislature. Since there is no statutory designation for this project, funding is not guaranteed. The legislature appropriated \$4 million in 1998 and \$3.9 million in 2001. The program is not funded in the current fiscal year due to a state revenue shortfall. The DNR has requested funds for the next fiscal year.

In February 2001, Governor Holden announced the recipients of \$3.9 million in Landmark Local Parks Program monies and nearly \$1.2 million in federal Land and Water Conservation Fund monies. Landmark Local Parks' recipients included the Jackson County Parks and Recreation Department (\$144,000 for the Longview Horse Park Renovation Project) and the Kansas City Department of Parks and Recreation (\$1.15 million for Swope Park).

Grants are made to local governments only; all cities and counties are eligible. A 50 percent match is required for acquisition and development and a 35 percent match is required for renovations/restoration projects. The Department of Natural Resources (Parks Division) rates applications, with preferences given to projects that meet recreational needs of the communities, planning goals, and unique or special attributes. Once rated, an interagency committee called the State Interagency Council on Outdoor Recreation (SIACOR) makes final allocation decisions.

Lewis & Clark Bi-Centennial Discovery Grants

Created by executive order in 1998, the Missouri Lewis & Clark Bicentennial Commission's mission is to "rekindle the spirit of discovery, achievement, and wonder fostered by the original expedition." Discovery grants are designed to promote their expedition and the bicentennial celebration. Some communities are using grant monies to provide trails anywhere along the Missouri River. The Department of Tourism oversees this program, but grants are administered by the MDNR.

Missouri Storm Water Grant and Loan Program

Funds for this program were approved by voters in November 1998. Grants and loans are available to first-class counties, communities within first-class counties, and any city not within a county for stormwater control plans, studies, and projects. Grants may not exceed 50 percent of the project cost. According to the MDNR, procedures and rules regarding distribution of these funds are still under development.

Historic Preservation Revolving Fund/Historic Preservation Fund Given the historic nature of some trails, funding from this source may be an option. This fund provides loans for acquisition and protection of endangered historic properties. Funds are available to non-profits, government agencies, schools, individuals, and businesses. Properties must be eligible for listing on National Register of Historic Places. The state also provides a 60 percent matching grant to communities for identifying, evaluating, registering, and protecting cultural resources through its Historic Preservation Fund.

Part Three: State Funding Sources -Kansas

Local Government/Outdoor Recreation Grant Program

The Local Government/Outdoor Recreation Grant Program helps communities throughout Kansas fund outdoor recreation projects. The legislature allocated roughly \$500,000 annually to the program in recent years, which provided small recreational grants to communities (pools, playground equipment, etc.) The program was not funded in FY '01.

State Conservation Commission Programs

The State Conservation Commission (SCC) has cost-share programs to help control erosion or improve water quality. The programs are designed to provide financial assistance to landowners that employ conservation practices. Included in the list of practices eligible for funds are contour buffer strips, riparian forest buffers, streambank and shoreline protection, and wetlands restoration and enhancement. All landowners within the state are eligible to receive cost-share funds. The programs are administered locally by the 105 conservation districts. Local district supervisors give priority to those projects based on critical needs within their district.

According to the SCC, funding is provided primarily to individual landowners. However, a local government/public agency may be classified as a landowner, as a project may be on city-owned or county-owned land. These entities may be eligible for buffer establishment funds or projects in riparian areas, or there may be rare situations in which funding for seeding native grass is available.¹¹ SCC funds could be used to create trails through a number of programs, including:

- 1. Water Resources Cost-Share Program. Provides state financial assistance to landowners for the establishment of enduring water conservation practices. Apply through the local county conservation district.
- 2. Non-Point Source Pollution Control Fund. Provides state financial assistance for non-point source pollution control practices for the protection or restoration of surface and groundwater quality. Apply through the local county conservation district.
- Riparian and Wetland Protection Program. Addresses the conservation and management of riparian areas (banks of streams or rivers) and wetlands. Funded projects include wetland enhancement, fencing, tree planting, etc. Apply through the local conservation district
- 4. Multipurpose Small Lakes Program. Provides state financial assistance to governments and other entities for the construction or renovation of a dam for flood control and water supply and/or

recreation purposes. The Multipurpose Small Lakes Program, which is a part of the Kansas Water Plan, provides for "add on" features for the development of a proposed watershed structure to its fullest potential and/or renovation of an existing structure to provide for additional benefits. A planned flood control structure may become multipurpose by adding water supply storage and/or recreation. Conversely, a planned water supply structure may become multipurpose by adding flood control or recreation to the project. Renovation projects may also be treated this way. Each structure must contain flood control features and meet specific criteria set out in the law to be eligible for funding under the Multipurpose Small Lakes Program. Each project must include adequate land treatment of the drainage area to protect the site from pollution and siltation. The major sponsor of a Multipurpose Small Lakes project must have taxing authority and power of eminent domain. Payback of state funds used for the water supply portion of the structure is required. Processing of the applications is through the State Conservation Commission; apply through the local watershed district.¹²

5. Watershed Planning Assistance Program. Provides state financial assistance for obtaining engineering services and environmental assessments for the development of general plans and other flood control and rehabilitation projects in watershed district.

There are several potential regional approaches to financing the MetroGreen trails program. Specifically, Missouri allows local jurisdictions to form regional transportation and regional recreation districts, each of which could fund trails and greenways. A future bi-state tax that allocates funds for trails and recreational activities is also discussed. In addition to the options outlined in this section, the region could seek special appropriations from the state legislatures to fund MetroGreen.

Regional Recreation District - Missouri

With voter approval, regional recreation districts may be created that cross municipal and county boundaries for the purpose of creating, operating, and maintaining public parks, neighborhood trails, and recreational facilities and grounds. An existing district can also be expanded. The result of fairly recent Missouri enabling legislation, regional recreation districts are designed to give rural areas populated by urban commuters an ability to provide recreation programs and community activities.

Once created, a 7-member board of directors is appointed. Districts are political subdivisions of the state and may issue general revenue bonds and levy and collect taxes. If authorized by voters, a district may levy a property or sales tax. The property tax may not be more than 60 cents per \$100 of assessed value per year on property within the district; the sales tax may not exceed 1/2 percent on retail sales.¹³

Part Four: Regional Financing Options There have been few communities that have explored the use of recreation district enabling legislation. In April 1999, voters in Clay County approved the state's first recreation district - the Kearney-Holt Recreation District. There was considerable debate surrounding the creation of the district. Some local elected officials felt the district would raise taxes unnecessarily, while others felt city park programs were adequate. A <u>Kansas City Star</u> columnist who supported the district argued that it would not have been necessary had Clay County been aggressive in developing a parks program for unincorporated areas and cooperating more with cities. "The recreation district represents citizens taking issues into their own hands to fill unmet needs."¹⁴ Since the creation of the district voters have twice rejected property tax levy measures designed to fund a community center and outdoor aquatics center.

Transportation Development District - Missouri

Voters can create transportation development districts, which may impose special assessments or taxes to fund roads and bridges. As reported in the Northland Trails Vision Plan for Clay and Platte Counties, "it appears that pedestrian and bicycle facilities, such as trails, may be included within the scope of such projects."¹⁵ Once a district is created, a 5 to 15member board of directors is elected by voters to administer the program. A project requires approval by the Missouri Highway and Transportation Commission and/or the local transportation authority (the county), depending on the project's location, ownership, and future maintenance responsibilities. A project that is connected to the state system must conform to that system. If not, approval by the state commission is typically a formality. The district may use special assessments, property taxes, sales taxes, or alternate sales taxes to fund its projects. It is up to the community to impose the taxes and decide how to use the revenues (with state approval).

Bi-State Tax

The Kansas-Missouri bi-state sales tax was conceived years ago as a way for the two-state metropolitan area to cooperate politically and raise revenues for regional projects. Voters in four of five area counties approved the bi-state tax in 1996 by a 65 percent margin. Only Wyandotte County voters rejected the measure, and then by a slim 55/45 percent.

The ballot measure provided a 1/8-cent tax, which generated about \$25 million a year for the renovation of Kansas City's Union Station and the development of Science City. The ballot language specified that the tax would expire once \$118 million was raised. With the expiration of the bistate tax approaching (in 2002), discussions are underway in the community for a renewal of the tax with possible beneficiaries identified as cultural organizations and the sports stadiums.¹⁶

The current enabling legislation is limited to cultural and sports facilities and activities. To modify its uses, both Missouri and Kansas Legislatures would be required to pass identical amendments expanding that tax's possible uses.

A number of public surveys have been taken to determine community interest in another bi-state tax initiative, testing various projects or activities that might achieve public support. While public support for adding trails and recreational facilities is strong, other projects appeared to hold stronger public support for a regional tax. In order for the current enabling act to be used as a vehicle for trails funding, it would need to be determined whether additional amendments to the law would be necessary. (Missouri enabling statutes 70.500 is located on page E-73).

Other methods of regional funding may be possible for the Kansas City region. Missouri and Illinois both approved legislation allowing for two regional park districts - one in Illinois, one in Missouri - that would work together, using funds from a dedicated sales tax. Voters approved such a measure in November 2000.

Regional Financing Options – Missouri & Kansas

Financing	Description	Jurisdiction	0 0	Tax Impact	Implementation
Option		N.4: 1	Capacity		Process
Regional recreation district [17]	Regional recreation districts may cross municipal and county boundaries for the purpose of creating, operating, and maintaining public parks, neighborhood trails, and recreational facilities and grounds. If a district already exists, statutory provisions allow for the expansion of that district. When a Regional Recreation District is organized, it shall be a corporate body and a political subdivision of the State, and may sue and be sued, issue general obligation revenue bonds, and levy and collect taxes.	Missouri	If authorized by the voters, a district may levy: 1) a tax of not more than 60 cents per year on each \$100 of assessed valuation on all property within the district; or, 2) a tax not to exceed one-half of one cent on retail sales.	Depends on the configuration of a proposed district. To date, only one district exists in the region (Kearney-Holt in Clay Co.). Two property tax levies have been defeated there.	Voters in the proposed district must approve a Regional Recreation District and tax levies.
Transportation development district	Transportation development districts may be created to fund, promote, plan, design, construct, improve, maintain, and operate road, bridge, and related infrastructure projects, including pedestrian and bicycle facilities such as trails.	Missouri	District may use any one or more of the following funding methods: special assessments, property taxes, business license taxes, and sales taxes. Property tax rate may not exceed the annual rate of 10 cents on \$100 assessed valuation. District may impose a sales tax at a rate of 1/8%, 1/4%, 3/8%, 1/2%, or 1%. Any district that consists of one or more entire counties may by resolution impose a sales tax for transportation purposes designated by the district.	Depends on the configuration of the proposed district.	Voter approval required to create the district. District may make one or more special assessments that specifically benefit the properties within the district. Property taxes must be approved by at least a 4/7th vote. Sales taxes imposed by resolution and subsequent approval by voters at state general, primary, or special election.
Bi-state sales tax	Current 1/8-cent bistate sales will expire in early 2002. Proceeds are remitted to the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District Commission for use in renovating the Union Station property in Kansas City, MO. Enabling legislation has passed in both states to allow for future regional sales tax increased sales tax (up to 1/4- cent) for cultural and sports projects.	5-County metro region	Current 1/8-cent tax currently generates roughly \$25 million annually. A 1/4-cent tax would generate roughly \$50 million annually.		Simple majority voter approval in eligible metro counties required to enact the program and levy a sales tax

The state of Missouri provides counties with several options for funding capital purchases and improvements, such as the conservation of land for parks/trails. Common funding sources outlined in this chapter include property taxes and general obligation bonds and sales and use taxes for parks, stormwater and capital improvements. Overall, property taxes are used less frequently to fund parks and recreation since the authority to levy a sales tax for parks was granted in 1995.¹⁸ Property taxes and general obligation bonds are, however, a funding option available to and being used by Missouri counties and cities. Counties can also make use of developer dedications and impact fees.

Property Taxes & General Obligation Bonds

First class, non-charter counties are allowed to purchase land for public parks, playgrounds, and recreation purposes. With approval by the county commission and voter approval, the county may levy an annual tax of not more than 10 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation for the acquisition, planning, improvement, maintenance, and operation of such parks.¹⁹ This process requires that 100 voters of the county file a petition with the governing body requesting the levy. The question must be in substantially the following form: *Shall a ...cent tax per one hundred dollars of assessed valuation be levied for public parks?*²⁰

The state provides extra taxing authority (64.320) to Jackson and St. Louis Counties (any first class county having a charter form of government and containing part of a city with a population of three hundred thousand or more). Jackson County may levy an annual tax for parks not to exceed 20 cents on the \$100 dollars assessed valuation.²¹ The tax is levied with approval of the county governing body and after a public vote.

Additional taxing authority exists under state statute (67.755), which allows for the governing body of any political subdivision to provide, equip, develop, operate, maintain and conduct a system of public recreation, including parks and other recreational grounds and facilities. If sufficient funds are not available from ordinary levies, funds may be raised by a special tax levy, general obligation bond issue within constitutional limits, or revenue bond issue. The tax levy cannot exceed 20 cents on \$100 of valuation. The taxes and bonds authorized under this statute, however, are less likely to be exercised since they require approval by a two-thirds majority of voters. All ballots submitting such special tax to the voters shall state the rate of the proposed levy in cents per hundred dollars of assessed valuation. The governing body charged with the administration of a public recreational facility may sell at public sale any property acquired for the facility by means other than condemnation, in excess of that actually occupied by the public recreational facility, and all proceeds from such sales shall be used to retire any revenue bonds issued to finance the project. In the event that any political subdivision is now authorized by statute to levy a tax for this purpose, the combined levies shall not exceed the larger levy authorized.

Part Five: Financing Options at the County Level -Missouri With respect to borrowing limits, the State Constitution permits counties and cities, by a vote of the qualified electors, to incur an indebtedness not to exceed 10 percent of assessed valuation. County/municipal bond referenda can be held on any county or municipal primary, general or special election. The vote required shall be 4/7th at the general municipal election day, primary or general elections and 2/3rd at all other elections.

Sales Taxes

There are several different county sales taxing options that can be used to fund parks, greenways, and trails: a sales tax for parks, a sales tax for capital improvements, and a sales tax for stormwater and public works improvements. Each option requires voter approval and each has its own taxing capacity. (See the Missouri Municipal Financing Options section for more background on local sales taxes.)

In 2000, voters in Platte County approved a 1/2-cent sales tax to fund parks, trails, and stormwater improvements. Roughly \$9 million of the \$60 million expected to be raised over the next decade will be used to fund the elements of the Northland trails system (10 miles of trails each year through 2010).²²

Use Tax

The use tax substitutes for a state or local sales tax on goods or materials that are purchased out-of-state. The use tax is designed to level the playing field between local merchants, who must charge sales taxes, and out-of-state catalog and direct-market vendors who do not. Use tax revenues are not earmarked but rather directed to a city/county's general fund.

The state levies a .04225 percent use tax on out-of-state sales (an amount equal to the state sales tax on in-state sales). Local use taxes were collected beginning in 1991. In that year, a statewide flat .015 percent local "in lieu" tax was adopted because it was easier and less costly for the Department of Revenue to administer. Since the local use tax was higher than some county and city combined sales taxes, the Supreme Court nullified the across-the-board 0.15 percent rate. To make the use tax uniform, the Missouri legislature passed a law that provides for a local-option use tax at a rate equal to a county/city's sales tax rate, with voter approval. It is very difficult to estimate the revenue from a local use tax because it is based on the purchases made by individuals and businesses in a city from out-of-state vendors. There is no information available on such sales in prior years.²³

Counties and municipalities can levy a use tax with voter approval by a simple majority of the electorate. The use tax will be enacted at the level of the jurisdiction's sales tax. (See use tax in the county section for more details). A use tax was adopted in Kansas City...Top of Form 1

Impact Fees/Developer Dedication Requirements/Excise Taxes

The Northland Trail Vision Plan for Clay and Platte Counties outlined in specific detail the use of dedication requirements/impact fees for the acquisition of trails. Excerpts from this plan are summarized in this section.²⁴

The land acquisition techniques described here range in degree of complexity from a simple request for a land gift to the requirement that land be dedicated (or payment in lieu) as a condition of development. Zoning and subdivision regulations can, with some strategic amendments, be used to require dedications, setbacks, and other desired elements to promote a trails system.

The authority to utilize dedication requirements and impact fees arises from the county's police power. Each is imposed through exercise of this power as a condition of development approval. (Note: Even though a state may not have adopted impact fee enabling legislation, these fees are a form of development exaction and, therefore, an exercise of the police power, pursuant to local home rule powers²⁵, and even pursuant to standard planning, zoning, and subdivision enabling legislation.²⁶)

A dedication exaction is a condition or stipulation of approval that requires the applicant to convey an interest in land as a condition of the subject approval. An impact fee is a fee is legislatively adopted (though it can be imposed on an ad hoc basis.) The fee amount is calculated to cover the applicant's fair share of the public infrastructure for which the fee is calculated. Generally, the fee amount is set based upon an established equivalent unit to offset the capacity of the infrastructure system being funded and consumed by the development proposed by the applicant. Exactions may be imposed at different points in the approval process. Traditionally, a dedication exaction is imposed as a condition of rezoning, award of a special/conditional use permit, or upon plat approval.

While counties clearly have the authority to condition development permits to mitigate the impacts of a project on identifiable public resources and interests, such development exactions must have a "close fit" to the development's impact. Thus, dedication exactions and impact fees for trails must be reasonably related to the development's impact on the availability of open spaces and recreational areas such as trails. Here's a summary of the ways in which these options can be implemented.

- Subdivision Code Dedication Requirement. Amend the subdivision codes to allow dedication requirements where the property, with respect to which development approval is sought, is included in or adjacent to the proposed trail system.
- *Formal Dedication Ordinance*. A formal dedication/impact fee ordinance may be adopted that establishes requirements for new development.

- Zoning Code "Trail Corridor" Requirements. Amend the zoning codes to introduce and establish the "trail corridor" concept by including language similar to the following: "Any development within 100 feet of the trail system shall have a setback from the trails or open space of at least 20 feet." For situations involving the development of a single parcel of land (not subject to the subdivision or platting process), the counties should also consider an amendment that would make issuance of a building permit contingent upon the dedication of land and/or construction of a trail.
- Administrative Appeal Process. Amend the zoning and subdivision codes, or establish and a stand-alone requirement, to create an administrative appeals process to provide local governments with the opportunity to correct alleged improper application of trails or green space requirements without immediate court actions. For example, where a specific design standard or condition is imposed or a dedication exaction is required, the developer should have an appeals process available prior to judicial intervention.
- Establish expanded sidewalk or multi-use trail requirements.
 Expand or adopt sidewalk requirements for all districts or lot sizes.
 Allow a waiver of the sidewalk requirements if established criteria are met. Define sidewalk to include "multi-use trail" where
 "appropriate" allow or require a segment of the mapped trail system to be substituted for sidewalks where the trail is adjacent to or included in any given development.²⁷

Neighborhood Improvement District

A neighborhood improvement district is an area of a city or county with defined limits and boundaries which is created by vote or petition and which is benefited by an improvement and subject to special assessments against the real property therein for the cost of the improvement.²⁸ The cities and counties can issue general obligation bonds and impose special levies on residents within the district to pay for the improvements. These districts can be established to improve, among other things, parks and recreational facilities, dikes, levees, and other flood control works, vehicle and pedestrian bridges, main and lateral stormwater drains, and to acquire property or interests in property.²⁹

The governing body may create a neighborhood improvement district when a petition has been signed by property owners of at least two-thirds of the proposed district. Alternatively, voters within the proposed boundaries may approve the creation of a district at a general or special election. The margin must reflect the votes needed to approve general obligation bonds: 4/7th of the electorate at the general municipal election day, primary or general elections and 2/3rd at all other elections. The measure must set forth the project name for the proposed improvement, the general name of the proposed improvement, the estimated costs, the boundaries, and the proposed methods of assessment within the district, including any annual assessment of maintenance costs of the improvement in each year after the bonds are paid in full.

County Financing Options Tables

The tables that follow outline recent park/trail initiatives and financing option in the Kansas City metro area. Specific taxing/borrowing capacity, tax impact, and implementation processes are provided. The figures provided are rounded estimates based on most recent available data from the Missouri Department of Revenue and individual county and city audits, comprehensive annual financial reports, and studies.

Annual tax revenues (property and sales) are estimated for the first year of implementation and do not account for annual estimated growth rates. The general obligation bond calculations assume a six percent interest rate compounded monthly for 20 years. Property tax and general obligation bond cost estimates are provided for owners of a home of an *actual market value of \$100,000*. These taxes are levied on \$100 of assessed value, which is 19 percent of estimated market value for residential property.

Jackson County Financing Summary

Jackson County Finar			-	
Summary of Recent Conservation Funding	Summary of Tax/Bond Capacity	Tax Impact of Revenue Option	Implementation Process	Election Analysis
Jackson County levies a property tax for parks but has significant taxing capacity remaining. The County does not have a dedicated sales tax for parks or capital improvements and has incurred no general obligation bonded debt.	Property tax: Property tax rate of 9 cents for parks (down from 16 cents in 1996). 11 cents in remaining taxing capacity. 1-cent would generate roughly \$700,000 annually.	Property tax: Additional annual property tax cost of a 1 cent tax increase (on \$100 valuation) for owners of a \$100,000 home would cost \$2 a year.	Property tax: Simple majority voter approval.	Property tax: 11 out of 16 measures (69%) at the county, city, school & fire district levels were approved since 1997.
	G.O. bonds: debt margin of \$680 million. Net bonded debt per capita equals 0.	G.O. bonds: Additional annual property tax cost of \$5 million bond to owners of a \$100,000 home is \$1.20.	G.O. bonds: voter approval by 4/7th of the electorate at general municipal, primary, or general elections and 2/3rd at all other elections.	G.O./revenue bonds : 20 out of 23 bond measures (87%) passed since 1997 (at the county, municipal, school district, and special district levels)
	Park sales tax: none currently levied.	Park/storm water sales tax: 1/2-cent sales tax would generate roughly \$36.8 million annually.	Park sales tax: Simple majority voter approval.	Sales taxes: 11 out of 18 measures (61%) at the county and city levels were approved since 1997.
	Capital improvement & storm water sales tax: None currently levied	Capital improvement & storm water sales tax: 1/2-cent sales tax would generate roughly \$36.8 million annually.	Capital improvement & storm water sales taxes: Simple majority voter approval.	
	Use tax: None currently levied	Use tax: Potential revenues difficult to predict.	Use tax: Simple majority voter approval.	Use tax: 0% (1 out of 1) measures at the local level were rejected since 1997.
	Neighborhood Improvement District: Varies, depending on the neighborhood.	Neighborhood Improvement District: Varies, depending on the neighborhood.	Neighborhood Improvement District: By petition of approval of voters (margins the same as for g.o. bonds).	Neighborhood Improvement District: N/A
	Impact fees/dedication requirements: a condition or stipulation of approval that requires the applicant to convey an interest in land as a condition of the subject approval or a fee to offset the costs of infrastructure of the new development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Depends on the impact of the development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Levied by ordinance of the local governing body.	N/A

Platte County Conservation Financing Summary

As a result of a county-wide visioning process, Platte County residents expressed the desire for enhanced parks and recreation opportunities as one of the main priorities of the county. The County Commissioners named a citizens' task force, members of whom studies the issue and developed a parks master plan in 2000. The plan recommended a 1/2cent sales tax to fund parks, trails, and stormwater projects. The tax was approved by 57 percent of the voters in August 2000. As a result of this measure, the county has initiated a parks and recreation department to manage the program, staff of whom work with city parks departments, including Kansas City, MO's Board of Parks and Recreation Commissioners and not-for-profit recreation organizations. Noted Presiding Commissioner Better Knight in March 20001 State of the County Address, "during this first year of the plan, a great deal of time will be spent on evaluating potential sites for park locations as well as developing partnerships with area groups."

Platte County also recently completed the Northland Trail Master Plan in partnership with Clay County. This plan details a trails system for the entire area north of the river, including on-road bicycle facilities and off-road trails for a variety of users. The plan includes facility recommendations and financing options. Part of the money from the sales tax has been earmarked for trails. The County Commission believes that federal and state matching grant funds will be a significant source of funding for trails.³⁰

Summary of Recent Conservation Funding	Summary of Tax/Bond Capacity	Tax Impact of Revenue Option	Implementation Process	Election Analysis
Platte County voters approved a 1/2-cent sales tax to fund parks, recreation, and trails in 2000. The county does not currently levy a parks property tax or capital improvement or storm water	Property tax: No dedicated parks property tax. 1-cent would generate roughly \$120,000.	Property tax: Additional annual property tax cost of a 1-cent tax increase (on \$100 valuation) for owners of a \$100,000 home would cost roughly \$2 a year.	Property tax: Simple majority voter approval.	Property tax: 20 out of 23 measures (87%) passed since 1996 (at the municipal, school district, and special district levels.)
sales taxes.	G.O. bonds: Debt margin of \$92.5 million; bond rating of AA- for its g.o. bonds (only 4 other MO counties have attained this rating). Net bonded debt per capita equals \$247.	G.O. bonds: Additional annual property tax cost of a \$5 million bond to owners of a \$100,000 home is roughly \$7.	G.O. bonds: voter approval by 4/7th of the electorate at general municipal, primary, or general elections and 2/3rd at all other elections.	G.O./revenue bonds: 19 out of 21 of all bond measures (90%) passed since 1996 (at the county, municipal, school district, and special district levels).
	Park sales tax: Levies 1/2 percent tax (approved in 8/00; effective 4/01 through 12/09).	Park sales tax: Current tax is expected to generate about \$60 million over 10 years. About \$9 million will go toward the county's portion of the proposed Northland trails system, \$9 million will be spent on storm water, and \$45 million on parks.	Park sales tax: Simple majority voter approval.	Sales taxes: 100% approved (3 out of 3) countywide sales tax measures since 1996 (law enforcement, bi-state, and parks/storm water). 50% of all county <u>and</u> municipal/special district sales tax measures were approved during that period.
	Capital improvement & storm water sales tax: None currently levied.	Capital improvement & storm water sales tax: 1/2 percent tax would generate roughly \$6 million annually.	Capital improvement & storm water sales taxes: Simple majority voter approval.	
	Use tax: No taxing capacity remaining.	Use tax: Roughly \$1.8 million in tax revenues annually.	Use tax: Simple majority voter approval.	Use tax: 60% of all use tax measures were approved since 1996 (county and municipal).
	Neighborhood Improvement District: Varies, depending on the neighborhood.	Neighborhood Improvement District: Varies, depending on the neighborhood.	Neighborhood Improvement District: By petition of approval of voters (margins the same as for g.o. bonds).	Neighborhood Improvement District: N/A
	Impact fees/dedication requirements: a condition or stipulation of approval that requires the applicant to convey an interest in land as a condition of the subject approval or a fee to offset the costs of infrastructure of the new development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Depends on the impact of the development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Levied by ordinance of the local governing body.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: N/A

Clay County Conservation Financing Summary

Clay and Platte County have completed the Northland Trails Master Plan. This plan details a trails system for the entire area north of the river, including on-road bicycle facilities and off-road trails for a variety of users. Unlike Platte Co., Clay does not currently have a dedicated funding source. In fact, the county's property tax has been frozen as a result of a promise made to voters by former commissioners (1987) in return for an increase in the sales tax levy. In an attempt to seal this promise, voters are being asked in November 2001 whether to set the county's road and bridge, parks, and general fund property taxes at zero. Future commissioners will not be able to revive those levies without voter approval.

Clay County Conservation Financing Strategy

	vation Financing Stra			
Summary of Recent Conservation Funding	Summary of Tax/Bond Capacity	Tax Impact of Revenue Option	Implementation Process	Election Analysis
Working with Platte Co. to implement a trail system in the northern parts of our metropolitan region.	Property tax: 1-cent would generate roughly \$240,000 annually.	Property tax: Additional annual property tax cost of a 1 cent tax increase (on \$100 valuation) for owners of a \$100,000 home would cost \$2 a year.	Property tax: Simple majority voter approval.	Property tax: 16 out of 25 measures (65%) passed since 1996 (at the municipal, school district, and special district levels.)
	G.O. bonds: No general obligation bonded debt.	G.O. bonds: Additional annual property tax cost of \$5 million bond to owners of a \$100,000 home is \$3.50.	G.O. bonds: voter approval by 4/7th of the electorate at general municipal, primary, or general elections and 2/3rd at all other elections.	G.O./revenue bonds : 25 out of 26 measures (96%) passed since 1996 (at the county, municipal, school district, and special district levels).
	Park sales tax: None currently levied.	Park sales tax: 1/2- cent sales tax would generate roughly \$13 million	Park sales tax: Simple majority voter approval.	Sales taxes: 13 out of 19 measures (68%) passed since 1996 (at the county,
	Capital improvement & storm water sales tax: None currently levied.	Capital improvement & storm water sales tax: 1/2-cent sales tax would generate roughly \$13 million annually.	Capital improvement & storm water sales taxes: Simple majority voter approval.	municipal, school district, and special district levels.)
	Use tax: Approved in 11/01; A portion of revenues fund parks and trails.	Use tax: First year being imposed; difficult to predict revenues.	Use tax: Simple majority voter approval.	Use tax: 4 ouf ot 13 measures (31%) passed since 1996 (at the county and municipal levels)
	Neighborhood Improvement District: Varies, depending on the neighborhood.	Neighborhood Improvement District: Varies, depending on the neighborhood.	Neighborhood Improvement District: By petition of approval of voters (margins the same as for G.O. bonds).	Neighborhood Improvement District: N/A
	Impact fees/dedication requirements: a condition or stipulation of approval that requires the applicant to convey an interest in land as a condition of the subject approval or a fee to offset the costs of infrastructure of the new development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Depends on the impact of the development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Levied by ordinance of the local governing body.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: N/A

Summary of Recent Conservation Funding	Summary of Tax/Bond Capacity	Tax Impact of Revenue Option	Implementation Process	Election Analysis
No dedicated parks/trails funding source.	Property tax No dedicated parks property tax. 10 cents in remaining capacity. 1 cent would generate roughly \$75,000 annually.	Property tax: Additional annual property tax cost of a 1 cent tax increase (on \$100 valuation) for owners of a \$100,000 home would cost \$2 a year.	Property tax: Simple majority voter approval.	Property tax: 50%
	G.O. bonds: Currently no bonded debt.	annual property tax cost of	G.O. bonds: voter approval by 4/7th of the electorate at general municipal, primary, or general elections and 2/3rd at all other elections.	G.O. bonds: 78%
	Park sales tax: None currently levied.	Park sales tax: 1/2-cent sales tax would generate roughly \$4 million annually.	Park sales tax: Simple majority voter approval.	Sales taxes: 57%
	Capital improvement & storm water sales tax: None currently levied.	Capital improvement & storm water sales tax: 1/2-cent sales tax would generate roughly \$4 million annually.	Capital improvement & storm water sales taxes: Simple majority voter approval.	
	Use tax: None currently levied	Use tax: Potential revenues difficult to predict.	Use tax: Simple majority voter approval.	Use tax: 25%
	Neighborhood Improvement District: Varies, depending on the neighborhood.	Neighborhood Improvement District: Varies, depending on the neighborhood.	Neighborhood Improvement District: By petition of approval of voters (margins the same as for g.o. bonds).	N/A
	Impact fees/dedication requirements: a condition or stipulation of approval that requires the applicant to convey an interest in land as a condition of the subject approval or a fee to offset the costs of infrastructure of the new development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Depends on the impact of the development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Levied by ordinance of the local governing body.	N/A

Cass County Conservation Financing Summary

Part Six: Financing Options at the Municipal Level -Missouri Missouri municipalities have a variety of financing options for parks, trails, and stormwater improvements. Property taxes and general obligation bonds, sales taxes, impact fees/dedication requirements, and stormwater utility fees are among the most common approaches highlighted here. Details about their use to fund trails in selected cities are provided. There are some distinctions in the authority of a municipality to impose these options depending on the class of the municipalities. Tables at the end of this section provide the details and list each city in the Kansas City metro area by type.

The Classification of Cities

In some cases, the financing options described here depend on the classification of the municipality. Missouri statutes classify municipalities on the basis of population and limit the form of government options within each classification. According to the Secretary of State, state statutes provide that a community may incorporate as a city of the third class, fourth class, or village on the basis of the population at the time of incorporation. Once a community is incorporated under a given classification, the municipality does not automatically change classification with a gain or loss of population. A municipality may change classification only when the change is approved by a majority vote.³¹

Home rule charter cities may exercise those powers defined in their charters that are not prohibited by law (statutory cities have only those powers granted by specific statutes.) In reality, charter cities do not exercise much additional taxing authority with the exception of such things as tourism and hotel taxes. In addition, charter cities have more latitude to impose impact fees. Statutory cities have no specific authorization to impose these fees, although some argue that this power is implied. As a result of this ambiguity, statutory cities have been reluctant to impose them. ³² (Many cities are, however, using developer dedications and/or charging fees in lieu of land dedications.)

The final category of municipalities is special legislative cities. Seven municipalities operate under a special legislative charter system that dates back to the 1800s (Liberty is among them). These cities are in limbo as neither statutory nor home rule cities. The Legislature is required to amend any changes to authorities, although this has never happened.

Type of city	Population requirements	Type of government
Village	Less than 500	Elected board of trustees: 5 if the village has less than 2,500; 9 is more than 2,500.
Fourth-class cities	At least 500 but less than 3,000	Permitted to have either mayor/board of alderman form or mayor/city administrator form.
Third-class cities	3,000 or more	Granted greater flexibility with the authority to establish the mayor/council form, the council/manager form, the commission fork or the mayor/city administrator form.
Constitutional charter cities	5,000 or more	Any form of government that the people approve in the charter.
Legislative charter cities	Varies. Typically small and mid-sized cities.	Varies.

Classification of Municipalities

Property Taxes & General Obligation Bonds

Local governing bodies can fund parks and recreation with property tax revenues through the appropriations process. Specific tax levies for parks and recreation are also available, with voter approval. Cities can levy up to a total of 20 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation.³³

The city council may submit the tax to the voters or citizens may petition for an election. That process requires signatures of 100 voters calling for an annual tax for the establishment and maintenance of free public parks. The question shall read: *Shall a ...cent tax per one hundred dollars assessed valuation be levied for public parks?* (Note: section 64-401 deals with the extension of a municipal park system to an adjacent area, the petition process, election requirements, tax levies, etc.)

Voters in some cities have approved property tax increases in recent years for non-school funding:

- Kansas City approved a tax increase for public libraries in 1996
- Lee's Summit residents approved a public safety property tax in 1995
- Kansas City voters passed a tax increase for zoo improvements in 1990.

General obligation bonds can provide funds for the acquisition and construction of major capital facilities such as parks, open space, and greenways, although this is not a popular park/trails option for cities or counties according to Dave Ostlund of the Missouri Parks and Recreation Association.³⁴ The state does not limit the tax rate for payment of principal and interest on municipal bonded debt. The State Constitution permits the cities, with voter approval, to incur indebtedness for city purposes not to exceed 10 percent of assessed valuation. (Cities may issue debt for an additional 10 percent for the purpose of acquiring the right-of-way, construction, extending, and improving street and avenues and/or waterworks, electric or light plants, proving the total general obligation indebtedness does not exceed 20 percent of assessed valuation.³⁵) Voter approval by 4/7th of the electorate is required at a general municipal election day, primary or general elections and 2/3rd of the electorate at all other electors.

Sales Taxes

There are a number of sales tax measures available to cities. These tax measures call for funds for a variety of projects, from flood-control improvements in Independence to parks in Liberty to public safety in Kansas City.

There are several likely reasons for the universal popularity of the sales tax option. First, visiting shoppers contribute to a city's sales tax revenues, spreading the burden among residents and nonresidents (however if rates are universally increased, residents pay high rates as well). In addition, consumers don't typically feel the pinch of sales taxes (at just pennies per purchase as opposed to annual property tax bills), although the costs do add up. And finally, sales taxes are appealing because they can include a sunset - even though local leaders may come to rely on these revenues and typically will try to extend or renew them.

Within the Kansas City metro region, sales taxes have gained favor in recent years as a revenue-raising alternative to property taxes, which have climbed as school districts have successfully passed property tax measures. Noted Independence City Manager Larry Blick, "it's better for us to use the sales tax and leave the property tax to the community if they want to use it for education." In addition, many property tax increases require approval by a super-majority of voters (although a dedicated parks property tax would require a simple majority) and would necessitate very high rate increases to generate comparable revenues to a sales tax. (As noted earlier, however, property tax measures for non-school funding have been approved in recent years.)

Finally, local officials have gotten encouragement - in the form of new sales tax enabling authority - from state lawmakers in both Kansas and Missouri. The Missouri General Assembly authorized sales tax improvements for stormwater, parks, and fire systems in recent years, joining the Kansas Legislature, which increased the sales tax for capital improvement in cities, with voter approval, in 1998. Several Kansas and Missouri cities quickly took advantage of the new taxing authority.³⁶

Sales and use taxes are assessed on retail activity. Missouri cities can levy dedicated sales taxes, including up to 1/2-cent for capital improvements and up to 1/2-cent for parks and/or stormwater improvements. In addition, a transportation sales tax is available, funds of which could be used for trails, bike paths, etc. (Generally speaking, the capital improvements sales tax is used more frequently to fund parks). The City of Independence passed a 5-year, 1/2-cent tax for street repairs and park improvements in 1998.

The city of Kansas City currently levies a total sales tax rate of 2 percent: three 1/2-cent sales taxes support capital improvements, debt service, and public mass transportation; an additional 1/2-cent tax to renovate the Liberty Memorial ran from April 1999 through September 2000. The city collected about \$105 million in sales and use tax revenue in fiscal year 1999, accounting for about 23 percent of the city's tax revenue.³⁷

A 15-year, 1/4-cent sales tax was approved by Kansas City voters in August 2001 and will be used to pay for new fire department facilities and personnel.

Use Tax

Since local option use taxing authority was granted, local use taxes have been adopted in several cities, including Kansas City.³⁸ (See page E-73 for ballot language requirements.)¹ There are no state restrictions on how use tax revenues may be directed; Kansas City's revenue funds deferred maintenance and capital projects.

Stormwater Utility Fees

Stormwater utility fees are imposed on property owners to pay for stormwater management. Methods of determining stormwater utility charges vary considerably around the country. Typically, charges are based on the amount of runoff generated from the property, the amount of impervious areas (hard surfaces) on the property, or the assessed value of the property. According to the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), utility fees provide a more reliable source of funds for local stormwater management than do property taxes. The EPA is encouraging cities to use utilities to begin funding improvements to their water and stormwater systems.

Home rule cities have clear authority to impose stormwater fees through an established stormwater utility. This authority is less clear for statutory cities since there is no direct statutory authorization. The way in which a fee can be imposed is also open to interpretation: the Hancock Amendment requires voter approval for any license fees or taxes although voter approval is not required for options that are considered user fees.³⁹

In 1998, Kansas City voters approved a new system to pay for stormwater management and improvements. A sliding scale fee based on the amount of runoff a property generates replaced a flat-rate stormwater fee. The fee structure generates about \$7 million annually; funds are being used to fund a huge backlog of clogged and damaged catch basins. The extra funds come from adding about 25,000 customers, mostly businesses, to the rolls.⁴⁰

In November 1998, voters approved state Constitutional Amendment No. 7, which provided \$200 million in general obligation bonds for stormwater control (mostly in larger counties) and \$100 million to improve drinking water system (mostly in small and rural areas.) Grants and loans are made available to local governments through the Missouri Department of Natural Resources.

¹ In counties with populations greater than 900,000 (St. Louis only) the use tax is designed to fund a Community Comeback Program (preventing neighborhood decline, promoting neighborhood reinvestment, etc.)

Impact Fees/Developer Dedication Requirements/Excise Fees

Impact fees and developer dedication requirements are common tools used by governments to help off-set the costs of parks, greenways, and trails. A local government can require that money, land, facilities, etc. be provided by a developer to a public jurisdiction. While impact fees must be collected and used within a described area, excise fees may be used to fund projects throughout a jurisdiction.

For these financing techniques to be effective, a community must be able design a program that is acceptable to all parties, can withstand court challenges, and outlines which specific lands are acceptable for donation. Impact fees work best when a governing body has a strong conservation plan and is able to negotiate effectively with the development community.

Several cities in the Kansas City metro area use developer dedications as part of their zoning and subdivision requirements to fund parks and trails. These cities typically call for either a dedication of land or a fee in lieu of land for new residential development. Adoption of these regulations requires approval of the local governing body. (See the Missouri County section for more background on impact fees and developer dedication requirements.)

As noted earlier, home rule cities have a clear authority to impose impact fees. This authority at the statutory city level is open to interpretation. Land dedications and fees in lieu of land, however, are being used frequently through zoning and subdivision authority by statutory and home rule cities to create parks and trails surrounding new development. The dedication or fee requirements vary from city to city. For example, Kearney requires developers to dedicate open space or parklands upon which trails can be developed or pay a fee of \$150 per new home.

Neighborhood Improvement Districts

As outlined in the Missouri county section, a neighborhood improvement district is an area of a city or county with defined limits and boundaries, which is created by vote or petition and which is benefited by an improvement and subject to special assessments against the real property therein for the cost of the improvement.⁴¹ The cities and counties can issue general obligation bonds and impose special levies on residents within the district to pay for the improvements. These districts can be established to improve, among other things, parks and recreational facilities, dikes, levees, and other flood control works, vehicle and pedestrian bridges, main and lateral stormwater drains, and to acquire property or interests in property.⁴² (Refer to the Missouri County Financing Options section for implementation details.)

Billboard Tax

In August 2000, voters in Grain Valley approved a tax on billboards by 64 percent of the vote. Changes in state statutes regarding billboards enabled the taxing option. Proceeds from the 2 percent tax on gross revenues from billboards in the city are going to enhance the city's main street area and parks. (The intent of the tax is to put money toward beautification, however the funds go to the city's general fund and can be used for other purposes as decided by the alderman.) "There is some feeling that (billboards) can be an eyesore, so the money would be directed to beautification," said Fred Mills, the city administrator.⁴³

In November 2000, Missouri voters rejected a citizen initiative to ban construction of new billboards, a failure attributed to strong opposition in rural counties and misleading information by the billboard industry. The number of billboards in Missouri is considerably greater than in neighboring states and few rules govern their placement.⁴⁴

Tax Increment Financing

Tax increment financing (TIF) is a real estate development technique applicable to industrial, commercial, and residential projects to cover the costs of publicly provided project improvements. TIF uses anticipated increases in real estate tax revenues resulting from increased property values to pay off bonds sold to finance qualifying redevelopment costs. TIF allows the financing of land acquisitions and improvements with taxfree borrowing, thereby reducing interest costs. In addition, use of TIF allows businesses to purchase renovated sites and buildings at less than market costs. The city of Independence has funded two park/trail projects using tax increment financing. The city of Independence has helped fund two trail projects using tax increment financing. Money from the TIF was dedicated to linear parks and trail improvements.

Municipal Profiles

This section outlines the ways in which local financing options are being used by cities in the Kansas City metro area to fund trails and greenways.

Liberty

The Mid-America Regional Council estimates the city of Liberty will grow by about 3 percent annually - slightly higher than the rest of the Kansas City metropolitan areas. According to the city's "Blueprint for Liberty" comprehensive plan, Liberty is relatively young, moderate-growth community with increasing affluence.

To meet the needs of its residents, Liberty adopted a bicycle/pedestrian plan in 1997 and has completed four off-road trails. The city currently maintains more than four miles of multi-use trails and a nature trail. The city intends to expand its multi-use trail system and extend an off-street trail system to be developed along all of the major drainage ways and their tributaries. (Current city parklands may include stormwater management and conservation lands.) The city relies on a variety of resources to funds its trails: a 1/4-cent sales tax for parks, federal and state grants, and developer dedications. The city generally requires a certain portion of the property from a planned development be allocated for parks/trails. This dedication can come in the form of a direct assignment of the land (10 acres per 1,000 people) or a contribution in lieu of the land (\$8,000 per acre.) In some cases, private open space may be provided in a proposed subdivision to meet up to half of this requirement.

Public support for an extension of city trails seems strong. In 1998, the city conducted a mail-in survey; 60 percent of the 618 respondents would like to be able to walk or bicycle to a grocery store near their home. Another 60 percent felt that neighborhoods could be redesigned to increase walking and biking.⁴⁵

Kearney

The city of Kearney has adopted a comprehensive trail plan that calls for the establishment of bicycle, pedestrian and equestrian trails that will comprise part of the planned northland trails system. The city has completed a 41/2 mile trail system, funded primarily through developer land donations, and federal and state grants. City officials are now working on plans for trails and spurs that will connect new development to the trail network.

Developers are required by the city to dedicate open space or parklands upon which trails can be developed. Alternatively, developers can donate money in lieu of land in the amount of \$150 per new home. In addition, the city is incorporating sidewalk trails into its road widening projects, which will be connected to the main trail networks and neighborhood schools.

City planners rely on the park/trail guidelines and standards from the state's Landmark Local Parks (LLP) program. In fact, the city far exceeds the amount of trails per population size outlined by the LLP. It is believed that although many cities have similar subdivision requirements, some choose not to implement them for fear that maintenance costs will be too great.⁴⁶

Kansas City

Kansas City has several trail projects underway, including the Riverfront Heritage Trail. This project is a joint initiative with the Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas to develop a trail along the Missouri and Kansas Rivers in the downtown areas. Initial funds to design and construct the trail's first phase have been provided through federal transportation grants. The city is also working with the US Army Corps of Engineers on trails as part of flood control improvements along the Blue River and Brush Creek. The Kansas City Parks and Recreation Commission adopted a new Parks and Recreation, Boulevards and Greenways Plan in 1993, and has opened sections of its Indian Creek Trail along 103rd Street. This plan is updated every 10 years. The Commission also adopted a Bicycle Facility Plan in 1999. A committee, led by the Kansas City Public Works Department, has developed an on-road bicycle plan for the city, which is under council consideration. The Parks Commission is also responsible for reviewing land acquisition options and presenting recommendations to the board and accepting deeds of land as gifts. The Kansas City Area Transportation Authority developed the Trolley Track Trail from 47th Street to 85th Street along the old Country Club right-of-way.

A variety of sources are used to help fund the city's parks, trails, and greenways from the federal to the local levels. The city generates its own funds through a 1/2-cent capital improvements sales tax. Revenues are divided equally among the six council districts to fund a project such as land acquisition, drainage improvements, and playgrounds.

The city also requires developers to contribute to protection of open space and trails. A developer has three options: 1) provide open space within the development. This privately-owned land is to be maintained by the neighborhood association; 2) dedicate land to the city. The city must judge the land valuable for park, trail, and open space use by the public; or 3) pay money in lieu of a land dedication. A formula exists to determine cost, taking account the number of acres of the development, average person per unit, and the average land value per acre. This fee must be paid to the city treasurer before a building permit is issued.⁴⁷

Independence

In 1998, voters in the city of Independence passed a 5-year, 1/2-cent sales tax to pay for street improvements and park repairs. The city may ask residents to pass an extension of the tax, which will expire in 2003, and may modify the use of the revenues.⁴⁸ While funds are now being used to upgrade existing parks, a parks master plan is in the work in which trails projects and recreational priorities will be identified.

The city has helped fund two trail projects using tax increment financing (TIF). Money from the TIF was dedicated to linear parks and trail improvements. The city also recently formed a Bicycle Advisory Committee to seek input into its plans.

Lee's Summit

The city council in Lee's Summit adopted a comprehensive greenway plan that includes 40 miles of multi-use trails to connect parks and natural areas in the city with residential and commercial areas. To fund the plan, voters approved a dedicated sales tax for parks and trails, which generates about \$50,000 annually for trails. The city has also received state grants (Landmark Local Parks) and federal transportation enhancement funds. While the city does not have a formal developer dedication program, officials work closely with developers to encourage donations of park land, trails, and green spaces. Typically, park planning managers participate in the land development review process, recommending ways to incorporate parks and green spaces into the plans. The process also serves to inform developers about the tax advantages of donating land for parks.

Planners have had the best luck with large subdivisions of 300 or more homes. Finally, because of the community's tight housing market, trails and parks are becoming a selling point, providing another incentive for developers to donate land to the city's park department.⁴⁹

Financing Options Summary: Home Rule Cities

Cities by Type	Summary of Financing Options	Summary of Tax/Bond Capacity	Implementation Process		
Home Rule Charter	Home rule cities governed by individual charters. In practice, tax/bond levies are in line with statutory cities and charter cities levy no additional property or sales taxes. However, impact fees and excise taxes are unique to home rule cities and are often imposed.				
Cities: Blue Springs;	Property tax: Mill levy on real and personal property for parks, recreational grounds, etc.	Property tax: Cities authorized to levy a park tax of up to 20 cents with voter approval.	Property tax: Majority voter approval required.		
Independence; Kansas City; Lee's Summit.	G.O. bonds: Provide funds for the acquisition and construction of major capital facilities paid through the property tax levy. Bond funds can also be used for general governmental activities.	G.O. bonds: The State Constitution permits cities, with voter approval, to incur indebtedness for city purposes not to exceed 10 percent of assessed valuation.*	G.O. bonds: Voter approval by 4/7th of the electorate at the general municipal election day, primary or general elections and 2/3rd at all other elections.		
	Sales taxes: Cities can levy dedicated sales taxes for capital improvements, parks and/or stormwater improvements, and transportation.	Capital improvement sales tax: Up to 1/2-cent for capital improvements is available. Parks/stormwater sales tax: Up to 1/2-cent for parks and/or stormwater improvements is available.	Sales taxes: Majority voter approval required.		
		Transportation sales tax: Up to 1/2-cent is available, funds of which could be used for trails, bike paths, etc			
	Use tax: Tax applies to merchandise purchased tax-free from out-of-state vendors. The use tax will be enacted at the rate of the jurisdiction's current sales tax. NOTE: Revenues from this tax are directed to the general fund.	Use tax: State base rate is .4225; cities can levy use tax on top of this up to their sales tax rate.	Use tax: Majority voter approval required.		
	Impact fees/dedication requirements: a condition or stipulation of approval that requires the applicant to convey an interest in land as a condition of the subject approval or a fee to offset the costs of infrastructure of the new development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Depends on the impact of the project.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Levied by ordinance of the local governing body.		
	Stormwater utility fees : Imposed on property owners to pay for storm water management.	Stormwater utility fees: Varies.	Stormwater utility fees: Majority voter approval likely required.		
	Neighborhood improvement districts: The city or county may issue general obligation bonds and levy special assessments on property owners within the district. NOTE: Any city with a population of 350,000 or more must appoint a citizen advisory committee composed of members of each council district on proposed neighborhood improvement district.	Neighborhood improvement districts: G.O. bonds may net exceed 10% of assessed valuation.	Neighborhood improvement districts: Petition signed by 2/3 of property owners or approval by voters at general or special election (margin required are the same as for G.O. bonds).		

Financing Options Summary: Third and Fourth Class Cities

City Sample/Type	Summary of Financing	Summary of Tax/Bond	Implementation Process
City Sample/Type	Options	Capacity	implementation Process
3rd Class Cities: Excelsior Springs; Gladstone; North Kansas City; Strasburg.	Property tax: Mill levy on real and personal property for parks, recreational grounds, etc.		Property tax: Majority voter approval required. The city council may submit the tax to the voters or citizens may petition for an election. That process requires signatures of 100 voters calling for an annual tax for the establishment and maintenance of free public parks.
4 th Class Cities: Archie; Avondale; Belton; Buckner; Camden Point; Cleveland; Creighton; East Lynne; Edgarton; Freeman; Grain Valley; Glenaire; Grandview; Greenwood; Harrisonville; Houston Lake; Lake Annette: Lake Tapawingo; Lake Waukomis; Lake Winnebago; Lone Jack; Kearney; Oak Grove; Parkville; Peculiar; Platte City; Platte Woods; Pleasant Valley; Randolph; Raymore; Raytown; Riverside; Smithville; Sugar Creek; Weatherby Lake	acquisition and construction of major capital facilities paid through the property tax levy. Bond funds can also be used for general governmental	permits cities, with voter approval, to incur indebtedness for city purposes	G.O. bonds: Voter approval by 4/7 th of the electorate at the general municipal election day, primary or general elections and 2/3rd at all other elections.
	Sales taxes: Cities can levy dedicated sales taxes for capital improvements, parks and/or stormwater improvements, and transportation.	Capital improvement sales tax: Up to 1/2-cent for capital improvements is available. Parks/stormwater sales tax: Up to 1/2-cent for parks and/or stormwater improvements is available. Transportation sales tax: Up to 1/2-cent is available, funds of which could be used for trails, bike paths, etc	Sales taxes: Majority voter approval required.
	Use tax: Tax applies to merchandise purchased tax-free from out-of-state vendors. The use tax will be enacted at the rate of the jurisdiction's current sales tax. NOTE: Revenues from this tax are directed to the general fund.	Use tax: State base rate is .4225; cities can levy use tax on top of this up to their sales tax rate.	Use tax: Majority voter approval required.
	Stormwater utility fees : Imposed on property owners to pay for storm water management.	Stormwater utility fees: Varies.	Stormwater utility fees: Majority voter approval likely required.

E-44

Developer dedications: A condition or stipulation of approval that requires the applicant to convey an interest in land as a condition of the subject approval or a fee to offset the costs of infrastructure of the new development.	Developer dedications: Varie	s. Developer dedications: Levied by ordinance of the local governing body.
Neighborhood improvement district: The city or county may issue general obligation bonds and levy special assessments on property owners within the district.	districts: G.O. bonds may	ent Neighborhood improvement net districts: Petition signed by 2/3 of property owners or approval by voters at general or special election (margin required are the same as for g.o. bonds).
Kansas City MetroGreen Plan

Financing Options Summary: Villages

	Thagee		
City Sample/Type	Summary of Financing Options	Summary of Tax/Bond Capacity	Implementation Process
Villages: Baldwin Park; Barringham; Farley; Ferrelview; Leslie; Oakview; Oakwood; Oakwood Park; Ridgely; West Lime	cities.	Transportation sales tax: Must have a population of at least 500 to impose.	Refer to tables for 3 rd /4 th class cities.

Financing Options Summary: Legislative Charter Cities

City Sample/Type	Summary of Financing Options	Summary of Tax/Bond Capacity	Implementation Process		
Legislative Charter Cities:	These cities are governed by special legislative charters. They do not have the powers of home rule charter cities. Refer				
Liberty; Missouri City; Pleasant Hill.	to the following tables for 3 rd and 4 th class cities.				

*Cities may issue debt for an additional 10 percent for the purpose of acquiring the right-of-way, construction, extending, and improving street and avenues and/or waterworks, electric or light plants, proving the total general obligation indebtedness does not exceed 20 percent of assessed valuation.)

The state of Kansas provides counties with several options for funding capital purchases and improvements, such as the conservation of land for parks/trails. Common funding sources outlined in this chapter include property taxes, general obligation bonds, and sales taxes. Unlike Missouri, there are no property tax limits and general obligation bonds do not always require voter approval. There is also no dedicated sales tax for parks and stormwater; however, sales tax revenues can be earmarked with voter approval.

Property Taxes, Special Levies & General Obligation Bonds

According to the Kansas Association of Counties, the property tax is the most significant revenue source for county governments in Kansas. In 1998, Kansas' 105 counties levied roughly \$649 million in ad valorem property taxes to provide for a variety of services such as road maintenance and repair, law enforcement, mental health services, etc.

The state's property tax lid law, which was enacted in the 1960s, expired in 1999. As a result, there is currently no limit on the amount of taxes that can be levied for any purpose. The county's governing body through the budgeting process typically approves tax levies. Unlike Missouri counties, governing bodies in Kansas counties have the ability to raise taxes without a public vote. There are circumstances in which levies are put to a vote, as described below for a petitioning process. In addition, counties can legally put a tax increase *advisory* measure on the ballot. However, Randy Allen, Executive Director of the Kansas Association of Counties, argues that for the governing body to be truly representative, tax levy decisions should be left up to elected leaders. Since the tax lid was lifted, some county tax rates have increased significantly. However, some of this rise is attributed to the long length of the tax lid, an expected "catching up" of the rates.⁵⁰

State law allows for the creation of various public funds by which to hold and expend property tax revenues (e.g., equipment reserve fund, highway improvement reserve fund). A capital improvement fund is available to counties that have formally approved a multiyear capital improvement plan. Monies in the fund may be used to finance any public improvement in the adopted plan.⁵¹ Johnson, Leavenworth, and Wyandotte have established capital projects funds.

As allowed by state statute, any county may establish, maintain, and make additions to public parks and recreation grounds, including those of the cities, park districts, or townships, *in agreement with* those jurisdictions. The county may issue general obligation bonds or may make a special levy to pay the costs and to pay a portion of the principal and interest on the bonds authorized by cities located in the county (KSA 19-2801). Before any public park, museum or recreation grounds are acquired or established and any bonds issued or tax levy made, a notice must be published once each week for two consecutive weeks in the

Part Seven: Financing Options at the County Level -Kansas official county newspaper describing the intent of the governing body, method of financing, etc. If, within 60 days after the last publication, there is a protest signed by at least five percent of the electors who voted for the secretary of state at the last preceding general election, an election shall be called and held within 90 days after the last publication of said notice or at the next general election if held within that time. If no protest or no sufficient protest is filed or if an election is held and the proposition carries a majority, the governing body may establish the park, museum or recreation grounds and may issue bonds or levy a tax to pay the costs. *However, if bonds exceed \$50,000, majority voter approval is required.*⁵² Bonded indebtedness is limited to 30 percent of assessed valuation. There are, however, exceptions that are not included in this percentage that make it very difficult for a city or county to reach its debt ceiling.

Sales Taxes

The principal non-property tax revenue source available to Kansas counties is the local sales tax. Seventy-five of the state's 105 counties have diversified their revenue sources through voter-authorized sales taxes."⁵³ Of these, fifty counties levy a 1 percent tax.

Counties can levy 1/4-cent, 1/2-cent, 3/4-cent, or 1-cent county sales taxes, with exceptions. Typically, counties levy up to 1 percent in sales tax. They can, however, levy up to an additional 1 percent for dedicated purposes under special circumstances, primarily health care. The Kansas Legislature gave counties a three year window of opportunity to impose an addition tax of up to 0.1 percent for stormwater management. Only Johnson County imposed the tax during the time the authority was available. Wyandotte County has the authority to impose additional taxes for law enforcement/jail construction. Finally, Johnson and Wyandotte counties levy the bi-state 1/8 cent sales tax.

Sales taxes are levied for general purposes (with revenues shared with the cities) or specific purposes (in which case the counties keep the revenues.) General local sales tax revenues (from the sales tax levied by the county) are distributed to the county and each of its cities according to a state mandated formulate based upon population and ad valorem taxing effort. In Johnson County, the county receives roughly 28 percent of local sales tax revenues, while cities receive about 72 percent.

Unlike Missouri, there is no specific sales tax allocation for parks/ recreation/trails. However, statutes allow for the governing body of the city or county proposing the tax to specify the purposes for which the revenue would be used, and a statement generally describing such purposes shall be included as part of the ballot proposition.⁵⁴

All local sales taxes require voter approval. A sales tax measure may be placed on the ballot by the board of county commissioners or through the petition process as follows: 1) if a petition requesting a referendum is signed by 10 percent of the electorate; 2) the governing body(s) of a cities

or cities within the county containing a population of not less than 25 percent of the entire county population adopts a resolution requesting a referendum is passed by 2/3 or more of the governing body membership; 3) the governing body of a city(s) within the county which levies at least 25 percent of the property taxes levied by all taxing subdivision within the county adopts a resolution requesting a referendum passed by 2/3 or more of the governing body membership.⁵⁵

Impact Fees/Developer Dedication Requirements/Excise Taxes

Impact fees and developer dedication requirements are common tools used by local governments to help pay for parks, greenways, and trails near residential, commercial, and industrial developments. Johnson County charges a percentage of the land value of newly developed property in the unincorporated area to help pay for county parks. (It's possible to arrange to dedicate land instead of paying the fee.) The parkland dedication policy lays out detailed equations to determine the fee that takes into account the fair market value of the property, the uniformity of the lot sizes, etc. (For example, for properties with 4 acres of more, 1 percent is donated.) When land will be subdivided for end-use development, zoning administrators determine the fees based on such things as lot size, number of occupants, types of subdivision improvements, etc. Appeals can be made to the board of zoning appeal. Money is collected in the county's park fund, separated by township. No funds have been allocated yet. The park department would be the likely benefactor; any allocation would require approval by the county commission.56

Local Financing Options Tables

The tables that follow outline recent park/trail initiatives in the Kansas City metro area and various financing options. Specific taxing/borrowing capacity, tax impact, and implementation processes are provided. The figures provided are rounded estimates based on most recent available data from the Kansas Department of Revenue and individual county and city audits, comprehensive annual financial reports, and studies.

Annual tax revenues (property and sales) are estimated for the first year of implementation and do not account for annual estimated growth rates. The general obligation bond calculations assume a 6 percent interest rate compounded monthly for 20 years. Property tax and general obligation bond cost estimates are provided for owners of a home of an *actual market value of \$100,000*. Property taxes are levied on \$100 of assessed value, which is a percentage of estimated market value for residential property.

Johnson County Conservation Financing Summary Johnson County's park and recreation district (which operates under K.S.A. 19-2859 <u>et seq</u>.) was formally created by the Kansas State Legislature in 1955 as the Shawnee Mission Park District. It was later expanded to include the entire county. The district is one-of-a-kind in Kansas; state legislation allowing for the district's creation applies specifically to Johnson County.

In April 2001, the Johnson County Park and Recreation District Board approved a 20-year \$192 million expansion plan - MAP 2020 - that would double the county's parkland. The park district's plan would use a 1/10cent sales tax increase and a nine-year property tax increase to fund the park expansion. County commissioners would have to approve a mill levy and voters would have to approve a sales tax increase. Projections indicate that even at the proposed mill levy's highest level (in the second year of the plan), the resulting District-related property tax on a house with an assessed value of \$175,000 would be \$41.34. By the final year of the plan, the District-related property tax on that same house could decrease to as little as \$18.14.57 Commissioners budgeted \$6 million for pay for land acquisition for the next fiscal year, enough for the first year of the acquisition plan. Described as a maintenance, no-frills budget, however, no additional land acquisition funding is included in projections for 2003 through 2006. Park board officials say they are considering a bond vote to fund future purchases. (Reported the Kansas City Star, park officials could also seek voter approval to sell bonds or pursue debt financing, park board members feel they have public support for a bond, although there is some concern about impacting the county's AAA bond rating.⁵⁸) The long-term budget also adds a mill-levy increase in 2003, ending several years of rate rollbacks.⁵⁹ It is expected that the remaining \$34.6 million of the program will be funded through state grants, foundations, gifts, developer donations, the granting of easements or conservation easements, joint use of facilities and other alternatives that reduce the need to purchase land.

Park officials are trying to maintain a ratio of parks to residents of at least 22 acres per 1,000. The ratio is now at 14 while Jackson County has a ratio of 32 acres per 1,000 residents. The plan calls for the county to build the parks and cities to contribute in some ways, such as paying for multi-use centers. New parkland is ranked the county's number 2 priority in the 20-year strategic plan (behind roads and bridges.) And Johnson County's Citizens' Visioning Committee, a 23-member group named by the County Commission in 1995 to study the county's future needs, recommended the acquisition of more land for parks. The recommendation came after testing residents' opinions about local priorities.⁶⁰

The county utilizes a variety of land acquisition methods to fund this system: developers and individual owners are encouraged to donate flood plain lands, grants of right-of-way and conservation easements are utilized, and fee-simple acquisition is used whenever necessary. County

residents have supported several major park and trail funding measures in recent years. In 1986, Johnson County voters approved a 1/2 mill tax levy that established the Streamways Parks System, a countywide network of trails and parks along eight major streams. Johnson County voters approved a \$6 million general obligation bond in 1998 to acquire land for Big Bull Creek Regional Park. In all, the district operates with roughly 1 percent of the total county budget. State statutes also allow the district to issue revenue bonds to be paid from user fees for various recreational activities. The district has several bonds outstanding.

Johnson County is also pushing for a more proactive approach to stormwater management. To address flooding problems, Johnson County's Stormwater Management Advisory Council (SMAC) uses proceeds from a 1/10-cent sales tax to pay for stormwater projects in the county and its cities. In 2001 alone, SMAC is funding about 20 new projects totaling about \$7 million.

nsas	City	Metro	Green	Plan	

Summary of Recent Conservation Funding	Summary of Tax/Bond Capacity	Tax Impact of Revenue Option	Implementation Process	Election Analysis
In April 2001, Johnson County Park and Recreation District Board approved a 20-year \$192 million expansion plan – MAP 2020 – that would double the county's parkland. County Commissioners have since budgeted the requested \$6 million for land acquisition	Property tax: Park & Rec District has a dedicated 1/2 mill levy for streamway development (in addition to portion of county mill levy the district receives). Additional 1/2- mill increase would generate roughly \$2.65 million annually.	Property tax: Additional annual costs on 1/2-mill increase to owners of a \$100,000 home is \$7.50	Property tax: . Approval of the county's governing body with petitioning process available.	Property tax: N/A
(although full funding by the commission for future years is unlikely) The park district's plan also calls for a sales tax and a property tax increase, and park officials are considering a G.O. bond. Residents have supported several major park and trail funding measures in recent years: countywide 1/2 mill tax levy in 1986 to fund Streamways Parks System, countywide \$6 million g.o. bond in 1998 to acquire land for Big Bull Creek Regional Park, and a	G.O. bonds: AAA credit rating by Standard & Poor's. The county's ratio of net general bonded debt to assessed valuation has declined since 1994. The debt per capita in 1998 was \$111. Johnson Co. Park & Rec. District: available legal debt margin is \$71.6 million (97% of total is available). The district also has more than \$1.5 million in net revenue available for debt service. District issued a \$6 million G.O. bond in 1998	G.O. bonds: Additional annual property tax costs of a \$5 million bond to owners of a \$100,000 home is \$1.25.	G.O. bonds: Majority voter approval required for bonds greater than \$50,000.	G.O. bonds: 9 out of 18 measures (50%) at the county, city, and school district levels were approved since 1996.
1/8-cent parks sales tax in the city of Olathe in 1999.	Sales tax: current rate of .975%; revenues rose 7.6% from FY '98 to FY'99.	Sales tax: 1/4-cent tax would generate roughly \$22.5 million annually; 1/10- cent would generate roughly \$9.1 million annually.	Sales tax: County commission may call a referendum by resolution. Simple majority voter approval. One or more cities containing at least 25 percent of the county's population may force a referendum on a countywide tax.[61]	Sales taxes: 100% of all city/county sales tax measures were approved since 1996.
	Impact fees/dedication requirements: a condition or stipulation of approval that requires the applicant to convey an interest in land as a condition of the subject approval or a fee to offset the costs of infrastructure of the new development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Depends on the impact of the development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Levied by ordinance of the local governing body.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: N/A

Unified Government (Wyandotte County/Kansas City, KS) Conservation Financing Summary

The Unified Government of Wyandotte County/Kansas City, Kansas is home to the newly constructed \$228 million, 75,000-seat Kansas Speedway. When 400 acres near the new track were approved for development, it was agreed (in a permit through section 404 of the Clean Water Act) that 9,000 feet of riparian easements would be acquired downstream. These easements would be roughly 200 feet wide on either side of a streamway. The riparian sites are being funded with the same sales tax bonding issuance (star bonds) that is paying for public infrastructure.

Kansas City MetroGreen Plan

Summary of Recent Conservation Funding	Summary of Tax/Bond Capacity	Tax Impact of Revenue Option	Implementation Process	Election Analysis
No dedicated park/trails sales or property taxes.	Property tax: 1/2-mill increase would generate roughly \$350,00 annually. (Mill levy was decreased during 2000).	Property tax: Additional annual costs on 1/2-mill increase to owners of a \$100,000 home is \$7.50.	Property tax: Approval of the county's governing body with petitioning process available.	Property tax: N/A
	G.O. bonds: Legal debt margin of \$131 million. Ratings of A2 from Moody's and AA from Standard and Poor's on all debt assumed from both the former City of Kansas City, KS and Wyandotte Co. Unified Gov't maintains 2 debt service funds for payment of G.O. bonds; one for the city issued debt and one for the county issued debt.	G.O. bonds: Additional annual property tax costs of a \$5 million bond to owners of a \$100,000 home is \$9.50.	G.O. bonds: Majority voter approval required for bonds greater than \$50,000.	G.O. bonds: 4 out of 4 measures (100%) (all school district) passed since 1996.
	Sales tax: 1.00% local sales tax; revenues dropped 1% from FY '98 to FY '99.	Sales tax: .025% tax would generate roughly \$3.4 million.	Sales tax : County commission may call a referendum by resolution. Simple majority voter approval. One or more cities containing at least 25 percent of the county's population may force a referendum on a countywide tax.[62]	Sales tax: 100% (1 of 1) county sales tax measures were approved since 1996.
	Impact fees/dedication requirements: a condition or stipulation of approval that requires the applicant to convey an interest in land as a condition of the subject approval or a fee to offset the costs of infrastructure of the new development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Depends on the impact of the development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Levied by ordinance of the local governing body.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: N/A

E-54

Summary of Recent Conservation Funding	Summary of Tax/Bond Capacity	Tax Impact of Revenue Option	Implementation Process	Election Analysis
No dedicated park/trails funding source. No parks dept. or parks master plan. Planning dept. planning to	Property tax: 1/2-mill increase would generate roughly \$144,000 annually.	Property tax: Additional annual costs on 1/2-mill increase to owners of a \$100,000 home is \$7.50.	Property tax: Approval of the county's governing body with petitioning process available.	Property tax: N/A
develop this in the future.	G.O. bonds: \$17 million in outstanding G.O. bond debt	G.O. bonds: Additional annual property tax costs of a \$5 million bond to owners of a \$100,000 home is \$23.	G.O. bonds: Majority voter approval required for bonds greater than \$50,000.	G.O./revenue bonds : 2 out of 2 measures (100%) at the county and school district levels passed since 1996.
	Sales tax: 1% tax rate; revenues rose 2.4% from FY '98 to FY '99.	Sales tax: 1/4-cent tax would generate roughly \$1 million annually.	Sales tax : County commission may call a referendum by resolution. Simple majority voter approval. One or more cities containing at least 25 percent of the county's population may force a referendum on a countywide tax.[63]	Sales taxes: 100% (1 of 1) county sales tax measures were approved since 1996.
	Impact fees/dedication requirements: a condition or stipulation of approval that requires the applicant to convey an interest in land as a condition of the subject approval or a fee to offset the costs of infrastructure of the new development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Depends on the impact of the development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Levied by ordinance of the local governing body.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: N/A

Leavenworth County Conservation Financing Summary

MetroGreen Finance Strategy

Part Eight: Financing Options at the Municipal Level -Kansas Like Missouri, Kansas municipalities have a variety of financing options for parks, trails, and stormwater improvements. Property taxes and general obligation bonds, sales taxes, impact fees/dedication requirements, and stormwater utility fees are among the most common approaches highlighted here. Details about their use to fund trails in selected cities are provided. Tables at the end of this section provide details about how each option may be applied.

The Classification of Cities

The 627 cities in Kansas are municipal corporations, incorporated by the residents of a defined area under certain minimum state standards.⁶⁴ Every city in Kansas has the constitutional authority to be a home rule city. While cities are classified by population (see the following table), this legal classification is not very relevant to its powers, reports the League of Kansas Municipalities.

Class	Size	Options
1 st class	Must have a minimum population of 15,000.	Can opt to remain a 2 nd class city if population is between 15,000 and 25,000.
2 nd class	Population of between 2,000 and 15,000.	Can opt to remain a 3 rd class city if population is between 2,000 and 5,000.
3 rd class	Any other incorporated city with a population less than 2,000.	
Townships	Varies; typically a few hundred people.	NOTE: Principal function is road maintenance; some townships provide library, fire protection, etc.

Cities/townships in Kansas are classified as follows:

Property Taxes & General Obligation Bonds

Like counties, municipalities in Kansas no longer have a property tax limit. The League of Kansas Municipalities reports that, "as a result of this unprecedented legislative action, cities now are advised to increase local property taxes with caution and prudence."

While most cities have several tax fund levies, only a general fund levy is required, plus any tax levy required for debt payments. Cities have considerable discretion, by statute and/or home rule, as to the funds they utilize. (Overland Park has the lowest property mill rate of any first-class city in Kansas, followed by Prairie Village.)⁶⁵

There are several potential scenarios by which cities can use their property taxing authority to allocate money for parks and trails. Typically, general fund appropriations are made to fund parks by the governing body. Although there is no longer a property tax lid in effect, the governing body must pass and publish a resolution or ordinance stating if an increase in the tax has been made. Funds can also be spent from a city's capital reserve fund. In order to establish such a fund, a city must first have a formally approved multiyear capital improvement plan.⁶⁶ Moneys may be credited to the fund by budgeted transfers, with any property tax levied for the fund authorized by the home rule ordinance.⁶⁷ (Cities can also establish park maintenance funds, not designed for acquisition).

Bonded indebtedness is limited to 30 percent of assessed valuation, yet there are exceptions not included in this percentage that make it difficult for a city or county to reach its debt ceiling. Generally, cities can issue G.O. bonds for land acquisition/park purposes without voter approval, unless a citizen petition is filed (KSA 12-1302). Before bonds shall be acquired, the governing body must publish a notice of its intention for two consecutive weeks in the official city paper. The lands to be acquired and the amount of the bonds shall be included. These bonds can be issued without voter approval *unless* a petition requesting an election is signed by at least 10 percent of voters who voted in the last regular city election. If an election is held, majority voter approval is required. With respect to improvements of land, no bonds shall be issued without voter approval.⁶⁸

For cities of the first class with a board of park commissioners, voter approval may be required to issue general obligation bonds in some instances (KSA 13-1348).

Special Assessments

Cities can create a benefit district and levy a special assessment to pay for the costs of new infrastructure within the district. According to the League of Kansas Municipalities, about three-fourths of the cities in Kansas levy special assessments for sidewalk improvements, with about 70 percent of such cities assessing 100 percent of the cost against the benefiting property. This type of financing mechanism could probably best be used to create new sidewalks, bike paths, etc. rather than improve and make changes to existing ones. The median per capita amount received by the 72 cities reporting special assessment districts to the LKM in 1999 was \$14.53. In addition, more than half the cities levy special assessment for storm sewer improvements.

Cities can establish other special districts and levy taxes accordingly. For instance, state statutes (K.S.A. 12-1782 et seq.) authorize and prescribe the procedures for cities to establish business improvement districts and to levy annual business improvement service fees. These fees finance special and extended public services within the districts. Tax improvement fund districts can also be created. These are typically used to generate funds for economically distressed areas.

Sales Taxes

The principal nonproperty tax revenue source available to cities is the local sales tax. Cities can levy sales taxes in the amount of 1/10, 1/14, 1/2, 3/4, or 1 percent. (Certain cities may levy rates up to 1.75 or 2 percent). Cities also receive a portion of county sales tax revenues. (K.S.A. Supp. 12-188 creates four classes for cities for the purpose of imposing limitations and granting additional taxing authority. These classes are unrelated to the usual classes of cities, such as first, second, etc. None of the special authorizations granted in these statutes provide additional taxing power to cities in the Kansas City metro area.)

The governing body may submit a question to the voters and must submit a question upon submission of a petition signed by at least 10 percent of registered voters.⁶⁹ One or more cities containing at least 25 percent of the population of a county may force a referendum on a countywide tax. According to the League of Kansas Municipalities, more than threefourths of the city sales tax referendums in the State of Kansas have been approved over the years. ⁷⁰ A referendum can be held at any time and a mail ballot may be used.

While the majority of local governments in Kansas use sales tax revenues for general fund purposes, cities can dedicate a portion of revenues for specific purposes. State statutes do not outline a specific parks sales tax; it's up to the municipality and then the voters to earmark a tax for parks, recreation, trails, etc.⁷¹ Specifically, the governing body of the city proposing the tax must specify the purpose or purposes for which the revenue would be issued, and a statement generally describing such purpose shall be included as part of the ballot proposition.⁷² Most dedicated sales taxes include a sunset provision.

State legislation allowed a window to increase city sales tax levies by 1/8 percent for certain purposes, including parks. In December 1999, voters in the City of Olathe passed a 5-year sales tax for parks, recreation, and trails by 68 percent. The measure authorized a 1/8 percent levy on top of the 1 percent already in place. The tax will raise an estimated \$14 million over 5 years. The election was held by mail.

Stormwater Utility Fees

Stormwater utilities are an arm of the city, created by charter ordinance. All cities operating a municipal water, electric or gas systems may levy a fee or rate. These charter ordinances and the ways in which fees are levied vary from city to city. For instance, some cities charge a flat rate per meter while others have developed more sophisticated approaches, such as fees based on the amount of impervious surfaces or per feet costs for residential, commercial and industrial use. Stormwater fees are approved by a city's governing body.

Cities are increasingly levying stormwater fees because of the need to repair aging stormwater infrastructure and to respond to the public demand for improved drainage. These improvements are also being tied to beatification and quality of life improvements. In the city of Lenexa, a stormwater utility charge is levied on residential, commercial and industrial users. These fees are used to implement the city's "Rain into Recreation" program, which will use a series of natural, park-like detention basins connected by greenway corridors to filter the water after heavy rains and provide recreational opportunities when dry. In a stormwater survey conducted by the City of Lenexa, water quality was named the number one priority of local residents.⁷³

City leaders in Overland Park are discussing plans to raise \$4.5 million in new taxes to repair the city's stormwater system. A committee of community leaders recommended the 1-mill property tax increase and a special stormwater fee to be levied against every piece of land in the city (homeowners rate of \$2 per month, business rate of \$2 per month per 2,458 square feet.) The city passed a stormwater utility fee in September 2001.

Impact Fees/Developer Dedication Requirements/Excise Taxes

Impact fees and developer dedication requirements help off-set the costs to local governments of infrastructure generated by the developer. While Kansas has no impact fee enabling legislation, the power to levy them is implied. Proceeds should be designated for those projects impacted by the development. Cities are also imposing park excise fees and land dedications to off-set the impact of a development. (See the Missouri section for more background on impact fees and developer dedication requirements). These techniques require approval by the governing body.

To pay for local parks and trails, Olathe collects a park excise tax on new homes and a square foot charge for industrial and commercial development. Fees are graduated depending on the kind of development and affordability. Unlike an impact fee, revenues from the excise tax can be collected and used throughout the city.

Liquor Drink Tax

The state levies a 10 percent gross receipts tax on the sales of alcohol. The revenue is allocated 30 percent to the state and 70 percent to the cities and counties where the tax is collected. Each city over 6,000 population and each county receiving money must establish a "special parks and recreation fund" and a "special alcohol and drug programs fund." In cities of 6,000 or less, the money is deposited half in the parks and recreation fund and half in the general fund. Unlike most others outlined here, the liquor drink tax is not a local option tax. It is, however, a park and recreation funding source for Kansas cities and counties.

Tax Increment Financing

As described earlier, tax increment financing (TIF) is a real estate development technique applicable to industrial, commercial, and residential projects to cover the costs of publicly provided project improvements. TIF uses anticipated increases in real estate tax revenues resulting from increased property values to pay off bonds sold to finance qualifying redevelopment costs. TIF allows the financing of land acquisitions and improvements with tax-free borrowing, thereby reducing interest cots. In addition, use of TIF allows businesses to purchase renovated sites and buildings at less than market costs. Although this is infrequently used, the city of Independence has helped funds two trails projects using tax increment financing.

Municipal Profiles Gardner

Known as the "City of Trails" (the Santa Fe and Oregon cross through), Gardner has adopted a trail plan and design guidelines and has constructed several miles of off-road trails. The city takes a variety of approaches to create new trails and greenways: bike path and collector right-of-way requirements, developer land dedications, and the encouragement of common areas owned and maintained by home associations that feed into the trails system.

The city considers two basic types of sidewalk/pedestrian paths in its policy. First, on-street sidewalks/paths are located adjacent to a roadway, replacing the standard sidewalk. A combination of public right-of-way and/ or easements is utilized for the trail.

Next, off-street pedestrian paths are provided within private development through dedication of property or pedestrian easements. If dedicated for public use, they may form a linear park and provide recreational amenities for the community. They may be located in drainage basins or on typical development ground.

Sidewalk/pedestrian paths are intended to be located on all major arterial, minor arterials, and industrial/commercial collectors. Off-street pedestrian paths are intended to be located in drainage basins or floodplains and located within areas that might otherwise be difficult to develop due to topographical or design constraints.⁷⁴

The city requires that developers create pathways along arterials and collectors of new development, typically 10-foot-wide asphalt bicycle paths. Instead of a standard sidewalk, the city's greenways/trails system plan encourages paths to be created in a meandering manner. The city also imposes a fee on new development to support parkland. Developers can either pay \$200 per lot or dedicate parkland of greater value. (Funds from the fees can be used toward parks or trails in any part of town.) The city encourages the dedication of land that connects neighboring developments, creating green corridors in the process. For every lot within one subdivision, there will be a bike path that feeds into a greenway, which is connected to an arterial system. (City officials are considering increasing park fees and adding a fee for the development of commercial or industrial lots. The city council would have to approve a fee adjustment.)

While the city relies heavily on its park fee and developer dedication program, officials look for additional acquisition and maintenance funding sources: grants, general appropriations, county partnerships, and potentially a future sales tax increase. The city works closely with the Johnson County Parks Department. Gardner has a north/south greenway system that is expanding with the help of Johnson County. Some of the dedicated land ties into the county trails. Many Gardner residents can now bike to work and many children can bike to school. One of the challenges that remain is connecting the city's core - the older parts of town - with the trails, greenways, and bike paths in newer areas.⁷⁵

Olathe

Olathe has constructed an extensive system of trails and bicycle facilities that link neighborhoods, commercial districts, and parks. The city relies on a variety of sources to funds its recently updated Trails and Greenways Plan, including federal and state grants, dedicated sales tax revenues, and a park excise tax.

The 1/8-cent sales tax was approved in a November 1999 mail ballot election with 68 percent of the vote. Revenues are roughly \$1.3 million in 2000, \$2.2 million in 2001, and \$2.4 million in 2002. There are different categories of improvements funded with sales tax revenues: community parks, including one with a sports orientation; aquatic center improvements; neighborhood park acquisition for older, established areas of town; and the trails and greenways segment. Revenues from the sales tax were used to leverage federal TEA-21 funds for several trail projects.⁷⁶

In addition to the sales tax, an effective park excise tax has helped finance neighborhood parks throughout the city. Unlike an impact fee, receipts from the tax can be used for projects throughout the city. The city has two categories of funds, which can be used for new acquisition or maintenance: 1) receipts from single-family and duplex residential development are deposited in a fund to support neighborhood parks in fast-growing areas; and 2) a general park fund to receive receipts from all commercial, industrial, and multi-family development for parks and trails.

The fees are set at \$260 per dwelling unit, \$0.13 per square foot of building area for commercial, and \$0.17 per square foot of building area for industrial. Fees are collected at the latest possible point in the process (from the homebuilders upon issuance of a building permit) in order to lessen carrying costs. The city does not have a donation in lieu of a fee option, a request made by the development community at the outset of the program. Still, some developers have donated greenways corridors property in addition to payment of the fee.

Community members have been active in the parks and trails programs. The Olathe Citizens for Parks Committee actively campaigned for the parks sales tax measure. Currently, a parks and recreation leadership board exists to help guide acquisitions and development. A parks foundation has also been created to encourage businesses and residents to make direct contributions to support parks and recreations.

Lenexa

"Lenexa is thinking outside the box on stormwater," reported the <u>Kansas</u> <u>City Star</u> in an editorial from July 2000. "Or more precisely outside the conventional concrete runways that have contained - or failed to contain the runoff from rainfall. Lenexa is reverting to nature."⁷⁷ Named "Rain into Recreation," the city plans to use a series of natural, park-like detention basins connected by greenway corridors. The approach uses the natural features of the land to move water along the system, improving water quality in the process. The basins will collect trash and silt after heavy rains and double as sites for ball fields and other recreational uses when dry.⁷⁸ A model for neighboring communities, the system's natural filtration could help many cities meet new federal water quality standards on storm run-off. Riparian greenway areas will connect the shared detention systems. The greenways will allow stormwater to flow naturally without obstruction while removing contaminants in the water; trails will provide recreational opportunities for residents.⁷⁹

The plan's price tag: \$82.6 million over 10 years. That figure is compared to \$99 million to keep the current system and fix problems as they arise. In 2000, voters in the City of Lenexa approved a 1/8-cent sales tax for stormwater/recreation improvements, with a strong environmental message that appealed to voters. This tax costs residents about \$20 a year and is expected to generate \$1.375 million in 2001. The city is also levying a stormwater utility charge at a rate of \$30 per year per household. Commercial and industrial utility charges will be based upon the amount of hard or impervious surface on the property (or \$2.50 per 2,750 square feet per month). Kansas stormwater fees are approved by the governing body; Missouri fees require a public vote. About \$982,000 is expected to be raised in 2001 through this source. Other financing sources include a capital fee for new development (requiring developers to pay fees in lieu of building their own retention basin; this option will be considered by the city council soon), and revenue from existing sources such as the mill levy and the Johnson County Storm Water Management Program.

Lenexa is an affluent suburb of roughly 30 square miles. It is one-third built out, with 11,000 developable acres. The program came about through a community vision process and comprehensive plan update in the late '90s. The city hired a local consultant to help develop the stormwater master plan (now a watershed master plan) that outlined the need for better site design (more open space), protecting riparian corridors, and regional detention and retention. Stormwater is managed for multiple objectives: flood reduction; conservation water quality; and new recreational opportunities. The biggest cost is the water detention (new lakes, dams, etc.)

City planners inventoried all of Lenexa's creeks, prioritizing most sensitive creeks that should have natural buffers. They continue to acquire easements and build trails. Johnson County is studying stream setback requirements and pushing for a more proactive approach to stormwater management. MARC is actively organizing communities to talk about watershed management, common standards, and more environmentally based criteria. It should be noted, however, that stormwater management is the purview of engineers, not environmentalists, and a cultural change takes time.⁸⁰

In many ways, the "Rain-into-Recreation" program serves to enhance the city's current trails plan. The city is implementing a trails plan that requires trails connections within and between subdivisions. The city's park dedication requirements - its "three percent ordinance" - requires developers to provide 3 percent of land or its cash value as development occurs for parks/trails. The city also funds trails through its general fund, appropriations through the annual Capital Improvement Plan, state and federal grant money, and the city's share of the state alcohol tax. The city has also incorporated some off-road trails in lieu of sidewalks into its new road projects.

In July 2001, the parks department completed a bicycle/pedestrian survey designed to help the city plan for addressing non-motorized transportation. Public workshops were also held. The city anticipates adoption of a plan in November. Top priorities for bike enthusiasts included widening curb lanes to provide more riding space on city streets; traffic claiming safety measures; and paving shoulders in rural areas.⁸¹

Overland Park

The city of Overland Park adopted a master greenway linkages plan many years ago. The plan follows creeks, floodplains, thoroughfares or other roadways. The city has no park tax but works with developers on land dedications. When development occurs on a tract with property designated for a greenway, the city requires that property be dedicated to the city as parkland. The city rarely purchases land for this system, rather it's acquired through a deed of dedication. Occasionally there is a piece of property that the parks department will actively try to purchase or obtain through easements, however, that is the exception rather than the rule. The city also has several flood plains and has purchased parklands through the federal flood insurance program.⁸²

Financing Options	s Summary – First Class Cities		
City Sample/Type	Summary of Financing Options	Summary of Tax/Bond Capacity	Implementation Process
Leavenworth; Kansas	Property tax/special assessment levies: Mill levy on real and personal property for parks, recreational grounds, etc.	Property tax/special assessment levies: No limit.	Property tax/special assessment levies: Typically, general fund appropriations are made to fund parks by the governing body after a resolution or ordinance about an increase in the tax has been made. Funds can also be spent from a city's capital reserve fund. In order to establish such a fund, a city must first have a formally approved multiyear capital improvement plan. [83]
	G.O. bonds: Provide funds for the acquisition and construction of major capital facilities paid through the property tax levy.	G.O. bonds: Bonded indebtedness is limited to 30 percent of assessed valuation, yet there are exceptions not included in this percentage that make it difficult for a city or county to reach it's debt ceiling.	G.O. bonds: Any first class city having a board of park commissioners is authorized to issue general obligation bonds to purchase land for park, parkway, boulevard, or airport purposes with voter approval at a general or regular city election or special bond election. In lieu of an election, however, a board of park commissioners or an airport authority may pledge net income of an airport facility to the municipality for payment of the bond without an election. There is a citizen petition process, however, that would even mandate an election under these circumstances.
	Sales taxes: City retailers' tax on goods and services.	Sales taxes: Cities can levy sales taxes in the amount of 1/10, 1/14, 1/2, 3/4, or 1 percent.	Sales taxes: Majority voter approval required. It's up to the governing body to submit a sales tax question to the voters unless a petition signed by at least 10 percent of registered voters is filed calling for an election.[84] One or more cities containing at least 25 percent of the population of a county may force a referendum on a countywide tax. To earmark revenues, the governing body must specify the purpose(s) for which the revenue would be used, and a statement generally describing such purpose shall be included as part of the ballot proposition. [85]
	Stormwater utility fees: Utility fee for residential and commercial users.	Stormwater utility fees: Varies.	Stormwater utility fees: Approval by the governing body.
	Impact fees/dedication requirements: a condition or stipulation of approval that requires the applicant to convey an interest in land as a condition of the subject approval or a fee to offset the costs of infrastructure of the new development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Depends on the impact of the development.	Impact fees/dedication requirements: Levied by ordinance of the local governing body.

City Sample/Type	Summary of Financing Options	Summary of Tax/Bond Capacity	Implementation Process
 2nd Cities: Lansing, Fairway; Gardner; Merriam; Mission; Edwardsville; Roeland Park 3rd Class Cities: Easton; Edgarton; Mission Hills; Westwood; Tonganoxie. 	Refer to table for 1 st class cities.	Refer to table for 1 st class cities.	General obligation bonds: Generally, cities can issue g.o. bonds for land acquisition/park purposes without voter approval, unless a citizen petition is filed (KSA 12-1302). Before bonds shall be acquired, the governing body must publish a notice of its intention for two consecutive weeks in the official city paper. The lands to be acquired and the amount of the bonds shall be included. These bonds can be issued without voter approval unless a petition requesting an election is signed by at least 10 percent of voters who voted in the last regular city election. If an election is held, majority voter approval is required. With respect to improvements of land, no bonds shall be issued without voter approval. [86]

Financing Options Summary – Second & Third Class Cities

MetroGreen Finance Strategy

Election Analysis

Voting Trends and Election Results for Fiscal and Environmental Measure

Voters throughout the Kansas City metro region have shown a willingness to approve public funding for parks, open space, and trails in recent years. For example:

- Lee's Summit voters recently approved a tax increase for the development of a 700-acre park.
- In 1998, Johnson County voters approved a \$6 million general obligation bond to purchase a new regional park Big Bull Creek, the county's largest at 1,400 acres.
- In 1999, voters in the City of Olathe approved a 1/8-cent sales tax for parks.
- In Leawood, voters passed a \$12.5 million general obligation bond

 the largest bond in the city's history to add parkland and
 improve existing parks.
- And Platte County voters approved a sales tax to fund the county's parks and trails system in 2000.

This section takes a closer look at voting behavior for all fiscal and environmental measures at the municipal and county levels. The information, a review of approval rates and turnout trends, is designed to help conservation planners understand voting patterns on a county-bycounty basis.

Missouri Elections

Election Calendar	
February (even/odd years)	Available for public election (last filing day is in November)
March (odd years)	Charter city and charter counties only (last filing day is in December)
March (even years)	Presidential primary & charter cities and charter counties only
April (odd/even-year)	General municipal election day (last filing day is in December)
June (odd/even-year)	Available for school and water district elections (last filing day is in April)
August (odd-year)	Available for school districts and municipalities only (last filing day is in May)
August (even year) November (odd years) November (even years)	Primary election (last filing day is in April) Available for public elections General election (last filing day is in August)

Missouri state statues allow for local mail ballot elections (chapter 115). There have been only three held in the state, however, over the past couple of decades, probably due to a fairly cumbersome process.

Voter Turnout & Fiscal Environmental Approval Rates - By County & Kansas City

The following graphs outline voter approval rates for fiscal and/or environmental measures by county. Specific information such as results, measure descriptions, jurisdictions, and election dates, are located on subsequent pages under Election Results. Please note that the fiscal measures included have a tax impact on all or most voters and do not include more narrowly applied fees and permits (unless they are universally applied and/or environmentally related.) Measures for all jurisdictions are included (state, county, municipal, school district, fire protection district, etc.). In some instances, the jurisdiction of a special district crosses county lines. The tables indicate whether or not a measure was approved or rejected in the county in question. The results are not weighted; a successful fiscal measure with only a few votes is counted the same as a countywide measure with thousands of votes.

For consistency among counties, voter turnout graphs are classified by election month rather than election type. For instance, odd-year November elections are classified as general elections in some counties and special elections in others. Voter turnout is, therefore, grouped as "November elections" in the graph. (In this instance, odd-year elections typically have lower turnout than even years.)

The election results provided in the following tables represent the vote total for each of the individual jurisdictions noted above. The overall vote total is not provided.



Kansas City Voter Turnout (Averages from 1996 to 2001) Kansas City Election Results Fiscal & Environmental Measures (1997 - 2001)



Platte County Voter Turnout (Averages from 1996 to 2001)



Platte County Election Results Fiscal & Environmental Measures (1996 - 2001)



*March/June total represents 7 out of 7 elections.

Clay County Election Results Fiscal & Environmental Measures (1996 - 2001)



Jackson County Election Results Fiscal & Environmental Measures (1997 - 2001)



Cass County Election Results

Fiscal & Environmental Measures (1996 - 2001)



Kansas Elections

Election Schedule

National, state, and county elections are held in the fall in even-numbered years. City, school, water, and drainage elections are held in the spring. Generally, questions can be submitted during any election.

For instance, Kansas city elections will be held in February 2002 (primary, if needed) and April 2002 (general election). National, county, and state elections will be held in August 2002 (primary) and November 2002 (general).

Deadlines for Ballot Questions

- Primary elections: same as candidate filing deadline
- Spring Elections General Election ballot: deadline is the day of the Primary Canvass, which is the Friday following the election.
- Fall elections General Election ballot: deadline is the day of the State Canvass. Not later than September 1 unless it falls on a Sunday or holiday.

2002 Municipal Elections

- January 22: deadline for questions to be placed on the Primary Election ballot
- February 6: advance voting begins
- February 26: city primary election
- March 1: deadline for questions to be placed on the General Election ballot
- March 13: advance voting begins
- April 2: city general election

2002 County Elections

- June 10: deadline for questions to be placed on the Primary Election ballot.
- July 17: advance voting begins
- August 6: primary election
- September 1: deadline for questions to be placed on the General Election ballot.
- October 16: advance voting begins
- November 5: advance voting begins

Mail ballots are held for questions only. It's up to the local governing body to determine if a mail ballot will be used. These elections seem to go in spurts, although they are more often used in off-years. For instance, there has been only one so far in 2001; 1999 had 8 mail ballot elections. In all there have been roughly 200 since the passage of state enabling legislation in 1983.

Voter Turnout & Fiscal Environmental Approval Rates - By County

The following graphs outline voter approval rates for fiscal and/or environmental measures by county. Specific information such as results, measure descriptions, jurisdictions, and election dates, are located on subsequent pages. Please note that the fiscal measures included have a tax impact on all or most voters and do not include more narrowly applied fees and permits (unless they are universally applied and/or environmentally related.) Measures for all jurisdictions are included (state, county, municipal, school district, fire protection district, etc.). In some instances, the jurisdiction of a special district crosses county lines. The tables indicate whether or not a measure was approved or rejected in the county in question. The results are not weighted; a successful fiscal measure with only a few votes is counted the same as a countywide measure with thousands of votes.

Johnson County



Voter Turnout (Averages from 1996 - 2001)

*Mail ballot elections are not countywide.

Johnson County Election Results Fiscal & Environmental Measures (1997 - 2001)



Note: 100% approval rate in August election represents 1 out of 1 measure.

Wyandotte County Election Results Fiscal & Environmental Measures (1997 - 2001)



Note: A total of 3 measures.

Leavenworth County Election Results Fiscal & Environmental Measures (1997 - 2001)



Note: A total of 3 measures.

Sales Tax in the City of Olathe, Kansas (December 1999: Mail Ballot Election)

"Shall the City of Olathe, Kansas, be authorized to levy a one-eighth of one percent (.125%) City Retailers' Sales Tax, in addition to the one percent (1.0%) currently levied within the City of Olathe, Kansas, and to use the revenue from the additional tax to fund the acquisition and improvement of public parks and recreation areas, such additional tax to take effect on April 1, 2000, and to end on March 31, 2005?"

Missouri Sample Use Tax Ballot Language

Shall the (county or municipality's name) impose a local use tax at the same rate as the local sales tax, currently at a rate of (insert percent) provided that, if any local sales tax is repealed, reduced or raised by voter approval, the respective local use tax also shall be repealed, reduced or raised by the same action? A use tax return shall not be required to be filed by persons whose purchases from out-of-state vendors do not in total exceed two thousand dollars in any calendar year. (NOTE: for charter counties with populations greater than 900,000, ballot language outlines uses for Community Comeback Program; for cities of greater than 900,000, ballot language outlines uses for language regarding transportation tax and capital improvements tax).⁸⁷

Regional Recreation District - Missouri

(67.796). For the creation of a new district: Shall there be organized in the counties of . . ., state of Missouri, a regional recreational district for the establishment and maintenance of public parks, recreational facilities, and other recreational grounds within the boundaries of such proposed district, to be known as ". . . Regional Recreational District" as (requested by petition filed with the county clerk of . . . Or provided by ordinance no. . . . of . . .) County, Missouri, on the . . . day of (month) . . ., (year). . . ?

For an addition to a district:

Shall there be annexed to the "... Regional Recreational District" the territory within the boundaries of (describe the territory)?

Neighborhood Improvement District - Missouri

Shall . . .(name of city or county) be authorized to create a neighborhood improvement district proposed for the . . .(project name for the proposed improvement) and incur indebtedness and issue general obligation bonds to pay for all or part of the cost of public improvements within such district, the cost of all indebtedness so incurred to be assessed by the governing body of the . . .(city or county) on the real property benefited by such improvements for a period of . . .year , and, if included in the resolution, an assessment in each year thereafter with the proceeds thereof used solely for maintenance of the improvement?⁸⁸

Sample Ballot Language

Election Results

Kansas City (MO) Voter Turnout

Election Date	Election	Registered Voters	Ballots Cast	Turnout Percentage
August 8, 2000	Primary	200,591	26,629	13%
March 7, 2000	Presidential Preference Primary	196,181	19,343	10%
November 2, 1999	Special	190,016	32,077	17%
August 3, 1999	Special	189,440	31,089	16%
April 6, 1999	School & Special	190,922	58,810	31%
March 4, 1999	Municipal Primary	189,053	42,777	23%
November 2, 1998	General	187,734	79,913	43%
February 3, 1998	Special	215,226	43,124	20%
November 4, 1997	Special	216,231	29,868	14%
April 1, 1997	School & Special	212,951	23,945	11%
November 1, 1996	General	209,755	113,239	54%
August 6, 1996	Primary	203,560	28,651	14%

Kansas	City	(MO)	Election	Results
--------	------	------	----------	---------

Election Date	Election Type	Jurisdiction	Measure	Result
April 3, 2001	School Board*	Consolidated School District No. 4 of Jackson County	Bonds of \$16 million for school construction, improvements	Approved with 58%
April 3, 2001	School Board*	Consolidated School District No. 4 of Jackson County	Increase operating levy by 50 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Rejected with 40% in favor
April 3, 2001	School Board*	School District of the City of Independence	Increase operating levy by 51 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Approved with 58%
November 7, 2000	General	Kansas City	State of Missouri Prop A (<i>Environmental</i>): Limits billboards & tree removal. Prohibits most new and some existing outdoors ads along the National Highway System and prohibits advertisers from removing trees and vegetation along public right of ways.	Failed
August 8, 2000	Primary	Kansas City	Revenue bonds	Approved with 73%
August 8, 2000	Primary	Kansas City	Environmental: recycling measure	Rejected with 46% in favor
August 8, 2000	Primary	Center School District No. 58	Tax levy	Approved with 51%
November 2, 1999	General	City of Kansas City	Extend two 1/2-cent sales taxes for capital improvements (roads, bridges, light rail)	Rejected with 40% in favor
November 2, 1999	General	City of Kansas City	Extend 1-cent sales tax for stormwater project, parks improvements	Approved with 60%
August 3, 1999	Special: Municipal/school	City of Kansas City	Increase the convention and tourism tax from 5.5% to 6.5%	Approved with 65%
August 3, 1999	General Municipal	Grandview School District C4	Sales tax increase	Approved with 64%
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	Jackson Co.	1/4-cent sales tax to build new courthouse, hire more sheriff's deputies, and improve the county's 911 emergency	Rejected with 33% in favor
April 6, 1999	General Municipal		State of Missouri Prop A: 50-cents-per-month fee on cellular phone bills to finance a statewide 911 system for cellular phones.	Rejected with 41% in favor
April 6, 1999	School & Special*	Reorganized School District No. 7	G.O. bonds for school improvements	Approved with 69%
April 6, 1999	School & Special*	Kansas City	State of Missouri Prop A: 50-cents-per-month fee on cellular phone bills to finance a statewide 911 system for cellular phones.	Rejected with 41% in favor
April 6, 1999	General Municipal	Kansas City	Impose 1/2-cent sales tax for funding flood relief projects	Rejected with 40% in favor
February 3, 1998	Special	Kansas City	Tax increment financing for power & light district	Approved with 60%

MetroGreen Finance Strategy

Kansas City MetroGreen Plan

June 2, 1998	Special	Consolidated School District No. 1	G.O. bonds for school construction, improvements	Approved with 81%
November 3, 1998	General	Independence School District	G.O. bonds for school construction, improvements	Approved with 70%
November 3, 1998	General	Kansas City	Extend 1/2-cent sales tax for infrastructure	Rejected with 46% in favor
November 3, 1998	General	Kansas City	Stormwater fees of between 35 and 50 cents	Approved
November 5, 1996	General	State of Missouri	State of Missouri Constitutional Amendment 8 (<i>Fiscal/Environmental</i>): Extends state's 1/10 sales tax to fund parks and soil erosion.	Approved
April 1, 1997	Special/School*	Kansas City	G.O. bonds of \$110 million to purchase street lighting system	Approved with 68%
November 4, 1997	Special	Kansas City	Increase the sales tax by 1/2-cent to fund capital improvements	Rejected with 42% in favor
April 2, 1996	School/Special*	Center School District No. 58	Increase operating levy	Approved with 75%
April 2, 1996	School/Special*	Center School District No. 58	G.O. bonds for school construction, improvements	Approved with 66%
June 4, 1996	Special	Kansas City Library District	Increase tax levy	Approved with 64%

*April odd-year elections in Missouri Counties are classified as Municipal General elections.

Clay County Election Results Fiscal/Environmental Measure (1996 - 2001)

Election Date	Election Type	Jurisdiction	Measure	Result
April 3, 2001	General: municipal, school	Platte Co. School District R-3	G.O. bonds of \$8.5 million for school construction, improvements	Approved with 80%
April 3, 2001	General: municipal, school	Clinton R-III School District	G.O. bonds of \$6 million for school construction.	Approved with 86%
April 3, 2001	General: municipal, school	Smithville School District	G.O. bonds for school improvements	Approved with 80%
April 3, 2001	General: municipal, school	North Kansas City School District	Increase tax levy by 27 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation for school facilities	Approved with 53%
April 3, 2001	General: municipal, school	North Kansas City School District	G.O. bonds of \$69.5 million for libraries and schools	Approved with 64%
April 3, 2001	General: municipal, school	City of Lawson	G.O. bonds of \$200,000 for stormwater system	Approved with 61%
April 3, 2001	General: municipal, school	Kearney Holt Recreation District	Levy a tax of 42 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation for public parks and recreational facilities	Rejected with 31%
April 3, 2001	General: municipal, school	Kearney Fire District	Increase tax levy 3 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation to fund dispatching service	Approved with 58%
April 3, 2001	General: municipal, school	Kearney School District R-I	G.O. bonds of \$10.5 million for school construction, improvements	Approved with 70%
April 3, 2001	General: municipal, school	Clay County	Increase tax levy 6 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation for county health center	Rejected with 45% in favor
February 6, 2001	Municipal	Kearney School District R-I	Increase school tax levy to \$3.59 per \$100 of assessed valuation for general operating purposes	Approved with 64%
February 6, 2001	Municipal	City of Gladstone	Impose a 1/4-cent sales tax for municipal fire department	Approved with 83%
November 7, 2000	General	Clay Co.	State of Missouri Prop A (<i>Environmental</i>): Limits billboards & tree removal. Prohibits most new and some existing outdoors ads along the National Highway System and prohibits advertisers from removing trees and vegetation along public right of ways.	Approved with 50.4%
November 7, 2000	General	Excelsior Springs School District No. 40	G.O. bonds of \$8 million for school construction, improvements	Approved with 65%
November 7, 2000	General	City of Pleasant Valley	Impose a 1/2-cent sales tax for stormwater projects	Approved with 53%
November 7, 2000	General	City of Kansas City	Extend 1/2-cent sales tax for Liberty Memorial, parks, trails	Rejected with 42% in favor
November 7, 2000	General	City of Kansas City	Impose 1/2-cent sales tax for capital improvements/light rail	Approved with 35% in favor
August 8, 2000	Primary	Clinton R-III School District	Tax levy	Approved with 50%
August 8, 2000	Primary	Smithville R-II School District	Tax levy	Approved with 65%

August 8, 2000	Primary	City of Kearney	G.O. bonds	Approved with 67%
August 8, 2000	Primary	City of Excelsior Springs	Sales tax increase	Approved with 76%
August 8, 2000	Primary	City of Glenaire	Tax levy	Approved with 56%
August 8, 2000	Primary	Liberty Fire Protection District	Sale tax increase	Approved with 59%
August 8, 2000	Primary	City of Liberty	Parks sales tax	Approved with 51%
August 8, 2000	Primary	City of Kansas City	Environmental: recycling measure	Rejected with 41% in favor
August 8, 2000	Primary	City of Kansas City	Revenue bonds	Approved with 74%
August 8, 2000	Primary	Clay County	Tax levy	Rejected with 44% in favor
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	Smithville Fire District	Impose 1/2-cent sales tax for operations and personnel	Approved with 81%
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	Smithville R-II School District	G.O. Bonds of \$400,000 for school construction, improvements	Approved with 82%
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	Liberty School District No. 53	G.O. bonds of \$36 million for school construction, repair	Approved with 83%
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	Lawson School District R-XIV	G.O. Bonds of \$2.9 million for school construction, improvements	Approved with 73%
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	Clinton Co. School District R-	Increase tax levy by 30 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation for operating expenses, maintenance of schools	Approved with 70%
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	Village of Oakwood	Increase levy by 20 cents on \$100 assessed valuation for general municipal purposes	Approved with 80%
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	City of Gladstone	Revenue bonds of \$4 million for waterworks and sewerage system	Approved with 81%
November 2, 1999	General	Kearney Holt Recreation District	Levy a tax of 49 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation for parks, recreational facilities	Rejected with 32%
November 2, 1999	General	City of Kansas City	Extend two 1/2-cent sales taxes for capital improvements (roads, bridges, light rail)	Rejected with 30% in favor
November 2, 1999	General	City of Kansas City	Extend 1-cent sales tax for stormwater project, parks improvements	Approved with 54%
August 3, 1999	Special: Municipal/school	City of Excelsior Springs	Extend 1/4-cent sales tax for capital improvements	Approved with 66%
August 3, 1999	Special: Municipal/school	City of Lawson	G.O. bonds of \$375,000 for waterworks and sewage system	Approved with 75%
August 3, 1999	Special: Municipal/school	City of Lawson	Revenue bonds of \$550,000 to improve waterworks and sewage system	Approved with 75%
August 3, 1999	Special: Municipal/school	City of Kansas City	Increase the convention and tourism tax from 5.5% to 6.5%	Approved with 62%
April 6, 1999	General Municipal	Clay Co.	State of Missouri Prop A: Puts a 50-cents-per-month fee on cellular phone bills to finance a statewide 911 system for cellular phones.	Rejected

April 6, 1999		City of Kansas City	Impose 1/2-cent sales tax for funding flood relief projects	Rejected with 24% in favor
April 6, 1999		Clay County	Environmental: create a regional recreation district	Approved with 70%
April 6, 1999	General Municipal	Kearney School District R-1	G.O. Bonds of \$8 million to fund school improvements	Approved with 70%
February 2, 1999	Special	North Kansas City School Board No. 74	Increase operating levy by 32 cents on \$100 assessed valuation to fund new schools	Approved with 68%
February 2, 1999	Special	City of Excelsior Springs	Levy a tax to equalize the obligations of all users of gas, energy, etc.	Approved with 54%
February 2, 1999	Special	City of Excelsior Springs	Impose use tax of 2%	Approved with 61%
February 2, 1999	Special	City of Excelsior Springs	Continue 1/4-cent sales tax for capital improvement	Approved with 70%
February 2, 1999	Special	City of Excelsior Springs	Impose a 15% tariffed local service rate to provide emergency telephone service	Approved with 52%
November 3, 1998	General	Holt Fire District	Additional levy of 10 cents on \$100 assessed valuation for ambulance	Approved with 58%
November 3, 1998	General	Holt Fire District	Additional levy of 10 cents on \$100 assessed valuation for the district	Approved with 55%
November 3, 1998	General	School District R-3	G.O. bonds of \$10 million for new school construction	Approved with 78%
November 3, 1998	General	City of Avondale	G.O. bonds of \$565,000 for streets	Approved with 77%
November 3, 1998	General	City of Kansas City	Extend 1/2-cent sales tax for infrastructure	Rejected with 42% in favor
November 3, 1998	General	City of Kansas City	Stormwater fees of between 35 and 50 cents	Approved with 51%
August 4, 1998	Primary	Unincorporated area	Prop A – city roads	Rejected with 26% in favor
August 4, 1998	Primary	City of Excelsior Springs	1/2-cent sales tax for streets	Approved with 71%
August 4, 1998	Primary	City of Kansas City	Stormwater fees of between 35 and 50 cents	Rejected with 38% in favo
August 4, 1998	Primary	City of Kansas City	1/2-cent sales tax for local parks – solely for restoration of Liberty Memorial	Approved with 65%
April 7, 1998	Municipal General	Lawson School District	Question 2 – tax	Approved with 80%
April 7, 1998	Municipal General	Lawson School District	Question 1 – bonds	Approved with 69%
April 7, 1998	Municipal General	City of Pleasant Valley	Question 1 bonds	Rejected with 51% in favor
April 7, 1998	Municipal General	City of Oakwood Village	Question 2 - fire levy	Approved with 73%
April 7, 1998	Municipal General	City of Oakwood Village	Question 1 - municipal levy	Approved with 73%
April 7, 1998		City of Liberty	Extension of the 1/2-cent sales tax to fund capital improvements, including a ball field	Approved with 84%
April 7, 1998	Municipal General	City of Glenaire	Prop 2 tax levy	Rejected with 45% in favor
February 3, 1998	Municipal	Clay County	Proposition A: 1/8-cent sales tax for law enforcement	Approved with 58%
April 1, 1997	Municipal	Lawson Fire District	Tax levy of 30 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Rejected with 42% in favor
April 1, 1997	Municipal	Smithville R-III School District	G.O. bonds of \$2.75 million for school construction, repair	Approved with 77%
April 1, 1997	Municipal	Liberty School District No. 53	G.O. bonds of \$13.5 million for school construction, repair	Approved with 75%

April 1, 1997	Municipal	City of Kansas City	G.O. bonds of \$110 million to purchase street lighting system	Rejected with 52% in favor (57% required for passage)
April 1, 1997	Municipal	City of Excelsior Springs	Continue 1/2-cent sales levy for capital improvements	TBD
April 1, 1997	Municipal	Excelsior Springs School District No. 40	Increase operating levy by 15 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation to provide for teachers, staff, technology	Rejected with 54% in favor
February 4, 1997	Municipal	School District No. R-1 of Kearney	G.O. bonds of \$3 million to build new schools	Approved with 66%
February 4, 1997	Municipal	North Kansas City School District	School levy increase	Rejected with 40% in favor
November 5, 1996	General	Clay Co.	State of Missouri Constitutional Amendment 8 (<i>Fiscal/Environmental</i>): Extends state's 1/10 sales tax to fund parks and soil erosion.	Approved
November 5, 1996	General	Lawson Fire	Impose a fire district tax	Approved with 65%
November 5, 1996	General	City of Excelsior Springs	Bond	Approved with 61%
November 5, 1996	General	City of Excelsior Springs	Property tax levy	Approved with 51%
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Oakview	Impose a use tax at 1.5%	Approved with 79%
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Smithville	Impose a use tax at 1.5%	Approved with 57%
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Randolph	Increase the sales tax by 1/2% for capital improvements	Rejected with 57% in favor (12 votes cast)
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Randolph	Impose a use tax of 1%	
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Pleasant Valley	Impose a use tax of 1.75%	Rejected with 24% in favor
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of North Kansas City	Impose a use tax of 1.5%	Rejected with 43% in favor
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Liberty	Impose a use tax of 1.5%	Rejected with 23% in favor
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Excelsior Springs	Impose a use tax of 2.0%	Rejected with 39% in favor
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Gladstone	Impose a use tax of 2%	Rejected with 37% in favor
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Holt	Impose a use tax of 1%	Rejected with 20% in favor (18 total votes cast)
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Kansas City	Publicworks revenue bonds of \$15 million.	Approved with 73%
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Kansas City	<i>Environmental:</i> Impose fees for waste tire sites and waste tire haulers to encourage environmentally sound management of waste tires.	Approved with 63%
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Kansas City	Environmental: Salvage yard fee for reinspection of yards	Approved with 70%
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Kansas City	G.O. bonds of \$1.08 million to design and construction a bridge replacement	Approved with 73%
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Kansas City	Impose a use tax of 1.5%	Rejected with 41% in favor
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Lawson	Impose a use tax of 1.5%	Approved with 100% (1 vote
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Kearney	Impose a use tax	Rejected with 41% in favor
August 6, 1996	Primary	Clay County	Impose a use tax	Rejected with 40% in favor

Platte County Election Results

Election Date	Election Type	Jurisdiction	Measure	Result
April 3, 2001	General Municipal	City of Platte City	Revenue bonds of \$1.4 million for waterworks and sewerage system	Approved with 65%
April 3, 2001	General Municipal	City of Platte City	G.O. bonds of \$4 million for roads and storm sewer improvements	Approved with 69%
April 3, 2001	General Municipal	Farley Benefit Assessment Special Road District	Increase levy by 35 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Approved with 70%
April 3, 2001	General Municipal	Platte County R-3 School District	G.O. bonds of \$8.5 million for school construction, improvements	Approved with 84%
April 3, 2001	General Municipal	Weatherby Lake Fire Protection District	Increase levy by 30 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Approved with 69%
November 7, 2000	General	Platte County	State of Missouri Prop A (<i>Environmental</i>): Limits billboards & tree removal. Prohibits most new and some existing outdoors ads along the National Highway System and prohibits advertisers from removing trees and vegetation along public right of ways.	Approved with 54% (rejected statewide with 49% in favor)
November 7, 2000	General	City of Kansas City	Impose a 1/2-cent sales tax for light rail	Rejected with 40% in favor
November 7, 2000	General	City of Kansas City	Extend 1/2-cent sales tax for Liberty Memorial to fund revitalization of Penn Valley Park	Rejected with 47% in favor
November 7, 2000	General	City of Weston	Fiscal/Environmental: Increase monthly rates for trash collections and recycling	Approved with 51%
August 8, 2000	Primary	Smithville R-II School District	Increase operating levy by 10 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Approved with 57%
August 8, 2000	Primary	Southern Platte Fire Protection District	Increase levy from 50 cents to 70 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation for 24-hour on-site firefighters	Approved with 58%
August 8, 2000	Primary	City of Kansas City	Environmental/fiscal: Curbside recycling fee	Rejected with 49% in favor
August 8, 2000	Primary	City of Kansas City	Revenue bonds of \$395 million for airport expansion	Approved with 80%
August 8, 2000	Primary	Platte County	Impose a 1/2-cent sales tax for parks and storrmwater Environmental	Approved with 57%
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	Central Platte Fire Protection District	G.O. bonds of \$1.5 million for fire station renovation	Approved with 66%
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	Central Platte Fire Protection District	Increase levy 7 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Rejected with 50%
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	Smithville Fire Protection District	Impose a 1/2-cent sales tax for additional personnel	Approved with 82%
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	Smithville R-2C School District	G.O. bonds of \$400,000 for school construction	Approved with 72%
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	Sugar Lake Fire Protection District	Increase levy by 15 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Approved with 73%
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	Weston Benefit Assessment Special Road District	Increase levy by 35 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Approved with 72%
------------------	-------------------	--	---	--
April 4, 2000	General Municipal	City of Lake Waukomis	Increase tax levy to fund general municipal services, including fire	Approved with 76%
November 2, 1999	General	City of Kansas City	Extend sales tax for capital improvements, parks, streets Environmental	Approved with 58%
November 2, 1999	General	City of Kansas City	Extend 1/2-cents sales tax for capital improvements, light rail	Rejected with 35% in favor
November 2, 1999	General	Public Water Supply District No. 9	Revenues bonds of \$1.2 million for waterworks system	Approved with 60%
August 3, 1999	Special	City of Kansas City	Increase convention and tourism tax from 5.5% to 6.5%	Approved with 65%
August 3, 1999	Special	North Platte R-1 School District	Increase operating levy to \$3.90 on \$100 of assessed valuation	Approved with 61%
April 6, 1999	General Municipal	Smithville R-11 School District	G.O. bonds of \$6.6 million for school construction, improvements	Approved with 71%
April 6, 1999	General Municipal	North Platte R-1 School District	Increase operating levy to fund operations and capital projects	Rejected with 44% in favor
April 6, 1999	General Municipal	North Platte R-1 School District	Increase operating levy for school projects	Rejected with 37% in favor
April 6, 1999	General Municipal	City of Platte City	License tax on outdoor advertising	Approved with 54%
April 6, 1999	General Municipal	City of Houston Lake	Extend tax levy 25-cents on \$100 of assessed valuation for general municipal purposes	Approved with 82%
April 6, 1999	General Municipal	City of Kansas City	Impose 1/2-cent sales tax to fund flood relief projects Environmental	Rejected with 28% in favor
April 6, 1999	General Municipal	Park Hill School District	G.O. bond of \$21 million for school construction, improvements	Approved with 74%
April 6, 1999	General Municipal	Southern Platte Fire Protection District	G.O. bond of \$3.9 million to fund new fire station, equipment	Approved with 75%
April 6, 1999	General Municipal	Platte County	State of Missouri Prop A: 50-cents-per-month fee on cellular phone bills to finance a statewide 911 system for cellular phones.	Rejected with 43% in favor (rejected statewide with 48% in favor.)
November 3, 1998	General		State of Missouri Constitutional Amendment No. 7 (<i>Fiscal/Environmental</i>): G.O. bonds of \$17.3 million in bonds to grants/loans to local governments for construction or improvements to public sewage treatment, drinking water system, and stormwater control projects.	Approved with 68%
November 3, 1998	General	City of Kansas City	Extend 1/2-cent sales tax for bridges and light rail	Rejected with 46% in favor
November 3, 1998	General	City of Kansas City	New stormwater fee Environmental	Approved with 53%
November 3, 1998	General	City of Houston Lake	Increase the levy by 25-cents on \$100 of assessed valuation for streets and public facilities	Approved with 65%
November 3, 1998	General	City of Parkville	Impose a 1/2-cent sales tax to fund capital improvements	Rejected with 34% in favor
November 3, 1998	General	Platte County R-3 School District	G.O. bond of \$10 million for school construction, improvements	Approved with 81%

November 3, 1998	General	Platte County	State of Missouri Constitutional Amendment No. 7 <i>Fiscal/Environmental):</i> G.O. bonds of \$17.3 million in bonds to grants/loans to local governments for construction or improvements to public sewage treatment, drinking water system, and stormwater control projects.	Approved with 68%
August 4, 1998	Primary	City of Kansas City	Impose a 1/2-cent sales tax for parks/Liberty Memorial restoration	Approved with 70%
August 4, 1998	Primary	City of Kansas City	Impose a stormwater fee Environmental	Rejected with 42% in favor
August 4, 1998	Primary	City of Platte City	G.O. bonds of \$1.7 million for roads	Approved with 76%
August 4, 1998	Primary	City of Platte City	G.O. bonds of \$500,000 for buildings	Approved with 59%
August 4, 1998	Primary	City of Platte City	Revenue bonds of \$1 million for waterworks and sewer system	Approved with 76%
August 4, 1998	Primary	West Platte Fire Protection District	Increase levy by 10 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation for fire protection	Approved with 60%
August 4, 1998	Primary	West Platte Fire Protection District	Increase levy by 10 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation to fund ambulance service	Approved with 63%
April 7, 1998	General Municipal	City of Weston	Impose a 1/2-cent sales tax for transportation projects	Approved with 67%
April 7, 1998	General Municipal	Southern Platte Fire Protection District	Increase levy to 50 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation to fund EMT	Approved with 51%
November 4, 1997	General	Smithville Fire Protection District	Impose 1/2-cent sales tax for fire protection services	Rejected with 32% in favor
November 4, 1997	General	City of Kansas City	Extend 1/2-cent sales tax for Union Station & Liberty Memorial restoration	Rejected with 26% in favor
November 4, 1997	General	City of Kansas City	Wastewater revenue bond of \$125 million to improve sewer system	Approved with 55%
November 4, 1997	General	City of Kansas City	Increase the sales tax by 1/2-cent to fund capital improvements	Rejected with 20% in favor
April 1, 1997	General Municipal	City of Kansa City	G.O. bonds of \$110 million to purchase street lighting system	Rejected with 54% in favor
April 1, 1997	General Municipal	City of Camden Point	G.O. bonds of \$265,000 for city streets	Rejected with 32% in favor
April 1, 1997	General Municipal	Smithville R-II School District	G.O. bonds of \$2.75 million for school construction, improvements	Approved with 61%
April 1, 1997	General Municipal	City of Platte City	Local use tax of 2%	Rejected with 28% in favor
April 1, 1997	General Municipal	City of Lake Waukomis	Increase tax levy by 50 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation for general municipal purposes, including fire suppression services	Approved with 75%
April 1, 1997	General Municipal	Farley Benefit Assessment Special Road District	Increase tax levy by 35 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation.	Approved with 56%

November 5, 1996	General	Platte County	Bi-state sales tax: 1/8-cent sales tax to restore Union Station	Approved with 61%
November 5, 1996	General	State of Missouri	Constitutional amendment to extend the 1/10-cent sales tax for 10 years to fund soil and water conservation and state parks. <i>Environmental</i>	Approved with 74%
August 6, 1996	Primary	Platte City	Impose a local use tax	Rejected with 44% in favor
August 6, 1996	Primary	Southern Platte County Fire Protection District	Increase the levy to 47 cents (on \$100 valuation) to fund on- sight firefighters and EMT	Approved with 70%
August 6, 1996	Primary	Smithville R-II School District	Eliminate the reduction in the operating levy for school purposes	Approved with 82%
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Weston	Impose a local use tax	Approved with 51%
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Camden Point	Platte County Regional Sewer District to impose a sewer service charge sufficient to pay revenue bonds in the amount of \$1.1 million	Rejected with 33% in favor
August 6, 1996	Primary	Platte County	Impose a local use tax	Approved with 58%
August 6, 1996	Primary	City of Riverside	Impose a local use tax	Approved with 51%
June 4, 1996	Special	Weatherby Lake Fire Protection District	Increase the tax levy by 30 cents (on \$100 valuation) to provide supports for the district	Approved with 97%
June 4, 1996	Special	Public Water Supply District No. 4	Issue revenue bonds of \$800,000 to extend and improve the water system.	Approved with 76%
June 4, 1996	Special	North Platte R-1 School District	Eliminate a rollback in its operating levy	Approved with 82%
June 4, 1996	Special	North Platte R-1 School District	Increase operating levy for capital improvements by 35 cents (on \$100 valuation)	Approved with 76%
April 2, 1996	General Municipal	Platte County Sewer District	Create a sewer subdistrict and incur indebtedness to fund sewer projects	Approved with 70%
April 2, 1996	General Municipal	City of Parkville	Extend a 1/2-cent sales tax to fund transportation purposes	Approved with 68%
April 2, 1996	General Municipal	Reorganized School District R- 3	G.O. bonds of \$5.7 million to fund school construction and land acquisition for schools	Approved with 69%
April 2, 1996	General Municipal	Park Hill School District	Question 1: Increase the operating tax levy by 49 cents (on \$100 valuation) to fund school construction, improvements, and maintenance	Approved with 67%
April 2, 1996	General Municipal	Park Hill School District	Question 2: G.O. bonds of \$34 million to fund school construction	Approved with 74%
April 2, 1996	General Municipal	City of Platte Woods	Increase the tax levy by 30 cents (on \$100 valuation) to fund fire protection and trash collection costs.	Approved with 80%
March 5, 1996	Special	County	Question 1: 1/2-cent sales tax increase for law	Approved with 78%
March 5, 1996	Special	Platte City	Question 2: 1/2-cent sales tax increase for city park acquisition, development, maintenance, improvements.	Approved with 67%

Election Date	Election	Registered Voters	Ballots Cast	Turnout Percentage
April 1, 2001	General Municipal			9%
November 7, 2000	General	56,898	34,228	60%
August 8, 2000	Primary			10%
April 4, 2000	General Municipal			9%
August 3, 1999	Special	32,930	5,616	18%
April 6, 1999	Municipal General	52,106	16,884	32%
November 3, 1998	General	47,814	22,731	48%
August 4, 1998	Primary	47,568	5,051	11%
April 8, 1998	General Municipal	46,892	4,922	11%
November 4, 1997	Special	21,629	2,678	12%
April 1, 1997	General Municipal	44,411	4,655	10%
November 5, 1996	General	43,830	29,563	67%
August 6, 1996	Primary	40,512	10,591	26%
April 2, 1996	General Municipal	28,928	10,996	28%
March 5, 1996	Special	38,641	5,818	15%

Platte County Voter Turnout (countywide elections)

Jackson County Election Results

Election Date	Election Type	Jurisdiction	Measure	Result
April 3, 2001	Municipal General	Lone Jack	Allows city to charge sewer impact fees for new construction	Approved with 72% in favor
April 3, 2001	Municipal General	Oak Grove	Repeal existing 1% sales tax and enact 1/2% sales tax	Rejected with 18% support (NOTE: YES VOTE Increases tax impact.)
April 3, 2001	Municipal General	Independence School District	Increase operating levy by 51 cents on each \$100 of assessed valuation to improve salaries for teachers	Approved with 58% in support
April 3, 2001	Municipal General	Consolidated School District #4 (Grandview)	G.O. bond of \$16 million for school improvements	Approved with 66% in favor
April 3, 2001	Municipal General	Consolidated School District #4 (Grandview)	Increase operating levy by 50 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation to improve teacher pay and technology	53% in support
April 3, 2001	Municipal General	Fort Osage Fire Protection District	Levy an additional tax of up to 15 cents on each \$100 of assessed valuation for emergency vehicles and equipment	Rejected with 38% in favor
February 6, 2001	Special	Reorganized School District No. 4	G.O. bond in the amount of \$29.5 million for school construction	Approved with 85%
February 6, 2001	Special	Grain Valley R-V School District	G.O. bond in the amount of \$3.5 million for school construction	Approved with 82%
November 7, 2000	General	Jackson Co.	State of Missouri Prop A (<i>Environmental</i>): Limits billboards & tree removal. Prohibits most new and some existing outdoors ads along the National Highway System and prohibits advertisers from removing trees and vegetation along public right of ways.	Approved with 51% (rejected statewide with 49% in favor)
November 7, 2000	General	City of Independence	Excise tax or license surcharge on new development in Little Blue Valley, paid by developers and contractors to fund street construction	58% in support
November 7, 2000	General	City of Lee's Summit	G.O. bond of \$8 million to build new streets and central garage	Approved with 65%
November 7, 2000	General	City of Oak Grove	\$8,775,000 in revenue bonds to finance improvements to the waterworks and sanitary sewerage system	Rejected with 33% in favor
November 7, 2000	General	Raytown School District (Consolidated s.d. #2)	G.O. bond of \$47 million to air condition and improve schools	Approved with 71%
November 7, 2000	General	Raytown School District (Consolidated s.d. #2)	Increase operating levy by 23 cents on \$100 assessed value to pay for electricity and labor on air conditioning and technology	Approved with 60%

November 7, 2000	General	Fort Osage School District (reorganized s.d. #1)	\$13.5 million g.o. bond to fund school improvements. NOTE: no tax increase needed; similar measure with a tax increased failed in April 2000.	Approved with 70% (4/7th vote required)
November 7, 2000	General	Fort Osage Fire Protection District	Levy of 18-cents per \$100 assessed valuation to provide for 6 additional personnel	Approved with 53%
November 7, 2000	General	Fort Osage Fire Protection District	Levy of 15-cents per \$100 assessed valuation for the district's pension program	Rejected with 35% in support
November 7, 2000	General	Inter-City Fire Protection District	Levy of 20-cents per \$100 assessed valuation to support the district	73% in support
August 8, 2000	Special	City of Buckner	Levy a 1.5% use tax	51% in support
August 8, 2000	Special	City of Grain Valley	\$500,000 bond to improve city park system, trail, and soccer field <i>Environmental</i>	Approved with 66% NOTE: no tax increase needed
August 8, 2000	Special	City of Grain Valley	\$1 million bond to improve the water and sewer system	Approved with 73%. NOTE: no tax increase needed
August 8, 2000	Special	City of Grain Valley	\$2 million bond to expand waste treatment plant.	74% in support. Note: The cost to citizens would vary according to wastewater used
August 8, 2000	Special	City of Grain Valley	\$2 million bond to pay improve streets, sidewalks, and stormwater facilities. <i>Environmental</i>	Approved with 73%
August 8, 2000	Special	City of Grain Valley	Billboard tax on 2% of revenues generated from outdoor advertising structures to pay for city beautification <i>Environmental</i>	64% in support
August 8, 2000	Special	City of Grandview	Continue a 1/2-cent sales tax for transportation.	68% in support
August 8, 2000	Special	City of Greenwood	G.O. bonds of \$1.4 million fund capital improvements and a .5% sales tax to repay bonds	Rejected with 53% in support
August 8, 2000	Special	City of Independence	1/4-cent sales tax to pay for flood-control project and storm- sewer improvements.	Approved with 62%
August 8, 2000	Special	City of Raytown	1/2-cent sales tax increase to fund major road and storm sewer construction <i>Environmental</i>	Rejected with 43% in favor
August 8, 2000	Special	City of Raytown	1/2-cent sales transportation sales tax to fund street maintenance and curb repair	Rejected with 42% in favor
August 8, 2000	Special	City of Raytown	1/2-cent sales tax to fund park improvements and senior center <i>Environmental</i>	Rejected with 35% in favor
August 8, 2000	Primary	City of Kansas City	Fiscal/Environmental: Curbside recycling fee	TBD
April 4, 2000	Municipal General	Jackson Co.	1/4-cent sales tax to build new courthouse, hire more sheriff's deputies, and improve the county's 911 emergency	Rejected with 40% in favor
April 4, 2000	Municipal General	City of Buckner	Impose 1.5% use tax	Rejected with 46% in support
April 4, 2000	Municipal General	City of Lone Jack	Increase occupation license fee to \$35	Approved with 67% in favor
April 4, 2000	Municipal General	City of Lone Jack	Charge sanitary capacity and sewer fees	Rejected with 47% in favor

April 4, 2000	Municipal General	City of Lone Jack	1/4-cent sales tax for storm water improvements	Approved with 53% in favor
April 4, 2000	Municipal General	City of Lone Jack	Increase building and plumbing permit fees	Approved with 57% in favor
April 4, 2000	Municipal General	City of Lone Jack	Impose 1/4% sales tax for storm water capital improvements <i>Environmental</i>	Approved with 51% in favor
April 4, 2000	Municipal General	Village of River Bend	Property tax of 50 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation for general municipal purposes	Approved with86% in support
April 4, 2000	Municipal General	Fort Osage School District (reorganized s.d. #1)	G.O. bond of \$13.5 million to pay for school renovations; 8- cent increase in tax rate	Rejected with 55% in favor (57% required)
April 4, 2000	Municipal General	Grain Valley School District (reorganized s.d. #5)	G.O. bond of \$3.2 million for school construction.	68% in support. NOTE: Since 1977, Grain Valley residents have approved 10 consecutive bond issues.
April 4, 2000	Municipal General	Lake Lotawana Fire Protection District	Levy of 25-cents on each \$100 of assessed property value to provide ambulance service.	Rejected with 8% in favor
November 1, 1999	Special	City of Grain Valley	Impose a tourism tax on hotel/motel rooms of between 2% and 5%.	Approved with 73%
August 1, 1999	Special	City of Greenwood	Continue to levy 69 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation for emergency services	Approved with 93%
April 6, 1999	Municipal General	Jackson Co.	State of Missouri Prop A: 50-cents-per-month fee on cellular phone bills to finance a statewide 911 system for cellular phones.	Rejected with 48% in favor (rejected statewide with 48% in favor.)
April 6, 1999	Municipal General	City of Oak Grove	Repeal existing 1% sales tax and enact 1/2% sales tax	68% in support – YES vote means vote against spending
April 6, 1999	Municipal General	Grain Valley School District	Allow school district to be annexed into Metropolitan Community Colleges which would subject residents to 23- cent levy per \$1000 valuation	Rejected with 40% in support
April 6, 1999	Municipal General	City of Raytown	Retain 1% city sales tax for 5 years.	66% in support (majority required)
February 2, 1999	Special	Grain Valley R-5 School District	G.O. bonds of \$2.8 million for school construction	Approved with 88%
November 3, 1998	General	State of Missouri	State of Missouri Constitutional Amendment No. 7 (<i>Fiscal/Environmental</i>): G.O. bonds of \$17.3 million in bonds to grants/loans to local governments for construction or improvements to public sewage treatment, drinking water system, and stormwater control projects.	Approved with 71% (approved Statewide with 65%)
November 1, 1998	General	City of Independence School District	G.O. bond of \$34.7 million for school construction	76% in support
November 1, 1998	General	Lone Jake Community Fire Protection District	Tax levy up to 25 cents per \$100 assessed valuation to support the district	Approved with 54% in support

November 1, 1998	General	Lake Lotowana Fire Protection District	Levy a tax of 20 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation for the district	58% in support
August 1, 1998	Primary	City of Independence	1/2-cent sales tax for streets and park improvements. First municipal tax approved by voters since 1973. Measure was a scaled-down version from rejected plan a year earlier.	Approved with 70%
August 1, 1998	Primary	City of Grain Valley	G.O. bond of \$4 million to pay for infrastructure improvements and a new city hall	Rejected with 56% in support
August 1, 1998	Primary	City of Grandview	1/2-cent sales tax for capital improvements	Approved with 62%
April 7, 1998	Primary	Consolidated School District #6	Levy a tax of 22 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Rejected with 49.5% in favor
April 7, 1998	Primary	Central Jackson County Fire Protection District Question	G.O. bonds of \$2.5 million for training, equipment, and new stations.	Approved with 84%
April 7, 1998	Primary	City of Greenwood	Sales tax of 1/2-% for local parks Environmental	Approved with 59% in favor
April 7, 1998	Primary	City of Lee's Summit	5% hotel/motel tax to improve tourism and economic development	Approved with 83%
February 3, 1998	Special	City of Blue Springs	5% hotel/motel tax to raise an estimated \$425,000 annually	Approved with 80%
February 3, 1998	Special	Blue Springs School District	G.O. bond for \$25 million to fund school construction	Approved (2/3 voter approval required) district has a record of passing 20 consecutive bond issues
February 3, 1998	Special	Reorganized School District #4	G.O. bonds of \$25 million for school construction	Approved with 82%
November 7, 1997	Special	City of Lee's Summit	Excise tax, charging developers a fee based on how much traffic their projects generate	Approved with 73%
November 4, 1997	Special	City of Lee's Summit	1/2-cen sales tax to fund road improvements	Approved with 58%
November 4, 1997	Special	City of Lee's Summit	3/8-cent sales tax to purchase land for a 700-acre community park, expand the city's greenway system and restore neighborhood parks. <i>Environmental</i>	Approved with 51%
April 1, 1997	Special	City of Independence	1/4-cent sales tax for park improvements Environmental	Rejected with 48% in favor
April 1, 1997	Special	City of Independence	1/2-cent sales tax to fund road improvements	Rejected with 46% in favor
April 1, 1997	Special	City of Lone Jack	G.O. bonds of \$585,000 for new sewer system	Approved with 66% in favor
April 1, 1997	Special	City of Oak Grove	Increase tax levy by 25 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation to establish public safety department	Rejected with 25% in favor
April 1, 1997	Special	Consolidated School District #4	Bonds of \$15 million for new schools	Approved with 68%
April 1, 1997	Special	Fort Osage R-1 School District	G.O. bonds of \$9.875 million for new schools	Approved with 58% in favor
April 1, 1997	Special	Prairie Township Fire Protection District	Tax levy of 20 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Approved with 63%
April 1, 1997	Special	Jackson County	Impose monthly sewer fee	Rejected with 38% in favor

Cass County Election Results

Election Date	Election Type	Jurisdiction	Measure	Result
November 6, 2001	General	Northeast Cass Fire Protection District	Property tax of 30 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Rejected with 38% in favor
November 6, 2001	General	West Peculiar Fire Protection District	G.O. bonds of \$1 million	Approved with 63%
November 6, 2001	General	Strasburg School District	G.O. bonds of \$493,000	Approved with 71%
August 7, 2001	Primary	Northeast Cass Fire Protection District	Property tax of 15 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Rejected with 30% in favor
August 7, 2001	Primary	Central Cass Fire Protection District	Property tax of 49 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Rejected with 23%
August 7, 2001	Primary	Harrisonville	1/2% sales tax for transportation	Rejected with 38% in favor
April 3, 2001		Kingsville School District	Property tax of 52 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Approved with 64%
April 3, 2001	Municipal General	Kingsville School District	G.O. bonds of \$1.6 million	Approved with 64%
April 3, 2001	Municipal General	Belton School District	G.O. bonds of \$14 million	Approved with 60%
April 3, 2001	Municipal General	Archie	Sales tax of 1/4% for street maintenance	Approved with 70%
April 3, 2001	Municipal General	Belton	G.O. bonds of \$1.8 million for municipal offices	Rejected with 54%
April 3, 2001	Municipal General	Belton	Revenue bonds of \$6.6 million and sales tax to fund capital improvements	Approved with 58%
April 3, 2001	Municipal General	Belton	Sales tax of 1/2% for storm water control and local parks	Rejected with 39% in favor
April 3, 2001	Municipal General	Belton	Sales tax of 1/2% for capital improvements	Rejected with 31% in favor
April 3, 2001	Municipal General	Harrisonville	1/2% sales tax for parks	Approved with 64%
November 7, 2000	General	Lee's Summit	G.O. bonds of \$5.8 million for road improvements	Approved with 62%
November 7, 2000	General	Cass Co.	1/4% law enforcement sales tax	Approved with 52%
November 7, 2000	General	Midway School District	G.O. bonds of \$1.3 million	Approved with 57%
November 7, 2000	General	Sherwood School District	G.O. bonds o f \$3.3 million	Approved with 60%
August 8, 2000	Primary	Cass Co. Library District	Property tax of 10 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Rejected with 44% in favor
August 8, 2000	Primary	Raymore	G.O. bonds of \$3.9 million for municipal complex	Approved with 69%
August 8, 2000	Primary	Raymore	G.O. bonds of \$1 million for roads and storm water	Approved with 74%
August 8, 2000	Primary	Kansas City	1/2% sales tax for parks (Liberty Memorial)	Approved with 57%
August 8, 2000	Primary	Kansas City	1/2% capital improvement sales tax for light rail	Approved with 52%
August 8, 2000	Primary	Harrisonville	Revenue bonds of \$9 million for waterworks system	Approved with 61%
August 8, 2000	Primary	Lake Annette	Property tax of 50 cents per \$100 of assessed valuation for parks/rec	Rejected with 33% in favor

August 8, 2000	Primary	Lake Annette	General revenue property tax of \$1 per \$100 of assessed valuation	Approved with 50%
August 8, 2000	Primary	Lake Annette	\$20 per lot road tax	Rejected with 46% in favor
April 2, 2000	General	West Peculiar Fire Protection District	G.O. bonds of \$1.5 million	Rejected with 47% in favor
April 2, 2000	Municipal General	Peculiar	G.O. bonds of \$1.5 million for sewerage system	Approved with 73%
April 2, 2000	Municipal General	West Peculiar Fire Protection District	G.O. bonds of \$1.5 million	Rejected with 56% in favor
April 2, 2000	Municipal General	Sherwood School District	G.O. bonds of \$3 million	Approved with 59%
April 2, 2000	Municipal General	Harrisonville School District	G.O. bonds of \$5.7 million	Approved with 61%
April 2, 2000	Municipal General	Midway School District	G.O. bonds of \$2.4 million	Rejected with 46% in favor
November 2, 1999	General	Kansas City	1/2-cent sales tax for roads, bridges	Rejected with 46% in favor
August 3, 1999	Primary	Midway School District	G.O. bonds of \$1.8 million	Rejected with 38% in favor
April 6, 1999	Municipal General	Midway School District	G.O. bonds of \$1.8 million	Rejected with 53%
April 6, 1999	Municipal General	School District 7	G.O. bonds of \$31million	Approved with 62%
April 6, 1999	Municipal General	Harrisonville	Revenue bonds of \$3.3 million for electric utility system	Approved with 64%
April 6, 1999	Municipal General	Harrisonville	1/2% sales tax for capital improvements	Approved with 60%
April 6, 1999	Municipal General	Lake Annette	Increase general revenue property tax	Rejected with 31% in favor
April 6, 1999	Municipal General	Lake Annette	Property tax of 50 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation for parks/rec	Rejected with 30% in favor
April 6, 1999	Municipal General	Lake Annette	Extend road tax	Rejected with 43% in favor
April 6, 1999	Municipal General	Lone Jack School District	G.O. bonds of \$2 million	Approved with 70%
February 2, 1999	Special	Peculiar	Use tax	Approved with 52%
February 2, 1999	Special	Public Water Supply District	Revenues bonds of \$1.5 million	Approved with 94%
February 3, 1998	Special	Strasburg School District	G.O. bonds of \$114,000	Approved with 96%
November 3, 1998	General	Cass Co.	Statewide: Missouri Constitutional Amendment 7 – Bonds for clean water, stormwater, sewer	Approved with 66%
November 3, 1999	General	Cass Co.	Statewide: Missouri Constitutional Amendment 8 – 1/2% sales tax for natural resources, parks	Rejected with 47%
August 4, 1998	Primary	Central Cass Fire Protection District	Property tax of 35 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Rejected with 42% in favor
August 4, 1998	Primary	Cass Co.	Use tax	Rejected with 35% in favor
April 7, 1998	Municipal General	Belton School District	G.O. bonds of \$7.9 million	Approved with 72%
April 7, 1998	Municipal General	Harrisonville	G.O. bonds of \$4.2 million for municipal facilities	Rejected with 43\$ in favor
April 7, 1998	Municipal General	Harrisonville	G.O. bonds of \$1.2 million for community center	Rejected with 40% in favor

MetroGreen Finance Strategy

Kansas City MetroGreen Plan

April 7, 1998	Municipal General	Central Cass Fire Protection District	Property tax of 50 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Rejected with 40% in favor
April 7, 1998	Municipal General	Western Cass Fire Protection District	Property tax of 5 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Approved with 48%
August 5, 1997	Primary	Peculiar	Revenue bonds of \$1.5 million for sewerage system	Approved with 80%
August 5, 1997	Primary	West Peculiar Fire Protection District	Property tax of 30 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Approved with 64%
April 1, 1997	Municipal General	R-1 School District	G.O. bonds of \$625,000	Approved with 66%
April 1, 1997	Municipal General	Raymore	1/2% sales tax for storm water and parks	Approved with 54%
April 1, 1997	Municipal General	Peculiar	Use tax	Rejected with 36% in favor
November 5, 1996	General	Lee's Summit	Revenue bonds of \$32 million for sewerage system	Approved with 62%
November 5, 1996	General	Strasburg School District	G.O. bonds of \$620,000	Approved with 63%
November 5, 1996	General	Raymore	G.O. bonds of \$3.2 million for sewerage system	Approved with 75%
April 2, 1996	Municipal General	Harrisonville	G.O. bonds of \$1.1 million for emergency services center	Rejected with 57% in favor
April 2, 1996	Municipal General	Harrisonville	G.O. bonds of \$3 million for parks/swimming pools	Approved with 73%
April 2, 1996	Municipal General	Harrisonville	1/2% sales tax for parks	Approved with 75%
April 2, 1996	Municipal General	West Peculiar Fire Protection District	Property tax of 5 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Approved with 66%
April 2, 1996	Municipal General	Lake Annette	Property tax for parks/rec	Approved with 57%
April 2, 1996	Municipal General	Lake Winnebago	1% sales tax	Rejected with 25% in favor
April 2, 1996	Municipal General	Cleveland	Revenue bonds of \$110,000 for sewerage system	Approved with 70%
April 2, 1996	Municipal General	Lone Jack School District	G.O. bonds of \$1.4 million	Approved with 93%
April 2, 1996	Municipal General	Sherwood School District	G.O. bonds of \$1.89 million	Approved with 64%
April 2, 1996	Municipal General	Western Cass Fire Protection District	Property tax of 5 cents on \$100 of assessed valuation	Approved with 57%
August 6, 1996	Primary	Belton	Use tax	Rejected with 41% in favor
August 6, 1996	Primary	Cass Co.	1/2% capital improvement sales tax	Approved with 55%
August 6, 1996	Primary	Peculiar	Use tax	Rejected with 47% in favor
August 6, 1996	Primary	Central Cass Fire Protection District	G.O. bonds of \$575,000	Approved with 62%

Election Date	Election	Registered Voters	Ballots Cast	Turnout Percentage	
April 3, 2001	General Election: municipal	316,138	42,068	13%	
February 27, 2001	Primary Election: municipal	172,527*	8,743	5%	
November 1, 2000	General Election: national, state, county, township, city	312,788	220,252	70%	
August 1, 2000	Primary Election: national, state, county, township, city.	298,527	69,308	23%	
April 7, 2000	General Election: municipal	77,046	6,944	9%	
January 25, 2000	Mail Ballot: School District			58.50%	
February 29, 2000	Primary Election: city, water district	7,795	744	10%	
January 25, 2000	Mail Ballot: School District			55%	
December 7, 1999	Mail Ballot Election: City of Olathe			51%	
June 8, 1999	Mail Ballot Election: school district			56%	
April 6, 1999	General Election: city, school, water, drainage	280,644	36,722	13%	
March 2, 1999	City/School Primary Election	222,587	13,589	6%	
November 3, 1998	General	274,259	135,958	50%	
August 4, 1998	Johnson Co. Primary Election: national, state, county, township, city	268,820	66,620	25%	
April 7, 1998	Municipal General Election	114,529	11,934	10%	
March 3, 1998	Primary Election: municipal (only 1 contest is the city of Leawood on the ballot)	3,835	373	11%	
January 27, 1998	Mail Ballot: School District			54%	
October 14, 1997	Mail Ballot: School District			48%	
September 9, 1997	Mail Ballot: School District			63%	
August 5, 1997	Mail Ballot: Municipal			58%	
April 1, 1997	General Election: city, school, water	252,342	53,010	21%	
February 25, 1997	Primary Election: city and school district	250,943	14,229	6%	
November 1, 1996	General.	246,497	192,202	78%	
August 1, 1996	Primary	228,956	72,571	32%	

*Includes Miami County eligible voters.

MetroGreen Finance Strategy

Johnson County Election Results

Election Date	Election Type	Jurisdiction	Measure	Result
April 3, 2001	General Election: Municipal, school	Spring Hills Unified School District #230 (Johnson and Miami Counties)*	G.O. bonds of \$12.5 million to construct, improve schools	Rejected with 49% in favor
April 3, 2001	General Election: Municipal, school	Spring Hills Unified School District #230 (Johnson and Miami Counties)*	G.o. bonds of \$2.2 million to construct new school practice gym and tennis courts	Rejected with 35% in favor
April 3, 2001	General Election: Municipal, school	Spring Hills Unified School District #230 (Johnson and Miami Counties)*	G.O. bonds of \$2.5 million to purchase future school site	Rejected with 42% in favor
November 7, 2000	General Election: National, state, county, municipal	City of Merriam	Sales tax increase of 1/8% to improve the "Historic Merriam District" and pay revenue bonds	Approved with 58%
November 7, 2000	General Election: National, state, county, municipal	City of Merriam	Sales tax increase of 1/8% to pay for neighborhood street improvements.	Approved with 67%
November 7, 2000	General Election: National, state, county, municipal	City of Merriam	G.O. bonds of \$5 million to pay for Public Safety/City Hall facility	Rejected with 48% in favor
November 7, 2000	General Election: National, state, county, municipal	City of Shawnee	Sales tax increase of 1/8% to pay for park and rec land acquisition and storm drainage improvements <i>Environmental</i>	Approved with 57%
November 7, 2000	General Election: National, state, county, municipal	Olathe Unified School District #233	G.O. bonds of \$60 million to construction/improve schools	Approved with 73%
August 1, 2000	Primary Election: national, state, county, municipal	City of Lenexa	Sales tax increase of 1/8% to pay for stormwater improvements and related recreational projects <i>Environmental</i>	Approved with 75%
April 4, 2000	General Election: municipal	City of Leawood	Sales tax increase of 1/8% to pay for street improvements	Approved with 64%
January 25, 2000	Mail Ballot: School District	Spring Hill Unified S.D. (Johnson/Miami Co., KS)	G.O. bonds of \$26.7 million for new schools, equipment, etc.	Rejected with 40.5% in favor
January 25, 2000	Mail Ballot: School District	Gardener-Edgerton-Antioch Unified (Johnson Co.)	G.O. bonds of \$41.5 million for school construction, repair, etc.	Approved with 57%
December 7, 1999	Mail Ballot Election: municipality	City of Olathe	Increase the sales tax by 1/8% fund the acquisition and improvement of public parks and recreation areas <i>Environmental</i>	Approved with 68%
June 8, 1999	Mail Ballot: School District	DeSoto School District #232	G.O. bonds of \$42.5 million for new schools	Approved with 56%

November 3, 1998	General Election: national, state, county, municipal	Johnson Co.	G.O. bonds of \$6 million to acquire 1,400 acres of land for a regional park <i>Environmental</i>	Approved with 69%
November 3, 1998	General Election: national, state, county, municipal	City of Overland Park	Increase the sales tax by 1/8% to fund residential street improvement program	Approved with 60%
November 3, 1998	General Election: national, state, county, municipal	City of Leawood	G.O. bonds of \$12.5 million for park improvements Environmental	Approved with 75%
April 7, 1998	General Election: Municipal	City of Olathe	G.O. bonds of \$5 million to acquire, construct indoor aquatic center	Rejected with 40%
January 27, 1998	Mail Ballot Election: School District	Johnson/Miami County Unified School District No. 229*	G.O. bonds of \$167 million to for school construction and improvements	Approved with 57%
October 14, 1997	Mail Ballot Election: School District	Olathe school district #233	G.O. bonds of \$124 million to construct, improve schools and acquire new computers	Approved with 71%
September 9, 1997	Mail Ballot Election: School District	Gardner-Edgerton-Antioch USD #231	G.O. bonds of \$34 million to construction, repair schools and athletic complex and acquire new computers	Approved with 54%
August 5, 1997	Mail Ballot Election: Municipality	City of Olathe	G.O. bond of \$1.96 million to construct new library	
April 1, 1997	General Election: Municipal, School District, Water District	United School District #232 (Desoto)	G.O. bonds of \$37.6 million to construct, improve schools	Rejected with 51% in favor
April 1, 1997	General Election: Municipal, School District, Water District	United School District #232 (Desoto)	G.O. bonds of \$250,000 to purchase site of future elementary school	Rejected with 50% in favor
April 1, 1997	General Election: Municipal, School District, Water District	City of Mission	G.O. bonds of \$3.4 million to construct community center	Approved with 80%
November 5, 1996	General Election: national, state, county, municipal, school	United School District #232	G.O. bonds of \$57.5 million to construct new schools, purchase school sites, and acquire new computers	Rejected with 47% in favor
November 5, 1996	General Election: national, state, county, municipal, school	Johnson County	(bi-state question) resolution authorizing participation in the Kansas and Missouri Metropolitan Culture District and approving 1/8% sales tax increase to restore union station	Approved with 61%

E-95

Wyandotte County Election Results

Election Date	Election Type	Jurisdiction	Measure	Result
April 3, 2001	General: municipal	Kansas City School District	G.O. bond for school improvements	Approved with 95%
November 7, 2000	General	Turner School District	G.O. bond for swimming pool	Approved with 60%
April 4, 2000	General: municipal	Bonner Springs School	G.O. bond for school renovation	Approved with 68%
		District		
November 3, 1998	General	Turner School District	G.O. bond for school renovation	Approved with 78%
November 5, 1996	General	Wyandotte County	Union Station	Rejected with 45% in favor

Leavenworth County Voter Turnout

Election Date	Election	Registered Voters	Ballots Cast	Turnout Percentage
November 1, 2000	General	35,921	23,820	66%
November 3, 1998	General	33,354	14,444	13%
November 5, 1996	General	31,019	22,708	73%

Leavenworth County Election Results

Election Date	Election Type	Jurisdiction	Measure	Result
November 3, 1998	General	United School District No. 497	G.O. bonds of \$16.6 million to fund school construction,	Approved with 54%
			improvements	
November 5, 1996	General	Leavenworth County	G.O. bonds of \$21.7 million to fund county jail	Approved with 55%
November 5, 1996	General	Leavenworth County	Impose a 1-cent sales tax to pay G.O. bonds to fund county	Approved with 54%
			jail	

- 1 Jeffrey Spivak & Matt Campbell; "Big Gains in the Suburbs Pace Growth in KC and Missouri' Northland's Surge in Tallies Offset Losses in Urban Core," The Kansas City Star, March 16, 20002.
- 2 Special Report: Comparative Analysis of Tax Effort, City Auditor's Office, City of Kansas City, October 2000
- 3 Eric Palmer, "Growth Forecast Updated; KC Area Economy to rise 2.2 percent in 2001, Board Says," Kansas City Star, April 18, 2001.
- 4 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, Jackson County, Missouri, For the Year Ended December 31, 1999.
- 5 Comprehensive Annual Financial Report, Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, Kansas, December 31, 2000.
- 6 "Keeping Our Commitment; Preserving Land in the Chesapeake Watershed," A report by the Chesapeake Bay Commission and the Trust for Public Land, 2001.
- 7 "Community Open Space: New Techniques for Acquisition and Financing," developed by the Trust for Public Land and published in the MIS Report by the International City/County Management Association; co-editors are TPL's D. Ernest Cook and urban consultant William P. Ryan.
- 8 Mill Creek Streamway Park: A Vision for the Future; Johnson County Park and Recreation District.
- 9 U.S. Department of Transportation; Federal Highway Administration; Recreational Trails Program brochure; www.fhwa.gov/environment
- 10 Keeping Our Commitment: Preserving Land in the Chesapeake Watershed, A report by the Chesapeake Bay Commission and the Trust for Public Land; 2000.
- 11 "Conservation Practices Available for Cost-Share," Kansas State Conservation Commission; www.ink.org.
- 12 State and Federal Water Programs 1999; Compiled by the Kansas Water Office; www.kwo.org
- 13 Northland Trails Vision Plan, prepared by Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation.
- 14 Bill Graham, "Keep an Eye on the Kearney-Holt Recreation District," Kansas City Star, May 6, 1999.
- 15 Northland Trails Vision Plan, Clay/Platte Counties; Legal, Institutional & Funding Report, produced by Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation.
- 16 Brian Cookson, "Bi-state 2 tax already tops both legislatures' agendas," The Business Journal, Week of December 24, 1999.
- 17 Ibid.
- 18 Phone conservation with Dave Ostlund, Missouri Parks and Recreation Association, July 22, 2001.
- 19 Missouri Revised Statutes; 54-235.
- 20 Missouri State Statutes, 64-451.
- 21 Missouri Revised Statutes; 64-320.
- 22 Benita Y. Williams, "Count Considers Vote on Use Tax," Kansas City Star, March 14, 2001.
- 23 Missouri Local Use Tax, Missouri Municipal League, November 1996, www.mocities.com.
- 24 Northland Trails Vision Plan, Clay/Platte Counties; Legal, Institutional & Funding Report, produced by Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation.

Endnotes

- 25 Morgan et al., supra note 12. Terry D. Morgan, *State Impact Fee Legislation*: Guidelines for Analysis, Land Use & Zoning Digest, March 1990.
- 26 Ibid, as reported by Martin L. Leitner and Susan P. Schoettle, "A Survey of State Impact Fee Legislation," The Urban Lawyer, Summer 1993.
- 27 Northland Trails Vision Plan, Legal, Institutional & Funding Report; Platte and Clay Counties; prepared by Bucher, Willis & Ratliff Corporation.
- 28 Missouri Revised Statutes; 67.453.
- 29 Ibid.
- 30 Platte County Presiding Commissioner Betty Knight, The State of the County, as published by the Kansas City Star, March 7, 2001.
- 31 Missouri Secretary of State; Official Manual; 1999-2000; www.sosweb.state.mo
- 32 Phone conservation with Richard Sheets, Senior Staff Associate, Missouri Municipal League, September 13, 2001.
- 33 Phone conservation with Gary Markenson, Executive Director, Missouri Municipal League, July 12, 2001.
- 34 Phone conservation with Dave Ostlund, Missouri Parks and Recreation Association, June 9, 2001.
- 35 Missouri State Constitution, Section 26 (b), (c), (d), (e).
- 36 Yael T. Abouhalkah, "Overtaken by Sales-Tax Fever, Municipalities Across the Metro Area are Seeking Higher Sales Taxes - and Testing the Tolerance of Taxpayers for Ever-Increasing Levies," Opinion, Kansas City Star, July 2, 2000.
- 37 Special Report: Comparative Analysis of Tax Effort, City Auditor's Office, City of Kansas City, Missouri, October 2000.
- 38 Benita Y. Williams, "County Considers Vote on Use Tax," Kansas City Star, May 16, 2001.
- 39 Phone conservation with Richard Sheets, Missouri League of Municipalities; September 27, 2001.
- 40 Glenn Rice, "Voters OK fee plan on sewers," Kansas City Star, October 4, 1998.
- 41 Missouri Revised Statutes; 67.453.
- 42 *Ibid*.
- 43 Fred Mills, Grain Valley City Administrator, as reported by John Martellaro, "Grain Valley Alderman Vote to Put Billboard Tax on Ballot," Kansas City Star, April 12, 2000.
- 44 John A. Dvorak, "Rural Residents Vote in Force to Reject Billboard Initiative," Kansas City Star, November 9, 2000.
- 45 Phone conservation with Rob Richardson, Community Development Department, City of Liberty; October 1, 2001.
- 46 Phone conservation with Kaleb Kentner, Community Development Director, city of Kearney, September 26, 2001.
- 47 Phone conservation with Steve Abbott, parks planner, the city of Kansas City; September 27, 2001.
- 48 Linda Man, "Public's Views on Recreation Sought; Independence Parks Agency Works on a Master Plan," Kansas City Star, April 4, 2001.

- 49 Phone conservation with Tom Garland, parks department, City of Lee's Summit; October 1, 2001.
- 50 Phone conservation with Randy Allen, Executive Director, Kansas Association of Counties, July 2, 2001.
- 51 Budget Tips Bulletin for Counties, 2001 for 2001; published by the League of Kansas Municipalities, Topeka, Kansas.
- 52 Kansas State Statutes: 19-2801.
- 53 Research Report, Kansas Association of Counties, February 2000.
- 54 K.S.A. 12-187, countywide and city retailers' sales taxes.
- 55 K.S.A. 12-187, as outlined by the Kansas Association of Counties, Annual Demographic and Taxation Report, May 2001.
- 56 Phone conservation with Karen Miller, Johnson County Planning Department; October 2, 2001.
- 57 MAP 2020 Plan, Johnson County Parks and Recreation District web site; http://jcprd.com/pages/tda_section/pages/execframe.html
- 58 Finn Bullers, "Park Officials OK Expansion But Funding to Buy Land is Uncertain," Kansas City Star, April 19, 2001.
- 59 Finn Bullers, "Proposed Johnson County Budget has Few Frills," Kansas City Star, June 15, 2001.
- 60 Editorial, "County Should Move Ahead on Park Plan, Kansas City Star, December 11, 2000
- 61 Budget Tips for Counties, 2000 for 2001, published by the League of Kansas Municipalities, Topeka, Kansas.
- 62 *Ibid*.
- 63 Ibid.
- 64 "Local Governments in Kansas An Inventory of Governmental Taxing Units," League of Kansas Municipalities, 1991.
- 65 "Overland Park City Notes," Kansas City Star, April 14, 2001.
- 66 Phone conversation with Don Osenbaugh, Director of Finance and Field Services, League of Kansas Municipalities, July 3, 2001.
- 67 Budget Tips Bulletin for Cities, Kansas League of Municipalities, May 2000.
- 68 Phone conservation with Lynn Cramers, bond counsel, Gilmore & Bell, P.C., Municipal Finance, September 27, 2001.
- 69 Kansas Statutes, 12-187; countywide and city retailers' sales taxes.
- 70 Budget Tips for Counties, 2000 for 2001, published by the League of Kansas Municipalities, Topeka, Kansas.
- 71 Phone conversation with Don Osenbaugh, Director of Finance and Field Services, League of Kansas Municipalities, July 3, 2001.
- 72 Kansas Statutes, 12-187; countywide and city retailers' sales taxes.
- 73 "Turning Rainwater into Recreation; Lenexa's New Approach to Storm Water Management," City of Lenexa web site; www.ci.ks.lenexa.us.
- 74 City of Gardner; Sidewalk/Pedestrian Paths Guidelines.
- 75 Phone conservations with Brian Harker, city planner, and Jeff Steward, parks planner, City of Gardner; September 2001.
- 76 Phone conservation with Dale Crawford, Parks Department, Olathe, Kansas; October 5, 2001.
- 77 Editorial, "Lenexa Sales Tax Should be Approved," Kansas City Star, July 26, 2000.

- 78 Linda Cruse, "Improvements Plan Charts Five-Year Course," Kansas City Star, March 3, 2001.
- 79 "Turning Rainwater into Recreation; Lenexa's New Approach to Storm Water Management," City of Lenexa web site; www.ci.ks.lenexa.us.
- 80 Phone conservation with Tom Jacobs, Watershed Manager, City of Lenexa, July 3, 2001.
- 81 Linda Cruse, "Park board reviews bike/pedestrian survey results," Kansas City Star; July 14, 2001.
- 82 Phone conservation with John Stone, planning department park planner, City of Overland Park, October 2, 2001.
- 83 Phone conversation with Don Osenbaugh, Director of Finance and Field Services, League of Kansas Municipalities, July 3, 2001.
- 84 Kansas Statutes, 12-187; countywide and city retailers' sales taxes.
- 85 Kansas Statutes, 12-187; countywide and city retailers' sales taxes.
- 86 Phone conservation with Lynn Cramers, bond counsel, Gilmore & Bell, P.C., Municipal Finance, September 27, 2001.
- 87 Missouri Revised Statutes 144.757; Local use tax to fund community comeback program rate of tax St. Louis County ballot of submission notice to director of revenue repeal or reduction of local sales tax, effect on local use tax.
- 88 Missouri Revised Statutes; 67.457.

F-1

Operations, Maintenance and Management

Operations, Maintenance and Management

Operating, maintaining and managing MetroGreen will require a commitment by individual jurisdictions to build and maintain specific segments as well as a coordinated effort among Kansas City metro area communities that are partners in the development of this Plan and the future implementation of MetroGreen. Additionally, private sector organizations and individuals will need to be involved in the future operations and management of MetroGreen facilities. The following text defines key aspects of operating and managing MetroGreen facilities, beginning with a discussion of operational policies, facility management, land management, safety and security, trail user rules and regulations, an emergency response plan, and risk management program.

Over the course of time, local communities in the metropolitan Kansas City region will encounter a variety of issues that are important to the successful management and operation of the MetroGreen system. The implementation of MetroGreen will require each of the seven counties and many cities to plan, finance, build, operate and maintain various segments of the regional system. The following operational policies are defined to assist jurisdictions in responding to a variety of MetroGreen implementation issues. More specific problems and issues may arise during the long-term development of MetroGreen that result in additional policies being considered and adopted.

Land Acquisition Policies

Many of the MetroGreen segments are along the region's many rivers and streams. The protection of stream corridors is essential in order to permit these stream channels and their floodplains to perform the natural infrastructure functions that are envisioned by MetroGreen. Stream corridors are best protected by delineating the landscape boundaries of the 100year (regulatory) floodplain; and then by encouraging landowners to engage in land stewardship practices that limit encroachment and preserve the native landscape.

This section of the Plan defines land acquisition procedures that can be used to conserve, protect, and preserve the stream corridors of the Kansas City metropolitan area. This Plan recommends a voluntary land acquisition program for protecting the streams and floodplains. The text in

MetroGreen Operations



Overview

this section offers a menu of tools that landowners, land conservation organizations and local governments can use to establish the physical boundaries of the MetroGreen system. In the event that certain parcels of land within the floodplain are considered vital to the overall MetroGreen system, mechanisms defined herein enable local governments to purchase or negotiate for the dedication of certain property rights. Dedication should be negotiated in a manner that is consistent with local, state and Federal laws that permit and govern such action.

Methods for Protection of Land through Management

The resources of a specific parcel of land may be conserved through either an established set of policies called Management Plans, or through negotiated agreements or easements with private property owners.

Management Plans

Management plans are typically prepared for government-owned lands. In addition, agencies can work together to establish management plans for lands under their control. Management plans should identify valuable resources; determine compatible uses for the parcel; determine administrative needs of the parcel, such as maintenance, security and funding requirements; and recommend short-term and long-term action plans for the treatment and protection of the resources.

Easements

Easements are land management agreements in which a community receives less than full interest in a parcel of land in order to protect a valuable resource. These agreements establish legally binding contracts or a mutual understanding of the specific use, treatment and protection that certain lands will receive. Property owners who grant easements retain all rights to the property except those that have been granted by the easement. The property owner is responsible for all taxes associated with the property, less the value of the easement granted. Easements are generally restricted to certain portions of property, although in certain cases an easement can be applied to an entire parcel of land. Easements are transferable through title transactions, thus the easement remains in effect in perpetuity. Three types of easements are:

Conservation Easements

This type of easement generally establishes permanent limits on the use and development of land to protect the parcel's natural resources. Dedicated conservation easements can qualify for federal income tax deductions. Tax deductions are allowed by the federal government for donations of certain conservation easements. The donations may reduce the donor's taxable income.

Preservation Easements

This type of easement is intended to protect the historical integrity of a structure or important elements of the landscape by sound management practices. Preservation easements may qualify for the same federal income tax deductions as conservation easements.

Public Access Easements

Right of public access easements provide the general public with the right to access and use a specific parcel of property. Both conservation easements and preservation easements may contain clauses for the right of public access and still be eligible for tax benefits.

Methods for Protection of Land through Regulation

The second method of protecting land is through government regulation. Regulation is defined as the government's ability to control the use and development of land through legislative powers. The following types of development ordinances are regulatory tools that can meet the challenges of projected suburban growth and development and at the same time conserve and protect MetroGreen resources.

Dedication/Density Transfers

Also known as incentive zoning, this mechanism allows greenways to be dedicated to the local government in return for allowances of increased density on the development of a property. The potential for improving or subdividing part or all of a parcel of real property, as permitted by a local government's land use development laws, can be expressed in dwelling unit equivalents or other measures of development density or intensity. Known as density transfers, these dwelling unit equivalents may be relocated to other portions of the same parcel or to contiguous land that is part of a common development plan. Dedicated density transfers can also be conveyed to subsequent holders if properly noted in transfer deeds.

Negotiated Dedications

A local government may ask a landowner to enter into negotiations for certain parcels of land that are deemed beneficial to the protection and preservation of specific parcel of land. The local government may ask for the dedication of land for MetroGreen when landowners subdivide property (a minimum size would be determined by the local government). Such dedications should be proportionate to the relationship between the impact of the subdivision on community services and the percentage of land required for dedication - as defined by the US Supreme Court in Dolan v. Tigard.

Fee-in-Lieu

To complement negotiated dedications, a fee-in-lieu program may be necessary and desirable to serve as a funding source for other land acquisition pursuits of MetroGreen. Based on the density of development, this program allows a developer the alternative of paying money for the development/protection of land in lieu of dedicating land for MetroGreen. This money can then be used to implement MetroGreen management programs or acquire additional MetroGreen lands.

Greenway Development Exactions

An exaction is a condition of development approval that requires a developer to provide or contribute to the financing of public facilities at their own expense. In this case, a developer may be required to build a greenway facility as a condition of developing a certain number of units because the development will create need for new greenspace.

Reservation of Land

A reservation of land does not involve any transfer of property rights but simply constitutes an obligation to keep property free from development for a stated period of time. Reservations are normally subject to a specified period of time, such as six or 12 months. At the end of this period, if an agreement has not already been reached to transfer certain property rights, the reservation expires.

Buffer/Transition Zones

This mechanism recognizes the problem of reconciling different, potentially incompatible land uses by preserving MetroGreen lands that function as buffers or transition zones between uses. Care must be taken to ensure that use of this mechanism is reasonable and will not destroy the value of a property.

Overlay Zones

An overlay zone and its regulations can be established in addition to the zoning classification and regulations already in place. Overlay zones are superimposed over existing zones or districts to add specific regulations to a particular landscape type. Because greenways are long linear corridors that can span an entire community or region, an overlay zone is an effective method for achieving uniform control of land development and continuity in environmental protection practices.

Methods for Protection of Greenways through Acquisition

The third method of protecting MetroGreen lands is through the acquisition of property. A variety of methods can be used to acquire property for MetroGreen purposes.

Donation/Tax Incentives

A local government agency agrees to receive full title to a parcel of land at virtually no cost. In most cases, the donor is eligible to receive federal tax deductions on personal income as previously described under conservation easements. In addition, property owners may be able to avoid inheritance taxes, capital gains taxes and recurring property taxes through land donation.

Fee Simple Purchase

This is a common method of acquisition where a local government agency or non-profit land trust purchases property outright. Fee simple ownership conveys full title to the land and the entire "bundle" of property rights including the right to possess land, to exclude others, to use land or sell land.

Easement Purchase

This mechanism is the fee simple purchase of an easement. Full title to the land is not purchased, only those rights granted in the easement agreement. Therefore the easement purchase price is less than full title value.

Purchase/Lease Back

A local government agency or non-profit land trust can purchase a piece of land and then lease it back to the seller for a specified period of time. The lease may contain restrictions regarding the use and development of the property.

Bargain Sale

A property owner can sell property at a price less than the appraised fair market value of the land. Sometimes the seller can derive the same benefits as if the property were donated. Bargain sale is attractive to sellers when the seller wants cash for the property, the seller paid a low cash price and thus is not liable for high capital gains tax, and/or the seller has a fairly high current income and could benefit from a donation of the property as an income tax deduction.

Option/First Right of Refusal

A local government agency or non-profit land trust can establish an agreement with a public agency or private property owner to provide the right of first refusal on a parcel of land that is scheduled to be sold. This form of agreement can be used in conjunction with other techniques, such as an easement, to protect the land in the short term. An option would provide the agency with sufficient time to obtain capital to purchase the property or successfully negotiate some other means of conserving a MetroGreen parcel. Often, an option involves a payment to the property owner to protect the land from sale during the time that the local government or land trust is working to complete the purchase.

Rezoning Petitions

Petitions for rezoning parcels that are adjacent to or include areas identified as potential MetroGreen sites should be recommended by local government planning agencies for inclusion into the MetroGreen system. The planning agency can encourage or negotiate for the dedication of those areas as part of the rezoning process.

Purchase of Development Rights

A voluntary Purchase of Development Rights (PDR) program involves purchasing the development rights from a private property owner at a fair market value. The landowner retains all ownership rights under current use, but exchanges the rights to develop the property for cash payment. Under this agreement the community holds the development rights, but the landowner continues to own and manage the land and its resources. This permanently protects the land from development without the expense of buying the land outright.

Condemnation

The practice of condemning private land for use as an element of MetroGreen should be viewed as a last resort policy by local governments. Using condemnation to acquire property or property rights can be avoided if strong private and public support for MetroGreen is present. Condemnation should be seldom used for the purpose of dealing with an unwilling property owner.

It is recommended that the right of eminent domain for a specific MetroGreen parcel be exercised by a local government only if all of the following conditions exist:

- a) that the property is valued by the local government and is part of the MetroGreen system and is regarded as an environmentally sensitive parcel of land, necessary for the protection of life due to flooding threats, significant natural resource, or critical parcel of land, and as such has been defined by the local government as an irreplaceable property;
- b) that written scientific justification for the local government's claim that the property possesses such value should be prepared and offered to the property owner;
- c) that all efforts to negotiate with the property owner for the management, regulation and acquisition of the property have been exhausted and that the property owner has been given reasonable and fair offers for compensation and has rejected all offers;
- d) that due to the ownership of the property, the time frame for negotiating the acquisition of the property will be unreasonable, and in the interest of pursuing a cost effective method for acquiring the property, the local government has deemed it necessary to exercise the right of eminent domain.

Right of Public Access and Use of Trail Lands

The general public should have access to and use of those MetroGreen lands that support public use (i.e. trail development), and that are owned by local governments or private sector owners that support such use, or on land that a local government has secured the right of public access and use. All access and use should be governed by a Greenway Trail Ordinance (a sample is provided later in this chapter). The use of all trails should be limited to non-motorized uses, including hiking, bicycling, running, jogging, wheelchair use, skateboarding, in-line skating (rollerblading), equestrian use (where applicable), mountain biking, and other uses that are determined to be compatible with MetroGreen trails.

Naming of MetroGreen Corridors

MetroGreen corridors are typically named for the significant natural features that are found within the corridor. The corridors can also be named after an individual or individuals if these persons are distinguished within a local community, or if these persons have contributed a substantial gift toward a MetroGreen facility's development within that corridor segment.

Local government agencies should work with each landowner on an individual basis to determine if fencing and screening is appropriate or required. A local government may agree to fund the installation of a fence or vegetative screen; however, it should be the responsibility of the adjacent property owner to maintain the fence or vegetative screen in perpetuity, including the full replacement of such fence or screen in the event of failure or deterioration due to any circumstances.

An Adopt-a-MetroGreen Corridor Program should be established by MetroGreen, Incorporated and its partner public agency and private sector organizations to encourage community groups, families, businesses, school groups, civic clubs and other organizations to join in managing the MetroGreen system. MetroGreen should offer to implement this program for every MetroGreen corridor in the system, and work closely with local organizations to ensure that these groups have adequate support and guidance to manage and maintain trails in a manner that is consistent with MetroGreen objectives. MetroGreen, Inc. should develop written agreements for each Adopt-a-MetroGreen Corridor entity and keep a current record of the agreement on file. Adopt-a-MetroGreen Corridor entities will be assigned a specific section of the MetroGreen system, defined by parcel, location or milepost. The activities of each organization should be monitored by MetroGreen, its partners or designee. Agreements for management should be adaptable to amendment or termination at any time by either party.

Management Agreements should be established between local governments and other public or private organizations wishing to assist with management of designated segments of the MetroGreen system. The objective of these agreements is to define areas of maintenance and management that are compatible with existing land management activities, especially where greenways intersects with public or private properties and/or rights-of-way. Management agreements spell out specific duties, responsibilities and activities of the local governments and public or private organization that wishes to assist with management activities. The agreements can be amended or terminated at any time by either party.

Local governments can use cross access agreements to permit private landowners that have property on both sides of a MetroGreen corridor access to and use of a MetroGreen corridor to facilitate operation and land use activities.

Cross access agreements are based on United States case law and specific experiences from other trail systems throughout the United States. Adjacent landowners generally have the right to use the access at any time. However, access cannot block the right-of-way for trail users, other than for temporary measures such as permitting livestock to cross, or transporting equipment. Adjacent landowners are responsible for acts Fencing and Vegetative Screening

Adopt-a-MetroGreen Corridor Program

Management Agreements

Cross Access Agreements

or omissions that would cause injury to a third party using the trail. If a landowner must move products, materials, livestock or equipment across the trail on a regular basis, appropriate signage should be installed to warn users of the trail to yield for such activities.

Crossing of abandoned or active rail lines, utility corridors and/or roads and highways will require the execution of agreements with companies, local, state or federal agencies and organizations that own the rights-ofway. These crossings must provide clearly controlled, recognized, and defined intersections in which the user will be warned of the location. In accordance with the American Association of State Highway Transportation Officials (AASHTO) and the Manual on Uniform Traffic Control Devices (MUTCD), the crossing will be signed with appropriate regulatory, warning and information signs.

MetroGreen Facility Management

MetroGreen facilities should be maintained in a manner that promotes safe use. Trail facilities should be managed by local governments that are partners in MetroGreen, private sector partners, or their designees. Trail maintenance should include the removal of debris, trash, litter, obnoxious and unsafe man-made structures, and other foreign matter. Trailheads, points of public access, rest areas and other activity areas should be maintained in a clean and usable condition. The primary concern regarding maintenance should always be public safety.

All trail surfaces should be maintained in a safe and usable manner at all times. Rough edges, severe bumps or depressions, cracked or uneven pavement, gullies, rills and washed out treads should be repaired in a timely manner. Volunteer vegetation occurring in the tread of the trail should be removed in such a manner so that the trail surface is maintained as a continuous, even and clean surface.

Land Management

Property owned or used by local governments or private sector organizations for the MetroGreen system shall be maintained in a condition that promotes safety for trail users, as well as safe, enjoyable use for adjacent property owners. To the extent possible, the property shall also be maintained in a manner that enables the corridor to fulfill multiple functions (i.e. passive recreation, alternative transportation, stormwater management and habitat for wildlife). Property that is owned or managed by other entities should be managed and maintained in accordance with the policies of that public body responsible for the affected parcel.

Vegetation within MetroGreen corridors shall be managed to promote safe use (where applicable), serve as wildlife habitat, buffer public trail use from adjacent private property (where applicable), protect water quality, and preserve the unique aesthetic values of the natural landscape. Removal of native vegetation shall be done with discretion and removal of exotic species should be accomplished in a systematic and thorough manner. At times, and in appropriate locations, local governments may choose to use control burns or approved herbicides and pesticides to manage lands and vegetation in public ownership.

Vegetation adjacent to trails shall be managed as necessary to maintain clear and open lines of sight along the edge of the trail, and eliminate potential hazards that could occur due to natural growth, severe weather or other unacceptable conditions. To promote safe use of any MetroGreen trail, all vegetation should be clear-cut to a minimum distance of three (3) feet from each edge of a trail. Selective clearing of vegetation should be conducted within a zone that is defined as being between three (3) to ten (10) feet from each edge of a trail. At any point along a trail, a user should have a clear, unobstructed view along the centerline of a trail 300 feet ahead and behind his/her position. The only exception to this policy should be where terrain or curves in the natural landscape of a trail serve as the limiting factor.

Local governments or their designated agent should be responsible for the cutting and removal of vegetation. Removal of vegetation by an individual or entity other than the local government or its designee shall be deemed unlawful and subject to fines and/or prosecution.

It may also be necessary for local governments to conduct wildlife management programs on lands that are publicly owned. This shall be accomplished in a manner that is in keeping with accepted laws, professional practices and/or recommended strategies that are provided to local governments by wildlife management experts.

Safety and Security

In order to provide a standard of care that offers reasonable and ordinary safety measures, local governments should work with MetroGreen, Inc. to cooperatively develop and implement a Safety and Security Program for the MetroGreen system. This program should consist of well-defined safety and security policies; identification of trail management, law enforcement, emergency and fire protection agencies; proper posting, notification and education of the trail user policies; and a system that offers timely response to the public for problems that are related to safety and security. The safety and security of the MetroGreen system will need to be coordinated with local law enforcement officials, local neighborhood watch associations, and Adopt-a-MetroGreen Corridor groups.

Important components of the safety and security program include the following. MetroGreen, Inc. and local governments should:

 Work with law enforcement agencies to establish a MetroGreen Safety and Security Committee that can meet periodically to discuss safety strategies and procedures for segments of the MetroGreen system.

- 2) Prepare a MetroGreen Safety Manual and distribute this to management agencies and post it at all major trailheads.
- 3) Post User Rules and Regulations at all public access points to greenway trails.
- 4) Work with management agencies to develop Trail Emergency Procedures.
- 5) Prepare a Safety Checklist for the MetroGreen system, and utilize it during field inspection of MetroGreen facilities.
- 6) Prepare a MetroGreen User Response Form for comments and complaints and provide copies at all trailheads.
- 7) Work with management agencies to develop a system for accident reporting and analysis.
- 8) Conduct a regular Maintenance and Inspection Program, and share the results of these investigations with all management agencies.

User Rules and Regulations

Trails within MetroGreen corridors should be operated like other parks and greenways within local government jurisdictions, open for public use from sunrise to sunset, 365 days a year, except as specifically designated. Individuals who are found to be using unlighted facilities after dusk and before dawn should be deemed in violation of these hours of operation and treated as trespassers. Where MetroGreen trails are lighted for nighttime use, the rules established within the trail ordinance should govern permitted uses and activities.

Local governments shall enforce trespassing laws as defined under the respective state (Kansas/Missouri) general statutes for publicly owned lands and facilities.

Local governments should always discourage the general public from using any segment of a greenway trail that is under construction. Trail segments should not be considered officially opened for public use until such time as a formal dedication ceremony and official opening occurs. Individuals who use greenway segments that are under construction without written permission from a local government should be deemed in violation of the system's access and use policy and treated as a trespasser.

Trail Ordinance

Multi-use conflict is a national problem for community and regional greenway systems. Typically, conflicts are caused by overuse of a trail; however, other factors may be problematic, including poorly designed/ engineered trail alignments, inappropriate user behavior, or inadequate facility capacity. The most effective conflict-resolution plan is a well-conceived safety program that provides the individual user with a code of conduct for the community trail, oftentimes called a trail ordinance. Many communities across the United States have adopted progressive trail

ordinances to govern public use and keep trails safe for all users. The following rules and regulations are recommended for the MetroGreen system. These rules should be displayed both on brochures and information signs throughout the system.

- Be courteous: All MetroGreen trail users, including bicyclists, joggers, walkers, wheelchairs, skateboarders and skaters, should be respectful of other trail users regardless of their mode of travel, speed, or level of skill. Never spook animals; this can be dangerous for you and other users. Respect the privacy of adjacent landowners. No trespassing allowed from trails, remain on trails at all times.
- 2) Keep right: Always stay to the right as you use the trail, or stay in the lane that has been designated for your user group. The exception to this rule occurs when you need to pass another user.
- 3) Pass on the left: Pass others going in your direction on their left. Look ahead and behind to make sure that your lane is clear before you pull out and around the other user. Pass with ample separation. Do not move back to the right until you have safely gained distance and speed. Faster traffic should always yield to slower on-coming traffic.
- 4) Give audible signal when passing: All users should give a clear warning signal before passing. This signal may be produced by voice, bell or soft horn. Voice signals might include "Passing on your left!" or "Cyclist on your left!" Always be courteous when providing the audible signal. Profanity is unwarranted and unappreciated.
- 5) Be predictable: Travel in a consistent and predictable manner. Always look behind before changing position on the trail, regardless of your mode of travel.
- 6) Control your bicycle: Lack of attention, even for a second, can cause disaster always stay alert! Maintain a safe and legal speed at all times.
- 7) Do not block the trail: When in a group, including your pets, use no more than half the trail, so as not to block the flow of other users. If your group is approached by users from both directions, form a single line or stop and move to the far right edge of the Trail to allow safe passage by these users.
- 8) Yield when entering or crossing trails: When entering or crossing the Trail at an uncontrolled intersection, yield to traffic already using the other trail.
- 9) Do not use this trail under the influence of alcohol or drugs: It is illegal to use MetroGreen trails if you have consumed alcohol in excess of the statutory limits, or if you have consumed illegal drugs. Persons who use a prescribed medication should check with their doctor or pharmacist to ensure that it will not impair their ability to safely operate a bicycle or other wheeled vehicle.
- 10) Clean-up your litter: Please keep MetroGreen trails clean and neat for other users to enjoy. Do not leave glass, paper, cans or any other debris on or near the trail. Clean-up after your pets. Pack out what you bring in - and remember to recycle your trash.

- 11) Keep pets on leashes: All pets must be kept on secure and tethered leashes. Keep pets off of adjacent private property.
- 12) Prohibition on campfires: Fires for any purpose are prohibited within the MetroGreen system unless at a park shelter with grill facilities.

Emergency Response Plan

In order to effectively patrol the MetroGreen system and respond to the potential for fire, flash floods and other natural or human-caused disasters, local governments should adopt a MetroGreen emergency response plan. This plan should define a cooperative law enforcement strategy for MetroGreen lands based on services that are typically provided by police, sheriff, fire and EMS agencies. Specifically, all MetroGreen trails should be provided with an address system that denotes specific locations along the length of a trail corridor. A site plan that illustrates points of access to each trail corridor should be produced and provided to each emergency response agency. Trails in flash flood areas shall be appropriately signed to warn users. Each trail should be designed to permit access for law enforcement, fire and EMS agencies and vehicles that are not in excess of 6.5 tons gross vehicle weight. A system of cellular-type emergency phones should be located in remote sections of the system, providing users with access to the area 911 Emergency System. All emergency phones should be placed above the 100-year flood elevation to ensure long-term usage.

The emergency response plan should also define the agencies that will respond to 911 calls, and provide easy to understand routing plans and access points for emergency vehicles. For long distance trails, access points for emergency and maintenance vehicles should be located at reasonable distances from trailheads (approximately every 2-3 miles). Trails along the entire MetroGreen system should be designed and developed to support a minimum gross vehicle weight of 6.5 tons.

Risk Management Plan

The purpose of a Risk Management Plan is to increase safety for the users of the MetroGreen system and reduce the potential for accidents to occur within the system or on lands adjacent to the system. While it is impossible to guarantee that all risk will be eliminated by such a plan, implementation of a plan is in fact a critical step to reduce liability and improve safety. A Risk Management Plan establishes a methodology for greenway management that is based on current tort liability and case law in the United States related to the development, operation and management of public use greenway lands and facilities.

The ultimate responsibility for managing the MetroGreen system, as defined within this plan, rests with local governments. The Risk Management Plan has as its major goals:

1) Risk identification: determining where risk (threat to safety or potential loss) exists within the corridor.

- Risk evaluation: conducting appropriate examination of areas defined as a risk and determining the factors that contribute to risk.
- Risk treatment: defining and implementing an appropriate solution to the area of risk in accordance with one of the four options:
 - a) Risk avoidance: prohibiting use of a risk area.
 - b) Risk reduction: limit use of area and repair risk area immediately.
 - c) Risk retention: obtain waivers from all potential users of the risk area.
 - d) Risk transfer: transfer risk area (property) to an agency better suited to manage the area.

The following 16-step plan should be implemented by the local governments to establish a Risk Management Plan for the MetroGreen system.

- 1) Develop a policy statement about risk management.
- 2) Conduct a needs assessment for the greenway program.
- 3) Determine goals and objectives for risk management what are acceptable and non-acceptable management levels.
- 4) Develop specifications for site and facility development.
- 5) Establish a clear and concise program for risk management.
- 6) Define supervision and responsibility for risk management.
- 7) Define appropriate rules and regulations that govern the use of the trail system.
- 8) Conduct routine/systematic inspections and investigations of the trail system.
- 9) Develop an accident reporting and analysis system.
- 10) Establish procedures for handling emergencies.
- 11) Develop appropriate releases, waivers and agreements for use and management.
- 12) Identify best methods for insuring against risk.
- 13) Develop a comprehensive in-service risk-management training program for employees of local governments.
- 14) Implement a public relations program that can effectively describe the risk management program and activities.
- 15) Conduct periodic reviews of the Risk Management Plan by outside agents to ensure that the plan is up to date.
- 16) Maintain good legal and insurance representation.

Liability

The design, development, management, and operation of MetroGreen system must be carefully and accurately executed in order to provide a resource that protects the health and welfare of the public. Liability may occur when a facility has been under-designed to handle its intended volume of use; when management of the facility is poor; or when unexpected accidents occur because the trail manager failed to recognize a potentially hazardous situation. To reduce the possibility and exposure to liability, the local government partners in MetroGreen should have in operation the following measures prior to opening the first segment of greenway:

- 1) A thorough Maintenance Program that provides the appropriate level of care to greenway users;
- 2) A Risk Management Plan that covers all aspects of the MetroGreen system and, as necessary, adjacent landowners;
- 3) A comprehensive working knowledge of public-use laws and recent case history applicable in Kansas/Missouri.

Trails are no greater liability to local governments than park and recreation, sidewalk or urban open space resources. Existing (self-)insurance program(s) may be adequate to protect a local government from financial loss that might occur through the development and operation of the MetroGreen system. Local governments should review their current policies and check coverages to be certain that all aspects of their policies are up-to-date.

Local governments should exercise reasonable care in the design and construction of all greenway facilities to reduce hazardous, public nuisance and life-threatening situations. Recreational use statutes in Kansas and Missouri serve to reduce the exposure that adjacent landowners might expect to realize from the proximity of trails to private property. In fact, it is very difficult to find any case law in the United States where an adjacent property owner has been sued because a trail user strayed onto the adjacent private property and fell victim to an accident that was caused by the adjacent landowner. Some landowners have claimed that their insurance rates will go up because of the presence of a trail abutting their property. Once again, there is no case history among insurance companies to support this claim. Of course, landowners must not go out of their way to create attractive nuisances that might lure trail users onto their property. Additionally, Greenways built along easements are the responsibility of the managing agency, not the property owner, and the liability associated with the trail is with the former.

It is important that no fees be charged to use any portion of the MetroGreen system. Charging fees typically impacts the way in which the recreational use statutes in Kansas/Missouri apply to the use of the system. A voluntary donation to the MetroGreen system will generally not affect the recreational use statute.

Catalog of ArcView GIS Resource Database

One of the strengths of a greenway is that they can simultaneously provide multiple benefits across a wide range of community components. A frequent benefit is simply the ability to link apparently disparate facilities or activities and, as a result, leverage resources or provide new connections within the community. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) can spatially represent a vast array of community assets, liabilities, features, and resources. Knowing where these entities exist allows a more detailed planning process that can target, avoid, connect, or highlight community features.

At the outset of this project it was determined that the ArcView GIS platform would be used to plan and coordinate the facility development of MetroGreen. First, area communities were asked to supply GIS files that could aid in the identification of preferred greenway routes. In return, the MetroGreen project will provide a GIS file that displays the entire system for the Kansas City area. It is anticipated that each of the local governments will incorporate the MetroGreen System into their various planning efforts and coordinate trail development with neighboring jurisdictions. The result will be a single, connected system of greenways that serves the entire Kansas City metropolitan area.

The list of requested features (shown below) was exhaustive, and it was anticipated that no single community would have GIS files for all of the listed items. Unfortunately, few of the requested files were available. It is suggested that as communities continue to develop a GIS database, they consider documenting the important features listed below and add them to their GIS system.

The GIS files requested are the following:

- Flood/Drainage Information
- General Environmental Information
- Transportation Facilities
- Critical Community Facilities
- Composite Maps Illustrating Publicly and Privately Held Green Space Resources
- Natural Resources Inventories



Requested GIS Files

appendix G

GIS Files Received

While not all of the requested GIS files were available, many files were received from participating municipalities and others. The following list represents the ArcView files used to prepare the MetroGreen System Map:

MARC

- bike plan 2000 existing KS
- bike plan 2000 existing MO
- bike plan 2000 planned KS
- bike plan 2000 planned MO
- bike plan 2000 proposed KS
- bike plan 2000 proposed MO
- collector roads
- interstate
- lakes
- minor arterials
- principal arterials
- metro parks

Johnson County

- buffers
- parks
- trails 99

Wyandotte County

- · road centerlines
- · city limits
- lakes
- parks
- · railroads
- streams

Lee's Summit (CAD files)

- city limits
- creeks
- floodplain
- greenways
- · James A. Reed Wildlife Area
- lakes
- railroads
- schools
- sewer

A computer file copy of the MetroGreen Map is available for distribution for public use. Because ArcView GIS was used to construct the MetroGreen System, metro area planners, officials, and staff will be able to add the MetroGreen file to their GIS resources and overlay the plan with other GIS files. Awareness of the system's planned corridors will encourage cooperation and coordination in the development of local plans.



To obtain a GIS file of the MetroGreen System contact Marlene Nagel or Aaron Bartlett at: MARC 600 Broadway, Suite 300 Kansas City, MO 64105 816-474-4240

For assistance contact Aaron Bartlett: abartlett@marc.org