GOVERNING BODY WORKSHOP AGENDA ROELAND PARK Roeland Park, City Hall 4600 W. 51st Street Monday, March 7, 2022 6:00 PM

- Michael Poppa, Mike Kelly, Mayor • Trisha Brauer, **Council Member** Council Member • Tom Madigan, Benjamin Dickens, **Council Member** Admin. Council Member Kate Raglow, • Jan Faidley, Council Member Clerk Council Member
 - Michael Rebne. **Council Member**
- Keith Moody, City Administrator
- Erin Winn, Asst.
- Kelley Nielsen, City
- John Morris, Police Chief
- Donnie Scharff, Public Works Director

Admin	Finance	Safety	Public Works
Raglow	Rebne	Poppa	Brauer
Dickens	Hill	Madigan	Faidley

Ι. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Α. February 21, 2022

DISCUSSION ITEMS: П.

• Jennifer Hill.

Council Member

- 1. Review Elledge Drive Improvement Plan - Direction on Bike Lanes - 15 min
- 2. Review 47th Street Overlay District Ordinance Revisions - 10 min
- Discuss Changing City Hall Administrative Assistant schedule back 3. to 8-5 on Mondays - 10 min
- 4. Review of Storm Water Utility Options - 2022 Objective
- 5. Executive Session - "I move to recess the Governing Body into executive session in order to discuss the potential acquisition of real estate, pursuant to the real estate exception of the Kansas Open Meetings Act, K.S.A.75-4319(b)(6). The open meeting to resume at in the council chamber."

Ш. **NON-ACTION ITEMS:**

IV. ADJOURN

Welcome to this meeting of the Committee of the Whole of Roeland Park.

Below are the Procedural Rules of the Committee

The governing body encourages citizen participation in local governance processes. To that end, and in compliance with the Kansas Open meetings Act (KSA 45-215), you are invited to participate in this meeting. The following rules have been established to facilitate the transaction of business during the meeting. Please take a moment to review these rules before the meeting begins.

- A. Audience Decorum. Members of the audience shall not engage in disorderly or boisterous conduct, including but not limited to; the utterance of loud, obnoxious, threatening, or abusive language; clapping; cheering; whistling; stomping; or any other acts that disrupt, impede, or otherwise render the orderly conduct of the Committee of the Whole meeting unfeasible. Any member(s) of the audience engaging in such conduct shall, at the discretion of the City Council President (Chair) or a majority of the Council Members, be declared out of order and shall be subject to reprimand and/or removal from that meeting. Please turn all cellular telephones and other noise-making devices off or to "silent mode" before the meeting begins.
- B. **Public Comment Request to Speak Form.** The request form's purpose is to have a record for the City Clerk. Members of the public may address the Committee of the Whole during Public Comments and/or before consideration of any agenda item; however, no person shall address the Committee of the Whole without first being recognized by the Chair or Committee Chair. Any person wishing to speak at the beginning of an agenda topic, shall first complete a Request to Speak form and submit this form to the City Clerk before discussion begins on that topic.
- C. **Purpose.** The purpose of addressing the Committee of the Whole is to communicate formally with the governing body with a question or comment regarding matters that are on the Committee's agenda.
- D. **Speaker Decorum.** Each person addressing the Committee of the Whole, shall do so in an orderly, respectful, dignified manner and shall not engage in conduct or language that disturbs, or otherwise impedes the orderly conduct of the committee meeting. Any person, who so disrupts the meeting shall, at the discretion of the City Council President (Chair) or a majority of the Council Members, be declared out of order and shall be subject to reprimand and/or be subject to removal from that meeting.
- E. **Time Limit.** In the interest of fairness to other persons wishing to speak and to other individuals or groups having business before the Committee of the Whole, each speaker shall limit comments to two minutes per agenda item. If a large number of people wish to speak, this time may be shortened by the Chair so that the number of persons wishing to speak may be accommodated within the time available.

- F. **Speak Only Once Per Agenda Item.** Second opportunities for the public to speak on the same issue will not be permitted unless mandated by state or local law. No speaker will be allowed to yield part or all of his/her time to another, and no speaker will be credited with time requested but not used by another.
- G. Addressing the Committee of the Whole. Comment and testimony are to be directed to the Chair. Dialogue between and inquiries from citizens and individual Committee Members, members of staff, or the seated audience is not permitted. Only one speaker shall have the floor at one time. Before addressing Committee speakers shall state their full name, address and/or resident/non-resident group affiliation, if any, before delivering any remarks.
- H. **Agendas and minutes** can be accessed at www.roelandpark.org or by contacting the City Clerk

The governing body welcomes your participation and appreciates your cooperation. If you would like additional information about the Committee of the Whole or its proceedings, please contact the City Clerk at (913) 722.2600. APPROVAL OF MINUTES-I.-A. 3/7/2022

Item Number: Committee Meeting Date:



City of Roeland Park

Action Item Summary

Date:	
Submitted By:	
Committee/Department:	
Title:	February 21, 2022
Item Type:	

Recommendation:

Details:

How does item relate to Strategic Plan?

How does item benefit Community for all Ages?

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

D February 21, 2022

Type Cover Memo

GOVERNING BODY WORKSHOP MINUTES
Roeland Park City Hall
4600 W 51st Street, Roeland Park, KS 66205
Monday, February 21, 2022, 6:00 P.M.

 Mike Kelly, Mayor Trisha Brauer, Council Member Benjamin Dickens, Council Member Jan Faidley, Council Member Jennifer Hill, Council Member 		iber Member er er	 Tom Madigan, Council Member Michael Poppa, Council Member Kate Raglow, Council Member Michael Rebne, Council Member 	 Keith Moody, City Administrator Erin Winn, Asst. Admin. Kelley Nielsen, City Clerk John Morris, Police Chief Donnie Scharff, Public Works Director 	
	Admin	Finance	Safety	Public Works	
	Hill	Madigan	Faidley	Dickens	
	Raglow	Rebne	Рорра	Brauer	

(Governing Body Workshop Called to Order at 8:00 p.m.)

ROLL CALL

CMBR Dickens called the meeting to order. All Governing Body members were present.

I. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

A. Governing Body Workshop Minutes February 7, 2022

The minutes were approved as presented.

II. DISCUSSION ITEMS

1. Tool Kit Presentation from Affordable Housing Task Force

Kristy Baughman, Director of Education and Planning at United Community Services of Johnson County, presented an overview of the findings from the Johnson County Community Housing Study and the Housing for All Task Force. Roeland Park was a part of the study, contributed funding and participated in elements of the study and also on the Task Force.

They discussed housing affordability in Johnson County and Ms. Baughman provided specifics to Roeland Park. She noted that 39 percent of renters in Johnson County are housing cost burdened with 32 percent of renters in Roeland Park being housing cost burdened. Ms. Baughman reviewed the income needed to purchase single-family homes in Johnson County as well as income needed to rent.

CMBR Rebne asked if there was any anecdotal data for professions not being able to afford to live in Roeland Park. He added that many older individuals and women also cannot afford to live there. Ms. Baughman said that although Johnson County is affluent, it is not all across the board.

The housing study showed that the Roeland Park housing stock is older relative to more southern parts of the county where there is newer development. Roeland Park has seen less than 5 percent of homes on the market since 2000. Community feedback they received is that seniors are looking to move to find better options that are more affordable and a space to age in. Ms. Baughman also reviewed the City's construction activity, permits and building demolition and rebuilds.

Things they should consider is housing which limits those that are disabled or have educational barriers. The task force has looked at solutions to removing those barriers, how to preserve existing housing, and keep the housing areas safe.

Mayor Kelly asked about the survey process itself, how it was conducted who participated. Ms. Baughman said it was done in the summer of 2020, was online, and with an English/Spanish paper version distributed to libraries and community centers. They received close to 5,000 respondents with about 150 of them being from Roeland Park. Mayor Kelly asked if they got a good cross representation of the cities. Ms. Baughman said that Chapter 2 of the report breaks down the qualitative information which includes data collected from their listening sessions as well as from the survey. The larger communities had a higher breakdown as they had more data. In the appendix there is more information on who completed the study. Ms. Baughman did say she wished they had more renters complete the study.

CMBR Rebne said that historically Roeland Park has been a white community and those cycles persist in other ways outside of laws they enact. He said a way to be more welcoming and inclusive is to find a way to provide affordable housing. Ms. Baughman said for the first time they have moved beyond 75 percent white noting that the community is changing but is still largely white. She noted there are different demographics moving into the communities and staying which is helping to make them more diverse.

CMBR Faidley added that between the history and where they want to be is controlled by what the price line represents. CMBR Rebne said that is how systemic racism works is in terms of housing cost.

Ms. Baughman asked everyone to check out the REDLINED: Cities, Suburbs, and Segregation exhibit at Johnson County Arts and Heritage Museum. She said the issues are not exclusively related to the cost of housing, but it's the history of difficulty for people of color being able to get loans, buy homes, building generational wealth, other things that factor in.

CMBR Faidley mentioned the middle housing that she thinks will continue to happen. She also noted the Rocks which will be a large complex in their City. Ms. Baughman said there is a lot of desire for living in a place with walkability and live-work-play amenities.

2. Discuss 2022 MOU for Co-Responder Services

City Administrator Moody said the attachments in the packet provide the MOU and background information on the co-responder program. The proposed MOU provides for a second co-responder covered by a grant for 2022. Currently there is no commitment to cover the cost of the second responder for 2023. Mission and Merriam have indicated they will cover the cost for the second responder but has asked the Northeast Johnson County consortium to participate in that expense. City Administrator Moody noted that activity for Roeland Park has been in the middle compared with other Johnson County cities. He added that their Police Department does support this program and appreciate being able to call on the co-responders. The cost for the responder is based on a per capital basis.

CMBR Faidley asked City Administrator Moody if had seen Commissioner Becky Fast's email addressing the increase of co-responders by neighboring cities. City Administrator Moody said the information provided by Commissioner Fast included numbers up through 2021 and are factored into their

calculations for a second responder. He said there has been no activity in 2022 yet. CMBR Faidley said the trend looks like it is increasing to offer that assistance to the officers on the street, a program she sees as really beneficial. City Administrator Moody said Police Chief Morris appreciates having that program available to them. He also said that they are seeing an increased cost since some cities have left their initial group.

CMBR Raglow said she had opportunity to listen to a Johnson County co-responder for Northeast Johnson County who spoke at her church. She said they do amazing work. Their hours, however, are inconsistent yet they try to meet the need of the calls they get. Sometimes after an interaction with the police, they follow-up with the person. CMBR Raglow said the responders are there to benefit the community and provide support.

City Administrator Moody said included in his attachment is a breakdown of the responsibilities of coresponders.

CMBR Poppa said this issue is close to him and he would like to continue with the program and see the full amount allotted for the 2023 budget.

CMBR Madigan said that mental health has been ignored for a long time and would support the second co-responder in the budget as it will widen the coverage.

Mayor Kelly agreed with everyone's commitment to the program and glad they have an opportunity to double their service. He did add that he would like to hear from Police Chief Morris. He also said they need to discuss the 2023 budget but did not feel they had enough information to decide at this time.

There was consensus among the Governing Body to enter into the MOU. They agreed that they would like to receive input from Chief Morris and at this time would hold off discussing numbers for the 2023 budget until they got better numbers.

City Administrator Moody said he would put together an estimate assuming that Merriam, Mission and Roeland Park would share the second co-responder. He said there is also the potential for other smaller cities to participate and the City's cost would be reflective of population and how many cities ended up participating.

III. COMMITTEE ITEMS

There were no items discussed.

IV. ADJOURN

MOTION: CMBR MADIGAN MOVED AND CMBR REBNE SECONDED TO ADJOURN. (MOTION CARRIED 8-0)

(Roeland Park Governing Body Workshop Adjourned at 9:13 p.m.)

Item Number: **DISCUSSION ITEMS-II.-1.** 3/7/2022 Meeting Date:



City of Roeland Park

Action Item Summary

Date:	2/28/2022
Submitted By:	Donnie Scharff, Director of Public Works
Committee/Department:	Public Works
Title:	Review Elledge Drive Improvement Plan - Direction on Bike Lanes - 15 min
Item Type:	Discussion

Recommendation:

Review Elledge Drive project plans with council & seek direction on bike lane options.

Details:

Committee

Below is a link to the Elledge Dr preliminary plan sheets for review. The project is planned for 2022 construction and will include stormwater improvements, select curb & gutter replacement, some driveway approach replacement where sidewalks are being replaced to meet ADA compliance. Bike lane options are included in the design as well. https://www.roelandpark.net/372/2020-Capital-Improvements

Staff did have the traffic engineer complete a project assessment in accordance with our recently adopted Complete Streets policy. The plans have been developed to address that analysis. Attached is the complete streets analysis from the traffic engineer.

A neighborhood meeting was held on February 24th to discuss the project with residents to get feedback on the improvements as well as the proposed bicycle lane additions. Based on the feedback, there were comments from resident's that some were supportive of dedicated bike lanes where other's favored either Share the Road bike lanes and some did not want bike lanes at all. Attached is the Roeland Park Pedestrian & Bicycle Infrastructure Strategy Report that reflects locations for high priority bicycle networks. Please see pages 14 & 17 of the attached report for reference. Staff is seeking direction for the preferred bike lane options listed below.

- Option #1 Incorporate marked bike lanes along Elledge Dr (this option could allow vehicular parking over the stripped bike lanes or on street parking could be prohibited along both sides of Elledge Dr)
- Option #2 Share the Road Pavement Markings & Signage (Riders have access to full

driving lane, on street parking could still be allowed)

A raised median added at the Elledge pedestrian crossing between Parish and Delmar has been considered to improve safety of pedestrians (provides a point of refuge). Motorists waiting to pick up or drop off students at Roesland frequently que in the east bound lane of Elledge at this pedestrian crossing. The median could hinder traffic going around the queued cars. Prohibiting parking on Elledge in the area of the pedestrian crossing through Parish would solve this problem and this would also enhance the safety of the pedestrians crossing at this location by eliminating queued vehicles which obscure motorist's visibility of pedestrians crossing. A similar approach is suggested for 48th Street near Parish.

How does item relate to Strategic Plan?

How does item benefit Community for all Ages?

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

- Elledge Dr Complete Streets Analysis Report
- D Roeland Park Ped & Bike Infrastructure Strategy Report

Type Cover Memo Cover Memo



TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

TO:	Donnie Scharff, Public Works Director
FROM:	Janelle Clayton, PE, PTOE
DATE:	February 4, 2022
SUBJECT:	Elledge Drive – Complete Streets Considerations

<u>Purpose</u>

The purpose of this technical memorandum is to summarize the analysis of Complete Street elements that may be implemented along Elledge Drive from Roe Lane to W 47th Street in Roeland Park, Kansas and provides documentation on data collected and design decisions.

Background

Elledge Drive is currently in the design phase for a Johnson County CARS reconstruction project. The City, in conjunction with their Complete Streets Ordinance, has requested the project corridor to be analyzed for the implementation of complete street improvements. Elements of complete streets include Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) compliant pedestrian access routes, street and sidewalk lighting, pedestrian and bicycle facilities, access management, ADA compliant public transit stops and stations, context sensitive landscaping, utility relocations and street amenities allowing for efficient levels of service.

Elledge Drive Roadway Characteristics

Elledge Drive is approximately 32' in width (from back of curb to back of curb), that provides 28' in travel-way width, not including curb and gutter. On-street parking is prohibited on the south side of Elledge Drive from Parish Drive to W 47th Street. The posted speed limit on Elledge Drive is 25 mph. There is an existing pedestrian signal located just west of Parish Drive.

Existing Traffic Volumes

The City recorded daily traffic counts (ADT) along Elledge Drive between Buena Vista Street & Clark Drive from Saturday, January 22nd, 2022, to Friday, January 28th, 2022. The resulting ADT volumes are summarized below:

Average Daily Traffic (vpd)								
	Sat. 1/22 & 1/29	Sun. 1/23	Mon. 1/24	Tues. 1/25	Wed. 1/26	Thurs. 1/27	Fri. 1/28	Typ. Wkdy (Tues- Thurs)
EB Elledge Drive	1,451	1,293	1,786	1,677	1,800	1,666	1,787	1,714
WB Elledge Drive	1,395	1,235	1,530	1,482	1,563	1,500	1,626	1,515
Total Both Directions	2,846	2,528	3,316	3,159	3,363	3,166	3,413	3,229



Existing Speed Data

	Average Speed (mph)	85 th Percentile Speed (mph)	Percent of Vehicles Exceeding 25 mph
EB Elledge Drive	27	35.43	90.47%
WB Elledge Drive	12	27.51	29.49%

Existing Crash Data

Crash data was provided by The Kansas Department of Transportation (KDOT) for the years 2016-2020, and a segment crash rate was calculated for Elledge Drive from Roe Lane to W. 47th Street.

The FHWA formula for the road-segment crash rate is:

Where:

R = Crash rate for the road segment expressed as crashes per 100 million vehicle-miles of travel (VMT)

C = Total number of crashes in the study period

N = Number of years of data

V = Number of vehicles per day (both directions)

L = Length of the roadway segment in miles

There were four crashes on Elledge Drive during the 4-year period of crash data. All the crashes were property damage only. One was a sideswipe crash, one was a parked car, one was a rear-end, and one was an angle/side-impact crash. There were no correctable crash patterns identified.

The segment crash rate was determined along the segment above:

R = <u>100,000,000 * 4</u> 365 * 5 * 3,229 * 0.55 = 123.41 crashes per 100 million VMT or 1.23 crashes per million VMT

KDOT's statewide average for segment crashes on a 2-lane undivided, urban roadway with no access control from 2015-2019 is 1.770 crashes per million VMT. Therefore, the segment crash rate for Elledge Street from Roe Lane to W 47th Street is lower than the statewide average.



Existing Safety Concerns

Some of the concerns in the area expressed by residents included the existing signalized pedestrian crossing at the intersection of Elledge Drive between Delmar Street & Parish Drive, and the occurrence of parked cars along Elledge Drive being hit while parked overnight.

The concerns at the signalized pedestrian crossing included an email from a resident (Leonora Echeverria 1.24.2022) stating her daughter has had four incidents where, even though the pedestrian signal was activated, a car ran the red light when she was crossing the street. A police officer witnessed the first two incidents.

Bicycle Lanes

Dedicated and shared bike lane options were considered along Elledge Drive. Discussion of some of the considerations for either treatment follow:

On-street parking is allowed for most of Elledge Drive, and there is not enough roadway width to provide dedicated bike lanes and on-street parking. There is not a traffic ordinance that prohibits parking in a bike lane, although it is not the ideal condition as a bicyclist who is utilizing the bike lane may not be expecting the conflict with a car parked over it. Some on-street parking does occur on Elledge Drive but is typically limited to a few vehicles along the entire length. A dedicated bike lane does allow for the bicyclist to ride at their preferred speed without interference from prevailing traffic conditions.

The American Association of State Highway & Transportation Officials (AASHTO) "*Guide to Bicycle Facilities, 4th Edition*" indicates that the preferred operating width for a bicyclist is 5', and therefore under most circumstances, the recommended width for bike lanes is 5'. The 5' width is from the face of the curb as shown in the figure below.





The existing 28' of travel way plus 1' gutter on each side provides a useable 30' section of roadway. This would allow for 2-5' bike lanes and 10' driving lanes along Elledge Drive.

Roadways that carry *very low* to *low* volumes of traffic and may also have low speeds, may be suitable as shared lanes in their present condition. The benefits of a shared lane would be the elimination of the conflict with vehicles potentially parked on Elledge Drive with bicyclists utilizing the lanes, and it gets the bicyclists out of the debris zone of the curb-and-gutter section and discourages unsafe passing by vehicles.

As there is acceptable width along Elledge Drive to provide dedicated bike lanes, the design has included dedicated lanes where possible. In areas where there is not enough width, such as the pedestrian crossing near Parish Drive that includes a refuge island, the bike lane temporarily ends through the section.

Pedestrian Crossing Safety Improvement

Different improvement options were considered for the existing signalized pedestrian crossing on Elledge Drive, just west of Parish Drive. The pedestrian signal mainly serves the students from Roesland Park Elementary, located just to the south of Elledge Drive and on the west side of Parish Drive.

First, the existing location was analyzed to determine if the mid-block location was the most appropriate location for the pedestrian signal. Consideration was given to relocating the signal to the intersection of Elledge Drive & Parish Drive. Relocating it to the east of the intersection is not ideal, as it would create the need for students to cross Parish Drive and Elledge Drive, in addition to crossing three lanes of traffic on Elledge Drive. Relocating it to the west leg of the intersection is not ideal unless a full-intersection signal is installed. The current mid-block location allows a northbound left-turn driver on Parish Drive to make the turn in time to see the red signal indication. If it were located at the intersection, a second signal pole would be required so a northbound driver could see the red indication and not make a turn. Therefore, it was determined that the existing mid-block location is the preferred location.

Second, the option of removing the signal was considered. If removed, a rectangular rapid flashing beacon (RRFB) could be installed in its place. The RRFB consists of the pedestrian crossing sign with a horizontal flashing light bar that activates with a pushbutton that flashes rapidly to bring attention to a pedestrian trying to cross. While studies have shown the RRFB increases driver compliance, it would still be considered a lesser treatment than a pedestrian signal. Therefore, the pedestrian signal is shown to be used in place.

Geometric improvements were also considered at the pedestrian crossing to help bring attention to its presence. First, a raised crosswalk was considered. This would include elevating the crosswalk approximately 6" in height that would create a "speed table" to



slow traffic down. The option was discussed with the roadway designers and ultimately rejected due to the drainage issues it would create.

Second, a pedestrian refuge island was considered. Although these treatments are typically reserved for uncontrolled crossings, a refuge island will help bring attention to the crossing location and also serve as a traffic calming measure by making the roadway feel narrower, although the lane widths would remain at 10'. The refuge island will also provide a safer place for a pedestrian to wait should a vehicle not comply with the red light.

Street Lighting

Street lighting along Elledge Drive was also analyzed. An inventory of the existing street lights was taken in the field and observed during dark hours to determine where existing deficiencies may exist. Calculations were performed in AGi32, a lighting analysis software, to determine the existing lighting distributions and illuminance and if those would meet the design criteria. The analysis indicated that current lighting levels provide adequate lighting along Elledge Drive and the adjacent sidewalks. Therefore, no additional lighting is recommended at this time.



Pedestrian + Bicycle Infrastructure Strategy

Roeland Park, Kansas | August 2017

Table of Contents

Introduction	4
Infrastructure Strategy	8
Priority Sidewalk Network	10
Priority Bicycle Network	14
Priority Intersections	18
Project Summaries	22
Quick Build Guide	31

Introduction



This Pedestrian & Bicycle Infrastrucutre Strategy is a program of pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure improvements in the City of Roeland Park, KS. It presents a deliberate and phased approach to building a safer and more interconnected network of pedestrian and bicycle facilities.

This report presents a blueprint for a more complete sidewalk network in Roeland Park, and provides an important update to the city's Sidewalk Program. The priority projects identified in this strategy focus on creating a network of sidewalks that are safe, comfortable, continuous, and that connect important destinations.

This strategy also identifies a priority bicycle network that synthesizes several previous planning efforts and identifies specific infrastructure improvements for different segments of the network.

Sidewalk and bicycle networks depend on safe crossings at intersections. This strategy recommends improvements to certain key

intersections around the City to remove barriers to connectivity and enhance safety in locations where conflicts with automobiles may occur.

The priorities identified in this report build on past planning efforts while providing a new strategic approach. They outline a path to achieve Roeland Park's goals for walkability and connectivity, expressed in the City's 2012 Comprehensive Plan, and 2016 committee report on bicycle and pedestrian safety.

In the implementation section of this report, recommendations are organized into prioritized project segments. Existing and potential funding sources are identified. Finally, a "Quick Build Guide" describes a number of inexpensive and interim treatments for improving conditions on an accelerated timeline.

This document was produced for the City of Roeland Park, KS by BikeWalkKC, and made possible with the support of the LiveWell Johnson County program and the Johnson County Department of Health and Environment.

Existing Conditions

There are thirty-seven miles of streets within the boundaries of Roeland Park. Approximately ten miles of those streets (27%) are missing sidewalks on either side. All arterial and collector streets have sidewalks, with the exception of Roe Boulevard north of 48th Street and Buena Vista Street between Shawnee Mission Parkway and 53rd Street (see Figure 1). Most areas between Roe Boulevard and Neosho Avenue have sidewalks. The Roe Highlands subdivsion, between the community Center and 51st Street also has sidewalks on every street.

Elsewhere in Roeland Park, sidewalks are less common. Sidewalks have been constructed along "through" streets that provide more continuous paths between destinations, but sidewalks on many side streets are missing. These gaps make it difficult for residents to reach many destinations via a direct and convenient route. Marked crossings exist mostly in the areas of the Roeland Park Shopping Center and Roesland Elementary School.

Marked crossings exist mostly around and between the Roeland Park Shopping Center and Roesland Elementary School. Most crosswalks are in the continental style, which is highly visible to motorists. Some crosswalks are marked in the parallel-line style, which is much less visible. Lack of marked crossings reduces the comfort and safety of pedestrians, especially in high-traffic and high-speed corridors.

While several projects are planned and budgeted, including a shared use path on Roe Boulevard, there are currently no dedicated bicycle facilities in Roeland Park. Share the road signs and onstreet painted sharrows exist in some locations.



Figure 1 - Existing Sidewalks and Marked Crossings

Previous Plans

Over the past decade, several planning efforts have proposed approaches for implementing pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure in Roeland Park. These proposals helped shape the recommendations made in this report, but there is significant variation in the recommendations of the various plans. One of the goals of this Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Strategy is to synthesize all of these recommendations into a single, coherent strategy for infrastructure improvements that responds to the motivations and aspirations of each of the prior efforts. Figure 2 maps the routes for trails and bicycle facilities that were recommended in previous plans.

2010 & 2016 Sidewalk Program:

The most comprehensive plan for sidewalk improvements in Roeland Park is the city's Sidewalk Program, first adopted in 2010 and updated in 2016. The program envisions sidewalks built on both sides of every city street and lays out several phases for sidewalk extensions. The highest priority phases would fill in gaps in the existing sidewalk network, on streets currently lacking sidewalk. Lower priority phases would see a second sidewalk added to streets that already have sidewalk on one side.

The program also identifies routes for bike trails across the city, though it doesn't specify precise alignment or other design details. The trails would generally follow two east-west routes, both extending from near Bishop Miege High School in the east. One would serve Roesland Elementary and Roeland Park Shopping Center before splitting into three routes, two leading into the City of Mission, and one extending to Roeland Park Community Center. The second major route would serve the southern half of the city, splitting into two routes at R Park. **Pedestrian & Bicycle Safety Ad-Hoc Committee:** The Roeland Park Pedestrian and Bicycle Safety Ad-Hoc Committee was formally created by the City Council on July 23, 2015 with a one-year mission to look at the current state of transportation in and around the City as it relates to pedestrian conditions, ADA accessibility, bicycling, and transit accessibility. The Committee released a report making a number of recommendations regarding these modes. Among them was a recommendation for bicycle facilities to link the proposed bicycle trails from the 2016 Sidewalk Program. These would primarily consist of north-south on-street connections between the previously proposed trail routes.

2012 Roeland Park Comprehensive Plan:

This plan calls for a community trail network. The proposed network consists of two east-west and three north-south segments that, when connected would essentially form two loops. Few connections to neighboring cities are explicitly laid out, in contrast to the 2016 Sidewalk Program.

Greater Kansas City Regional Bikeway Plan:

Adopted in 2015, this plan envisions a regional network of bicycle facilities that support active transportation. A segment of bikeway is proposed through Roeland Park. It would begin on Roe Lane at the county line, extend west on 50th Terrace, and shift to 51st Street. At Nall Avenue, part of it would continue into Mission, while another segment would extend south on Nall Avenue.

Rosedale Master Plan:

This plan set out a vision for the future of the Rosedale neighborhood in Kansas City, Kansas. It proposed new bicycle infrastructure serving the neighborhood, including signed bike routes on 47th Street and on Elledge Drive, leading to Roe Avenue.



Figure 2 - Previous Proposals for Trails & Bicycle Infrastructure

Infrastructure Strategy

The strategy for improving infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists in Roeland Park focuses on connecting residents to the city's important destinations with safe, comfortable, direct routes for walking and cycling. The recommended infrastructure improvements are intended to support both recreation and transportation by foot or bicycle.

This strategy has three parts. The first part is the **Priority Sidewalk Network**, which identifies important street segments for construction of future sidewalks within the City. Next is a **Priority Bicycle Network**, which describes the type and location of bicycle facilities that together would provide safe and comfortable cycling conditions throughout Roeland Park. Recommendations for **Priority Intersections** outline a methodology for making improvements to intersections that would enhance safety for those walking and biking.



Key Principles

Previous planning efforts identify improvements to pedestrian and bicycle infrastructure in Roeland Park, but there is not consensus about which streets should be improved or about which improvements are most urgent. The following principles attempt to establish a strategic framework for prioritizing projects that brings together the goals and aspirations of previous efforts. These principles guide all of the recommendations in this Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Strategy:



Safe and Comfortable

Route and facility choices should ensure that users of all ages and abilities can safely travel, and support conditions that make it inviting and comfortable to do so.



Direct and Continuous

Routes should provide a direct and efficient path to destinations, while also being located so that all areas of the city have convenient access to highquality facilities nearby.



Connecting Important Destinations

Pedestrians and cyclists want to travel to the same destinations as motorists. Improvements should be prioritized to connect people to the destinations they want to visit.

Destinations

Connecting destinations is one of the key principles guiding the infrastructure recommendations in this report. The destinations in map below are derived primarily from the 2012 Comprehensive Plan, which described a concept of Roeland Park as a "village" with a number of "centers" where services and destinations are located. The centers include a "Neighborhood Center" at 47th Street and Mission Road and a "Town Center," which includes the Roeland Park Shopping Center, City Hall, and the surrounding area. Two other centers are located in and around potential future development at the former Mission Gateway site. Figure 3 shows the centers presented in the Village concept, along with a number of other important destinations, including schools and parks, that would likely attract pedestrian and cyclists.



Figure 3 - Roeland Park Destinations

Priority Sidewalk Network

The Priority Sidewalk Network is an interconnected citywide network of pedestrian routes that connect to all major destinations in the community. This Priority Sidewalk Network identifies the best routes for direct and comfortable connections to places that people want to go. Many of these routes have sidewalks today, but there are also several important gaps where no sidewalks exist. The Priority Sidewalk Network also identifies several off-street segments that provide important connectivity between areas that do not have direct and convenient connections along the existing street nework.

Routes on the priority network were identified with the following criteria:

- The priority network connects identified destinations to each other and to as many Roeland Park residents as possible.
- The network supports a scenario in which a resident would not walk more than a block or two to reach quality pedestrian facilities, and would not have to walk along an arterial or collector street that did not have comfortable facilities.
- Recognizing that Roeland Park has a sometimes-inconsistent street grid, routes are identified to be as direct and continuous as possible.
- Routes have been designed to incorporate safe crossings at major barriers, such as Roe Boulevard.







Figure 4 - Priority Sidewalk Network

Proposed Improvements

First Priority:

Missing Sidewalks on Priority Network Streets

Most of the streets on the Priority Sidewalk Network already have sidewalks, but there are some gaps. Because these streets are the most important for creating a safe, comfortable and interconnected network, they are identified as the first priority for improvements. Roeland Park is currently planning and designing a shared use path along Roe Avenue. Because this path would represent a major upgrade in pedestrian facilities along a key arterial, and because improvements would also help to address the barrier Roe Avenue creates for pedestrians travelling east and west, Roe Avenue improvements are also shown as a top priority.

Second Priority:

Missing Sidewalks on Reconstructed Streets

The City of Roeland Park has a street mill and overlay program (funded in part by federal Community Development Block Grant funds) for streets that have been determined to be in poor condition and that require structural repairs. Because street reconstruction projects are already modifying the existing roadway, they are convenient opportunities to add sidewalks where they are missing today. Adding sidewalks during reconstruction could simplify the design process and require fewer City resources that in the sidewalk is constructed separately.

Third Priority: Other Missing Sidewalks

There are several streets that are not on the Priority Sidewalk Network and not planned for reconstruction, but that are still missing sidewalks of any kind. Construction of sidewalks on at least one side of these streets will complete the goal of providing sidewalks on all public streets in Roeland Park.







Second Sidewalks

Even the very best pedestrian accommodations can't serve Roeland Park residents if they have no way to get to them. Sometimes the biggest barrier is right outside a resident's front door. Having sidewalks on both sides of the street enhances the safety and comfort of pedestrians, and removes barriers at the very beginning and and end of a walk. In the future, sidewalk could be added to the second side of city streets. Streets in the priority network should be prioritized for second sidewalks. Other streets could follow the initial phasing, with second sidewalk added as roads are reconstructed.

Off-Street Connections

In locations where the street grid is incomplete or especially circuitous, off-street pedestrian connections can make it much easier for Roeland Park residents to get to destinations. These offstreet connections are included as part of the Priority Sidewalk Network and should be considered as high-priority projects in parallel with the City's on-street sidewalk program.



Figure 5 - Proposed Sidewalk Improvements

Priority Bicycle Network

Several recent plans have called for bicycle infrastructure in Roeland Park. Dedicated bicycle facilities do not yet exist in the city, but recent growth in cycling for recreation and commuting alike is increasing demand, as reflected in recent planning efforts. The Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Strategy includes a new proposal for cycling infrastructure. This proposal recommends a Priority Bicycle Network that supports recreation and commuting with a variety of facility types. This network serves travel both within Roeland Park and to destinations beyond the city limits.



Proposed Improvements



Bike Lanes

Bike Lanes are recommended for those streets on the Priority Bicycle network that have sufficient space between existing curbs for at least two ten-foot automobile lanes and two five-foot bicycle lanes. Specifically, that includes Roe Lane, Elledge Drive, 47th Street, and 51st Street between Buena Vista Street and Roe Avenue. Bicycle lanes are also recommended for regional bike routes identified on MARC's Regional Bikeway Plan. The Regional Bikeway Plan identifies portions of 50th Terrace, 51st Street and Nall Avenue as priority routes. In these locations, additional curb width or right-of-way may be necessary to accommodate dedicated bike lanes.





Source: Project for Public Spaces

Shared-Use Paths

Shared-use paths function like extra-wide sidewalks that provide enough space for bicyclists and pedestrians to safety interact. A shared-use path is recommended along Roe Avenue where design and engineering is currently underway for improvements to the entire street. Generally a shared use path should be ten to twelve feet wide to safely and accommodate pedestrians and cyclists together.





Source: reconnectrochester.org

Neighborhood Greenways

Most of the routes identified on the Priority Bicycle Network are too narrow to accommodate dedicated bike lanes in the width beween existing curbs. However, because these streets are generally residential in nature, with limited traffic and low speeds, they can still function as safe and comfortable connectors for cyclists. Many of the streets identified as part of the Priority Bicycle Network are also identified on the Priority Sidewalk Network. With minor improvements to traffic calming and wayfinding, these "Neighborhood Greenways" can perform as multifunction neighborhood amenities that benefit cyclists, pedestrians, and adjacent residents.

Neighborhood Greenways

Sometimes called "Bicycle Boulevards," the Neighborhood Greenways identified in the Priority Bicycle Network are streets where conditions allow bicycle traffic to be safely mixed with automobiles. The National Association of City Transportation Officials defines Bicycle Boulevards as follows:

"Bicycle boulevards are streets with low motorized traffic volumes and speeds, designated and designed to give bicycle travel priority. Bicycle Boulevards use signs, pavement markings, and speed and volume management measures to discourage through trips by motor vehicles and create safe, convenient bicycle crossings of busy arterial streets."

The concept of a Neighborhood Greenway or Bicycle Boulevard is appealing in Roeland Park for several reasons. First, many of the streets that make convenient bike connections are not wide enough to incorporate dedicated bike lanes without the the cost and disruption of major construction. However, since these streets generally have few cars and low speed limits, it's possible for cyclists to comfortably mix with traffic. In most cases, the experience for cyclists on these routes would be enhanced by minor design modifications that slow down traffic and enhance safety.

Neighborhood Greenways are also appealing in Roeland Park because there is a great deal of overlap beween the Priority Bicycle and Sidewalk networks. That presents an opportunity to enhance priority streets for all users, and to incorporate design elements that increase the comfort and safety for cyclists in coordination with any adjacent sidewalk improvements. Done thoughtfully, relatively minor improvements including signage, pavement parkings, and traffic calming features could transform Roeland Park's Neighborhood Greenways into unique and marketable amenities that add value and beauty for those who live or travel on the street.



Source: bikemore.net



Source: nacto.org



Source: reconnectrochester.org

Prioritization

The Priority Bicycle Network identifies dedicated bike lanes for important routes that have the physical space to restripe the street without any modifications or expansion of the existing curbs. This means that these projects can be implemented for little more than the cost of paint and striping. Because of the ease of implementation, and because of the enhancement they could provide to cyclist comfort on important routes, these striped bike lanes are recommended as the first priority for implementation.

The shared-use path for Roe Avenue is recommended as the second priority for bicycle improvements. This route will provide a critical north-south spine for an interconnected bike network and link many community destinations. Improvements on Roe will also assist cyclists in crossing east-west, which today is a major barrier. Design and engineering for Roe Avenue improvements are already underway. Neighborhood greenways are the third priority for bicycle improvements. Bicycle-friendly features can be incorporated on designated routes as part of the City's ongoing street reconstruction program. Intersection improvements, traffic calming, and other features benefit cyclists as well as pedestrians, and are straightforward to implement when intentionally designed to integrate with other improvements.

Bike lanes are identified for some streets on the Priority Bicycle Network that do not have room for dedicated facilities today. However, these streets represent important regional connections designated on MARC's Regional Bikeway Plan. Opportunities to incorporate dedicated bicycle facilities should be pursued when Roeland Park undertakes substantial street construction on these routes. In some cases, aditional right-ofway or easements may be necessary.



Figure 6 - Proposed Bicycle Network

Priority Intersections



Intersections form important links in a pedestrian and bicycle network. Intersections are where pedestrians and cyclists interact and share the same space with motorists. These conflict points are where collisions are most likely to occur and where walkers and bikers are most likely to feel uncomfortable. Even with quality sidewalks and bicycle facilities, inadequate crossing treatments and intersections can make travel challenging by foot or bike.

In addition to intersections where two or more public streets intersect, there are also conflict points at major driveways that require special attention. In these areas, where motorists mingle with pedestrians and cyclists, efforts should be made to minimize the number and width of driveways, and to provide clear signs and markings to make sure users of all transportation modes are aware and respectful of each other.

Safe Intersection Design

Features that can affect the quality of a pedestrian crossing include the presence of a marked crosswalk, intersection width (affecting crossing distance), curb radius, visibility of the crossing (due to vegetation, signs, or buildings), and the presence of curb ramps. The images to the right illustrate intersections with basic treatments that make them safer for pedestrians. Each has wide, visible crosswalks and American with Disabilities Act (ADA)-compliant curb ramps that aid mobility-impaired pedestrians. The image at top also displays a pedestrian refuge island that helps address the long crossing distance of the intersection and wide curb radius of the far corner.

Today, marked crossings exist mostly around and between the Roeland Park Shopping Center and Roesland Elementary School. Most crosswalks are in the continental style, which is highly visible to crossing motorists. Some crosswalks are marked in the parallel-line style, which is less visible. Most intersections in Roeland Park also have ADAcompliant curb ramps.

The intersections recommended for improvements generally have ADA curb ramps but lack adequate crosswalks. The maps on the following page and the table in the Implementation section list these intersections, as well as others that might be considered for additional improvements, such as bulbouts or signage. (The attached Quick Build Guide details some of these additional improvements, and how to implement them inexpensively or on an interim basis).



Ped Bike Image



Ped Bike Image

Proposed Improvements

First Priority:

Intersections of Priority Network Streets

The highest priority for intersection improvements are the locations where two different streets that are both on the Priority Sidewalk Network intersect each other. These are locations most likely to have pedestrian traffic, and often involve crossing streets with heavy traffic. Today, most intersections of priority network streets are missing crosswalks. The intersection of Rosewood Drive and 53rd Terrace is particularly important. This intersection is unsignalized and difficult to cross for pedestrians and cyclists today, but it represents a key east-west connector where priority routes converge. As Roe Avenue improvements are designed, signalization of this intersection should be considered.

Second Priority:

Intersections of Priority Streets with Other Streets

The second priority for intersection improvemetns are locations where priority network streets intersect other streets. These connections are important to create a continuous route along the priority network that is safe and comfortable. These intersections also provide access to the priority network from areas that require crossing the street.





Third Priority: Other Intersections

When sidewalk improvements and bicycle facilities are constructed on streets that are not part of the priority network, there is an opportunity to incorporate intersection improvements as well. Together, sidewalk and infrastructure improvements can complete a comfortable pedestrian network on all public streets in Roeland Park.



Improving All Sides of the Intersection

Within each intersection, the highest priority improvements are safe and comfortable crossings for those segments that link pedestrian routes on either side of the intersection. This context informs which segments of the intersection are most important to improve, and how many segments require improvement. Recognizing that the sidewalk network will continue to develop, and that many people today live or work or visit destinations on the side of a street where there is no sidewalk, it should be a long-term goal to provide safe and comfortable accommodation on all corners and segments of intersections.

Street Alignments

In some locations, improvements beyond crosswalk markings and ADA compliant curb ramps are necessary because of the particular layout of the road. The angle of intersecting streets, the width of the street, the permitted turning movements, and other factors may create barriers for pedestrian and cyclist comfort and safety. The Quick Build Guide identifies a variety of techniques to improve the performance of intersections with tools that can be deployed quickly and for low cost.



Figure 7 - Priority Intersections

Project Summaries

Sidewalks

Location	Priority	Side of Street	Located Between	Notes
Buena Vista St	First	West	Shawnee Mission Pkwy	
Community Center Ext to Skyline Dr	First	N/a	Rosewood Dr to Skyline Dr	Outside of R/W
Elledge pedestrian sidepath	Fist	N/a	Roe Blvd and Elledge Rd	
Granada to Roe Ln connection	Fist	N & E	End of Granada to Roe Ln	Potentially outside of R/W
Nall Ave	First	East	From 49th St to Nall Park sidepath	
Nall Park sidepath	First	N/a	Through Nall Park from Nall Ave to Rosewood Dr	Outside of R/W
Neosho Ave	First	West	48th St and 50th St	
Reinhardt Dr	First	East	47th St and 48th St	Neighborhood Greenway
Reinhardt Dr	First	East	End of Horizons parking to 50th St	Neighborhood Greenway
Roe Blvd	First	West	From 48th/49th to Johnson Dr	Planned CARS project shared use path
Roe Pkwy	First	East	48th St & level with end of other Roe Pkwy sgmt	
Roesland Elementary path	First	N/a	Parish Dr and Clark Dr	Neighborhood Greenway
Rosewood Dr	First	North	Roe Ave to Linden St	Second sidewalk
53rd Ter	First	North	Roe Ave to Rosewood Dr to Linden St	
56th St	First	North	Roe Ave and Granada St	
Location	Priority	Side of Street	Located Between	Notes
-----------------------------	----------	-------------------	--	-------
Alder Dr	Second	N & E	55th St and 56th St	
Ash St	Second	S & W	51st St and Sycamore Dr	
Birch St	Second	West	Roeland Dr and 58th St	
Birch St	Second	East	51st St and Sycamore Dr	
Canterbury Rd	Second	East	47th St and 48th St	
Canterbury Rd	Second	West	50th St and 51st St	
Clark Dr	Second	East	52nd Pl and 53rd St	
el Monte St	Second	West	47th St and dead end	
Howe Dr	Second	West	50th St and 51st St	
Linden St	Second	N & E	Sherwood Dr and 55th St	
Linden St	Second	East	52nd St and Rosewood Dr	
Mission Rd	Second	West	South of 47th St to start of side- walk	
Pawnee Dr	Second	East	50th and Reinhardt Dr	
Roe Pkwy (dead end segment)	Second	S & W	48th St and dead end	
Rosewood St	Second	West	Alder Dr and Ash Dr	
Sherwood Dr	Second	West	55th Ter and 56th St	
51st St	Second	North	Neosho Ave and Howe Dr	
51st St	Second	North	Canterbury St and Mission Rd	
52nd St	Second	South	Linden St and Roe Ave	
52nd St	Second	North	Neosho Ave and Howe Dr	
52nd Pl	Second	South	Clark Dr and Neosho Ave	
57th Ter	Second	North	Ash Dr and Cedar St	
58th St	Second	South	Nall Ave and Birch	

Location	Priority	Side of Street	Located Between	Notes
Alder Dr	Third	North	Birch St and Sherwood Dr	
Alhambra St	Third	East	47th St and Elledge Dr	
Ash Dr	Third	East	53rd St/Sycamore Dr and 55th St	
Birch St	Third	East	53rd St/Sycamore Dr and 55th St	
Birch St	Third	East	North of 49th St to dead end	
Briar St	Third	West	Alder St and 55th St	
Cedar St	Third	West	Linden St to 55th St	
Cedar St	Third	West	55th Ter to 56th St	
Cedar St	Third	East	57th St to 58th St	
Falmouth Rd	Third	East	47th St and 48th St	
Granada St	Third	N/E	Roe Ln and north end of Granada	
Granada St	Third	N/E	55th St and Johnson Dr	
Howe Dr	Third	West	49th St and 50th St	
Howe Dr	Third	West	51st St and 52nd Ter	
Linden St	Third	West	55th Ter and 56th St	
Pawnee Dr	Third	West	48th St and 50th St	
49th St	Third	South	Neosho Ave and Mohawk Dr	
49th St	Third	South	Pawnee Dr and Reinhardt Dr	
50th Ter	Third	South	Pawnee Dr and dead end	
51st Ter	Third	South	Rosewood Dr east to existing sidewalk	
52nd St	Third	North	Nall Ave and Birch St	
55th Ter	Third	North	Sherwood Dr and Roe Blvd	
56th St	Third	North	Roe Blvd and Granada St	
57th Ter	Third	South	Birch St and Roeland Dr	
58th St	Third	South	Birch St and Roeland Dr	
58th St	Third	South	Birch St and Roeland Dr	
Windsor	Third	East	47th St and 48th St	

Bikeways

Location	Infrastructure Type	Located Between	Notes
48th St	Neighborhood Greenway	Mission Rd and Parish Dr	
50th St	Neighborhood Greenway	Mission Rd and Neosho Ave	
50th Ter	Bicycle lane	Roe Blvd and Rosewood Dr	MARC Bikeway plan
51st St	Bicycle lane	Buena Vista St and Roe Blvd	
51st St	Bicycle lane	Rosewood Dr and Nall Ave	MARC Bikeway plan
53rd St	Neighborhood Greenway	Buena Vista St and Mission Rd	
53rd Ter	Neighborhood Greenway	Buena Vista St and Roe Blvd	
54th Ter	Neighborhood Greenway	Buena Vista and 55th St/Grana- da St	
55th St	Neighborhood Greenway	Granada St and Nall Ave	
Ash St	Neighborhood Greenway	56th St and Johnson Dr	
Buena Vista St	Neighborhood Greenway	Shawnee Mission Pkwy and Elledge Dr	
Cedar St	Neighborhood Greenway	51st St and Sycamore Dr	
Elledge Dr	Bicycle lane	Roe Ln and 47th St	
Fontana St	Neighborhood Greenway	47th St and Elledge Dr	
Juniper Dr	Neighborhood Greenway	Rosewood Dr and 56th St	
Mission Rd	Neighborhood Greenway	51st St and 53rd St	
Nall Ave	Neighborhood Greenway	Nall Park Path and 51st St	
Nall Ave	Bicycle lane	51st St and 58th St	
Nall Park Path	Shared-use path	Nall Ave to Rosewood Dr at Community Center	
Neosho Dr	Neighborhood Greenway	Elledge Dr and 53rd St	
Reinhardt Dr	Neighborhood Greenway	47th St and 53rd St	
Roe Blvd	Shared-use path, west side of street	48th St and Johnson Dr	
Roe Ln	Bicycle lane	Roe Blvd and city limits	MARC Bikeway plan
Roesland Elementary path	Neighborhood Greenway	Parish Dr and Clark Dr	
Rosewood Dr	Neighborhood Greenway	Community Center and Roe Blvd/53rd Ter	
Rosewood Dr	Bicycle lane	50th Ter and 51st St	MARC Bikeway plan
Sycamore Dr	Neighborhood Greenway	Nall Ave and Cedar St	

Intersections

Intersection	Priority	Notes
47th St and Elledge Dr	First	
47th St and Reinhardt Dr	First	
48th St and Mission Rd	First	
48th St and Neosho Ave	First	
48th St and Reinhardt Dr	First	
48th St and Roe Blvd	First	
48th St and Roe Ln	First	
48th St and Wells Dr	First	
50th St / Wells Dr and Neosho Ave	First	Complex intersection, improvements may involve adjustment to street geometry
50th St and Clark Dr	First	
50th St and Mission Rd	First	
50th St and Reinhardt Dr	First	
51 St and Nall Ave	First	
51st and Buena Vista St	First	
51st and Rosewood Dr	First	
53rd and Nall Ave	First	
53rd St and Buena Vista St	First	
53rd St and Neosho Ave	First	
53rd Ter and Buena Vista St	First	
53rd Ter and Roe Blvd	First	
55th and Nall Ave	First	Complex 5-way intersection, improvements may involve adjustment to street geometry
55th St and Shawnee Mission Pkwy	First	
56th St and Roe Blvd	First	
57th and Nall Ave	First	
57th St and Ash Dr	First	
57th St and Roe Blvd	First	
57th St and Roeland Dr	First	
Ash Dr and Johnson Dr	First	
Buena Vista and Shawnee Mission Pkwy (w)	First	
Clark Dr at Roesland Elementary Path	First	
Elledge Dr and Neosho Ave	First	
Elledge Dr and Delmar St	First	
Roe Blvd at Elledge path extension	First	
Roeland Dr and Johnson Dr	First	
Rosewood Dr and Juniper Dr	First	
Rosewood Dr at Community Center path	First	
Sycamore St and Cedar St	First	
Sycamore St and Juniper Dr	First	
Sycamore St and Rosewood Dr	First	

47th and Delmar St	Second
47th St and Alhambra	Second
47th St and Cantebury Rd	Second
47th St and el Monte St	Second
47th St and Falmouth Rd	Second
47th St and Fontana St	Second
47th St and Mohawk Dr	Second
47th St and Windsor St	Second
48th Ln and 48th St	Second
48th St and Cantebury Rd	Second
48th St and Catalina St	Second
48th St and Falmouth Rd	Second
48th St and Mohawk Dr	Second
48th St and Pawnee Dr	Second
48th St and Roe Pkwy	Second
48th St and Windsor St	Second
49th and Nall Ave	Second
49th and Neosho Ave	Second
49th St and Rosewood Dr	Second
49th Ter and Rosewood Dr	Second
50th and Nall Ave	Second
50th St and Cantebury Rd	Second
50th St and Howe Dr	Second
50th St and Mohawk Dr	Second
50th St and Pawnee Dr	Second
50th St and Rosewood Dr	Second
50th Ter and Nall Ave	Second
50th Ter and Nall Ave	Second
51st and Ash St	Second
51st and Birch St	Second
51st and Briar St	Second
51st St and Fontana St	Second
51st St and Neosho Ave	Second
51st St and Rosewood Dr	Second
51st St and Southridge St	Second
51st Ter and Cedar St	Second
51st Ter and Rosewood Dr	Second
52nd and Nall Ave	Second
52nd PI and Reinhardt Dr	Second
52nd St and Neosho Ave	Second
52nd Ter and Buena Vista St	Second
52nd Ter and Neosho Ave	Second
52nd Ter and Roe Blvd	Second
53rd St and Clark Dr	Second

53rd St and Mohawk St	Second	
54th St and Roe Blvd	Second	
54th Ter and Buena Vista St	Second	
54th Ter and Roe Blvd	Second	
55th and Ash Dr	Second	
55th and Birch St	Second	On Priority Network
55th and Briar St	Second	
55th and Rosewood Dr	Second	
55th St and Cedar St	Second	
55th St and Granada St	Second	
55th St and Sherwood Dr	Second	
56th St and Juniper Dr	Second	
57th St and Linden St	Second	
Alder Dr and Juniper Dr	Second	
Catalina St and Buena Vista St	Second	
Elledge Dr and Alhambra	Second	
Elledge Dr and Fontana (S)	Second	
Parish Dr and Neosho Ave	Second	
Pawnee Dr and Reinhardt Dr	Second	
Roe Blvd and Sycamore Dr	Second	
Roe Ln and Southridge St	Second	
Roe Ln at Granada St sidewalk extension	Second	
Rosewood Dr and Cedar St	Second	
Sherwood Dr and Rosewood Dr	Second	
Sycamore Dr and Buena Vista St	Second	
Sycamore St and Alder Ln	Second	
Sycamore St and Alder Ln	Second	
Sycamore St and Ash St	Second	
Sycamore St and Birch St	Second	
54th St and Buena Vista St	Second	
57th St and Cedar St	Second	

47th Pl and Mohawk Dr	Third
47th St and Delmar St	Third
47th Ter and Catalina St	Third
47th Ter and Delmar St	Third
47th Ter and Mohawk Dr	Third
48th Ter and Pawnee Dr	Third
48th Ter and Reinhardt Dr	Third
49th St and Birch St	Third
49th St and Briar St	Third
49th St and Howe Dr	Third
49th St and Juniper Dr	Third
49th St and Mohawk Dr	Third
49th St and Pawnee Dr	Third
49th St and Reinhardt Dr	Third
49th Ter and Birch St	Third
50th and Birch St	Third
50th Ter and Briar St	Third
50th Ter and Juniper Dr	Third
50th Ter and Reinhardt dr	Third
51st St and Cantebury Rd	Third
51st St and Howe Dr	Third
52nd and Birch St	Third
52nd Pl and Clark Dr	Third
52nd Pl and Howe Dr	Third
52nd Pl and Mohawk St	Third
52nd St and Howe Dr	Third
52nd Ter and Catalina St	Third
52nd Ter and Clark Dr	Third
52nd Ter and Delmar St	Third
52nd Ter and Fontana St	Third
52nd Ter and Granada St	Third
52nd Ter and Howe Dr	Third
52nd Ter and Southridge St	Third
54th Ter and Granada St	Third
55th St and Linden St	Third
55th Ter and Cedar St	Third
55th Ter and Juniper	Third
55th Ter and Linden St	Third
55th Ter and Roe Blvd	Third
55th Ter and Sherwood Dr	Third
56th and Nall Ave	Third
56th St and Cedar St	Third
56th St and Granada St	Third
56th St and Linden St	Third

56th St and Sherwood Dr	Third
57th and Birch St	Third
57th Ter and Ash Dr	Third
57th Ter and Birch St	Third
57th Ter and Cedar St	Third
57th Ter and Roeland Dr	Third
58th and Birch St	Third
58th and Nall Ave	Third
58th St and Ash Dr	Third
58th St and Roeland Dr	Third
Alder Dr and Briar St	Third
Alder Dr and Sherwood Dr	Third
Ash Dr and Rosewood St	Third
Elledge Dr and Catalina St	Third
Linden St and Cedar St	Third
Lucas Ln and Reinhardt Dr	Third
Parish Dr at Roesland Elementary path	Third
Roeland Dr and Birch St	Third
Rosewood Dr and 53rd Ter	Third
Rosewood Dr and Linden St	Third
Rosewood Dr and Roe Blvd	Third
Sherwood Dr and Linden St	Third
Skyline Dr at Community Center path extension	Third
Sycamore Dr and Delmar St	Third
Sycamore Dr and Fontana St	Third
Sycamore Dr and Granada St	Third
Sycamore Dr and Southridge St	Third

Quick Fix Guide

Roeland Park, Kansas | August 2017

Quick Fix Guide

What's in the Guide?

The Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Strategy lays out a path toward achieving a safe, interconnected city for people traveling on foot and by bicycle. The strategy identifies locations where improvements are recommended, but recognizes that the detailed design of interventions will be crafted later, in response to budgetary constraints and public input.

Major interventions -- such as sidewalk construction, or the installation of a new traffic signal -- are often implemented through a conventional planning/design process, public input, and a formal budget program. These steps can sometimes require more resources and a longer project timeline.

Alternative approaches to project delivery may be implemented more quickly and inexpensively using a "quick-build" method. Precedents exist for building simple traffic calming measures, pedestrian crossings, and basic bike infrastructure using this a "quick-build" approach.

Quick-build interventions offer several benefits:

- Interventions are built with inexpensive materials that reduce project cost.
- A smaller cost means a municipality may be able to fund a quick-build project more quickly, avoiding long budgeting processes or the funding cycle for federal grants.
- Quick-build projects can function as demonstration or pilot projects that test the effectiveness of a design. Because the materials are often non-permanent or easily removable, officials can easily adapt an intervention or to replace it with more permanent construction.

This guide highlights a number of interventions that could be constructed using this quick-build approach that would support recommendations in the Pedestrian and Bicycle Infrastructure Strategy. An additional section shows how these interventions can be adapted for different purposes, from a pop-up demonstration to permanent infrastructure.

34/

1251

122

32 | Roeland Park, KS

83,0

Table of Contents

Interventions:	tin all
Pavement Markings	34
Bicycle Infrastructure	36
Intersections	38
Curb Extensions	40
Signs	42
The Quick Build Process	43
Materials and Phasing	44
Other Resources	46

mage source: Better Block KC

Pavement Markings

Marked Crosswalks

Highlighting a pedestrian crossing with a painted crosswalk alerts drivers to the potential presence of a pedestrian and helps indicate where the pedestrian can safely cross.

- "Continental" and "ladder" style crosswalks are the most visible styles.
- Especially at uncontrolled, mid-block crossings, marked crosswalks should be accompanied by pedestrian-crossing signage.
- Stop bars across the vehicle travel lane are recommended to reinforce the presence of the crosswalk.
- Permanent pavement markings should be done with thermoplastic, which is more reflective and more durable than other materials.





Source: PedBike Images



Source: PedBike Images\Michael Frederick

Lane Striping

On arterial and collector streets, the striping configuration can be changed or new striping added to reduce lane width.

- Research shows that reducing lane widths to as narrow as 10 feet can reduce average speed and reduce highend speeding, while not diminishing the capacity or level of service of the road.
- Restriping and narrowing lanes offers the opportunity to add new facilities to the road, such as bike lanes or on-street parking.
- Adding striping to define the edge of a parking lane constrains the travel lane and can slow traffic. Parking also has an extra traffic calming benefit because it forces traffic to stop as a vehicle pulls into or out of a parking space.
- Restriping can be completed as part of already planned resurfacing projects or as its own project.





Source: FHWA



Source: Better Block KC



Source: FHWA

Bicycle Infrastructure

Bike Lanes

Bike lanes provide a dedicated space for cyclists to travel in the roadway. A welldesigned lane improves the safety and comfort of cyclists and helps motorists interact with cyclists.

- Typically bike lanes are located on the outside of an automobile lane, adjacent to the curb.
- If on-street parking is permitted, the lane may be located between the travel lane and parking lane, or along the curb, buffered from the travel lane by the parking lane.
- Lanes should be a minimum of 5 feet wide (including the curb gutter) with a rideable surface of 4 feet minimum.
- An additional buffer at least 18 inches wide is strongly recommended between a bike lane and a parking lane to protect cyclists from the "door zone" of parked cars.
- A lane line should be dashed where the lane passes along a right-turn lane, through an intersection or past the entrance to a driveway, indicating that a car might cross the bike lane. Painting the entire width of the lane bright green along these segments is recommended to remind motorists and cyclists of the conflict zone.
- Bollards, planters, or jersey barriers can provide vertical separation of a bike lane from automobile traffic or parked cars.



Source: NACTC



Source: City of Columbus, OH



Source: NACTC

Neighborhood Greenways

Sometimes called "Bicycle Boulevards," the Neighborhood Greenways are streets where conditions allow bicycle traffic to safely mix with automobiles.

- Neighborhood Greenways use signs, pavement markings, and traffic calming measures to slow vehicles and increase comfort for cyclists.
- Many streets in Roeland Park are good candidates for Neighborhood Greenways. They are too narrow for bike lanes but could be enhanced by minor design modifications that slow down traffic and enhance safety.
- Neighborhood Greenways present an opportunity to enhance priority streets for all users, and to incorporate design elements that increase the comfort and safety for cyclists in coordination with any adjacent sidewalk improvements.
- A network of Neighborhood Greenways is recommended in the Pedestrian & Bicycle Strategy. This network overlaps with the Priority Sidewalk Network.

Bike Corrals

Bike corrals are large bicycle racks placed in a car parking space in a roadway or parking lot and protected by curbs or barriers.

- Corrals provide bicycle parking where there is demand for parking but where there is limited space for a rack off-street.
- A corral occupying one parking space can accomodate 8-24 bicycles, depending on the size of the space and the design of the corral.



Source: NACTO



Source: BikeMore Baltimore



Source: NACTO

Intersections

Complex Intersections

Complex intersections can create hazardous conditions for pedestrians. Simple adjustments to intersection geometry can address some of the hazards.



Source: Google Streetview

- Complex intersections result from a street intersecting with another street at a non-right angle, or from more than two streets intersecting.
- Such unconventional intersections create potentially hazardous conditions for pedestrians and make vehicle movements more complicated and hard to manage.
- Acute or obtuse angled intersections can reduce visibility for motorists or permit fast turns, which endanger pedestrians.
- Meanwhile, these intersections can increase the crossing distance for pedestrians.
- Adjusting complex intersections can make them safer for pedestrians and motorists. When intersections are reconfigured, roadway space can often be reallocated for pedestrian use.

Example Treatments

Y-Intersection

"Add island or square-off. Limit turning speed around obtuse angle, shorten crossings, separate vehicle flows."

Y Plus Grid

"Add island or square-off. Limit turning speed around obtuse angle, shorten crossings, separate vehicle flows."

Small and Large "Use curbs to manage drivers. Extend medians."



Driveways

Driveways, especially at the entrances to major commercial or multifamily developments, present many of the same challenges as full intersections.

- Driveway width, radius, and other features can affect pedestrian safety. Driveways that are too wide across might encourage motorist to speed through a driveway.
 Wide turning radii also permit fast and reckless driving through a driveway.
- In most cases, crossing pedestrians have the right-of-way at driveways, but there is often little to indicate this to motorists.
- Striping of crosswalks or stop lines can help alert motorists to the potential presence of people walking.
- Raised crossings can encourage careful maneuvering by motorists at driveway entrances and prioritize pedestrian traffic.
- Splitter islands channelize and guide traffic through a driveway entrance. These can be built with bollards and striping. A center lane stripe can achieve a similar effect.
- Differentiating sidewalk material or texture across a driveway can also bring attention to potential pedestrians, though this is most likely a longer-term measure.



Source: Google Streetview



Source: PedBike Images\Laura Sandt



Source: PedBike Images\Dan Burden

Curb Extensions

Curb extensions, or bulb-outs, expand the edge of a curb into a roadway. This space might be used for additional landscaping or wider sidewalks, and usually functions as a traffic calming element by narrowing the travel lane and prompting drivers to slow.

Intersections

Bulb-outs at intersections can be designed to slow approaching traffic, to shorten the crossing distance for pedestrians, or to calm vehicle turns by making curb radii smaller.

- Bulb-outs appear to constrain the travel lane, encouraging traffic to slow.
- By extending the curb into the street, the crossing is distance is shortened for pedestrians.
- With the extended sidewalk, pedestrians are more likely to be in a driver's field of vision.
- Intersection bulb-outs can shorten the turn radius for vehicles, forcing motorists to turn more carefully and increasing safety for pedestrians.



Source: PedBike Images



Source: City of Seattle

Pinch Points & Chicanes

Curb extensions can slow traffic or improve pedestrian crossings at mid-block locations.

• Pinch-points are mid-block curb extensions that calm traffic by narrowing the travel lane, while reducing the crossing distance for pedestrians.

- A chicane diverts travel lanes into an s-shaped path, forcing drivers to slow and maneuver more carefully.
- Combined with a crosswalk, a mid-block bulb-out can form a mid-block pedestrian crossing with shorter crossing distance and better visibility for pedestrians.



Source: Above & below: FHWA



Sidewalk Widening

Pedestrian space can be provided without building new sidewalks by expanding the sidewalk zone beyond the curb line.

- Where the space between curbs is wider than is necessary for travel lanes, the extra space can be devoted to pedestrians. This space functions as a widening of existing sidewalks or as a new sidewalk where none exists. Typically, barriers, such as plastic bollards or planter boxes, are placed to separate pedestrian space from vehicles.
- A simple intervention might only include barriers; a more comprehensive project could include street furniture, plants, pavement paint and other elements to increase visibility and attractiveness of the project.
- Sidewalk widening can be useful to relieve busy sidewalks, as a traffic calming measure or to provide new amenity zones.

Parklets

Like sidewalk widening, parklets reallocate road space to pedestrian uses. A parklet usually consists of a small platform occupying several parking spaces on which benches or street furniture can be placed. This essentially creates a small park.

- Parklets can function as small gathering spaces. Adjacent cafes and restaurants often add outdoor seating to the parklet.
- Parklets can also be used to create pedestrian-friendly spaces within parking lots.
- This intervention is often implemented with cooperation with property owners or through community initiative.



Source: Better Block KC



Source: NACTO



Source: NACTO

Signs

Signs

Signs can be a cost-effective measure to encourage vehicles to yield to pedestrians at crossings.

- Signs should be used in conjunction with marked crossings.
- The effectiveness of different signage types varies. At mid-block crossings, small, in-street pedestrian-crossing signs have been shown to be nearly as effective as a full on-call signal in getting motorists to yield.
- High-visibility signs should be placed on both sides of a street. This creates a "gateway effect" that reinforces the presence of a crossing.



Source: NACTC



Source: BikeWalkKC

The Quick-Build Process

Quick-build projects can be designed to meet a variety of goals. Such interventions can be designed to be a permanent, final design or they can form part of an iterative process in which a more captialintensive design is built later. Because they are often built using less permanent materials, quickbuild projects can function as very basic "demonstration" projects that show the public how a particular design – such as a bike lane – works. Or they might also work as "pilot" projects in which the effectiveness of the change is assessed. These scenarios can support a public engagement process. Meanwhile, a quick-build project could serve as an interim installation of an intervention until funding is secured for a more expensive, permanent construction.

Different levels of financial commitment, government involvement, and public engagement may be needed or advisable, based on the intended goals of the quick-build intervention. The table below from Street Plans Collaborative details the requirements for different quick-build project types.

This chart illustrates the progression of an iterative approach to project delivery. Though not all projects need to follow this exact model, it can be helpful to see how each project phase builds towards the next, using incremental steps to deliver a capital project intended to create lasting change.				070
Project Type (time interval - relative cost)	DEMONSTRATION (1 day - 1 month • \$)	PILOT (1 month- 1 year • \$\$)	INTERIM DESIGN (1 year - 5 years • \$\$\$)	LONG-TERM/CAPITAL (5 years - 50 years - \$\$\$\$)
Project Leaders	Can be led by anyone (city, citizen group, or both!)	Government / organizational leadership + involvement required	Government / organizational leadership + involvement required	Government / organizational leadership + involvement required
Permission Status	Sanctioned or unsanctioned	Always sanctioned	Always sanctioned	Always sanctioned
Materials	Low-cost, typically low- durability. Can be borrowed or easily made	Relatively low-cost, but semi- durable materials	Low-moderate cost materials, designed to balance flexibility with maintenance needs	High-cost permanent materials that cannot easily be adjusted
Public Involvement	Public input + public action	Public input, champion engagment, government / organizational stewardship	Public input, government / organizational stewardship	Public input, government / organizational stewardship
Flexibility of Design	High: organizers expect project to be adjusted and removed.	High: organizers expect project to be adjusted; it <i>may</i> be re- moved if it does not meet goals	Moderate: organizers expect project to be adjusted, but it is intended to remain in place until capital upgrades are possible	Low: project is considered a permanent capital upgrade that is unlikely to be adjusted signifi- cantly once installed
Collect data to refine approach for current or future projects?	Recommended	Always	Always	Always - project performance can inform future investments

Source: Street Plans Collaborative, Tactical Urbanist's Guide to Materials and Design, Version 1.0

Materials and Phasing

Many of the benefits of quick-build projects are made possible by using inexpensive, versatile materials. Even within the range of quick-materials, different quality materials exist to support different possible goals of a quick-build project. The examples below show how the same type of intervention can be built with different materials to support a different type of project goal.

Examples

Marked crosswalk



Source: Better Block K0

Project term: Demonstration

Materials: Tape, chalk, paint



Source: BikeWalkKC

Project term: Pilot or permanent Materials: Paint



Source: FHWA

Project term: Permanent

Materials: Durable markings such as epoxy paint, thermoplastic paint, preformed plastic

Protected Bike Lane



Source: Greater Victoria Placemaking Network

Project term: Demonstration, pilot

Materials: Traffic cones, store-bought planters



Source: City of Columbus, OH

Project term: Interim or permanent

Materials: Traffic cones, store-bought planters, paint



Source: City of Cambridge, MA

Project term: Permanent

Materials: Concrete separation from roadway

Curb extension



Source: Better Block K

Project term: Demonstration

Materials:

Store-bought plants, removeable planters, cones, paint



Source: City of Austin

Project term: Pilot, interim, or permanent

Materials: Flexible delineator posts, removeable planters, epoxy paint



Source: FHWA

Project term: Permanent

Materials: Concrete curb

Intersection



Source: TrailNet St. Louis

Project term: Demonstration

Materials:

Cones, DIY barriers, paint, chalk, signs



Source: Wikimedia\Richard Drdul

Project term: Pilot, interim, or permanent

Materials: Temporary curb, signs



Source: PedBike Images

Project term: Permanent

Materials: Concrete curb, signs

Other Resources

The following publications have additional information on quick-build projects, including intervention designs, materials, and best practices for project delivery.



Urban Street Design Guide

National Association of City Transportation Officials (NACTO)

A best practice guide for designing safe multimodal streets



Quick Builds for Better Streets *People for Bikes*

This publication describes the quick-build model from the project delivery perspective



Tactical Urbanist's Guide to Materials and Design

Street Plans Collaborative

A detailed guide to materials and best practices for pop-up and quick-build infrastructure projects



Slow Your Street

Trailnet (St. Louis)

A guide for building "pop-up" traffic-calming demonstrations

46 | Roeland Park, KS

This report was produced for City of Roeland Park by BikeWalkKC and made possible through funding by the LiveWell Johnson County program and the Johnson County Department of Health and Environment.

BikeWalkKC 3269 Gillham Road, Suite C Kansas City, MO 64109 816-205-7056 info@bikewalkkc.org



Our mission is to redefine our streets as places for people to build a culture of active living.

Item Number: DI Committee 3/ Meeting Date:

DISCUSSION ITEMS- II.-2. 3/7/2022



City of Roeland Park

Action Item Summary

Date:	3/1/2022
Submitted By:	Erin Winn
Committee/Department:	Neighborhood Services
Title:	Review 47th Street Overlay District Ordinance Revisions - 10 min
Item Type:	Discussion

Recommendation:

To review the changes to the 47th Street Overlay District

Details:

Background

In 2000, following the findings of a Neighborhood Community Impact Grant funded study, the City of Roeland Park, the City of Westwood and the Unified Government of Wyandotte County and Kansas City, KS established a multi-jurisdictional overlay district to govern development of the 47th Street Corridor. The ordinance established additional requirements for development in the area and established a multi-jurisdictional review committee as an additional layer of approval for any potential 47th Street development.

Original focus areas

- A common streetscape between the 3 jurisdictions
- Municipal gateways
- improved sidewalks- Within the 'Village' area, an urban sidewalk model was envisioned with wider sidewalks was proposed. Outside of the village, an emphasis onsidewalk continuity and appropriate buffers from the roadways was made.
- Street furniture, lighting, landscaping, and street tress were all addressed with the goal of a common palette
- Architectural character was addressed in detail, as was signage, screening of undesirable elements, and residential buffers.

Revisions

In 2016 members of the 47th Street Committee began studying the original ordinance and

subsequent development activity to assess areas of improvement upon review of how the language was interpreted and applied by developers. The review committee recommended the following changes:

- Remove the development review committee
- Clarifying the ordinance language where significant redundancies and unnecessary overlaps with the respective jurisdictions zoning language occurred.
- Removing references to the original study, it was deemed onerous to expect developers to review that study, in addition to the overlay district and underlying zoning district.
- Removing excessively restrictive language that has been difficult if not impossible to enforce over the years the ordinance has been in effect
- Addressing issues in the existing ordinance related to shared parking and overall parking capacity.
- Elimination of separation of Multi-Family and Commercial site design design standards, simplified to just site design standards addressing both uses, as the language was nearly identical between the two. Issues of MFR Density were already left to the local jurisdiction, and

issues of Land Use are unchanged from the original text.

Staff and Planning Commissioners from all three jurisdictions are working to finalize a revised ordinance that will be consistent across all municipalities.

How does item relate to Strategic Plan?

How does item benefit Community for all Ages?

Item Number: I Committee 3 Meeting Date:

DISCUSSION ITEMS- II.-3. 3/7/2022



City of Roeland Park

Action Item Summary

Date:	2/28/2022
Submitted By:	Kelley Nielsen
Committee/Department:	Admin.
Title:	Discuss Changing City Hall Administrative Assistant schedule back to 8-5 on Mondays - 10 min
Item Type:	Other

Recommendation:

Staff recommends changing City Hall's hours back to 8-5 on Mondays. City Hall is busier during the hours of 8-5 and gets busier during the spring and summer months. Most permits, licensing and ticket payments are made during business hours or online. Attached is the 2-year activity which shows very little utilization of the extended hours.

Details:

2020 Budget Objective:1. Extend City Hall office hours to 7 p.m. 1 day per week.

If a patron needs to conduct business with the City after 5 pm currently they must do it remotely or take time away from their work to come to City Hall before 5 pm. Developing a flexible work schedule for the administrative staff to allow City Hall to remain open until 7:00 pm one day each week would make it easier for patrons to conduct business at City Hall during the week day. The flexible work schedule approach would avoid any additional personnel costs.

How does item relate to Strategic Plan?

How does item benefit Community for all Ages?

ATTACHMENTS:

Description

Monday Evening Report

Type Cover Memo

Monday Evening Report								
DATES	CALL/ IN- PERSON	PERMITS	LICENSES	TICKETS	OTHER	DETAILS		
2020								
MARCH	Call at 5:10pm		1			To clarify animal license		
APRIL						p. coccu. c		
MAY								
JUNE								
JULY	Call at 5:15pm		1			To confirm rental license deadline		
AUGUST								
SEPTEMBER								
OCTOBER								
NOVEMBER								
DECEMBER			_					
			2	021				
JANUARY	Call 1/4 at 5:45pm			1		Ticket question		
	Call 1/25 at 5:10pm				1	Resident re: code violation letter		
FEBRUARY								
MARCH	Call 3/29 at 5:54pm				1	"When is the pool open?"		
APRIL	In-person at 5:40pm				1	Women locked out of car @ Aldi		
	In-person at 6:00pm			1		Resident complaint (taxes & code restrictions)		
MAY								
JUNE	In-person at 6:30pm			1		Ticket payment		
JULY								
AUGUST	Call 8/9 at 5:25pm				1	Help to reserve R Park		
	In-person 8/16 at 5:55pm				1	Question re: City Council meetings		
SEPTEMBER								
OCTOBER								
NOVEMBER								
DECEMBER	Call 12/27 at 5:15pm					Amazon driver called with delivery (City Hall locked)		
			2	022				
JANUARY								
FEBRUARY								
TOTALS			2	3	5			

Item Number: DISCUSSION ITEMS- II.-4. Committee 3/7/2022 Meeting Date:



City of Roeland Park

Action Item Summary

Date:	12/30/2021
Submitted By:	Keith Moody
Committee/Department:	Admin.
Title:	Review of Storm Water Utility Options - 2022 Objective
Item Type:	Discussion

Recommendation:

Staff is looking for direction from Council on if or how to proceed further development of a storm water utility.

Details:

Council discussed this topic at their 1/3/22 workshop. Indicating that they would like some time to consider and then continue the discussion. No additional information was requested by Council, the information below and attached are from the 1/3/22 initial workshop discussion item.

This item is a 2022 Objective, the complete objective item is listed in the "Additional Information" section below.

The attached presentation reflects insights provided by the City Administrator, City Attorney and City Engineer. It also reflects an implementation scenario that is revenue neutral for the City. This scenario provides clarity on how a new storm water fee with assumed reduction in the property tax mill impacts each of three primary property types (residential, commercial, and property tax exempt). Implementation of a storm water utility need not be revenue neutral.

The assumed method of applying the storm water fee is based upon impervious area (the primary element contributing to storm water run off) which is consistent with the approach employed by the other JOCO cities with a storm water fee. Attached is a map reflecting the impervious area identified by Larkin using the County's GIS system.

A storm water utility fee can be used to maintain, replace and operate the components of the storm water collection and conveyance system including, curbs, inlets, piping, open drainage ways along with staff, supplies and contractual services dedicated to storm sewer services. Street sweeping, catch basin cleaning, and brush/debri removal from drainage ways are examples of routine

maintenance items that would also be eligible for funding through the storm water fee.

How does item relate to Strategic Plan?

How does item benefit Community for all Ages?

Additional Information

1. Investigate Storm Water Utility Options Available to Roeland Park

<u>Justification:</u> Currently Roeland Park does not operate a storm water utility as is common among neighboring Johnson County communities. The 2020 version of the Single-Family Cost of Living Comparison showed that communities that operate a storm water utility and employ a related utility fee also tend to enjoy a lower property tax mill rate. Implementing a storm water utility could further diversify the revenue structure of the community, which is Strategic Plan Goal and Strategy 1.D- Dedicate resources to create a financial plan with the purpose to diversify the revenue base.

The investigation would entail an initial legal assessment of how a storm water utility may be established considering any unique circumstances in Roeland Park. The investigation would also entail a high-level engineering analysis to identify rough impervious surface area, common methods of applying a fee as well as identifying fees contributed by different land uses. The investigation would also look at how the resources can be deployed.

Cost Estimate: \$5,000 Account 270.5209 Engineering Services

Completion Date: 3/31/2022

Responsible Party: City Administrator, Public Works Director, City Council

Submitted By:

Keith Moody, City Administrator

ATTACHMENTS:

	Description	Туре
D	Storm Water Utility Options Presentation	Cover Memo
D	Roeland Park Impervious Area Map	Cover Memo

STORM WATER UTILITY DISCUSSION

1/3/22

STORM WATER UTILITY ASSUMPTIONS & OVERVIEW

- Presumed fee of \$.0289/ impervious square foot.
- Presumed average \$70/yr. fee per single family lot.
- Utility fee would not be applied to lots currently subject to storm water improvement assessment. (Average Assessment for RC12= \$224, RC13= \$245, RC14= \$150; assessment lasts for 10 years, 1,339 lots currently pay an assessment, roughly half of the single family lots)
- Fee applied to all types of uses. The total fees by type of land use:
 - Single Family Lots= \$199,500
 - Multifamily/Commercial/Office/Industrial Sites= \$72,600
 - Churches and Schools= \$21,000
 - City Owned Facilities= \$12,500
- Total Estimated Annual Utility Fee Revenues Based Upon these Assumptions= \$305,600

PROPERTY TAX AND STORM WATER ASSESSMENT INFORMATION

- 18% of property tax revenues come from commercial and 82% comes from residential properties.
- Each 1 mill equals \$103,000 in tax revenue, \$18.5k from commercial property and \$84.5k from residential property.
- Cities with a storm water utility in JOCO have fees that range from \$33 to \$336 per single-family lot, the average is \$131/yr./lot.
- The assumed \$70/yr./lot fee is less than half of the lowest current storm water improvement assessment in Roeland Park and 53% of the average storm water utility fee collected in JOCO per single family lot.
Storm Water Utility Cost for a Single Family- 2020



INITIAL IMPLEMENTATION

- Schools, churches, the City, and the Library do not pay property taxes but would generally be subject to a storm water utility fee imposed by a City.
- RC12 has 427 lots (equal to \$30k in utility fees), RC13 has 248 (equal to \$17k in utility fees) and RC 14 has 664 (equal to \$46k in utility fees) for a total of 1,339 lots currently subject to a storm water improvement assessment which would reduce the utility revenue by \$93k from the \$305,600 estimate; roughly 1/3 of the total.
- The initial implementation could generate around \$200k in storm water fees.
- Initial implementation could entail around a 2-mill reduction in the tax levy netting the budget impact to zero.

FULL IMPLEMENTATION

- Once all of the single family lots are paying the utility fee (2027) the mill could be reduced by 3 (from the current levy) and the net impact would be around a \$12 savings to an average home based upon the 2022 average home value (of \$236,800).
- A 3-mill reduction would reduce property taxes paid by commercial property \$55.5k and reduce residential property taxes paid by \$253.5k.
- Commercial Property would see a net increase in taxes/fees paid of \$17,100 (\$72,600 in new storm sewer fees - \$55,500 in fewer property taxes).
- Residential Property would see a net decrease in taxes/fees paid of \$54,000 (\$199,500 in new storm sewer fees \$253.,500 in fewer property taxes).
- Schools, Government Entities and Churches would see an increase in fees paid of \$33,500

Net change in taxes and fees to the City of -\$3,400.

DISCUSSION AND DIRECTION

- If the storm water utility fee is not increased annually by the amount that property taxes would have increased on the presumed 3 mill reduction, the net decline in taxes and fees will grow from the initial -\$3,400. Future Council's will need to act on an annual basis to manage this delta.
- Questions?
- Is implementing a storm water utility fee something Council would like to consider further?
- If so, would you like to consider initial implementation with only those properties currently not subject to a storm water improvement assessment?
- If so, would you want to employ an approach that results in a neutral impact upon revenues?

				W-48TH ST	
	A CONTRACTOR				
			HARDT-DR		
	And Constant				
		A CHERT			
			den a		
			Mar Contraction		
	A P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P P	EBEBER A			
		MARPERSON			
		WEADELO FERENCE			
		A SO DUM	<u>7</u>		
	Non-Residential Impervious Square Footage Totals				
		Building Area (sf)	Pavement Area (sf)	Recreational Surfaces (sf)	Total
	Schools and Churches	279,125	375,625	72,300	727,050
	Businesses / Multi-Family	858,693	1,633,232	20,070	2,511,994
	Public Uses	113,8/4	281,810	4/,8/1	443,555
	Total	1,231,092	2,290,000	140,242	
	Impervious Total Area	3,682,600	sf		
CITY OF R	UELAND MARK - IN	175KA100	5 SQUAR		E IUIALS

Legend	
BUILDING FOOTPRINT	
RECREATIONAL SURFACES	
BUSINESSES/MULTIFAMILY LAND) USE
PUBLIC USE LAND USE	
Religious Land Use	
SCHOOL LAND USE	
PAVEMENT EDGE	
PROPERTY LINES	
Roeland Park Legal Boundar	RY

\$106,427
\$199,500
\$305,927
L A M P R Y N E A R S O I

Item Number: Committee Meeting Date: DISCUSSION ITEMS- II.-5. 3/7/2022



City of Roeland Park

Action Item Summary

Date:
Submitted By:
Committee/Department

Title:

Executive Session - "I move to recess the Governing Body into executive session in order to discuss the potential acquisition of real estate, pursuant to the real estate exception of the Kansas Open Meetings Act, K.S.A.75-4319(b)(6). The open meeting to resume at _____ in the council chamber."

Item Type:

Recommendation:

Details:

How does item relate to Strategic Plan?

How does item benefit Community for all Ages?