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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Project Overview
This report represents the culmination of a yearlong effort to investigate sidewalk policy in Kansas City, Missouri and better understand the nuances behind the low public opinion of the city’s sidewalks. Sidewalks are an important aspect of life in a city but poor funding and lack of systematic maintenance have resulted in diminished walkability. Low citizen satisfaction ratings of the sidewalk network are a direct reflection of this underinvestment.

It is with this understanding that a partnership of BikeWalkKC, The MidtownKC Post, The Whole Person, The Mattie Rhodes Center, and The Front Porch Alliance launched SidewalksKC. The project was an effort to better understand the underlying causes of the poor condition of the sidewalk network and provide tangible solutions to addressing those challenges.

The steering committee investigated current policy, interviewed citizens, conducted surveys, and organized a three-part community action planning workshop.

Local Plan and Policy Review
A host of adopted plans and policies have codified the city’s commitment to walking as a solution to public health, safety, quality of life, and equity. The city’s comprehensive plan firmly planted the vision of a walkable community, followed by area plans adding further detail to that vision. Other policies specifically call for more investment in active transportation.

And in 2006 the city auditor conducted a performance audit of the city’s sidewalk program that underscored the need to address fundamental flaws in the way the city maintained its sidewalk network. Kansas City’s approach to sidewalks however, has seen little change. As a result, sidewalks continue to receive very low marks in the annual Citizen Satisfaction Survey.

Public Input
A series of three community action planning sessions convened stakeholders from all parts of the city. Many represented neighborhood associations in an official capacity while others were simply concerned citizens with a personal interest in walkability. Over the course of the planning sessions a general consensus on a vision and policy objectives became apparent.

Importance of Walkability
Safe Routes to School
Communities for All Ages
Public Health and Safety
Environment
Equity and Mobility
Quality of Life
SidewalksKC Common Values

1 Sidewalks are a fundamental layer of the transportation network.
2 Sidewalks are critical for the sustainability, health, and economic vitality of the city.
3 Accessibility in the public rights of way should be a top priority for the city.
4 Cost of sidewalks should not be sole responsibility of property owner.
5 There should be a clear and consistent city-wide sidewalk policy.
6 The process of funding and maintaining sidewalks should be equitable and inclusive of neighborhood input.

Recommendations

1 Develop a Sidewalk Action Plan in order to systematically address the highest priority walkability needs.
2 Reduce the financial burden on property owners for maintaining adjacent sidewalks.
3 Explore all potential funding mechanisms for sidewalks and adopt priorities into the 5-year Capital Improvement Plan.
4 Update the Walkability Plan.
5 Develop street design standards that represent best practice for walkability.
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INTRODUCTION

Importance of Sidewalks
Sidewalks are a critical component of the transportation network; they enhance quality of life, and build sense of place. They create vital linkages to public transportation, jobs, and schools. Walkable environments also encourage healthy, active lifestyles and strong local economies. The importance of walkability is trumpeted at the national level and reinforced in numerous local policies and plans.

Universal Support for Walkability

Walking to School
As a national movement, Safe Routes to School aims to make walking and biking to school safer, more convenient, and fun. Integrating physical activity into the lives of children is an effective strategy to combating high rates of chronic disease and poor health outcomes. Walking to school is a fantastic way for children to experience their community and have fun with friends. Additionally, active transportation has been shown to increase academic performance and attentiveness.

The Safe Routes to School National Partnership calls for investments in walking and biking infrastructure, citing that changes to the built environment through engineering improvements are a critical component of Safe Routes to School most successful programs include a thorough community assessment of the barriers to children walking and bicycling to school.

Communities for All Ages
Sidewalks are critical to create communities for all ages and ensure that people can lead healthy, independent lives. Lessening the dependence on automobiles can help seniors age in place. The AARP says that safe, accessible, well-maintained sidewalks are a fundamental community investment that enhances public health and maximizes social capital.

Locally, KC Communities for All Ages, a program of the Mid America Regional Council, promotes the idea of Housing for a Lifetime with the goal of reducing automobile dependence and increasing mobility options.
Public Health and Safety

According to the CDC, walking regularly is an effective way to prevent chronic disease associated with inactivity. Sidewalks are not only necessary for walking, but research published in the American Journal of Preventative Medicine found that people who live in neighborhoods with sidewalks are 47% more likely to get their daily recommended exercise.

Sidewalks also increase safety for pedestrians. According to research published by the Federal Highway Administration, pedestrian crashes are more than twice as likely to occur on streets without sidewalks, and streets with sidewalks on both sides of the street have the greatest pedestrian safety record.

"Safe, accessible, well-maintained sidewalks are a fundamental community investment."

-AARP Livability Fact Sheet

Environment

Investing in active transportation options can decrease harmful emissions from the burning of fossil fuels. The Federal Highway Administration has long acknowledged sidewalk construction as a strategy to improve air quality and allocates funding for this very purpose through the CMAQ program. Additionally, sidewalk construction is often an opportunity to include green infrastructure such as bioswales, rain gardens, and street trees.

Equity and Mobility

The cost of car ownership can unfairly burden many individuals and families in cities that offer limited mobility options. Sidewalks provide a lifeline for people by connecting them to jobs, healthy foods, schools, and public transportation.

Quality of Life and Economics

A study published by CEOs for Cities found that houses in neighborhoods with above average walkability can sell for up to $34,000 more than houses with average walkability.

$8558

Annual cost of car ownership according to AAA
**Walkability as a Local Priority**

Kansas City has a long history of adopting plans and policies that identify walkability as core to the city’s long-term vision. These official endorsements of walkability are an acknowledgment that investing in sidewalks and, more broadly, complete streets leads to a healthy, happy community. The following is a small sample of the city’s adoption of walkability as a core value.

**FOCUS Kansas City**

FOCUS identified the need for active transportation and called for reducing the reliance on automobiles. As the city’s comprehensive and strategic plan, FOCUS established a vision for active transportation as a viable option.

> “Great pedestrian streets will be created or reinforced when pedestrian movements and amenities are regarded equally to other modes of transportation.”
> -FOCUS Kansas City Building Blocks

**Area Plans**

The subsequent area plans all reinforce the vision of FOCUS, many of which establish walkability as a central theme. For example, the Briarcliff-Winwood Area Plan includes a guiding principle to promote and incentivize development that supports alternative modes of transportation, such as transit, walking, and biking. The vision statement of the Hickman Mills Area Plan calls for improved sidewalks and bike routes. This treatment of walking and biking is present throughout many of the adopted area plans.

**Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee**

Adopted by ordinance in June of 2008, the city’s Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee (BPAC) charged with, among other things, overseeing the implementation of the city’s Walkability Plan.

**Climate Protection Plan**

In July of 2008 the city adopted the Climate Protection Plan in an effort to reduce the city’s greenhouse gas emissions. The plan outlined an ambitious goal to increase the walk commuting rate from 3.9% to 8.9% by spending at least 2% of the city’s transportation budget on pedestrian infrastructure.

**Livable Streets Policy**

The Livable Streets Policy, adopted by council in January of 2011, codified the idea that active transportation should be considered alongside other forms of transportation in all street projects.

**Walkability Plan**

Resolution 030211 adopted the Kansas City Walkability Plan, which provides a broad framework for improving the safety and convenience of walking. The Walkability Plan, as a matter of policy, reinforces the need to invest in the pedestrian environment.
What is the KCMO Walkability Plan?

Purpose of the Plan

KCMO adopted the Walkability Plan in 2003 to ensure that land use patterns and economic development decisions would actively encourage people to walk. The plan also introduced a framework for prioritizing investments in pedestrian infrastructure.

The Walkability Plan was a fulfillment of a recommendation of FOCUS, the City’s comprehensive plan, that the City should provide equal consideration of all transportation modes.

Below are a few selected recommendations from the Walkability Plan.

Pedestrian Oriented Design

Recommendations

1. Requirement to conduct Pedestrian Impact Study for all new development
2. Proposed development standards to encourage pedestrian connectivity
3. Proposed design and orientation guidelines for new development

Street Design Guidelines

Recommendations

1. Requirement to conduct pedestrian assessment for all new streets.
2. A traffic calming program
3. Proposed crosswalk design and application criteria
4. Proposed design standards for pedestrian-friendly intersection treatments

Capital Improvement Program

Recommendations

1. Framework for prioritizing capital investments in the pedestrian network
2. Proposal to assist neighborhoods with planning and design of pedestrian infrastructure
3. Focus on improving ADA accessibility of sidewalks
State of the Sidewalks in KCMO

For the past several years, Kansas City residents and others across the country have been increasingly vocal about sidewalks. Over the past decade residents of KCMO have become increasingly vocal about the state of sidewalks. This sentiment is echoed in the annual Citizen Satisfaction Survey. And a 2006 performance audit of Kansas City’s sidewalk program discovered several key policy gaps but has largely gone ignored.

Current Sidewalk Management Policy and Practice

Three city programs are used for most sidewalk repair projects: citywide repair, PIAC projects, and federal projects. The programs vary in how projects are initiated and project size. While the Public Works department generally hires contractors to repair or replace all sidewalks, the adjacent property owner is almost always financially responsible for the cost.

Citywide Repair

Citywide projects are initiated through citizen request via KCMO’s 311 Action Center.

Inspection of sidewalks only occurs after a complaint has been sent to Public Works.

Adjacent property owners are notified when the sidewalk has been marked as deficient to give them the option to make repairs with their own contractor or to wait for Public Works to add it to the citywide project list.

Public Works creates an annual sidewalk project list based on the sidewalk allocation in the general budget.

After the project is completed, the property owner is assessed the cost of all sidewalk and curb repairs not including the ADA ramps in the case of corner lots.

The average time from 311 report to project completion is roughly three years.

Dedicated funding: FY 2016-17 approximately $250,000. However, most of this is recouped through property assessments.
PIAC Projects

PIAC projects are initiated through applications for annual in-district PIAC funds, generally by neighborhood groups, CiDs, or other entities. Successful projects are usually entire block lengths. This source can be used to build brand new sidewalks where they didn’t previously exist or to maintain or upgrade existing sidewalks. The City will generally replace all sidewalks within the project even if the sidewalks are in good repair.

Public Works will inspect sidewalks in all PIAC funded projects. It is unclear if the application alone will trigger an inspection of sidewalk conditions.

As is in the case of 311 reports, property owners adjacent to sidewalks deficient sidewalks must pay for repairs even as part of a larger PIAC project.

Property owners adjacent to sidewalks that are in good repair do not pay for replacement cost.

The City generally completes these projects within the year the PIAC fiscal year

Projects are usually completed within a year of PIAC funds being awarded, however, it may take a neighborhood group several attempts to succeed in their application.

Dedicated funding: None. This is a competitive application process and no sidewalk funding is guaranteed.

Federal Projects

The City has been successful in securing millions of federal dollars for complete streets upgrades, typically in inner-ring suburban areas where roads were originally built without sidewalks. The City also used a federal TIGER grant to replace aging sidewalks in the Green Impact Zone. Other sources have also been used for major capital improvements.

Projects are typically initiated by City staff based on an identified priority or long-range plan.

Property owners are notified at some point during the planning process but are not usually assessed the cost of construction.

The timeline from application to completion varies greatly.

Like PIAC, there is no dedicated annual funding from these sources. Most are competitive applications through the Mid America Regional Council or a federal department.
**Citizen Satisfaction Survey**

According to the annual Citizen Satisfaction Survey, sidewalks consistently rank near the bottom of all city services - in a period when overall satisfaction with city services has been trending upward, dissatisfaction with sidewalks remains high.

While people are somewhat more satisfied with the conditions of sidewalks in their own neighborhoods compared to the city in general, the highest levels of dissatisfaction are found south of the river.

The 4th district has the highest dissatisfaction rate, with 47% of residents being either dissatisfied or very dissatisfied. In the 3rd District, the rate is 44 percent. In other parts of the city, the more southern 5th and 6th districts show higher levels of dissatisfaction (43 and 46 percent) than the northern 1st and 2nd districts (32 and 33 percent).
Sidewalk Program Performance Audit of 2006

In 2006, based on poor citizen satisfaction with the way sidewalks were constructed and maintained, Kansas City undertook an audit of its sidewalk policies and implementation of those policies with the purpose of answering the following question:

*How does the city’s method of managing its sidewalk system compare to that of other large cities?*

**Primary Audit Findings**

**Kansas City does not systematically manage its sidewalks.**

The audit highlighted that the City had no process to evaluate conditions of sidewalks outside of complaints filed via the 311 Action Center. Repairs were scheduled only after inspectors conducted field evaluations of 311 complaints. This process is still in place.

**KCMO’s sidewalk funding mechanisms are confusing and place most of the burden on property owners.**

Assessing property owners is not unique but it does disincentivize residents from reporting poor sidewalk conditions - the only process by which the City is triggered to assess and catalogue conditions. Additionally, the audit criticized the fairness of pinning the cost on property owners.

**Sidewalk repairs on average took longer than 3 years between complaint and completion.**

The process was burdened with poor inspection practices, misinformed inspection staff, lack of departmental coordination, a long bidding process, and frequent replacement of out-of-spec construction. It is unclear if any improvement has been made since the 2006 audit.

**Audit Recommendations**

1. The Director of Public Works should draft a sidewalk policy for City Council consideration.

2. The Director of Public Works should implement a systematic sidewalk inspection program.

3. The City Manager should explore opportunities to provide financial assistance to property owners with limited incomes.

4. The Director of Public Works should ensure that construction bidders understand the time requirements contained in sidewalk construction contracts.

5. The Director of Public Works should direct staff to adequately train and supervise sidewalk inspectors.

6. The Director of Public Works should ensure that staff identify and coordinate the needs of sidewalk contractors with city departments and utility companies.

7. The Director of Public Works should direct staff to coordinate bidding for sidewalk repair/replacement so that the notice to proceed can be issued by the start of the construction season.

8. The City Manager should propose language for inclusion in the next Charter election that would permit on-call contracting for sidewalk projects.

9. The City Manager should improve sidewalk program communications with citizens.
Americans With Disabilities Act and KCMO Settlement

In 2012 the City of Kansas City, MO settled an investigation by the US Department of Justice (DOJ) with an agreement to make tangible strides toward compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). This settlement was part of a nationwide DOJ initiative called Project Civic Access; an effort to improve the accessibility of public buildings and public rights-of-way in cities and towns across the country. Among other violations, the DOJ investigation concluded that the City was not adequately addressing long-standing accessibility issues for those with disabilities on public sidewalks, a requirement of ADA Title II. The City agreed to the following conditions specific to sidewalks:

1 Within twelve months of the effective date of this Agreement, the City will implement and report to the Department its written process for soliciting and receiving input from persons with disabilities regarding the accessibility of its sidewalks, including, for example, requests to add curb cuts at particular locations.

2 Within twelve months of the effective date of this Agreement, the City will identify and report to the Department all streets, roads, and highways that have been constructed or altered since January 26, 1992. Paving, repaving, or resurfacing a street, road, or highway is considered an alteration for the purposes of this Agreement. Filling a pothole is not considered an alteration for the purposes of this Agreement. Within six years of the effective date of this Agreement, the City will provide curb ramps or other sloped areas complying with the Standards, UFAS, or the 2010 Standards, as applicable, at all intersections of the streets, roads, and highways identified under this paragraph having curbs or other barriers to entry from a street level pedestrian walkway. See paragraph 44 for more details regarding applicable standards.

3 Beginning no later than three months after the effective date of this Agreement, the City will provide curb ramps or other sloped areas complying with the Standards, UFAS, or the 2010 Standards, as applicable, at any intersection having curbs or other barriers to entry from a street level pedestrian walkway, whenever a new street, road, or highway is constructed or altered.

4 Within twelve months of the effective date of this Agreement, the City will identify all street level pedestrian walkways that have been constructed or altered since January 26, 1992. Paving, repaving, or resurfacing a walkway is considered an alteration for the purposes of this Agreement. Within six years of the effective date of this Agreement, the City will provide curb ramps or other sloped areas complying with the Standards, UFAS, or the 2010 Standards, as applicable, at all places where a street level pedestrian walkway identified under this paragraph intersects with a street, road, or highway. See paragraph 44 for more details regarding applicable standards.

5 Beginning no later than three months after the effective date of this Agreement, the City will provide curb ramps or other sloped areas complying with the Standards, UFAS, or the 2010 Standards, as applicable, at all newly constructed or altered pedestrian walkways where they intersect a street, road, or highway.
**SidewalksKC Process**

With a common interest in improving sidewalks, a small steering committee formed in the Fall of 2015 to begin a community-led sidewalk action plan. The project started small, focusing just on the neighborhoods of Midtown KCMO but eventually expanded to include the entire city. Ultimately, a strong community engagement process helped refine the vision for sidewalk policy in KCMO.

**Steering Committee**

The SidewalksKC steering committee met weekly from October 2015 through October 2016. The committee was composed of staff from The Whole Person, MidtownKC Post, BikeWalkKC, Mattie Rhodes Center, and The Front Porch Alliance. It was this committee that organized the action planning sessions, conducted the landscape analysis, and produced this report.

**Midtown Survey**

In early 2016 the steering committee conducted an online survey of Midtown KCMO residents, property owners, and workers. The complete results of that survey can be found in the Appendix. Some highlights are in the sidebar.

**Action Planning Sessions**

On July 13, August 2, and August 20, SidewalksKC brought together community stakeholders and city staff to discuss the importance of sidewalks and the challenges sidewalks create in their everyday life. Ultimately the discussion coalesced around a vision for a more equitable and sustainable sidewalk program.

A more detailed description of the action planning sessions is included in an Appendix.

The steering committee analyzed the small group discussions and prepared this summary of the common themes and vision presented by the participants.
Findings

Several clear themes emerged across the three action planning sessions that underscore the importance of investing in walkable places. Additionally, they help further explain the sentiment behind the low citizen satisfaction. This list of common values is a solid framework by which to adapt the city’s sidewalk policy and practice.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Values</th>
<th>Prioritization of Destinations</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Sidewalks are a fundamental layer of the transportation network.</td>
<td>1 Schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Sidewalks are critical for the sustainability, health, and economic vitality of the city</td>
<td>2 Neighborhood Centers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Accessibility in the public rights of way should be a top priority for the city</td>
<td>3 Grocery Stores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Cost of sidewalks should not be sole responsibility of property owner</td>
<td>4 Bus Stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 There should be a clear and consistent city-wide sidewalk policy</td>
<td>5 Parks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 The process of funding and maintaining sidewalks should be equitable and inclusive of neighborhood input</td>
<td>6 Commercial Districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Cultural Institutions/Higher Ed</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Community Policy Priorities

Eliminate property owner financial responsibility

The overwhelming sentiment among the participants was that the city ought to cover 100% of the cost of sidewalks. However, participants acknowledged the financial reality of addressing a $1 billion backlog of missing sidewalks and deferred maintenance and recommended establishing a method for prioritizing sidewalk needs.

Pay for Sidewalks by combining bond issuance with property tax increase

However, an increased city-wide property tax without the bonds was almost as popular with the participants. There was also strong support for a combination of funding sources including bonds, property taxes, set-aside public improvement funding and other sources. A few thought it would be possible to reprioritize existing transportation funding.

Create an equitable system for prioritizing sidewalk investment

Participants rejected the idea of spreading funding out equally across council districts or by smaller sub-districts. Instead, they preferred for the city to assess needs/demand across the city and fund sidewalks with the highest scores regardless of their geography. Additionally, they recommended to not distinguish between sidewalk maintenance or new construction. The preference should be to have high quality sidewalks in the areas where they are most needed.

Establish a systematic approach to sidewalk inspection and maintenance

Participants favored a system of inspection that assesses conditions of all medium-to-high-priority sidewalks on a regular rotation but leave inspection of lower priority to citizen complaints.
Recommendations

Key Next Steps
The following recommendations represent a synthesis of the entire SidewalksKC process into tangible actions necessary to improve the state of sidewalks in Kansas City, MO.

Recommendation 1 - Develop a Sidewalk Action Plan
There is an immediate need to develop a data-driven, systematic plan to meet the community’s demand for safe pedestrian infrastructure. A Sidewalk Action Plan should establish a process for prioritizing pedestrian infrastructure projects and detail clear steps for implementation.

Based on the specific needs of Kansas City and the dearth of existing policy and data on the issue of sidewalks, the Sidewalk Action Plan should include the following elements.

A. Vision - What are the city’s goals for sidewalks?
Through a transparent process, the Sidewalks Action Plan should clearly define the goals meant to be achieved through investment in pedestrian infrastructure. Establishing these common values will guide a fair and transparent prioritization framework.

B. Prioritization - What streets achieve these goals?
Through a mix of quantitative and qualitative data analysis, the Sidewalks Action Plan should translate the high level goals into a list of streets on which pedestrian improvements would have the greatest impact in achieving those goals. Quantitative analysis could help filter out streets that don’t meet baseline criteria while qualitative factors would help prioritize.

C. Current Conditions - What improvements are needed on these streets?
Because Kansas City does not have an inventory of sidewalks or crosswalks, a detailed assessment of the streets on the resulting priority list must be conducted to determine needed improvements. The Sidewalks Action Plan should use this data to create a list of individual projects with cost estimates and descriptions.
D. Phasing - What projects get built and when?

The project list should be completed within 10 years and broken into annual phases. The Sidewalk Action Plan will establish a rationale for this phasing but it should generally be based on a combination of priority scores, project logistics, and equity.

Sidewalks not on the priority list should have a process for evaluation. And sidewalks in later phases should have a process to move to a sooner phase based on availability of matching funds.

E. Funding - How are the projects paid for?

The City must commit to funding the annual project lists, regardless of the funding source, by adding them into the five year Capital Improvement Plan. Even though the planning process described here aims to narrow the pool of projects to those most needed for neighborhood connectivity, the total cost of the project list would still most likely exceed the sidewalk fund in the GO Bond. The Sidewalk Action Plan should also establish a mechanism for evaluating special requests for projects not on the priority list.

F. Sustainability – How do we create a strategic long-term approach?

Not only should the Sidewalk Action Plan be updated every five years, a more holistic approach to walkability must be created. Updating the long-dormant Walkability Plan should be a first step. Also, a systematic approach to managing all pedestrian facilities, not just those on the priority project list, must be established. The Sidewalk Action Plan should outline tangible steps toward long-term sustainability.
## Sidewalks Action Plan Approach

1. **Establish Goals and Priorities**

   SidewalksKC was a public engagement project to establish high level priorities for sidewalk investment. These priorities should guide the Sidewalk Action Plan process.

   Connecting neighborhood centers to schools, bus stops, healthy foods, parks, and commercial districts along safe walking routes should be prioritized.

2. **Map Routes**

   - **Inputs**
     1. Shortest routes between neighborhood centers and:
        - School
        - Bus Stops
        - Grocery Stores
        - Parks
        - Commercial Districts
     2. Area Plan Recommendations
     3. Shared Success Zone
     4. Public Input
     5. 311 Reports

   - **Output**

3. **Prioritize: Demand + Equity**

   - **Inputs**
     - Demand Measures
       - Population Density
       - Job Density
       - Schools
       - Parks
       - Commercial Districts
       - Transit Routes
       - Neighborhood Retail
       - Higher Education
       - Tourism and Cultural
     - Equity and Safety Measures
       - Households without car
       - High rates of poverty
       - Pedestrian crashes
       - Public health disparities
       - Title I Schools

   - **Output**
4. Assess Conditions

**Inputs**
Field Observations
- Speed and volume of traffic
- Number of traffic lanes
- Condition of sidewalk
- Width of sidewalk
- Buffer space
- Crosswalks and crossing distance
- ADA curb ramps
- Curb extensions or refuge islands
- Signals or stop signs

**Output**
Pedestrian Quality Index

5. Develop Annual Project Lists

**Inputs**
1. Needed improvements for each priority route (projects)
2. Cost estimate for each project
3. Demand + Equity score for each project
   A. Public Input

**Output**
Schedule of Projects
Annual project list with cost estimates. Phased based on priority scoring.

6. Identify Funding Source

**Flowchart**
- Sidewalk Project Request
  - In GO Bond Roadway List
    - Yes
      - GO Bond Roadway Budget
    - No
      - In Priority Project List
        - Yes
          - In GO Bond Sidewalks
        - No
          - Type of Project
            - Maintenance
              - GO Bond Sidewalks
            - New Construction
              - Source of Request
                - 3rd
                  - Direct to Neighborhood
                - Neighborhood Petition
                  - PIAC 75/25 Cost Share
Recommendation 2 - Revisit The Walkability Plan

Adopted in 2003, the Walkability Plan built off of the recommendations of FOCUS (KCMO’s comprehensive plan). The Walkability Plan laid out a long list of recommendations designed to encourage walkable development patterns and prioritize investment in the pedestrian network.

In the 14 ensuring years, The City has failed to implement many of those recommendations, however. The City must conduct a formal review of the progress toward the plan’s implementation and develop a long-overdue update.

A. Launch a Formal Review of Progress To Date

City staff must immediately work to determine what, if any, progress The City has made toward the implementation of the Walkability Plan in the 14 years since its adoption. The recommendations followed a significant investment of time researching best practice and engaging with the community. But there has been minimal effort to track implementation.

B. Provide an Annual Progress Report

The City must provide an annual Walkability Plan progress report; the plan itself includes a framework for implementation reporting. Staff should provide this report annually to the Bicycle Pedestrian Advisory Committee, City Plan Commission, and KCMO Council via Transportation and Infrastructure Committee or Planning Zoning and Economic Development Committee.

C. Immediately Adopt any Outstanding Policy Recommendations

Council and staff must immediately work to adopt any of the Walkability Plan’s outstanding policy recommendations.

D. Update Walkability Plan’s Chapter on Prioritization

The Sidewalks Action Plan (Recommendation 1 of this report) will provide a much needed update on the matter of prioritizing pedestrian infrastructure investment. Chapter 3 of the Walkability Plan should reflect the Sidewalk Action Plan data and priorities once it is completed.

E. Develop a Full Walkability Plan Update

A formal update to the plan is long overdue. The city must, in the middle-term, launch a complete overhaul of the Walkability Plan. Best practice would dictate that cities should update pedestrian master plans every 5-10 years with project lists updated on an annual basis.

Recommendation 3 - Accelerate the Implementation of ADA Sidewalk Improvements and fully adopt PROWAG Standards

The City must provide regular status updates on and accelerate its progress toward accessibility of its public sidewalks. There are currently over 2000 curb corners that are not in compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act and must eventually be upgraded. There are also issues of non-compliant cross slopes throughout the sidewalk network. While there is no legal obligation to fix existing, non-compliant infrastructure, the City is morally compelled to prioritize ADA compliance in its capital improvements plan. Any transportation infrastructure investment the City makes must consider this obligation to accessibility.

The City must also fully adopt the standards set forth by the Public Rights of Way Accessibility Guidelines established by the United States Access Board.
Recommendation 4 - Reduce Financial Burden on Homeowners

There is strong consensus that the cost of sidewalks should no longer be the sole responsibility of the property owner. Residents view sidewalks as a public service that should be the City’s responsibility. Under the current policy, citizens are reluctant to report sidewalk problems to 311. In order for any systematic approach to sidewalk maintenance and construction to work, the financial burden on property owners must be lifted.

Recommendation 5 - Explore All Funding Mechanisms

The city’s approach to sidewalks should be to create and implement a Sidewalk Action Plan that identifies a list of priority projects necessary to meet the city’s goals for walkability. While the proposed GO Bond could be a significant source of funding for the Sidewalk Action Plan, other sources should be directed as needed to complete the annual list of sidewalk projects.

The Sidewalk Action Plan should be considered a minimum investment in citywide walkability and not a ceiling. As other opportunities or priorities arise there should be a process to identify a funding source to complete such projects in addition to the Sidewalk Action Plan project list, not in lieu of.

Recommendation 6 - Build a Comprehensive Dataset

The Sidewalk Action Plan will require the collection of data along the highest priority routes and will lay out a process for a systemwide dataset. Pedestrian suitability should be measured across the entire street network; strategic investment in walkability requires that the City maintain a database on all street details that affect walking safety. Over the course of the next 5-10 years the City must build and maintain a detailed geographic database of street characteristics across the entire network.
Appendix A

Community Engagement Report
# Midtown Sidewalks Survey Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Think about the sidewalks in your neighborhood...</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Average Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks are in good repair, without areas of uneven or broken pavement.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks lighted for use at night.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks wide enough for at least two adults to walk side by side.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.847</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are curbs to separate the sidewalk from the street.</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are a grass strip, trees, parking spaces, or other buffer between the street and the sidewalk.</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.523</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Someone could use the sidewalk using a wheelchair, walker, stroller or other mobility aid without difficulty.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks are free of items that might block free walking such as fire hydrants, light poles, signs, etc.</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks and area next to them clear of weeds, brush, broken glass, and unsightly garbage.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.532</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are benches or other places to rest along your sidewalks.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sidewalks connect to major streets or other neighborhoods.</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.387</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average global score: 32.459
### Survey Results Continued

**Think about walking to a destination just outside of your neighborhood. Would you find the following when crossing big streets?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always or Usually</th>
<th>About Half of the Time</th>
<th>Seldom or Never</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Average Score @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Marked crosswalks</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.663</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stoplights</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk/don’t walk lights</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have to wait</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a long time at stoplights to cross</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have to push a walk button at stoplights</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.405</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drivers yield at crosswalks</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curb ramps</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Audible walk/don’t walk (for blind and visually impaired)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.469</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average global score @: 16.004

---

**Please respond to the following statements based on how strongly you agree or disagree with them.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly disagree</th>
<th>N/A</th>
<th>Average Score @</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I or my family would walk more if sidewalks were in better shape.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe more people would walk if sidewalks were in better shape.</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.601</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I or my family would walk more if it was safer to cross major streets.</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.072</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I believe more people would walk if it was safer to cross major streets.</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.712</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe walking alone in my neighborhood during the day.</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel safe walking alone in my neighborhood at night.</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average global score @: 12.629
Summary of SidewalksKC public meeting input
First draft Sept. 27, 2016

On July 13, August 2 and August 20, Midtown KC Walks brought together stakeholders with an interest in sidewalks and city staff people to discuss why sidewalks are important to them, what challenges sidewalks create in their everyday life, and to create a vision for a better citywide system of sidewalks. Participants also prioritized various options for funding and switching to a new system of assessment and prioritization of sidewalks.

After a large group presentation by the steering committee at each meeting, the participants divided five small groups for table discussions. The flip chart notes from the discussions are recorded in Appendix ?? at the end of this document.

The steering committee analyzed the small group discussions and has prepared this summary of the common themes and vision presented by the participants.

Overall areas of agreement
Across the three meetings, there was general consensus among participants on several areas, including:

- Sidewalks should be viewed as part of the overall system of transportation that includes streets, mass transit, bicycle and automobile transportation.
  - New sidewalks and sidewalk improvements should be considered within the context of the overall transportation system.
- The cost of sidewalks should not be born strictly by property owners.
  - The financial responsibility for sidewalk should be shifted to the city or to a mix of the city and property owners.
  - All residents Kansas City should pay into sidewalk funding based upon what they can afford to pay.
- The top priority for sidewalk building, repair and maintenance should be on neighborhood routes rather than business or entertainment areas.
- There should be a consistent city policy for sidewalks that applies to all geographic areas.
- Neighborhoods should have a greater role in helping set priorities for building and maintenance of sidewalks.
- The city’s sidewalk policy should include consideration of job creation.

Why sidewalks are important
At the first meeting, the participants were asked to discuss why sidewalks are important to them in their daily lives or to the constituents of their agencies or organizations. They said:

- **For exercise and health:** Participants said that sidewalks provide important opportunities for physical activity, especially for young people and the
elderly. They said that having good sidewalks may allow some older people to age in the community.

- **To foster a stronger, more connected community**: Participants said sidewalks can bring together residents and different neighborhoods, allow people to get to activity centers, and tie together neighborhood amenities. But in Kansas City, they said, sometimes sidewalks just end, leaving different parts of the city disconnected. They said that people are more engaged with their communities when they are connected.

- **To provide mobility**: Participants talked about mobility in the sense of having the freedom to move freely around the city from one place to another. Some said they love to walk. Others said that a strong system of sidewalks is important to families with strollers and people who use wheelchairs.

- **To provide accessibility**: Participants said well-maintained sidewalks would provide accessibility for people with disabilities so that they can achieve the same level of mobility as others. In some places, sidewalks are too narrow to be accessible or are overgrown or barred by trash or weeds. Participants said this lack of mobility is out of compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

- **For the economic viability of neighborhoods**: Participants saw several ways that good sidewalks are important to economic viability. They said they feel property values are higher in areas where sidewalks are present and maintained;

- **To provide a way for children to get to school**: Participants said that having a safe way for children to walk or bike to school is a very high priority for them, and it is often lacking in their neighborhoods.

- **To provide connections to mass transit**: Participants said sidewalks are necessary to get people to and from mass transit.

- **To improve safety or the perception of safety**: Participants said that lack of or rundown sidewalks present a safety hazard for those who need to use them. Several said they had stopped walking after being injured walking a dog or running, and parents said they had stopped walking with children. Some said that areas with run-down sidewalks may give the perception that an area is unsafe.

- **To make Kansas City feel like a modern city**: Several participants talked about positive experiences in another cities that have more useable sidewalks. One said lack of accessibility via sidewalks makes Kansas City seem like a ghost town to visitors; another said the condition of Kansas City’s sidewalks and curbs “make you feel like you are not living in a modern city.” Several mentioned that they had considered moving to another city because of the condition of sidewalks. They also said that “walking to adventures” was not appealing on many sidewalks.

**Challenges presented by our current system of sidewalks**

- **The current system of financing sidewalks seems inequitable.** The lack of equity in the sidewalk system was a major theme for the participants.
While they stated that sidewalks are important to their quality of life, they do not think their city's current system of sidewalk building, repair and maintenance makes sense. Some of the equity issues they raised included:

- **Personal financial burden:** They said they feel the current system, making each property owner responsible for sidewalk maintenance, is not fair. It creates too great a financial burden and does not strike people as fair. "Why would property owners spend $4K on sidewalks when their home is only worth $20,000?" one asked.
- **City policy on how sidewalks are funded is confusing.** One resident said that the option for using PIAC funding for sidewalk repair is hard to understand. Several said many property owners do not understand their responsibility for sidewalk maintenance or the options for financing required repairs. They said the city should do more education to help people understand their responsibilities.
- **Some parts of the city have good sidewalks while others have poor or no sidewalks.** Several participants mentioned the Green Impact Zone as a good example of what a neighborhood might look like if sidewalks were done well.

**While residents value street trees, the trees often interfere with the accessibility of sidewalks.** Participants said that Kansas City has a legacy of large street trees and residents value those trees, but tree roots can cause sidewalks to buckle and create a dilemma over whether it is more important to keep the tree or repair the sidewalk.

**The current system of sidewalk maintenance relies upon citizen complaints rather than a systematic look at maintenance.** Some participants said that although litter, dog poop and overgrow weeds often hinder mobility but don’t get reported to the city.

**Sometimes sidewalks are closed due to construction.**

**Vision for a sidewalk system that works for Kansas City**

Those at the meeting developed a vision for a system of sidewalks they would like to see in Kansas City. They said if sidewalks in Kansas City really worked...

- **...More people would walk as a means of health, recreation and connection to others.** In fact, participants said, instead of complaining about sidewalks, residents would take them for granted like they do in some other cities.
- **...People could easily walk to work, church, grocery stores and other activities.** Sidewalks would support businesses and community activities by making it easy for people to get to them.
- **...Children could easily walk or bike to school.**
- **...People would feel safe while walking on sidewalks.**
- **...Neighborhoods would be safer because more people were walking on the sidewalks.**
• Financial support of the sidewalk system would be equitable. That might mean a sliding scale for paying for sidewalk repairs. It might also mean neighborhoods working together to repair sidewalks.

• The city would have a workforce development policy that provided sidewalk-related jobs.

• City blocks would have a consistent streetscape. Instead of some properties having different or nonexistent sidewalks, repairs would be made along an entire block to afford consistency.

• Property values would increase because of improved mobility and improved appearance.

• Business development would also be enhanced.

At the third meeting, participants weighed different options for creating a new system of sidewalk development and maintenance and voted on how they would most like to see this system funded.

• By far, the participants said that the city should cover 100 percent of the cost of sidewalks, but they felt strongly that special request cost sharing should be available. None of the participants said they favored the current system of putting 100% of the cost on property owners, even if the city would subsidize costs for property owners in financial need. Several participants preferred the option of subsidizing cost based on the need/demand for a sidewalk in a particular location.

• The preferred method of funding sidewalk improvements was a combined bond issuance and increased property tax. However, an increased city-wide property tax without the bonds was almost as popular with the participants. There was also strong support for a combination of funding sources including bonds, property taxes, set-aside public improvement funding and other sources. A few thought it would be possible to reprioritize existing transportation funding.

• Given a continuum of options for how to prioritize funding across the city, the participants rejected spreading funding out equally across council districts or by smaller sub-districts. Instead, they preferred for the city to assess needs/demand across the city and fund sidewalks with the highest scores regardless of their geography.

• The system of sidewalk inspection favored by most participants is for the city to inspect all medium-to-high-priority sidewalks on a rotation and inspect lower priority based on citizen complaint.

• Given a continuum between 100% property owner and 100% city financial responsibility, the vast majority of participants favored 100% city responsibility. They consistently favored city taking the lead responsibility for: damage done to sidewalks by street trees, spot repairs on sidewalks, major repair and replacement of existing sidewalks, infill of sidewalks where they don’t already exist, curbs, gutters and storm drains for sidewalk infill.

• Participants said they acknowledged a difference between political reality and an ideal system. For example, they favored citywide prioritization of
funding for sidewalks based on need, but said they felt spreading funding across council subdistricts might be a more realistic plan.

- Given a set of jars and “coins” that could be used to pay for different types of sidewalk improvements, participants said they would prioritize spending on sidewalks this way:
  1. Around primary and secondary schools
  2. Near transit stops
  3. Where there are mobility challenges such as high poverty rates, low car ownership, and high transit/walk rates
  4. Where there are gaps in connectivity
  5. Around major institutions such as hospitals, museums and universities
  6. Around residents’ homes

Flip chart notes from public meetings

July Flip 13 chart notes by table
Table #1

Why sidewalks are important

- Aging population – exercise, health
- Community
- Accessibility
- Connectivity
- Economic performance
- *Walking/biking to school
- Property value
- Activity – all populations (youth, elderly, etc.)
- Creates density (Connects activity centers)
- Equity – walking is free

Challenges

- Tree roots (lack of planning)
- Narrow sidewalks
- Financial burden on property owners
- No buffer to road
- Vacant buildings
- Sidewalks are more than pavement - walkability
- City to citizen communications
- Visitors to KC “Ghost town”
- Connectivity
- Not appealing = to walk adventures

Vision

If sidewalks really worked....

- Walking to activities: church, groceries, retail
- Property value would increase
- More people would move to single family
- People would be connected (community)
- Prioritization of sidewalk
1. Repair
2. Fill gaps *schools, transit jobs)
3. New development, no exceptions
   • Everyone puts skin in game
   • Neighborhoods collaborate to repair, fill gaps
   • City rebate
   • Sliding scale for paying

Table 2

Why sidewalks are important

- Broken windows
  - Blight encourages bad activity People don’t care about this place
- Physical safety
- Personal financial burden
- Value and perceptions of economic impact: dev., neighborhoods
- Families, strollers, wheelchairs
- Priority for residents
- Why would property owners spend $4K on sidewalks when home is only worth $20,000
- Policies create unfair burdens
- Residence value sidewalks but rental owners don’t want to pay
- People love street trees but often removed with sidewalk repair or trees too big in first place

Vision

- More people would walk
- In some neighborhoods, people don’t walk or jog but sidewalks could build a culture of health
- Connectivity: neighbors walking, going to destinations, makes neighborhood safer
- Stronger pride of place in the community; people motivated to maintain property
- Kids walking and biking to school
- New mindset about how to get around
- Better zoning and policies make it easier to make more walkable places
- Grow property value, support business
- Create inviting destinations
- A better system to fund sidewalks
- Connect sidewalk work to workforce development: city policy? Community pride, skill development

Tradeoffs

- Are city funding priorities today as equitable as they could be? Opportunity to rebalance
- In many neighborhoods, public safety more urgent need
- Sidewalks less important if residents can’t afford to invest/maintain homes
- Educate and change mindset

Table 3

Why sidewalks are important

- So as people age they can stay in their community
- Our sidewalks are a mess
- Trying to find a way to finance

Challenges

- Like large trees
- Maintenance
- Connection throughout the neighborhood
- Curbs are gone
- Patchwork of repair around trees
- Parents have stopped walking because of fear of falling
- Wife said time to leave
- Construction sites
- “Make you feel like you are not living in a modern city”
- no curbs – looks like dog patch neighborhood
- connectivity – they just stop
- Patchwork – depending on who does repair
- People have been injured walking dog, running
- City estimates confusing for property owners
- Confusion over funding options (PIAC)
- Tree roots cause problems – city won’t remove
- Older people – hard to get around
- Have to look down when walking
- Can’t use some routes

Vision
- Would take them for granted – like New York, San Francisco
- Get me places I want to go, to walking trails, main streets, etc.
- Consistent streetscape – whole block rather than piecemeal
- Green Impact Zone – good example
- Streetscape could encourage development
- Universal design of public space
- Feel safe
- Buildings not crumbling
- Inviting streets
- PIAC not solution – broader
- Neighborhood streets repaired
- Fix residential first
- Would be able to talk to amenities
- See sidewalks as a transportation option rather than a property amenity
- Prioritize routes to activity centers
- Commercial versus residential – businesses have organizations to advocate for them

Tradeoffs
- Tearing out by utilities – coordination
- More affluent neighborhoods could pay, but would widen gap
- Citizens could pay some
- More concerned than about sewers
- Important to young people
- Improves perception of safety
- Create hierarchy of improvements
- Look for federal $$
- Split – special assessments and property owners
- Special taxing district (like TTD)

Table 4
Why sidewalks are important
- Safety (3)
- Schools (2)
- Access
- Mobility (1)
- Kids
- I love walking!
- Personal freedom
- No sidewalks to transit
- No SRTS
- Dangerous

**Challenges**
- Inconsistent sidewalks
- No sidewalks
- Cost
- ADA
- Build in new curbs and gutters
- Retrofitting places that weren't designed with sidewalks
- Funding/financing
- Light
- Snow/dog poop/litter/overgrown weeds – lack of reporting
- Seasonal challenges
- Heavy maintenance
- Education of responsibility
- Enforcement – traffic law

**Vision**
- Finally listening to taxpayers’ priorities
- Crime would go down
- City cover some or all of cost
- Better public health and/or physical fitness
- A positive dialogue and not negative
- Less pollution
- Equitable funding
- More personal freedom
- Increased sense of community including around schools
- Sidewalks would get the same emphasis as roads
- Property values would increase
- Systematic asset management

**Tradeoffs**
- Taxpayer $$
- Political capital for bond
- Incentives/TIF etc.
- Roadway capacity and new roads

**Table 5**

**Why sidewalks are important:**
- Total scope of work
- Accessibility
- Safety - health
- Transportation
- Connector – engagement
- Economics
- Maintenance
- Physical barriers
• Interaction will exist in built environment

**Challenges**
- Quality of life
  - New people
  - Retention
- Lights, crosswalks
- Consideration for real estate, recruitment
- Development – information
  - Public engagement
  - Timely notice and info
- Implementation of existing guidelines and regulations

**Vision**
- People would have choice: buying, work, access
- Overcome fear of going somewhere
- Fewer crashes with pedestrians/safety
- Healthier: comm, people, municipal assets
- Inclusiveness
- Better quality of life
- Overall describer: sustainable

**Tradeoffs**
- Miles of paved roads: less asphalt
- Less regressive process: fines versus programs to improve
- Narrower streets
- Incentives
- Need more data
- Tradeoffs – other infrastructure
- Pros
  - Visible
  - $$$
  - equitable
- Cons
  - Voted on
  - Tax increase
  - Plan!

**Questions (all tables)**
- What is Kansas City's definition of a sidewalk? Broaden definition
- Impact of sidewalks on property values

**Aug. 2 Flip chart notes by table**

**Table 1**
Every resident of Kansas City deserves sidewalks....
.... mutually accountable – city and property owner

Prioritizing
- Density
- Walkability
• Transit use
• Car ownership
• Ped traffic

Strategic about connection and network

Categorizing types of work
• Spot repair
• Replace
• New (bridge gap)

SPREAD THE BENEFIT

Table at front of room

Equitable system
• Neighborhoods
  o Things connect to ‘big dev,” not to neighborhoods
  o Prioritize existing neighborhoods over new development
• Need driven by area
• Functional and safe for all users especially disabled
• Consistent city wide policy
• Prioritize between maintaining existing and developing new sidewalks where they don’t exist
• Incremental approach for development to include additional sidewalk conditions

Funding
Existing neighborhoods
• Maintenance and building cost should be earmarked for specific fund dedicated to sidewalks – from existing property taxes
• Bigger commitment from commercial property owners
• Dev. Arterial sidewalks instead of neighborhood where don’t exist at all
• Change city spending priorities for spending to develop better, safer neighborhoods
• Focus more on benefits instead of costs
• Let neighborhoods have bigger say in funding decisions
• Do a better job telling residents of spending on sidewalks versus. Existing spending
• Benefits of sidewalks versus costs of school busses, police presence, etc.
• Benefits of connecting people versus costs
• Better neighborhood involvement in priorities (spending)

Another table

Fairness in funding
• 80 percent city 20% property owner
  o 20 percent would be the same for all property owners
  o grants for neighborhoods/residents who can’t afford
• look to street funding mechanism to fund sidewalks
  o higher taxes (property)
• tack on fee for permit for new development to go to sidewalk fund
• shared neighborhood impact assessment
  o not just individual property assessment
• density
• some neighborhoods
Fairness in funding
• Why are cities required to maintain roads but property owners must maintain sidewalks?
• Need to raise revenues?
  o To repair current
  o To build new
• Put an endowment for future repair into bond
  o **need a broader way to pay for something used broadly
  o sliding scale based on value of property

Every resident in KC deserves sidewalks
• urban versus suburban?
• What about exurban 3 acre lots – do they deserve them?
• Some people don’t want the liability or maintenance

Every neighborhood in KC deserves sidewalks….
• Appropriateness
• Kids walking in roads in suburbs
• Others walking in roads in suburbs
• Self determination or are they a public right of way and part of transportation system?
• This is regional system need to assess need

Another table
• Economic
• Responsibilities
• Infrastructure (streets/sidewalks)
• Control of household budgets
• Assurance of municipal maintenance
• Accommodation for the handicapped
• Community sidewalks (higher income versus lower income
• Community/municipal attention
• Quality of concrete/sidewalk
• Local economic growth
• Safety

Job growth, inside communities of low income
Aug. 17 Flip chart notes

Bucket 1: Prioritization of funding across the city

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of yes votes</th>
<th># of no votes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>City A: Funding is spread out evenly by city council district</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>City B: Spreads sidewalk funding evenly by smaller sub districts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>City C: Measures need/demand across the city and funds the sidewalks with the highest scores regardless of their geography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>(added by participants) Political reality is a hybrid of B and C</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bucket 2: Property owner financial responsibility

Discussion (notes from flip charts)

- New developments should have sidewalks

Place your dots somewhere on the continuum between 100% property owner and 100% city financial responsibility for each of the following situations:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>100% city</th>
<th>75/25</th>
<th>50/50</th>
<th>25/75</th>
<th>100% owner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Damage to sidewalk caused by street trees</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spot repairs to sidewalks</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Major repair and replacement of existing sidewalks</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Infill of sidewalks where they didn't already exist</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Curbs</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gutters</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm drains necessary for sidewalk infill</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Bucket 3: Cost Sharing

Discussion (notes from flip charts)
- Realistic (b) versus ideal (d)
- Education for property owners on maintenance
- Consider commercial/apartment owner responsibility
- For b – require developers to share cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of yes votes</th>
<th># of no votes</th>
<th>City A: Subsidizes cost for property owners based on financial need</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>City B: Has a graduated scale of cost split based on need/demand scoring of the sidewalk. For example sidewalks that score as the highest priority get 100% funded by the city, the next tier get 75%, the third tier get 50% and so on (added by participants: with special request cost sharing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>City C: Property owner takes full responsibility of the financial cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>City D: city covers 100% of sidewalk cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>(added by participants) city covers 100% of sidewalk cost but with special request cost sharing</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bucket 4: Financing

Discussion (notes from flip charts)
- However, all streets are funded the same as sidewalks

If you believe the city should bear some or all of sidewalk financial responsibility, please select any of the following ways you would be comfortable with in covering that cost:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of yes votes</th>
<th># of no votes</th>
<th>Bond issuance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Increased city-wide property tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Participants combined bond issuance and increased city-wide property tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>Special sales tax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>Set-aside in competitive public improvement funding program</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Shift funding in general budget to raise sidewalks to higher budget priority

Other - please write in

2  Reprioritize existing transportation funding
   Magic wand
6.5  Hybrid of all
   .5  Philanthropic and business support
1  Impact fees from new developments, beyond current impact zones

Bucket 5: Special Requests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of yes votes</th>
<th># of no votes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>City A: Inspects all sidewalks starting with the sidewalks determined to be of highest demand/need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>City B: Inspects sidewalks all sidewalks throughout the city regardless of their demand/need</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>City C: Only inspects sidewalks following citizen complaints</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>City D: Inspects all medium to high priority sidewalks on a rotation and inspects lower priority based on citizen complaint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bucket 6: Assessment of Conditions

Discussion (notes from flip charts)
- B with a thoughtful extension of resources
- Repairs occur over time, so inspection could change
- Tech and neighborhood reviews make evaluation much easier than they used to be (Smart City)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th># of yes votes</th>
<th># of no votes</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>City A: Provides no mechanism for requests outside of an adopted prioritization or phasing method</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>City B: Relies entirely on citizen requests/complains to make sidewalk improvements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>City C: Uses an adopted phasing/prioritization method to improve sidewalks but will consider requests that deviate from the plan through a petition process or a willingness for property owner to cover some of the cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>(added by participants) Goal of a, with a side of D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Participants were given a set of jars and “coins” that could be used to pay for different types of sidewalk improvements

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Schools, primary, secondary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Near transit stops</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Mobility challenges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High poverty rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Low car ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• High transit/walk rates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Gaps in connectivity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Parks (in or near)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Major institutions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Hospitals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Museums</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Universities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Residents’ homes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Workers’ jobs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Entertainment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Arenas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Restaurants</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Bars</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Concert venues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Retail and services</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>