

Parkville Route 9 Corridor Study
Steering Committee Meeting
December 16, 2015, 10:00 am – 12:00 pm
Parkville City Hall – Board Room
MEETING MINUTES

Consultant Attendees (5):

Sabin Yanez/CFS Team (Project Manager-Principal In Charge)	816-333-4477/syanez@cfse.com
Thomas Morefield/CFS Team (Public Engagement and Planning, BNIM)	816-783-1607/tmorefield@bnim.com
Andrew Robertson/CFS Team (Traffic Engineer)	816-333-4477/arobertson@cfse.com
Craig Davis/MCD & Associates (Project Financing)	craigdavis@mcdassociates.net
Tom Evans/Trekk (Traffic Engineer)	816-874-4655/tevens@trekllc.com

Steering Committee Members Present (8):

Nan Johnston, Mayor/Parkville	816-741-7676/njohnston@parkvillemo.gov
Mike Duffy/Riverside	816-372-9017/mduffy@riversidemo.com
Ed Bradley/Main Street Association	816-584-3130/ed.bradley@banklibertykc.com
Alicia Stephens/Platte County EDC	816-270-2109/astephens@plattecountyedc.com
Erik Bergrud/Park University	erik.bergrud@park.edu
Daren Higerd/Parkville Chamber	darenhigerd@weichert.com
Daniel Erickson/Platte County P&D	816-858-3368/derickson@co.platte.mo.us
Laurie McCormack/Park University	816-584-6210/laurie.mccormack@park.edu

Staff Members Present (3)

Stephen Lachky/MARC	816-701-8247/slachky@marc.org
Lauren Palmer, Parkville	816-741-7676/lpalmer@parkvillemo.gov
Tim Blakeslee, Parkville	816-741-7676/tblakeslee@parkvillemo.gov

Others Present (2):

Beverlee Roper/Platte County	beverlee.roper@co.platte.mo.us
Latina Ford/MARC	lford@marc.org

I. Review of Route 9 Project Segments

Goal: Review the detailed drawing of each of the Route 9 project segments to refresh the steering committee with the main components and cost per segment.

Progress: Project segments were reviewed and the following questions were answered.

- Do we have to construct the projects from one end and follow up with the next adjacent segment?
 - Most project segments can be built independently and therefore the order of construction can be determined based on a priority ranking system rather than starting on one end of the project and working on the next adjacent segment.

- Why is the cost of Project 1 (Route 45 to 62nd Street) higher than Project 2 (62nd Street to Parkville Athletic Complex)?
 - Project 1 (Route 45 to 62nd Street) has a retaining wall of about \$150,000 due to the topography of the site. Project 2 (62nd Street to Parkville Athletic Complex) does not have a retaining wall.
- What is the cost of just improving the Route 9 & Mattox Road intersection?
 - About \$400,000. There will be a cost breakout of the improvements to the Route 9 & Mattox Road intersection from Project 12 (Coffey Road to Mattox Road).

II. Review of Priority Ranking System

Goal: Discuss and tailor the project segment weighted ranking system to match expectations of the steering committee.

Progress: After an explanation of the weighting system for the benefits of each project and the feasibility of each project, the steering committee suggested that the subcategory titled “High Safety Benefit” was agreed to be misleading as all projects along the corridor drastically improves safety. The 15% allocated to the removed subcategory will be redistributed among the other benefit categories.

Another suggestion was to add a subcategory to the feasibility section to account for the effect of construction work on traffic. This will be taken into account within the “Ease of Constructability” subcategory.

Overall, the steering committee agreed with the weighted ranking system developed by the consultant team. It was determined that Project 1 (Route 45 to 62nd Street) & Project 2 (62nd Street to Parkville Athletic Complex) be submitted to the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) as one project and Project 7 (7th Street to 5th Street) & Project 8 (5th Street to 2nd Street) be submitted as another project.

III. Review of Project Financing Plan

Goal: Provide a review of possible project financing plans and receive feedback from the steering committee on the best approaches.

Progress: The main strategies for financing the Route 9 project included funding provided by local government and agency partnerships, a city-wide sales tax of 1% over the next 10 years, a new special district for business developments along the Route 9 corridor, and a potential future fund match by MoDOT depending on a potential influx of state funding.

The following topics were discussed in detail:

- Other local jurisdictions may be able to submit several of the project segments to MARC for funding as well as the City of Parkville.
- The City of Parkville’s capital improvements budget is about \$300,000 per year and will not cover the \$11.4 million cost of the Route 9 improvements.
- There will most likely be no sustaining pace for the first few project segments. The ranking system includes the subcategory “Economic Impact” which accounts for new business development taxable revenue which will accelerate the rate of funding.

- For the hypothetical situation that a \$12 million check was available to completely fund the project in one combine construction phase, it was estimated that it would take 5 years total to construct the project with Riverside to Parkville Downtown taking one year, Downtown to 13th Street taking two years, and 13th Street to Route 45 taking two years.
- It was noted that there are more costs to completing the projects than just the construction estimate. Typically the total cost of a project segment includes the construction cost, 10% more for engineering, and 5% more for observation. Adding this 15% to the budget brings the overall project estimate to \$13.1 million.

IV. Update on Final Report

Goal: Discuss the Final Report due January 5th, 2016 for the Board of Alderman Meeting and discuss any final questions with the steering committee.

Progress: The report is 90% complete and is under review. No questions were raised about the final report.

V. Steering Committee Recommendations

Goal: Solidify Steering Committee Recommendations to the Board of Alderman

Progress: Remarks and consensus made by the Steering Committee to the Board of Alderman included the following:

- These projects are a high priority and very doable.
- Transforming Route 9 into a Complete Street will greatly increase safety, decrease travel time and congestion, and will be attractive for new business developments that will generate additional tax revenue.
- As far as financing through grants, the project segments will be submitted to the Mid-America Regional Council (MARC) since all of the project segments have a very high score on MARC's project ranking system. If a MARC grant is awarded, they will ask each of the submitted projects to be scaled down and will require a 20% match of funds.
 - A viable option is to submit two or more projects to MARC since there are three different funding streams: the Missouri Surface Transportation Committee (MO-STP) which has a \$500,000 cap, the Active Transportation Programming Committee (ATPC) which has a \$500,000 cap, and the Congestion Mitigation and Air Quality Improvement Program (CMAQ) which has no cap.
 - The multiple projects to be submitted could each be a combination of two adjacent project segments. For instance, it is recommended that Project 1 (Route 45 to 62nd Street) & Project 2 (62nd Street to Parkville Athletic Complex) be submitted as one project and Project 7 (7th Street to 5th Street) & Project 8 (5th Street to 2nd Street) be submitted as one project. In this way, MARC funding would be maximized and the project would easily be scaled back by dropping a project segment rather than having any of the Complete Street features dropped due to the reduction in scale.
 - If multiple local authorities submit for a MARC grant, then the chances for multiple grants on the same roadway would go up.

- The 20% match of funds would still need to be addressed by other funding sources.
- A second source of funds is expanding a new special district for the locations which will be developed. This new tax revenue is thought to max out at \$127,000 per year assuming that all known major developments along Route 9 have been built and well established for many years. A more realistic short term maximum is about \$35,000 per year.
- A third source of funds could be created by a 0.5% Capital Improvement Sales Tax and/or 0.5% Economic Development Sales Tax. The revenues created from these sales taxes can be used to fund all capital improvements including park and recreation improvements. A 1% Sales Tax over 10 years would very likely fund the entire Route 9 Corridor improvement as well as other local projects.
 - The Regional Tax Analysis will need to be examined to compare Parkville tax rates to other local jurisdictions.
- Other funding sources were considered:
 - Current Missouri state budget forecasts for transportation infrastructure are significantly less than prior years. This has caused the Missouri Department of Transportation (MODOT) to suspend applications for their Cost Share Program. However, the Cost Share Program has proven enormously popular and efficient in enhancing the financial viability of MODOT and, therefore, the Project Team believes it will eventually be restored and potentially enhanced. Funding from the Cost Share Program could accelerate the construction process of Route 9.
 - A loan through the Missouri Transportation Finance Corporation (MTFC) could fund the project.
 - A Community Improvement District (CID) may be either a political subdivision or a not-for-profit corporation. If the CID is organized as a political subdivision, property and sales taxes may be imposed within the boundaries of the CID.
 - A Transportation Development District (TDD) may be created to act as the entity responsible for developing, improving, maintaining, or operating one or more “projects” relative to the transportation needs of the area in which the District is located. The district has the authority to finance the project through special assessments; property tax, sales tax, or toll roads. In addition, they can liquidate any and all of the above methods through debt financing.
 - A Tax Increment Financing (TIF) allows for the capture of 100% of incremental local property tax and 50% of incremental local sales tax for 23 years to be spent on the redevelopment of a Blighted Area as defined by Statute. A TIF would accelerate redevelopment and share a portion of the captured revenues with the specific location and use a portion to advance the Route 9 Project.

VI. Adjourn

Overarching Theme/Vision from the Downtown Master Plan

“Preserving the character of Downtown, while capitalizing on opportunities to enhance commerce, economic activity, and community interaction is critical to the future success of Downtown Parkville.”

Guiding Principles

- *Preserve and enhance the vitality of downtown Parkville as the economic and community center of the city.*
- *Respect the character of Parkville – quaint, historic, charming, quality of life.*
- *Focus on making connections – East St. to West St.; Commons to downtown; Parkville to Riverside; southern Platte County to downtown Kansas City.*
- *Minimize negative impacts on adjacent property owners. If/when negative impacts are unavoidable, consult key stakeholders and encourage participation and ownership in discussions of trade-offs.*
- *Appreciate the importance of parks and natural resources to Parkville; minimize negative impacts on cemeteries, Parkville Nature Sanctuary, riverfront parkland, etc.*
- *Create and support opportunities for compatible economic development.*

Key Objectives

- *Mitigate safety and capacity issues, and minimize traffic conflicts, on Route 9.*
- *The north-south multi-modal trail connection from Route 45 to downtown Parkville is a high priority.*
- *Access control throughout the corridor needs to be addressed.*
- *Enhance aesthetics and pedestrian movements, particularly in proximity to downtown Parkville and Park University.*
- *The East Street “complete street” redevelopment concept is a high priority.*
- *Accommodate compatible new development and redevelopment along the corridor.*
- *Need to understand desired improvements in order to negotiate and finalize incentives (as needed) to prompt development and finance infrastructure.*
- *Need to ensure corridor can handle traffic impacts associated with growth.*
- *Reduce future construction costs by facilitating the reservation of right-of-way for future improvements.*
- *Position the participating municipalities to compete in future transportation grant cycles for eligible improvements in the corridor.*