

SUSTAINABLE PLACES POLICY COMMITTEE

May 12, 2023 Meeting Summary

Committee Members

Councilmember Logan Heley, City of Overland Park, Kansas Co-chair
Mayor Dean Katerndahl, City of Parkville, Missouri Co-chair
Jon Birkel, Hunt Midwest
Michael Frisch, UMKC
Janet McRae, Miami County, KS
Erin Ollig, City of Overland Park, KS
Michael Park, City of Lee's Summit
Melissa Schmitz, MoDOT
Allison Smith, KDOT
Jeffrey Williams, City of Kansas City, MO

Guests

Tami Alexander, KDOT
Sara Copeland, Burns & McDonnell
Krystal Jolly, MoDOT
Kelli Kelly, PCs for People
Sean Partain, WSP USA, Inc

MARC Staff Present

Ron Achelpohl, Megan Broll, Karen Clawson, Taylor Cunningham, Beth Dawson, Katie Killen, Frank Lenk, Marlene Nagel, Martin Rivarola

Welcome and Introductions

Missouri Co-chair Mayor Dean Katerndahl called the meeting to order. Introductions in-person and online followed.

Approval of March 10, 2023 Meeting Summary*

Kansas Co-Chair Logan Heley called for any corrections to the meeting summary draft; none were suggested. Jon Birkel motioned to accept the meeting summary, and Michael Frisch seconded the motion. The motion passed and the meeting summary was approved.

EV Implications for Land Use

Sara Copeland, Senior Planner with Burns & McDonnell, presented information about electric vehicles (EVs) and the implications that their use will have for land use. Ms. Copeland announced she would focus more on infrastructure instead of vehicles, and introduced three different classifications of EV charging stations based on charge time. In our region, most publicly available stations are Level 2 (which take 4-8 hours to fully charge); the Bipartisan Infrastructure Law (BIL) focuses on DC Fast Charging (which take 20-30 minutes to fully charge).

Ms. Copeland presented several equity issues in EV ownership and charging, noting current charging stations are predominantly outside of disadvantaged communities. The four main barriers to EV are cost, rural charging (lack of charging stations and lack of power infrastructure), home-based charging, and vehicle range. Ms. Copeland then described EV charging stations' impact on land-use – without need for underground storage space, there's more flexibility in locations over standard gas stations. She presented several questions to consider for new and existing development projects, and if/how EV charging should be incorporated. She noted the importance of including utilities in planning, as one DC Fast Charger uses the same power as three fast food restaurants, and four chargers equals the power usage of a hotel (the National Electric Vehicle Infrastructure Program, or NEVI, requires four DC Fast Chargers at a station). Public Works departments and roadway engineers should also be included in planning conversations, as EVs are 20% heavier than gas-powered counterparts, and acceleration capabilities pose new concerns for safety. Ms. Copeland pointed committee members to the October 2022 APA Zoning Practice issue, which included four recommendations for EV service equipment as a land use.

Ms. Copeland ended her presentation and the committee discussed the topic. Frank Lenk questioned how to factor in increased range over time and need for EV charging stations throughout the city, as most people presumably charge at home so needs for charging would reduce as distance without needing to charge increases. Ms. Copeland noted that not everyone will be able to charge at home (apartment dwellers, those without a garage, travelers, etc), and as EV ownership increases, neighborhood power usage could become a concern. Studying current usage is needed, and that answer may change over time.

Committee members discussed power usage - solar power is not able to fully power a charging station, and is considered a supplemental source. Generally, Kansas City neighborhoods' electrical infrastructure is well positioned to provide the power needed, but rural areas are highly variable. While Evergy has been working to support EV charging throughout the region, utilities currently serve demand versus doing speculative line extension.

Infrastructure costs will largely be shared among homeowners (for home based charging), the general public (to provide for those who cannot rely on home charging), neighborhoods, and utilities. The NEVI program requires special certification for electricians (or a registered apprentice), and infrastructure to support those employees as well as EV owners should be considered. How do rebates and incentives apply? How can we support EV infrastructure in an equitable way? How do state/local government regulations align (or not)?

Karen Clawson, Principal Planner and Air Quality Program Manager with MARC, presented on how we use this information for regional planning. Our current EV readiness plan is outdated, and we are kicking off a process soon with regional stakeholders to answer questions about charging infrastructure priorities. Ms. Clawson outlined the elements of the draft scope of the plan, including identifying and engaging stakeholders, assessing current conditions, identifying needs, strategies, and desired outcomes. Discussion followed about ensuring EV is focused in areas to benefit the most people, which may be difficult in a system originally built around gas-powered vehicles. Improving walkability/bikeability and examining existing parking facilities to

help optimize EV impact was also mentioned.

Regional Housing Partnership: Housing, Land Use and Transportation Policy Discussion

Katie Killen, MARC Housing Program Manager introduced the Regional Housing Partnership, and the data hub that was developed from data collected in the region around housing. Taylor Cunningham of MARC reminded the committee of recent work to evaluate comprehensive plans around the region, including planning efforts tied to housing. Frank Lenk, Director of Research Services, presented updates to the housing data hub, which is available through the [MARC website](#).

The region is lacking in nearly 64,000 affordable rental units, and is in need of approximately 45,000 additional rental units whose cost is less than \$650/month. Mr. Lenk demonstrated the renter housing gap at different price points and across different incomes, and showed how some higher-income households are occupying units that would otherwise be affordable to lower-income renters. Renters who occupy housing at prices that exceed the 30% benchmark of their income are “crowded up” into housing that is ultimately less/not affordable (but potentially in stronger neighborhoods that they prefer). Mr. Lenk addressed some caveats, including other costs of living, thresholds for what determines housing affordability, desirability and job access of housing, and accessibility to resources across income groups. MARC is looking at who is affected by this gap, focusing on race/ethnicity, households with young children, elderly living alone, and those with mobility limitations.

Michael Frisch asked about what the percentage difference in income is for those people crowded up into more expensive housing, and if other opportunities (like more walkable neighborhoods, less commute time for jobs, etc) could off-set the difference. Mr. Lenk acknowledged that the “crowding” term may suggest that people are forced into more expensive housing, when some may be making a conscious choice to take advantage of other potential benefits available in those neighborhoods. Jeffrey Williams asked how housing subsidies/government assistance may be affecting crowding up areas, and while the current data does not include that, Mr. Lenk noted we could overlay that information to analyze potential trends. Mr. Frisch noted that this information gets at the real needs and subsidies required in housing, and should be incorporated into the HUD plans. Mr. Lenk asked the committee how we can incorporate this housing information into and ensure it complements long-term transportation planning.

Other Business

Time allotted for the meeting expired. Co-chair Heley noted that the MARC Regional Assembly would be held June 9th, and Agenda Item 5 (Concept Prioritization Discussion) would be deferred to the July meeting. Co-chair Heley adjourned the meeting, but allowed for those interested to stay and continue discussion.

Post-Meeting Discussion

All committee members remained for an informal discussion after the meeting adjourned. Jeffrey Williams noted the two big takeaways from the housing discussion are understanding and accounting for the lack of supply and for whom (households with lowest income levels), and

how to evaluate why certain people are choosing not to live in affordable locations (such as quality of life, educational opportunities, crime). Jon Birkel noted housing, jobs, and transportation should coordinate to determine the best places to develop housing. Discussion followed regarding changes to housing and transportation needs based on working from home/Covid, aging in place and home sizes, short term rentals, and the housing market.