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About the Urban Land Institute

**ULI Mission:** To provide leadership in the responsible use of land and in creating and sustaining thriving communities worldwide

- A multi-disciplinary membership organization with more than 45,000 members in private enterprise and public service
- Since 1947, ULI’s Advisory Services Program has helped more than 700 communities find independent, strategic, and practical solutions for the most challenging land use issues
Thank you to our sponsors!

Ten Minute Walk Campaign:
- National partnership with the Urban Land Institute, The Trust for Public Land, and the National Recreation and Park Association

Benefits of Parks:
- Strengthen community bonds
- Make healthy places for greater overall well-being
- Reduce depression and anxiety
- Increase physical activity
- Manage stormwater
- Improve air quality
- Provide spaces for community gathering and to celebrate
- Reduce urban heat island effects
- Improve connectivity and mobility for surrounding neighborhoods
- Create viable and unique destinations for memorable experiences
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Panel Assignment

Can we use the park system tool to mitigate inequity?

- What are the primary factors KC Parks should consider when aligning use of resources and mission?
- How should KC Parks incorporate community input in the design of facilities and open spaces to mitigate inequity?
- How can KC Parks balance newer growth areas of the city to the north with deferred maintenance of existing, older parks south of the river?
- How can KC Parks maximize its existing resources and partnerships to meet the needs of the community?
- Should KC Parks focus more attention on highest and best use of its land assets, even if this means disposal?
- How can KC Parks account for non-City owned land being used for recreational purpose when planning for future city park space in under-developed parts of the city?
- What is the best strategy for developing resources necessary to fulfill the department’s mission?
Key Observations

1. **Internal & External Mission Clarity**
   - Narrow mission vs broader mission

2. **Intragovernmental Functional Relationship**
   - Inability to assign responsibilities across external departments

3. **Shared Public Sector Vision**
   - Top of government to customers

4. **Expanding Liabilities**
   - Maintenance-New Capital Assets-More Maintenance

5. **Flat Revenues**
   - ½ cent sales tax erosion

6. **PIAC Funding**
   - Equal sharing but unequal needs < Equity

7. **Development Regulatory Guidelines**
   - Reinforce race & class segregation; don’t reinforce strategic advantage

8. **Community Engagement**
   - Not enough engagement; equitable outcomes are an objective

9. **Partnerships**
   - Missing Partnerships-Missing Financial Support
Existing Context
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**Major Parks Expansion**

- George Edward Kessler (1862-1923)
- Envisioned and designed the parks and boulevard system for Kansas City in 1883

1920 – 324,400 population
- 59.8 square miles
- 8.5 residents/acre

2017 – 479,932 population
- 318.6 square miles
- 2.4 residents/acre
Urban vs Suburban Contexts

- Maintaining old services vs providing new services

- **District 3: Lowest Life Expectancy Zip Codes** (64127, 64126, 64128, 64129, 64130, 64132)
  - 11 square miles
  - 36,272 people

- **District 1: Shoal Creek Neighborhood**
  - 33.5 square miles
  - 30,959 people
Urban vs Suburban Opportunities

District 1: Shoal Creek Neighborhood
- 33.5 square miles
- 30,959 people
- **Density**: 924 people/sq mi
- 1,225 acres of parkland (including golf course)

District 3: Lowest Life Expectancy Zip Codes
- 11 square miles
- 36,272 people
- **Density**: 3,297 people/sq mi
- 673.5 acres of parkland
Kansas City Property Values

- Far Suburban
- West Central
- Large Central City
- Underperformance
Kansas City, MO—December 2019

Market Value & Parks

- **Geographic Fragmentation**
  - **Economic/Health/Environmental Effects**
  - **North/South Fragmentation**
    - **Missouri River** (Natural Boundary)
      - **Forcing:** Suburban Growth
      - **Opportunity:** Park Connectivity Options
  - **East/West Fragmentation**
    - **Blue River** (Natural Boundary)
      - **Forcing:** Central/South Fragmentation
      - **Opportunity:** Park Connectivity Options
    - **Troost Ave.** (Manmade Boundary)
      - **Forcing:** Under-development
      - **Opportunity:** Park Connectivity Options

Source: TRF 2017; Abraham, D 2019
Market Value & Parks

- **Market Impact:** Access to Grocery Stores
- **Health Impact:** Access to Parks
- **Public Services:** Access to Libraries

*Source: TRF 2017; Abraham, D 2019*
Recommendations for Success:
The Vision and Goals should drive the metrics

Metrics from Parks Masterplan 2015

▪ Neighborhood Parks
  ▪ 4 acres per 1,000 people

▪ Community Parks
  ▪ 7 acres per 1,000 people

▪ Regional Parks
  ▪ 15 acres per 1,000 people

▪ Preserves & Greenways
  ▪ 2 acres per 1,000 people

▪ Trails
  ▪ 0.75 miles per 1,000 people

Best Practices/Goals for Success

▪ Site Context
  ▪ Protect farmland
  ▪ Floodplain functions
  ▪ Conserve habitats for threatened & endangered species
  ▪ Locate future parks along with mixed use developments

▪ Soil & Vegetation
  ▪ Implement xeriscaping
  ▪ Alternative landscaping including forestry

▪ Human Health & Well-being
  ▪ Maximize accessibility

▪ Operations & Maintenance
  ▪ Reuse opportunities for trimmings
  ▪ Implement efficient irrigation
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Historical Context

Over 100 years of Kansas City’s parks and boulevards system practices—and other municipal land use practices and policies—have contributed to concentrations of poverty in the urban core and the simultaneous hollowing out of the core due to “suburban sprawl” within the city boundary.
Timeline of Land Use Policies That Contributed to Inequity in Parks System

1877 - Kansas City acquired first park land
1892 - Charter approved for park board to condemn land
1895 - Park board established
1906 - Acquisition of land for parks begins
1907 - Racial steering began in Kansas City (1920s)
1918 - Missouri Supreme Court upholds restrictive covenants
1920 - HOA established to use parks and boulevards in Kansas City as buffers (1920s)
1930 - Federal Home Loan Act
1932 - FHA approves 77,000 homes in Kansas City. Only 1% mortgages of black families (1934 through 1962)
1940 - FHA supports racial restrictions
1948 - 1,243 racial covenants in Kansas City (1948 through 1960)
1960 - Northern annexation (1960s - 2000s)
1962 - Parks City State Federal
Timeline of Land Use Policies That Contributed to Inequity in Parks System

Federal Home Loan Bank Residential Security Map: 1940
“Redlining Map”
Timeline of Land Use Policies That Contributed to Inequity in Parks System
Timeline of Land Use Policies That Contributed to Inequity in Parks System
Timeline of Land Use Policies That Contributed to Inequity in Parks System

Concentrations of carless households are found in urban communities of color as well as at the region’s periphery.

61. Percent of Households Without a Vehicle by Census Tract and High People-of-Color Tracts, 2006-2010

- Less than 1%
- 1% to 2%
- 3% to 5%
- 6% to 11%
- 12% or more

60% or more people of color
Timeline of Land Use Policies That Contributed to Inequity in Parks System
Timeline of Land Use Policies That Contributed to Inequity in Parks System
Existing Conditions

- Top down decision-making
- Past racist housing practices and policies = harm to residents
- Disparate:
  - Health
  - Education
  - Employment
  - Land use + maintenance
  - Community development

- Expanded municipal footprint transferred municipal revenues from the urban core to expenditures north of the river
- Municipal resource transfer from the urban core to the outer fringe produced fewer benefits for those restricted to the urban core by “racial steering”
Recommendations: Bottom-up decision-making via community engagement

- Focus on social equity first
- Work directly with residents to create a shared definition of equitable planning and equitable development
- Racial equity assessment/audit of your internal policies and practices
- KC Parks staff and board address challenges and opportunities that emerge from assessment
- Find KC Parks staff and commission champions for this work
- Work with community residents and other stakeholders to create an anti-displacement strategy
- Residents are park assets
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Maximizing Resources

Limitations on Resource Allocation Highlight Equity Issues

- There is a looming financial cliff due to competition for KC Parks’ key funding source and growing O&M needs tied to a sprawling park asset inventory.

- The agency has identified nearly $60M in deferred maintenance while continuing to fund new infrastructure and growth in the Northlands.

- KC Parks is ranked 32nd on the Trust for Public Land’s ParkScore with high marks for acreage and investment on a per capita basis.
  - National Average: $87
  - Kansas City, MO: $126.70

- Lower population density has diluted the benefit and minimizes the investment impact.

- The ½ cent sales tax does provide a stable funding source but is competing with other services (i.e., public safety).
Maximizing Resources

Changes in Citywide Resource Allocation Processes

- Finance Department is implementing citywide priority-based budgeting to enhance citywide financial sustainability, planning, reform, and resiliency
- Make public the increased and ongoing maintenance, insurance, utility and personnel costs
  - **Recommendation** – Fiscal notes, presented by the Finance Director and prepared with the input of the KC Parks Director, should be included as part of the capital budget
- Implement a more collaborative, citywide capital budgeting process to better coordinate the citywide capital improvement plan (CIP)
  - **Recommendation** – Initiate a Capital Review Team
  - **Recommendation** – Transfer KC Parks street maintenance capital needs to DPW
Maximizing Resources

Rescope Park Facilities to Improve Financial Performance

- Restructure Golf Operations to maximize net revenue
  - Operation breaks even and the rounds played are constant
  - Coverage is uneven, with geographic redundancy, which allows the possibility of closing up to 2 facilities
- Recommendation – Reposition the Heart of America Golf Course
  - Save $200,000 in maintenance costs and generate lease income
  - Build green infrastructure with Overflow Control Program funds
  - Relocate First Tee to Swope Memorial
  - Lease a portion of the course to a golf-oriented entertainment operator (e.g., Top Golf, Drive Shack)
- Recommendation – Close either Shoal Creek or Hodge Park Golf Course
  - Courses are adjacent to one another, and there is limited competition for high-quality municipal golf
  - Decommission one of the courses for redevelopment

Case Study: Rogell Golf Course (Detroit, MI)

- Former 120-acre golf course, traversed by the Rouge River, with a significant portion in the floodplain and flooding issues in the surrounding neighborhoods
- Worked with the community on long-term vision for the site that includes new and restored wetlands, active and passive open space, and areas reserved for future development
Maximizing Resources

Harmonizing Development and Infrastructure Investment Policy

- There is tension between investing in facilities in support of new development in the Northlands and focusing limited resources to improve and maintain existing assets. The capital budget explicitly reinforces this practice by stating:

  “Funding decisions are based on.........demographic growth patterns, with an additional effort made to complete projects begun in previous years.”

  “Improvements outside of the central city have been targeted at key infrastructure links which experience substantial growth, and attention will continue to be given to meeting the developing needs of these areas.”
Maximizing Resources

Coordinated Planning for Maximum Impact

- City lacks cohesive framework for directing future growth
- Limits ability to leverage
- Opportunity for more coordination among area plans, capital improvements, departmental plans, and regulations
- Limited resources are stretched thin geographically, diluting their impact
- Aligning and layering investment to produce results: Detroit’s Strategic Neighborhood Fund
Maximizing Resources

Layering Park and Other Investment

- Value of parks to strong healthy neighborhoods
- Potential for parks to be catalytic and serve as foundation for additional growth
- Using citywide strategy and target investment areas as a starting point for driving park-adjacent development
  - Need for partners outside of KC Parks to help drive success
- Housing as a complementary use
  - Where are the City and partners investing in new and rehabbed housing?
  - Where are infill opportunities on publicly-controlled parcels near parks?
Maximizing Resources
Using KC Parks and City Assets Strategically

- 9% of land area for parks
- Highest and best use – feasibility and desirability of selling land
  - Revenue generation
  - Practical challenges
  - Demand and market conditions
- Close review of land inventory – what is serving its purpose and worthy of limited resources, and what is not?
- Creative thinking about serving need and adding value
Maximizing Resources
Past and Current Practices in Parkland Dedication

- Tension between supporting growing Northland and sustaining existing system
- Northern development pattern dependent on private developers and subdivision regulations
  - Dedicate land for public parks, with certain standards
  - Provide private facilities
  - Make payment in lieu
- Practices have resulted in KC Parks assuming responsibility for what functions as private open space, instead of land or funding for true recreational amenities
- Example: Northeast Shoal Creek
Maximizing Resources
Making Better Use of Dedications and Impact Fees
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Governance Principles

In order to meet equitable development outcomes, the processes and structure that organize the park will need to be organized around the following principles that center the community in decision-making:

- Consider parks as civic infrastructure platforms activated by programming and leading to more equitable and engaged communities.
- Build upon, strengthen, and coordinate diverse leadership and participation.
- Create more equitable neighborhoods.
- Convene partners and coordinate investment for maximum impact.
Current Structure

- The governance and responsibility for the KC Park System is centralized under the Park Commissioners. This limits collaboration and the ability to access outside sources of capital. It also does not provide a feedback loop between residents and decision-makers.

Types of Capital Available:
- City Capital Fund
- Sales Tax
- Fee-for-Service
- Philanthropy
- Corporate Sponsorships
- Foundations
- Revenue Generation
- Neighborhood Knowledge
- Local Relationships
- Cultural Competency

To be Responsible for:
- Operate
- Maintain
- Improvements
- Program
- Engage
- Market & Communicate
- Fundraise

At the following Assets:
- Parks
- Boulevards
- Museums & Monuments
- Program
- Trail Network
Relationship Diagram

This panel proposes that effectively engaging residents in their park system and achieving equitable outcomes will require the creation of new entities that can bring addition financial and social capital to the park system: The Conservancy and Neighborhood Park Friends Network.
Proposed Structure

Park Friends Groups and a Conservancy both bring new pools of capital to the city parks—just in different forms. Park Friends exist to ensure that communities who may be disconnected from sources of financial or political capital are able see meaningful investment in their public assets. It also ensures that that feedback loop between residents and decision-makers is closed or erased. The Conservancy and City gain meaningful guidance and ground-level partnership on the allocation of resources.

Types of Capital Available:
- City Capital Fund
- Sales Tax
- Fee for Service
- Philanthropy
- Corporate Sponsorships
- Foundations
- Revenue Generation
- Neighborhood Knowledge
- Local Relationships
- Cultural Competency

To be Responsible for:
- Operate
- Maintain
- Improve
- Fundraise
- Organize Neighbors
- Plan and Prioritize Capital Improvements
- Program & Activate

At the following Assets:
- Parks
- Parkways
- Boulevards
- Museums & Monuments
- Program Trail Network
Governance Recommendations

- Separate cultural institutions from the park system
- Separate trail maintenance and the completion of the MetroGreen Plan from the park system
- Establish a Conservancy that equitably builds community citywide while concentrating its place-making functions in the historic core of the Kessler system
- Build a network of Park Friends groups and integrate into decision-making and prioritization of resources
- The Conservancy should establish an endowment policy for all projects in which it participates
- Activate the park through convening partnerships with service providers who deliver programs as part of their core mission
- Establish a Park Equity Fund administered by the Conservancy to facilitate the priorities and projects of the Park Friends Network and measure progress towards equitable park development
Existing Context
Historical Context
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Design Guidelines

Park Typologies

- Relevance of Existing Facilities
- Universal Level of Service
  - Inclusive, Safe, Accessible, Sustainable
- Maintenance Costs
  - Lowest Density – Lowest Cost per Acre
    - Native/Conservation
    - Responsible Development
    - Regional Open Spaces
  - Urban Core – Highest Cost per Acre
    - Civic Gathering Spaces
    - Pocket Parks/Urban Plazas
Case Study
Swope Park | Heart of America Golf Course

- Consolidate existing golf program within Swope Park
- Blue River Floodplain & Floodway
- +/- 200 acres of opportunity

FEMA FLOODPLAIN
100-YEAR REGULATORY FLOODPLAIN
FEMA FLOODPLAIN
FLOODWAY
MATURE VEGETATION & >15% SLOPES
Case Study
Swope Park | Heart of America Golf Course

- Green Stormwater Infrastructure Opportunity
- Habitat Restoration
- Partnership Opportunity with MDC, Nature Center, DNR, etc.
- Fiscal Benefit
  - Reduction in maintenance
  - Lease opportunity to 3rd party revenue generator
  - Partner with other agencies for shared costs for implementation and ongoing maintenance
Case Study
Northland | Development Pattern

- Coordinate with City Planning and Development and area planning efforts to concentrate new development around community activity centers and restrict sprawl, encourage density, and incentivize development and investment in existing urban core
- Evaluate realistic growth projections and necessary housing stock
- Refine and enforce development requirements for parkland and impact fees to support parks & rec in delivering quality parks
Case Study
Independence Plaza Park Development

- **Increased Tree Canopy**
  - Plant trees to plan for succession and biodiversity. Increase shade, seasonal interest, and reduce heat-island effect.

- **New Park Sign**
  - Signage with info on Friends Group paid by re-grant.

- **Market Ready Lot**
  - With value-capture potential.

- **Affordable Housing**
  - Multi-family, mixed-income housing incentivized by city.

- **MRS. THOMAS / Neighborhood Leader**
  - Friend of the park lives here.

- **New Restrooms/Shelter**
  - Community planned and designed with neighborhood and funded by campaign.

- **Improved Play Lawns**
  - Flexible green space that supports active and passive recreation.

- **Natural Area**
  - Lower maintenance zone.
  - Green Stormwater Infrastructure.
  - Increased biodiversity.

- **Accessibility**
  - Remove park barriers such as perimeter fences and increase accessible paths.

- **Green Stormwater Infrastructure**
  - Underground stormwater management in partnership with water department and improved conditions for street tree planting.

- **Parking Protected Bike Lane**
  - Coordinate with public works.

- **Rain Garden/BMP**
  - Funded by water department.

- **Metered Parking**
  - Revenue to park on boulevards to contribute to Parks and Recreation budget.

- **Curb Bump Outs**
  - Extended curbs to protected cyclist and parked vehicles and shorten crosswalks.
Key Recommendations

- Internally develop intergovernmental clarity on mission
- Develop a process to create strong partnerships with philanthropy, corporate, and community partners for Friends of Parks groups and a citywide conservancy
- Reexamine planning and zoning regulations as well as investment incentives to develop mixed use, high-quality, denser development near park edges
Thank You

http://www.uli.org/advisoryservices
### Key Recommendations

**Bottom-up decision-making via community engagement**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Focus on social equity first</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work directly with residents to create a shared definition of equitable planning and equitable development</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial equity assessment/audit of your internal policies and practices</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KC Parks staff and board address challenges and opportunities the emerge from assessment</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Find your KC Parks staff and commission champions for this work</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work with community residents, and other stakeholder to create an anti-displacement strategy</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residents are park assets</td>
<td>ST, MT, LT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ST=Short-term  MT=Medium-term  LT=Long-term*
### Key Recommendations

#### Maximizing Revenues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fiscal notes, detailing operating budget impacts, included in capital budget</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initiate Capital Review Team</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfer KC Parks street maintenance responsibilities to DPW</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reposition Heart of America Golf Course</td>
<td>MT/LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Close either Shoal Creek or Hodge Park Golf Course</td>
<td>MT/LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Create citywide strategy to direct growth and coordinate/maximize investment</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore opportunities to combine investment in neighborhood parks with adjacent housing, especially on parcels controlled by public agencies and committed non-profit partners, and in alignment with existing housing programs</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate land inventory to ensure holdings are supporting KC Parks mission</td>
<td>ST/MT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ST=Short-term   MT=Medium-term   LT=Long-term
## Key Recommendations

### Maximizing Revenues: Dedication and Impact Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Take a stronger position in these negotiations to ensure each development is providing bona fide park opportunities rather than further encumbering the park system with limited public benefit</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provision of private recreational amenities to serve a single subdivision should not be permitted as a substitute to contributing to the broader system. Those residents will also be able to use more regional facilities and trails (not to mention the parkways and boulevards under KC Parks’ jurisdiction), even if they rely less on traditional neighborhood parks</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payments-in-lieu should be unrestricted for use by KC Parks for the acquisition, development, or improvement of a public park wherever the greatest need exists, rather than limiting to a certain geography</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ST=Short-term   MT=Medium-term   LT=Long-term
## Key Recommendations

### Assets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with City Planning and Development and Area Planning efforts to concentrate new development around community activity centers and restrict sprawl, encourage density, and incentivize development and investment in existing urban core</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evaluate realistic growth projections and necessary housing stock to support quality parks and recreation amenities</td>
<td>ST</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refine and enforce development requirements for parkland and impact fees to support parks &amp; rec in delivering quality parks</td>
<td>ST/MT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ST=Short-term  MT=Medium-term  LT=Long-term
# Key Recommendations

## Governance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>What</th>
<th>When</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Separate cultural institutions, trail maintenance, and the completion of the Metro Green Plan from the park system</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a conservancy that equitably <em>builds community</em> citywide while concentrating its <em>place-making</em> functions in the historic core of the Kessler system</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Build a network of Park Friends Groups and integrate into decision-making and prioritization of resources</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Conservancy should establish an endowment policy for all projects in which it participates</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activate the park through convening partnerships with service providers who deliver programs as part of their core mission</td>
<td>MT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish a Park Equity Fund administered by the Conservancy to facilitate the priorities and projects of the Park Friends Network and measure progress toward equitable park development</td>
<td>LT</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ST=Short-term   MT=Medium-term   LT=Long-term*